

Delta Smelt Working Group Meeting Notes

October 30, 2006

Participating: Gonzalo Castillo (USFWS), Mike Chotkowski (USBR), Steve Culberson (CBDA, guest), Kevin Fleming (CDFG), Lenny Grimaldo (CDWR), Tracy Hinojosa (CDWR), Peter Johnsen (USFWS), Matt Nobriga (CDWR), Ted Sommer (CDWR), Stephani Sparr (CDWR, guest), Kevin Sun (CDWR, guest), Jim White (CDFG) and Victoria Poage (USFWS, convener and scribe)

For Discussion:

Review of PTM requested at October 10 meeting

Recommendation for WOMT: There was no recommendation from this meeting.

Notes:

At the October 10 meeting the Working Group identified a need for Particle Tracking Modeling of the effects of CCF intake gate operations. The following runs assuming a VAMP-like hydrology were requested:

- Scenario A, SJR 7000 cfs, combined export 3000 cfs, all barriers in, and CCFB gates standard operation
- Scenario B, SJR 7000 cfs, combined export 3000 cfs, all barriers in, and CCFB gates are open
- Scenario C, SJR 7000 cfs, combined export 3000 cfs, all barriers out, and CCFB gates standard operation
- Scenario D, SJR 7000 cfs, combined export 3000 cfs, all barriers out, and CCFB gates are open
- Scenario E, SJR 4500 cfs, combined export 1500 cfs, all barriers in, and CCFB gates standard operation
- Scenario F, SJR 4500 cfs, combined export 1500 cfs, all barriers in, and CCFB gates are open
- Scenario G, SJR 4500 cfs, combined export 1500 cfs, all barriers out, and CCFB gates standard operation
- Scenario H, SJR 4500 cfs, combined export 1500 cfs, all barriers out, and CCFB gates are open

All particles were injected at stations 815, 902 and 910. Injection began April 15 and ran through May 15. The runs assumed the tidal conditions from the 2006 VAMP period.

Rather than the traditional bar chart output, the Working Group requested a cumulative output of particle fates. Review of the results revealed that “barriers out” vs. “barriers in” made a much greater difference in particle fates than did CCF gate operations.

Differences were also observed when comparing Scenarios A and B to Scenarios E and F, indicating that low flows and low exports would be preferable to higher flows and higher exports. The summary table below depicts results for May 15.

Particle Fate Station	Percent of Particles @ CVP			Percent of Particles @ SWP		
	910	815	902	910	815	902
Scenario A SJR 7000 cfs/exp. 3000 cfs/barriers in/CCF gates std ops	10.9	1.2	13.5	13.8	0.8	20.4
Scenario B SJR 7000 cfs/exp. 3000 cfs/barriers in/CCF gates open	8.3	0.7	12.0	15.3	1.1	22.3
Scenario C SJR 7000 cfs/exp. 3000 cfs/barriers out/CCF gates std ops	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scenario D SJR 7000 cfs/exp. 3000 cfs/barriers out/CCF gates open	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scenario E SJR 4500 cfs/exp. 1500 cfs/barriers in/CCF gates std ops	3.4	0.2	2.8	1.8	0.1	1.2
Scenario F SJR 4500 cfs/exp. 1500 cfs/barriers in/CCF gates open	2.4	0	2.2	2.3	0	1.8
Scenario G SJR 4500 cfs/exp. 1500 cfs/barriers out/CCF gates std ops	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scenario H SJR 4500 cfs/exp. 1500 cfs/barriers out/CCF gates open	0	0	0	0	0	0

The Working Group will continue to discuss potential modifications to barrier installation at a later meeting.

Next Scheduled Meeting: Not yet scheduled.

Submitted,

VLP