

## Appendices A1 – A9

### Table of Contents

|   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Appendix A1: Sacramento River .....   | A-4                                   |
| 1.1 Sacramento River .....  | A-5                                   |
| 1.1.1 Flow Measures, including interaction with Shasta and CVP Operations ..... | A-5                                   |
| 1.1.2 Non-Flow Measures .....   | A-10                                  |
| 1.1.3 Funding Commitments and Regulatory Assurances .....                       | A-11                                  |
| 1.1.4 Timing .....  | A-12                                  |
| 1.1.5 Expected Outcomes .....   | A-12                                  |
| Appendix A2: Feather River .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.2 Feather River, Including Interaction with Oroville and SWP Operations ..... | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.2.1 Flow Measures .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.2.2 Non-Flow Measures .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.2.3 Funding .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.2.4 Timing .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.2.5 Expected Outcomes .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Appendix A3: Yuba River .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3 Yuba River .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.1 Flow Measures, including interaction with Yuba Water Accord .....         | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.2 Non-Flow Measures .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.3 Funding .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.4 Timing .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.5 Expected Outcomes .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.6 Miscellaneous Provisions .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.3.7 Yuba River Appendices .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Appendix A4: American River .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.4 American River .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.4.1 Flow and Temperature Measures .....                                       | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.4.2 Non-Flow Measures .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.4.3 Funding .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.4.4 Timing .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.4.5 Expected Outcomes .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Appendix A5: Mokelumne River .....  | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.5 Mokelumne River .....   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |

|   |   |                                |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1.5.1   | Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.5.2   | Non-Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.5.3   | Independent Assessment of the Proposed Mokelumne River VA.....          | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.5.4   | Agreement Term.....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.5.5   | Mokelumne River Appendices.....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Appendix A6: Tuolumne River .....   |   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.6   | Tuolumne River.....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.6.1   | Flow Measures, including seasonal and WY variations .....               | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.6.2   | Non-Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.6.3   | Funding .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.6.4   | Timing .....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.6.5   | Expected Outcomes .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Appendix A7: San Joaquin River Settlement Downstream of the Merced River (Friant Division) .... |   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.7   | San Joaquin River Settlement Below Merced River (Friant Division) ..... | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.7.1   | Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.7.2   | Non-Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.7.3   | Funding .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.7.4   | Timing .....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.7.5   | Expected Outcomes .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Appendix A8: Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta .....   |   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.8   | Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta .....                                      | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.8.1   | Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.8.2   | Non-Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.8.3   | Funding .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.8.4   | Timing .....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.8.5   | Expected Outcomes .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Appendix A9: Putah Creek.....   |   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.9   | Putah Crrek .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.9.1   | Flow Measures.....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.9.2   | Non Flow Measures .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.9.3   | Funding .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.9.4   | Timing .....  | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 1.9.5   | Expected Outcomes .....   | A-Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Appendix A10: Illustrative Scope and Magnitude of Non-flow Projects .....                       |   | A-15                           |
| 1.10.1  | Sacramento River Habitat Projects.....                                  | A-16                           |

|        |   |                                       |
|--------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1.10.2 | Feather River Habitat Projects .....                | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.10.3 | Yuba River Habitat Projects .....                   | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.10.4 | American River Habitat Projects .....               | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.10.5 | Mokelumne River Habitat Projects.....               | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.10.6 | Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Habitat Projects ..... | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 1.10.7 | Tuolumne River Habitat Projects .....               | <b>A-Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |

## **Appendix A1: Sacramento River**

## 1.1 Sacramento River

Parties diverting water from the Sacramento River mainstem are proposing a coordinated suite of flow and non-flow measures that are intended to provide a holistic and integrated approach to improve populations of native fish species, especially steelhead and the four runs of Chinook salmon, on the Sacramento River mainstem. These flow and habitat measures build on the regulatory requirements imposed on the parties to the voluntary agreement since 2000, both of which contribute to the implementation of the narrative objective for salmon protection, and the numeric objectives for Delta outflows and Sacramento River inflows.<sup>1</sup>

As a general matter, the measures described in this Project Description are intended to augment flows and implement habitat measures to provide the opportunity for juvenile fish to successfully spawn, shelter, forage, rear, and migrate out of the Sacramento mainstem (as measured at the confluence of the Feather River). By providing additional habitat and working to improve watershed health, these measures are intended to better meet the needs of fish species and thereby help those populations move towards the narrative salmon doubling goal and other metrics of robust and viable populations. Finally, because of the inherent variability within each year, there is a measure to allow, in dry, below normal and above normal years, for at least an additional 100,000 acre-feet of water that may be used for the benefit of fish and wildlife, for instance, (i) as additional flows to augment the natural signals for outmigration conveyed in storm events for Spring and Fall run Chinook salmon, (ii) as additional flows to augment minimum flows or (iii) for any other purpose deemed to be biologically beneficial under the governance and adaptive management plan.

### 1.1.1 Flow Measures, including interaction with Shasta and CVP Operations

#### 1.1.1.1 Proposed Flow Commitments

The parties to the voluntary agreements on the Sacramento River mainstem are prepared to make a series of additional flow commitments that are intended to augment the existing flow regime during specific seasons of the year, intended to provide additional pulse flows at biologically sensitive periods, and preserve cold-water pool to ensure viability of fish species during the warm summer months. Those additional flow commitments are as follows:

##### 1.1.1.1.1 Fall Flow Stabilization (All Years)

As the irrigation season closes during the late summer and winter-run chinook salmon emerge from redds, releases for, water demand and instream flows move from the peak summer rates to lower winter rates which results in decreased storage releases from Shasta Reservoir. The winter releases are

---

<sup>1</sup> As to flow and habitat measures that have been adopted since 2000, Exhibit 1 hereto (“Sacramento Valley Salmon Recovery Program – Completed Projects – 2000-2017”) lists the various Sacramento Valley Salmon Recovery Program projects that were completed during 2000 through 2017. These projects have contributed to the implementation of the narrative objective for salmon protection. These projects form a strong foundation for the additional habitat measures proposed under the voluntary agreements. It is noteworthy that, of the almost 150 projects completed since 2000, almost half of those are on the Sacramento River mainstem.

lower not only because the growing season is completed and downstream diversions decrease accordingly but also so that Reclamation can rebuild storage in Shasta Reservoir during the winter season to create enough cold-water assets needed to protect winter-run salmon in the following spring and summer months. As releases from Shasta and downstream diversions decrease, there is the potential to dewater early spawned fall-run Chinook salmon redds. There is also a need for additional rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids and the need to reduce fluctuations in demands due to rice straw decomposition.

To address these concerns, the parties propose to modify releases from Shasta during October so as to stabilize flows in the Sacramento River mainstem and operate so those flows smoothly transition to the wintertime base flows in the Sacramento River. In coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Sacramento River Settlement Contractors (SRSCs) and other parties diverting water from the Sacramento River mainstem would coordinate their diversions for rice straw decomposition from October 1 through November 30 to lower peak diversion rates and spread the period for rice straw decomposition over a longer time. The target for winter releases would be established based on end of September (EOS) storage in Shasta Reservoir. Such winter base flow releases would be set to improve refill capabilities for Shasta Reservoir to build cold-water pool storage for the following year.

Here are examples of potential Keswick releases based on Shasta Reservoir EOS storage condition. These examples would be refined through modeling efforts under the guidance of the governance structure described below.

| <b>1.1.1.1.1 If EOS Shasta Reservoir storage is:</b> | <b>Then, winter base flow releases would be:</b> |
|--|--|
| Less than 2.2 MAF                                    | 3,250 cfs  |
| 2.2 MAF to 2.8 MAF                                   | 4,000 cfs  |
| 2.8 MAF to 3.2 MAF                                   | 4,500 cfs  |
| More than 3.2 MAF                                    | 5,000 cfs  |

Reclamation would determine these winter base flow release rates after the majority of emergence of winter-run Chinook salmon, prior to the majority of fall-run Chinook salmon spawning in any specific year and Shasta EOS storage, in coordination with parties to Voluntary Agreements and consistent with legal and regulatory requirements. The SRSCs, upstream Sacramento Valley CVP contractors and Reclamation propose that they will work together to smooth Sacramento Valley diversions so as to improve the likelihood of reaching winter base flow targets. Nothing in this coordinated effort would limit Reclamation’s discretion over all CVP operations and its obligation to operate the CVP to meet regulatory requirements and all contractors’ needs (including in the Lower Sacramento River, the Delta and export areas). It is understood that Reclamation will make its operational decisions based on the needs of the CVP as a whole and in accordance with any requirements under then-applicable State Water Resources Control Board decisions, Biological Opinions issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service and/or the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and flood control requirements.

*1.1.1.1.2 Actions in Wet Years*

In wet years, there may be opportunities for Reclamation to make additional releases that would have the hypothesized benefits of cleaning spawning gravels, creating/restoring/enhancing floodplain habitat, and creating pulse flows that build on natural signals (e.g. storm turbidity). All of these initiatives would require the reoperation of Shasta Reservoir, which is subject to Reclamation approval. All of these initiatives also must be done in a manner that does not create any additional risk to public safety, human health or property damage. These initiatives would only occur in wet years when the action does not result in a water cost to the CVP or the SWP, as determined by Reclamation and DWR, respectively.

The SRSCs propose that, in the event of a wet year, they will collaborate with Reclamation and other parties diverting water from the Sacramento River mainstem to identify the opportunities to engage in activities that will benefit fish and wildlife in the Sacramento River mainstem.

All such activities are subject to the sole and complete discretion of Reclamation, recognizing Reclamation's responsibilities for public safety, the preservation of human health and the prevention of property damage or reductions in the water supplies available to the CVP and/or SWP. Within those constraints, however, the SRSCs will work to coordinate operations with Reclamation to divert additional water into floodplains (including but not limited to the Sutter and Yolo Bypasses) and/or to create other spawning and rearing habitat, depending on the time of year. Particular attention will be paid to the opportunities to enhance outmigration of juvenile salmonids through targeted pulse flows synchronized with natural storm events.

#### *1.1.1.1.3 Actions in Above Normal, Below Normal and Dry Years*

The SRSCs propose that during above normal, below normal and dry years, which cumulatively total about 58% of all years according the Sacramento Valley 8-station index, they would make available 100,000 acre-feet through land fallowing/crop shifting (or limited groundwater substitution) within their service areas. This supply would be made available to Reclamation and Reclamation would be responsible for reoperating Shasta Reservoir and passing water through the Delta as outflow, in coordination with DWR. During these years, there is a hypothesized need for additional flows in April and May to enhance spring-run juvenile salmon outmigration survival. There is also a need in these years for additional Delta outflow while also balancing the potential impacts to the cold-water pool storage at Shasta Reservoir. In above normal years and below normal years when there is an adequate cold water pool in Shasta Reservoir to protect winter run salmon, there would be a target base flow during April and May of 8,000 cfs at Wilkins Slough that would be met through the combination of natural side channel flows; releases from Shasta Reservoir for legal and regulatory requirements and other project purpose;; and, to the extent that Shasta releases need to be increased to meet the Wilkins Slough target, those water costs would be charged to the 100,000 acre-feet asset. To the extent that combination of water sources does not support the target base flow throughout the entire two-month period, a shorter period or an alternative flow target will be utilized under the governance and adaptive management plan. In dry years, it is unlikely that there would be enough cold water pool assets in Shasta Reservoir, so no spring flows would be available, but rather the 100,000 acre-foot asset would be available on the delivery pattern of the fallowed land through reoperation of Shasta Reservoir for augmentation of instream flows and Delta outflow, to the extent such reoperation does not create an additional water supply impact, as determined by Reclamation. The water may alternatively be used to augment cold water pool storage in Shasta Reservoir for the benefit of winter-run Chinook salmon.

The SRSCs believe that there will be an enhanced ability for Reclamation to make water available for targeted spring pulse flows if there is a land fallowing/crop shifting program for 100,000 acre-feet in

place at the time that Reclamation makes operational decisions in the spring. If, however, Reclamation is not able to make such spring releases relying on the commitment for the production of 100,000 acre-feet (e.g., based on concerns relating to cold-water pool storage levels during the late summer/early fall period), then Reclamation would retain the discretion to add the 100,000 acre-feet to water releases during the summer or fall for other ecosystem benefits. Reclamation, at all times, retains sole discretion for the operation of the CVP and the release of the 100,000 acre-feet will not be used in a manner that causes changes to water supply allocations and or the timing of such allocations to CVP contractors north or south of the Delta or otherwise adversely affects CVP system-wide operations. The 100,000 acre-feet of water based on land fallowing/crop shifting is included within the water cost dependent on year-type.

While Reclamation retains sole discretion in the manner in which it operates the CVP, Reclamation would participate in the proposed Voluntary Agreement governance structure to solicit input on CVP operations and the manner in which Reclamation can include the provision of this additional 100,000 acre-feet for environmental benefits without adversely affecting CVP contractors or CVP system-wide operations. The proposed governance structure includes collaboration on planning and accountability through reporting on outcomes.

#### *1.1.1.1.4 Actions in Critically Dry Years*

In critically dry years, there is limited water to meet limited beneficial uses. During such years, the inflow into Shasta Reservoir is substantially lower than average and the necessary flows at Wilkins Slough are at times equal to Shasta Reservoir inflow, meaning that Reclamation is unable – as a practical matter – to store water in Shasta Reservoir to accumulate a cold-water pool. Finally, there are few significant storms that increase base flows in the Sacramento River mainstem.

Parties diverting water from the Sacramento River mainstem would cooperate with Reclamation provide a single spring pulse flow of 30,000 acre-feet in March, with a focus on last two weeks of the month. The water would be made available from Shasta or Whiskeytown reservoirs at Reclamation's sole discretion. The pulse flow event would be timed to ensure that the water is 100% recoverable by the CVP and SWP through Delta exports (or other mechanisms at the discretion of Reclamation) as addressed through Coordinated Operations Agreement (COA) accounting. The pulse flow event would be coupled with a storm event when possible, likely as an extension of the recession limb of the rainfall runoff hydrograph so as to ensure exportability.

The pulse flow event would not occur under any of the following conditions:

- The action causes any impact to the amount or timing for Reclamation's allocations to any CVP contractors (in any CVP Division, north or south of the Delta).
- The critical year in question immediately follows another critical year or follows a dry year.
- Any new or additional RPMs, RPAs, or other regulatory actions affecting CVP operations occur as a result of this action.

The pulse flow event would also be conditioned on temperature management considerations for the remainder of the year. Thus, if the pulse flow were to be considered for April, Reclamation would need



to consider its projection for EOS storage at Shasta Reservoir, the need for water during the fall to prevent redd stranding and to encourage migration, etc.

In the event that a pulse flow event occurs and then the year type turns from critical to dry, then any water released for the pulse flow event would be credited towards the 100,000 acre-foot requirement described above in future above normal, below normal and dry years.

### *1.1.1.2 Biological Rationales for Flow Commitments*

#### *1.1.1.2.1 Fall Flow Stabilization*

The fall flow stabilization will have the effect of smoothing the transition from summer diversion and release patterns to the lower base flow needed to protect fall-run Chinook salmon redd spawning and prevent redd dewatering, and to maintain constant water elevations and temperatures. Such reduced releases are consistent with the need for rice straw decomposition water that benefit avian species and the Pacific Flyway and are further consistent with protecting carryover storage for cold-water pool storage that benefits winter-run Chinook salmon and other species. Finally, such reduced diversions minimize the water cost of these measures.

#### *1.1.1.2.2 Winter Flow Releases*

The winter flows regime will maintain side channel tributary inflows from hydrologic events and also maintain bypass and weir operations/inundation. This flow regime would benefit fall-run Chinook salmon by providing constant flows, temperature and velocities to incubating redds and early rearing habitat in the upper Sacramento River system. It would, similarly, provide these same benefits to late fall-run Chinook salmon. It would further continue to provide benefits to avian species using the Pacific Flyway, benefit winter-run Chinook salmon by protecting cold-water pool storage, and protecting consumptive uses of water by minimizing the water cost of these measures.

#### *1.1.1.2.3 Spring Flow Releases*

In the spring, Keswick releases are typically steady until flows are needed to support instream demands on the mainstem Sacramento River and Delta requirements. As a standard practice, Reclamation operates Shasta in the spring to have storage in the reservoir high enough (e.g., 3.7 million acre-feet) to use the Shasta temperature control device (TCD) upper gates to maximize the cold water pool potential for winter Chinook egg incubation management.

If this condition is met, releases from Shasta, initially focused on April and May, for the primary purpose of increasing spring-run Chinook outmigration and survival in the lower Sacramento River would be made, incorporating science, monitoring, and decision making and testing the hypothesis of flow and survival.

If Reclamation determines that projected inflows to Shasta Reservoir are likely less than sufficient for summer temperature management pursuant to its ESA obligations, and/or taking the spring action will cause changes to water supply allocations and/or the timing of allocations (to each CVP division north or south of the Delta), or the action impacts other system-wide operations, the water would be added to releases during the summer or fall for other ecosystem benefits, and would serve to augment Delta

outflows at those times. Under certain circumstances, the water may be utilized to augment cold-water pool resources.

#### *1.1.1.2.4 Summer Flow Releases*

During the June through September summer period, flows in the Sacramento River mainstem and the releases from Shasta Reservoir would be established so as to meet the temperature and other downstream requirements in the then-current Biological Opinion(s), State Water Resources Control Board decision(s), and to meet CVP contract deliveries. This would primarily benefit winter-run Chinook salmon redds.

If a spring action is not taken or only a portion of the 100,000 acre-foot asset is used to meet the Wilkins Slough target, the water asset could also be using in the summer for delta outflow on the following schedule that the water is made available.

### **1.1.2 Non-Flow Measures**

#### *1.1.2.2 Spawning Habitat (Keswick to Red Bluff Diversion Dam)*

Reclamation and the SRSCs propose annually to place 40,000 to 55,000 tons of gravel at the Keswick and/or Salt Creek injection sites. For comparison purposes, over the past 17 years, there has been a total of approximately 90,000 tons of gravel placed at various locations on the Sacramento River mainstem. Within five years, Reclamation and the SRSCs would create at least three site-specific gravel restoration projects upstream of Bonnyview Bridge.

#### *1.1.2.3 Rearing Habitat (Keswick to Red Bluff Diversion Dam)*

Reclamation and the SRSCs propose to create a total of 40-60 acres of side channel habitat at no fewer than 10 sites in Shasta and Tehama County.

#### *1.1.2.4 Rearing Habitat (Red Bluff Diversion Dam to Verona)*

The SRSCs believe that, at present, they can create 3,225 acres of floodplain habitat in existing areas. The additional spring flows described would inundate another 650 acres of rearing habitat within the current Sacramento River levee system. In-river restoration projects (of the type undertaken by River Garden Farms) would amount to 225 acres of rearing habitat over 15 years. Inundation of the lower portion of the Colusa Basin Drain would yield another 300 acres of floodplain habitat. The inundation of CDFW's Tisdale property would add another 500 acres of floodplain habitat while levee setbacks would add a further 200 acres. Finally, the inundation of the Sutter Bypass would provide 2,000 acres of floodplain habitat. That quantity of habitat is sufficient to support a population of 70,000 to 80,000 fall-run Chinook salmon adults, which is three times more than the current returns.

### 1.1.2.5 *Man-Made Structures (Keswick to Verona)*

Finally, the SRSCs propose to undertake a number of projects to modify man-made structures to reduce their impacts on salmonid populations. These projects would include completing the remaining high-priority fish screen projects and reducing lighting on all bridges crossing the Sacramento River within five years.

## 1.1.3 **Funding Commitments and Regulatory Assurances**

### 1.1.3.1 *Included in the Planning Agreement*

The Sacramento River mainstem element is based on a number of key terms in the Planning Agreement that provide regulatory and management conditions that are essential to the coordinated suite of flow and non-flow measures being proposed by the SRSCs. Those key terms are: (i) governance structure, (ii) the safe harbor/no surprises policy, (iii) compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, (iv) the strategy for the issuance of other necessary permits such as section 404 permit, and (v) a robust science program. Those terms are described in detail in the Planning Agreement.

### 1.1.3.2 *Water Code section 1707 Petition and Related Operations Agreement*

The 100,000 acre-feet of water made available by the SRSCs in above normal, below normal and dry years will be dedicated to fish and wildlife beneficial uses for the term of the voluntary agreement pursuant to a Water Code section 1707 petition for change process. Reclamation and CDFW will develop and approve an operations plan/agreement, subject to review and consultation with the SRSCs, to ensure that the 100,000 acre-feet of water made available by the SRSCs shall be used for the WQCP program of implementation to protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses.

### 1.1.3.3 *NRDC v. Zinke*

If the *NRDC v. Zinke* litigation results in a reduction in SRS Contract supplies via changes to contracts or constraints on performance, then any additional amounts of water made available for fish and wildlife purposes from such an outcome shall be offset against the 100,000 acre-foot quantity of water to be made available in above normal, below normal or dry years. In the alternative, such an outcome shall serve as an “off-ramp” that would allow any or all of the SRSCs to withdraw from the voluntary agreement.

### 1.1.3.4 *Funding Commitments*

The Parties propose to work with state and federal agencies to utilize dedicated funds consisting of: (a) contributions based on deliveries to or diversions by the Parties, and (b) repurposing of existing funding. The Parties believe that these sources, in combination, provide a sustainable and long-term funding stream that will be sufficient to support the projects being conducted under the auspices of the Voluntary Agreement.

- The Parties propose that contributions based on deliveries to or diversions by the Parties of water from the Bay-Delta watershed would be collected annually during the term of the Agreements. Through the contributions, the Parties expect to secure funds totaling

approximately \$425 million for the additional flows, and \$345 million for the science program, over the term of the Agreements.

Specifically, a fund would initially be established using reprogrammed Proposition 1 funds and subsequently funded through the collection of a surcharge on water diverted within the Bay-Delta watershed for the duration of the fifteen-year term of the Voluntary Agreement. Such a surcharge would not apply to agencies diverting water under their own water rights, provided that those agencies contribute water as part of the Voluntary Agreement.

- The Parties also propose that the State and Federal governments would seek to repurpose or reprogram existing funds and seek new funds in order to support this important effort. The State of California agrees that it will pursue repurposing/reprogramming State bond money and seeking any necessary legislation to provide additional monetary funds. This includes potential directed and competitive funding opportunities from various State sources. Up to approximately \$1.3 billion in bond funding is available for instream flows, restoration, multi-benefit flood projects, and other activities

#### **1.1.4 Timing**

New water will be made available for environmental purposes primarily during the spring period when juvenile spring-run chinook salmon migrate out from spawning and rearing grounds to the Delta. As described in more detail above, in wet years, there will be collaboration with Reclamation to release water in ways that benefit fish and wildlife. In above normal, below normal and dry years, the parties will make available 100,000 acre-feet of water, most likely for one or more pulse flow events in the April to May period, ideally timed to coincide with the receding leg of the storm hydrograph. That timing would complement and accentuate the instinct of salmonids to outmigrate during periods of high flows and high turbidity, which is thought to contribute to increased survival rates. In summer months if the asset is not used in the Spring, it would be available for summer or fall outflow augmentation. In critically dry years, any water made available would likely be timed so as to be fully recoverable under COA accounting and would likely be made available in the last two weeks of March, which are likely the last period of any substantial precipitation.

#### **1.1.5 Expected Outcomes**

The Sacramento River provides spawning, migration, and/or rearing habitat for all runs of Chinook salmon, steelhead, and sturgeon. Improvements in spawning, migration and rearing will occur, as noted above, through improved access to and reactivation of floodplains throughout the Sacramento River basin, along with carefully timed flow management to promote improved conditions along the Sacramento River. CVP and upper Sacramento water users will work to stabilize fall flows to minimize risk of dewatering and stranding. In wet years, and in consideration of cold-water pool management, early initiation of storage management releases for the purposes of spawning gravel cleaning functions, floodplain habitat, general fish migration flows and moderation of flood control-related pulse flows would be implemented. In critical years, a single spring pulse flow in March, with a focus on last two weeks of the month, and coupled with a storm event when possible, will be implemented to aid migration under dry conditions.

##### *1.1.5.1 Rearing habitat*

This proposal would substantially improve rearing habitat through the implementation of several landscape level and area-specific improvements in rearing habitat access and conditions. Habitat enhancements to improve rearing and migration conditions for salmonids throughout the Sacramento River basin, including more than 7,000 acres of improved floodplain rearing habitat in Sutter Bypass,

Yolo Bypass, as described above, will provide important ecological functions in combination with ongoing operations. Together, the large increase in landscape-level rearing habitat access will substantially improve rearing conditions. Several other projects address passage, spawning habitat, and predation. These structural habitat improvements will accrue benefits to all runs of Chinook, steelhead, and sturgeon.

#### *1.1.5.2 Migration Conditions*

In combination with the rearing habitat improvements expected to occur from November through March throughout the basin, and in consideration of cold-water pool management, real-time migration patterns, and rearing habitat conditions, Sacramento River flows will be pulsed in April and May to support successful migration of spring-run Chinook. Sacramento River flows would be coordinated to provide maximum benefits and to ensure protection of cold-water in Shasta. Increased in-stream flows using the 100 TAF block of water described above would be provided in above normal, below normal and dry years to augment existing flows and improve overall migration conditions. Working with the regulatory agencies and other parties the interface between these flow changes and structural habitat for rearing benefits would be managed and further explored through the application of testable hypotheses and adjustments to actions. All such actions would be subject to the “safe harbor/no surprises” provisions of the Planning Agreement.

#### *1.1.5.3 Spawning habitat*

The substantial gravel placement throughout the Upper Sacramento River described above will provide rearing benefits for spring-run and fall-run Chinook, green sturgeon, and steelhead.

#### *1.1.5.4 Terrestrial habitat*

This proposal includes approximately 23,300 acres of land fallowing to generate the water that would be used for in-stream and Delta outflow purposes. It was developed in consideration of minimizing terrestrial species effects, through both the amount of land fallowing that would occur and the ability to provide winter wetland area where possible. The SRSCs expect that federal and state wildlife agencies will permit and not require any mitigation associated with this land fallowing action.



## **Appendix A10: Illustrative Scope and Magnitude of Non-flow Projects**

## 1.10.1 Sacramento River Habitat Projects

| Project  | Identified In... | Description   | Targeted Habitat  | Benefits   | Years                    | Timeline without VSA                             | Life Stage | Possible Funding Source(s)          | Implementation Lead    | Contingency | Planning/CEQA Status | Construction/Action Started? | Regulatory Requirement? |
|--|------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------|--|------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Spawning Habitat Keswick to Red Bluff Diversion Dam; Objective – Annually place 40,000 to 55,000 tons of gravel at the Keswick and/or Salt Creek injection site(s). Create at least three site-specific gravel restoration projects upstream of Bonnyview Bridge within 5 years.</b>  |                  |   |   |  |                          |  |            |                                     |                        |             |                      |                              |                         |
| Salt Creek Gravel Injection  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Improve substrate conditions for spawning salmonids at key riffles                  | up to 25,000 CY   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area   | Bi-Annually (1-10 years) | unknown  | S          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Market Street  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Improve substrate conditions for spawning salmonids at key riffles                  | up to 12,000 CY   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area   | Tri-Annually             | unknown  | S          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | N/A                  | Year by Year                 | No                      |
| Turtle Bay Island Side Channels and Gravel   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Improve substrate conditions for spawning salmonids at key riffles and side channel | place and shape 25,000 CY   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area   | Tri-Annually             | unknown  | S,R        | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Keswick Dam Gravel Injection   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Improve substrate conditions for spawning salmonids at key riffles                  | up to 25,000 CY   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area   | Annually (1-15 years)    | Yes currently (but annual funds are not assured) | S          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | N/A                  | Year by Year                 | No                      |
| <b>Rearing Habitat Keswick to Red Bluff Diversion Dam; Objective – Create a total of 40 to 60 acres of side channel habitat at no fewer than 10 sites in Shasta and Tehama County</b>  |                  |   |   |  |                          |  |            |                                     |                        |             |                      |                              |                         |
| South Shea Levee   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area; improve of natural river morphology; increase floodplain habitat, riparian habitat, and instream cover | 0-5 years                | unknown  | S,R        | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Shea Levee   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area; improve natural river morphology and connection to historic side channel habitat                       | 0-5 years                | unknown  | S,R        | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Tobiasson Island - Side Channel/South Bank   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area; improve of natural river morphology; increase floodplain habitat, riparian habitat, and instream cover | 0-5 years                | unknown  | S,R        | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Side Channel Habitat - Cypress Ave. Bridge Downstream  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 0-5 years                | Potentially in 2019                              | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Shea Island Channel/Rearing  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 0-5 years                | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Anderson River Park Channel/Rearing  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 0-5 years                | Potentially in 2020 but need permits             | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Kutras Lake Project  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 6-10 years               | Potentially 2020                                 | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Tobiasson Island Channel/Rearing   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 6-10 years               | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Kapusta Island and River Right Bank Channel/Rearing  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 6-10 years               | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Reading Island Channel/Rearing   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 6-10 years               | Potentially in 2020 but need permits             | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Rancho Briesgau Channel/Rearing  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 11-15 years              | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| China Gardens Side Channel   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area; improve of natural river morphology; increase floodplain habitat, riparian habitat, and instream cover | 11-15 years              | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Rio Vista  | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 11-15 years              | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| East Sand Slough   | Upper Sac AFHRP  | Creation and improvement of side channel habitat                                    | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 11-15 years              | unknown  | R          | Upper Sac AFHRP, Bond, Science Fund | Potentially USBR, SRSC | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| <b>Rearing Habitat Red Bluff Diversion Dam to Verona; Objective – Enhance ~ 2,000 acres of floodplain habitat in the Sutter Bypass within the term of the Voluntary Agreement. Provide fish passage and floodplain habitat at Tisdale Weir within 5 years and Colusa Weir within 10 - 15 years. Inventory historic oxbows and design fish passage and floodplain projects within 5 years and implement projects within 10 years.</b> |                  |   |   |  |                          |  |            |                                     |                        |             |                      |                              |                         |
| Off-Channel Rearing Habitat Restoration Projects - Side Channel/Oxbow/Floodplain on Lower Battle Creek (below Coleman Hatchery) on Lands Owned by BLM and CDFW   | SRS              | Study and Determine potential oxbow restoration sites                               | TBD   | Improve natural river morphology, riparian habitat, instream cover, and habitat complexity   | 6-10 years               | No   | R          | Bond, DWR                           | SRSC, CDFW, BLM, USBR  | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Tisdale Weir and Bypass Multibenefit Project   | SRS/SVSRP        | Operable Weir   | None, weir modification only but required to inundate Sutter bypass | Operable weir to allow for adult passage for upstream migration, and out-migrating juveniles to access Sutter Bypass                                     | 0-5 years                | No   | AM, R, M   | Bond, DWR                           | SRS/SVSRP              | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Tisdale Bypass into Sutter Bypass  |                  | Improve the bypass property into suitable habitat                                   | 500 acres   | Property already owned by CDFW and accessible, create habitat for outmigrating salmon  | 0-7 years                | unknown  | R, A       | Bond, DWR, CDFW                     | SRSC/DWR/CDFW          | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Lower Colusa Basin Drain Floodplain  |                  | Flood lower basin lands through Knights Landing Outfall Gates (KLOG)                | 300 acres   | Operations of KLOG to allow passage of outmigrating salmon onto floodplain   | 0-5 years                | No   | R          | Bond, DWR                           | SRSC/SVSRP/DWR         | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Sutter Bypass Area Multibenefit Project  | SRS              | Increase Suitable Habitat   | 2000 acres  | Increase suitable habitat for out-migrating juveniles to access Sutter Bypass  | 6-15 years               | No   | R, M       | SRS                                 | SRSC, CDFW, BLM, USBR  | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Setback Levee  |                  | Construct setback levee on existing Sac levees with willing landowners              | 200 acres   | Additional rearing habitat connected with Sac River  | 10-15 years              | No   | R          | Bond, CDFW, DWR                     | SRSC, DWR, Corp        | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Colusa Weir Multibenefit Improvements  |                  | Operable Weir   | None, weir modification only but required to inundate Sutter bypass | Operable weir to allow for adult passage for upstream migration, and out-migrating juveniles to access Sutter Bypass                                     | 6-10 years               | No   | AM, R, M   | Bond, DWR                           | SRS/SVSRP              | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |
| Sutter Bypass Weir 1 - Rehabilitation of Weir Structure and Fish Ladder. Coupled with New Lower Butte/Sutter Bypass Water Management Plan  | SRS              | Operable Weir   | None, weir modification to benefit migrating juveniles and adults   | Operable weir to allow for adult passage for upstream migration, and out-migrating juveniles to access Sutter Bypass                                     | 0-5 years                | No   | AM         | Bond, DWR                           | SRS/SVSRP              | No          | No                   | No                           | No                      |



|  |                 |  |   |  |   |     |    |                        |                  |    |    |     |    |
|--|-----------------|--|---|--|---|-----|----|------------------------|------------------|----|----|-----|----|
| Sutter Bypass Weir 2 Multibenefit Project  | SRS/SVSRP       | Operable Weir  | None, weir modification to benefit migrating juveniles and adults | Operable weir to allow for adult passage for upstream migration, and out-migrating juveniles to access Sutter Bypass | 0-5 years                               | No  | AM | Bond, DWR              | SRS/SVSRP        | No | No | No  | No |
| <b>Man Made Structures Keswick-Verona; Objective – Complete remaining high-priority fish screen projects. Reduce lighting to 3 lux or less at fish screens and bridges within 5 years. Incorporate ongoing redd dewatering coordination with Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District into a Voluntary Agreement. Address fish passage issues at Weir 1 and Weir 2 within 5 years</b> |                 |  |   |  |   |     |    |                        |                  |    |    |     |    |
| Reduced Lighting and Sacramento River Bridges  | Upper Sac AFHRP | Perform study on bridges and lighting conditions and work with agencies to reduce lighting | TBD   | Increase survival of migrating fish by reducing predation risks  | 0-5 years                               | No  | M  | Upper Sac AFHRP        | SRS/SVSRP        | No | No | No  | No |
| Screen Meridian Farms Water Company  | SRS/SVSRP       | Install fish screen  | N/A   | Fish screen, benefits based on the Sac Valley fish screen program  | 0-5 years                               | No  | M  | AFRP                   | USBR, SRSC       | No | No | No  | No |
| Screen Natomas Mutual Water Company  | SRS/SVSRP       | Install fish screen  | N/A   | Fish screen, benefits based on the Sac Valley fish screen program  | 0-5 years                               | No  | M  | AFRP                   | USBR, SRSC       | No | No | No  | No |
| Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District Dam Operations to Project Salmon Redds   | SVSRP           | Weir and bypass operations   | TBD   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area   | 0-5 years                               | No  | I  | AFRP                   | USBR, SRSC       | No | No | No  | No |
| Study, Design, and Implement Modifications to Known Redd Dewatering Locations  | New             | Perform study on redd locations and water elevations based on river stages                 | TBD   | Increase existing suitable spawning habitat area   | 0-10 years (annual)                     | No  | I  | AFRP                   | USBR, SRSC, CDFW | No | No | No  | No |
| Program for Identification of Predation Hot Spots. Adaptively Manage for the Reduction/Improvement of Predator Contract Points at Man-Made Structures Where Predator Interactions Have Been Observed   | New             | Perform Study  | TBD   | Study, currently occurring   | 0-2 years                               | Yes | M  | AFRP, CDFW, SRSC, NCWA | CDFW             | No | No | Yes | No |
| Study Route-Specific Survival at Key Diversion Facilities and Implement Appropriate Devices that Reduce Route Selection Into Lower Survival Areas  | New             | Perform Study  | TBD   | Study  | 0-10 years; Annual plan within one year | No  | M  | AFRP                   | USBR, SRSC       | No | No | No  | No |

