
From: Barbara Byrne - NOAA Federal <barbara.byrne@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal; Randi Field; Evan Sawyer - NOAA Affiliate
Subject: draft Shasta RPA adjustment modeling -- base case vs. RPA adjustment scenarios
Attachments: Shasta RPA adjustment scenario comparison_Byrne draft.pptx; 2011 amended NMFS BiOp_1.2_Shasta ops.pdf

<starting this conversation with a subset of folks -- some wrinkles to be worked out before engaging the larger group?>

At the last meeting with Maria, we touched on some possible NMFS qualms about the base case vs. the amendment scenarios -- I understood there to be two potential areas of concern about the "base case" (1) to what extent are the not-necessarily-straightforward-to-model operational restrictions in the 2009 BiOp (see in particular Actions 1.2.1-1.2.4 in the attached excerpt of the 2011 RPA amendment) built into the CALSIM "current ops" base case? (2) why does the temp modeling assume the target temp and location of the amendment in both base case and amendment scenarios?.

(1) may take a bit of work to review; if operational restrictions not fully included the amendment scenario may overstate the water supply impacts and perhaps that can just be mentioned as a caveat when presenting model results. (2) may eventually require some additional temperature runs; for now we can probably just acknowledge that the "base case" is with regard to the operational, not temperature criterion, elements of the proposed amendment.

I put together the attached slide to help us internally to understand the modeled scenarios, and possibly to use in a presentation at the workshop. Still a bit rough and might not be quite correct -- sending around to start the discussion. Suspect a call may be the best way to work through this, perhaps after Reclamation has a chance to chew on and provide a revised slide.

Randi -- Can you look at the attached and help me correct any inaccuracies? (Please loop in Mike or Nancy if appropriate) I'm still not totally clear on how an assumption re: temperature feeds into HEC-5Q, or if HEC-5Q just spits out temp based on input flows and some standard TCD assumptions which is then compared to some temp target.

Garwin & Evan -- FYI.

--

Barb Byrne
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office: 916-930-5612
Mobile (no reception at my desk): 916-761-9952
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

