
From: Brian Ellrott - NOAA F... (Google Slides) <comments-noreply@docs.google.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 8:27 AM
To: naseem.alston@noaa.gov
Subject: EnvBaselineFigure... - Having climate change here, and not i...

Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal replied to a comment in [EnvBaselineFigure bje](#)

 **Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal**

Change

Having climate change here, and not in human impacts implies that we do not characterize climate change as a human impact, so I added slide 6 to fix this. Naseem was concerned that slide 6 (CC as a human impact) could be too controversial. We wanted the group to weigh on this.

 **Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal**

I think we stick with it this way. The regional climate guidance has a good description of climate variability vs. climate change, noting primarily the temporal scale differences. so having them both in the bottom box is capturing two different things. The guidance also cites IPCC In stating that climate change is likely due to human impacts. But if the intent of this figure is to identify the phenomena upon which we layer the project, other projects, etc., it seems right to have CC in the bottom. If the intent of hte figure were to attribute causes, then it would be in the "Human Impacts" box, and "environmental variations" would be more wisely defined as something that occurs in general in time scales of weeks to decades.

 **Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal**

What about calling the upper box "Human Actions" - to clarify that's what we are binning there, rather than what results from their (our) actions.

 **Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal**

I also want to reiterate my comment from before: last part of the right side language (“...to which we add...”) - I think we leave this out - we are not including what that means - we would be adding it to the effects for the I&S and J-analysis, but not part of informing the baseline... this is strictly a baseline vs PA figure. I made the same comments in the analytical approach.

 **Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal**

"Human Actions" instead of "Human Impacts" seems like a good solution.

Cathy, you good with that?

Naseem, go ahead and make the language change or deletion you're talking about (last part of the right side language). I'm fine with leaving that language there, assuming it is factually correct, but go ahead and modify or delete it as you see fit.

 **Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal**

I like it. I actually have a version of this updated in PPT b/c I couldn't do what I wanted to do in this format. Updates include using a dashed line for the date of consultation, adding non-CVP beneficial actions (like Ecorestore, Sac san). I can make those other changes and put that into the analytical approach.

 **Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal**

Sounds good - should probably replace figure 4 in the memo with that latest version.

 Open

Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

You have received this email because you are a participant in this thread. [Change what Google Docs sends you.](#) You can reply to this email to reply to the discussion.

