
From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 5:21 PM
To: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal
Cc: Howard Brown - NOAA Federal; Brittany Cunningham - NOAA Affiliate; Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal; Brian Ellrott; Garwin Yip
Subject: Re: ROC Team Check-In Tomorrow

Regarding your questions, I think a conversation with Garwin and Jeff (and maybe Erin) would be the best way to get at those. Not necessary for the entire group.

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 Apr 10, 2019, at 5:17 PM, Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov> wrote:

I (and, I assume, Brittany) are open to a check-in on the ITS but we won't have much to report. Brittany is working on a "mashup" of the CWF ITS and the 09 BiOp ITS.

I *do* have a few questions about how CWF assigned take that we could discuss if appropriate and not too weedy for the whole group. Based on a very preliminary read, I have some qualms/questions about these approaches and wanted to (a) make sure I understand the CWF approach, and (b) see if your thinking has changed since 2017.

1. Delta survival (p. 1169- 1172): Take exceeded if measured survival difference (post-NDD minus pre-NDD) more negative than 50%ile of modeled survival difference (PA-NAA).

- Why is 75th percentile row highlighted? Isn't the median row the relevant threshold?
- Operationally, how will this work? Will experiments be conducted every month?
- What about inter-annual variability...will field survival be measured every year?
- Measured survival will have it's own error...will average or median survival be used to compare to the 50th percentile threshold?
- Did the BiOp really assume that the range of take would only be in the upper half of the modeled survival distribution (and thus, any survival in the lower half exceeds the effects analyzed in the BiOp)?

2. DCC operations (p. 1175-1176). If I understand it correctly, take can only be calculated at the end of the migration season when we can generate the estimates of population fraction.

- While the metric allows for decent precision, it seems...delayed.
- What do y'all think about taking a different approach for the current consultation?

On Wed, Apr 10, 2019 at 4:00 PM Howard Brown - NOAA Federal

<howard.brown@noaa.gov> wrote:

No objections from me. Also wondering if we should have a short check-in with Barb and Brittany on the ITS. Maybe split the hour like we did on Monday?
Howard

On Wed, Apr 10, 2019 at 3:58 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal

<cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hey all --

I propose we NOT have a team check-in tomorrow, but instead use it for Joe, Brian, Howard, Garwin and I to check in on the I&S.

Any objections?

Thanks -
Cathy

--

Howard L. Brown

Policy Advisor

NOAA Fisheries, West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

(916) 930-3608

Howard.Brown@noaa.gov



www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

--

Barb Byrne

Fish Biologist

NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

Office: 916-930-5612

barbara.byrne@noaa.gov

California Central Valley Office

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814



Find us online

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

