

CDFW 2020 Strategy Session #2

Meeting Agenda

Sites Reservoir Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** | July 14, 2020 | **Location:** | WebExCall in : 408-418-9388, access code: 146 539 3309 |
| **Time:** | 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm |

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose:** Discuss and develop 2020 CDFW ITP approach and diversion criteria |
| **Invitees:** |
| Ali Forsythe, Sites Authority John Spranza, HDRErin Heydinger, HDR | Rob Tull, JacobsChris Fitzer, ESARob Leaf, Jacobs | Monique Briard, ICFJim Lecky, ICFJason Hassrick, ICFMike Hendrick, ICF |
| **Agenda:** |  |  |
| **Discussion Topic** | **Topic Leader** | **Est Time** |
| 1. Introductions for New Members
 | John  | 5 min |
| 1. Review and Discussion of Action Items
 | John | 15 min |
| 1. Update on Recent CDFW Meetings
2. ITP Staffing and Schedule
 | John  | 5 min |
| 1. Update on Baseline, Modeling and Cold Water Benefits
 | Erin/Rob Leaf | 15 min |
| 1. Define “Reasonably Foreseeable Project”
 | John | 15 min  |
| 1. Discuss AI-3 and AI-4
 | Jim/Leaf/Tull | 20 min |
| 1. Open Discussion
 | All  | 10 min |
| 1. Next Steps
 | John  | 5 min |

| **Action Item**  | **Owner** | **Deadline** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Refine tax table for backward iteration of fishery effects and then determine the yield and engineering inputs needed to incorporate into the BON | Tull/Lecky | TBD |  |
| 2 | Review/revise upstream diversion criteria for DS benefit protections and NDOI, Freeport and OMR requirements from ITP | ICF and Spranza | 7/28/20 | Currently being revised by ICF per discussions with Integration |
| 3 | Matrix for reasonably foreseeable projects and rational for inclusion/exclusion | ICF and Spranza | 7/28/20 | Currently being revised by ICF per discussions with Integration.  |
| 4 | Memo on fish in good condition (5937) | ICF | 8/7/20 |  |

**Potential General CDFW Policy Approach to ITP: REVISED1**

1. Define the yield and cost requirements of the project
	* Annualized release is 230k – 240k AF at $650-$710 per AF without WIFIA or $600-660 with WIFIA loans.
2. Optimize project to minimize impact where possible and achieve the identified benefits in WISP
3. Run model and compare to:
	* With and Without Project effect
	* CDFW scenarios
4. Further optimize if possible with CDFW
5. Acknowledge impacts and benefits to CDFW and educate CDFW staff and management about the rational for upstream protections and how they relate to downstream benefits and effects to areas they are concerned with (ITP)
6. Submit ITP and brief ITP Negotiation Lead
7. Elevate to CDFW management to make a decision (accept, reject or conditionally accept with revision) if staff have significant concerns and would resist permit based on benefits and effects not staff-proposed downstream criteria.

1The order of these have been revised based on 7/14/20 discussion to reflect the need to define a project and is in the process of being further refined by ICF/Integration

**Notes**

* Project’s range for deliverable water is 230k – 240k AF and $650-$710 per AF without WIFIA or $600-660 with WIFIA loans.
* Breakdown of water allotment is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Member** | **Reservoir Participation (AFY)** |
| **Public Water Agencies** |
| * + North of Delta
 | * + 52,142
 |
| * + South of Delta
 | * + 140,750
 |
| *Subtotal Public Water Agencies* | *192,892* |
| **State of CA** | * + ~ 40,000
 |
| **Total Requirement** | * + **~230,000**
 |

* DCR 2019 final in July
* DWR will use CalSim III for Delta Conveyance
	+ Calsim III expected September 2020
* Los Vaqueros analysis is taking a different and non-compatible approach to ours. Details to come from additional discussions with Rob Leaf.
* Current Shasta coldwater pool sensitivity analysis (5/20/20) indicates that August and September releases in Tier 2 and 3 years that result from the exchanges could, on average, decrease monthly average temperature at Sacramento River below Clear Creek (CCR) by up to 0.4 degrees Fahrenheit in August and September. This decrease in temperature would, on average, reduce temperature-based egg mortality by about 5% in those years. (memo here: [https://sitesreservoirproject.sharepoint.com/:f:/r/envpermitting/Data%20and%20Background%20Information/Operations%20Modeling%20Documents?csf=1&web=1&e=gMCTLu](https://sitesreservoirproject.sharepoint.com/%3Af%3A/r/envpermitting/Data%20and%20Background%20Information/Operations%20Modeling%20Documents?csf=1&web=1&e=gMCTLu)
	+ **Sites Benefits to ROC on LTO Cold Water Pool Management Summary**
		- Tier 1 years:
			* No benefit
		- Tier 2 years:
			* Decreasing releases in April through June could preserve Shasta cold water pool for more targeted release in the hatching period (described above).
		- Tier 3 years:
			* Decreasing releases in April through June could preserve Shasta cold water pool for more targeted release in the hatching period (described above).
		- Tier 4 years:
			* Little benefit – On its own, Sites could not benefit Shasta cold water pool in an appreciable manner. In combination with intervention measures, Sites may prove beneficial.
* Jacobs is currently working on modeling the project with and without federal investment.
* Approach to Sites current modeling analysis needs to take into account project time/schedule requirements. This necessitates some up-front planning for what biological protections should be included in the initial screening analysis and then carried through to the initial full modeling run. The following are items that could be considered for the initial screening analysis:
	+ Reasonably Foreseeable Actions and/or Protections to include in initial screening. These would have a draft CEQA or NEPA document or part of a BO or ITP that (open for discussion):
		- Fremont Weir Notch
			* Effect to habitat (timing and duration of inundation)
		- Delta Conveyance Project/Water Fix(WF has Draft EIR)
		- VA’s
		- Wilkins Slough 8,000 April/May)
		- Fish Screen Limitations
		- Others
	+ Other Actions related to, but not included in the initial screening analyses that could be included at a later date (open for discussion)
		- Sutter Bypass protections
			* Flow over weirs: Tisdale, Moulton, Colusa, etc,
			* Changes to timing and duration of inundation
		- Pulse Protections
		- Scaled diversion at Red Bluff and Hamilton City
* Federal Investment is still undetermined and Jacobs is working on a model with and without federal investment.
* Jacobs also has a model that can vary flows at each Sutter weirs should we wish to use that.