

---

**From:** Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 21, 2019 11:20 AM  
**To:** Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal  
**Cc:** Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal  
**Subject:** Re: ROC LTO - I&S w-r effects table

My initial thoughts in blue below.

On Tue, May 21, 2019 at 1:11 PM Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal <[evan.sawyer@noaa.gov](mailto:evan.sawyer@noaa.gov)> wrote:  
Hey Brian,

Yeah, let me take a look. I'm just finishing up work on Shasta performance metrics and was going to circle back to the I&S tables. I'll start with WR (again) and change SR, SH and GS accordingly.

Quick question (looping Joe in as I&S co-lead): what's your expectation regarding 'action components' that are directed at WR (e.g. Juvenile trap and haul, or LSNFH)? Would you expect an effect to be described for the other species? **Generally no unless we expect an important effect on another species.** My assumption has been that for those WR-specific actions they are not considered for the other species? But do you think that's right? **I'm ok with that given the time crunch for this project.** Or since it's poorly described anyway should I include them qualitatively for the other species, like:

**(Example)** "*Juvenile trap and haul of WR may also affect GS juveniles in the area. This action component is not described with enough detail to provide certainty as to how it would be implemented or the extent of effects. Although uncertain, based on the probable timing of the action component, which is likely to occur contemporaneous with GS juvenile presence, NMFS assumes that the action component would expose a small proportion of juvenile GS to the stress of trapping and handling associated with 'juvenile trap and haul of WR'. In response, those juvenile GS exposed to this action component would be expected to have a probable change in fitness of reduced growth rate, which is expected to occur infrequently (7% of years).*"

Something like that? I'm trying to figure out how best to include our 'assumptions' in the effects section.

Thoughts appreciated.  
Evan

On Tue, May 21, 2019 at 10:27 AM Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <[brian.ellrott@noaa.gov](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)> wrote:

It's a beautiful day in the neighborhood. Thanks for updating the table with the beneficial approach and pulling the uncertain rows back in.

I made some changes in response to Garwin's comments, and re-ordered the rows following what Joe did for steelhead (high stressors and benefits, med stressors and benefits, low s's and b's, uncertain, NA) and would love to make sure you're good with those changes before it goes to Reclamation tomorrow.

Do you have time today to give the attached table another review? I think the priority on this means you have time, but maybe not. Let me know.

Thanks,  
Brian

--

**Brian Ellrott**

*Central Valley Salmonid Recovery Coordinator*

*NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region*

*U.S. Department of Commerce*

Mobile: 916-955-7628

Office: 916-930-3612

[brian.ellrott@noaa.gov](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)

--

**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](mailto:Evan.Sawyer@noaa.gov)

[www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov)



--

**Brian Ellrott**

*Central Valley Salmonid Recovery Coordinator*

*NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region*

*U.S. Department of Commerce*

Mobile: 916-955-7628

Office: 916-930-3612

[brian.ellrott@noaa.gov](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)