



# Sacramento River Temperature Task Group

## Spring Pulse Flow Planning Subgroup Meeting Summary

March 3, 2023

### Participants

Agency	Attendees
CDFW	Crystal Rigby, Tracy Grimes, Doug Killam, Dan Kratville, Erica Meyers
DWR	Kevin Reece
NMFS	Stephen Maurano, Garwin Yip
Reclamation	Elissa Buttermore, Lisa Elliot, Tom Patton
SWFSC	Cyril Michel, Flora Cordoleani
Hoopa Tribe	Veronica Yates
SRSC	Yuen Lenh
USFWS	Matt Brown
Kearns & West	Mia Schiappi, Terra Alpaugh

### Action Items

- **Tom Patton** to
  - Reach out to ACID GM re: coordination of diversion dam installation; find out what their proposed schedule is this year
  - Email updated March forecast to group next week with updated May storage forecast
- **KW** to
  - Distribute key documents (attached):
    - Spring Pulse Guidance Document – direction from the LTO Coordinators on Proposed Action and BiOps with respect to Spring Pulse
    - Suggested Spring Pulse Flow Guidance Document Revisions – this document highlights where the spring pulse group had questions about the Guidance Document in past years; revisions have not yet been made to the Guidance Doc
    - Spring Pulse Flow Study Plan – outline process for considering, evaluating, and implementing spring pulse flow, including monitoring

- Spring Pulse Flow Process Plan – outlines process/timing/coordination considerations which may come into play
- Schedule next meeting the week of March 13
- **Elissa/Lisa** to begin editing a past version of the Pulse Flow Operations Plan and circulate for folks to fill in information in preparation for this year
- **Elissa** to provide draft from last year.
- **Cyril Michel** to bring some slides and past analysis to the next meeting to use as a jumping off point for discussing potential pulse scenarios in the event the March forecast shows improved May storage.

## Key Discussion Topics with Summary of Perspectives, Outcomes, and Agreements

### Meeting Objectives

1. Review Operations Update and May storage projections.
2. Initiate discussion of potential pulse scenarios.
3. Determine next steps needed to make recommendation to SRTTG.

### *Operations Update & Discussion of Next Steps*

Reclamation provided a brief update on the current conditions and operations using the 50 percent forecast with a focus on the parameters impacting whether a spring pulse flow can be considered.

- Any potential spring pulse flow volume is not reflected in the forecast.
- Trinity and Shasta basins are doing well in terms of accumulating snowpack but it is not nearly as high as elsewhere in the state.
- Trinity storage remains low, so Reclamation is not anticipating moving water from the Trinity to the Sacramento this year; i.e., Sacramento temperature management will not be helped by Trinity diversions.
- In the current forecast, Shasta's end of April storage should be very close to 4 MAF, which is the general threshold for considering a pulse flow, but February runoff volumes have not been as high as forecasted in that forecast.
- Shasta storage is currently 2.7 MAF, which is a little behind the forecasted volume.
- The March forecast could show an improved total May 1 storage, and there is also the possibility of additional storms.

Perspectives and questions shared by subgroup members included:

- What tier year is this anticipated to be?

- Reclamation explained that they water year type is right on the line between below and above normal. Under the Interim Operations Plan, there are not many restrictions for operations during these types of years. Reclamation was not concerned about dropping into a Tier 4 Year; they expect a year in the Tier 2 or 3 range.
- CDFW noted that based on the Guidance Document, it looks like a Tier 2 year and asked whether runoff would bump the Sacramento into a Tier 1 year. Reclamation acknowledged it is possible, but they will not know until March at the earliest.
- Reclamation suggested that the group reconvene to examine the next forecast's project May 1 storage.
  - NMFS suggested that the group be more proactive in planning for a spring pulse flow. The spring pulse flow action is being considered for incorporation as part of the Voluntary Agreements, the Sites Project, and the next Proposed Action. As a result, implementing a flow if possible this year would be a good learning experience. NMFS suggested planning for at least a two day pulse of 10,800 cfs.
  - SWFSC agreed that this year looks more promising for implementation than any other since the spring pulse flow was integrated into the Proposed Action as an option; they want to make sure they have time to work through any process kinks. They will bring past analysis of scenarios as a strawman for the next discussion.
  - Reclamation will begin editing a past Pulse Flow Operation Plan to use as a template. They will distribute to the group.
- The group reviewed the constraints around implementing a pulse flow when the ACID Diversion Dam is in the process of installation or has been installed. Reclamation committed to calling the ACID General Manager to find out this year's installation schedule.
- Reclamation commented that the year might be wet enough to piggyback a pulse flow on a storm event to minimize the total water cost.