

## **Sacramento River Temperature Task Group**

### **Special Meeting on 6/13/12**

**Objective:** Provide advice to the Water Operations Management Team (WOMT) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on measures to assist with improving and stabilizing Chinook population in the Sacramento River. Annually, Reclamation develops temperature operation plans for the Shasta and Trinity divisions of the CVP. These plans consider impacts on winter-run and other races of Chinook salmon, and associated project operations. SRTTG meets to discuss biological, hydrologic, and operational information, objectives, and alternative operations plans for temperature control. Once SRTTG has recommended an operation plan for temperature control, Reclamation then submits a report to the SWRCB. After implementation of the operation plan, the SRTTG may perform additional studies and commonly holds meetings as needed typically monthly through summer and into fall to develop revisions based on updated biological data, reservoir temperature profiles and operations data.

#### **Attendees:**

**FWS:** Craig Anderson, Matt Brown

**DFG:** Alice Low, Patricia Bratcher

**Reclamation:** Paul Fujitani, Thuy Washburn, Rod Wittler

**SWRCB:** Kari Kyler

**NOAA:** Bruce Oppenheim, Garwin Yip

**WAPA:** Tom Patton

**FWD:** not present

**Hoopa:** not present

**Note Taker:** Barbara Rocco, Independent Contractor

**Yurok Tribe:** Mason Harris

#### **Agenda:**

This special meeting was convened to discuss the exceedance points and notification (the target is 56°F) of exceedances. The group was to receive and review a new model from Russ Yaworsky (Reclamation) that would enable it to make a decision on the compliance point.

#### **Background:**

Washburn (Reclamation) sent an email before the 6/8/12 meeting to the SRTTG members stating that there were concerns about the Sacramento River temperatures the previous week and asking to meet on 6/8/12 to discuss the temperature operations and future plans and compliance points.

#### **Discussion:**

Yaworsky (Reclamation) ran another temperature analysis. Did the group get a chance to look at this?

DFG: Yes, we looked at it and communicated by email yesterday. The modeling between Jellys Ferry and Bend Bridge was not that different as far as water temperatures. Winter run information did come into play in our decision; there aren't that many winter run coming back

this year, which is a huge concern, but they are spawning in the upper reaches; therefore, biologically, there won't be an impact of keeping the compliance point at Jellys Ferry.

NMFS: Each fish agency weighed in on both compliance points and looked at Russ' new model. We believe that the temperature compliance point should be changed to Jellys Ferry.

Everyone is in agreement with this. Jim Smith (FWS) couldn't be here today but agreed by email yesterday.

Reclamation: Temperatures at Jellys Ferry are beginning to rise. We opened another middle gate yesterday and closed the upper gate, and had some release changes. Reclamation will continue to target Jellys Ferry. Winter-run are spawning upstream, but that's no surprise, right?

DFG: Well, with lower population numbers, they spawn higher in the system and are not as spread out. With better returns, they would be more distributed; we've had low returns now for several years so it's not surprising that it's happened again this year.

Do you have the information you need for the temperature profile now?

Reclamation: Our assumption is that we've decided that the compliance point will be at Jellys Ferry for the rest of the summer unless we see that something has changed.

Yes, and if there are problems, there would be a meeting of the group to discuss them.

The question was raised about the status of Brown's proposal to avoid full power peaking this summer. It was agreed that this subject would be best addressed at the next meeting.

Next meeting: Given that we've already had two conference calls in June, should we have another one on the 4th Thursday of the month as scheduled? Yes, keep the June meeting because we will have the new temperature profiles by then.

Temperature management plan: For the temperature management plan, Washburn had intended to send the document to Oppenheim; however, the group expressed interest in seeing it as well. When the report is completed, Washburn will send it to the entire group. In addition, Oppenheim asked that if anyone was interested in seeing the biological rationale information that goes to the SWRCB, he would share the information with the group. It would be good to have people review the language, which is only about a paragraph long. Everyone agreed; Oppenheim will send it to the group.

**Next meeting:** Conference call on 6/28/12 at 1:00 p.m.

**Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:20 p.m.