

---

**From:** Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 7, 2019 5:18 PM  
**To:** Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal  
**Cc:** Kristin Begun  
**Subject:** Re: East Side Division comments

**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](mailto: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](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)

