

OUTCOMES MEMORANDUM

TO: CAMT Members
FROM: Bruce DiGennaro
DATE: June 5, 2020
RE: May 19, 2020 CAMT Meeting #91

Attendees: Brett Harvey, Brycen Swart, Carl Wilcox, Chuck Hanson, Dana Lee, Darcy Austin, Denise Reed, Erik Loboschefsky, Erin Cole, Eva Bush, Frances Brewster, Kaylee Allen, John Ferguson, Josh Israel, Larry Brown, Lynda Smith, Mario Manzo, Michelle Banonis, Rachel Johnson, Sam Luoma, Scott Hamilton, Stephen Maurano, Steve Culberson, Steve Lindley, Ted Sommer, Yuan Liu

Action Items:

- K&W – create a second version of meeting notes for more widespread distribution (limited to key outcomes and action items, include a header stating “Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants”)
- Bruce – reconvene CAMT working group to develop/update management questions (for Science Action Agenda and including salmon entrainment)
- ? – Make SFEI Rearing Habitat Study materials 508 compliant so they can be shared on State/Federal websites
- All – provide feedback on clarity of “Life Cycle Models Management Brief”
- Salmon Subcommittee – discuss what specific hydrodynamic criteria it would be helpful to map (in relation to SFEI Rearing Habitat Study)
- Salmon Subcommittee – discuss timeline for near-term salmon actions
- Salmon Subcommittee – discuss how best to support the “Life Cycle Models Management Brief” (e.g., what would endorsement look like?)

Discussion Highlights:

1. Agenda and Updates

- Delta Smelt LCM Workshop
 - Received positive feedback on workshop
- Tule Red
 - Monitoring crews found long-fin smelt in restored areas
- Sac River Partnership Science Plan
 - Draft science plan completed by Denise Reed, will bring an update to CAMT in June or July
 - Series of webinars starting in June
- Winter Run Life Cycle Model
 - May 28 webinar - presentation from Science Center (Kate can provide more information)
- Jennifer is passing baton to Darcy as new PWA rep

2. May Policy Group Meeting Outcomes

- Support for science presentations – appreciation for bringing outside research to Policy Group
- Don’t abandon efforts to examine project impacts - particularly where there are disagreements.
- Elevate the issue of SDM and its relationship to the DSSP.

- Support for convergence of science investments (e.g. CSAMP, CVPIA, IEP, SRSP, etc.).
- Put more effort into salmonid issues.

3. Technical Team Notes

- Background
 - Interest in making notes from technical teams more widely available (similar to CVPIA's SIT notes)
 - Concern that notes could be used in litigation and formalizing would require additional time and effort associated with review and approval
- Memo drafted outlining context, arguments for and against
- Questions/Comments
 - Very valuable to have technical notes made widely available for the sake of transparency and keeping people informed
 - Helpful to have notes available for missed meetings, open and transparent communication. Not too concerned about notes being used for litigation
 - Would this be for all technical teams or just some?
 - Would be for all teams
 - Concerned about getting mired in wordsmithing given experience with smelt entrainment studies
 - If changes are being made they should be across the board for all meetings/teams (i.e., CAMT/CSAMP shouldn't be treated differently)
 - How wide is widely available?
 - Potentially they would get posted to CSAMP website and would be available for anyone to view
 - Not particularly interested in adding a review process, consider posting with the caveat that they are facilitator's notes that have not been reviewed
 - Agree they shouldn't be posted as representing the view of the technical teams. Don't think that notes replace attending a meeting especially as we're attempting to establish trust amongst those attending the meeting. Concerned that coming to agreement on notes could be a significant effort. Notes should be action item oriented.
 - Agree that notes should just be a reflection of facilitator's record
 - Add a header to each page of notes that states that this is the facilitator's record
 - Have struggled with this at IEP over the years. Purpose of notes should be to give a flavor of what happened in meetings, deliverables should speak for themselves (as opposed to diving deep into machinations of wordsmithing)
 - Agree with having some availability of notes at a high level (possibly just major outcomes and action items)
 - Science Management Team notes are a good parallel for how to share notes amongst teams
 - Are we considering changing what's included/formatting in current notes?
 - No, continue to generally steer clear of personal attribution
 - Do current notes meet needs?
 - ◆ Yes
 - Consider steering clear of detailed summary notes and just focus on action items and outcomes
 - May need to change meetings to formally agree on outcomes
 - For those who favor making notes more widely available, would leaving out detailed summary be sufficient?
 - Open to trying but concerned that it may not be enough information

- Would like to see a happy medium reached
- Not in favor of having full notes posted publicly
- If the concern is that CSAMP/CAMT members are not receiving information from their colleagues who attend other meetings, then that seems like a communication problem between representatives and their respective agency staff
- Are technical teams open to all?
 - Rules are pretty fluid – not a lot of protocols around technical team participation
- There appears to be consensus around making a high level, streamlined version of the notes more widely available

4. Science Action Agenda Update

- Next iteration is due in 2022, update is currently underway
- Focusing on management questions first (through outreach/review/refinement)
- Screening criteria to ensure questions/actions fall within SAA scope
- Workshop dates will be announced via listserv and posted on Council's website
- Questions/Comments
 - What is the process for submitting management questions?
 - Already looking at various groups' existing documents but additional input around updates would be helpful. Send questions to: Rachael.Klopfenstein@deltacouncil.ca.gov
 - Do you want justification included for questions?
 - ◆ If justification isn't included, we'll run it through screening criteria. Justification would help provide context.
 - Are you soliciting beyond existing documents?
 - ◆ Working on documents because that's what's accessible but asking for additional input (e.g., updates, formal group input, public workshop, online)
 - ◇ Science Program website will be available for providing input (not currently available)
 - Does CAMT want to provide an updated set of "CAMT management questions" or let individuals/agencies respond separately?
 - Potentially aligns with CAMT's retrospective effort
 - Seems like it would be beneficial to go beyond existing documents to glean current questions
 - Seems like there could be a benefit to CAMT providing questions (could reach a broader audience)
 - Support concept – not sure about the details of providing questions vs objectives
 - What's the best way for CAMT to facilitate producing an updated set of question? Re-constitute subcommittee? Draw from recently produced documents?
 - Consider doing work in small groups
 - Bruce to re-convene working group
 - Feedback due June 26

5. Salmon Subcommittee Updates

- CSSP Update
 - Refinement of activity and Q statements is almost complete
 - Q Method survey (aimed at sorting Q statements so as to prioritize activity statements) should be released the week of 5/18

- Questions/Comments
 - Do activities extend beyond habitat restoration (example provided is related to habitat restoration)
 - Yes, they include science, management and monitoring activities and run the gamut across topics.
- Advancing SFEI Study
 - Purpose
 - Provide a resource for future restoration planning
 - Support future Prop 1 submittals and evaluations
 - Improve the effectiveness of restoration investments
 - Next Steps
 1. Make mapping more accessible for restoration planning
 - a. For example, make web mapping interactive (Pascale has been looking into this)
 2. Elevate awareness of report/conduct outreach
 - a. For example, use as a reference for future Prop 1 solicitations
 3. Improve mapping of hydrodynamic criteria (e.g. velocity), shoreline conditions and substrates (e.g. shoals)
 4. Consider how to reflect other stressors (e.g. predation, contaminants)
 - Questions/Comments
 - Interested in sharing material but it will need to be 508 compliant to post on state/federal websites
 - SST put considerable effort into hydrodynamic studies, would be helpful to understand what specific additional hydrodynamic criteria mapping is needed (Spatial? Temporal?)
 - SST report and prioritized activities from CSSP should help focus
 - Consider having Salmon Subcommittee dive into specifics. How do questions around sheltering, foraging etc. tie in?
 - New research being published re: biological/abiotic components of restoration beyond physical restoration
 - Would like to see the biological side incorporated into further effort
 - Is SFEI Rearing Habitat study complete?
 - Yes, survey was completed in April
 - Are additional resources needed for next steps?
 - 1&2 shouldn't require additional resources; 3&4 may require additional resources
- Near-term Salmon Actions Memo
 - Salmon Subcommittee reviewed list of 25 near term salmon-related management actions and identified potential roles for CSAMP. 10 projects were identified that may benefit from CSAMP engagement. Recommendations at this time are to:
 - Wait to finish ongoing planning studies (e.g., CSSP) before selecting specific projects for CSAMP engagement
 - Promote modeling of benefits of all the actions
 - Questions/Comments
 - Seems like the place CAMT can be most beneficial is to evaluate benefits of various restoration actions throughout the Delta.
 - Is CSAMP/CAMT the right arm for this effort? Would like input from Salmon Subcommittee regarding which projects should be included in models to anticipate potential benefits.

Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

- Not sure there's a request being made of CSAMP/CAMT, rather this is the Subcommittee keeping CAMT informed that additional effort is needed to evaluate potential benefits through modeling before advocating for any projects
 - Original intention of review was to evaluate which projects to model in SIT
 - Some may already have been run through SIT
 - What's the timeline?
 - There isn't a schedule at this time, but these are near-term actions – good question for Subcommittee to consider.
- Salmon Entrainment
 - Proposed approach:
 - Management questions (developed iteratively by Subcommittee and CAMT)
 - Overarching management questions
 - Specific science questions
 - ◆ Direct vs indirect entrainment – disagreement as to whether it's possible to separate/evaluate impacts
 - Technical discussions with experts
 - Implementation (define study scope, secure resource and contract as needed)
 - No timeframe as of yet – likely a six a month process
 - Questions/Comments
 - Concerned regarding COVID impacts and imbalance of capacity for taking on/fully participating in new collaborative initiatives. Concerned that this may inhibit the inclusiveness that's needed on this project and wondering what's the appropriate timeframe/speed for moving forward
 - Developing questions between Subcommittee and CAMT may be time intensive. Is a dedicated CAMT working group needed?
 - Concerned about burden but keep hearing that additional salmon effort is needed. Wondering if there are small salmon-related steps where we can focus our energy
 - SFEI Habitat Study and CSSP are great examples of recently completed and current salmon-related efforts (respectively)
 - Perhaps development of management questions for Science Action Agenda could be utilized to develop some entrainment questions.
- Habitat Restoration Monitoring
 - Draft "Life Cycle Models Management Brief" produced (stemming from Winter Run Life Cycle model workshops), endorsed by SIT and concordant with their priorities
 - Recommendation is to build predictions and monitoring into restoration projects to better gauge impacts
 - Soliciting feedback on clarity of brief
 - Questions/Comments
 - Should CAMT consider endorsing this brief?
 - Part of endorsement could be CAMT raising this to Policy Group and advocating for initiatives to take place
 - Not sure how an endorsement would be framed
 - ◆ Not clear what we'd be endorsing – an approach? Use of existing information?

Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

- Interested to see how Rachel's paper (re: biological components of restoration) might integrate with this
- Consider having Subcommittee discuss how to move this forward