

**Kenny, Ann**

---

**From:** Kenny, Ann  
**Sent:** Monday, July 02, 2001 11:11 AM  
**To:** Drabek, John; Garland, Dave; Fitzpatrick, Kevin  
**Subject:** FW: Quick question/Non-hydrologic effects.

Any additional comments?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Whiting, Kelly [mailto:Kelly.Whiting@METROK.C.GOV]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 02, 2001 10:27 AM  
**To:** 'Rachel McCrea'  
**Cc:** Kenny, Ann; Masters, David; Paul Fendt Parametrix (E-mail)  
**Subject:** RE: Quick question

Rachael - In response to your request. Here is how my previous comments have been addressed.

The "non-hydrologic" effects of relinquishments of water rights has been scaled back considerably from past submittals. The overall effect of all non-hydrologic effects remains a small negative impact on summer low flows which will need to be addressed as part of a proposed low flow mitigation plan. I asked how the relinquishment of water withdrawals would be handled in the low flow analysis, in terms of assumed timing of the water withdrawals. I still suspect the numbers are more representative of withdrawal rates which would be sustained for a few hours per day, and probably not everyday of the week. The indication was that it was up to Joe Brascher as to how to incorporate the water withdrawal table into the low-flow impact. Therefore, I have no idea how this will be performed.

I also do not fully understand the logic behind the "non-respondents" to the survey. It appears that a much larger percentage of the non-respondents were assumed to have been withdrawing water than would be indicated by the trend set by those that responded to the survey. Furthermore, the rates of withdrawal for the non-respondents were assumed to be at the upper end of the range of those that responded. It seems more logical that if 80% of the respondents indicated no water withdrawal, that 80% of the non-respondents would also be assumed to withdraw no water, and the rate assumed would be an average (weighted by parcel size) of those that responded positively to water withdrawals. This comment was made in my review comments on the 12/00 SMP and were discussed during facilitated meetings. The response to comment was to make no changes to these assumptions.

I expect to see how these numbers will be used when the low-flow plan is submitted Thursday AM(???). Perhaps a walk-through on how these effects were incorporated into the low flow assessment could be provided during the Thursday PM meeting. Alternatively, if there is a desire for a "Yeah/Neah" some details could be provided as to how the numbers will be incorporated, as well as their relative magnitude compared to other effects on summer low flows.

--Kelly.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rachel McCrea [mailto:rachelm@floyd-snider.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 02, 2001 9:56 AM  
**To:** Kelly R. Whiting (E-mail)  
**Subject:** Quick question

Kate had a low flow follow-up question on her list that never made it to my list for our Wednesday meeting. Did you have additional comments on the non-hydrologic effects information associated with D7? I guess that Joe is working on this stuff and a final yeah/neh would be beneficial.

AR 023805

7/6/2001

DOE 7/19/01 0387

Thank you,  
Rachel McCrea  
Floyd Snider McCarthy, Inc.  
83 S King Street, #614, Seattle, WA 98104  
206-292-2078  
rachelm@floyd-snider.com