
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2019 3:01 PM
To: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: Re: If You Do Have Some Time....

A follow-up:

Is this a correct characterization? It's my revision to the uncertainties table given this week's conversations.

Anderson (2018) model simulates egg to hatch through age-dependent temperature mortality and the spatially dependent background mortality from hatch through fry stages. The Anderson model assumes that redds/eggs are most sensitive to DO conditions during the five days preceding hatch and results include mortality only for that period

In considering differences between results from the Anderson and Martin model, NMFS considers that the Anderson model could underestimate mortality by failing to account for egg mortality prior to the hatch period and failing to include eggs that die before the hatch period in the percentage mortality during the hatch period.[\[CM1\]](#)

[\[CM1\]](#) I understand that Reclamation does not agree with this assumption. However, NMFS must identify the differences in results and identify our understanding of what causes those differences in results – and therefore how and why we use those different results. We are identifying that understanding and assumption here.

If this understanding is incorrect, we could revise with documentation of the correction.

Regarding other parts of the effects analysis:

if you have any points on the ramping rates comment, I'll take that.

I could use any ideas on the comment on spring pulse flows: **Please provide a citation and/or gage data to substantiate this assertion for the areas below the confluence of Mill and Deer Creek. It is also unclear how this is related to the proposed action that includes a spring pulse. Does this describe COS or WOA or some other condition?**

On Sat, May 25, 2019 at 12:16 AM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

....here's what I need (sorry if you are telling me this for the second or third time).

1. Assurance that you've done the cross-checks for Shasta section with I&S tables.
2. Assurance that you've tied up what Stephen was helping with.
3. Table 2.5.2-13 (conversion of 7DADM to monthly mean). Rec questions why we have this in here since we aren't applying it in our analysis. We have agreed to provide info on how/why this is used. Would we propose this be a screening tool? Or applied to modeling results of monthly temps? We've also agreed to caveat that flow is a factor in this conversion (duh I guess but whatever).

That's all for now, but I haven't opened the Shasta section to see either your or Naseem's recent additions. Need to save something for Saturday.....

