

3/3

Agenda

1) Review potential rule changes.

AB - Chgs. to draft.

net crop irrig. water req. = Derrel Martin's working.

CIR can mean a lot of things.

Average irrigator - means "how much put on land."

⊕ [TAKE AWAY THE EFFICIENCY (E)'S - WATER DELIVERED THAT GETS TO THE CROP.

AB - What is "available" to the plant.

NOT ET - includes one thing

plant may not have been using.

DK - Take out losses to get to field.;

AB - Correct

DK - "Divert evap water" - at stream or
wherever to meet CIR.

So OK.

AB - IF canal - make sure evap gets to field to take care of. Have to put loss into equation.

DK - How do gated pipes / canals pivot work w/ this?

AB - Go back to Derrel's report. to see what

Ref. to watch

RB - Above + beyond any losses.

DK - Sep. from method you use. Doesn't matter whether getted pipe / pivot. - works.

AB - Just want to be sure methodology matches what doing.

DK - Not in FN - in Rule.

AB - Dist was 40 page rule.

DK -- will see what measuring & where.

Rule should explain principles.

AB - Rule based on average efficiencies.

BB. Need to understand mechanics.

RC - Define as legal def. See what I wanted re: work.

DK - Problem is the footnotes & trying to clarify what it means.

AB - Assuming average soil & ~~water~~ run off - you have to get 65/85. Do you??

Assuming things.

RC - Dist that map takes into account stored moisture.

DK - "net" not an issue 'til you brought it up.

AB - 1226 - Re: concepts - "best avail. methodology available." & SUFF doc to allow indep. replication.

ADD - (I) re: having consistent req. B/T Rule + Regs.

(X)

AB - Take it out of rule + explain it in Report.

DH - Q re: "fully wettest."

Chg. re: "given res would have been able to divert last 20 yrs."

AB - Explained - "Given current levels of development, would we have been F/A?"

BB - Q re: use of 20 yrs. when 70-2000 were 28 wettest yrs.

Cover re: by the decline F/A - is really -O-A.

AB - Can dem see benefit of doubt a trst.

Chg. re: if inq. st. didn't meet 65/85 - 2nd step is to look at expectation ~~it~~ @ priority data. ~~was of~~ if still meet - OK. if NOT - F/A.

DK - 2 20-yr. periods - need to look @ ① # of days + ② ht. of approp. Not st. to just use # of days task

AB - Assumption = able to divert @ 1700 a day we can divert. Note that assumption "k no way to know how much avail. @ present... Know not always true.

AB - Fixed

DK - Editorial.

"Water rts" or "permit" → vs. "appropriation" - use later.

• Chg. re: jr. rt. NOT inq. rt.

Chad S. - make DK's chg. here too.
improvement.

LH - "diverted" ?

ADD - (I) re: "determined to be sufficient for purposes of the water rt." may be (I)
re: Notice

AB - may need to talk out "standard of interference" language. B/c we won't be doing that.

LH - Q re: # days.

RB - Test for hydro ~~as~~ as volume?

DK -

BA - more concerned w/ "lost jr. rt." vs. "lost Sr. rt."

AB - (I) re: jr. rt.

AB - look @ each one - where re. not irrig. rt

DH - work w/ permit holder re: standard - if
can find - do this as full-book.

DK - Comments. No standard out there.
OK w/ orig. language

AB - What to do w/ I-S flow?

OK - write a standard approp. for use.

< Deleted the proposed chg. re: non-irrig.
rts. >

Chg. re: "purged" def. - do re: clarify^{B/C}
SDF method.

AB - Approx 10/50 - key is what use on each
side of equation.

Not "consumed" but "removed from water
table that doesn't go back."

⊗ { Need to figure out what you are doing
that ~~is~~ indicates planning necessary.

RB / DK - Don't need. Raises Q's by highlighter.

Delete def. re: "pumped"

DK - Formatting (I) re: B+C

OR

def. conditions are A B or C., F/A..

BB - Wants to review revised version.

AB - Tentatively ok?

DK - Yes - reluctantly.

AB - need to use for next report.

RB - 10/50 go to 28/40?

AB - no.

BB - no (I) 4 "gr. rt."

< B/C rule says "any rt." >

Agenda

2) NGVP

LH - Concept re: how NRPS could do
proactive planning.

UNRD has taken step.

Also - reshaping I S flow approp.
If legal + good science ~~set~~ behind.

JN - Ask N Long to adjust who fill
reservoir?

LH - no - pavement done - could play
into the mix.

AB - 3 as subset of 1? ?

LH - Potential to adjust LPPD to
get better base flow test / take pressure
off yrs.

AB - Concept appropriate to look at in an
IMP process.

State - wide rule would be
difficult.

Discuss w/ LG + LL NRDS -
Does lead to #1 - preplanning -
what does that look like?

LL NRD + Nevada have or are
considering 2 yr. work. Assume
other pre - planning...

RL - Yes don't know what looks like yet.

AB - What preplanning needed to satisfy
concern?

LH - Q we have too.

AB - What do you have to have?

Chad - Imp?

AB - Diff. B/r Imp + Imp under F/A??

RC - DNR not involved.

ADD - Not imp - but under right area. S-H
concept not there...

RC - Don't know that it want my rights plan to be "Every
CS - How tall tree to do... by F/A.

AB - Re: #1 - LEND has already done.

RC - LEND - can't speak for the.

"Brain NRDs initiate preplanning in
consultation w/ ~~the~~ G + P + DNR."

of do #2 - NRDs will include
DNR + G+P in process of discussing...

CS - Why statute?

Remind "dir tip triggers if
do voluntary planning" ??

AB - I-S flow causes tip of
trigger, but preplanning is underway.

but try trigger % of I-S flow

CS - yes - allows time to stage
IS flow + basin wants a
planing to avoid P/A.,

AB - Close in UNRD.

80's - 90's = wet. Do drop off
'85 + pick up 2005 - will
want closer to being P/A.

Concern = how much erosion to I-S
flows do you accept - intent?

CS - Concern was 4 statute cty
Agree could erode.
Ctying statute would be worse
than allowing some erosion.

DH - Re: concept #1 - earlier we get
stated + water wells + understand
hydrology + irrig. acres - the better.
Some NRDs going for - but also a
election yr.
Remove barriers + be sure DNR #
not restricted to areas already
reported.

AB - chg NRDS initiate pre-planning -
G+P will initiate consid. of
restoring flows and basin unit
be F/A b/c of I-S flow.
[Apply rule & of process initiated -
NOT F/A]

It - continues to be erosion what happens?

AB - maybe an "basin preplanning including
a moratorium."

RC - Can't any agree w/ that. We've already
done.

CS - Timelines instead of now??

RB - Shut down Pagan WRD?
Reg. Imp of 40 yrs. off?

CS - Any of covered they'll be in a next
report.

BB - Q re: when it would work.

Revisions

need stat. chg. to do.

AB - Will send out w/ rule chg for further
discussion.

RB/CS - Proposal becomes the revision
AB prepared.

LH - G+P wants to think about one more.

BB - 2A + 2B explained?

LH - Need to work w/ DNR.

AB - Could reshape if no request to go
above current limit.

But cues of request were for e.g.
streamflow.

Cue in for revision of IS Flow 4
w/ok that people won't object...

CS - "legally achievable & ecologically justified"
is betwixt.

RB/Km - Was to delete G+P experts.

AB - on for now w/ "???" need to
think about one more.

Understood a major stumbling block...

Meaty: ① Finalized rule dgy.
② Cue to agreement on language

4/18 10 A m Meaty.