From: Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 4:51 PM
To: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal
Cc: Howard Brown; Naseem.Alston; Brian Ellrott
Subject: Re: QUICK LOOK: Fwd: Questions for tomorrow

See below for my thoughts in red.

-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, Jun 6, 2019 at 4:09 PM Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov> wrote:

> s call with the peer reviewers. Anyone care 'Hey, please look at the bold text below in anticipation of tomorrow
> ?land? Can someone be ready to answer this for me tomorrow "non-proposed action" to venture into
>
> Here's the paragraph it references:
>
> Reclamation established a WOA scenario as part of the BA's Environmental Baseline to isolate and define potential effects of the proposed action apart from effects of non-proposed action. The model run representing this scenario does not include CVP and SWP operations, but does include the operations of non-CVP and non-SWP facilities, such as operation of public and private reservoirs on the Yuba, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers. NMFS considers the without-action scenario to represent effects related to the existence of CVP and SWP facilities. The without-action scenario provides context for how these facilities have shaped the habitat conditions for species and critical habitat in the action area. The environmental baseline section in Reclamation's BA includes a WOA scenario and also the past, present, and ongoing impacts of human and natural factors, including the present and ongoing effects of current operations that were considered in prior consultations. Howard

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Michelle Havey** <mhavey@anchorqea.com>
Date: Thu, Jun 6, 2019 at 2:45 PM
Subject: Questions for tomorrow
To: Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal <cathy.marcinkevage@noaa.gov>
Cc: John Ferguson <jferguson@anchorqea.com>

Hi Cathy,

Thank you for the call – sorry to catch you between meetings! I have included several questions posed by the reviewers so far for the discussion tomorrow:

- Where is it described how the PA for BO was simulated in any of the life cycle or related models? There were statements about only flow and temperature effects were included but I did not see anything on the magnitude of the differences in model inputs between flow or temperature between the no-action and PA scenarios. Cathy
    - How were the outputs of the feeder models (e.g., DSM2, HEC, etc.) aggregated for inputs to the life cycle or egg mortality models? How different were these inputs? Cathy, Evan?
    - I sense that the regional analyses seem to show a lot of effects of the PA while the modeling showed almost difference between no-project and project. These will be a challenge when the results are integrated.
- There seems to be an inconsistency between the geographical sections with how the PA is being evaluated – some sections appear to evaluate the effects overall under the proposed PA while other sections are comparing the current conditions to the anticipated conditions under the PA. No question. Comment noted and agreed. I&S section which the reviewers don't have brings the effects home in the aggregate roll up.
- Can you provide a Glossary of Acronyms? There's one in the ROCON drive we should send over.
- Can you clarify whether the BiOp was evaluating the "change in proposed operations" (an incremental kind of analysis) or whether the BiOp engages in a "de novo" "overall" assessment of effects of the totality of operational criteria incorporated in the PA which I would interpret as the "totality of operational criteria for the combined CVP and SWP". Presumably, operation based on RPAs from the previous BiOp resulted in use of operational criteria (assuming they were followed) that did not jeopardize the ESA-listed species (i.e., resulted in acceptable levels of take that had minimal adverse impacts?). If this were true, an "incremental analysis" would seem more appropriate to me. Both. I&S section, which the reviewers don't have, brings the effects home in the aggregate roll up.
    - Ken's provided the following answer – "The simple explanation is all activities to date are baseline, including how they operate the pumps, etc. then you assess the totality of proposed operations including new actions and carryover actions. Basically, the PA is how operations will occur in the future." Yup.
- Where is the "synthesis and integration" (Integrating the Effects, from the Analytic Approach Section 2.1)? Ken mentions that is he seeing lots of effects in the regional effects analysis appendixes, but not "overall". But where is the "overall" synthetic analysis presented? I&S sections that are not subject to peer review. I thought Maria explained in the peer review kick off meeting.
- It would be helpful to get more explicit guidance wrt just what models/approaches/analyses were those that were of greatest interest to secure peer review

- **For p. 2 of the Environmental Baseline (Section 2.4), can NMFS explain the comparison of the "proposed action" as compared to the "non-proposed action". What is the "non-proposed action" in a system that is already full of dams and has had a long legacy of complex regulatory schemes designed to move and transfer water, much less pass ESA regulatory review? How could one possibly engage in a " model run representing this (no-action) scenario (that) does not include CVP and SWP operations"? How could the water conveyance system work without CVP and SWP operation? Yup. It would be AWESOME is the reviewers provided that comment in their reports.**

As we discussed, Dave would benefit from a bit more specific guidance on a few narrow areas where he should focus his efforts to provide valuable feedback with his review. He said that he has "had lots of involvement in the CV over the years - reviewing Battle creek/CNFH issues, serving on the CA hatchery scientific review group, key role in development of the CV constant fractional marking programs for Chinook, review of studies concerning survival rates of juvenile Chinook through the delta, OMR, etc. - but these have always been narrowly focused reviews for which I always felt I had something useful to say or to contribute."

If you are able to provide any answers to these questions before the call, please let me know and I can distribute those answers to the reviewers.

Thanks,

Michelle

Michelle Havey
Managing Fisheries Biologist

ANCHOR QEA, LLC
1201 3rd Avenue, Suite 2600
Seattle, WA 98101
T 206.287.9130
C 206.683.9199

Anchor QEA's Seattle office has moved. Please update your records to reflect our new address.