

---

**From:** Garwin Yip - NOAA Federal <garwin.yip@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 31, 2017 4:13 PM  
**To:** 'Maria.rea@noaa.gov'  
**Cc:** Brycen.Swart@noaa.gov; Eric Danner; Aimee Moore  
**Subject:** Shasta RPA amendment science work plan  
**Attachments:** SNOAA - CVO17082809000.pdf

Maria,

Dave Mooney gave me a hard copy of the attached Draft Science Work Plan (Plan) when I was at a different meeting in his office, so I don't think it was really a well-developed plan ready for review and comment, but rather, a work in progress to start the discussion. In fact, the document says, "Initial drafting for coordination." I haven't heard any progress made on the Plan, and certainly do not have a revised document. Eric Danner, Brycen Swart, and I reviewed the Plan. We appreciate Reclamation taking the lead in putting together the initial thoughts in the Plan, but we all agree that it is too rough to provide salient comments, therefore we offer the following general comments:

- We agree with the purposes of the Plan.
- The Plan mentions many things that do not pertain to the specific effort at hand, that is, developing a science work plan for temperature management and protection of winter-run. For example, the Plan mentions the 4 Hs (hydrology, habitat, hatcheries, and harvest), and other non-temperature dependent factors like predation.
- There are very few (and incomplete) hypotheses that could be developed and included into the Plan. There are also multiple questions that maybe we all are grappling with, but not developed into studies that could be implemented in order to move us towards finding answers.
- Frankly, the Plan is all over the place and very disorganized, but something to start with.
- Under Science Partnerships, "Reclamation envisions an approach that provides for Reclamation taking a lead role in the development of physical/operational modeling, with NMFS focusing more specifically on leading biological modeling." NMFS-SWFSC is very concerned with this proposal. Parallel physical modeling between Reclamation and the SWFSC may not make sense, but Reclamation would need to be very transparent and be able to (and willing to) make changes to their models when new information comes in. Otherwise, it makes sense for the SWFSC to retain and develop in-house physical modeling capabilities. There is a big sensitivity issue with funding if the SWFSC's physical modeling capabilities would require Reclamation funding.

-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](http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov)

