
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2019 1:09 AM
To: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: Shasta Updates

A few things to start your morning:

1. Shasta Figure 2.5.2-21 is boxplots of TDM for Martin and Anderson for each Tier. Looking at the performance metrics text we provided to Rec, and the spreadsheet that Miles sent, we note that in Tier 1 years there is a max TDM of 39%. Why isn't that reflected in teh figure? Aren't the whiskers the range?
2. Howard has a meeting with Barry today at 1:30. I'm hearing that there is thinking that the J-game changed on Shasta as a result of the meetings and perf measures of the last few weeks. I of course do not agree. He's asked for any brief specific points about why Shasta is not better. I can definitely come up with some, but welcome any you would like to contribute. Now's your chance! (For instance: It's become clear that Rec wants it to be ok to have a TDM of 39% in GOOD water years.).
3. I revised Shasta effects section text, created I&S table entries, and drafted a supplemental section. I'm happy to have you review any and all as a QA/QC at the least, but to augment if you are able. They are named below, and I'll also cc you on my email to Brian and others.

2.5 and 2.6 Upper Sac Effects V18 srb.docx
Shasta_Supplement_V1.docx
2.8 Integration and Synthesis winter-run V9 MASTER.docx

4. Did we say to stay with mean for the TDM in the analysis? Right? If not I need to change some things..... And Maria has in her head we are using the median....
5. On the RPA things, we may hand that off to Howard after a chat. So don't make that a priority.

All for now.
Cathy