
From: Maria Rea - NOAA Federal <maria.rea@noaa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 10:21 AM
To: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal
Cc: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate; Howard Brown; Garwin Yip; Barbara Byrne
Subject: Re: Adaptive management discussion tomorrow

Good. I also noted reference to an MOA which I don't see and we never signed - - probably take out. Also probably remove references to fish tech team and the north delta studies (perhaps footnote that these were removed, but could be included if combined a gain with CWF in future).

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 28, 2019, at 7:04 PM, Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

It is VERY easy to remove CWF from the five agency document. Nearly every time it is mentioned, it is partnered with "and the existing opinions" so no meaning will be changed. We can get on that with a quick turnaround when needed.

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 Feb 28, 2019, at 6:29 PM, Maria Rea - NOAA Federal <maria.rea@noaa.gov> wrote:

Thank you all so much for this email and previous one. I think it will be good discussion tomorrow. I re-read everything this afternoon. It strikes me that it would be relatively easy for us (Evan?) to do a surgical strikeout of CWF elements and language on the 5 agency document.

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 28, 2019, at 2:49 PM, Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

Oops!

Below are a few more key points from Evan that I thought helpful to pass on:

- App C only applies to "site-specific" PA components (there is no agreement to a long-term adaptive process... other than reconsultation?)
- Reclamation (Dave) seems willing to provide the necessary sideboards for some components <-- this is

good for what they want (us hands off) but leaves a lot "off-the-table"

- Given the limited description of many of the action components (specifically the programmatic components), a plan to address that uncertainty is absolutely necessary.
- We noted a circular logic that Rec presented in noting their response for not getting "credit" for actions in the jeopardy determination: Propose conservation measures -> if they can't be adequately described to show a benefit in the jeopardy analysis --> Reclamation will remove from the PA --> if removed from the PA --> there's even less certainty that those conservation measures will be implemented/funded --> without the conservation measures what's left is only the "worst case" in terms of effects --> that "worst case" is what necessitates the proposed conservation measures --> ...back to the beginning.
- CDFW does not have the option for a "programmatic" ITP --> which is why they must have an AMP.

On Thu, Feb 28, 2019 at 2:38 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

Maria --

Attached are the AM-related documents that you requested to go into tomorrow's directors call on ROC. They include:

- The Five-Agency AMP.
- Term and Condition 6 from the CWF BiOp.
- ROC LTO BA Appendix C (Real-Time Water Operations Charter)

I have not attached the proposed action (BA Ch. 4) but can send that if you need it.

Points of note:

- -See Table 4.6 of the BA. There are several project components that they have noted as "AM", but Rec has made clear that "AM" there does not mean AM in the traditional sense. My take is that they are more "optional, experimental" things that they MAY do and that they would like worked into the jeopardy analysis (despite the uncertainty of effect). There is no certainty of them occurring.
- -Nowhere does App C or the PA refer to the five-agency AMP, and Dave Mooney said that Reclamation does not support that because it is associated with CWF.
- -However, they have not identified an alternative process that shows:

- - Includes Full AM cycle
- - Process to incrementally reduce uncertainty (not willy nilly ops)
- - Clear protocols for communication and transparency
- - Clear opportunities and protocols for stakeholder involvement
- - Collaborative and consistent decision making process
- - Deference to regulatory authority on final decision
- We feel they are therefore skipping the setup phase, going right to the iterative phase. Therefore for each action we'd need to see plan for stakeholder involvement, setting objectives, ID alternatives, ID conceptual models, and develop monitoring. Instead of repeating work, the generalized program establishes the framework for all of these, and makes them consistent across actions.
- -Charlotte had indicated that Rec is planning to discuss the ROC LTO BA monitoring/AM "management vision" to the IEP directors on March 13. From the planning call for that meeting, Josh plans to present the PA and Appendix C. When asked about the 5-agency plan, Josh said that Rec would need to hear directly from NOAA that they do not endorse the BA approach and want to go with the 5-agency approach (we have told them that in pre-furlough meetings and . Seems the conversation was tense, as was the 2/27 "Focus Group" meeting with Dave Mooney.

That's all for now. Please let me know if you have any additional thoughts or questions.

Cathy

On Thu, Feb 28, 2019 at 11:18 AM Maria Rea - NOAA Federal <maria.rea@noaa.gov> wrote:

Howard tells me adaptive management will be the focus of the Directors call tomorrow. I'm happy to be a strong advocate for what we need.

Can one of you send me:

- the five agency adaptive management plan (appended to CWF)
- cut and paste of CWF terms and conditions re: adaptive management
- Reclamation PA cite on adaptive management - - is there something other than what is in PA, which I have with me?

Sorry I won't be in office between now and the call; let me know if

any key points you want me to raise.

Thanks,
Maria

Sent from my iPad