

**From:** Steve Ford <sford@water.ca.gov>  
**To:** TSB\_DOMAIN.TSB\_PO(DODENWEL)  
**Date:** 8/14/98 12:48pm  
**Subject:** Re: Input!

>>Following are my comments/rankings of Kevin's proposals.

>>

>>I had to leave the meeting before the treadmill and Tracy discussions, but  
 >>have attached Ted's summaries of them as Word (RankingIEPFF1.doc) and  
 Wordperfect 5.0 (RankIEPFF1.doc) files. The adopted workplan reflect where  
 we are on it. However, I also had a pretty good talk with Shawn about your  
 views regarding the importance of the shad tests. I hadn't heard some of  
 the background before and I'll try to bring it to Randy's attention and get  
 back to you about it before next week's meeting. Its my impression that  
 because of the timing of the fish's availability that UCD staff didn't  
 think they could do smelt and shad in the same year. If so, perhaps we  
 could do the smelt as planned and consider the shad next year.

>

>>As for the proposed Tracy work, I don't see much that's likely to be of  
 >>use to CALFED. Very little of the results sound like they'll be  
 >>available in time to affect the initial 5,000 cfs south Delta screen. Some  
 >>might be available to help design of subsequent screen moduals. But it  
 >>sounds like the most of USBR's study results may only be useful for  
 >>post-construction modifications of the CALFED screens. USBR's proposed  
 >>Tracy program seems pretty reasearchy unusually inconsistant with where I  
 thought  
 >>USBR is in the CALFED forum. USBR will go its way, but I suspect that DWR  
 >>management would be a lot more likely to cost-share if it fit better with  
 CALFED's  
 >>likely plans. That doesn't bode well for USBR's proposed program if  
 requires state cost-sharing.

>>

>RANKINGS OF KEVIN'S PROPOSALS

>

>>Determination of pre-screen loss rates at CCF of entrained species  
 >>low to medium priority- At this point, I don't really see how loss  
 estimates of  
 >>these other species are going to be all that much more useful for impact  
 >>assessments or making management decisions than the salvage index of  
 losses that we have been using. If we had estimates of these species  
 populations....  
 >>which would allow us to determine the relative impact of these losses..... I  
 >>would rate it higher.

>>

>>Evaluation of Pre-screen Losses using Wild or Habituated Fish  
 >>Medium - I think using this approach would give us a better estimate of  
 >>actual salmon losses, which could be compared to the population  
 >>estimate to assess overall impact.

>>

>>Effects of Covering Secondary Louvers at Skinner  
 >>High - We've talked about doing this for years, its cheap and has some  
 >>potential benefits for existing facilites and for the design of new ones.

>>

>>Evaluation of Effects of Collection and Transport on Salvaged Fish,  
 >>particularly delta smelt and splittail  
 >>Medium - This info could be useful to improving transport methods and/or  
 >>providing solid info to support modification of existing regulatory  
 >>requirements that aren't as effective as assumed, particularly those for  
 >>delta smelt. Right now seems to be conflicting views that (1) screening  
 and salvage needed and (2) almost none of fish are surviving. Should be  
 coordinated  
 >>with similar USBR studies or let them do it.

>>

>>Effects of Collection of Transport on the Long-Term Survival of Chinook  
>>salmon at the Skinner.  
>>High - Think it could yield useful info on benefits of the salvage  
>>program and potential improvements, but should be coordinated and  
possibly cost-shared with USBR  
>>  
>>Monitoring Predation at salvage release sites  
>>Low - I get the impression that studies of this sort have been done in the  
>>past, I'm uncertain that this one is going to add much. Other things seem  
>>more important at this point.  
>>  
>>  
>>