

CALFED Interagency Fish Facilities Technical Team

Comments on Meeting Minutes
from
June 16, 1998 Meeting

I agree with the minutes that were E-mailed to me except as noted below. I also have some general comments about the Fish Facilities Technical Team meetings. These are:

- After such a long time since the last meeting, it would have been good to make this a two-day meeting. The first day would consist of presentations of the alternatives and the second would be discussion of the questions. I found it difficult to get up to speed and have anything meaningful to say in the one day meeting.
- A change in format would make it more efficient. The first part of the meeting would be presentations and the second part would be discussion by the committee members. I thought the committee members spent too much time listening to various groups making sales pitches for their own agendas. More factual presentations of the information would have been more beneficial.

South Delta

Q1 How would we stage the construction of a new south Delta fish screen complex?

I think that the minutes are not quite correct here. The consensus was that an operational screen facility should be built at some even fraction of the full buildout. For example, a 2,500 cfs facility could be built so that a second facility built later would provide a 5,000 cfs total or 5 more increments would provide the full 15,000 cfs. This facility would be built with the capability of evaluating its performance and performing other tests.

A full research facility at Tracy would have the disadvantages of not being in the most likely location of the full facility at the north end of Clifton Court Forebay (CCF). In addition, if it is decided later that all future screens should be at CCF, the research screens would be a lost investment. However, I think it is more likely that there will be screens at CCF.

The facility should also be a joint effort between the state and USBR. This would provide training and first hand information to personnel from both agencies. Since they both might have to maintain a joint facility setup the working relationship.

Flexibility - There would be little or no gained flexibility from separate facilities since the screens will most likely be in several V-screen modules which can be closed off. The only flexibility would be in the use of different conveyance facilities in the south delta.

North Delta

For getting fish around the Alternative 2 pump station and screens, I thought the group concluded that a ladder could also be used for striped bass.

Why does the McCormack-Williamson Tract have to be flooded? Can't we just have a conveyance through it?

A major issue that should be investigated is: What effect will this have on the downstream migrants out of the Mokelumne River.

In 15) on the second page of minutes, "...risk is much higher in designing effective screens in the South Delta...", the risk is twofold: 1) operationally it is much more difficult to operate (debris, aquatic plants, etc.); 2) survival of Sacramento River salmonids would be less likely.

Something that was left out was the comments on staging from Alternative 2 to 3 at a later date. To change from Alt. 2 to 3 at a later date the following would have to be done: new pump station (more head is needed), new conveyance, Mokelumne River and other crossings required. Items that could be used by both alternatives are: fish screens, part of conveyance, gate structures at the screens. Items that would be lost are most of the conveyance to the McCormack-Williamson Tract and set back levees below the Tract.

D - 0 6 0 8 8 4

D-060884