From: Erin Strange - NOAA Federal <erin.strange@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 8:50 PM
To: Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal
Cc: Cathy Marcinkevage; Brown, Howard; Kristin Begun; Barbara Byrne; Susan Boring; Naseem Alston
Subject: Re: ROC on LTO: East Side Division team

Attached are my comments. Let me know if you have any questions or need clarification.

Erin

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 9:50 PM Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov> wrote:

Erin,

Here's my formal request for you to review the ROC on LTO East Side Division effects analysis:

-- The file is attached, as I suspect that you don't have access to the CVP ROCON drive.
-- The San Joaquin River section is on page 50-73, and would include the species and critical habitat analyses.
-- If you have time, I would appreciate your review of the Stanislaus River analysis as well.
-- You review and comments should be through the lens of effects of the proposed action components on CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and especially in the context of the de minimus requirement in the settlement agreement. In addition, if we have the benefit of your review on the Stanislaus River effects, to review our characterization of CV spring-run Chinook salmon, or "spring-running fish" and effects of the proposed action elements on them.
-- Comments back (in track changes) by COB Tuesday, May 14, would be great, but if not possible, we could discuss and see what's workable.

Thanks.

-Garwin-

Garwin Yip
Water Operations and Delta Consultations Branch Chief
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Office: 916-930-3611
Cell: 916-716-6558
FAX: 916-930-3629
www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

On Thu, May 9, 2019 at 11:00 AM Erin Strange - NOAA Federal <erin.strange@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Garwin - If this is a formal request for my time, I will need more specifics so that I can appropriately reorder my priorities.

Specifics like:
1) which sections or parts of sections should I review and with what eye,
2) what version do I work from and where does it live,
3) how much time should I devote to this (i.e. I know very little about the details of the proposed project),
4) when are my comments due

Thanks - Erin

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 11:20 AM Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov> wrote:

It'd also be very helpful if Erin could review the San Joaquin section, specifically, and the entire East Side Division effects analysis, in general.

-Garwin-

_____
Garwin Yip
Water Operations and Delta Consultations Branch Chief
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Office: 916-930-3611
Cell: 916-716-6558
FAX: 916-930-3629
www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 9:27 AM Kristin Begun - NOAA Affiliate <kristin.begun@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Garwin,

Thanks for mentioning that. I wasn't sure which document to work off of. I will incorporate Rosalie's comments/edits into the V8_KMB3-GY version, and will let you know when the clean version is on the server.

Thanks,
Kristin

On Wed, May 8, 2019 at 9:04 AM Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov> wrote:

Kristin,

As you know, Barb is tied up with higher priority assignments, at least through the end of this week.

As mentioned last night, we received comments back from Rosalie on the East Side Division effects section, which you already placed in the ROCON drive.
-- The "Date modified" field indicates that the "2.5 and 2.6 East Side Effects V8_KMB3-GY" is more current than "2.5 and 2.6 East Side Effects V8--to reviewers-do not change." Whichever is the most current, please use that version as the base/your master, rename it, then incorporate Rosalie's track changes from the file "2.5 and 2.6 East Side Division Effects--to reviewers.rd" into it.
-- Please address all outstanding comments, and Rosalie's track changes, so in the end, we will have a clean document with only comment bubbles for references.
-- Note that I will be sending out task e-mails individually, and you may have overlapping tasks. If you need help with workload or priorities, Howard, Cathy, and/or I will be available to help.
-- Please see Barb's response, below, regarding contaminants.
-- PA-NMI scenario: We don't have time to debate the rationale for in or out, and it's not worth the effort to remove the scenario from the effects section, but please make sure that the text explains/clarifies the need for it.

I don't expect Barb to work on this (please don't), but be available to Kristin if questions arise.

Thanks!

-Garwin-

_____
Garwin Yip
Water Operations and Delta Consultations Branch Chief
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
California Central Valley Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Office: 916-930-3611
Cell: 916-716-6558
FAX: 916-930-3629
www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov

On Tue, May 7, 2019 at 5:18 PM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov> wrote:

Contaminants: I did delete contaminants from the table of stressors, but think I forgot to list it as N/A (think now -- rather than N/A) in the introductory table of Recovery Plan stressors, so should be changed there. I never had a writeup associated with, so no narrative to delete.

PA-NMI. If we delete PA-NMI, it causes problems with the entire yeartype distribution analysis because the current write-up hinges on that scenario. I don't believe it is irrelevant to understand the individual PA components; in fact we were directed to do so. Because of the interaction between the flow schedules and the yeartype method on the Stan, we can NOT evaluate those separate PA components without the "bridging" PA-NMI scenario.

I am open to keeping in some general conclusions and moving the full analysis to an appendix, or to my memo to the record (but not sure that works since readers of the BiOp won't know what I've done), but that takes time we don't have to shift it around and explain it in a new place.

How is this different from Evan noting that temperature improvements are from better storage, not a better temp management method? The situation seems very analogous, and I think part of our evaluation is to understand from which PA component effects are coming from.

On Tue, May 7, 2019 at 4:57 PM Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov> wrote:

> Kristin,
>
> Can you take on addressing the remaining comments in the East Side Division? Barb will be tied up at least through the remainder of the week.
>
> Within the comments, 2 are on my mind:
> — contaminants: delete that subsection/analysis, double check the environmental baseline section to make sure ag in addressed.
> — PA-NMI scenario: Barb has a response to my comment about why that scenario is in the analysis. Seems to me that we need to analyze the effects of the action, not try to figure out whether PA minus COS, or 60-20-20 minus/vs. NMI is the cause of the adverse effects. I suggest deleting that/those sections.
>
> Sent from my iPhone

--

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

--
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

--
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