
From: Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2019 2:08 PM
To: Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal
Cc: Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal; Garwin Yip; Brittany Cunningham - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: Re: I&S

yes.

and that if that was true, the table should have included a conclusion rather than "uncertain" which they then COULD be included in I&S...

Naseem O. Alston
ESA-Section 7 Coordinator/Fish Biologist
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
Sacramento, CA
(916)930-3655
<http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/>

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 2:00 PM Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal <joe.heublein@noaa.gov> wrote:
Hi Naseem,

I think I understand your question- if the division/effects section leads made an assumption about an effect in their narrative and conclusion, but then listed it as uncertain or NA in the I&S table, Brian and I most likely missed the discrepancy between the text and table and omitted the component from the I&S

Is that what you mean?

-Joe

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 1:44 PM Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov> wrote:
thanks Brian and Joe.

Only thing I'm wondering about - is whether the Effects section indicated uncertainty, where it should have provided a conclusion/effect based on assumptions described in the assumption table. Which may then translate to a row in the I&S table.

Naseem O. Alston
ESA-Section 7 Coordinator/Fish Biologist
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
Sacramento, CA
(916)930-3655
<http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/>

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 1:38 PM Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov> wrote:

Rosalie is doing a 2nd round review of w-r I&S now.
She has not reviewed spring-run I&S yet, but I'm trying to address issues that she commented on in the w-r I&S that also apply to s-r I&S. Should be able to minimize comments on s-r that way.

Just one add-on to Joe's response regarding the Table questions you asked - yes, the division leads are aware that stressors identified as "uncertain" or "NA" were being deleted from the I&S tables should be covered in the effects sections.

Does that help?

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 10:37 AM Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal <joe.heublein@noaa.gov> wrote:
Hi Naseem,

I believe Rosalie was only able to provide early comments on green sturgeon and winter-run I&S. I have incorporated Garwin and Rosalie's latest comments into **GS I&S- 2.8 Integration and Synthesis GS V5-JH-to reviewers-do not change**

I'm not sure what Rosalie's timeline is on her latest review of all the I&S sections. I plan on incorporating Garwin and Sarah's comments into steelhead I&S today, and will let you know when I name that file.

Table question- Rosalie recommended that we delete rows that are 'NA' or 'uncertain' in effect/magnitude unless we include the element in our I&S analysis/conclusion. We initially discussed including a narrative paragraph capturing these uncertain or NA elements in the I&S but my recommendation now is that uncertain/NA are only included in the effects. If division leads don't discuss uncertain/NA elements in their effects sections, then we should probably delete the row in the effects tables as well. I think this may be the only approach that time will permit at this stage of review.

-Joe

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 8:10 AM Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov> wrote:
Hi Brian and Joe,

You may have heard that Brittany and I are working to quickly start putting the ITS together. In order to do this, having finalized conclusions throughout the I&S would be extremely helpful!

Could you let Brittany and I know where each is at in terms of incorporating Rosalie's review (applying her review to others if she has not reviewed each doc). Estimate to complete?

As I mentioned in a previous email, I was a little unclear about the status/state of the I&S sections when Garwin sent them out for review, as they appeared to have not incorporated Rosalie's comments yet, etc. I had started to look through spring-run first, and then opened winter-run along side and saw all of Rosalie's comments so wasn't sure about the value of reviewing it at that point.

That being said, I have a few comments/edits in both the spring-run and winter-run, please find attached.

Question about the TABLES: from the winter-run track changes, it appears many rows are being deleted. Could one of you briefly explain this evolution for my understanding?

Also, related to our conversation with Rosalie regarding NOT carrying over "uncertainties" in the I&S - how did you all address this? Has there been any circling back to Effects-writers if the uncertainty came from them? We talked about the effects sections needing to include assumptions for any uncertainties to reach conclusions about expected effects to species/CH.

Brittany and I are supposed to get the ITS going pretty far THIS WEEK (according to schedule)! I appreciate your assistance in getting caught up to speed!

Naseem O. Alston
ESA-Section 7 Coordinator/Fish Biologist
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
Sacramento, CA
(916)930-3655
<http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/>

--

Joe Heublein
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Office: 916-930-3719
FAX: 916-930-3629
joe.heublein@noaa.gov
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

--

Joe Heublein
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Office: 916-930-3719
FAX: 916-930-3629
joe.heublein@noaa.gov
www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

