
From: Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal <evan.sawyer@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 9:58 AM
To: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal
Cc: Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal; Brian Ellrott
Subject: Re: Analytical Approach Figures and Comment

They look fine to me.

If time wasn't an issue I would move the purple box: "define the AA" below the purple box: "Identify E&T species/designated CH" and have that species box point to the orange box: "describe the status of species/CH"

With regard to Maria's comment I'd disagree. With the exception of the LCM discussion, the effects section describes the effects to the individual/PBF and the I&S rolls it up to the population/species/CH.

Evan

On Sun, Apr 7, 2019 at 11:21 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hey there you three I&S pros --

I have a short(?) ask - maybe 30-45 mins tops. It doesn't have to happen today, but by middle of Tuesday would be helpful especially if I need to make changes.

Can you look at the figures 2.1.3-1 and 2.3.1-2 in the analytical approach and the comments and tell me what you think regarding the need to revise? We worked out these figures (over and over and over) in the earlier stages of CWF with Rosalie, Dan, Erin, Garwin. And everyone signed off. But that was before we actually wrote the effects and I&S, and there are some notable points in the comments from Maria and Garwin. I'd like to make changes now to be accurate with what we maybe ended up doing in CWF and/or are doing in this consultation.

Feel free to email/chat/call me/comment -- whatever is easiest for you.

It's in CVP ROCON/Draft BiOp/2.1 Analytical Approach and the version is V5.

Thanks -
Cathy

--

Evan Bing Sawyer,
Natural Resource Management Specialist
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office: (916) 930-3656
Evan.Sawyer@noaa.gov
www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

