

Questions on Trinity Division elements of the 2019 ROConLTO BA

1. How will Trinity Reservoir end of September storage will be maintained? How will the reservoir be managed during successive drought years? **Resolution during call:** *No end-of-September storage targets in the BA; reservoir managed the way it is now.*
2. No description of cold water pool management -- how will water temperature objectives in the Trinity River be complied with? **Resolution during call:** *BA doesn't include any new compliance measures; management under PA will be same as current operations.*
3. UKTR chinook salmon not included in SRKW analysis. Can SSS (stream salmonid simulator) chinook population modeling for Trinity or lower Klamath be conducted to determine effects of the action on Chinook salmon production? Effects to SRKW from TRD operation cannot be determined without this. **Resolution during call:** *Justin and Seth has been in discussion with Nick Som (FWS) about getting SSS results. Results likely not available until end of March at best.*
4. No temperature modeling for compliance locations. Only Lewiston temp modeling provided. Lesiston is not a compliance point, nor does it provide insight into rearing habitat or adult migration conditions in the river. Can results of temperature modeling at Douglas City and North Fork-Helena be provided? **Resolution during call:** *Reclamation will provide temperature results for those or nearby locations.*
5. No habitat modeling or fish production modeling for SONCC coho salmon. Without one or the other can't estimate population effects and associate the proposed action with effects to the species, or use habitat as a surrogate. Can some sort of habitat modeling be provided? **Resolution during call:** *Reclamation looking into options.*
6. Humboldt County's no less than 50,000 AF of water contract is briefly acknowledged in the proposed action section. Does the proposed action incorporate the county's water contract? Does the CalSim modeling incorporate the water contract? **Resolution during call:** *Humboldt County's water contract is part of the PA, but not incorporated in the CALSIM modeling.*
7. Lower Klamath fall augmentation flows in the PA, but NCO. A programmatic BiOp has been done but no take authorized. **Resolution during call:** *Reclamation will change this project component from "NCO" to "Site-specific" and "Core" in Table 4-6. The group agreed that Reclamation doesn't need to provide additional effects analysis since the flows are already included in the modeling. NMFS California Coastal Office staff will conduct the effects analysis in the BiOp.*
8. No climate change scenarios modeled or discussed or the likely combined effects of the action and the effects of climate change or how their effects might compound threats to

species. **Resolution during call:** All modeling uses the ELT Q5 climate change scenario, which includes 15 cm of sea level rise and represents projected Year 2030 climate conditions. See some key page refs, below.

Chapter 3 of BA (Environmental Baseline):

- p. 3-17: "...the operational model (CalSim) was run using the standard hydrologic period of record (1922-2003) and projected climate,..."

Appendix D (Modeling):

No page numbers in Appendix D, so page references are to the page of the PDF file

- PDF page 8 (in Attachment 2-1, Section 1): The three scenarios (Without Action, Current Operations, and Proposed Action) "evaluate the impacts of different project operations at projected Year 2030 climate conditions....Section 5 describes the assumptions used for Year 2030 climate conditions...."
- PDF page 42-43 (in Attachment 2-1, Section 5): Section 5 is "Planning Horizon - Year 2030 Climate Condition"

9. No Chinook salmon habitat modeling to estimate effects to habitat for MSA. **Resolution during call:** Reclamation looking into options.