BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

American River Group Notes

Conference Line: +1 (321) 209-6143; Access Code: 596 336 817#
Webinar: **Join the meeting now**
Thursday, September 24, 2026

Action Items

- All to review materials and provide suggestions for additional scenarios by COB Friday, 9/25 or 8am or Monday, 9/28 latest. Review and input requested from USFWS and CDFW specifically given their expertise.
- Brian to meet with the Water Forum and NMFS on October 1-1:45pm to discuss swing weighting. K&W to schedule.
- K&W to schedule Ad Hoc Meeting #3 on September 28 to discuss any additional suggestions and finalize alternatives.

Introductions

1. BKS Law Firm: Jennifer Buckman
2. California Department of Parks and Recreation: N/A
3. Carmichael Water District (CWD): N/A
4. CBEC Engineering: N/A
5. CDFW: Andrew Gaan, Jason Julienne, Erica Meyers
6. City of Folsom: N/A
7. City of Roseville: N/A
8. City of Sacramento: N/A
9. Cramer Fish Sciences: Steve Zeug
10. CSUS: N/A
11. CVP SOD Ag Districts: N/A
12. DWR: John Ford
13. EBMUD: I-Pei Hsiu

14. Environmental Council of Sacramento: N/A
15. Kleinschmidt: Vanessa Martinez
16. NMFS: Carrie Skorcz, Paula Higginson, Sam Pyros
17. PCWA: Darin Reintjes
18. PSMFC: N/A
19. Sacramento Regional Water Authority: N/A
20. Sacramento Suburban Water District: Robert Wichert
21. Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians: N/A
22. SJWD: N/A
23. SMUD: N/A
24. Stantec: Sarah Hamilton, Stephanie Theis, Adam Witt
25. Sunzi Consulting: N/A
26. SWRCB: Travis Dennis
27. USACE: N/A
28. USBR: Carolyn Bragg, John Harrison, Kevin Thielen, Mandy Migura, Myrna Girald Perez, Tony Yang
29. USFWS: N/A
30. WAPA: N/A
31. Water Districts: N/A
32. Water Forum: Ashlee Casey, Erica Bishop
33. Watercourse Engineering: Mike Deas
34. Other: Brian Mahardja, Clyde Macdonald
35. Kearns & West: Karis Johnston, Katy Kennedy, Mia Schiappi, Angela Hessenius

Preliminary Model Run Discussion

Vanessa Martinez, Kleinschmidt, provided an overview of the results from the preliminary model runs of the four bypass scenarios identified by the ARG to illustrate temperature management tradeoffs and provide an opportunity for feedback.

- At the previous meeting, four bypass scenarios were identified for a first draft temperature modeling run to provide an opportunity for ARG members to see the impacts and tradeoffs across the different scenarios and potentially propose additional variations.

- The following draft bypass scenarios were modeled:
    - Scenario 1: 250 cfs beginning on October 15, increasing to 500 cfs on October 28, decreasing to 250 cfs on November 14, ending on November 30
    - Scenario 2: 250 cfs beginning on October 21, increasing to 500 cfs on October 28, decreasing to 250cfs on November 7 and ending on November 22
    - Scenario 3: 500 cfs beginning on October 28 and ending on November 30
    - Scenario 4: 500 cfs beginning on October 15 and ending on November 30
- These four scenarios were modeled for Automated Temperature Selection Procedure (ATSP) 41 across four different meteorological (Met) years (2011, 2014, 2017, and 2020) as well as the average across the four Met years. Scenarios 1 and 2 were also modeled for ATSP 38, which has a cooler target of 65F in October rather than 68F.
- If there are warm conditions in October and that requires the use of a significant amount of cold water to meet temperature targets, the tradeoff is that temperatures that can be achieved with the bypass will be warmer. That difference is most pronounced at the beginning of a bypass. By the first week of November, there is almost no difference in temperature across the scenarios.

Questions/Comments

- Reclamation asked if the initial temperature decrease for each scenario is due to the shutter configuration or strictly the power bypass?
    - Kleinschmidt responded that these happen simultaneously.
    - Reclamation noted that it would be interesting to see a scenario in which the shutters are pulled out in mid-October prior to initiating the power bypass.
- CDFW asked if the temperature data from these model runs will be distributed.
    - Kleinschmidt responded that yes, Kearns & West distributed the data to the ARG.
- Reclamation noted that some ARG members had requested to see daily data, but since these are subject to specific meteorology, there may be a risk of being too granular.
- Reclamation asked if the group could review the rest of the temperature-dependent mortality (TDM) modeling to inform additional alternatives. This meeting is the time to present alternatives.

Brian Mahardja, SDM Analyst, reviewed the preliminary consequence table outputs from the Shiny app, which includes metrics for each bypass scenario for Chinook salmon, Steelhead, and hydropower generation.

- The Shiny app is available to run. To run the app in the SalmonCountR folder, select “app.R”, then select "2026," then select "compare alternatives", then select "Run."

Questions/Comments

- The Water Forum clarified the modeling results shared include ATSP 38 for Scenarios 1 and 2, which is not included for these metrics, and asked if there are other nuances in those models that the group would like to see results for.
    - SDM Analyst responded that some information is missing in the Shiny app due to the timing of when they received input information. If more information needs to be incorporated into the Shiny app, please make them aware.
- NMFS asked whether the temperature outputs are at Watt or Hazel.
    - SDM Analyst responded that he would need to look up this information to confirm.
- Reclamation noted that it might be helpful to know when the bypass stops being effective, which could improve the hydropower generation metrics.
    - Kleinschmidt responded that Scenarios 1 and 2 end earlier, while Scenarios 3 and 4 continue through the end of November. The difference in temperature between all the model results in the last two weeks of November being more similar.
    - Reclamation shared that if there are diminishing returns at the end of a bypass, reducing the bypass days would be helpful. Every day that the bypass could be removed without making a substantial impact on the outcomes for fisheries would reduce the impact on hydropower generation, making that scenario more appealing to decision makers.
- Reclamation asked if the TDM metrics represent cumulative impacts.
    - SDM Analyst responded that yes, the TDM metrics consider the whole time period.
    - Reclamation asked if certain times are more critical than others.
    - SDM Analyst shared that November is the most critical; spawning dates would be shifted earlier if temperatures were cooler.
- SDM Analyst noted that no ARG members had expressed interest in participating in expert elicitation for TDM weights, so that will not be taking place this year.
- CDFW noted that it would be helpful to model average temperatures at Nimbus or Hazel in addition to Watt to get an understanding of temperature ranges across spawning and holding reaches through October and into November.
    - Kleinschmidt responded that water temperature results at Hazel are included in the results that will be distributed after this meeting.

- NMFS shared that NMFS would like more time to consider additional scenarios.
    - ARG members discussed the timing for the process of finalizing additional scenarios to run. All parties will submit potential additional scenarios by Monday, September 28. The group will meet to discuss and decide which additional two scenarios will be modeled. The results will be shared during the Thursday, October 1 Ad Hoc Meeting.

Objective Weighting

The SDM Analyst invited organizations to participate in an objective weighting exercise to Reclamation as part of the Structured Decision-Making (SDM) Process. Two organizations volunteered to participate.

- The Water Forum will meet with the SDM Analyst on Friday, October 2 from 1:00-1:45pm.
- NMFS will meet with the SDM Analyst on Friday, October 2 from 2:30-3:15pm.

Questions/Comments

- Reclamation clarified that this exercise will not have an impact on the overall process but will be shared with decision makers during the objective weighting exercise with Reclamation on October 5th.

Next Meeting

- The next Ad Hoc meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 28, 2026, from 3:00 – 3:45 p.m.
- The next Ad Hoc meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 01, 2026, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
- The next regularly scheduled ARG meeting is on Thursday, October 15, 2025, from 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.