Action Items from CDFW 60-day

1. Salmonids
   1. Flow survival
      1. Would be Significant effect?
         1. Would remain LTS but add in Wilkins 10,700 cfs Mar-May as voluntary mitigation
            1. What species/runs would that apply to? ICF to review
      2. Pulse protection with 10,700 Mar-May as mitigation?
      3. Exchanges potentially significant, mitigation is no exchanges when identified as potentially detrimental to species
   2. Rearing effects in Sutter, Side Channel, river margin and near river floodplain habitat
      1. Jason to work with Ken on Off Channel Habitat Paper
         1. Team will use this during final EIR and ITO
      2. Still LTS?
2. Fremont Weir
   1. Effect of reduced entrainment into Yolo.
      1. Steve to finalize analysis and team to include in discussion
      2. Team to include discussion of Pope et al and that juvenile fish that do not get entrained do not necessarily have reduced survivability as they go won the mainstem.
      3. Still LTS?
3. Temperature of Releases
   1. Sites to identify Significant(?) as it could affect 24 C threshold for delta smelt and propose mitigation similar to water quality.
      1. Mitigation would be monitoring and cessation of flows into the bypass should water temp or DO exceed threshold.
4. Delta Smelt
   1. Effect to DS change to Significant
      1. Resulting from effects to food species abundance in spring
         1. CDFW explicitly stated it considers any effect to DS as significant
         2. Mitigation would be per existing methodology, tidal restoration at 10x the rate of longfin mitigation
         3. Don’t understand how this is rational with the WSIP flows and can we reconcile that?
5. Longfin smelt
   1. Still significant with mitigation
      1. Mitigation is still being discussed with CDFW team
      2. CDFW suggested we continue to work on mitigation through final but identify the initial 11-15 acers in the draft
6. Other
   1. Waterfix analysis for effects to inundated habitat would be required
      1. Resulted in 4 miles of restoration of river bech habitat for waterfix
      2. Not sure this is such a large issue for sites as we are upstream and taking a mx of 4,900 cfs off of winter flows that only effect one (not 3) rivers
      3. Marin and Steve working this up

**Additional Actions**

1. Bolster discussion and included uncertainty in following analyses:

* Exchanges – to be managed through reclamation’s existing temp mgt team with Authority collaboration
* Delta smelt food effects that are seen in spring and the uncertainty of the effect of yolo flows on the food for DS
* Add all months of divers to Table 11-11
* How pelagic habitat effects are mitigated by tidal restoration

1. Address the potential confusion with Michel et al 2021’s finding that a positive effect of the project on juvenile survival that would result from diversions that reduce flow below 20k cfs
2. Discuss the potential risks associated with AMP and that it would be avoidance and minimization
3. Sophie to elaborate on the adult splittail analysis to better qualify and discuss the adequacy and applicability of it to the adults.
4. Lifecycle model and juvenile rearing model are very limited, explain its effectivity in delta rearing habitat