
From: Howard Brown - NOAA Federal <howard.brown@noaa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 2:37 PM
To: Garwin Yip; Cathy Marcinkevage; Barbara Byrne; Justin Ly; Seth Naman; J. Stuart; Kristin McCleery - NOAA Affiliate; Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal; Brian Ellrott; Dan Lawson - NOAA Federal; Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: Please Read: More on the Sufficiency Review

Folks, There have been some questions about the review of the proposed action so in order to clarify this, I have added a new second column with the title and leading questions pasted below. The goal is here is to identify big ticket things in the PA that we need to flag as we move into the consultation.

Thanks for revisiting this!

Description of the Proposed Action: Is there information or science that supports the proposed action or components of the proposed action? Has the proposed action provided the science to support it's description? For example, is there recent information or science to support the proposed Shasta Summer Cold Water Temperature Management; proposed changes to OMR, removing I:E, HORB or Georgiana Slough Barriers from the Proposed Action. Think back to our "gap" analysis review of the draft proposed action during the tiger team meetings.

--

Howard L. Brown
Senior Policy Advisor
NOAA Fisheries, West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
(916) 930-3608
Howard.Brown@noaa.gov



www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov