

OUTCOMES MEMORANDUM

TO: CAMT Salmon Subcommittee Members
FROM: Rafael Silberblatt
DATE: June 4, 2020
RE: May 14, 2020 CAMT Salmon Subcommittee Meeting

Attendees: Alison Collison, Brad Cavallo, Brett Harvey, Bryan Matthias, Brycen Swart, Cathy Marcinkevage, Carl Wilcox, Cedar Morton, Deanna Sereno, Frances Brewster, Jean Castillo, John Ferguson, Kate Spear, Pascale Goertler, Rene Henery, Thad Bettner, Todd Manly

Action Items:

- Brycen, Kate, Pascale - Reach out to PIs (for Prop 1 and Delta Stewardship Council-funded salmon projects) to determine if/when they would be available to present at a future Subcommittee meeting
- ESSA - Distribute CSSP Q-Survey
- All – Provide feedback on CSSP survey recipients by 5/15
- All - Send Brett feedback on Restoration Needs Management Brief prior to May CAMT meeting
- Bruce - Revise Salmon Actions Recommendations Memo prior to May CAMT meeting
- Bruce - Develop salmon entrainment slides for May CAMT meeting for Subcommittee's review.

Discussion Highlights:

1. Coordinated Salmonid Science Plan

- Final Q Survey Criteria:
 - Learning Benefits - The activity accelerates learning on key cause-effect mechanisms influencing salmonid survival, behavior & diversity through the Delta.
 - Magnitude of Benefits - The activity will contribute to recovery of salmonids at the population level or will help to identify actions most likely to contribute to detectable levels of population recovery.
 - Multi-Species Benefits - The activity is expected to generate multi-salmonid benefits and conversely, will pose a low chance of unintended negative consequences / trade-offs to other priority salmonids.
 - Implementability - The activity is highly implementable (i.e., few hurdles to implementation based on regulatory/permitting complexity, on-the-ground logistical challenges, good models or precedent, potential litigation, need for willing cooperation of private property owners, cost, political will, etc.)
- Subcommittee to send final revisions to survey recipient list by May 15
- Follow-up call on May 16 to discuss revised Activity Statements & resulting Q statement revisions
- Survey notice to be distributed by May 18

- Survey intended to be released on May 20

2. Salmon Actions Memo

- Memo summarizes near-term management actions listed in Salmon Actions Matrix and identifies ten potential projects that would benefit from CAMT 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
- Bruce to incorporate group's revisions ahead of May 19 CAMT meeting

3. Restoration Needs Management Brief

- Management Brief reflects information life cycle models need to inform habitat restoration and winter-run life cycle advisory committee work
- Member questions/comments and responses:
 - Consider tying this restoration criteria to the SFEI study to make this product stronger. Where are there opportunities to further connectivity of restoration efforts between the two?
 - Brief is not intended to make recommendations, which is why specific science actions related to connectivity are not included.
 - Consider reviewing at May CAMT meeting.
 - Brief and SFEI report will inform Prop 1 RFPs. Those solicitations are likely coming soon which is why showing to CAMT again would be helpful.
 - Regarding the hypothetical example currently included in the Brief, managers wouldn't want to fabricate an answer.
 - Developing a real example now, initial results should be ready by June.
 - These could be included as priorities in a general way for the upcoming solicitation cycle.
 - A key message for solicitation would be to include a requirement for predictions within restoration management plan or project. An integral part of these plans and actions is monitoring and how monitoring can tie back into support decision making.
 - As it pertains to Prop 1, it would have to be a standalone monitoring activity as opposed to an actual restoration project. This is the case as the Prop 1 funding wouldn't last long enough to see a project through. I think we're all interested in understanding this Brief better. The problem is that science funding from CDFW is restricted to the Delta.
 - Do we want CSAMP's endorsement of this?
 - Yes, Life Cycle and SIT teams identified this as a major gap and the Brief would help in addressing it. The more we delay, the longer it takes to get to a tool that we need. I would like to see CAMT get behind this, whether it's through partnering with SFEI (for example) or forming a collaborative working group.
- Subcommittee to send feedback and questions to Brett in advance of CAMT meeting next week
- The recommendation of the Subcommittee is to keep advancing this process

4. Salmon Entrainment

- Entrainment questions are broken into three categories: overarching questions; questions related to direct entrainment; and questions related to indirect entrainment
 - Direct entrainment questions are specific to fish arriving at facilities in near field
 - Indirect entrainment questions may be more difficult to answer and/or other entities may currently be working on them (therefore some working group members feel these questions should be “optional”)
- Subcommittee comments/questions and responses:
 - Concerned that indirect questions may not be getting sufficient attention because they’re deemed “too hard”. How we address direct effects is based on our understanding of indirect effects. The value is to understand indirect and direct together.
 - It’s critical to clearly distinguish between direct/indirect effects.
 - This still feels really new. I’m ok with sharing with CAMT but we need more time to review/consider before deciding to move forward with implementing what this outlines.
 - Do the overarching questions consider the current BiOps? Consider replacing “BiOps” with “operations” instead of referencing BiOps specifically.
 - From a historical perspective, one of the key arguments between management and technical staff across agencies was that technical staff noted that salmon die in the south Delta as a result of indirect effects. We need to understand indirect effects to answer big picture questions, direct and indirect effects can’t be decoupled.
 - This process should focus on questions we can answer with available data. It seems those questions are by and large related to direct entrainment. I’m all for answering indirect entrainment questions if there is data available for them.
 - The big picture questions are sufficient for CAMT at this time, there will need to be a lot of iteration to work through the entire document with CAMT.
 - Consider removing the word “optional” from the indirect questions.
 - For next week’s CAMT meeting, it would be nice for this group to have recommendation as to which questions we should be pursuing - the first and last bullet under general questions seem to do that and they addresses direct and indirect entrainment.
 - What are we asking of CAMT at this time?
 - Getting their agreement on our recommendation that allows us to do more work on addressing first and last of the big picture questions. We also need approval of our proposed approach.
 - I think it’s ok to slow down collaborative studies given the realities of COVID. I think we should get more management type people involved to confirm which questions we will be pursuing. We can then take that discussion to science group to see what questions can/can’t be answered. That would inform what data is and is not available. Maybe we also identify the studies completed since the SST addressing direct and indirect entrainment and go from there.
- At the May 19 CAMT meeting, a brief update will be provided that includes proposed approach. Overarching questions and a couple of examples of more specific questions will also be shared.

Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

- The Subcommittee recommends that CAMT form a subgroup to work with the Subcommittee on developing questions.

5. SFEI Rearing Habitat Study

- Next steps will be shared with CAMT at May meeting.

6. DSP & Prop 1 Funded Studies

- Subcommittee members agreed that Pascale's document is ready to be shared
- Brycen, Kate, and Pascale to consider how/when to have PIs present to Subcommittee. Subcommittee to offer suggestions on priorities
- Member questions/comments and responses
 - How can the Subcommittee be more involved in Prop 1 solicitations?
 - Historically CAMT has shared its priorities with CDFW. It is left up to individual administrators as to how and to what extent those priorities are incorporated. There is no external review of the solicitations.