
From: Maria Rea - NOAA Federal <maria.rea@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 8:32 PM
To: Howard Brown - NOAA Federal
Cc: Barry Thom; Beverly Pies - NOAA Federal
Subject: Re: Annotated Agenda and other materials

Thanks Howard. This is super helpful. Here's a bit of my preferred Director level narrative.

Barry, you've noted a few times that we may not be on the same page with respect to the PURPOSE of the performance objectives. I think this is correct. NMFS NEEDS the performance objectives to reach a non-jeopardy conclusion because the effects predicted from the proposed action are too great and would jeopardize species. Therefore the purpose of the performance objectives is to bound the level of effect (and associated take) to an acceptable level to the species, in combination with other actions we will be discussing on Thursday.

I think that Reclamation thinks of these as an add-on and we are trying to hold them accountable for their action. It's more direct than that in terms of getting us to an opinion that we can issue in less than four weeks.

This is also important to note if Paul tries to elevate as a "policy issue." It not (only) a policy issue, it is a science and technical issue in terms of an assessment of what the species can withstand without increasing appreciably the risk of survival and recovery.

Because we have to bound the effects, we also need to put in reinitiation triggers. These are not punitive, or because we want to reinitiate, but merely because we don't have any choice because we can't authorize effects that jeopardize species.

I would also suggest that you can caucus anytime for any purpose. With us, or possibly for a Paul-Barry-Earnest caucus.

Lastly, I am hearing through anonymous but well-placed sources that Paul is alone in his desire not to acknowledge that we have a draft jeopardy situation and that an RPA may be the fastest and most direct way out of this. Jeopardy opinions are not the end of the world, and what is important is that we work on a solution quickly. We will talk about this more at the prebrief tomorrow.

- M

Sent from my iPad

On Jun 4, 2019, at 3:30 PM, Howard Brown - NOAA Federal <howard.brown@noaa.gov> wrote:

Barry,

Attached is draft annotated (talking points) agenda for the Wednesday's performance measure meeting. Also attached are:

1. Working Draft Conditions List - this is just to give you an early look at what we are working on for the Thursday meeting.
2. The NMFS Shasta performance metrics (I think I sent this to you yesterday also)

3. Reclamation's counter-proposal to our metrics - this is not actually a counter proposal, but their own proposal that includes "some" of our work.

Barb is working on the Delta metrics and will share as soon as she gets it to a place that reflects current thinking from internal discussions today.

See you tomorrow.
Howard

--

Howard L. Brown

Policy Advisor

NOAA Fisheries, West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

(916) 930-3608

Howard.Brown@noaa.gov



www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

<NMFS Annotated ROC Agenda_June 5, 2019.docx>

<DRAFT Conditions List by species - V1.docx>

<NMFS_ROCON Shasta performance metrics v8.docx>

<BOR_ROC Performance Objectives 20190604 DRAFT.docx>