

Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal

From: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal
Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 8:20 PM
To: Kristin Begun - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: Re: ROC on LTO: East Side Division team

It is long. I added in that "Because" sentence as my response to Garwin's comment. I have that sentence in the text introducing the temperature analysis, but Garwin suggested I included it in every caption (in case readers just looked at the tables). The "no month/year type combination" sentence is also a bit odd...but I was trying to keep the caption consistent for all tables and that would normally be the sentence explaining that red indicates temps exceeding the criterion. Garwin flagged that that was confusing since there was no red shading (because no temps exceeded the threshold).

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 4:14 PM Kristin Begun - NOAA Affiliate <kristin.begun@noaa.gov> wrote:
Hi Barb,

Quick question on the east side effects. Is this whole paragraph meant to be in the table description or should part of it (starting at "Because" be normal text below the table?

Table 2.5.7-17. Evaluation of water temperature suitability under the PA for adult immigration of CV spring-run Chinook salmon (Temperature criterion = 68°F 7DADM). Data are modeled monthly water temperatures (not 7DADM), by San Joaquin "60-20-20" year type, under the PA. Because the modeled monthly temperatures, averaged by water year type, will be lower than the maximum daily temperatures most relevant for evaluating 7DADM criteria, this analysis underestimates temperature-related impacts to CV spring-run Chinook salmon on the Stanislaus River. There are no month/year type combinations in which monthly water temperatures exceed the temperature criterion. Gray shading indicates month/year type combinations in which the life stage is not expected to be present in the Stanislaus River.

	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP
Goodwin Dam												
Wet	53.0	52.6	50.7	47.9	47.9	49.1	50.0	51.4	51.7	52.4	53.0	53.2
Above Normal	55.4	54.3	51.6	48.5	48.2	49.7	50.6	51.9	52.5	53.8	54.7	55.5
Below Normal	54.4	53.8	51.3	48.7	49.0	50.3	51.7	52.3	53.0	54.1	54.6	54.9
Dry	54.8	54.1	51.4	48.5	48.8	50.7	51.7	52.6	53.7	54.5	54.8	55.1
Critical	57.5	56.4	52.8	49.7	49.8	51.5	52.7	53.9	55.5	56.7	57.8	58.2
Knights Ferry												
Wet	53.4	52.8	50.6	48.0	48.2	49.3	50.4	52.0	52.6	54.8	55.1	54.7
Above Normal	55.8	54.3	51.3	48.6	48.7	50.6	51.0	52.6	54.7	56.9	57.3	57.4
Below Normal	54.7	53.8	51.1	48.7	49.4	51.3	52.0	52.9	55.1	57.3	57.1	56.8
Dry	55.2	54.1	51.1	48.5	49.3	51.7	52.4	53.7	56.6	57.6	57.3	57.0
Critical	57.9	56.3	52.5	49.6	50.3	52.6	53.6	55.3	58.7	60.3	60.8	60.2
Orange Blossom												

Thanks,
Kristin

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 9:04 AM Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov> wrote:
Kristin,

As you know, Barb is tied up with higher priority assignments, at least through the end of this week.

As mentioned last night, we received comments back from Rosalie on the East Side Division effects section, which you already placed in the ROCON drive.

-- The "Date modified" field indicates that the "2.5 and 2.6 East Side Effects V8_KMB3-GY" is more current than "2.5 and 2.6 East Side Effects V8--to reviewers-do not change." Whichever is the most

current, please use that version as the base/your master, rename it, then incorporate Rosalie's track changes from the file "2.5 and 2.6 East Side Division Effects--to reviewers.rd" into it.

-- Please address all outstanding comments, and Rosalie's track changes, so in the end, we will have a clean document with only comment bubbles for references.

-- Note that I will be sending out task e-mails individually, and you may have overlapping tasks. If you need help with workload or priorities, Howard, Cathy, and/or I will be available to help.

-- Please see Barb's response, below, regarding contaminants.

-- PA-NMI scenario: We don't have time to debate the rationale for in or out, and it's not worth the effort to remove the scenario from the effects section, but please make sure that the text explains/clarifies the need for it.

I don't expect Barb to work on this (please don't), but be available to Kristin if questions arise.

Thanks!

-Garwin-

Garwin Yip

Water Operations and Delta Consultations Branch Chief

NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

California Central Valley Office

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814

Office: 916-930-3611

Cell: 916-716-6558

FAX: 916-930-3629

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov



On Tue, May 7, 2019 at 5:18 PM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov> wrote:

Contaminants: I did delete contaminants from the table of stressors, but think I forgot to list it as N/A (think now -- rather than N/A) in the introductory table of Recovery Plan stressors, so should be changed there. I never had a writeup associated with, so no narrative to delete.

PA-NMI. If we delete PA-NMI, it causes problems with the entire yeartype distribution analysis because the current write-up hinges on that scenario. I don't believe it is irrelevant to understand the individual PA components; in fact we were directed to do so. Because of the interaction between the flow schedules and the yeartype method on the Stan, we can NOT evaluate those separate PA components without the "bridging" PA-NMI scenario.

I am open to keeping in some general conclusions and moving the full analysis to an appendix, or to my memo to the record (but not sure that works since readers of the BiOp won't know what I've done), but that takes time we don't have to shift it around and explain it in a new place.

How is this different from Evan noting that temperature improvements are from better storage, not a better temp management method? The situation seems very analogous, and I think part of our evaluation is to understand from which PA component effects are coming from.

On Tue, May 7, 2019 at 4:57 PM Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov> wrote:

Kristin,

Can you take on addressing the remaining comments in the East Side Division? Barb will be tied up at least through the remainder of the week.

Within the comments, 2 are on my mind:

- contaminants: delete that subsection/analysis, double check the environmental baseline section to make sure ag is addressed.
- PA-NMI scenario: Barb has a response to my comment about why that scenario is in the analysis. Seems to me that we need to analyze the effects of the action, not try to figure out whether PA minus COS, or 60-20-20 minus/vs. NMI is the cause of the adverse effects. I suggest deleting that/those sections.

Sent from my iPhone

--


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



--

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

