
From: Erin Strange - NOAA Federal <erin.strange@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal
Cc: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal; Rosalie del Rosario; Howard Brown; Brian Ellrott; Barbara Byrne; Garwin Yip
Subject: Re: ROC LTO Analytical Approach

My thoughts are attached. -- Erin

On Tue, Mar 5, 2019 at 12:50 PM Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov> wrote:
Hi Cathy,

Attached are my initial thoughts (since I get to look at it again later).
I added mine to Brian's edits/comments.

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 Sun, Mar 3, 2019 at 5:16 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:
All --

As I warned (most of) you, I have a first cut for your review of particular sections of the analytical approach of the ROC LTO BiOp.

There are several items that cannot be updated or finalized right now because of pending decisions, finalization of approaches, or updated guidance. Those are noted.

There are several places where I want to check whether or not there is updated info, and I have flagged those, too.

In what I think is the most substantive change, Evan and I have worked to break down the "magnitude" column of the tables we used in the integration and synthesis (and introduce here in the analytical approach) for CWF. This is a change based on the CWF experience and we think applies here too, especially since, again, we have multiple writers in this opinion. These changes attempt to be more transparent and clear in the logic that goes into the magnitude categorization, and are intended to help effects analyses drafters know how to consistently pull out the info needed for consistent application in the integration and synthesis. We're really trying to be consistent ;).

What you'll see is explicit introduction and incorporation of 1) the lethality of the stressor, 2) the proportion of the population exposed to the stressor, 3) the frequency of exposure to that stressor, and 4) the magnitude category that results from these. It's not a change in how we do things, it is simply explaining it much more concretely.

Because the process for this consultation requires efficiency and expediency, I've used comment bubbles to flag specific sections for each of you. You are welcome to look at the rest (and Naseem and Howard are on the books to provide a review of the "more final version" based on the ROC LTO assignments), but not necessarily expected to. Note that the edits are track changes of the CWF analytical approach, which had been extensively reviewed, so I'm not anticipating major issues with most of this. The introduction of the logic behind the magnitude assessment is more than a minor change but helps with some challenges we've experienced with CWF.

Some specifics:

NASEEM, ROSALIE, ERIN:

Section 2.1.3 on p. 24

Table 2-1 changes, and changes to text just after that.

NASEEM, BRIAN, HOWARD:

Please see the items flagged for you by the comment.

BARB: FYI

CVP ROCON\Draft BiOp\2_ESA\2.2 Analytical Approach\CWF_2.1_An_App_ROC_Markup_V3.docx

Finally....can you reply by **COB Tuesday**? If not, let me know, but please know that we need to make this a priority.

Thanks,
Cathy

--
Erin Strange
San Joaquin River Branch Chief
California Central Valley Area Office
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
Office: 916-930-3653
erin.strange@noaa.gov

