
From: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov>
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2019 6:15 PM
To: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal
Subject: Re: "Similar Approach" for Components
Attachments: Not in PA language from Delta section.docx

Attached is the language we captured during the Delta meeting (kept in track changes so you could see the deleted language that Reclamation asked us to avoid). From the "5.21 group" version of the MASTER doc in the Delta effects folder.

On Sat, May 25, 2019 at 5:16 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hey Barb --

There were a few items on Wed at the Shasta meeting for which we (NMFS) agreed to take an approach similar to some items for the Delta. I wasn't in the Delta meeting to know exactly what this approach is, so am looking for what you can provide. It has to do with treating things as a comparative analysis with the baseline for components that are part of the current RPA.

For example, here's the item we had in our section:

Reclamation will not incur COA debt in order to augment spring storage by agreeing to meet Delta demands from Oroville Reservoir releases before requiring Shasta Reservoir releases

And here's the note I took during the meeting on what to do about it: Any associated text will reflect that we will treat this as a comparative analysis with the baseline since this is part of the current RPA. Take same approach to addressing this as what was used to address HORB in Delta section.

Can you provide for me (not today necessarily!) anything to help with similar language for COA as for HORB, or any other description of this approach?

Thanks! Plugging away.....

Cathy

PS Your approaches all seemed good to me.

--

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

