From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 6:37 PM
To: Barbara Byrne; Sarah Gallagher - NOAA Federal; Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate; Brian Ellrott; Garwin Yip; Howard Brown
Subject: Re: ROC FAST TURNAROUND METHOD NEED

Didn't realize that the attachment wasn't there. Please see the excel file attached to my original email on Feb 28 at 2:31 pm. Those are the line numbers I refer to. Thanks!

Cathy Marcinkevage
California Central Valley Office
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office: (916) 930-5648
Cell: (562) 537-8734
cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov

On Mar 5, 2019, at 5:38 PM, Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

> All --
> A few directed questions that will help ICF prioritize work.
>
> ***Please respond by noon Wednesday.***
>
> **Evan and Sarah:** Lines 26-27 (Sac River Redd Dewatering) and Line 29 (Clear Creek Redd Dewatering). Here's a caveat to that:
> Redd dewatering analyses that use monthly time step flow data (Clear Creek) are of questionable value (unless daily flow changes are monotonic over the month). Of course, if the simulated daily time step data (as used in Sac River) do not represent actual flow variations reasonably well, they're not much better than monthly flows.
>
> What priority to you put on this analysis, knowing this caveat?
>
> **All, especially Barb:** Line 37-39 and 40-48. For lines 37-39 (Stan and Lower SJR floodplain inundation), the result is area inundated based on the average monthly flow. For Lines 40-48 (tribs and bypasses using the SIT relationships), it is area suitable as rearing habitat.
>
> First, I told ICF to prioritize LInes 37-38 to give us Stan results (because there isn't a lot for the Stan in other methods). Any disagreements?
>
> Next, are there strong feelings on priority of tribs vs bypasses or vice versa for Lines 42-48? Or some tribs vs others? If you really want your division, speak up!
>
> Finally, what format would you want to see results? Average acres per month? And by water year type? Or exceedance plots for each month and WYT?

Evan and Sarah : SALMOD. The SALMOD model is applied to the Upper Sac, with that broken into five (I think) reaches and results generayed for each reach. I don't know that we need all reaches. Could you look at the CWF SALMOD description and analysis and tell me which reaches we need, and if all of them, which we need first /most? I think reach 5 may be the most useful. I can point you to the locations in the CWF BiOp Wed morning.

All for now. Thanks all!

Cathy

On Thu, Feb 28, 2019 at 2:31 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

> All --
>
> Please see the attached list of WUA and IFIM related methods. This is in response to an initial request from us to ICF. The green rows are more specific to our request, and the rest are similar/related by weren't asked for specifically.
>
> ***Please respond by noon tomorrow with an indication of methods that you would like completed for your division.***
>
> Note that the last column is ICF's take on the method -- if you have more "on the ground" or update knowledge that differs, you should defer to your own expertise.
>
> Let me know if you have any questions.
>
> Thanks!
> Cathy
>
> ---------- Forwarded message ---------
> From: **Ellis, Gregg** <Gregg.Ellis@icf.com>
> Date: Thu, Feb 28, 2019 at 1:50 PM
> Subject: Available models.xlsx
> To: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal (cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov) <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>