

From: Linda Whetton
To: Balsom, Janet; Barger, Mary; Burke, Kelly; Burton, Gary; Christensen, Kerry; Damp, Jonathan; Davis, William E.; Dongoske, Kurt; English, Jeff; George, Roxane; Greiner, Lloyd; Harris, Christopher; Henderson, Norm; Jackson, Loretta; James, Leslie; Johnson, Rick; Kincaid, Chris; King, Robert; Knowles, Glen W.; Kubly, Dennis; Lehr, Phillip; McMullen, Ken; O'Brien, John; Persons, Bill; Peterson, Randy; Potochnik, Andre; Seaholm, Randolph; Shields, John; Steffen, Mark; Stevens, Larry; Werner, Bill; Yeatts, Michael
Date: 6/25/2005 9:41:19 AM
Subject: Fwd: Flow Recommendations from TWG Participants

See attached message from Josh Korman.

cc: Amy Heuslein (via fax @ 602-379-3833)

From: Josh Korman <jkorman@ecometric.com>
To: Linda Whetton <LWHETTON@uc.usbr.gov>
Date: 6/21/2005 3:06:39 PM
Subject: Flow Recommendations from TWG Participants

Linda,

Ted has asked me to forward the responses. re. flow treatments to be discussed for experimental planning exercise in early July at Flag. We received two comments which are appended below:

RESPONSE FROM GLEN KNOWLES

With respect to our discussions of experimental flow at the knowledge assessment workshop next month, we request that GCMRC please portray the Seasonally Adjusted Steady Flow as a legitimate alternative, that it be given equal weight to any other flow alternatives considered, and that it be portrayed as an alternative that has explicit requirements from BR per the 1995 biological opinion.

We also request that the knowledge assessment include a thorough analysis of hydropower, including information on the "cost" of various experimental flow alternatives, both in terms of above-market cost of power resources and relative cost to ratepayers.

RESPONSE FROM MARK STEFFEN

Hi Ted. I guess we were supposed to indicate to you flow alternatives to consider for the LTEP or knowledge assessment workshop by June 8th? I would suggest that we should consider the EIS alternative that was labeled "Moderate Fluctuating Flow Alternative". Some parts of this alternative are attractive to me and I think with some modifications it might be attractive to most stakeholders. Also, as I told Josh, I think it is very important to include the aquatic food base when considering impacts of different flow alternatives.

CC: Ted Melis <tmelis@usgs.gov>, Barbara Ralston <bralston@usgs.gov>