

**Anderson, Skyler@Waterboards**

---

**From:** Margaret Tauzer - NOAA Federal <margaret.tauzer@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 09, 2016 6:39 PM  
**To:** Bean, Caitlin@Wildlife; Anderson, Skyler@Waterboards  
**Subject:** MMR another iteration of spreadsheet  
**Attachments:** 20160509StanshawCole.zip

Hi Skylar and Caitlin,

I added one more cell to input whether hydro is returned to Stanshaw Creek (cell N38). If you enter "0" then no diversion is given to hydro. Otherwise enter "100" and the other rules apply (i.e. 2 cfs bypass at POD and .90Q at highway 96).

I did this because I got a call from Wil asking how much flow could be diverted now that Stanshaw Creek has lowered to 7 cfs. On the spreadsheet, since hydro isn't returned N38=0, making the diversion consumptive use only. Wil is thinking that if the diversion is less than 10% of existing flow then it doesn't need to be returned (with streamflow at 7 cfs, he would divert 0.7 cfs to not be returned). That becomes more of a water rights question because it would meet the fisheries needs but would be more than the consumptive need only.

Let me know if Wil is correct in that Coles could divert with no return as long as they are meeting the 2 cfs bypass and the .90 of unimpaired Q at highway 96. I would have to adjust the spreadsheet to reflect that.

Margaret











