

Kristin Begun - NOAA Affiliate

From: Kristin Begun - NOAA Affiliate
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 2:24 PM
To: J. Stuart - NOAA Federal
Subject: Re: FYI -- Delta perf objectives

Jeff, let me know if I can help with the Delta ITS section in any way. Also, I think take of 13 green sturgeon is reasonable, especially since we haven't seen any in salvage lately. The last verified salvage of green sturgeon was on 1/22/2016.

On Wed, Jun 12, 2019 at 10:12 AM J. Stuart - NOAA Federal <j.stuart@noaa.gov> wrote:

That sounds reasonable. Just trying to make sure nothing slips through the cracks in our rush to the finish line. Those "omissions" have a tendency to come back and bite you in the bottom.

On Wed, Jun 12, 2019 at 9:53 AM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov> wrote:

Jeff -- about to look at your other comments, but Reclamation has been telling us that this "limit to historic loss" approach replaces the salvage or loss thresholds (e.g. 2% of the WR JPE; 3000 steelhead) from the original and most recent BA, and the rest of the OMR management elements also carry forward -- including the -5,000 cfs OMR limit. I see that Mooney sent over a draft revised FULL PA -- will check with Garwin et al and see if that is ready to be shared or is still too draft (don't want to revise things twice over based on an interim version).

On Wed, Jun 12, 2019 at 6:37 AM J. Stuart - NOAA Federal <j.stuart@noaa.gov> wrote:

Also noticed in this current write up that there is no reference to a "baseline" of -5,000 cfs OMR flows during the period of salmon presence - nominally January - June. How does this current write up fit in with all of the other OMR management actions from the original BA? How do we splice all of their actions together, such as the turbidity bridge, and estimate of 5% of a population in the Delta as the start of OMR management, with this "take" section? Does this new element only replace the one bullet of "salvage and loss thresholds" in the 2/5/19 BA version? Looking forward to your clarification.

Jeff

On Wed, Jun 12, 2019 at 5:46 AM Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Barb,

Thanks for putting this together. I added one comment on top of Jeff's version in the loss section, and made a minor edit in the DCC section.

The comment is: Can we provide a biological rationale for why this level of loss (and associated far field effects) would help avoid jeopardy? Based on Michel (2018), one could argue that maintaining the status quo would likely contribute to maintaining freshwater survival below population survival levels. There's a lot to unpack there with confounding effects beyond loss at the pumps, but I think there's a strong enough argument such that we should provide a biological rationale for status quo.

On Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 8:52 PM J. Stuart - NOAA Federal <j.stuart@noaa.gov> wrote:

Please see my comments in the attached document. Answers to these comments will enable me to understand and write a suitable supplement to the PA regarding Reclamation's current position.

On Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 12:04 PM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov> wrote:

Dear I&S section leads and Delta effects co-leads -- The current (and I think final) Delta performance objectives are described on p. 5-7 of the attached doc -- sharing FYI. The framework, timing, and populations included were decided at the Directors level; Dave Mooney and I just clarified the specifics necessary to calculate the necessary thresholds. My understanding is that I will work with Jeff to add a supplemental analysis of these to the effects section and we will work with the I&S and ITS leads to incorporate into the I&S section and ITS.

The edits to the DCC section (p 4 of the attached) were discussed the week of 5/20 and have already been incorporated into the Delta effects section (but not necessarily the I&S sections, since those weren't prepared for peer review).

ALERT: The Shasta performance objectives are still pending edits and agreement -- the draft objectives in the attached doc may yet be revised.

--

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



--

Jeffrey S. Stuart, M.S.

Fishery Biologist

NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

California Central Valley Office

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814-4706

Office: 916-930-3607

J.Stuart@noaa.gov



Find us online

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov



*



--

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

--

Jeffrey S. Stuart, M.S.

Fishery Biologist

NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

California Central Valley Office

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814-4706

Office: 916-930-3607

J.Stuart@noaa.gov



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



--

Jeffrey S. Stuart, M.S.

Fishery Biologist

NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814-4706

Office: 916-930-3607

J.Stuart@noaa.gov



Find us online

www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

