

---

**From:** Joe Heublein - NOAA Federal <joe.heublein@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 8, 2019 8:32 AM  
**To:** Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal  
**Cc:** Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal; J. Stuart; Brian Ellrott; Sarah Gallagher - NOAA Federal; Cathy Marcinkevage - NOAA Federal; Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal  
**Subject:** Re: (v2) SWIFT RESPONSE REQUESTED: Peer Review Focus

This effects all the divisions except maybe the Delta but here's a broad issue that came up in BOR review of Am R effects for the peer reviewers to consider -

Paraphrase of BOR comments- temperature modeling provided in the BA is only for comparative purposes, and the use of historical temperature information to analyze future temps under the PA is not appropriate because it involved COS operations and not PA operations.

Assuming that everyone agrees we should have an analysis of the effects of estimated absolute (not relative or comparative) water temps under the PA on listed species

Question for the peer reviewers-

Are we using best available information for estimated future water temps under the PA (i.e., modeling provided in the BA)?

-Joe

On Fri, Jun 7, 2019 at 4:16 PM Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <[barbara.byrne@noaa.gov](mailto:barbara.byrne@noaa.gov)> wrote:  
For Delta --

- What are the panel's views on the sensitivity of the salvage data period on salvage-density model results? Is there a "best" data period that (for future consultations; not time to adjust for the current consultation) should be used to compare two different operational scenarios?
- What are the panel's views on the clarity of description/scientific support for NMFS's Delta conceptual model (top of the Delta effects section)?

On Fri, Jun 7, 2019 at 2:54 PM Evan Sawyer - NOAA Federal <[evan.sawyer@noaa.gov](mailto:evan.sawyer@noaa.gov)> wrote:  
Hi All,

A follow up from Cathy's email yesterday and today's meeting with the peer-review panel where the panel reiterated the question:

Is there explicit guidance wrt just what models/approaches/analyses were that are of greatest interest to secure peer review?

Basically are there any hot topics that we would really like/need peer-review on?

Sarah identified the following on Clear Creek:

- "Are there significant risks or benefits that have been overlooked?", and
- "Are proposed flows and temperatures appropriate for the species?"

For Shasta I think a key issue is (Related to Panel Charge question #5):

5. Does the draft biological opinion adequately address data gaps and uncertainties? Specifically:
  - A. Are uncertainties and assumptions in the effects analysis clearly stated and reasonable based on current scientific knowledge?
- As it relates to Section 2.5.2.1 (specifically 2.5.2.1.2 Project Uncertainties)

Do any of the Division leads have other key topics that we would really like/need peer-review on?

Evan

--

**Evan Bing Sawyer,**  
Natural Resource Management Specialist  
*NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region*  
*U.S. Department of Commerce*  
Office: (916) 930-3656  
[Evan.Sawyer@noaa.gov](mailto:Evan.Sawyer@noaa.gov)  
[www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov)



--

**Barb Byrne**  
Fish Biologist  
*NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region*  
*U.S. Department of Commerce*  
Office: 916-930-5612  
[barbara.byrne@noaa.gov](mailto: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](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov)



--

Joe Heublein

California Central Valley Office  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Office: 916-930-3719  
FAX: 916-930-3629  
[joe.heublein@noaa.gov](mailto:joe.heublein@noaa.gov)  
[www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov)

