
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2019 2:23 PM
To: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate; Howard Brown; Garwin Yip; Barbara Byrne
Subject: ROC on LTO Analytical Approach
Attachments: CWF_2.1_An_App_ROC_Markup_V1.docx

Hi all --

Evan and I are the "team" for the analytical approach, which is to go to coordinators on 2/22 and GC/Sec 7 review on 2/25 (at least based on an older schedule).

It won't be ready for that. But I have some ideas on steps forward below. Do I get an award for being the first to miss a deadline? Like a Pinterest fail?

Here's the scoop. A marked up version of the CWF approach is attached.

There are several revisions that are pending more info/decisions, including:

- Role of AM in the PA, and any use of the CWF AMP.
- Determination of NMFS' consultation approach (what is project, what is programmatic).
- How we incorporate climate change after getting synthesis of science from Nate Mantua.
- What tools we will ultimately have to use.
- "Finalization" of the baseline memo.

Who should have eyes on this at some point?

In my comments, I have call-outs for specific people either to confirm what is written, provide additional info, understand my reasoning for a suggested change, or do something specific. This includes Howard, Garwin, Evan, Brian, and Naseem. I think that getting it in front of Naseem soon would be useful to address those particular items.

I had instructed Evan to prioritize the sufficiency review and action deconstruction while I took a first crack at this. He and I have had some conversations on potential changes, which I've attempted to call out with comments to him, that we think would more clearly allow us to identify the aggregation of effects in the integration and synthesis. However, I think that these changes should be a point of discussion with Naseem, Howard, Garwin, and Evan (and me, if they happen after this week).

Key for Brian and Naseem is a call out on p. 32 regarding a recovery analysis. We have been at risk in the CWF litigation from the argument that we did not do an adequate "recovery analysis", and we should address that potential weakness here.

Proposed next steps:

- 1) This week, Evan and Naseem address what they can regarding integration and synthesis while everyone else does a focused review on their call outs. I understand that sufficiency review is the priority for the week, so these may or may not be addressed by 2/25. If not, we prioritize addressing them the week of 2/25.
- 2) As soon as those are in a good place, it goes for a first-run Sec 7 and GC review, with the knowledge that the "pending" sections are still subject to change, and those will simply have to be reviewed later.
- 3) We continue to work out the pending sections, with a target mid-March for those to be completed and go to Sec 7 and GC review.

Evan, that therefore puts the section in your court to manage this week. I expect you to be pretty involved in the meetings with FWS and Rec, but if you can farm out these call-outs for people to get started on, we can still capitalize on this week.

I hope this helps! I really don't think that there is a lot to do on this once we know where the project stands on the key items of AM and project-vs.-programmatic. I'm TOATLLY confident that it will all come together, just beautifully!

Ping me with questions or comments!

Cathy