

Delta Smelt Scoping Team Meeting (10/16/20)

Attendees: Chuck Hanson, Erin Cole, Erwin Van Nieuwenhuyse, Eva Bush, Larry Brown, Mike Eakin, Pat Coulston, Sam Luoma, Scott Hamilton, Shawn Acuna, Yuan Liu

Action Items

- Bruce – cancel 10/20 DSST meeting, push start time of Nov 17 DSST meeting back to 2:30
- Pat – share non-substantive typos found/suggested edits in Entrainment Studies 1&2 with group
- Eva/Bruce – send Bruce references to studies cited; add/confirm references
- Bruce – make edits to Entrainment studies 1 & 2 as described below
- Scott – reach out to Will regarding list of relevant entrainment studies and share w/ group
- Bruce – invite Will to participate in next DSST call

Discussion Highlights

- Entrainment Studies 1 & 2
 - In preface, consider revising language regarding Study 4 and scratching the word “opinions” (i.e., “...does not necessarily reflect the ~~opinions~~ or positions of CSAMP member entities”)
 - In executive summary, consider revising “pulled out” (i.e., “the last study did not move forward because investigators pulled out of the process due to other commitments”)
 - In Study 2 – include study reference table/footnote
 - Add byline to executive summaries to make authorship clear
- Entrainment Study 3 Options
 - Consider adding foreword to Pete’s report to address comment/concerns + Scott’s “reality check” analysis
 - Attempted project follow up has not borne fruit:
 - Entreaties with Pete (did not pan out)
 - Ted’s DSST effort suggestion
 - Engagement of third-part investigators (Lenny reached out to Josh and maybe Ed – did not pan out)
 - Follow-up attempt autopsy
 - Straw proposal for moving forward
 - Release Pete’s document as a CSAMP technical report
 - Include a very basic added Conclusion and Discussion authored by a volunteer
 - Include critiques, concerns, a summary of Scott’s analysis, etc as attachments
 - Include an integrated forward authored by DSST
 - Package with the usual DSST memo
 - Questions/Comments
 - There is a lot of uncertainty (in both the numerator and denominator) around proportional entrainment – not clear whether we know enough to say anything about population level effects. Influences whether there is value in pursuing study 4 at this time (additional studies may be needed beforehand).
 - Does the current population situation (ie, near extinction) suggest study 4 is worthwhile or not?
 - Need input from management regarding whether to further study entrainment or move on to other topics
 - Solicited input - response was to pursue both

Facilitator Notes, Not Reviewed or Approved by Meeting Participants

- Consider taking back to CAMT with clearly defined tradeoffs in terms of resources – e.g., research into other life stages (larval entrainment)
- Seems like we've hit a brick wall – may be valuable to at least document how we've reached this point
 - Not sure it's a brick wall so much as a decision point.
- Two questions:
 - What do we do about study 3? How might we document what's been done thus far? How might we wrap it up?
 - Do we pursue study 4 and if so how?
 - There has been a qualitative attempt (Will Smith) – is there still a need for study 4?
 - Pete's work on volumes was useful, would be helpful to share
 - Seems like all the studies go from entrainment to salvage through an expansion factor – but if there's a relationship between salvage and population impact you could detect it without knowing the expansion factor. Rather than reinventing the wheel, re-assess the literature to see if there have been population level impacts (would need to sort pre/post 2008 BiOp). Address uncertainty concerns in a preface, hold off on study 4 pending lit review on population impacts.
 - Would need to compile a list of relevant work
 - Not particularly useful to go blow by blow through each report – instead, compile DSST's comments on studies and include in a memo to CAMT along with USGS reports and a summary of Pete's effort. Don't move forward with study 4.
- Next meeting
 - Nov 17 at 2:30