Table 3D-3. Habitat Impact Analysis Criteria for Parker and Walker Creeks Based on a Modified Tennant Method for Maintaining Various Levels of Habitat Conditions

Habitat Condition	Parker Creek		Walker Creek	
	April-September Flow (cfs)	October-March Flow (cfs)	April-September Flow (cfs)	October-March Flow (cfs)
Fair[a]	$25.2	$25.2	$15.0	$15.0
Good[b]	19.0	19.0	11.3	11.3
Excellent[b]	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6
Optimum	7.6	7.6	4.5	4.5
Outstanding	7.6[c]	5.0	4.5[c]	3.0
Excellent	6.3	3.8	3.8	2.3
Good	5.0	2.5	3.0	1.5
Fair (degrading)	3.8	1.9[d]	2.3	1.2[d]
Poor (minimum)	1.3	1.3	0.8	0.8
Severe degradation	<1.3	<1.3	<0.8	<0.8

[a] Fair habitat conditions were assumed for flows equal to or exceeding Tennant's flushing or maximum flow recommendations (200% of mean annual flow).

[b] Good and excellent habitat conditions were assumed for flows between Tennant's optimum and flushing or maximum flow recommendations.

[c] Omitted from habitat impact analyses because of overlap with optimum habitat condition.

[d] Tennant's fair habitat conditions were identical to poor habitat conditions; consequently, the midpoint between poor and good habitat conditions was calculated and labeled fair for greater resolution.