

Yolanda Sandoval

From: William Peck
Sent: Monday, July 04, 2005 11:16 AM
To: kbid@courtlnd.net
Subject: Re: Fw: 2006 Estimated Water Supply Availability

Kenny,

That is correct, the January estimate will be 2 inches greater under both last year and five-year average inflow conditions if the present storage is left in the reservoir. Using the "93-level development" inflows the estimate would differ by a little more than one inch.

The reason for the difference in the "93-level development" is that less water will be available from the sediment pool to be used for irrigation. If we were to experience "93-level development" inflows the reservoir level increases into the irrigation pool (above 1932.5). The sediment pool is shared under water short years and the amount given to the irrigation interest is based on how short the supply is (sliding scale). In other words, the shorter the supply the large portion of the sediment pool the district gets (as you can see it does not make a large difference, but an inch can be significant under these extreme shortages). I guess another way of looking at this is if we were to have a banner year and the lake would happen to fill to a point where we would not be in a water short year, the districts water supply would be unaffected by what is left in the lake because none of the sediment pool would be available for your use.

Bill

>>> "KBID" <kbid@courtlnd.net> 7/4/2005 10:50:34 AM >>>

Bill, I'm still debating the merits of taking the Harlan County water with Spud Hobson. We have went back to this e-mail from you. If I understand correctly, the 2" would be carried over to the next year under both the 2004 inflow and the five year average scenario. The only one which wouldn't work that way would be the 1993 level inflows which I don't quite understand but do not need an explanation at this time.

Am I correct in this? The question Spud keeps hitting me with if we don't use this water will we loose it for next year. Under both of your examples, next years supply is 2" higher if we don't use this year.

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

From: "KBID" <kbid@courtlnd.net>
To: "KBID" <kbid@courtlnd.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2005 7:32 AM
Subject: Fw: 2006 Estimated Water Supply Availability

>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "William Peck" <WPECK@gp.usbr.gov>
> To: <kbid@courtlnd.net>
> Cc: "Craig Scott" <CSCOTT.6MCC.ibr6dm10@gp.usbr.gov>; "Marvin Swanda"
> <MSWANDA.6MCC.ibr6dm10@gp.usbr.gov>
> Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2005 4:46 PM
> Subject: 2006 Estimated Water Supply Availability

>
>
>> Kenny, per our conversation earlier today, we have worked up some numbers
>> comparing the 2006 Estimated Water Supply based on various inflow
> conditions and
>> the decision to release from Harlan County Dam.
>>
>> 1.A. If we assume inflows similar to 2004 throughout the remainder
>> of
the
> year
>> and no irrigation release from Harlan County, the January 2006
>> estimated
> farm
>> delivery would be approximately 3 inches.
>> 1.B. If we assume inflows similar to 2004 throughout the remainder
>> of
the
> year
>> and irrigation releases are made during 2005, the January 2006
>> estimated
> farm
>> delivery would be approximately one inch.
>>
>> 2.A. If we use the last five-year average inflows throughout the
> remainder of
>> the year and no irrigation release is made from Harlan County, the
January
> 2006
>> estimated farm delivery would be approximately 4.5 inches.
>> 2.B. If we use the last five-year average inflows throughout the
> remainder of
>> the year and irrigation releases are made during 2005, the January
>> 2006 estimated farm delivery would be approximately 2.5 inches.
>>
>> 3.A. If we use '93 level inflows' and no irrigation release is made
from
>> Harlan County, the January 2006 estimated farm delivery would be
> approximately
>> 8.0 inches (utilizing some storage above the sediment pool).
>> 3.B. If we use '93 level inflows' and irrigation releases are made
during
>> 2005, the January 2006 estimated farm delivery would be
>> approximately
7.0
> inches
>> (utilizing some storage above the sediment pool).
>>
>> 4. Using the average annual evaporation rate at today's lake level
>> of
> 1929.7

> > feet the lake would lose approximately 28,400 acre-feet. The annual loss
> to
> > evaporation using the average annual rate and the shutoff elevation
> > of
> 1928.17
> > feet would be 26,500 acre-feet. The 2,000 acre-feet difference in
> evaporation
> > loss would be significantly less than the 12,000 acre-feet that
currently
> exist
> > between elevation 1929.7 and 1928.17. This is a pretty rough
> > estimate
but
> > should illustrate that if irrigation releases are not made the
> > storage
> will not
> > all be lost to evaporation.
> >
> > Let us know if you have additional questions or comments.
> >
> > Bill
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>
>
>