

---

**From:** Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 14, 2019 9:22 AM  
**To:** Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal; Garwin Yip  
**Cc:** Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate; Barbara Byrne; Howard Brown  
**Subject:** Re: Draft Supplemental Shasta Effects

Cathy,

This looks good. My read of it is that the numbers (e.g. TDM ranges) in the effects tables will not change. Is that correct?

It seems like the theme of reduced uncertainty wrt WT management, but expected quantitative effects from the initial analysis still being accurate is something to briefly explain in the I&S. Do you agree? And are there other key themes to carry forward into the I&S?

Thanks,  
Brian

On Fri, Jun 14, 2019 at 1:09 AM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <[cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov](mailto:cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov)> wrote:

All --

The attached (and on the drive) is the supplemental Shasta effect section, meant to capture the "yes" action(s) and the recent revisions to the PA (including performance metrics and what were previously sent by Rec as T&Cs).

I'm forwarding to all in spirit of maximizing time, but know that this has not been reviewed by anyone yet. Technically, it's in Garwin's court for first level BC review.

Thanks,  
Cathy

S:\Draft BiOp\2\_ESA\2.5-2.6 Effects of the Action\Shasta Division\Shasta\_Supplement\_V1.docx

--

**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](mailto:brian.ellrott@noaa.gov)