

---

**From:** Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 5, 2019 1:41 AM  
**To:** Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal  
**Subject:** Re: SRKW

well, I wasn't sure why'd be talking about comparing current with proposed? since we aren't doing that for the species of this ROC either (but did for CWF)

I haven't thought that much (or read) about what the KW would use, but I'm not clear why he wouldn't use the effects of the PA on species.

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, Apr 4, 2019 at 11:08 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <[cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov](mailto:cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov)> wrote:

Do you get Dan L's issue/concern related to the comparative analysis and then using that to get to our integration? I guess I don't know what is different in this compared to CWF that introduces a concern that we didn't deal with there. I haven't talked with him much, but wouldn't it be most efficient to use the CWF text then revise/update/refine to meet this project's effects? B/c when it comes down to it, it's really just about the whale food. But we are using the same analytical tools with same limitations, have same comparative scenarios, etc. I set up a call for Fri but I don't get the issue! just wanted to save the whole group's time....

Anyhow let me know if you want to work out a strategy beforehand.