From: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 4, 2019 10:45 PM **To:** Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal

**Cc:** Smith, lan; Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal; Howard.Brown **Subject:** Re: EFH questions from lan; please weigh in if needed.

I concur!

On Thu, Apr 4, 2019 at 4:43 PM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal < <u>barbara.byrne@noaa.gov</u>> wrote: Looping in the ROC management team to give them a chance to offer their opinions, but my take is:

- 1. Using the CWF format is fine; keeping in mind that the action area of CWF was (I believe) limited to Delta, mainstem Sac, and American (and the bay and nearshore coastal). The action area for the ROC consultation includes those areas as well as Clear Creek and the Stanislaus and the lower San Joaquin (no longer Trinity) so please be sure to "build out" the CWF template to accommodate the full action area of the ROC consultation.
- 2. Yes, the BiOp should address EFH for Pacific Coast Salmon, Pacific Coast Groundfish, and Coastal Pelagic Species.

Thanks, Barb

On Thu, Apr 4, 2019 at 3:03 PM Smith, Ian <<u>ismith@usbr.gov</u>> wrote: Barb,

I've compared the 2009 EFH section with more recent BiOps, and there are stark differences in what is included. I am going to be using the CA Water Fix (2017) for updated language and format.

The 2017 BiOp includes groundfish and pelagic species. Should I include these in our analysis?

Thanks

--

## Ian F. Smith

Fisheries Biologist Bureau of Reclamation Bay - Delta Office I Street, Suite 140 Sacramento, CA 95814 916.414.2414 Work 916.201.1306 Cell 916.414.2439 Fax

"Why don't oysters share? Because they're shellfish."

--

**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

