Action Items from CDFW 60-day **INTERNAL USE ONLY**

1. Salmonids
   1. Flow survival
      1. Effect would remain LTS
         1. Add in Wilkins 10,700 cfs Mar-May as voluntary mitigation
            1. What species/runs would that apply to?

ICF to review and address in document

Ali and John to write up the LTS characterization and set up voluntary mitigation with blanks

ICF to fill in spp details on why it would further reduce the effects of the project

* + 1. Exchanges would be called significant
       1. ICF to what impact this would fall under (FISH 1, 2, 3?)
       2. Mitigation is no exchanges when identified as potentially detrimental to species
       3. ICF to work up “carefully worded” discussion of exchanges to be managed through Sac River Temp Group with Authority collaboration
          1. Work in State Boards acceptance of Reclamation’s TMP
  1. 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 ITP
     2. Modify to Significant
        1. Pending feedback from Jerry/Ali
        2. Mitigation would be commitment to what? ICF to develop and make commensurate with effect.
           1. Jeremy’s work may be available
           2. Jason and Marin to work landsat

1. 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 down the mainstem.
      3. Still LTS?
         1. Marin and Steve working on the numbers of fish that could be effected
      4. What happens if we remove our FW criteria?
         1. This is to be addressed between draft and final
      5. We will circle back on this once analysis/info is available from Marin and Steve
2. Temperature of Releases 8/13 In process to be resolved with significant effect and mitigation, no specific thresholds (temp or DO) are included but a program approach.
   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.
         1. ICF to develop mitigation and thresholds for trigger
      2. ICF to cross-reference with WQ chapter to make sure we are consistent
3. Delta Smelt 8/13 ICF waiting for direction should it need to be modified to significant with mitigations
   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
            1. ICF to revise effect and mitigation for effect
4. Longfin smelt; 8/13. STET
   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
         1. Follow-up post draft pre final EIR
5. Other
   1. Waterfix analysis for effects to inundated habitat would be required
      1. Resulted in 4 miles of restoration of river bench 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
         1. Review analysis and determine if there is an effect
         2. If possible, include analysis in Draft
   2. 8/13: Approximately 4% or 2,000 feet of channel margin/potential rearing habitat could be affected throughout the entire length below diversions
      1. Waiting for the outcome of the 8/19 meeting to determine pathway
         1. No action result from 8/19 would result in no change to document and hold for RTC

**Additional Actions**

1. Bolster discussion and included uncertainty in following analyses:

* Delta smelt food effects that are seen in spring and the uncertainty of the effect of yolo flows on the food for DS
  + Included in analysis for DS
* Add all months of our diversion into Table 11-11
  + Marin to modify table
  + Will pair with the weighted analysis of juvenile entrainment into yolo
* Sutter Bypass
  + Similar weighting analysis to that of Yolo
* How pelagic habitat effects are mitigated by tidal restoration
  + No action required, information is contained in document.

1. Adult salmonids coming up Yolo and that potential effect
   1. Jason is working up the Wallace weir information
      1. Jim to touch base.
      2. Could also include temp triggers in the fall for salmonids in water quality mitigation
2. 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
   1. Marin is working up
3. Discuss the potential risks associated with AMP and that it would be avoidance and minimization
   1. Aquatics team to work to better characterize AMP language in EIR/S to ensure we recognize the current limitation and unknows of the effectivity of the program
4. Sophie to elaborate on the adult splittail analysis to better qualify and discuss the adequacy and applicability of it to the adults.