

---

**From:** Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2019 6:22 AM  
**To:** Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal  
**Cc:** Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal; Howard Brown; Garwin Yip  
**Subject:** Re: More Upper Sac EB Questions

Thanks Naseem. I view the Sacramento River gravel injection, side channel restoration, and the fish screen program as being in the EB. My understanding is that those have been funded through CVPIA and the NCWA Recovery Program/Sac Settlement Contractors and that would likely continue outside of CVP/SWP operations, so seem to be in the EB (past and future components), rather than the PA. Maybe Reclamation has communicated otherwise to us.

On Mon, May 13, 2019 at 10:21 PM Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <[naseem.alston@noaa.gov](mailto:naseem.alston@noaa.gov)> wrote:

My understanding is we are going in a slightly different direction.

Where programs of restoration that Rec proposes to continue to support, we may describe these as continuing to benefit sp/CH at the framework-level (rather than just describing in the envB).

I commented about some of this via a different conversation - maybe inline with document text? That I wasn't sure if we've ever consulted on the screening program? anyone know?

Naseem O. Alston  
ESA-Section 7 Coordinator/Fish Biologist  
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
California Central Valley Office  
Sacramento, CA  
(916)930-3655  
<http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/>

On Mon, May 13, 2019 at 8:01 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <[cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov](mailto:cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Perfect! I'll insert the text I proposed, and leave it to you guys to incorporate (or delegate to be incorporated) into the EB. Thanks!

On Mon, May 13, 2019 at 7:47 PM Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <[brian.ellrott@noaa.gov](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Those are existing restoration efforts that should be in the EB with at least some general language in the EB about potential beneficial effects (e.g., help maintain and possibly expand spawning gravel availability, increase habitat complexity, and help minimize entrainment at Sacramento River diversions).

What you wrote about those actions being in the EB looks good to me.

On Mon, May 13, 2019 at 8:19 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <[cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov](mailto:cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov)> wrote:

My email box is swamped, and in case yours is too, I'll send this again to see what you think!

so, whaddya think?

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 11:22 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal

<[cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov](mailto:cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Hello --

Similar to my Battle Creek question, the ROC BA includes some activities as conservation measures in the upper sac but provides little meat. Many have commented that these are included in the EB.

the text we have in the shasta effects analysis currently for these "conservation measures" is below. There is no more explanation in the BA, so this is what we have to work with.

#### **1.1.1.1.1 Spawning and Rearing Habitat Restoration**

##### **1.1.1.1.1.1 Spawning Gravel Injection**

Reclamation proposes to create additional spawning habitat by injecting 40–55 tons of gravel into the Sacramento River by 2030, using the following sites: Salt Creek Gravel Injection Site, Keswick Dam Gravel Injection Site, South Shea Levee, Shea Levee, and Tobiasson Island Side Channel.

##### **1.1.1.1.1.2 Side Channel Habitat Restoration**

Reclamation and the Sacramento River Settlement Contractors propose to create 40–60 acres of side channel habitat at approximately 10 sites in Shasta and Tehama County by 2030, including Cypress Avenue, Shea Island, Anderson River Park; South Sand Slough; Rancheria Island; Tobiasson Side Channel; and Turtle Bay.

##### **1.1.1.1.1.3 Small Screen Program**

As part of adaptive management, Reclamation and DWR propose to continue to work within existing authorities (e.g., Anadromous Fish Screen Program) to screen small diversions throughout Central Valley CVP/SWP streams and the Bay-Delta.

---

I didn't see these in EB after a quick look, but thought it worth asking to confirm. If in the EB, I'll say that:

"The effects of this project are included in the baseline conditions of the analysis for this biological opinion. Because the ROC on LTO PA does not include specificity in resources, timing, or defined actions by which these projects would occur, any benefits besides those considered in the baseline condition are not included in this analysis of effects."

But if they are not in the baseline, i'm simply going to say that "Because the ROC on LTO PA does not include specificity in resources, timing, or defined actions by which these projects would occur, any benefits are not included in this analysis of effects."

Seem ok?

--

**Brian Ellrott**

*Central Valley Salmonid Recovery Coordinator*

*NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region*

*U.S. Department of Commerce*

Mobile: 916-955-7628

Office: 916-930-3612

[brian.ellrott@noaa.gov](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)

--

**Brian Ellrott**

*Central Valley Salmonid Recovery Coordinator*

*NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region*

*U.S. Department of Commerce*

Mobile: 916-955-7628

Office: 916-930-3612

[brian.ellrott@noaa.gov](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)