

12/14

(I) G&P

Q - We administer I-S flow its slightly different.
[Auto-administer for I-S flow?]

LH - Answer to Q would be from administrator.
Correl. Rts. - 1933 - Warsaw case

1982 - study

By time I-S flow passed,

Five agencies - Biology, Geomorphology, Connectivity, Water Quality, Hydrology

Early I-S flow dealt w/ water quality. Now
looking @ other types of flows.

% exceedance chart.

July - Aug - Sept - flows would not be there @
85% exceedance level.

G-I
Slide (rel. B/T I-S gages + 20% exceedance would
be).

most times I-S flow is below 20% exceedance

Q - RB - Where's 85%?

LH - S cfs - doesn't show up.

(51-95 period.)

Says that 15% of time was dry...

~~Ohio~~ Louisville slide.

See parts of basis w/ I-S flows - have problems.

If dot has opportunity to protect - could be an
reversible status.

J Turn - Why should I-5 flow be treated differently?

CH - Public mt.

Suggest current statute

RB - What do you suggest?

Mark
Nelson - Bringer (Z) up by Commission next day.

The AB + JL are out to talk to us +
Rep also.

Basic message = go slowly - be careful. Have

I-5 flow that's been there a lot. B/C

agree to anything - make sure it's something

we can fix. We've tried to see if

one way to be proactive, yet not

give away more than we feel we've got.

Always get regulated down. Will be

asking for more in future B/C species

need

If can legally work by DNR 46 Cognitive

of species - willing to look @ it.

Looking for voluntary, integrated habitat
planning for your areas.

RC - Don't know. Willing to listen.

Floyd - are member of 15 member Bd. Willing

to - - GUMP we have in place to

not adequate. If our Bd. looks at -
if will be F/A a yr. from now, considering
redskins, probably wouldn't get red done. If
NOT F/A next January - that there'd be
strong word in Bd. to look @.

RL - Bd = strong feeling I-S flows worked
into something bigger + more than originally.

AB - Why

RL - B/c way administered differently all yr.
Once 2000 needed - was assumption that'd
be end of call a river...

Lloyd - on feelings too.

Don't know & have prob. of flushing
flows in spring. Same flows in July +
Aug. Cause problems.

AB - Don't think they are same flows.

Lloyd - I-S flow should reflect diff. ^{8/11} high
turbulent flows + others.

AB - Purple = approved. for fish community in general
(all months less than 2000?).

North Bd

Had to adjust existing water st. (to take into
acct. that that habitat been in all that time).

Donna Hoover - min. act. for survival

AB - min. act. for use.

RB - What is G+P "willing to do"?

KW - may be willing to "teach" some of the #'s
of these are times we think we
can get by. (w/o giving up too much)
we're willing to look at it if others
willing to give something too.
- otherwise - we have to look to leverage.

AB - Re: irrig - - 35-37000 of "irrig. out. rec
to maintain good
to obtain fish
community."

Just as farmer wants all - may be times
when willing to say "I'll take less
voluntarily so someone else can get
water." Clarity...

KW - See how could be danger in that...

Chad Smith

Bullock - Try to improve shape of the call for water.
Way to get what need in spring + in
summer get lower water?? Why to
shape / support it biologically to give us
more when we need it + the more the
they need it. Case not there yet.

AB - If go down that route - e.g. your "best
science" says the "do" of "X water" -
next step = chg permit?

CS - Depends. If biology holds up + gives benefit -

+ chg of permit only way - maybe do.

AB - other way to do it = indiv. nr. holder makes the call.

E.g. - 1) chg # on permit vs.
2) nr. to call for 3500, but
GTP notes detem. of whether
to call or not.

KN - Q = if you can do that -

AB - if you don't call - we don't have
to administer.

KN - used notes have scientific.

Want in writing whether ~~is~~ administer.

Admin. attractive to us b/c takes
politicians out of it. Dangerous if we
don't have to do anything re: this.

OH - LP flow = fish flow. No one looked @
terms + places to see what does for results.

KN - Set out the plan - Look @ H.C. Don't
mention the 10750+ what people get worked
up over.

CS - if look @ IS flow \$ (only tel we have in door)
want to see you looking @ too.

RC -

AB - We have not see any evidence in long flows that you

could not explain by the drought. Not seeing flows plummeting.

Lloyd - \ chats a Elkhorn have increased.
But - his river flows worry us.

JT - Willing to stop Oala growth?

KN - One forward 4/4 plan.

JT - Asking for P/A 4/4 the designations
Doesn't bring us together at all.

AB - If it fact one up 4 scientific regime re:
flex. re: how administer - satisfy concern?

RC - Don't know. Big thing = way DNR handles
calls - old base flows with new idea
flows are today.
Can't get to your I-S flows. Have to
bring in new water.

RB - Got a increase.

AB - No.

RB - Preventing people from taking anything out
Protecting flows that were never there.
Bottom line = greater I-S flows when only
there 200% - 50% of the. Administering
as though ^{needed} there 100% of the.

AB - We say, if flow = less than what
permit for - well shut off it. Diff.

from saying it has to be there 100% of time.

AD - (D) I asked GWP whether they should consider whether there would be times they wouldn't need full permitted assets in river. For their basis - they say they need to be sure there decision based on good science.

RR - Why not just give what they got?

AB - 962 cited law.

On depth can't refuse admin. of water if it holds does us to.

DL - Adm: 1) how you would treat it when date whether F/A.

- One answer = treat at same level as when granted.

If still have same ar. given - OK - don't have to look @ whether @ full levels.

- if only there 2000-

[look @ when water was avail.
when granted.

AB - That's the proposal I've been talking about
World-City rule of F/A

Rules says "you are F/A if you don't get 65% in June + July." Instead of that, say "we will look @ water

avail. to go. nr. who granted.
So - as long as still getting same to
not P/A

Essentially saying system = not no worse.,
Whatever go. nr. is.

CS- Admin. 100% of tie - but getting more than
100% ... so not P/A.

DT- Something to consider. Don't look @ host go. register -
of would look @ end yr.

AB- Under state law, kept @ can't deny diversion
for use unless pub. ~~interest~~ ^{interest}. So if
App. case is - we don't necessarily
deny interest. Still looking @ host go. nr.,
no matter what it was.

BB- Prob. = making overall big assumption. how
go could be something other than using.

KB- Cuz. criteria.

AB- Why rule is now - if a go. using nr. -
will do the C/R. of go. nr. = etc

Plat - look at.

Didn't put in rule how to
develop SW nr.

CS- Infinite grant nr. ? Econ. test?

JT- Under current rule - nr. able to

be granted until P/A basin = P/A

Lloyd - Serious problem if DNR will issue
gr. it. if only then 58% + test for
P/A = 83%. Don't know if we were
ever @ 83%.

AB - What would that ^{rule} look like?

Lloyd - take consid. of air then @ the
granted + use as part of P/A detem.

RB - Don't look @ "what for"
look @ "what available"

AB - Still need understanding of what to close basin.

CS - Purpose of 85% / 65%??

AB - If you say can control @ ②
sure was right.

Other side of coin: If issue a gr. SW strip,

if eroded it - would be P/A

Control w/ 65, 85 at some ~~level~~ levels.

RB - Just grant new it. here 65% 63%?

AB - not sure have it. to do that.

Ends < private cost? Don't do re: ②

re: state.

Suggesting - continue "for issue only"

re: gr. it. - still 65/83 test unless

was not there for Jr. nor after 962 passed.

JT - more comfortable w/ than than others.

AB - After 962 - if I-S flow less than
prior, wouldn't call basic F/A

RB - Why distinguish B/T B/Y + after 962 -
if going to keep look @ issuing res.
of limit res. res. - & say "not in
best int. unless there first hand".
If great res. only there 20-50% of
the 7 use 83/85 test ---?

AD - Not what saying. ^{your} difficult to pass
law for us to ignore ~~some~~. Why??

Who wouldn't use 69/83 - would my
need 33%.

CG - What about experts.

AB - Same after 962 applied.

BB - Case supports this.

RB - Why not -? SW patented?

BR - makes worse. Not re. way to

approved determine of whether basis = FIA.
Can explain why. Best way to determine.
The "why" = B/c based on CIR

DK Not sure that's what she's saying.

AB Help if you articulate.

DK Use 65/83 for post LB 962 consid.
But if employer use only gets water
35% of the - 35% use would be
what used. No CIR involved.

BB Frequency of occurrence.

AB - If irrigation rate + @ the gate
was less than CIR - use that test -

CS - What about other rules?

AB - Re: other rules - thing DNR struggled 4 -
I-S flow for fish lease.
Eth. Plat lease.

Beef processing lease - are we going to write
rule re: visible amount?

J. Th. - Where new rule = more robust.

AB - Say grant SW diversions to Lloyd +
can divert on average 30 days.
Then - way it would work = would look -
2 yrs down rd. + if can divert - not 7m
of irrig. rate + jr. rate + has to divert
40 days to get 65/83. - but the

grates could divert 100 days - dg of just
go by whether or exposed - you'd be #1.

BB - can get water re: approx.

Test = in law re: what can divert under it.

AB - Rt. #1 = B.U. can be 100% satisfied of
gets for 40 days

Don't get volume - be great rate.

BB - Antiquely determining.

AB - Whatever B.U. -

has use = divert 40 days

When grates or. Don't have volume
etc. ~~to~~ ^{than} norm. of 30 days/yr.

You could, B/C availability of rent
→ so it erodes - #1.

~~#1~~ - dg or could be satis. 100% of p years + period.
Then can say H-C degraded.

AB - Re: what when grates it -
if gave a rate.

Can divert 320 - needs an W.

New well devel.

only divert 300 -

J. Th. - Qualifies ~~ness~~ things up.

DK - Some e.g.'s not helpful.

AB - I-S flows not the issue.

BB - Allow to be true the operators
wasn't there.

Rt. = 1 qd. every day.

not supposed to use if not for B.U.
most irrig. only take what need to
water crop.

AB By looking @ just the rates, would be saying
40 test - could've taken 720 last
yr.

Concern: "any time rt. determined = a
prob." - might not be true.

Use 6/5/83 for irrig. - BUT if jr. who
issued doesn't recd - use what's available.
Write up

KW - Curtin to ~~look~~ @ species? Or rule
AB would chg. rule - not statute.

Diff. BT admin. S + LW effect of rev well

AB to write it up.

Lloyd - Re: Elton basin - feel all yrs shut
off 2 Jls - Aug. B/c of that.
Then when you determine P/A what look @
what's status of 6/5/83 - but what
water avail. to the enclosed since graded.

AB - Q Kirk asking = unanswered - want to see
G + P look @ whether can work with the folks
re < diff. way to call for water?

RB - Yes - water.

EW - Give informal reading for Bd.

ST - My Bd says "no"

RB - Was do Imp - ~~to~~ F/A.

KW - Don't know if we have flexibility elsewhere
b/c of Coop Agre.

DK - Don't fill Elwood b/c of Z-S Plan