
From: Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2019 9:49 AM
To: Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal
Cc: Rosario, Rosalie B del
Subject: Re: ROC - Environmental Baseline Chapter

Thanks. Yeah, I did see some of Rosalie's comments (not all), and will update the EB section in the BO. I wanted to do that before sending it out, but ran out of time. It seems like it would be ok to make edits now, but I'll ask today on the ROC call.

Funny, I thought it was too controversial to not have climate change in the human impacts bin - then it seems like we are denying that humans have played a role in climate change. I'm fine going back to the way it is in v3 as long as we add some explanatory text to the figure caption to address the issue. Polling the group to what others think sounds good.

Brian

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 11:29 AM Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov> wrote:
I personally think that would come across as too controversial (CC = human impacts).
we can see what others think.

btw, did you see Rosalie had a lot of good comments she added to the memo? (I hadn't seen them before)
Would apply to the beginning language of the EnvB section.

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, Mar 21, 2019 at 10:35 AM Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov> wrote:
Thanks for checking in with her. I like your suggestion of "...including restoration actions"

I also moved climate change to Human Impacts. Are you ok with that?

How about this?

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1w981y02Q6NY8PWWUIIdScA645dDxJOGP9EtBQe0-mKu8/edit?usp=sharing>

On Tue, Mar 19, 2019 at 11:09 AM Naseem Alston - NOAA Federal <naseem.alston@noaa.gov> wrote:
btw,

brought the EnvB figure into the management mtg - handed it to Maria.
She said she had seen it (recently, as she is reviewing the analytical approach section), and generally liked it.
One point she made (that I think she said someone else noticed as well) - was that the figure portion for actions continuing in the baseline (non-CVP/SWP actions) - and the title "Human Impacts" may only indicate negative actions. She recommended we make sure to explicitly include positive actions.

Maybe "Human Impacts (positive and negative)
or "non-CVP/SWP actions included restoration actions"

other ideas?

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 Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 4:07 PM Brian Ellrott - NOAA Federal <brian.ellrott@noaa.gov> wrote:
Here's the chapter. Most of the comment boxes are related to keeping the literature cited straight. There are two small placeholder spots, but other than that, it's complete.

--

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

--

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

--

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