
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 5:06 AM
To: Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal
Cc: Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal; Howard Brown; Rosalie del Rosario; Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal; Barbara Byrne; Naseem Alston; Sarah Gallagher; j.stuart@noaa.gov; Brittany Cunningham - NOAA Affiliate; Susan Boring; Kristin McCleery - NOAA Affiliate; Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: Re: I&S Tables

Hi all --

Well it's only Tuesday but I do have on my fancy friday clothes....I dropped the ball in revising the AA to address this previously despite our discussions. I have no problem with revising it and will do so unless someone objects. I think it should be straightforward, but Brian, if you have any suggested text, I'll take it. This seems the most logical and defensible approach.

Thanks!
Cathy

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 May 13, 2019, at 6:37 PM, Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov> wrote:

Thanks for looking at the CWF BO, Joe. That context helps.

I support including all of the BA Table 4-6 components (and their stressors/factors) in the I&S summary of effects tables as long as the Analytical Approach is updated to account for analyzing PA conservation measures in a manner similar to how we analyze PA-related stressors. I know we talked about modifying the AA to better address conservation measures, but I'm not sure where that effort is at.

Capturing how we're factoring each PA component into the analysis in the I&S tables makes it clear that we're weighing the adverse and beneficial aspects of the PA. In general, there is more certainty wrt the expected adverse impacts of PA-related stressors than there is for the potential benefits of PA conservation measures. The I&S tables could potentially show the specifics behind that generalization really well, whether it be uncertainty that the conservation measure will occur, or what a conservation measure's potential impacts are, or both, provided we can update the AA so the effects

tables account for both stressors and conservation measures. Happy to help on the AA front if needed.

If we do not update the AA so the effects tables account for the potentially beneficial aspects of conservation measures, then the conservation measures should not be in the tables in the Effects section or the I&S - they'll need to be discussed in text in the effects sections and at least mentioned in the I&S in text.

I recommend the management team put on their best fancy Friday clothes, think it over with Rosalie and let us know how to proceed. Happy to be a part of that discussion too if needed. Apologies for backtracking from where we last landed with Rosalie, but the potentially perceived imbalance between how we're weighing stressors and potential benefits became real when we started deleting components from the tables.

Thanks,
Brian

On Mon, May 13, 2019 at 1:30 PM Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal <joe.heublein@noaa.gov> wrote:

I took a quick look at the CWF BO and as far as I can tell the stressor (I&S tables) are only included in I&S section. In the CWF BO stressor tables seem to be comprehensive meaning that there are NA and low magnitude stressors included. It may be easier to revert back to this approach so we avoid redundancy and multiple stressor table formats (in effects sections), streamline 508 compliance, etc. We can add all the uncertain or NA stressors to the bottom of the I&S tables (now arranged from high to low magnitude stressors) so as not to distract the reader. Let me know what you think.

Thanks

Joe

--

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