To: <helen@bcsnet.it> (Helen Chernoff) **DocID 80215**

Subject: Fwd: Conversation with K. Farley-2nd attempt

Attached is the copy of a phone log of a conversation I had with Kevin about the model. I'm going to write a few sentences about this, essentially saying that we revised our use of the model to be consistent with the author's design. Essentially, his model design and calibration were based on fish exposure to the 0-2 cm layer only. Hence our use of the model should be the same.

Ed

----- Message from "Ed Garvey" <Garvey@tamsconsultants.com> on Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:20:47 -0500 -----

To: "Claire Hunt" <HUNT.PO_NJ.TAMSNJo@tamsconsultants.com>
cc: "Hudson" <Hudson.PO_NJ.TAMSNJo@tamsconsultants.com>
Subject: Conversation with K. Farley-2nd attempt

Sorry about the first transmittal. My email program deleted the enclosed text.

2/22/01

I spoke with K Farley this afternoon about 2:30 pm concerning our use of his model. I explained the basic approach we had used in applying the model output to the FISHRAND calculations for the Lower Hudson (i.e., use of the top two segments). I also explained our concern with regard to the lack of change between the model results for the No Action and Preferred Alternative simulations. Lastly I explained our solution to the problem by using the uppermost model sediment layer (0-2 cm) for driving the FISHRAND calculations instead of the 0-2 and 2-4 cm layers.

He indicated that our experience with the model output was consistent with the model design. The model does not have a particle exchange process between the sediment layers. As a result, our original application of the model (using 0-2 and 2-4 cm layers) exposed the fish to a layer (2-4 cm) which he had assumed was largely isolated from interaction with the surface. Thus the Farley white perch calcs showed a response to the preferred alternative while the FISHRAND calcs as originally performed did not. Dr. Farely agreed with my assertion that our remedy to use only the 0-2 cm sediment layer for both the No Action and Preferred Alternative would yield the most representative forecasts for the Lower Hudson. In this fashion, both FISHRAND and the Farley model forecasts would respond in a similar manner. Additionally, the forecasts would both be dependent on the same sediment conditions. Lastly, Dr. Farley pointed out that the sediment layers are 2.5 cm thick, not 2 cm thick, according to his original report.

Ed

==========
Ed Garvey, Ph.D., P.G.
TAMS Consultants, Inc.
300 Broadacres Drive
Bloomfield, NJ 07003
Phone: (973) 338-6680
Fax: (973) 338-1052
Email: egarvey@tamsconsultants.com