

## OUTCOMES MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** CAMT Members  
**FROM:** Bruce DiGennaro  
**DATE:** February 28, 2020  
**RE:** February 18, 2020 CAMT Meeting #88

---

**Attendees:** Brycen Swart, Carl Wilcox, Cathy Marcinkevage, Chuck Hanson, Dana Lee, Darcy Austin, Deanna Sereno, Erin Cole, Frances Brewster, Heather Casillas, John Ferguson, Josh Israel, Kate Spear, Kaylee Allen, Louise Conrad, Lynda Smith, Pat Coulston, Rachel Johnson, Rene Henery, Sam Bashevkin, Sam Luoma, Shaara Ainsley, Ted Sommer, Yumi Henneberry,

### Action Items:

- All - Submit questions for Delta Smelt Life Cycle Models workshop (likely to be scheduled for late March/early April)
- All - Provide feedback on Delta Smelt Conditions Report
- Bruce - Follow up with Louise regarding Eva's availability to assist with Entrainment Study reports.
- Salmon Subcommittee - Consider next steps related to SFEI Salmon Rearing Habitat Study
- Bruce & Darcy - Facilitate formation of subcommittee to tee up CAMT input on SAA management questions
  - SAA subcommittee members include: Darcy, Brycen, Sam and Erin (+ keep Erik in the loop)
- Bruce – consider using Compass's progress report card format for sharing CAMT retrospective information
- All - Provide comments on draft DSSP Implementation Report

### Discussion Highlights:

#### 1. Agenda and Updates

- Delta Smelt Life Cycle Models
  - Submit questions for Delta Smelt Life Cycle Models workshop
  - Workshop will be held in late March/ early April timeframe; it will be oriented towards CSAMP/CAMT but open to all
- Salmon Rearing Habitat Report
  - Received draft report on 1/23
  - Held adviser meeting on 2/4 and provided feedback regarding:
    - Presentation of maps
    - Mapping velocity
    - Suitability maps
    - Calculations of suitable habitat
  - The final draft will be circulated to Delta Conservancy and CAMT on 2/21 and the final report will be released by 2/28
  - Salmon Subcommittee – consider next steps related to Salmon Rearing Habitat Study
- Salmon Subcommittee Update
  - 2020 Workplan
    - Looking for opportunities to engage with current Prop 1 funded projects
    - Developing Salmon Entrainment scope of work

## Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

- Coordinated Salmonid Science Plan
  - Next steps:
    - Streamlining activity list
    - Q Method Survey to prioritize activities (pilot followed by broader survey)
    - Info flow mapping
  - Questions/Comments
    - Consider lessons from Delta Smelt Entrainment: there is value in tracking changes in salvage/entrainment over time to determine impacts from rule changes and whether regulations are working
    - Are there any Prop 1 Funded projects that might touch on salmon entrainment?
      - ◆ QEA study
      - ◆ Acoustic telemetry study: hydrodynamic modeling might link exports to behavior
- Delta Smelt Scoping Team - Entrainment reports
  - Question for CAMT: should DSST's perspective be added to Entrainment Study prefaces? Alternatively, should areas of agreement/disagreement be presented as a majority/minority report?
    - Interest in seeing disagreements presented on paper (as opposed to letting open questions remain)
    - It would be helpful for DSST to speak to management relevance
    - Consider using Volume 2 of SST report as a model for capturing areas of disagreement regarding the interpretation of data based on questions received from CAMT
      - Consider looking at 2013 CAMT Key Questions, it's a long list (50+ questions) but the list of questions for consultants was trimmed
      - SST disagreements were around interpretation and scope (as opposed to facts) - consider leaving scope open and making questions specific
    - Consider an outside project manager to get study across the finish line (similar to role played by John Ferguson for SST report)
      - Follow up with Louise regarding Eva Bush's availability
- The Delta Smelt Conditions Report has been posted on the Science Program's website (will also be posted on CSAMP's website) – feedback welcome

## 2. Science Action Agenda – Management Needs and Questions (Henneberry)

- Whereas the 2017 Science Action Agenda was focused on filling science action gaps, this current update places equal weight on management needs
- The audience is regional directors, DPIC, science managers, researchers with the goal of helping to direct priorities and demonstrate alignment
- Questions for CAMT:
  - Would having management actions be helpful?
  - Is scale/level right?
  - Would directors make use of this?
- Questions/Comments

## Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

- When soliciting input from researchers be careful to make input generic (so researchers providing input don't create conflicts of interest)
- It would be helpful to have a community supported list of priorities for developing internal agency strategic objectives
- Consider showing sources of actions/needs
  - How comfortable is CAMT (and other groups/agencies) with being identified with each action/need?
- One key need to address is the extent of benefits from habitat restoration (in the face of flow limitations)
- What is the most efficient process for CAMT to provide input?
  - Consider forming representative subcommittee to draft needs and share out to CAMT
    - Subcommittee volunteers?
      - ◆ Sam, Brycen, Darcy, Bureau/DWR representation?
      - ◆ Solicit input from Salmon Subcommittee and DSST
  - Start with current list of SAA management needs and/or previous CAMT key questions
  - CAMT key questions are at right level for researcher/science manager but maybe not for regional directors' management needs
  - Fill in status column and use CAMT key question categories as starting point to solicit input
  - Consider hypotheses that were included in CAMT key questions report.
  - Are questions still relevant to what we want answered?
- (How) does this tie to CAMT retrospective?
  - Trying to kill two birds with one stone
  - For CAMT retrospective, consider using Compass's progress report card format for sharing information

### 3. 2020 Workplan

- Items that still need to be scoped:
  - Assigned
    - Delta Smelt Science Plan Implementation
    - Resiliency Strategy Implementation
    - BiOp Implementation
    - Prop 1 Studies
    - Salmon Entrainment
    - Steelhead Monitoring
    - Seasonal Outflows
    - USBR Prize Competition
  - Unassigned
    - Habitat Restoration
    - Delta Monitoring Reviews
    - Delta Smelt Propagation

#### 4. Delta Smelt Science Plan Implementation

- Delta Smelt Science Plan, Management & CSAMP
  - Key messages from the DSSP
    - Focus on mechanisms – essential to understanding stressors and assessing effectiveness of management actions
    - Understand and fill monitoring gaps
    - Understand responses – e.g. food web x flow x contaminant interactions
    - Deliver understanding for management through monthly, quarterly and annual updates
    - Take a programmatic approach – science manager, 3-year cycle, commitment of financial resources
  - Denise’s plan is science focused and the SDM is focused on management – What is the best way to get science and management to talk to each other?
    - Management is currently driving agenda
    - When evaluating Delta Smelt actions, need to make sure there aren’t negative impacts to salmon (means parallel salmon/smelt efforts needs to share assumptions)
    - Annual cycle + periodic (3-5 year) review to ensure that management actions being considered are the “right ones”
  - The Science Program Manager position has been filled and a list of synthesis topics has been developed (internally for DWR) – otherwise, the following recommended next steps have yet to be undertaken:
    - Develop predictive tools to address specific problems
    - Convene a monitoring workshop
    - Establish an independent science panel to provide timely advice
    - Conduct an inventory of information on carbon sources
    - Conduct specific experiments on contaminants
    - Solicit proposals relevant to filling specific knowledge gaps relevant for management
    - Develop a list of synthesis topics
    - Science Program Manager (done)
    - Adopt a multi-year planning process
  - Expected outcomes from integrated DSSP + SDM
    - Actions for conserving smelt
    - Impacts to other species
    - Implementation of actions in adaptive management framework
  - Possible next steps
    - How to ensure implementation and integration of DSSP and SDM?
    - Is a Conservation Program Manager needed?
    - Which of Denise’s recommendations to pursue?
  - Comments/Questions
    - Defining objectives in SDM should be an iterative process led by CSAMP (or other outside agency)
    - Is SDM format a good one for identifying gaps and bringing it back to decision making?
      - Yes, very clear where gaps are during SDM evaluation steps. Identifying research

## Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

priorities is an explicit step but need to communicate that out.

- What would a Conservation Program Manager give us that CAMT doesn't?
  - Oversight? Accountability? Identifying gaps/opportunities?
    - ◆ Various agencies have oversight responsibilities, not sure that an individual program manager would be helpful outside of sharing information
    - ◆ Suggests a more hierarchical structure as opposed to current distributed CAMT structure
- DSSP Test Report Update
  - Comments on draft report due 2/28
  - Having concluded science cataloging stage and assessment stage (using North Delta Flow action as an example), currently at reporting stage
  - Purpose of report:
    - Document (summarize) 2019 science planning processes & outcomes
    - Limited assessment of extant & DSSP planning, relative to each other
    - Report management-relevant observations from the assessment
    - Share observations (not recommendations)
      - Examples of observations:
        - ◆ Burden of simultaneous reporting and planning
        - ◆ Great potential for DSSP Science Manager to help facilitate reporting
        - ◆ Preliminary results currently fuel major action/science adaption
  - Questions/Comments
    - One takeaway is that current actions (e.g, North Delta Flow Action) are thoughtful, structured processes that incorporate stakeholder input
    - Appears to be a need for facilitation/tracking/communication/sharing information for both annual workplans and full 3 year cycle
      - Is this a role for Brycen and Brittany?
    - Presentations seem to be an efficient means of short-cutting reporting to share information and put science before decision makers
    - Need for rigorously monitoring confounding factors
      - Is this a role for Brycen and Brittany to oversee?

## 5. Planning for May 13 Policy Group Meeting

- Add DSSP report to May Policy Group meeting agenda