

**Selected Delta-related references relevant to water project-related effects in the south Delta**

Prepared by Barb Byrne, NMFS California Central Valley Office  
August 2018

*Note:* Takeaway bullets and quotes have been selected as being most relevant to the recently proposed draft Initial Actions in the reinitiation effort related to OMR management or the I:E ratio and do not represent all key conclusions of the citations.

**1) California Department of Water Resources (2014). Stipulation Study: Steelhead Movement and Survival in the South Delta with Adaptive Management of Old and Middle River Flows. Prepared by David Delaney, Paul Bergman, Brad Cavallo, and Jenny Melgo (Cramer Fish Sciences) under the direction of Kevin Clark (DWR). February 2014.**

[http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/announcement/Final\\_Stipulation\\_Study\\_Report\\_7Feb2014.pdf](http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/announcement/Final_Stipulation_Study_Report_7Feb2014.pdf)

*Takeaway Bullet:* I believe that the conclusions drawn in this report are overbroad and only weakly caveated in the report. Analysis focused primarily on junctions with the San Joaquin River rather than on movement behavior within south Delta channels yet draws broad conclusions about effects of OMR in general.

*Quote (p. ES-4):* The statement “Under the OMR flow treatments tested in this study, there appeared to be little influence of OMR flows tested on steelhead tag travel times on the route-level and steelhead tag movement at the junctions and routes examined in this study (p. ES-3)” is technically correct but may be misleading to those not aware that the bulk of the analysis was in the mainstem San Joaquin River route and thus not necessarily applicable to the OMR corridor itself. Despite the limited range of OMR flows, small sample sizes, and focus on conditions in the mainstem San Joaquin River, the executive summary goes on to conclude (in my opinion, improperly) that “There is little evidence that altering OMR flows within the range that we examined in this study would alter fish behavior in a meaningful way”.

*Caveat:* Limitations in the range of OMR conditions tested, changes to OMR within treatment periods, and relatively low power tests should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of the stipulation study. The report reflects the outcomes of the statistical analysis of selected hypotheses at a few locations in the south Delta and, in my opinion, does not support broad conclusions about fish movement in the interior Delta in relation to OMR flows.

**2) del Rosario, R. B., Y. J. Redler, K. Newman, P. L. Brandes, T. Sommer, K. Reece and R. Vincik (2013). "Migration Patterns of Juvenile Winter-run-sized Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) through the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta." San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science 11(1).**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/36d88128>

*Takeaway Bullet:* Winter-run Chinook salmon enter the Delta as early as October in some years and may make their way to the south Delta and be exposed to water-project-related hydrodynamic effects.

*Quote (from abstract):* “Winter-run passed Knights Landing...between October and April, with substantial variation in peak time of entry that was strongly associated with the first high flows of the migration season. Specifically, the first day of flows of at least 400 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> [~14,000 cfs] at Wilkins Slough (rkm 190) coincided with the first day that at least 5% of the annual total catch was observed at Knights Landing. ... Differences in timing of cumulative catch at Knights Landing and Chipps Island indicate that apparent residence time in the Delta ranges from 41 to 117 days, with longer apparent residence times for juveniles arriving earlier at Knights Landing.”

*Caveat:* Juvenile Chinook salmon were identified to race based on the length-at-date classification system, which has some uncertainty, but probably less so in the October and November time-frame when winter-run Chinook are essentially the only young-of-year Chinook run present in the system.

**3) Hankin, D., D. Dauble, J. Pizzimenti, and P. Smith (2010). The Vernalis Adaptive Management Program (VAMP): Report of the 2010 Review Panel. Prepared for the Delta Science Program. May 13, 2010.**

[http://www.sjrg.org/peerreview/review\\_vamp\\_panel\\_report\\_final\\_051110.pdf](http://www.sjrg.org/peerreview/review_vamp_panel_report_final_051110.pdf)

*Takeaway Bullet:* Complex hydrodynamics in the Delta, multiple stressors affecting salmonid survival, and a limited range of experimental conditions limit the inferences possible from the VAMP studies.

*Quotes:*

(p. 9) “Regarding export objectives, our feeling is that it makes sense during VAMP to continue limiting exports to some fraction of San Joaquin River flow at Vernalis so that the entire flow of the San Joaquin River is not diverted and so that reverse flows, if they occur, are not large. We cannot, however, offer any guidance as to what the Vernalis flow/export ratio should be...However, we do not believe that migration through Old River and subsequent salvage trucking and release is a desirable route for downstream migrating smolts. To the maximum extent possible, migration through the mainstem San Joaquin channel should be encouraged.”

(p. 3) “The complexities of Delta hydraulics in a strongly tidal environment, and high and likely highly variable impacts of predation, appear to affect survival rates more than the river flow, by itself, and greatly complicate the assessment of effects of flow on survival rates of smolts. And overlaying these complexities is an apparent strong trend toward reduced survival rates at all flows over the past ten years in the Delta. Nevertheless, the evidence supports a conclusion that increased flows generally have a positive effect on survival and that it is desirable, to the extent feasible, to reduce or eliminate downstream passage through the Old River channel. The panel understands, of course, that flow, exports, and the placement of barriers in the Delta are the variables affecting survival that are most easily managed.”

*Caveat:* See takeaway bullet.

**4) Johnson, R. C., S. Windell, P. L. Brandes, J. L. Conrad, J. Ferguson, P. A. L. Goertler, B. N. Harvey, J. Heublein, J. A. Israel, D. W. Kratville, J. E. Kirsch, R. W. Perry, J.**

**Pisciotta, W. R. Poytress, K. Reece and B. G. Swart (2017). "Science Advancements Key to Increasing Management Value of Life Stage Monitoring Networks for Endangered Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon in California." San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science 15(3).**

<https://doi.org/10.15447/sfews.2017v15iss3art1>

*Takeaway Bullet:* Our ability to evaluate risks to listed salmonids at finer spatial and temporal scales may require changes to our monitoring.

*Quote (from abstract):* “We concluded that the current monitoring network was insufficient to diagnose when (life stage) and where (geographic domain) chronic or episodic reductions in SRWRC cohorts occur, precluding within- and among-year comparisons. ... We identified six system-wide recommended actions to strengthen the value of data generated from the existing monitoring network to assess resource management actions: (1) incorporate genetic run identification; (2) develop juvenile abundance estimates; (3) collect data for life history diversity metrics at multiple life stages; (4) expand and enhance real-time fish survival and movement monitoring; (5) collect fish condition data; and (6) provide timely public access to monitoring data in open data formats.”

*Caveat:* Most of the recommended actions will require additional resources for implementation.

**5) Monismith, S., M. Fabrizio, M. Healey, J. Nestler, K. Rose and J. Van Sickle (2014). Workshop on the Interior Delta Flows and Related Stressors: Panel Summary Report. Prepared for the Delta Science Program. July 2014.**

<http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Int-Flows-and-Related-Stressors-Report.pdf>

*Takeaway Bullet:* The migration of both Chinook fry and smolts may be disrupted by interior Delta flow fields; steelhead may also be affected but less so given their larger size.

*Quotes:*

(p. 37): “Chinook salmon fry are not strong swimmers and typically hold in shallow embayments or use structures to keep from being carried along by the prevailing current. Kjelson et al. (1982) noted that beach seine catches of Chinook salmon fry in the Delta dropped significantly at night, suggesting fry were moving away from shallow nearshore areas at night. Larger fry were captured further offshore, near the surface during the day but broadly distributed in the water column at night. If the fry move away from shore at night they would lose visual and tactile clues to their position and would likely simply be carried by the currents. This is characteristic of salmon fry (and smolt) behavior during downstream migration, which occurs primarily at night due to passive drift, but may be less functional in the tidal Delta. In the historic Delta, with its extensive marshes and many blind ending dendritic channels, simply drifting at night might not take the fry very far. In the modern Delta, however, with open trapezoidal channels and high-velocity tidal currents, fry might be carried a considerable distance in the Delta and find themselves in unfavorable habitats when light returns.”

(p. 39-40): “Although Chinook salmon smolts do not go with the flow strictly in proportion to discharge they do make use of flow during migration. This raises the possibility that they could be confused by reverse flows in OMR. Because of the reverse flows in OMR when exports are large, the smolts are likely to receive mixed signals from tidal flux as water could be moving toward the pumps on both flood and ebb tides depending on the operation of the gates to Clifton Court Forebay (CCF). In this case, smolts may find themselves virtually trapped within OMR over several tidal cycles and potentially attracted into CCF because of inappropriate signals from water chemistry and flow. Since conveyance through the Delta is designed to ensure high quality of export waters (i.e., low salinity) it may be that near the pumps there is insufficient salinity signal on the tidal flow to direct the smolts and they simply go with the flow toward the pumps expecting that it is carrying them downstream. Salmon also make use of compass orientation during their migrations although the extent to which they might use this ability in the Delta is uncertain. It is possible that they might recognize that moving southward in OMR was inappropriate but whether they would be motivated to make some kind of corrective action is unknown.”

(p. 44): “It appears that steelhead, which are larger than Chinook salmon smolts, are less affected by interior Delta flow fields, move through the Delta more quickly than Chinook salmon and experience greater survival. Nevertheless, steelhead are entrained into CCF and into the export pumps suggesting that some of the cues and clues they receive during their migration through the Delta lead them in the wrong direction.”

*Caveat:* The report notes that “(p. 74) the vast majority of inferences about the effects of flows in the Delta on listed species are based on correlation analyses. Although correlation analysis is a useful first step when searching for relationships among variables, it often tells little or nothing about cause and effect” and “(p. 75) Fish in the Delta are subject to a large number of stressors and untangling the independent effects of these stressors has proven very difficult.”

**6) Perry, R. W., R. A. Buchanan, P. L. Brandes, J. R. Burau and J. A. Israel (2016). "Anadromous Salmonids in the Delta: New Science 2006–2016." San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science 14(2).**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.15447/sfews.2016v14iss2art7>

*Takeaway Bullet:* This paper covers a lot of topics relevant to the draft proposed Initial Action so have not selected a single takeaway bullet. My selected quote emphasizes the point that more is known about the behavior of salmonid smolts compared to salmonid parr or fry.

*Quotes:*

(from abstract) “Although much has been learned, knowledge gaps remain about how very small juvenile salmon (fry and parr) use the Delta. Understanding how all life stages of juvenile salmon grow, rear, and survive in the Delta is critical for devising management strategies that support a diversity of life history strategies.”

*Caveat:* None specific to this paper; each of the studies summarized in this paper have their own associated caveats.

**7) Salmonid Scoping Team (2017). Effects of Water Project Operations on Juvenile Salmonid Migration and Survival in the South Delta. Volume 1: Findings and Recommendations. January 2017.**

[http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/central\\_valley/water\\_operations/OCAPreports.html](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/central_valley/water_operations/OCAPreports.html)

*Takeaway Bullet:* See selected quotes for key takeaways.

*Quotes:*

*(p. ES-6):* “Water export operations contribute to salmonid mortality in the Delta via direct mortality at the facilities, but direct mortality does not account for the majority of the mortality experienced in the Delta; the mechanism and magnitude of indirect effects of water project operations on Delta mortality outside the facilities is uncertain.”

*(p. ES-6):* “The evidence of a relationship between exports and through-Delta survival is inconclusive; the key findings presented in this table are supported by medium or high basis of knowledge, but our basis of knowledge on the relationship between exports and through-Delta survival is low (Appendix E, Section E.6.2.1).”

*(p. ES-7):* “It is unknown whether equivocal findings regarding the existence and nature of a relationship between exports and through-Delta survival is due to the lack of a relationship, the concurrent and confounding influence of other variables, or the effect of low overall survival in recent years. These data gaps support a recommendation for further analysis of available data, as well as additional investigations to test hypotheses regarding export effects on migration and survival of Sacramento and San Joaquin River origin salmonids migrating through the Delta.”

*(p. ES-10):* “Uncertainty in the relationships between I:E, E:I, and OMR reverse flows and through-Delta survival may be caused by the concurrent and confounding influence of correlated variables, overall low survival, and low power to detect differences (Appendix E, Section E.2.3).”

*(p. ES-10):*

“• I:E: The relationship between Delta survival of San Joaquin River Chinook salmon and I:E is variable but generally positive for lower I:E values (e.g., I:E less than 3) (Appendix E, Section E.11, Figure E.11-1). Results of these studies are confounded by the use of flow ratios since the same I:E ratio can represent different absolute flow and export rates. These results are further confounded by installation and operations of various South Delta barriers. Data are available from only two years of AT studies using steelhead (Appendix E, Section E.11-4).

• Exports: There was a weak positive association between the through-Delta survival of San Joaquin Chinook salmon and combined exports using the CWT data set, but comparisons are complicated by the correlation between exports and San Joaquin River inflow (Appendix E, Section E.6.2.1).”

*Caveat (p. ES-12):* “Current understanding of juvenile salmon and steelhead survival in the Delta is constrained by a variety of factors...” [See the list of “Constraints on Understanding” on pages ES-12 to ES-13]

**8) Salmonid Scoping Team (2017). Effects of Water Project Operations on Juvenile Salmonid Migration and Survival in the South Delta. Volume 2: Responses to Management Questions. January 2017.**

[http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/central\\_valley/water\\_operations/OCAPreports.html](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/central_valley/water_operations/OCAPreports.html)

*Takeaway Bullet: If the in-season risk assessments in the draft proposed Initial Actions result in a start to OMR management later than January 1, ESA-listed salmonids (winter-run in most years, spring-run in many years, and steelhead in some years) may not have protection equal to that provided by implementation of the 2009 NMFS BiOp.*

*Quote (p. ES-2):* “Although not capturing the seasonal variation in juvenile movement, the January 1 onset of Old and Middle rivers (OMR) reverse flow management coincides with the presence of winter-run Chinook salmon in most years, spring-run Chinook salmon in many years, and steelhead in some years (Figures 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4 in Section 4). If OMR reverse flow management were initiated based on first detection in the Delta rather than a fixed date, OMR reverse flow management would often begin earlier than January 1 for the protection of winter-run or spring-run Chinook salmon, and later than January 1 for the protection of steelhead. The January 1 trigger date provides a general approximation of a date by which juvenile winter-run Chinook have likely entered the Delta and, based on its simplicity for triggering management actions, has utility.”

*Caveat:* See some technical disagreements about OMR management described on pages ES-2 to ES-3