

1 Spencer Kenner (SBN 148930)  
James E. Mizell (SBN 232698)  
2 Emily M. Thor (SBN 303169)

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

3 Office of the Chief Counsel  
1416 9<sup>th</sup> St., Room 1104  
4 Sacramento, CA 95814  
Telephone: 916-653-5966  
5 E-mail: jmizell@water.ca.gov

6 Attorneys for California Department of Water  
Resources

**BEFORE THE**

**CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**

10 **HEARING IN THE MATTER OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**  
12 **AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF**  
13 **RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE**  
14 **IN POINT OF DIVERSION FOR CALIFORNIA**  
**WATER FIX**

**TESTIMONY OF SHAWN ACUNA**

15 I, Shawn Acuña, do hereby declare:

16 **I. INTRODUCTION**

17 My name is Shawn Acuña, I am a Senior Resource Specialist for Metropolitan Water  
18 District of Southern California. I have over 15 years of experience in fish biology and  
19 environmental science. I received a B.S. in Aquatic Biology (1998) at the University of  
20 California, Santa Barbara. After several years working in the field of environmental science  
21 and aquaculture, I returned to continuing education and received a M.S. in Animal Biology  
22 (2007) and Ph. D in Ecology (2011) with the University of California, Davis. I have worked  
23 in research that spans a wide field of laboratory and field studies. These topics include, but  
24 are not limited to, impacts from toxins such as environmental pollutants to toxin producing  
25 cyanobacteria blooms, impacts from physical stressors (salinity and temperature), and  
26 effects of nutritional stress. I have experience with gross pathology, histopathology, and  
27 nutrition and health biomarkers.

28 My current work with Metropolitan is focused on assessing responses of listed fish

1 species in the California Delta, with focus on Longfin smelt and Delta Smelt, to  
2 environmental stressors to better inform water project management and promote  
3 sustainable management of listed fish species. My duties include participation on the  
4 Longfin smelt Management Analysis and Synthesis Team (Longfin smelt MAST), the Flow  
5 Alteration MAST, the Delta Smelt Scoping Team, conducting research and writing  
6 manuscripts on Delta smelt, Longfin smelt, and multiple stressors in the San Francisco  
7 Estuary. A true and correct copy of my statement of qualifications has been submitted as  
8 DWR-1200.

## 10 II. OVERVIEW OF TESTIMONY

11 This rebuttal testimony responds to issues raised by Protestants related to existing  
12 conditions for Delta Smelt and allegations that new flows would be effective in providing  
13 positive ecosystem changes for Delta smelt. My testimony is in direct response to CSPA  
14 (CSPA-202, p.2) testimony that:

15  
16 In considering conditions to place on the permits for the SWP and CVP in this  
17 proceeding, the Board can and must evaluate conditions for all aspects of SWP and  
18 CVP operation, not just those immediately related to the new points of diversion.

19 My testimony is also responding to issues raised regarding impacts to existing conditions,  
20 specifically, CSPA-204, pp. 4, 6 and 28 and 31-32; CSPA-200, errata, pp. 5, 11, and 22-24,  
21 NRDC-58, errata, p. 4 and 34-36; April 23, 2018, Transcript, Vol. 32, p. 137-139; CSPA-  
22 204, p. 28; April 11, 2018, Transcript, Vol.28, pp. 27, 112, 135-136, and 151-153; April 24,  
23 2018, Transcript, Vol. 33, pp.114-115.

24 I am also responding to several parties whose experts suggested that the SWRCB's  
25 2010 Flow Criteria Report and the SWRCB's Phase II Technical Basis Report  
26 recommended standards should be accepted without modification, suggesting that there  
27 was no new relevant information that should also be considered. (See e.g., CSPA-202,  
28

1 errata, pp. 7-11; April 11, 2018, Transcript, Vol. 28, p. 122; April 24, 2018, Transcript, Vol.  
2 33, pp. 110-115; PCFFA-161, p. 8:7-9.) This is inaccurate. Since 2010, there has been a  
3 large body of highly relevant scientific investigation, and this testimony is intended to  
4 identify some of that new information. This new information suggests that the 2010 Flow  
5 Criteria Report and the Phase II Technical Basis Report should not be accepted by the  
6 SWRCB as the best available science without further consideration of current science.  
7

8 A brief summary of my rebuttal opinions is provided below:

- 9 • Opinion 1: The effects of current SWP-CVP operations on Delta smelt are  
10 uncertain, and should be managed accordingly.
- 11 • Opinion 2: Current Delta smelt proportional entrainment in the SWP-CVP  
12 south Delta pumping facilities is low.
- 13 • Opinion 3: Opinion 3: The extent that delta smelt abundance is influenced by  
14 flow is uncertain.
- 15 • Opinion 4: Multiple factors affect Delta smelt distribution.
- 16 • Opinion 5: The extent that Delta smelt feeding success is influenced by flow  
17 is uncertain.
- 18 • Opinion 6: Survey bias should be considered when making management  
19 decisions.  
20

21 **III. OPINION 1: THE EFFECTS OF CURRENT SWP-CVP OPERATIONS ON**  
22 **DELTA SMELT ARE UNCERTAIN, AND SHOULD BE MANAGED**  
23 **ACCORDINGLY.**

24 Several Protestants stated that the SWP-CVP operations are the primary cause of  
25 currently low Delta smelt abundance indices, and therefore additional management of  
26 project operations will improve Delta Smelt abundance. I disagree. Many studies  
27 demonstrate that the current status of Delta smelt is the result of multiple factors, several of  
28

1 which are unrelated to project operations. (DWR-1242, DWR-1243.). In determining factors  
2 affecting abundance, it is important to acknowledge that even where there is evidence of a  
3 statistical relationship between abundance of any species and some aspect of flow or water  
4 quality, many attributes of flow are cross correlated (meaning they are related). In such  
5 cases, further research, including field research, is required to determine which mechanism  
6 related to flow is providing the apparent benefit or to determine if the apparent relationship  
7 is spurious. (See e.g., DWR-1319 and DWR-1359.)

8 Current operation of the SWP-CVP can impact Delta Smelt either directly through  
9 entrainment (See Section IV, below) or indirectly through changes in flow patterns. (See  
10 Section V, VI and VII.) As I explain in my testimony, it is uncertain that further regulation of  
11 current SWP-CVP operations targeting direct or indirect would improve Delta smelt  
12 abundance.

13 **IV. OPINION 2: CURRENT DELTA SMELT PROPORTIONAL ENTRAINMENT**  
14 **IN THE SWP-CVP SOUTH DELTA PUMPING FACILITIES IS LOW.**

15 Entrainment at the Project pumps was identified as a significant impediment to  
16 species viability by NRDC-58, errata, pp.34-36; CSPA-204, p. 4; and April 23, 2018,  
17 Transcript, Vol. 32, pp. 138-139. Contrary to the representations of Dr. Rosenfield and  
18 others, entrainment in the south Delta pumping facilities post-BiOp is low. Assuming the  
19 prescreen losses quantified by Castillo et al 2012 (DWR- 1260) have remained the same,  
20 and entrainment has been reduced significantly, you would expect to see trends in Delta  
21 smelt abundance improve, but that does not appear to be occurring. (DWR-1243, DWR-  
22 1233.) The reason may be that entrainment is not driving species abundance. To evaluate  
23 this, entrainment impacts on the species have been tested using several multivariate  
24 analyses and these analyses did not support for a population level effect. (DWR-1254,  
25 DWR-1255, DWR-1253, DWR-1252.)

26 The issue of proportional entrainment in the SWP-CVP was most recently  
27  
28

1 investigated, and preliminary results reported, in Korman et al. 2018.<sup>1</sup> This analysis  
2 suggests that proportional entrainment in 2011, a relatively high abundance year, was an  
3 order of magnitude lower than in the early 2000s.<sup>2</sup> (DWR-1259, see also, DWR-1358.)  
4 Korman et al utilized state of the art Particle Tracking Models with complex behaviors as  
5 well as developing abundance relationships with surveys and salvage data to quantify  
6 proportional entrainment. The results of the study suggest that proportional entrainment is  
7 low compared to pre-BiOp levels. The lack of improved abundance trends following the  
8 reduction in proportional entrainment suggests that entrainment may not be a significant  
9 factor affecting the status of Delta Smelt.

10 Furthermore, to keep Delta smelt away from the south Delta pumping facilities and  
11 reduce entrainment even further, DWR and Reclamation have been implementing pre-  
12 emptive operational activities based on new studies to reduce Delta smelt movement into  
13 the south Delta. Current real-time operations have focused on avoiding the creation of a  
14 turbidity bridge that could draw Delta smelt into the south Delta toward the existing  
15 pumping facilities. Sediment is mobilized after storms and moves down the Sacramento  
16 River. When this occurs, the SWP-CVP reduce pumping at the correct time, which limits  
17 the quantity of sediment getting entrained into the south Delta, thereby preventing the  
18 formation of a turbidity bridge, thus reducing the probability of Delta smelt entrainment in  
19 the SWP-CVP. Additional opportunities for operational flexibility, such as through  
20 operations of the CWF, would facilitate further reductions in Delta Smelt entrainment and  
21 stabilization of water supplies. To further support this type of flexible operation, a model has  
22 been developed from the authors of Grimaldo et al (2017) that can be used predictively to  
23 quantify the risk of entrainment in the current SWP-CVP facilities. (DWR-1380.) Project  
24 operators can use the information to determine the need for actions to further reduce  
25 entrainment risk.

26 <sup>1</sup> Proportional entrainment is the amount of entrainment at the Water Projects compared to the  
27 population abundance.

28 <sup>2</sup> I acknowledge that low abundance indices may also contribute to low salvage rates.

1 It is my opinion that as a result of required and voluntary actions current entrainment  
2 is already very low and it is unlikely that additional regulation of SWP-CVP operations to  
3 further reduce entrainment would improve Delta smelt abundance. .

4 **V. OPINION 3: THE EXTENT THAT DELTA SMELT ABUNDANCE IS**  
5 **INFLUENCED BY FLOW IS UNCERTAIN.**

6 Contrary to the testimony of CSPA-204, p. 28 and 31-32; NRDC-58, errata, p. 4 and  
7 34, April 11, 2018, Transcript, Vol. 28, pp. 27, 112, 135-136, and 151-153, Delta smelt  
8 research has not shown a reliable correlation between abundance and winter-spring X2,  
9 summer X2, or Fall X2. (DWR-1261, DWR-1262, DWR-1263.) Four multivariate models  
10 have been used to test the importance of X2 location and outflow to the Delta smelt  
11 population, and all have failed to find support for the conceptual model that Delta smelt  
12 population viability was significantly related to the position of X2 or outflow. (DWR-1252,  
13 DWR-1253, DWR-1254, DWR-1255, DWR-1265.) As Kimmerer et al. 2009 explained,  
14 "...abundance of Delta Smelt did not vary with X2," and, "Adding the previous year's Fall  
15 Midwater Trawl as a covariate did not improve the fit of the X2 model for the fall index of  
16 Delta smelt abundance." (DWR-1262, pp. 11-12.) Kimmerer et al. 2009 further determined  
17 that Delta Smelt abundance was not related to the extent of low salinity habitat (DWR-  
18 1262, p. 11-12.). Kimmerer et al. 2009 surmised that while such variables as temperature,  
19 tidal velocities or proximity to certain bathymetric features are likely to be important  
20 attributes of Delta smelt habitat, they are unlikely to vary with flow in the Delta. (DWR-  
21 1262, Kimmerer et al. 2009.)

22 Dr. Rosenfield (NRDC-58, errata, p. 34; April 24, 2018, Transcript, Vol. 33, pp. 2-3)  
23 referenced the analysis in the MAST report that suggests a correlation with flow and  
24 summer to fall survival. However, that analysis only used part of the data set. If the whole  
25 data set were to be used, there is no relationship between summer to fall survival and flow.  
26 Reliance on truncated data was not found to be warranted by Maunder and Deriso (2011)  
27 in which they used the whole data set to develop their lifecycle model. (DWR-1254.)

28 Contrary to the statements of Dr. Rosenfield (NRDC-58, errata, p. 4 and 34 and

1 NRDC-33 and NRDC-35), there is weak evidence of any relationship between Delta Smelt  
2 abundance and summer X2. (DWR-1362.) There are no published and peer reviewed  
3 studies that have concluded that there is a relationship between Delta Smelt abundance  
4 and summer X2.

5 The Feyrer et al. 2007<sup>3</sup> model was used in the current FWS BiOp as the main  
6 support for the Fall X2 RPA. The Feyrer et al. 2007 model correlated X2salinity, turbidity,  
7 and temperature. . When questioned about the Feyrer et al. 2007 paper, Mr. Baxter  
8 asserted that fall salinity is related to Delta smelt abundance. (Transcript April 11, 2018,  
9 Vol. 28, p.25.) Mr. Baxter did seem to acknowledge the National Academy of Science's  
10 critical review of the Fall X2 reasonable and prudent alternative (RPA) that is part of the  
11 FWS BiOp. (Transcript April 11, 2018, Vol. 28, p.53-54.) I agree with the National  
12 Academy of Science's review of the FallX2 RPA. There are methodological problems with  
13 Feyrer et al. 2007 as they used a linear model which is inappropriate for an abundance  
14 analysis because it produces unreasonable results that show new Delta smelt recruits even  
15 after abundance is zero. (DWR-1264.)

16 Even if the method was appropriate, the Feyrer et al. 2007 model has low predictive  
17 ability. A recent model was developed by Greenwood et al. (2017), based on Feyrer et al  
18 (2007). The Greenwood et al. (2017), model predicts the effects of various Fall X2 locations  
19 on the survival of Delta Smelt (Fig. 1). (DWR-1265.) The purpose of the analysis was to  
20 quantify the change in survival based on changing the position of X2 using the model from  
21 Feyrer et al (2007). The analysis found that the Feyrer et al (2007) model only predicted  
22 about 25% of the variance across different scenarios. Moreover the model was nearly as  
23 likely to predict reduced mortality as it was to predict increased mortality for much of the X2  
24 scenarios. This analysis suggests that Feyrer et al (2007) is an unreliable basis for  
25 management actions to improve survival.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>3</sup> Subsequent to the 2008 biological opinion, Feyrer et al. 2011 was published. This study does not  
28 investigate an abundance relationship with X2 or outflow. Feyrer et al. 2011 tested various water  
quality parameters to determine attributes of species habitat.




Figure 1. Posterior Density Distributions from 10,000 Simulations of the Change in Delta Smelt Fall to Summer Survival when Fall X2 is Moved from an Upstream Location to a Downstream Location. (DWR-1264.)

**VI. OPINION 4: MULTIPLE FACTORS AFFECT DELTA SMELT DISTRIBUTION.**

Dr. Rosenfield suggested that changes in the location of the low salinity zone could increase entrainment risk. (NRDC-58, errata, pp. 34-36.) The certainty of the previous statement assumes that Delta smelt behavior is simple, however, recent research shows that smelt behavior is much more complex. (DWR-1249, see e.g., DWR-1249.) Previous studies have shown that Delta smelt simply distribute into the LSZ during the juvenile stage and return to freshwater in the adult stage for spawning. (DWR-1266, DWR-1242.) Recent studies have shown that Delta smelt life histories are more complex. (DWR-1243, DWR-



1 1268.) Three prevailing life histories have been identified as resident freshwater, resident  
2 brackish water, and migratory, although migratory is the dominant life history there have  
3 been significant proportions of the populations being residents. (DWR-1268.) This was the  
4 case during the high-flow water years (2006 and 2011) and a low-flow water years (2007,  
5 2012, 2013, and 2014) where there was a significant portion (20-48%) of the fish sampled  
6 exhibited a resident life history. (DWR-1268.) With certain life histories not showing a  
7 relationship with different flow regimes, there isn't support for the conceptual model that  
8 suggests that the entire population (i.e. all three life history types) are dependent on the low  
9 salinity zone and that flow will help all the Delta smelt redistribute them into the low salinity  
10 zone (or that distribution into the LSZ is a benefit for all three life history types).

11 Delta smelt migratory behavior appears to be related to multiple factors rather than  
12 just salinity. This is consistent with Gross et al. 2018 which found that species' distribution  
13 is not based solely on turbidity or any other single factor. (DWR-1249, see also, 1269 and  
14 1243.) Gross et al. (2018) investigated Delta Smelt movement using the particle tracking  
15 model and found that Delta smelt movement is not simply toward greater turbidity, salinity,  
16 nor based on tidal movement. Simulations using simple behaviors such as turbidity seeking  
17 resulted in most Delta Smelt going out to the ocean, even though turbidity was lower. Even  
18 more complex behaviors such as tidal surfing and turbidity seeking resulted in the Delta  
19 smelt rarely entering known spawning region of the Cache Slough Complex, which is where  
20 we'd expect them to end up if tidal movement was the predominant factor influencing  
21 distribution. Delta smelt distribution being related to multiple factors and not just salinity or  
22 turbidity is also consistent with more recent studies which found that Delta smelt were  
23 tolerant of a range of salinities, including higher salinities up to 18.5 ppt. (DWR-1244,  
24 DWR-1245, DWR-1246.) This means that Delta smelt could seek habitats that have a  
25 range of suitable habitat characteristics outside the low salinity zone.

26 **VII. OPINION 5: THE EXTENT THAT DELTA SMELT FEEDING SUCCESS IS**  
27 **INFLUENCE BY FLOW IS UNCERTAIN**

28 Rosenfield argued that CWF related changes in flow would reduce Delta smelt

1 growth and recruitment through reduced turbidity and food availability. (NRDC-58, pp. 36,  
2 and 39-40.) The assumed mechanism with flow and feeding success is that increased  
3 flow could improve feeding success by both increasing turbidity and increasing zooplankton  
4 densities. There are several concerns with these mechanisms. First, increasing flows to  
5 increase turbidity must account for sediment associated contaminants. Contaminants in  
6 the Delta can reduce survival of prey, can reduce feeding success, and increase  
7 bioenergetics needs. (DWR-1270, DWR-1271, DWR-1272, DWR-1281.) In regards to  
8 flows increasing the productivity of zooplankton, *Pseudodiaptomus forbesi*, an important  
9 prey of Delta smelt did not increase in productivity in response to flow or increased  
10 phytoplankton. (DWR-1273.)

11 As for higher densities of zooplankton, Hammock et al (2017) found that greater  
12 densities of food in the freshwater reaches did not equate to greater gut fullness compared  
13 to brackish water that had lower densities and relatively greater gut fullness. (DWR-1244.)  
14 This pattern persisted even when accounting for turbidity. This was counter to the  
15 prevailing conceptual model involving food and Delta smelt (DWR-1242) suggesting that  
16 moving Delta smelt with flow would move Delta smelt to the low salinity zone where feeding  
17 success and prey densities are greater. However, Hammock et al. 2017 found that prey  
18 densities were higher in freshwater and feeding success was greater downstream of X2.  
19 (DWR-1244.) It is suggested that the Project operations are impacting productivity (BiOp  
20 2008) but productivity is higher in the south Delta near the SWP-CVP pumps as compared  
21 to much of the San Francisco Estuary. (DWR-1242.) The presence of clams does not  
22 readily explain this as the clams are present throughout the Delta (DWR-1274) and  
23 productivity is still higher in the south Delta. (DWR-1242.) Flows were suggested to  
24 suppress the clams but recent studies seem to indicate that the clam distributions above  
25 and below the 2 ppt isohaline will shift with the movement of isohaline. (DWR-1274.) The  
26 clams will still be present and mostly just shift their distribution as recruitment success  
27 moves with the salinity field. (DWR-1274, DWR-1275, DWR-1276.) The response of the  
28 clams to changes in X2 suggest that flow is not good control method.

1 **VIII. OPINION 6: SURVEY BIAS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHEN MAKING**  
2 **MANAGEMENT DECISIONS.**

3 The potential for survey bias was raised during the cross examination of Randy  
4 Baxter of the Department of Fish and Wildlife. When questioned, Mr. Baxter seemed to  
5 suggest that multiple samples during surveys could average out survey bias. (April 11,  
6 2018, Transcript, Vol.28, p. 11.) Mr. Baxter's response does not address the issue of  
7 systematic bias.

8 Survey bias is a statistical term that does not imply intentional bias. It is important to  
9 test for survey bias because identifying the biases will help to increase certainty in any  
10 conclusions that may be drawn from surveys. (DWR-1238.) Using the raw data without  
11 accounting for bias is not recommended. (DWR-1238, DWR-1239, DWR-1240.) Not  
12 accounting for bias can end up "leading to spurious conclusions." (DWR-1240.) Only a few  
13 published studies have accounted for or considered bias in their analysis of Delta smelt  
14 surveys, such as Latour (2016a) and Mahardja et al (2017). (DWR-1241, DWR-1240.)

15 Neither Latour (2016a) nor Mahardja et al (2017) have suggested that increasing  
16 survey station number would correct for bias as was suggested by Mr. Baxter (Transcript  
17 April 11, 2018, p. 12:5-13.) Instead Latour (2016a) and Mahardja et al (2017) recommend  
18 increasing sampling frequency, accounting for detection bias determined from the higher  
19 frequency sampling, and incorporate the bias in the analysis to improve certainty in any  
20 conclusions that may be drawn from that data such as abundance. (DWR-1241, DWR-  
21 1240.) Latour (2016a) evaluated whether turbidity affected Delta smelt catchability and  
22 suggested that it was most likely affecting the detection probability. (DWR-1241.) Mahardja  
23 et al (2017) found that size and abundance affected the detection of Delta smelt. (DWR-  
24 1240.) For CSAMP/CAMT, Dr. Latour conducted a study on catchability and determined  
25 that the Fall Midwater Trawl catch data was affected by the time of day and depth the  
26 Spring Kodiak Trawl Delta catch data was affected by. (DWR-1258.) The results suggest  
27 that Delta smelt prefer different parts of the water column depending on external factors  
28 such as time of day and tide. This was also suggested by Bennett and Burau (2015) and

1 Feyrer et al (2013) when they conducted repeated trawls showing that Delta smelt trying to  
2 move upstream will move to the sides and bottom of the water column when the tide is out  
3 going. (DWR-1248, DWR-1282.)

4 **IX. CONCLUSION**

5 Factors that affect Delta smelt population dynamics have been studied for decades.  
6 (DWR-1242, DWR-1243.) Over the last decade, it has been increasingly clear that Delta  
7 Smelt life history is complex, and that several factors are interacting to affect Delta Smelt  
8 and their habitat in ways we don't fully understand. Much has been discovered but as we  
9 uncovered new understandings of how Delta smelt use and respond to their environment  
10 many more questions and new conceptual models were formed. What we do know is that  
11 our simplistic understanding of Delta smelt is much more nuanced than was described in  
12 the conceptual models in the 2008 BiOp.

13  
14 Executed on this \_\_\_ day of July, 2018 in Sacramento, California.

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 Shawn Acuna  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2 Bibliography

- 3 Bennett WA. 2005. Critical assessment of the delta smelt population in the San Francisco Estuary,  
California. *San Franc Estuary Watershed Sci* 3(2).
- 4 Bennett W, Burau JR. 2015. Riders on the storm: selective tidal movements facilitate the spawning  
5 migration of threatened delta smelt in the San Francisco Estuary. *Estuaries Coasts* 3:826–  
835.
- 6 Bever, A. J., MacWilliams, M. L., Herbold, B., Brown, L. R., & Feyrer, F. V. (2016). Linking  
7 hydrodynamic complexity to Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) distribution in the San  
Francisco estuary, USA. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science*, 14(1).
- 8 Brown, L. R., Komoroske, L. M., Wagner, R. W., Morgan-King, T., May, J. T., Connon, R. E., &  
9 Fangue, N. A. (2016). Coupled downscaled climate models and ecophysiological metrics  
forecast habitat compression for an endangered estuarine fish. *PloS one*, 11(1), e0146724.
- 10 Bush, E. E. (2017). Migratory life histories and early growth of the endangered estuarine Delta  
11 Smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*). University of California, Davis.
- 12 [CNRA] California Natural Resource Agency. 2016. Delta Smelt resiliency strategy.
- 13 [CNRA] California Natural Resource Agency. 2017. Delta Smelt resiliency strategy. Progress  
update.
- 14 Castillo G, Morinaka J, Lindberg J, Fujimura R, Baskerville- Bridges B, Hobbs J, Tigan G, Ellison,  
15 L. 2012. Pre-screen loss and fish facility efficiency for Delta Smelt at the south Delta's State  
Water Project, California. *San Franc Estuary Watershed Sci* 10(4).
- 16 CDFW. 2016. CDFW Rationale for summer Delta flow augmentation for improving Delta smelt  
17 survival. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Unpublished Report.
- 18 Crauder, J. S., Thompson, J. K., Parchaso, F., Anduaga, R. I., Pearson, S. A., Gehrts, K., Fuller, H,  
19 & Wells, E. (2016). Bivalve effects on the food web supporting delta smelt—A long-term  
study of bivalve recruitment, biomass, and grazing rate patterns with varying freshwater  
outflow (No. 2016-1005). US Geological Survey.
- 20 Crimaldi, J. P., Thompson, J. K., Rosman, J. H., Lowe, R. J., & Koseff, J. R. (2002). Hydrodynamics  
21 of larval settlement: the influence of turbulent stress events at potential recruitment sites.  
*Limnology and Oceanography*, 47(4), 1137-1151.
- 22 Feyrer F, Nobriga ML, Sommer TR. 2007. Multidecadal trends for three declining fish species:  
23 habitat patterns and mechanisms in the San Francisco Estuary, California, USA. *Can J Fish  
Aquat Sci* 64:723–734.
- 24 Feyrer, F., Portz, D., Odum, D., Newman, K. B., Sommer, T., Contreras, D., Baxter, R, Slater, S,  
25 Sereno, D, & Van Nieuwenhuysse, E. (2013). SmeltCam: Underwater video codend for  
trawled nets with an application to the distribution of the imperiled delta smelt. *PloS one*,  
26 8(7), e67829.
- 27 Finger, A. J., Schumer, G., Benjamin, A., & Blankenship, S. (2017). Evaluation and Interpretation of  
Genetic Effective Population Size of Delta Smelt from 2011–2014. *San Francisco Estuary  
and Watershed Science*, 15(2).
- 28

- 1 Fisch KM, Henderson JM, Burton RS, May B. 2011. Population genetics and conservation  
2 implications for the endangered delta smelt in the San Francisco Bay- Delta. *Conserv Genet*  
3 12:1421–1434.
- 4 Fisch, KM, Ivy, JA, Burton, RS, May, B. 2012. Evaluating the performance of captive breeding  
5 techniques for conservation hatcheries: A case study of the Delta smelt captive breeding  
6 program. *Journal of Heredity*. 104: 92-104.
- 7 Fong S, Louie S, Werner I, Davis J, Connon RE. 2017. Contaminant effects on California Bay-Delta  
8 species and human health. *San Franc Estuary Watershed Sci* 14(4).
- 9 Gentry, L.E., M.B. David, and G.F. McIsaac. 2014. Variation in riverine nitrate flux and fall  
10 nitrogen fertilizer application in east-central Illinois. *J. Environ. Qual.* 43:1467–1474.  
11 doi:10.2134/jeq2013.12.0499
- 12 Grosell M, Nielsen C, Bianchini A. 2002. Sodium turnover rate determines sensitivity to acute  
13 copper and silver exposure in freshwater animals. *Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol*  
14 *Pharmacol* 133:287–303.
- 15 Greenwood, M. Phillis, C, Grimaldo, L. 2017. Public water agency 2017 Fall X2 adaptive  
16 management plan proposal. USBR Proposal to USFWS.
- 17 Grimaldo, LF, Smith, WE, Nobriga, ML. 2017. After the storm: Re-examining factors that affect  
18 Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) entrainment in the Sacramento and San Joaquin  
19 Delta. Collaborative Adaptive Management Team Report.
- 20 Gross, E, Saenz, B, Rachiele, R, Grinbergs, S, Grimaldo, L, Korman, J, Smith, P, MacWilliams, M,  
21 Bever, A. 2018. Estimation of Adult Delta Smelt Distribution for Hypothesized Swimming  
22 Behaviors Using Hydrodynamic, Suspended Sediment and Particle-Tracking Models.  
23 Collaborative Adaptive Management Team Report.
- 24 Hammock, B. G., Slater, S. B., Baxter, R. D., Fangue, N. A., Cocherell, D., Hennessy, A., Kurobe,  
25 T, Tai, C, & Teh, S. J. (2017). Foraging and metabolic consequences of semi-anadromy for  
26 an endangered estuarine fish. *PloS one*, 12(3), e0173497.
- 27 Hobbs, J., Moyle, P. B., Fangue, N., & Connon, R. E. (2017). Is extinction inevitable for Delta Smelt  
28 and Longfin Smelt? An opinion and recommendations for recovery. *San Francisco Estuary  
and Watershed Science*, 15(2).
- 29 IEP MAST (2015) An updated conceptual model of delta smelt biology: Our evolving understanding  
30 of an estuarine fish. Interagency Ecology Program, Management, Analysis, and Synthesis  
31 Team
- 32 Jabusch, T, Trowbridge, P, Heberger, M., Orlando, J, De Parsia, M, & Stillway, M. 2018. Delta  
33 Regional Monitoring Program Annual Monitoring Report for Fiscal Year 2015–16:  
34 Pesticides and Toxicity. US Geological Survey.
- 35 Jassby, A. D., Kimmerer, W. J., Monismith, S. G., Armor, C., Cloern, J. E., Powell, T. M., Schubel,  
36 JR, & Vendlinski, T. J. (1995). Isohaline position as a habitat indicator for estuarine  
37 populations. *Ecological applications*, 5(1), 272-289.
- 38 Johnson ML, Werner I, Teh SJ, Loge F. 2010. Evaluation of chemical, toxicological, and

- 1 histopathologic data to determine their role in the pelagic organism decline. [Internet].  
2 [accessed 2015 October 24]. Final report to the California State Water Resources Control  
3 Board and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. University of California,  
4 Davis.
- 5 Kimmerer WJ. 2008. Losses of Sacramento River Chinook salmon and delta smelt to entrainment in  
6 water diversions in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. *San Franc Estuary Watershed Sci*  
7 (6)2.
- 8 Kimmerer, W. J., Ignoffo, T. R., Kayfetz, K. R., & Slaughter, A. M. (2018). Effects of freshwater  
9 flow and phytoplankton biomass on growth, reproduction, and spatial subsidies of the  
10 estuarine copepod *Pseudodiaptomus forbesi*. *Hydrobiologia*, 807(1), 113-130.
- 11 Kimmerer, W. J., MacWilliams, M. L., & Gross, E. S. (2013). Variation of fish habitat and extent of  
12 the low-salinity zone with freshwater flow in the San Francisco Estuary. *San Francisco*  
13 *Estuary and Watershed Science*, 11(4).
- 14 Kimmerer, W. J., Gross, E. S., & MacWilliams, M. L. (2009). Is the response of estuarine nekton to  
15 freshwater flow in the San Francisco Estuary explained by variation in habitat volume?.  
16 *Estuaries and Coasts*, 32(2), 375.
- 17 Komoroske, L. M., Connon, R. E., Lindberg, J., Cheng, B. S., Castillo, G., Hasenbein, M., &  
18 Fanguie, N. A. (2014). Ontogeny influences sensitivity to climate change stressors in an  
19 endangered fish. *Conservation physiology*, 2(1).
- 20 Komoroske, L. M., Jeffries, K. M., Connon, R. E., Dexter, J., Hasenbein, M., Verhille, C., &  
21 Fanguie, N. A. (2016). Sublethal salinity stress contributes to habitat limitation in an  
22 endangered estuarine fish. *Evolutionary applications*, 9(8), 963-981.
- 23 Korman, J, Gross, E, Smith, PE, Saenz, B, Grimaldo, LF. 2018. Statistical evaluation of particle-  
24 tracking models predicting proportional entrainment loss for adult Delta smelt in the  
25 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. CSAMP/CAMT report.
- 26 Kratzer, C. R., Kent, R. H., Seleh, D. K., Knifong, D. L., Dileanis, P. D., & Orlando, J. L. (2011).  
27 Trends in nutrient concentrations, loads, and yields in streams in the Sacramento, San  
28 Joaquin, and Santa Ana Basins, California, 1975-2004. U. S. Geological Survey.
- Latour, R. J. (2016a). Explaining patterns of pelagic fish abundance in the Sacramento-San Joaquin  
Delta. *Estuaries and coasts*, 39(1), 233-247.
- Latour, R. (2016b). Statistical modeling of delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) survey data in the  
San Francisco-San Joaquin Delta, with reference to temporal and spatial autocorrelation.  
CAMT Report.
- Long, G. Rudd, S. 2018. Structured decision making for Delta smelt demo project. CSAMP/CAMT  
Report.
- MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J., Sutton, N., Kawanishi, K., & Bailey, L. L. (2005). Improving  
inferences in population studies of rare species that are detected imperfectly. *Ecology*, 86(5),  
1101-1113.
- MacKenzie, D. I., & Nichols, J. D. (2004). Occupancy as a surrogate for abundance estimation.  
*Animal biodiversity and conservation*, 27(1), 461-467.
- Mac Nally, R., Thomson, J. R., Kimmerer, W. J., Feyrer, F., Newman, K. B., Sih, A., Bennett, WA,

- 1 Brown, L, Fleishman, E, Culberson, S, & Castillo, G. (2010). Analysis of pelagic species  
2 decline in the upper San Francisco Estuary using multivariate autoregressive modeling  
(MAR). *Ecological Applications*, 20(5), 1417-1430.
- 3 Mahardja, B., Young, M. J., Schreier, B., & Sommer, T. (2017). Understanding imperfect detection  
4 in a San Francisco Estuary long-term larval and juvenile fish monitoring programme.  
*Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 24(6), 488-503.
- 5 Manly, B. F. J., Fullerton, D., Hendrix, A. N., & Burnham, K. P. (2015). Comments on Feyrer et  
6 al. "modeling the effects of future outflow on the abiotic habitat of an imperiled estuarine  
fish". *Estuaries and coasts*, 38(5), 1815-1820.
- 7 Maunder, M. N., & Deriso, R. B. (2011). A state-space multistage life cycle model to evaluate  
8 population impacts in the presence of density dependence: illustrated with application to  
delta smelt (*Hyposmesus transpacificus*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic  
9 Sciences*, 68(7), 1285-1306.
- 10 Moyle PB, Brown LR, Durand JR, Hobbs JA. 2016. Delta Smelt: life history and decline of a once  
abundant species in the San Francisco Estuary. *San Franc Estuary and Watershed Sci* 14(2).
- 11 Miller, W. J., Manly, B. F., Murphy, D. D., Fullerton, D., & Ramey, R. R. (2012). An investigation  
12 of factors affecting the decline of delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) in the Sacramento-  
San Joaquin Estuary. *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, 20(1), 1-19.
- 13 Rose, K. A., Kimmerer, W. J., Edwards, K. P., & Bennett, W. A. (2013). Individual-based modeling  
14 of delta smelt population dynamics in the upper San Francisco Estuary: I. Model description  
and baseline results. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 142(5), 1238-1259.
- 15 Sommer T, Mejia F. 2013. A place to call home: A synthesis of delta smelt habitat in the upper San  
16 Francisco Estuary. *San Franc Estuary Watershed Sci* 11(2).
- 17 Thomson, J. R., Kimmerer, W. J., Brown, L. R., Newman, K. B., Nally, R. M., Bennett, W. A.,  
18 Feyrer, F, & Fleishman, E. (2010). Bayesian change point analysis of abundance trends for  
pelagic fishes in the upper San Francisco Estuary. *Ecological Applications*, 20(5), 1431-  
1448.
- 19 [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Formal Endangered Species Act consultation on the  
20 proposed coordinated operations of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project  
(SWP) [Internet]. [accessed 2016 Mar 14]. Sacramento (CA): U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- 21 [USFWS] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2016. Why flow is a necessary element of Delta smelt  
22 habitat. United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Memo. Sacramento (CA): U.S. Fish and  
Wildlife Service.
- 23 Weiss, PT, Gulliver, JS, Erickson, AJ. 2005. The cost and effectiveness of stormwater management  
24 practices. Minnesota Department of Transportation. Minnesota.
- 25 Weston, DP, Chen, D, Lydy, MJ. 2015. Stormwater-related transport of the insecticides bifenthrin,  
26 fipronil, imidacloprid, and chlorpyrifos into a tidal wetland, San Francisco Bay, California.  
*Science of the Total Environment*. 527-528: 18-25.
- 27
- 28