
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2018 7:42 AM
To: barry.thom@noaa.gov
Cc: Maria Rea; garwin.yip@noaa.gov; howard.brown@noaa.gov
Subject: ROC on LTO: Highlights from 11/20/18 "Tiger Team" meeting

Barry --

I just got confirmation that there is NOT a FWS-NMFS call on ROC on LTO this morning. However, I'm forwarding to you notes from Barb regarding the Reclamation "Tiger Team" meeting she attended for most of Tuesday. Of note are :

- Request to sign a non disclosure agreement (which I will send in a followup).
- Request to discuss concerns with the PA early next week rather than later, which I'm not sure we are wholly ready for.
- Potential concerns about what is in the baseline vs. not.
- Explanation of some project components that pair a non-flow action with operational flexibility.

I'm in a bit today and all day Friday to facilitate bridging tasks into next week, but let me know if there's anything specific you'd like me to do or setup in response to this info.

Thanks,
Cathy

Cathy Marcinkevage
California Central Valley Office
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office: (916) 930-5648
Cell: (562) 537-8734
cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov>
Date: November 20, 2018 at 6:49:08 PM PST
To: Maria Rea <maria.rea@noaa.gov>, Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov>, "Howard.Brown" <Howard.Brown@noaa.gov>, Cathy Marcinkevage <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Subject: Highlights from 11/20/18 "Tiger Team" meeting

(Note that I didn't include Barry on this update; please share with him as needed). Note also (see schedule details in e-mail) that **the next all-agency Tiger Team meeting is happening Monday (11/26) afternoon** (think Russ C. said starting at 1pm). Which is short notice and conflicts with the John Watts et al call.

Participants: Staff from all five project and resource agencies, including CDFW. * indicates participation by phone.

Reclamation: Dave Mooney, Katrina Harrison, Josh Israel, Ben Nelson, Armin Halston, Russ Callejo*

FWS: Paul Souza, Dan Castleberry, Jana Affonso, Kaylee Allen*

DWR: Michelle Banonis, Catherine McCalvin, Mike Ford, Harry Spanglet*

CDFW: Carl Wilcox, Brooke Jacobs

DOI Solicitors: Kevin Tanaka* (Sacramento), Lori Caramanian* (D.C.)

ICF: Greg Ellis

Confidentiality: Paul Souza asked that all who have seen/will see the draft Proposed Action, especially the section on COA, sign a confidentiality agreement. This is to protect the "Grand Bargain" discussion (which I gathered was related to COA and the State Board flows discussion -- not sure and I didn't ask for details since I had declined to sign the confidentiality agreement!). I didn't sign anything and offered to leave the meeting; was allowed to stay. Some folks are more concerned about the confidentiality agreement than others -- Paul is VERY concerned that loose lips don't sink the Grand Bargain. Issue may go away mid-December if "Grand Bargain" is reached. Will forward revised confidentiality agreement in separate e-mail.

Feedback:

Asked how Reclamation would like to receive feedback, Russ C. emphasized that Reclamation's preference is to receive live edits done in person by the all-agency Tiger Team. Also welcome are high level comments from Barry and Maria -- specific format not specified.

Schedule highlights:

- Reclamation's internal deadline to put the BA into final review is 12/31/18.
- CALSIM modeling already under way -- any changes to the Proposed Action will have to be analyzed "qualitatively".
- Given the BA deadline, while I did explain that we wouldn't be ready to give feedback until later next week (CDFW also asked for more time)...the "compromise" meeting schedule (Reclamation initially wanted official agency feedback at an all-day Monday meeting) for the All-agency Tiger Team next week is as follows:
 - Monday afternoon (1pm-4pm?) -- Feedback wanted but also time for agencies to ask more questions.
 - Tuesday afternoon (1pm-4pm?) -- Feedback wanted but also time for agencies to ask more questions.
 - All day Wednesday (10am-4pm?) -- Really want agency feedback on significant concerns with the Proposed Action on Wednesday

Stakeholder Outreach: Reclamation's current plan is to have a stakeholder meeting (think with both water users and NGOs, though not sure on this point) the first week of December. Not sure how much of the Proposed Action will be shared.

Big ticket comments on Proposed Action

I will provide all my comments on the Proposed Action as track changes by COB Wednesday, 11/21, for internal discussion -- flagging some of the bigger issues discussed today below. Can cover more at CV call or other call, if time allows.

- Lot of questions about baseline and how CVPIA/EcoRestore/current RPA commitments should be "binned" into baseline vs. proposed action. Reclamation's interpretation seems

to be that if there isn't a contract in place, it can be included in the proposed action since it otherwise isn't certain to occur. This topic has been flagged as needing further discussion, and (whatever the final outcome) greater clarification in the BA. **This will be a targeted topic for discussion at the Wednesday Tiger Team meeting.**

- I had interpreted the "Programmatic Adaptive Management" section at the end of the document (which contains many elements of the current RPAs or other commitments related to CVPIA and EcoRestore) as a grab-bag of ambiguous commitments to pursue non-flow actions that would mitigate for some of the operational changes in the proposed action. NOT CORRECT. Katrina explained (and the document does too, I just didn't read it closely enough) that each action that will be further consulted on is **expected to be presented as a paired non-flow/operational flexibility combo**. So, for Reclamation to pursue the proposed DCC improvements, it needs to be associated with additional OMR flexibility. For Reclamation to accelerate Battle Creek Restoration, it needs to be associated with relaxed temperature management on the mainstem Sacramento River. The fish agencies' cagey prelim responses tended to consternation. **This will be a targeted topic for discussion at the Wednesday Tiger Team meeting.**
- Some key elements of the Proposed Action (e.g. proposed changes to Shasta Temp Management) are not included in the modeling; others (e.g. OMR management) are included in a coarse "sideboard" manner.
 - **BIG RED FLAG:** Without supplemental CALSIM modeling (perhaps in the BiOp phase given timeline constraints) that captures the proposed Shasta ops temp management changes, the WR-LCM results will be of very limited use, since the CALSIM input (and thus the LCM results) will not look different in that regard compared to the "current ops" scenario, despite significant 'real world' impacts. I expressed this concern and CDFW seconded it. Paul Souza, however, seemed to have concerns about setting up "competing models".
- Reclamation's commitment to implement D-1641 DOES NOT INCLUDE the Table 3 Vernalis spring pulse flows.
- I:E ratio replaced by a steelhead loss trigger. We'll need to evaluate for our species; CDFW expressed concerns that the associated loss in spring outflow would be a concern for longfin smelt.
- Asked how that "I:E ratio alternative" conformed with the April-May OMR flows in CWF, Katrina clarified that the timeframe for the BA is 2030, and so not anticipated to cover post-tunnel operations when those CWF OMR ops would kick in.

Barb

--

Barb Byrne

Fish Biologist

NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

Office: 916-930-5612

barbara.byrne@noaa.gov

California Central Valley Office

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814



Find us online

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

