

## Draft for discussion purposes only

### Federal Agency Wednesday Check-in Call February 27, 2019

#### Good News:

1. BiOp peer reviews are being planned and look like they will work within NMFS contracting arrangements with John Ferguson's group. Agencies are proposing names reviewers. Next steps are to develop questions. On schedule.
2. Biological modeling is progressing well and the various efforts are on schedule.

#### Complete:

- DSM2 results
- CalSimII results
- Temperature results
- Egg mortality results
- Delta Passage Model
- IOS
- CVPIA SIT Survival

#### Forthcoming and on track:

- WR LCM
  - Upper Sac Temperature and Egg Mortality Modeling
  - Salvage-Density Method
  - DSM2-HYDRO Analysis
  - Recon on Salim, SALMOD, IFIM, Rec Mortality Model: Please let us know an ETA for this recon
3. NMFS and USFWS finished their review of the BA, provided comments and held meetings to go over priority comments on the BA on February 21 and 22. The meetings were productive and covered a surprising amount of ground in a short amount of time.

Several focus-group meetings were scheduled during the BA review meetings to discuss and clarify certain topics and allow for additional discussion to try and resolve priority matters.

Follow up focus-group meetings include:

- Fall X2 and food subsidy PA components (*Monday 2/25*)
- Adaptive Management (*Wednesday, 2/27*)
- Seasonal Storage Management and Allocations Logic (*Tuesday, 3/5*)
- Risk Assessment (*TBD*)
- Predator Control in Clifton Court Forebay (*TBD*)
- Division focus groups
  - Trinity (*Thursday, 2/28*)
  - Shasta Temperature Management and HEC-5Q modeling (*Tuesday 3/5*)
  - Clear Creek (*Tuesday, 2/26*)
  - Feather/American (*Tuesday, 2/26*)
  - Delta (*Thursday, 2/28*)
  - Stanislaus (*Monday*)

-

## Draft for discussion purposes only

### Concerns:

Consultation topics currently recommended to elevate to the March 8 3-agency Directors meeting:

#### 1. COA

- This is a very sensitive topic.
- NMFS concern is that the COA is so embedded into operations that it should be a clear part of the consultation. NMFS experience is that the COA has restricted operational flexibility to manage Shasta releases in the past.
- Reclamation's position is that the COA is signed and they have met their ESA Section 7 obligations with a No-Effect determination and that it is not up for further discussion.

#### 2. Operations of Shasta Dam Raise

- Reclamation would like to cover it as a site-specific, core operations action relying on a project description and analysis from the 2012 Feasibility Study. Not having it in at all poses challenges from leadership in DC. Want to figure something out.
- NMFS believes there is not sufficient information regarding the details of the proposed action or the effects analysis for a site-specific or programmatic consultation.
- FWS wants yellow-billed cuckoo supplemental information to support but does not feel this is an elevation topic.

#### 3. Fish Passage Program

- Reclamation has not proposed this as part of the proposed action. Part of Reclamation's position is that this action is part of the recovery plan and reclamation is not responsible for recovery of the species.
- NMFS believes this action would provide water supply benefits downstream of Shasta, particularly in dry and critically dry years. The Fish Passage Program also was an important RPA action in the NMFS 2009 BiOp for winter-run effects.

#### 4. Consultation status of Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP, a.k.a. "Trinity ROD flows") and Lower Klamath flow augmentation.

- Trinity ROD and Lower Klamath fall flows are described and modeled in the BA but listed as Not Being Consulted On because they are covered by existing BiOps.
- NMFS position is that the TRRP BiOp is outdated and requires reinitiation.

Consultation topics currently being discussed at upcoming focus meetings but likely will be recommended to elevate to the March 8, 3-agency Directors meeting:

#### 1. Adaptive Management Process

- NMFS and USFWS do not believe that the Adaptive Management program described in the BA is sufficient to meet the standard of providing reasonable certainty to subject actions or their outcomes.
- NMFS and USFWS believe that the 5-agency Adaptive Management Framework (AMF) developed during CWF was developed with the understanding that it would be applied not just to CWF but the future reinitiation of CVP/SWP consultation.

## **Draft for discussion purposes only**

- Reclamation maintains that they have not signed the CWF ROD and do not plan to adopt the 5-agency AMF for this consultation.

### **2. Seasonal Operations:**

- NMFS and USFWS do not have a clear understanding of how allocations Reclamation's shortage policy fit into fishery protections. They are concerned that allocation decisions may be made before fishery protections are fully considered.
- Reclamation maintains that allocation decisions are made after all other environmental commitments are taken into account and not the other way around.

### **3. OMR Management**

- The PA includes new OMR fish triggers for salmon and steelhead. NMFS does not necessarily disagree, in theory, with the proposed metrics, but existing monitoring programs are not in place to measure the triggers for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead. Reclamation is not proposing to fund or implement new programs to support the triggers.
- There is language in the PA regarding a Director-level option to offramp real-time OMR restrictions (see short para at bottom of p. 4-54 to top of 4-55). USFWS working on draft alternative language.

### **4. Risk Assessments**

- There are a number of places in the BA where "risk assessments" are being proposed to determine if species risk thresholds are being exceeded. NMFS is unclear how what the risk assessment metrics are and how they will be used to make decision.

### **5. Fall X2**

- Lack of specificity for target to maintain fall habitat for Delta smelt.
- NMFS has some concern about where the water would come from.
- Reclamation wants to define some salinity levels to go with Suisun gate operations and fall action

### **6. I:E Ratio**

- NMFS concerned that the proposed action does not include a suitable replacement for April/May San Joaquin steelhead protections.
- Delta focus group to discuss the extent that OMR criteria offer a suitable replacement.