
From: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal <evan.sawyer@noaa.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Barbara Byrne; J. Stuart; Brian Ellrott; Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal; Sarah Gallagher - NOAA Federal; Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal
Subject: (v2) SWIFT RESPONSE REQUESTED: Peer Review Focus

Hi All,

A follow up from Cathy's email yesterday and today's meeting with the peer-review panel where the panel reiterated the question:

Is there explicit guidance wrt just what models/approaches/analyses were that are of greatest interest to secure peer review?

Basically are there any hot topics that we would really like/need peer-review on?

Sarah identified the following on Clear Creek:

- "Are there significant risks or benefits that have been overlooked?", and
- "Are proposed flows and temperatures appropriate for the species?"

For Shasta I think a key issue is (Related to Panel Charge question #5):

5. Does the draft biological opinion adequately address data gaps and uncertainties? Specifically:

A. Are uncertainties and assumptions in the effects analysis clearly stated and reasonable based on current scientific knowledge?

- As it relates to Section 2.5.2.1 (specifically 2.5.2.1.2 Project Uncertainties)

Do any of the Division leads have other key topics that we would really like/need peer-review on?

Evan

--

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

