

**ROC on LTO tiger team meeting  
December 18, 2018**

Agenda: Stanislaus River effects  
Effects on Pacific eulachon

Attendees for the Stanislaus effects:

- Reclamation: Katrina Harrison, Dave Mooney, Armin Alston, Ben Nelson, Lauren Merida, Russ Callejo
- USFWS: Jana Affonso
- CDFW: Brooke Jacobs
- DOI-SOL: Lori Caramanian
- NMFS: Barb Byrne, Garwin Yip
- ICF: Gregg Ellis

Overarching issues:

- The “former” proposed action had a big section on adaptive management that included actions that would be implemented for increased water supply. That entire section will no longer exist with the voluntary agreements (VAs) included in the proposed action. Those actions that were in the adaptive management section, but not part of VAs, Reclamation is considering for inclusion in the proposed action on a case-by-case basis.

Key messages/questions/issues:

- Effects section writes off any spring-run as strays, so no effect of the proposed action on spring-run in the Stanislaus River. We may disagree.
  - Action items:
    - Barb to send to Reclamation the 10(j) rule for the experimental population
- SJRRP de minimus requirement:
  - Action item: Barb to ask Erin if “de minimus” is South Delta exports and fish triggers, or if it includes operations, say, at New Melones Reservoir, that end up in exports.
- Effects analysis discusses “construction effects” for construction of rearing habitat, yet only gravel augmentation proposed as a conservation measure in the Proposed Action. Reclamation will check on that and may explicitly add creation of rearing habitat to the proposed action.
- Effects analysis assumes immediate effects of restoration, including shading riparian vegetation. NMFS encouraged more realistic assumptions on the phasing in of benefits as the restoration site “matures”. NMFS also encouraged an explanation of the specific restoration targets and some realistic timelines of implementing restoration actions.
- Effects analysis says “Baseline temperatures within the Stanislaus would represent those of unimpeded flows” yet we were told during meeting that temperature results might not be available for the Stanislaus, so not clear how that statement is justified.
- Effects analysis states “As a result [of the Proposed Action], any negative effect . . . would be not be expected as the Revised Plan of Operations improves River conditions (water temperature and flows) for salmonids and improves management of the water to the benefit of all life-stages of salmonids within the Lower Stanislaus River.” NMFS asked

for the underlying details of this to be explained, as the conclusion regarding flows was surprising and the conclusion regarding temperatures was apparently an assumption not based on any modeling results.

- Juvenile steelhead trap & haul may or may not be in the proposed action (one of the elements of the programmatic section in the former BA; Reclamation not sure whether will be in the proposed action or not).
- No mention of green sturgeon in the Stanislaus; Barb suggested an acknowledgement that a confirmed green sturgeon was observed in the Stanislaus, but indicated that targeted operations for green sturgeon on the Stanislaus likely not necessary.
- After >1 hour of Q&A and clarification on the Stanislaus effects, Katrina told us that the proposed action for the Stanislaus River changed. Now based on the unsuccessful VA for the Stanislaus River, and will be something like 2-E “ish”/“like”/“lite”.

Attendees for the eulachon analysis:

- Reclamation: Katrina Harrison, Dave Mooney, Armin Alston, Ben Nelson, Lauren Merida, Russ Callejo, Janice Pinero
- USFWS: Jana Affonso
- CDFW: Brooke Jacobs
- DOI-SOL: Lori Caramanian
- NMFS: Barb Byrne, Garwin Yip, Justin Ly, Seth Naman
- ICF: Gregg Ellis

Overarching issues:

- None, but Justin and Seth were a step behind regarding the environmental baseline characterization of without action