


RMA Hydrodynamics and Delta Smelt Models Draft Report

PARTICLE TRACKING AND ANALYSIS OF ADULT AND LARVAL/JUVENILE DELTA SMELT FOR 2-GATE FISHERIES PROTECTION PLAN DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS



Prepared For:
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Contact:
Dennis Majors
dmajors@mwdh2o.com

Prepared By:
Resource Management Associates
4171 Suisun Valley Road, Suite J
Fairfield, CA 94534

Contact:
John DeGeorge
707-864-2950

April 20, 2009



Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| RMA Model | 2 |
| Model Background | 2 |
| Model Capabilities | 2 |
| Model Description | 3 |
| Finite Element Mesh | 3 |
| Boundary Conditions..... | 3 |
| Tidal boundary | 3 |
| Flows, exports, precipitation, evaporation, Delta Islands Consumptive Use | 3 |
| Electrical Conductivity (EC) | 4 |
| Turbidity..... | 4 |
| Hydrodynamic, EC and Turbidity Simulations..... | 7 |
| Analysis periods | 7 |
| Simulations..... | 8 |
| Triggers..... | 9 |
| OCAP | 9 |
| Two-Gates | 10 |
| Determination of Exports for OMR flow requirements..... | 12 |
| Results and Discussion | 13 |
| Gate Optimization..... | 14 |
| Two Gates with Increased OMR Flows | 19 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Adult Smelt Simulations | 22 |
| Background | 22 |
| Adult Delta Smelt Behavior Model | 22 |
| Model Calibration | 29 |
| Limitations of Analysis | 33 |
| Results and Discussion | 34 |
| Larval/Juvenile Smelt Simulations | 42 |
| Historical RMATRK Simulations..... | 42 |
| Analysis of 20mm Survey Observations of Delta Smelt | 42 |
| Hatching Period Analysis..... | 43 |
| Post-processing of Historical RMA PTRK Simulations | 43 |
| Tuning of Hatching Rates | 43 |
| Limitations of Analysis | 44 |
| Results of Analysis..... | 45 |
| References | 58 |

Table of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1 Model grid showing stage, inflow, export, DICU, gate and barrier locations. | 6 |
| Figure 2 Net Delta Outflow for each December through June simulation period..... | 8 |
| Figure 3 Simulated historical and OCAP (daily and 14-day average) Old + Middle River flows in comparison with OCAP flow goal for December 2003 - June 2004..... | 12 |
| Figure 4 Net flow on Old and Middle Rivers at Bacon Island for no gates (OCAP-LB2) and the “balanced” gate operation (2Gate-OCAP-LB2). | 15 |
| Figure 5 Old River gate operations employed to divert net flow from Old River. The “Close Flood and Ebb” and “Close Flood Only” operations reduce the Old River net flow approximately same degree..... | 16 |
| Figure 6 Comparison of simulated turbidity for OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST), and the 2 gate scenario with OCAP-2GST conditions. The 2 gate results compare Old River gate closure over the flood/ebb period (12 hrs/day) and for a more limited closure time (½ to 1½ hrs/day on flood tide only). Results are for January 20, 2004..... | 17 |
| Figure 7 Comparison of simulated turbidity for OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST), and the 2 gate scenario with OCAP-2GST conditions. The 2 gate results compare Old River gate closure over the flood/ebb period (12 hrs/day) and for a more limited closure time (½ to 1½ hrs/day on flood tide only). Results are for March 20, 2004..... | 18 |
| Figure 8 Simulated turbidity for historical conditions, OCAP operations, 2 gate scenario, and OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST) on 05 Jan 2003 at 23:00..... | 20 |
| Figure 9 Simulated turbidity for historical conditions, OCAP operations, 2 gate scenario, and OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST) on 27 Dec 2003 at 04:00. | 21 |
| Figure 10 For December 1999 – March 2000: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE) | 25 |
| Figure 11 For December 2001 – March 2002: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE) | 26 |
| Figure 12 For December 2002 – March 2003: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE) | 27 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 13 For December 2003 – March 2004: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE) | 28 |
| Figure 14 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 1999-2000. | 31 |
| Figure 15 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 2001-2002. | 31 |
| Figure 16 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 2002-2003. | 32 |
| Figure 17 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 2003-2004. | 32 |
| Figure 18 Adult Delta Smelt Particle Distributions for historical conditions, OCAP operations, 2 gate scenario, and OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST) on 16 Jan 2003 at 00:00. | 37 |
| Figure 19 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 1999 through March 2000. | 38 |
| Figure 20 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2001 through March 2002. | 38 |
| Figure 21 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2002 through March 2003. | 39 |
| Figure 22 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2003 through March 2004. | 39 |
| Figure 23 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2007 through March 2008. | 40 |
| Figure 24 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2003 through March 2004, with alternative OMR flow limits | 40 |
| Figure 25 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2003 through March 2004, with -3000 cfs OMR flows during RPA1 and lower bound flows during RPA2. For the 2-gate case, exports were reduced briefly near the end of January to maintain positive Qwest at San Andreas Landing..... | 41 |
| Figure 26 Source regions..... | 46 |
| Figure 27 Tuned Regional Hatching Rates, 2003. | 47 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 28 Comparison of Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and Predicted by Particle Model averaged over all surveys, 2003. | 47 |
| Figure 29 Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys, 2003..... | 48 |
| Figure 30 Regional Densities predicted by model, 2003..... | 48 |
| Figure 31 Time-series of Delta-wide Population estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and from Particle Model, 2003. | 49 |
| Figure 32 Time-series of Observed CVP Salvage and Salvage estimated from Particle Entrainment, 2003. | 49 |
| Figure 33 Tuned Regional Hatching Rates, 2004. | 50 |
| Figure 34 Comparison of Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and Predicted by Particle Model averaged over all surveys, 2004. | 50 |
| Figure 35 Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys, 2004..... | 51 |
| Figure 36 Regional Densities predicted by model, 2004..... | 51 |
| Figure 37 Time-series of Delta-wide Population estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and from Particle Model, 2004. | 52 |
| Figure 38 Time-series of Observed CVP Salvage and Salvage estimated from Particle Entrainment, 2003. | 52 |
| Figure 39 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “SJR near confluence” | 53 |
| Figure 40 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “SJR at False River” | 53 |
| Figure 41 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “SJR at Old River” . . | 54 |
| Figure 42 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “South Fork Mokelumne” | 54 |
| Figure 43 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Franks Tract” | 55 |
| Figure 44 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Old” | 55 |
| Figure 45 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Middle” | 56 |

Figure 46 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Grantline and Old”.
..... 57

Figure 47 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from all regions. 57

Introduction

This report describes the numerical modeling analysis of potential entrainment of adult, juvenile, and larval delta smelt in support of the 2-Gate Fisheries Protection Plan. The objective of the modeling analysis is to examine the incremental benefit of operable barriers in Old River and Connection Slough relative to proposed OCAP flow requirements in Old and Middle River.

Two distinct particle tracking techniques are used to represent the adult life stage and the larval/juvenile life stages. Adult delta smelt are not well represented using passive particle tracking techniques because they are sufficiently strong swimmers to resist tidal flows by moving out of the current and into shoals or near the bed where velocities are low. Entrainment adult delta smelt occurs during the period when the fish choose to move upstream for spawning. Periods of peak entrainment are correlated with high turbidity in the neighborhood of the exports resulting from storm flows. A particle behavior model has been developed by Resource Management Associates (RMA) with support from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) to simulate the movement of adult delta smelt during this period based on simulated distributions of salinity (represented as electrical conductivity, EC) and turbidity. Because turbidity is a key driver for the distribution of adult smelt, the optimum gate operation to minimize adult entrainment is based on controlling progress of the turbidity plumes from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and reducing the turbidity along Old and Middle Rivers downstream of the export facilities.

Larval and Juvenile delta smelt are considered to be small enough to represent as passively transported particles. Initial evaluation of gate operations for minimizing larval and juvenile entrainment was performed by CH2M Hill for MWD. In that study the DSM2-PTM was used to evaluate potential entrainment for smelt monitoring locations around the Delta. In this analysis a passive particle tracking methodology developed by Dr. Edward Gross working with Dr. Lenny Grimaldo (USBR) and Dr. Ted Sommer (DWR) is used to represent the spatial and temporal distribution of larval and juvenile delta smelt considering hatching rates, growth, and mortality. Hatching rates are derived through an automated tuning algorithm that develops a best fit estimate of regional hatching rates from the historic 20mm Trawl Surveys. Optimizing gate operations to minimize larval and juvenile entrainment involve minimizing advective and dispersive transport from regions of the Delta where fish densities are highest.

Both the adult and larval/juvenile particle tracking analyses presented in this report utilize the RMA Bay-Delta Model for hydrodynamics and water quality simulation and the RMATRK particle tracking model.

This report is organized in three sections. The first section describes the RMA Bay-Delta Model and the set of hydrodynamic, EC, and Turbidity simulations prepared for this study. The second section describes the adult delta smelt modeling. And the final section describes the larval and juvenile delta smelt modeling.

RMA Model

Model Background

RMA has developed and refined a numerical model of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system (Delta model) utilizing the RMA finite element models for surface waters. RMA2 (King, 1986) is a generalized free surface hydrodynamic model that is used to compute two-dimensional depth-averaged velocity and water surface elevation. RMA11 (King, 1995) is a generalized two-dimensional depth-averaged water quality model that computes a temporal and spatial description of conservative and non-conservative water quality parameters. RMA11 uses stage and velocity results from RMA2. As shown in Figure 1, the Delta model domain extends from Martinez to the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers and to Vernalis on the San Joaquin River.

The current version of RMA's Delta model has been developed and continually refined during numerous studies over the past 11 years. One of the most important additions has been the capability to accurately represent wetting and drying in shallow subtidal areas. The most comprehensive calibration efforts in recent years were performed during studies for CALFED (RMA, 2000), and Flooded Islands Feasibility Study (RMA, 2005).

The RMA model differs from DSM2 in that it uses a one- and two-dimensional representation, whereas DSM2 is solely a one-dimensional model. In addition, the RMA model tidal boundary can be set at Martinez or the Golden Gate, while DSM2 only uses the Martinez tidal boundary.

Model Capabilities

Hydrodynamic and water quality model output from RMA's Delta models, RMA2 and RMA11, provided temporal and spatial descriptions of velocities and water depths, and water quality, respectively, throughout the model domain. In the model, the results of the flow simulation are saved and used by the water quality model. The computational time step used for modeling the depth-averaged flow and water quality transport in the Delta is 7.5 minutes, and output from each model is saved every 15 minutes.

Due to the variable grid capability of the finite element method, fine detail can be added to emphasize specific areas in the vicinity of the current project without increasing detail elsewhere in the model grid. During the Suisun Marsh Levee Breach modeling project (RMA, 2000), considerable detail was added to the representation of Suisun Bay and the western Delta. Wetting and drying of the tidal mudflats was represented in sufficient detail to provide a good definition of change in the tidal prism with change in tidal stage.

Model Description

Finite Element Mesh

Figure 1 shows the entire finite element mesh (computational network) of the Delta model used for this study. A two-dimensional, depth-averaged representation was used for the Suisun Bay region, the Sacramento-San Joaquin confluence area, Sherman Lake, the Sacramento River up to Rio Vista, Big Break, the San Joaquin River up to its confluence with Middle River, False River, Frank's Tract and the surrounding channels, and the Delta Cross Channel. Suisun Marsh and Delta channels, and tributary streams were represented using a one-dimensional cross-sectionally averaged approximation.

The Delta finite element mesh was developed using an in-house GIS based graphical user interface program. This program allows for specification of the finite element mesh over layers of bathymetry points and contours, USGS digital line graph (DLG) and digital orthoquad (DOQ) images, and aerial photo surveys processed by USGS and Stanford University. Bottom elevations and the extent of mudflats were based on bathymetry data collected by NOAA, DWR, USACE and USGS. These data sets have been compiled by DWR and can be downloaded from DWR's Cross Section Development Program (CSDP) website at <http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/modeling/deltamodeling/models/csdp/index.html>.

Additional data were collected around Franks Tract by DWR and the USGS in 2004. USGS 10 m resolution Delta Bathymetry grids were obtained from the Access USGS website at <http://sfbay.wr.usgs.gov/access/Bathy/Delta/>.

Boundary Conditions

Boundary conditions are specified for all inflow and export locations and for flow control structures. The locations of the model boundaries for the calibration grid are shown in Figure 1.

Tidal boundary

The tidal boundary is set at Martinez, the western boundary of the model, using observed data for the RSAC054 station at Martinez.

Flows, exports, precipitation, evaporation, Delta Islands Consumptive Use

Inflow locations in the model are shown in Figure 1.

Daily average flows are applied for the Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, San Joaquin River, Cosumnes River, Mokelumne River, and miscellaneous eastside flows which include Calaveras River and other minor flows. The model interpolates between the daily average flows at noon each day. Data from Dayflow (<http://www.iep.ca.gov/dayflow/index.html>) and the IEP database (<http://iep.water.ca.gov/dss/>) are used to set these boundary conditions.

Delta Islands Consumptive Use (DICU) flows incorporate channel depletions, infiltration, evaporation, and precipitation, as well as Delta island agricultural use. DICU values are applied on a monthly average basis and were derived from monthly DSM2 input values (DWR, 1995).

Delta exports applied in the model include SWP, CVP, Contra Costa exports at Rock Slough and Old River intakes, and North Bay Aqueduct intake at Barker Slough. Dayflow and IEP database data are used to set daily average export flows for the CVP, North Bay Aqueduct and Contra Costa's exports.

Hourly SWP export flows for 2003 and later years are computed using the Clifton Court gate ratings and inside and outside water levels. The flows are adjusted on a monthly basis so the total computed flow matches the monthly SWP export. For 2002 and earlier, when water levels inside and outside the gates were not available, SWP exports were defined using DSM2 flows into Clifton Court, modified to remove erroneously large flows. Further details on Clifton Court Forebay gate operations can be found in (RMA, 2000), RMA's Flooded Islands Feasibility Study (RMA, 2005), and in (DWR, 2005).

Electrical Conductivity (EC)

Electrical conductivity (EC) is used as a surrogate for salinity. The western EC boundary of the model, Martinez, is set using the average of top and bottom EC measurements at RSAC054. The Sacramento River EC boundary condition is set using daily Sacramento River at Hood data and the San Joaquin River EC boundary condition is set using daily San Joaquin River at Mossdale data. The Sacramento River EC time series is also applied to Yolo Bypass. EC boundary conditions for all other inflows are set to constant estimated values.

Turbidity

For the 1999-2004 simulations, sufficient turbidity data were not available to set model boundary conditions and therefore, during previous work (RMA, 2008), suspended sediment concentration (SSC) was simulated using USGS data. For the current study, it was necessary to simulate turbidity because USFWS OCAP BO triggers were based on turbidity. Therefore, SSC data had to be translated to turbidity.

Suspended sediment concentrations tend to be roughly half of turbidity concentrations (Dave Fullerton, personal communication). To test this theory, this conversion was applied during periods when both turbidity and SSC data were available. The factor of 0.5 produced reasonable matches for Sacramento River and San Joaquin River data. These matches were better than those resulting from applying relationships found in literature.

For the Martinez boundary, only USGS Mallard SSC data were available for the periods of interest. Comparisons between Mallard SSC (in mg/L) and turbidity (in NTU) at Benicia showed very similar values for the two data sets. A relationship from literature did not produce a good match at all. Thus no adjustment was applied to the Mallard SSC data for use as turbidity boundary condition at Martinez.

For the 2007-2008 period, turbidity data were available from CDEC at Martinez, Sacramento River at Hood and San Joaquin River at Vernalis.

For all years, the Sacramento River turbidity boundary condition was also applied to Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, Cosumnes River and Mokelumne River. No turbidity value was applied to the miscellaneous eastside flows.




Figure 1 Model grid showing stage, inflow, export, DICU, gate and barrier locations.

Hydrodynamic, EC and Turbidity Simulations

Analysis periods

For each analysis period, hydrodynamic simulations were performed for November through June and water quality (EC and turbidity) simulations were performed for November through March. November was used as a spin-up period and was not used in the particle tracking simulations. Years simulated include:

- 1999-2000
- 2001-2002
- 2002-2003
- 2003-2004
- 2007-2008

Net Delta outflow (net flow leaving the Delta) for each December through June simulation period is plotted in Figure 2. The first four periods were selected based on distinct smelt salvage events. The 2007-2008 period was selected because of good availability of turbidity data for setting model boundary conditions. Of these years, the highest flows occurred in 2004, while 2007-2008 was a driest period.




Figure 2 Net Delta Outflow for each December through June simulation period.

Simulations

For each analysis period, historical hydrodynamic and water quality simulations were performed. All stage, inflows, exports, and operations of existing gates and barriers reflected historical conditions.

The next set of simulations reflected OCAP requirements, defined as the Reasonable and Prudent Actions (RPAs). Exports were modified to achieve OCAP Biological Opinion (BO) Old + Middle River (OMR) flow limits. OMR flows are calculated by computing the sum of the net flows at ROLD024 and RMID015 (Middle River) and ROLD024 (Old River at Bacon Island).

There are two periods of flow limitations. The first period, under RPA 1, sets OMR flow limits at -2000 cfs and the second period, RPA 2, sets flow limits between -1250 cfs and -5000 cfs. To accommodate the range for RPA 2, “lower bound” and “upper bound” simulations were performed with OMR flows at -1250 cfs and -5000 cfs, respectively. Turbidity limits determined the timing of onset of RPA 1. The

presence of spent delta smelt in the Spring Kodiak Trawls or the Tracy Fish Collection Facility (TFCF) and Delta –wide temperature determines the onset of RPA 2 as discussed below. During VAMP (Vernalis Adaptive Management Program) from April 15 through May 15, all export reductions were suspended.

“With Project” simulations were performed using operable gates in Old River and Connection Slough. The with Project simulations adhered to the OCAP flow limits with earlier trigger dates for RPA 1.

“No project” simulations were also run using this earlier trigger date so that direct comparisons could be made to determine the effects of the gates alone.

Inflows were not modified for the OCAP or two-gate/OCAP simulations, and therefore net Delta outflow (NDO) increased, resulting in reduced EC at Martinez. The G-model was used to modify the Martinez EC boundary condition based on the increased NDO. The G-Model is a salinity-outflow relationship based on a set of empirical equations developed from the one-dimensional advection-dispersion equation (Denton, 1993).

The G-model (DWR, 2005) is used to compute Martinez EC using historical NDO then using the OCAP increased NDO. The resulting EC computed for historical NDO was not an exact match with the observed historical EC used for the model boundary condition. Therefore, the difference between the two G-model computed EC time series was used to adjust the historical Martinez EC used in the model.

Triggers

OCAP

The RPA 1 trigger, limiting OMR flows to -2000 cfs, was based on turbidity conditions in the Delta. When the three-day-average turbidity from the historical simulations at each of three stations (Prisoner’s Pt, Holland Cut and Victoria Canal) is ≥ 12 NTU, RPA 1 was triggered. If historical smelt salvage data showed an increase in salvage before this turbidity trigger is reached, RPA 1 began sooner based on a qualitative assessment of the salvage data.

RPA 2, adjusting the OMR limit to -1250/-5000 cfs, is triggered by observed temperature data and or confirmation that delta smelt have begun spawning. When daily mean water temperatures at Mossdale, Antioch and Rio Vista is $\geq 12^{\circ}$ C, RPA 2 begins. RPA 2 can be suspended any time the three day average flow on Sacramento River at Rio Vista is $\geq 9,000$ cfs and three day average flow on San Joaquin River at Vernalis is $\geq 10,000$ cfs between the start of RPA 2 and June 30 or is suspended earlier when suspended earlier due to daily average water temperatures reaching 25° C for three consecutive days at Clifton Court Forebay.

CDEC and BDAT temperature data were used to check for the temperature triggers. USGS flow data were used to check for the flow triggers.

Two-Gates

For the with Project simulations, RPA 1 and gate operations begin when simulated historical turbidity at Jersey Point reaches 12 NTU. This turns out to be from 3 to 21 days earlier than the RPA 1 trigger for the OCAP simulations. The RPA 2 trigger is unchanged for the with Project simulations.

No project simulations were also run using this earlier trigger date so that direct comparisons could be made to determine the effects of the Project alone.

A summary of trigger dates is provided in Table 1, with the final operating schedule in Table 2.

Table 1 Summary of turbidity, temperature and flow triggers for OCAP and two-gate operations

| Analysis Period | Triggers | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | 3 station 3-day avg turbidity ≥ 12 NTU | Sooner based on salvage data? | Jersey Pt 3-day avg turbidity ≥ 12 NTU | 3 station daily mean water temps ≥ 12 C | Suspend RPA 2 Rio Vista ≥ 9000 cfs, Vernalis $\geq 10,000$ cfs | Clifton Court $\geq 25^{\circ}$ C for 3 days |
| Dec 1999 - Jun 2000 | 7-Feb-00 | 1-Feb-00 | 28-Jan-00 | 13-Mar-00 | 19-Feb-00 to 23-Mar-00 | -- |
| Dec 2001 - Jun 2002 | 16-Dec-01 | no | 7-Dec-01 | 21-Feb-02 | -- | -- |
| Dec 2002 - Jun 2003 | 30-Dec-02 | 23-Dec-02 | 20-Dec-02 | 25-Feb-03 | -- | 4-Jun-03 |
| Dec 2003 - Jun 2004 | 29-Dec-03 | no | 19-Dec-03 | 21-Feb-04 | -- | 19-Jun-04 |
| Dec 2007 - Jun 2008 | 7-Feb-08 | 1-Feb-08 | 11-Jan-08 | 2-Mar-08 | -- | -- |

Table 2 Final schedule for OCAP and two-gate operations

| Analysis Period | Final Schedule | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | RPA 1: OMR -2000 cfs | 2gate/RPA 1:OMR -2000 cfs | RPA 2: OMR -1250/-5000 cfs* | Return to historic flows |
| Dec 1999 - Jun 2000 | 1-Feb-00 | 28-Jan-00 | 23-Mar-00 | 30-Jun-00 |
| Dec 2001 - Jun 2002 | 16-Dec-01 | 7-Dec-01 | 21-Feb-02 | 30-Jun-02 |
| Dec 2002 - Jun 2003 | 23-Dec-02 | 20-Dec-02 | 25-Feb-03 | 4-Jun-03 |
| Dec 2003 - Jun 2004 | 29-Dec-03 | 19-Dec-03 | 21-Feb-04 | 19-Jun-04 |
| Dec 2007 - Jun 2008 | 1-Feb-08 | 11-Jan-08 | 2-Mar-08 | 30-Jun-08 |

*RPA 2 is suspended during VAMP: 15-Apr to 15-May

Determination of Exports for OMR flow requirements

A regression method was used to determine export reductions required to achieve the OMR flow requirements. The regression method considered south Delta demand (SWP, CVP, Contra Costa and south Delta DICU), San Joaquin River flow, south Delta barrier operations and historical OMR flow. Two iterations of the regression computations generally produced 14-day average OMR flows within 5% of the desired goal.

During times when OMR flows were outside the OCAP requirement, no adjustment was made to exports (i.e. exports were not increased to raise OMR flows to the OCAP limit).

An example of simulated OMR flows in comparison with the OCAP flow goal is plotted in Figure 3. The blue line shows the OCAP RPA1 OMR negative flow restriction, which is 2000 cfs from 29-Dec-03 until 2-Mar-04. For this case, the RPA 2 OMR negative flow restriction is set at 1250 to 5000 cfs from 2-Mar-04 through 19-Jun-04. Note that the OCAP negative flow restrictions cease during VAMP from 15-Apr-04 until 15-May-04. Simulated historical 1-day average OMR flow is shown in red. Simulated historical flows with OCAP 1-day average and 14-day average OMR flow are shown in green and black, respectively.




Figure 3 Simulated historical and OCAP (daily and 14-day average) Old + Middle River flows in comparison with OCAP flow goal for December 2003 - June 2004.

Results and Discussion

The primary drivers of the pre-spawning Adult smelt model (discussed in the following section) are hydrodynamics and turbidity. Smelt are thought to seek more turbid environments (USFWS, 2008). During high river flow periods, turbidity enters the Delta from the Sacramento River and Georgiana Sloughs and enters the south Delta through Old River and Middle River. When these two water bodies meet, they form a turbidity bridge that allows smelt to move to locations in close proximity to the influence of the SWP and CVP facilities, placing them at high risk for entrainment at the export pumps.

Water management actions (operation of the SWP and CVP export pumps) consistent with the OCAP RPA actions, by reducing negative Old and Middle River flows, prevents or delays the turbidity bridge from forming, thus keeping smelt away from the export pumps. The proposed operable gates in Old River and Connection Slough, when operated in conjunction with OMR flows can provide more flexibility in keeping turbidity away from the pumps.

Color contour plots of turbidity show the effectiveness of OCAP RPA actions and gate operations compared to OCAP actions alone. With minimum contours plotted at 12 NTU, these plots show whether or not a turbidity bridge forms. If turbidity exceeds 12 NTU all the way through Old and/or Middle River to the export facilities, smelt are more likely to pass through and become entrained.

Example turbidity contour plots are provided in Figure 8 and Figure 9 for the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 simulation periods. These plots show turbidity for historical conditions, operation of the SWP and CVP export pumps consistent with the OCAP actions, Project facilities operated to balance Old and Middle River flows, and operation of the SWP and CVP export pumps consistent with the OCAP actions with the same start time as the Project simulations.

On 05 Jan 2003, the operation of the SWP and CVP export pumps consistent with the OCAP actions reduce turbidity in the south Delta below historical levels, however the turbidity bridge still forms. With the two gates in place and operating to balance flows, the turbidity bridge does not form. The operation of the SWP and CVP export pumps consistent with the OCAP actions with the earlier start date (in this case, the start date is 3 days earlier), the turbidity bridge does not form, however the gap is much smaller than with the Project.

On 27 December 2003, the turbidity bridge forms with operation of the SWP and CVP export pumps consistent with the OCAP actions, but not with the earlier start date. The earlier start date results are similar whether the gates are in place or not. In this case, there is a ten-day difference between the start dates.

Gate Optimization

Several Project operations were examined. Under existing conditions, Old River is a faster path vs. Middle River for turbidity entering from the north Delta and then on to the export facilities in the south Delta. By closing the gates in Old River and Connection Slough during portions of the flood/ebb tidal cycle, Old River and Middle River net flow and tidal mixing can be modified to achieve the longest travel time for the turbidity laden waters to reach the export locations. With the overall increased travel time, turbidity decreases with settling, reducing the chance of a turbidity bridge forming and connecting the south and central Delta.

Figure 4 compares the net flows on Old and Middle Rivers for the no project condition and a 2 gates operation which “balances” the turbidity travel along the Old and Middle River channels. In the “balance” operation, the gate on Connection Slough is always closed, while the Old River gate is open and closed over some portion of the tidal cycle. When both gates are closed during a flood tide period, flow directly from Franks Tract to the south Delta is blocked. Water does reenter the Old River channel from Middle River along the east-west channels north and south of Woodward.

The adjustment in the Old River and Middle River net flows shown in Figure 4 can be accomplished by a range of gate closing/opening over the flood and ebb tidal cycles. Closing the Old River gate $\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day during the flood tide is sufficient time to accomplish the net flow changes displayed in Figure 5. Alternatively, the Old River gate may be closed for the entire flood tide period and the subsequent ebb tide period in order to achieve the same change in net flows. With this operation, the gate would be closed about 12 hours/day. This mode of operation would be more intrusive to boating and fish passage, but might further retard the southern movement of turbidity along Old River by decreasing the tidal mixing.

Figure 6 and Figure 7 compare the computed tidally averaged turbidity for the OCAP-2GST (OCAP with 2-gate start time) conditions for no gates, and the 2 Gates configuration with the 12 hr/day closure time (of the Old River gate) and the $\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ hr/day closure during the flood tide only. Figure 6 shows for the January 20, 2004 date, the limited Old River gate closure operation is as effective as the 12 hr/day operation in maintaining the turbidity gap in the south Delta. Figure 7 shows the results for the March 20, 2004 date. For this date, the limited Old River gate closure operation does a good job of maintaining the turbidity gap in Old River, but is overall slightly less effective than the 12 hr/day closure operation.




Figure 4 Net flow on Old and Middle Rivers at Bacon Island for no gates (OCAP-LB2) and the “balanced” gate operation (2Gate-OCAP-LB2).




Figure 5 Old River gate operations employed to divert net flow from Old River. The “Close Flood and Ebb” and “Close Flood Only” operations reduce the Old River net flow approximately same degree.

Tidally Averaged Turbidity, Jan 20, 2004




Figure 6 Comparison of simulated turbidity for OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST), and the 2 gate scenario with OCAP-2GST conditions. The 2 gate results compare Old River gate closure over the flood/ebb period (12 hrs/day) and for a more limited closure time (½ to 1½ hrs/day on flood tide only). Results are for January 20, 2004.

Tidally Averaged Turbidity, Mar 20, 2004




Figure 7 Comparison of simulated turbidity for OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST), and the 2 gate scenario with OCAP-2GST conditions. The 2 gate results compare Old River gate closure over the flood/ebb period (12 hrs/day) and for a more limited closure time (½ to 1½ hrs/day on flood tide only). Results are for March 20, 2004.

Two Gates with Increased OMR Flows

Once the optimal gate operations were determined, simulations were performed to test how much increase in negative OMR flows could be achieved without increasing smelt entrainment. OMR flows were increased to -3000 cfs, - 4000 cfs and -5000 cfs for the entire simulation period (except during VAMP).

05 Jan 2003 23:00




Figure 8 Simulated turbidity for historical conditions, OCAP operations, 2 gate scenario, and OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST) on 05 Jan 2003 at 23:00.

27 Dec 2003 04:00




Figure 9 Simulated turbidity for historical conditions, OCAP operations, 2 gate scenario, and OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST) on 27 Dec 2003 at 04:00.

Adult Smelt Simulations

Background

During the period of December through March, when adult delta smelt are moving upstream to spawn, there appears to be strong correlation between salvage of adult delta smelt at the state and federal export facilities and turbidity near the exports. Under the direction of Dave Fullerton and Curt Schmutte, MWD funded RMA to develop a particle behavior model that attempts to simulate the upstream movement of adult delta smelt and potential entrainment during this period. The behavior model works within the RMATRK particle tracking model, which is driven by the RMA Bay-Delta hydrodynamic and water quality model. The adult delta smelt behavior model is a work in progress and updates to the model algorithm will likely occur. In its current form the particle model has been shown to provide reasonable estimates of entrainment patterns for several historic years.

Adult Delta Smelt Behavior Model

The basic hypothesis of the behavior model is as follows. Adult delta smelt desire to move upstream from the Suisun Bay region during the late fall or early winter to spawn. The fish wait until the first storm events of the season increase the turbidity in the interior of the Delta. The fish prefer to avoid water with very low turbidity because of higher risk of predation and/or lack of food supply. The fish determine the desired direction of travel by sensing local gradients of salinity and turbidity. Initially, when they are in the Suisun Bay Region, the upstream direction is determined by a decreasing gradient of salinity. Once into the interior of the Delta where the salinity gradient is very small, the fish randomly explore the Delta channels to find suitable spawning habitat. If the turbidity is too low, the fish will move in the direction of increasing turbidity. If the turbidity gradient is too small however and it cannot be determined which direction leads to higher turbidity, the fish will hide.

Delta smelt are relatively small fish and not strong swimmers, so it is hypothesized that they will use a “surfing” mechanism with tidal flows to move through the Delta channels without expending a large amount of energy. In open channel flow, peak velocities are near the surface toward the middle of the channel, while near the bed or along shallow banks the velocity is very low. If a fish chooses to move with the tidal flow, it can easily move toward the surface where the velocity is highest. Conversely, if the fish chooses not to move with the tidal flow, then it can move toward the bottom where the velocity is very low. This allows the fish to ride the tidal flow in a preferred direction. For example, if the turbidity at the current location is too low and the fish desires to move toward more turbid water, it would tend to hold its position (move to the bottom) if the turbidity gradient along the direction of flow was such that the tidal flow was bringing higher turbidity water toward it. When the tide turned and flow directions reversed, the fish would move toward the surface to go with the tidal flow. Because tidal excursions in the Delta channels are quite large, often on the order of several kilometers, fish can move very quickly using this surfing mechanism.

The behavior model is implemented on top of the RMATRK particle tracking model. At each tracking step, the transport velocity is computed for a neutrally buoyant passive particle moving with the streamline velocity computed by the RMA Bay-Delta Model and subject to a random velocity component representing turbulent dispersion. Then the behavior model is used to determine an adjustment to the transport velocity. The behavior algorithm utilizes the local concentration and gradient of electrical conductivity (EC, simulated as a surrogate for salinity) and turbidity computed by the RMA Bay-Delta Model to determine the adjustment to the transport velocity.

The behavior algorithm is as follows.

- If the local EC is greater than the required maximum limit
 - Surf toward lower EC.
- Else if the local turbidity is lower than the required minimum limit
 - If the local turbidity gradient is greater than the minimum detectible gradient
 - Surf toward higher turbidity
 - Else if the local turbidity gradient is lower than the minimum detectible gradient
 - Hide
- Else if the local EC is lower than the desired minimum limit
 - Surf toward higher EC.
- If the local EC and local turbidity are within required limits
 - Randomly move (explore desirable habitat).

The surfing behavior is implemented by applying a scalar velocity factor to the transport velocity vector computed for neutrally buoyant particles. The velocity factors for moving with the tidal flow and resisting tidal flow are user defined constants. Reasonable limits for these factors are zero as a minimum and 1.2 as a maximum factor. Assuming a logarithmic vertical velocity profile the peak velocity is approximately 1.2 times the depth averaged velocity. Hiding is also implemented with a user defined scalar velocity factor, which causes the particles to move slowly or stop.

Random movement to explore desirable habitat is currently implemented as addition random mixing. When a particle is at a location where the EC is below the required maximum limit and the turbidity is above the required minimum limit a random velocity component is computed based on user defined dispersion coefficients in the longitudinal (streamline) and transverse directions. The velocity component is computed as

$$v_i = \sqrt{\frac{2K_i}{dt} * g}$$

where:

v_i is the velocity component in the longitudinal or transverse direction (m/s),

K_i is the user defined dispersion coefficient in the longitudinal or transverse direction (m²/s),

dt is the tracking time step (s), and

g is a randomly selected value from a normal Gaussian distribution with standard deviation of 1.0.

The user defined calibration parameters for the current implementation of the adult delta smelt behavior model are:

- Required maximum EC limit (umhos/cm)
- Required minimum turbidity limit (NTU)
- Minimum detectable horizontal turbidity gradient (NTU/m)
- Desired minimum EC limit (umhos/cm)
- Velocity factor for moving with tide flow
- Velocity factor for resisting tidal flow
- Velocity factor used when hiding
- Longitudinal dispersion coefficient (m²/s) for random exploration
- Transverse dispersion coefficient (m²/s) for random exploration

A comparison of observed turbidity at Clifton Court and smelt salvage data at Skinner and Tracy shows a clear correlation. As an example, Figure 13 shows Skinner and Tracy smelt salvage data plotted with observed turbidity in Clifton Court and dynamic and tidally averaged computed turbidity in Old River just outside Clifton Court for the December 2003 through March 2004 period. During this period, there were two spikes in turbidity and two corresponding spikes in smelt salvage. Similar correlation between turbidity and salvage data has been found for 1999-2000, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.




Figure 10 For December 1999 – March 2000: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE)




Figure 11 For December 2001 – March 2002: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE)




Figure 12 For December 2002 – March 2003: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE)




Figure 13 For December 2003 – March 2004: historical exports and Twitchell Island wind speed (above); and observed smelt salvage at Tracy and Skinner, observed Clifton Court turbidity, and computed dynamic and tidally averaged turbidity at the entrance to Clifton Court (below). (DRAFT FIGURE)

Model Calibration

In the current study, for each model simulation, 40,000 particles are dropped in Suisun Bay and a count is kept of the number of particles reaching the CVP and the entrance to Clifton Court. This number represents entrainment of model particles and must be scaled for comparison to salvage data.

To calibrate the model to observed salvage the total number of particles released was scaled up to the total population estimated by Rick Sitts (MWD) based on Kodiak trawl surveys. The value used was the averaged of the total population from all stations from the first two surveys of each year (Table 3).

Table 3 Summary of total smelt population based on trawl surveys.

| Year | Total Delta Population (Average of Survey 1 and 2) |
|-----------|--|
| 1999-2000 | not available, estimated to be 1,000,000 |
| 2001-2002 | 1,355,000 |
| 2002-2003 | 992,000 |
| 2003-2004 | 1,212,000 |

Observed salvage is less than the total entrainment due to pre screen losses (predation for example) and screen efficiency. Salvage computed from particle entrainment as (total abundance estimate/total number of particles release)*screen efficiency * pre-screen losses * particle entrainment. There is considerable uncertainty in the estimates of pre screen losses and screen efficiency at both primary export locations. The uncertainty is particularly high for the Skinner facility at the State Water Project (SWP) due to the Clifton Court Forebay. Estimates for this work are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Salvage factors at Skinner and Banks facilities.

| Facility | Pre-Screen Loss | Screen Efficiency | Salvage Factor | Source |
|----------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Skinner | 75% | 13% | $(1.0-0.75)*0.13=0.0325$ | Kimmerer, 2008 |
| Banks | 15% | 14.2% | $(1.0-0.15)*0.142=0.1207$ | (Bowen, need ref) |

Model parameters were adjusted manually to provide an approximate best fit of the entrainment pattern for the 2003-2004 simulation period that exhibited two distinct salvage peaks. The focus of the calibration was to match the timing of the initial salvage and timing of the peak salvage.

Table 5 Summary of factors and limits applied in the Adult Smelt model.

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Maximum EC | 1000 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ |
| Minimum Turbidity | 16 NTU |
| Turbidity Gradient Limit | 0.0001 NTU/m |
| Desired minimum EC | 150 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ |
| Move with tide velocity Factor | 1.2 |
| Resist tide velocity factor | 0.0 |
| Additional Dispersion within region of acceptable EC and Turbidity | |
| Longitudinal Dispersion Factor | 75 (m^2/s) |
| Transverse Dispersion Factor | 2 (m^2/s) |

Plots of computed and observed smelt salvage (Figure 14 through Figure 17) show that the model does a reasonable job of predicting smelt behavior. During 2000, the computed peak salvage occurs about two weeks earlier than observed, particularly at SWP and the overall numbers are lower. During 2001-2002, the peak is spread over a longer period than observed. In 2002-2003, the timing is fairly good, but the overall number at the SWP is lower than observed. During 2003-2004 the salvage is slightly earlier than observed at SWP and the peak at CVP is higher than observed. Overall, considering the uncertainties involved, the results indicate that useful estimates can be made with the model.




Figure 14 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 1999-2000.




Figure 15 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 2001-2002.




Figure 16 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 2002-2003.




Figure 17 Observed and computed smelt salvage at the CVP and SWP exports during 2003-2004.

Limitations of Analysis

Given the relatively simple behavior hypothesis, the adult delta smelt model is providing a very encouraging comparison between observed and simulated salvage. The model is still in development, however, and it is important to bear in mind limitations of the current analysis.

The model is strongly dependent on the simulated turbidity distribution. The turbidity model is currently limited by lack of observed data for boundary conditions and it does not consider potential resuspension of sediments in large open water areas such as Franks Tract. Accuracy of the turbidity model for future periods would be greatly improved if observations were available for the Yolo Bypass, Mokelumne, Cosumnes, Calaveras inflows as well as Delta Island return flows. The during the turbidity model calibration work for 2007-2008, local spikes in turbidity were correlated to wind events. This information can act as a starting point for implementing a resuspension algorithm in the model.

The timing of initial adult smelt entrainment was calibrated by adjusting the lower limit of acceptable turbidity. Based on the simulated turbidity distribution, the calibrated limit value was 16 NTU. If additional information becomes available to improve the simulated turbidity distribution, the lower limit value of the behavior model may need to be adjusted. For example, if the current turbidity model is over predicting turbidity in the south Delta, then with an improved turbidity model the adult smelt behavior algorithm would be recalibrated and the lower turbidity limit would be smaller.

The model currently under predicts salvage for 1999-2000. The simulated turbidity during that period appears to be low. Having a better representation of Delta Island return flow turbidity and resuspension in Franks Tract may improve the model performance for that year.

Relating particle simulation to salvage has large uncertainty. The total Delta population estimate based on spots surveys has large uncertainty. The prescreen losses and screen efficiencies are also uncertain. Particularly the prescreen losses for the SWP are a problem due to the Clifton Court Forebay. Changes to these estimates would not, however, have a strong impact on the calibrated behavior model parameters because the calibration was focused on the pattern of salvage, and not the magnitude of the salvage.

The current behavior model uses a random dispersion component to represent exploration within the region of acceptable habitat. Perhaps a better way to represent that process is to use the tidal “surfing” mechanism in a random direction. Tests are currently underway using a “run and tumble” decision process for randomly choosing a tidal surfing direction as a replacement for the current random dispersion. If this method is successful, the desired lower salinity limit in the current algorithm may no longer be needed. The desired lower salinity limit acts to prevent particles from dispersing far up the Sacramento where, during the winter runoff period, salinity is very low. If a tidal surfing method was used for the random exploration particles would be prevented from moving far up the Sacramento River

during high flow because the river is unidirectional downstream, so not lower salinity limit would be necessary.

Results and Discussion

This section includes spatial plots of particle distribution, comparisons of entrainment as a function of time for selected years and alternatives, and a table summarizing cumulative entrainment for each year and alternative.

Table 6 Summary of Adult smelt model analysis simulations.

| Simulation Name | Years Simulated | 2 gates | RPA 1 trigger | RPA 1 OMR (cfs) | RPA 2 OMR (cfs) |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| HIST | All | | | | |
| OCAP-LB | All | | OCAP | -2000 | -1250 |
| OCAP-UB | All | | OCAP | -2000 | -5000 |
| OCAP -2GST-LB | All | | Jersey Pt | -2000 | -1250 |
| OCAP-3000-2GST -LB | All | | Jersey Pt | -2000 | -1250 |
| 2GATE-LB | All | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -2000 | -1250 |
| 2GATE-UB | All | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -2000 | -5000 |
| 2GATE-2000 | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -2000 | Continue RPA 1 |
| 2GATE-3000 | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -3000 | Continue RPA 1 |
| 2GATE-4000 | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -4000 | Continue RPA 1 |
| 2GATE-5000 | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -5000 | Continue RPA 1 |
| 2GATE-3000-LB | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -3000 | -1250 |
| 2GATE-4000-LB | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -4000 | -1250 |
| 2GATE-5000-LB | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -5000 | -1250 |
| 2GATE-3000MOD-LB | 2004 | ✓ | Jersey Pt | -3000* | -1250 |

*For 2GATE-3000MOD-LB simulation, exports were reduced briefly near the end of January to maintain positive Qwest at San Andreas Landing.

Table 7 Summary of cumulative percent of total particles released as of March 31 of each simulation year.

| Simulation Name | Cumulative % of Total Particle Release | | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 31-Mar-2000 | 31-Mar-2002 | 31-Mar-2003 | 31-Mar-2004 | 31-Mar-2008 |
| HIST | 4.6 | 13.6 | 10.3 | 19.2 | 11.2 |
| OCAP-LB | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 2.1 |
| OCAP-UB | 0.02 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| OCAP -2GST-LB | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| OCAP-3000-2GST -LB | -- | -- | -- | 0.4 | -- |
| 2GATE-LB | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2GATE-2000 | -- | -- | -- | 0.0 | -- |
| 2GATE-3000 | -- | -- | -- | 0.6 | -- |
| 2GATE-4000 | -- | -- | -- | 3.5 | -- |
| 2GATE-5000 | -- | -- | -- | 5.9 | -- |
| 2GATE-3000-LB | -- | -- | -- | 0.2 | -- |
| 2GATE-3000MOD-LB | -- | -- | -- | 0.0 | -- |




Figure 18 Adult Delta Smelt Particle Distributions for historical conditions, OCAP operations, 2 gate scenario, and OCAP operations with 2 gate start time (OCAP-2GST) on 16 Jan 2003 at 00:00.




Figure 19 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 1999 through March 2000.




Figure 20 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2001 through March 2002.




Figure 21 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2002 through March 2003.




Figure 22 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2003 through March 2004.




Figure 23 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2007 through March 2008.




Figure 24 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2003 through March 2004, with alternative OMR flow limits .




Figure 25 Cumulative entrainment as percent of total particles released at the CVP and SWP export locations, December 2003 through March 2004, with -3000 cfs OMR flows during RPA1 and lower bound flows during RPA2. For the 2-gate case, exports were reduced briefly near the end of January to maintain positive Qwest at San Andreas Landing.

Larval/Juvenile Smelt Simulations

The objective of this analysis is to objectively estimate the delta smelt hatching distribution that is, by some metric, most consistent with available observations of delta smelt distribution and salvage. Both historic and scenario simulations use the RMA Bay-Delta Model and RMA-PTRK for passive particle tracking. The observations employed in the tuning analysis include 20mm survey observations and CVP salvage observations. The post-processing approach to estimate hatching and mortality developed by Edward Gross and Lenny Grimaldo (USBR) has been extended and applied to this analysis. The “engine” of the tuning method is the differential evolution algorithm (Price and Storn, 1997).

The hatching rates estimated for historic conditions will be applied without modification to the various operations scenarios. Therefore the effect of the revised operations on delta smelt hatching rate and distribution will not be reflected in the simulation results. The simulations will focus on the effect of the operations on delta smelt distribution and fate after the initial hatching occurs.

Historical RMATRK Simulations

The RMATRK model was applied to simulate particle transport for the larval and juvenile delta smelt period in 5 historical periods: 2000, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2008. 1999 was also simulated to compare with previous simulations performed with the UnTRIM hydrodynamic model and the FISH particle tracking model. Each simulation began on February 15th and extended through July 15th. At the beginning of the simulation, no particles were present. Particles were released and tracked by source region (Figure 26) with a total of 27 source regions included in the model domain. The regions are related to regions used in previous delta smelt distribution and abundance analyses (BJ Miller ref.). However, some regions were subdivided to allow increased resolution of variability in delta smelt density. In each region particles were released at a two hour interval at a specified release density (fish/m²/day). The location of all particles was output at a two hour interval over the simulation period. For each particle entrained by the CVP or SWP, the time of entrainment was recorded.

Analysis of 20mm Survey Observations of Delta Smelt

The 20mm survey observations were analyzed to estimate regional density and Delta population of delta smelt. A logistic function for capture probability (Kimmerer and Nobriga, 2007) was used to account for net efficiency in order to estimate the density of fish from the reported catch and fish length information. The fish density at the station locations was then interpolated onto a high-resolution model grid (MacWilliams et al. 2008) and the interpolated densities were volume averaged in each region to calculate regional-averaged density. The estimated population is the sum of the number of fish in each region, where the estimated number of fish in each region is calculated as the product of the fish density in that region and the region volume. Maps of the interpolated (cell) density and regional averaged density have been generated for each survey from 1995 through 2008.

Hatching Period Analysis

The hatching period was specified in each region according to temperature thresholds. The spawning period was assumed to begin when the 5 day trailing average temperature exceeded 12 C and a time lag of 9 days between the beginning of spawning and the beginning of hatching was assumed. The spawning period was assumed to end when the 5 day trailing average temperature exceeded 20 C and a time lag of 5 days between the end of spawning and the end of hatching was assumed.

Post-processing of Historical RMA PTRK Simulations

The particle locations calculated by the RMA PTRK model were analyzed in a post-processor to count the number of particles from each source region that are located in each analysis region (Figure 26) at each 2 hour output interval. Only particles released within the specified hatching periods were counted. Furthermore the particle counts were weighted by mortality factors according to the “age” of the particle, calculated as the time elapsed from the release (hatching) of the particle. Five different mortality rates were applied to each set of simulation results: 0.02 day^{-1} , 0.03 day^{-1} , 0.04 day^{-1} , 0.05 day^{-1} , and 0.06 day^{-1} . The mortality formulation and rates corresponded to the formulation and the range of values in Kimmerer (2008).

Tuning of Hatching Rates

An automated tuning approach is used to estimate the hatching rate in each region. Each regional hatching rate is constant in time during the hatching period specified based on the analysis of temperature data.

The regional hatching rates were tuned to minimize a cost function which was defined as the sum of two terms. The first term is the l_1 error norm in the comparison of regional averaged predicted and observed density and predicted and estimated density immediately upstream of the TFCF. The density estimated from salvage observations was calculated assuming pre-screen losses of 15% and whole facility efficiency of 14.2% through May 15 and 38.9% after May 15 (Mark Bowen, personal communication). The salvage observations were used in the tuning approach only from April 15th to June 30th of each year. This period was chosen as a rough approximation of the period when most fish salvaged are juvenile delta smelt and before the assumption of passive transport (no behavior) becomes clearly unrealistic.

The second term in the cost function is the absolute value of the bias in Suisun Bay and Delta-averaged density. The inclusion of this second term in the cost function improves the comparison between predicted delta smelt “population” and estimated delta smelt “population.”

The tuning algorithm is the differential evolution algorithm (Price and Storn, 1997) which is a general optimization algorithm used in many different applications. This algorithm is automated and does not

require any subjective judgment after the cost function is specified. Therefore, the hatching rates are objectively selected as the rates that minimize the specified cost function.

The tuning analysis was performed independently for each year and each mortality rate. The mortality rate was chosen somewhat subjectively as a rate which gave one of the best “scores” in terms of minimizing the cost function and gave a good order of magnitude comparison in terms of the total number of fish salvaged at the TFCF during the simulation period. The mortality rate of 0.03 day^{-1} was used for all years. In general, the “score” was similar for all mortality rates, though higher mortality rates (0.04 day^{-1} through 0.06 day^{-1}) gave slightly better “scores” for some years. The lowest mortality rates (0.02 day^{-1} and 0.03 day^{-1}) gave the best comparison to observed TFCF salvage during some years.

Limitations of Analysis

The largest limitation of the analysis may be the limited accuracy of estimated regional densities from the 20mm survey observations. Due to the typically low numbers of delta smelt caught in a tow, the catch at any one station varies substantially from survey to survey. Furthermore, the overall density estimates can be very sensitive to a small number of fish caught due to the large “scaling” introduced by the logistic function which approximates the variation of net efficiency with fish length.

The salvage efficiencies and pre-screen losses at the TFCF are also highly uncertain. The values applied in the analysis were specified by Mark Bowen (personal communication) but may substantially underestimate some losses of smaller delta smelt in the TFCF (Brent Bridges, personal communication). The pre-screen losses of 15% are a “best guess” that has been used in previous analyses (Pete Smith, personal communication).

The use of constant hatching rates is a rough approximation but introducing additional complexity of time variable hatching to the tuning process was not feasible for this project. The hatching periods specified based on temperature observations were also quite approximate. In fact many of the largest errors in the predicted delta smelt distribution often occurred in the early surveys or soon after the end of the hatching period, suggesting that the specified hatching periods were not precise. Further analysis of 20mm observations should provide improved estimates of hatching periods.

The representation of mortality is also highly approximate. The mortality rate is treated as both spatially uniform and constant in time. It is likely that mortality rate varies strongly both spatially and with the life stage of delta smelt.

The current tuning approach provides little insight to the possible range/uncertainty of hatching in each region. This limitation is particularly notable in the regions with an estimated hatching rate of zero. A Bayesian analysis would provide the full range of possible hatching rates in each region and distinguish regions with highly uncertain hatching rates from regions where the hatching rates can be determined with some precision.

Results of Analysis

Hatching rates were estimated for each historical period. In addition, observed and predicted regional density was compared for each survey in each historical period.

Many observed trends in delta smelt distribution and abundance were reproduced by the tuned particle tracking approach. For example, the observed regional densities averaged in time across all 20mm surveys was predicted fairly well by the tuned particle tracking approach for all years. The hatching distributions for 1999, 2000 and 2004 all appear to be realistic in broad terms. In these years the approach predicts a fairly broad distribution of hatching with substantial hatching in the western Delta and north Delta. Some of the finer structure of the predicted hatching distribution is questionable in these years, including the sometimes large variability in hatching rates of adjacent regions. However, in the other years, hatching distributions do not appear to be realistic. In 2002, 2003 and 2008, the estimated hatching in most regions is zero and the region to region hatching variability is very large. In addition, the predicted central Delta hatching rates are almost uniformly zero in these years, which is inconsistent with the predictions on other years with more reliable/consistent observations.

The likely reason for the unrealistic estimated hatching rates in some years is the large variability in observed regional density from among surveys.

Table 8 Summary of Larval/Juvenile smelt model analysis simulations.

| Simulation Name | Gate operations | RPA 1 trigger | RPA 1 OMR | RPA 2 OMR |
|-----------------|---|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| HIST | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| OCAP-LB | -- | OCAP | -2000 | -1250 |
| OCAP-UB | -- | OCAP | -2000 | -5000 |
| 2GATE-OPT2-LB | Connection SI closed, Old River open on ebb | Jersey Pt | -2000 | -1250 |
| 2GATE-OPT2-UB | Connection SI closed, Old River open on ebb | Jersey Pt | -2000 | -5000 |




Figure 26 Source regions.




Figure 27 Tuned Regional Hatching Rates, 2003.




Figure 28 Comparison of Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and Predicted by Particle Model averaged over all surveys, 2003.




Figure 29 Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys, 2003.




Figure 30 Regional Densities predicted by model, 2003.




Figure 31 Time-series of Delta-wide Population estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and from Particle Model, 2003.




Figure 32 Time-series of Observed CVP Salvage and Salvage estimated from Particle Entrainment, 2003.




Figure 33 Tuned Regional Hatching Rates, 2004.




Figure 34 Comparison of Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and Predicted by Particle Model averaged over all surveys, 2004.




Figure 35 Regional Densities estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys, 2004.




Figure 36 Regional Densities predicted by model, 2004.




Figure 37 Time-series of Delta-wide Population estimated from 20 mm Trawl Surveys and from Particle Model, 2004.




Figure 38 Time-series of Observed CVP Salvage and Salvage estimated from Particle Entrainment, 2003.




Figure 39 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “SJR near confluence”.




Figure 40 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “SJR at False River”.




Figure 41 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region "SJR at Old River".




Figure 42 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region "South Fork Mokelumne".




Figure 43 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Franks Tract”.




Figure 44 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Old”.




Figure 45 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region “Middle”.




Figure 46 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from the region "Grantline and Old".




Figure 47 Percent particles entrained at the CVP+SWP originating from all regions.

References

- Denton, R.A., 1993. Accounting for Antecedent Conditions in Seawater Intrusion Modeling – Applications for the San Francisco Bay-Delta. Hydraulic Engineering 93, Vol1 pp. 448-453. Proceedings of the ASCE National Conference on Hydraulic Engineering, San Francisco.
- DWR, 2005. Methodology for Flow and Salinity Estimates in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh, 26th Annual Progress Report, October 2005.
- DWR, 1995. “Estimation of Delta Island Diversions and Return Flows”, February 1995.
- Kimmerer, Wim J., 2008. Losses of Sacramento River Chinook Salmon and Delta Smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) to Entrainment in Water Diversions in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science. Vol. 6, Issue 2 (June), Article 2.
- King, I. P., 1995. “RMA11 – A Two-Dimensional Finite Element Quality Model”, Resource Management Associates.
- King, I. P., 1986 . “Finite Element Model for Two-Dimensional Depth Averaged Flow, RMA2V, Version 3.3”, Resource Management Associates.
- RMA, 2008. “RMATRK: Model Formulation and Testing”.
- RMA, 2005. “Flooded Islands Feasibility Study: RMA Delta Model Calibration Report”, June 2005.
- RMA, 2000. “Mathematical Modeling of Hydrodynamic and Water Quality Impacts of Suisun Marsh Levee Breaches”, December 2000.

Delta Smelt Distribution and Entrainment Forecasting Model

Real-Time Operational Modeling Tools

As part of this 2-Gate project the goal is to develop a real-time delta smelt distribution and entrainment forecasting system using the RMA Bay-Delta Model to guide real-time operations. The juvenile and larval delta smelt simulation will utilize passive particle tracking with post processing analysis of hatching and mortality developed by Edward Gross in cooperation with Lenny Grimaldo (USBR) and Ted Sommer (DWR). The adult delta smelt simulation will use an Electrical Conductivity (EC) and turbidity gradient based behavior model developed by RMA in cooperation with Dave Fullerton and Curt Schmutte of Metropolitan Water District.

Forecasts will be performed approximately every two weeks and will utilize the most recently available field observations of delta smelt density as well as forecasted estimates of inflow, inflow water quality, and operations from system operators and data collection groups. For each forecast period, several simulations may be performed using alternative estimates of future conditions. An initial set of forecast simulations will be performed using best estimates of future operations provided by USBR and DWR system operators. Upon review of particle distribution and entrainment estimates by the Smelt Working Group (SWG) a second set of forecast simulations may be performed with revised Delta operations with the objective of identifying operations that reduce expected delta smelt entrainment.

To date the RMA Bay-Delta model has been used as planning model. Prior to using this model in a real-time forecasting mode, the following additional work will be required to utilize the model efficiently for forecasting.

1. Initial conditions. Historic simulation using the most recent observed data must be performed to provide initial conditions for EC and turbidity in the system.
2. Gathering real-time boundary conditions. A methodology must be developed to rapidly acquire recent historic observations. We currently have a manually driven process to download data from various online sources such as CDEC to HEC-DSS time-series files. We propose to automate that process and include an automated validation procedure to screen for missing and invalid data.
3. Determining inflow, quality, and operations forecasts. We will need to work with system operators at DWR and USBR to determine appropriate estimates for Delta inflows and operations. We will also need to work with agency staff responsible for EC and turbidity observations to determine an appropriate technique for forecasting inflow quality.
4. Managing smelt survey data. We will work with agency staff in charge of smelt surveys to develop appropriate method/tools for acquiring and interpreting the most recent survey data and salvage data.
5. Develop set of output products for distribution to agency staff. We will identify the set of tables, plots, and spatial contours to be delivered from the forecasting output.
6. Test the forecast procedure for an example period.

The forecasting process will be designed to provide timely information to the SWG. The following is a draft schedule for one forecast.

Day 1 Morning:

- Gather new observed data, perform data validation.
- Perform historic simulation with latest available data
- Gather best estimate future operations from delta operators

Day 1 Afternoon

- Prepare and run initial forecast alternatives

Day 2 Morning

- Post process initial forecast results
- Prepare forecast products and transmit to SWG

Day 2 Afternoon

- Work with SWG to develop additional forecast alternatives if needed
- Prepare and run forecasts alternatives

Day 3 Morning

- Post process new results and prepare output products

Day 3 Afternoon

- Submit final output with tech memo to SWG

The three day schedule is suggested here as a goal to work toward. The actual initial forecasting process may take longer until all aspects of the process are streamlined. In particular, interaction with the SWG may take longer to identify operations alternatives.

RMA will perform real-time forecast simulations on approximately a two week interval throughout the delta smelt entrainment season. Each forecast period may be simulated with up to 6 estimates of future inflows, inflow quality, or operation strategies. There may be two sets of forecast simulations for each period. The first set will use future conditions based on USBR and DWR best estimates. After the Smelt Working Group (SWG) reviews the initial forecast results a second set of simulation may be performed with alternate delta operations with the objective of minimizing entrainment.

1. Gather most recent observed data and perform data validation, filling missing data as necessary.
2. Determine forecast period.
3. Simulate forward from end of previous initial condition simulation to start of new forecast with observed data to establish initial flow, EC, and turbidity distributions. This process will produce a continuous hydrodynamic and water quality data set from approximately the beginning of December through the time of most recently available observations.

-
4. Gather forecast estimates for inflows, inflow quality, and operations from system operators.
 5. Gather delta smelt survey and salvage data.
 6. Perform initial forecast simulation(s) based on best estimates of future operations.
 7. Provide initial forecast results for review by SWG. Evaluate results with SWG and determine if there appears to be potential for alternative operations to reduce entrainment.
 8. If needed, perform additional forecast trial simulations with alternative Delta operations.
 9. Prepare forecast output for distribution to agency staff. Output products will be delivered with a brief technical memo describing the forecast period, operations, and results.