

7/11

In-stream Flow Mtg.

Frank Albrecht.	Chad Smith	Jim Nellor.
Kirk Nelson	Dennis Schutt	Ron Bishop
Hutch	Russ Cella	Kent Miller

I Rules Hearing - Date - Place

II G+P Proposal.

- Walk-thru
- Discussion
- \textcircled{I} 's. to resolve.

Kirk - walk thru

RB - you said ALL have to do preplanning -
proposal doesn't

KN - \textcircled{I} = how many days.

AB - LL says "preplan" LP says "no"

BB - \textcircled{I} = "affected NRD"

KN - LL = 4 mi 1 day - his preplanning.
Elkhorn = 5 days.

BB - sly LP - then only LP NRD...

KN - just the NRD "close to being F/A"

Hutch - I-S Flow = for 15 yr. period...

AB - LL is 4 mi 2 day criteria & LP NOT -
in that situation - just LL preplan?

So by "affected" - mean NRD 4 mi x days
of F/A...

FA - 2 days - LL - still drive by LP itself &
not on LP...

AB - I < Flow not driven...

FA - How wide look at?

If just planning for 1 purpose - very
different purpose...

CS - Counsel = cost not wide... otherwise -
if not working 7 say that we e.g. 3 days
out...

FA - If wide UE / LE UL / LPN /
LPS

RB - That's the Q...

FA - See if can address 70 going too far.

AB - If LPN = 8 days away... + LL = $\frac{1}{2}$
2 day limit - reality = 2 yrs. from
now would say LL likely to be $\frac{1}{4}$ -
but LPN not likely to be so for a
while. So maybe do start out - even
the whole system...

FA - Give formula used...

RC - 6 day diff bit long + Elbham.

KN - Mora = stiller. + plan "preplanning"

(I)

AB - Put as option...

De (I) - what are benefits of this?

CS - Concerns re: admin. of I-S flow will
Cause $\frac{1}{4}$ deten... Our work to try to
collaborate - avoid run to legis + do
what's right. Proposal a way to try
to keep people working together...

Proposal sets way to collaborate 40 legis.

RC - If did mora + up in 1 day - doesn't

with of other NRDS don't want to sign.
CS- Good point. Cross answer = don't want
other NRDS trying to do something w/
I-S flow so others not doing
thing were trying to avoid (P) I think
we should craft broader,

ADD- maybe not prefer - but sign off on
"won't let or do other stuff"

KN- Can see why a prob. of preplanning. ADD- "Detritus"

AB- Benefits?

RC- Already there -

CS- Done it but will be F/A anyway?

RC- Yes - so close. Mother Nature not helping.

When get to July-Aug. - don't think was
intent I-S flow be there @ that time.

That's the potential benefit.

AB- So - see less admin. during irrig. season
as benefits

CS- #3 - 2 yr grace period - So far
next 2 yrs. I-S flow will
cause you to be F/A

RC- Our work will be done in this 2 yrs -
will have a plan by time it comes

off. Mon. will probably disappear
& be replaced by regulation. (Will
be non's - probably in one areas -

permanent - but temporary non will be gone.)

RB- Don't see much diff. P/T that + what
we're doing in our area. So 2 yr.
delay not that big a deal.

RC- Start to allow devel. where we think
it can 40 jumping thru hoops.

AB- Wait while for Govt to re-look @
flow regime.

RC- Maybe to SW users.

BB- no guar. till go down.

RB- If goes down - what's process?
If all flows reduced by 25% - what's
process?

AB- Govt could act to avoid permit
if down in summer - but ↑ @ some
other time - would need to ask for
add'l for "other time" + go thru process.

RC - Don't see benefit of signing I'd agree
if we've already done - gives us an other
person to go thru. Don't like cutting out
Dennis... but.

CS- Concerns = (R) @ table? 2 more days
beneficial...

1) Shouldn't be add'l work if already doing it.
Maybe have NRDs were talking about -
included in 2 yr. period of review
& not ask for it.

AB- Current NRD Rules - if DNR thought
could do job - may start off 1/A data.

KN -

more ←

LLNRD

UENRD

ULNRD

LENRD

LPNNRD

LPSNRD

Papio NRD

→ preplanning interest present.

AB - What would preplanning look like for groups or Rt.?

RC - All are in on EL model except Papio NRD.

FA - Connectivity... How long a process?

AB - Initial model by next fall - yrs. for data.

KN - Could be more time - begin preplanning...

Why fighting?

RC - Just want it right...

KN - we pg. deal - get out what you want.

Disintegrate if go to legis.

Benefits - not that far apart.

AB - "Get it right"?

RC - Preplanning doesn't scare me. What does "review" mean?

if all have to sign off - don't think will fly. Why not just I sign off?

AB - How decide if preplanning good enough?

KN - Ord. NRDs decide what Bd's can do.

All upon sustainability. Need good faith effort. If USES study - that might be preplanning. Maybe don't sign anything.

CS - (P) to sign is to be sure don't have to fight off attempt to chg. I. S. flow

AB - Delay of law re: FIA deten. - so need to sign.

PA - Muni use on Lower Platte.
MUD - reduced recharge?
Lincoln's - what date?

AB - Lincoln - not approved for reduced recharge yet - some dates back to 60's.

FA - Even if reduced 25% - of muni needs - how much?

AB - RC - Big factor.

FIA - Have to have approp. Has to protect recharge for wells depend on return flow - so recharge big.

FA - So much demand - need to work together. Well use & muni use on Lower Platte.

AB - Louisa + Elkhorn not FIA in + of selves - it's fact their trib to Platte that brings them in. A frustration.

RB - + demand is for I-S Flow.

City of Lincoln 200 cfs. to recharge 100 cfs peak. Small compared to I-S flow.

Dennis Secketer - We were 6 months ago -

if go thru process of recall + LE doesn't want to do - but city #'s -

how differentiate - are for UE +

are for LE ?? city any dist.

signs off - city #'s @ Louisa?

AB - Study would city #'s + of G+P city.

can happen if sign off or not. Until #'s do
by - LL being F/A doesn't mean others would be.
Potential advantage of working together = trying
to do some regional planning. If could work
together...

RB- Proposing study + do 40 requiring districts
to sign on?

KN- may be what we end up w/.

RB- Could do formally like pallid sturgeon
report.

DB- Collab. effort to do this instead of
pallid sturgeon report to do this.
Sees a mix of "Can we get non-
but what we really want = basin
wide. Including I-5 flows."

KN- mass hysteria.

RD- better NOT to go this route if want to
avoid hysteria. If just do I-L K
w/ dists. + power to evaluate I-5 flows"
don't trigger

RC- We're not into already. We're already
doing.

RB- All are - including Pajaro.

RC- LE - looking @ gradual tid - all
cost. All covs in wheel

RB- This approach doesn't target all
people. Don't target just listed NRP's
& trunks - that. There's - other -

like us, if not for your I-S flows -
I'd wager basin below Elm Creek
would not be F/A. It's put us in shape
you want to give RC a 2 yr. extension

Better off to enter agree w more than
just those who are w in 2 days.

FA - Who would agree. be w?

RB - Is - nuni's in an area...

AB - All the way up Platte?

RB - Not sure all the way up - but at least
give the option.

RC - Don't think nuni's would let this go
then b/c of flows July + Aug.

RB - So need to involve nuni's.

CS - What kind of insulation so that it
not subject to being undone in legs...?

AB - Broseer investigation/planning study re:
what's needed to meet F+WC / Power/etc
study = "Have I-S flow. Set aside +
take fresh look @ species + nuni
needs + how insure upstream?"
Correct?

KN - Will be as broad as that.

RB - Initially?

KN - One open up - will get everyone involved

RB - That could start more focused re:

I-S flow...

KN- But in interim - have ~~the~~ reshaping
Lion.

AB- They've done a lot of studies.

RB- Good model. Separate (I)

AB- "What do critics need" as start &
see what comes out

CS- Don't presuppose end result

KN- NRDS help like did in pallid sturgeon TF?

RB- We would be.

DS- > We would be.

RC-

AB- Could involve cities & power.

CS- major subcom. evolve to I S TF

AB- We'd be instigator - but different set of people

RB- Tied in NPTF as long as they exist.

Senators - if legis needed - will rely on TF.
if it comes out of there - expect not
to participate.

KN- Need more study - largely. Good in
first...

CS- Reshape I-S flow = cutting edge. Fairly
innovative - will take some effort.

AB- Say - put together study group + funds.

Anything else we need? More re;

FIA data - or see where it goes

til get this done.

RC- Don't do til have.

AB- Don't see how can not admin. SW res-
only way - are there times when G+P
would not need to see flows net?

KN- Next Cognate = how many SW res grant.
in near time.

FA- 962 handles a...

CS- If happens - people will still be had. Wait help.
Tough part.

AB- As long as you have approval + call for water -
unless we can say it's a waste - we have
no choice.

KN- If we say we won't make a call as
long as everyone @ stable + contributing.
Would be informal. And testimony + people
understand can't be used against us at
hearing.

AB- Your decision to not res: als.
If you could see to not call @ certain
times...

KN- Would get you off the legal books

JN- Were in regard of sustainability. That's hard.
1/2 of NPS having increased GW level over 20 yrs -
hard to tell the res: now. People in decline
areas - not hard to say.

AB- 1226 - need for LL to request now a SW.

RE- (nodded - intend to request for DNR).

AD- G+P willing to do - would like some assurance
of no challenge for NPS re: I-5 flow for

new future.

RB - Don't think any of us can speak for NRDS... ,

AB - Talk to Bbs + NRDS?

RB - Yes.

CS - For TF + if something pops up (legis.) we know we can count on that interference will be removed: "We're looking at."

RM - Polling Sturgeon?

KN - Started @ 5 yrs. Ended @ 7.

BB - This is 2 yrs - + you need info.

RB - most of info re: I-5 flow based on 3 study sites.

LH - Fed. experts to give of. re: whether
- how studies ?
- enough info for us. ?

RB - A few stretches had info.

LA - Correct.

RC - How long to come up w/ idea?

LH - I-L K / funding - takes time - Take
get into - 2 yrs. not enough...

RC - Just scope?

AB - GOP + DNR get \$ to try to get
scope to scope + try to get Agree. ^{B/H}
participants - look @ scope + look @
how much \$ + timeline... ,

LH - might be idea

KN - By End. Trust Fund request deadline... ,
Get back together in late August?

RB- Shell?

KN- 1) Scope of work
2) I-L K.

AB- Scope looked @ again by people that
sign I-L K.

KN- may be small effort this yr.
TF = 8/23?

AB- Don't know if need to worry about TF
now. before of effort.
G+P = major effort re: contact
efforts.

BB- Work on collab effort if want
NPPD involved. Collab effort - or
involve in funding ~~the~~ G+P?
Put together people NOW of collab.
effort.

Looking @ lower river - most knowledgeable.

AB- 1) Tech. Group put together
2) Dragg Coop. Agree.

RB- Jim C. can put together in his sleep.

KN- Glen Johnson + LeRoy Sievers put
together pallid sturgeon we.

BB- Whole lower Platte River not here.

Coalition? Think re: how to bring
others into it. Who does city of
Fritch want.

AB- TF not (I). Players are. need to

JWSF
I-L K

⊗

find time. ... Don't know if can get done
by Sept. Env. Trust deadline.

AB - ENKA - is place to go:

ENWRA - Pappas - LPS - LPN - Elkhorn -
Woods. (?)

Group to initiate studies in Lower Platte.

PA - Studies?

RB - GW studies.

AB - Suggest find time in August to
schedule mtg. NKDs talk to counterparts -

G & P go to Bd. DNR help any way can

write up concept in genl form Re:

what trying to do here. (AB to

draw + send initial concept). +

see if there's any sign on.

Give meeting to NKDs to see if
interest in coming to meeting.

RB - Looked into proposal?

KN - We're giving a lot. We've taken
on about all.

AB - make part of agree.

CS - Re: not going to legis.

See if can put together meeting

no one will go after.

RB - Looked into G & P choosing all experts?

LH - Has to be cooperative.

RB - Collaborative will get buy-in.

KN - Discussion is lively. Bylaws - &

happens unless group agrees. Not consensus -
But.

AB - Basis -

i) I L K

A) - Collaboration to scope study of
(F&W needs of LPlitt).

By all signs of ILK

B) - Everyone agrees to fund certain
amount.

C) - Scope study - the decision point
whether to move on w/ study or scope.

D) - Define timeline agreed to -
"ending date."

E) - During period - parties agree
not to mount legal challenge
of permit or attempt to chg. law.

⊗ happens by DNR during period.

Parties

CPNRD

TPNRD

TBNRD

UBBNRD

NPPD

Central

Long Pub Power

Leitch

Oron

GI

Keener

Frenot (Lyle Gill?)

AB to write up & send out
Who will discuss 4 other NRDS?

RC - Will throw it out to D-5 ones
tomorrow.

AB - Km + Kent to U-5 ones.
DNR will talk to cities.

RC to talk to LLNRD - ULNRD -
WE NRD - LENRD - ~~LENRD~~ LPNNRD - LPSNRD -
& Papiro

AB - Bullet points will be set tonight.

BB to contact power groups.

Expect representative @ next mtg.

BB - need meeting scoped out

AB - to talk to JK re: interlocal agreement.

GAP to ID folks looking @ for experts

KN - For tech. Committee

KN - meet B/4 then for scope? Come up
w/ schematics to talk about scope.

BB - Agree. Can put together group.

Revised John Shadle

KN - Chaperish - mark Payton

KN - Huter good re: tech groups
Open with 1st meeting - Rough
draft - scope

Out ahead of the so can
look @ - some of I L K.

RC - Pollid Sturgeon group = good start point.

AB- mtg. dates.

~~_____~~

10/3 - Met - 1:30 p.m. @ NPPD Auditorium, in Kearny.

"In-Stress Flow Study Group"

(after COMYST mtg - which is earlier in day).

BB- Re: F/A (I)'s -

AB- This group?

RB- Concerns?

BB - of non-irrig. st. - how does F/A go?

From SW perspective - are 1950 st.

being harassed by only looking @ jr. irrig.
st.

of petition to re-look - 65/85.

of not Plate - less concerned re: 65/85.

period of yrs. (I). - needs to be based
on water supply + ability to meet
approps.

model will help figure out what SW

requests are for your people st.

up o SW models tied to GW Q's -

don't know how we address.

How do you know effect of well

on SW st.? How carry down

→ I-S flow #? Big Q...

(*)

AB + BB will discuss + see where need to go

BB - need tools + don't have yet.

Don't have tool to implement ND Plan
either. No way to relate to target flows
or water rts.

Whether L Plate or C Plate - a
missing link.