

Fishery Resources



Memorandum

Date: January 20, 1998

To: CALFED Policy Group

From: Lester A. Snow *snaron*
Executive Director

Subject: Analysis of the Impacts of CALFED Alternatives on Fisheries Resources

Summary

The attached paper describes the evaluation of impacts of the Alternatives for three specific distinguishing characteristics (diversion effects on fisheries, Delta flow circulation, and brackish water habitat) relating directly to fishery resources. For each Alternative, the impacts of the common programs and conveyance components are evaluated by fishery species groups. The overall impacts of each Alternatives is accumulated and displayed for the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

This is the second draft of this document and was revised based on comments received from staff at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Water Resources, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. This version of the document reflects the integration of these comments and resolution of conflicting issues to the best of our ability.

The following list represents outstanding issues and/or areas of conflict that we have been unable to resolve. Some of these issues may be addressed prior to releasing the Phase II document, however, some will require further analysis and should be addressed as part of the issue resolution process between the draft and final EIS/EIR. We will present and discuss some these issues at the upcoming Policy Group meeting.

- Is the valuation detailed enough to show the impacts of the alternative components on each species?

CALFED Agencies

California The Resources Agency
Department of Fish and Game
Department of Water Resources
California Environmental Protection Agency
State Water Resources Control Board

Federal Environmental Protection Agency
Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Department of Commerce
National Marine Fisheries Service

- Have the impacts been accumulated to represent a valid summary of the Alternatives overall ranking for the distinguishing characteristics?
- Can we make these general assessments without detailed data such as provided by flow tracking models etc.? Are average mean flow directions for critical periods adequate for displaying the Alternative differences for flow circulation?
- Is it better to screen the salmon to stay in the river or allow them to enter the central Delta to take advantage of the new ERPP habitat?
- In Alternative 2, what is the risk associated with upstream passage over the pumps and screens for different species? Should we leave the through Delta conveyance in Alternative 2 unscreened?
- For chinook salmon, do you derive greater benefits from ERPP actions in the rivers than actions in the Delta?
- Is using the average X2 location for many years adequate to assess the impacts of the location of X2 on fisheries or is detailed data by year type and Delta location needed?

Action Item

This agenda item is for discussion - no decision is anticipated.