State Water Resources Control Board - Revised February 23, 2010

Informational Proceeding to Develop Flow Criteria for the Delta Ecosystem - Questions

Party submitting questions: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Priority ¹	Question	Witness
1	Hasn't the most inappropriate management decision that has led to "past failures in	Bay Institute/Any
	solving Delta fishery issues" been that insufficient water has been devoted to the	
	problem, like under-doses of penicillin that only make the problem worse by giving	
	the false appearance of addressing it?	
2	If new habitat for pelagic fish species (such as tidal marshes) is created in the Delta,	Bay Institute/Any
	and X2 compliance points are moved upstream into the Delta, what will be the likely	
	ecological effects in San Francisco Bay? In San Pablo Bay? In Suisun Bay? In the	
	marshes adjacent to Suisun Bay?	
3	Isn't it true that in order to maintain the entire estuary, it will be necessary to provide	Bay Institute/Any
	far greater Delta outflows than in recent history, even if new marsh habitat is created	
	in the Delta itself?	
4	Does the Bay Institute believe that reducing Delta outflow, as suggested by the State	Bay Institute/Any
	and Federal Water Contractors, is an important part of habitat restoration in the	
	Delta at places such as Cache Slough, in order for this restoration to help recover	
	pelagic fish species? Why or why not?	
5	Would habitat restoration in Cache Slough, Sherman Island, the Lower Mokelumne	Bay Institute/Any
	floodplain, and the Yolo Bypass, as contemplated in BDCP, benefit pelagic fish	
	species other than Delta smelt? Which species? Would those species be dependent	
	on low Delta outflow for this habitat restoration to successfully benefit them?	

1	DFG made no specific flow recommendations for this proceeding. Does DFG still	DFG/Any
	support the flow recommendations that it made in the 1987-8 Water Quality Control	
	Plan hearings and that it made in the 1992 Water Rights (D-1630) hearings as the	
	flows necessary to fully protect Delta fisheries?	
2	Isn't the natural population-level defense of salmon against predation massive	DFG/Salmonid panelist
	numbers of outmigrating smolts?	
3	If one predator of salmonids is eliminated in the Delta food chain, isn't it likely, or	DFG/Salmonid panelist
	even certain, that another predator will take its place?	
4	Isn't one of the largest determinants of future escapement the numbers of salmon	DFG/Salmonid panelist
	that enter the Delta as smolts as compared to fry?	
5	Why is in incorrect for the State and Federal Water Contractors to say that there is	DFG/Matt Nobriga (as co-author of
		Feyrer et al 2007, as cited in State and Federal Water Contractors'
	an "excess of habitat needed to support the current population" of Delta smelt?	testimony).
6	Is there a statistically significant relationship between fall X2 and delta smelt	DFG/Matt Nobriga (as co-author of
	is there a standardard sugarity and the standard sugarity and the standard sugarity and the standard sugarity s	Feyrer et al 2007, as cited in State
	abundance?	and Federal Water Contractors'
7	- 	testimony). DFG/Other stressors panelist
,	cum no were used to reduce the instance of investigation	Di G/Other stressors panelist
	What changes in Delta outflow would significantly reduce the effects of invasive	
1	species or increase the populations of native fishes?	SRCSD/Mr. Grovhoug
'	What is the range of percentages when direct entrainment losses at the Delta pumps	ortoob/wii. Grovilloug
	are compared with indirect losses? How does this vary for different species of fish?	
2	Considering indirect losses due to pumping operations, do you agree with the	SRCSD/Mr. Grovhoug
	testimony of the State Water Contractors that Delta pumping operations do not have	one of the same of
	a population level effect on Delta smelt? How about on other species? Please	
	specify which species.	
3	Would you please explain why the effort by the consultants for the State and Federal	SRCSD/Mr. Grovhoug
	Water Contractors to disprove a significant correlation between reverse flows and	
	"normalized salvage" fails to address the relationship between reverse flows and	
	population-level effects of Delta pumping on any native fish species?	
	population level effects of Delta pumping on any native fish species:	

4	Can you tell us if there is there a statistically significant correlation between reverse	SRCSD/Mr. Grovhoug
	flows or any other consequence of Delta pumping and population-level effects on	
	any native fish species? If yes, would you please tell us which species and roughly	
	quantify those effects?	
5	Would you please describe some of the most important effects of reverse flows on predation on native fish?	SRCSD/Mr. Grovhoug
6	Would you please describe some of the most important effects of low Delta outflow on predation on native fish?	SRCSD/Mr. Grovhoug
1	Do the State and Federal Water Contractors believe that any quantitative	SFWC/Any
	conclusions on Delta outflow needs can ever be reached at all, final or otherwise?	
2	Given that the Delta is the most studied estuary on the west coast of North America,	SFWC/Any
	how much more understanding do the State and Federal Water Contractors believe	
	is necessary to gain before remedial action is taken?	
3	Would it be fair to say that the State and Federal Water Contractors believe that they	SFWC/Any
	consider any Delta outflow whose ecosystem benefits are in any way uncertain is	
	wasted water? If not, what measure of uncertainty regarding Delta outflow is	
	allowable before it can be said that water is being wasted?	
4	Do the Contractors maintain that insufficient Delta outflows are not a stressor or in	SFWC/Other stressors panelist
	any way a cause of the decline of Delta fisheries and other aspects of the ecosystem?	
	Will increasing Delta outflow directly address the origins of any "stressors	
	impacting the Delta's species and ecosystems?"	
5	Do the State and Federal Water Contractors believe that "creating more empty space	SFWC/Hydrology panelist
	in upstream reservoirs leading to more capture of the needed flood flows" is	
	deleterious to fish in the Delta? Do the Contractors agree that it is essential for the	
	health of estuarine species to have frequent flood flows of varying magnitudes pass	
	through the Delta?	
6	What evidence do the State and Federal Water Contractors have that efforts to	SFWC/Salmonid panelist
	reduce predation can be successful to a degree that will improve survival of	
	salmonids on a population level?	

7	How do the State and Federal Water Contractors explain the strong correlations that	SFWC/Salmonid panelist
	were found in previous studies such as Kjelson's (Exhibit FWS-31 from the 1987	·
	Water Quality Control Plan hearings) between successful outmigration and	
	increasing flow, the closing of the Cross Channel Gates, and keeping Sacramento	
	River fish out of the Central Delta?	
8	Given that Kjelson and others, in previous studies, showed that juvenile salmon that	SFWC/Salmonid panelist
	entered the Delta as smolts had a much greater chance of successful outmigration to	
	the ocean than juveniles that entered the Delta as fry, why does the Water	
	Contractors' testimony fail to discuss this distinction? Do the tracking studies	
	performed by the Water Contractors deal only with juvenile salmon that enter the	
	Delta as fry?	
9	Given that the rate of predation of salmon smolts in natural and unimpaired river	SFWC/Salmonid panelist
	systems is about 98%, aren't the most important statistics regarding successful	
	outmigration comparative statistics that evaluate success under different scenarios of	
	operating the Delta?	
10	Is it the opinion of the State and Federal Water Contractors that sewage should be	SFWC/Other stressors panelist
	treated to a degree that no dilution by clean water should be needed at the point of	
	discharge into a waterway? Are the State and Federal Water Contractors prepared to	
	finance treatment to such a level throughout the Central Valley? If not, what	
	improvements are the Contractors willing to finance?	
	Are the State and Federal Water Contractors prepared to finance elimination of	SFWC/Other stressors panelist
	ammonium discharge at the Sacramento Wastewater Treatment Plant in order to test	
	their theory that present ammonium discharge at that site is the "underlying cause"	
	in the decline of pelagic species that is concealed by high Delta outflow?	
	Do the State and Federal Water Contractors, or other agricultural water purveyors,	SFWC/Other stressors panelist
	have any responsibility to address pesticide pollution from the agriculture to which	·
	they supply water? If yes, have the measures they have taken to reduce pesticide	
	pollution by their contractors been sufficient to reduce their contractors' pollution to	
	a negligible level?	
<u></u>		<u> </u>

Do the State and Federal Water Contractors support changes to the program that would clearly and immediately assign individual responsaricultural polluters in order to better reduce pollution from pesticial agricultural chemicals?	onsibility to
Do the State and Federal Water Contractors support a general ban or pyrethroid pesticides? Do they support a ban on domestic use of pyr pesticides?	
Is it the testimony of the State and Federal Contractors that "decline desirable prey for pelagic fish" have not been caused in any way by operations, by reverse flows, or by low inflows from the San Joaqui Delta?	export
Is it the testimony of the State and Federal Contractors that in the abammonium concentrations in the estuary, Delta smelt would be at all abundances they were at in 1990?	
Do the State and Federal Contractors maintain that, if ammonium w there would there be no benefit to increased Delta outflows in addre contaminants?	·
Is it the testimony of the State and Federal Contractors that periodic events in the magnitude of 75,000-100,000 cfs of Delta outflow are cleanse the estuary? If not, what flows are necessary to cleanse the encessary to cleanse the estuary of all the pollutants that the Contractant are the underlying causes of Delta fisheries declines?	needed to estuary? Is it
Do the State and Federal Contractors agree or disagree that prolonge the magnitude of 45,000 cfs of Delta outflow would likely accomplish objectives in increasing the food supply for Delta smelt as shorter to of 75,000-100,000 cfs? Why?	ish the same
USFWS made no specific flow recommendations for this proceedin Service still support the flow recommendations that it made in the 1 Quality Control Plan hearings and that it made in the 1992 Water Rihearings as the flows necessary to fully protect Delta fisheries?	987-8 Water

2	Does USFWS still support the flows developed by the Anadromous Fish Restoration	USFWS/Any
1	Program to achieve the doubling goals for anadromous fish in the Central Valley? Isn't the most basic conclusion of your testimony and exhibits that there is not	SVWU/Mr. Bourez
	enough water in the Central Valley to meet existing levels of diversions and exports	ovivo/min Board2
	while also providing water needed for fisheries and other aquatic beneficial uses (as described by Bay Institute and the U.C. Davis scientists team)?	
2	Why was it necessary to run the Cal-Sim model to show that existing levels of	SVWU/Mr. Bourez
	diversions and exports come at the expense of fisheries resources?	
3	Are you aware that CSPA and others have been saying for over 25 years that water	SVWU/Mr. Bourez
	in the Central Valley is over-appropriated?	
4		SVWU/Mr. Bourez
	would be examined?	