
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 4:51 PM
To: Dan Lawson - NOAA Federal
Cc: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal; Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal
Subject: Re: ROC on LTO action area

I think that helps to bolster using the same action area that was used for CWF, and for OCAP in 2009 before that! Evan, there's a great map and I think a good description of this is the CWF BiOp. I can point you to the Word file tomorrow if you need it.

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 6, 2019, at 11:59 AM, Dan Lawson - NOAA Federal <dan.lawson@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Evan

On the one hand, I don't think this distinction ultimately matters to the analysis. It's still really the same env baseline information regardless where you specifically draw the line on the coast, and the perspective of the analysis I'm anticipating is still encompassing a coastwide view of prey available for killer whales and how the action might reduce that.

But, yes, I do think it's misleading to conclude that CV fish don't occur at all north of Cape Falcon just because enough don't occur to be meaningful in the fishery context and for ease of fishery management purposes. If you look at this recent paper (Figure 3), I think it is clear that a small portion of Chinook found near the Columbia River and along the WA coast are CV fish.

Dan

On Wed, Mar 6, 2019 at 9:03 AM Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal <evan.sawyer@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Dan,

I'm writing the action area and I wanted to ask you: Do you feel that the action area for reinitiation should (or should not) include the WA coast? Does it matter for our(your) analysis?

Cathy said that you have been through this discussion before during WaterFix, and had made the case to include the coast of Washington? Reclamation only extends the the action area to the OR/WA border but the rationale used to define "Coastal Extent" as Point Conception to Cape Falcon (and not further North) relies on Satterthwaite *et al.* (2013). There are two problems with that because the analysis is limited by 1) the recreational fishing season ~April - October 31, and 2) locations where effort data was available (i.e. they did not examine vessels/ports in

Washington). Basically Satterthwaite (2013) was designed to not include the WA coast, so to use the study as justification saying that it shows no CV Chinook north of Cape Falcon misleading at best? Does this matter for your analysis?

Thanks,
Evan Sawyer

--

Evan Bing Sawyer,
Natural Resource Management Specialist
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office: (916) 930-3656
Evan.Sawyer@noaa.gov
www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov



--

Dan Lawson
NMFS Protected Resources Division
West Coast Region
7600 Sand Point Way NE, Bldg 1
Seattle WA 98115
206-526-4740
<Shelton et al 2018.pdf>