

Call: noon to 1pm 2/26/19

Questions on Feather Division elements of the 2019 ROConLTO BA

1. *(Medium priority)* Is it correct that Feather River operations are modeled the same in the COS and PA? **Resolution during call:** *Yes.*
2. *(Medium priority)* Is it correct that modeled Feather River operations are based on the BiOp associated with the current license, and thus not the most recent BiOp (related to the proceeding for which the FERC license has not yet been issued)? **Resolution during call:** *Reclamation to confirm.*
3. *(from CDFW)* How was the extension of the water transfer from July-September to July-November modeled, and could there be changes in Feather River releases because of that? The extension of the transfer window could result in flow changes in tributaries such as the Feather River during fall-run Chinook spawning. **Resolution during call:** *The BA didn't model any water transfers in the PA because of uncertainty about where the water would come from. However, Reclamation did post-process modeling results to assess capacity at Delta export facilities (and thus the potential timing and volume of additional transfers) under the PA. The effects analysis talks about the timing and quantity of potential increase in transfers which was estimated to be ~50 TAF more Delta exports in October and November.*
4. *(from CDFW)* Will the relevant parties seek approval from the SWRCB for transfers? **Resolution during call:** *BA is focused on ESA compliance and doesn't address other regulatory processes.*

Questions on American Division elements of the 2019 ROConLTO BA

5. *(High priority)* Can Reclamation send us the "2017 Flow Management Standard"? **Resolution during call:** *Yes, Reclamation will send.*
6. *(High priority)* Is it correct that Reclamation is committing to all elements of the "2017 Flow Management Standard" except for the carryover storage targets? **Resolution during call:** *Yes. Reclamation will use a "planning minimum" in lieu of the carryover storage target, but no commitment to any specific planning minimum.*
7. *(High priority)* Related to the "planning minimum", on p. 4-40, the BA says "Reclamation proposes to work together with the American River Stakeholders to define an appropriate amount of storage in Folsom

*Reservoir... ”. Does that include NMFS, FWS, and CDFW? **Resolution during call:** Reclamation will check on whether the fish agencies are included in “American River Stakeholders”.*

8. *(High priority) How was the “planning minimum” incorporated in the CALSIM modeling? **Resolution during call:** Reclamation modeled the “planning minimum” in the PA as an end-of-September 275 TAF storage target.*
9. *(High priority) If Reclamation commits to a “planning minimum” rather than the storage targets in the “2017 Flow Management Standard”, how does that change the feasibility of the flow/temperature schedules in the “2017 Flow Management Standard”? **Resolution during call:** NMFS should review the flow/temp outputs for the PA scenario in Appendix D for projected flows/temps under the PA. Flow/temp outputs projected within 2017 Flow Management Standard may not be applicable given the use of a “planning minimum” and other changes in the PA.*
10. *Is Reclamation proposing anything within the 2009 RPA (e.g. structural improvements, ramping protocols to reduce stranding)? If so, what are they? **Resolution during call:** Redd dewatering and ramping rates proposed in “Seasonal operations” on p. 4-41. In general, if not listed explicitly in the PA, not proposed.*
11. *Redd dewatering flows (and habitat assessments) are based on assumption that flow/inundation relationship is static; but the channel changes. Is there a component to adjust minimum flow standards to accommodate changing channel morphology? **Resolution during call:** Reclamation doesn’t believe the 2017 FMS has that sort of component. CDFW noted that FMS flows may be less protective than originally thought after, for example, the high 2017 flows. FMS flows may need adjustment over time to cover this.*
12. *Is it correct that the Nimbus Hatchery and associated RPA actions from 2009 BO (including a steelhead HGMP and fall-run hatchery management plan) are not assumed in the baseline and not included in the proposed action? **Resolution during call:** Nimbus Hatchery would continue under PA (see p. 3-21), however no specific commitments about program elements in the BA. Reclamation will check on steelhead HGMP and Fall-run HMP.*