TOPIC: Engineering Committee Meeting - Topeka

DATE: 7-31-2007

FILE UNDER: RR Engineering Committee 2007

YES / NO

Our primary purpose: explain cBCU calculation
- graphics
- spreadsheet / revised table
- language change in Appendix C

⇒ Is this something that the engineering committee can recommend to RRCA?

1. Stipulation says I not part of cBCU
2. Appendix C doesn't separate U_c & I_c
3. Should be using 4th model run
   - Demonstrate IWS credit runs
   - Current cBCU runs (note I_c)
   - Proposed cBCU runs (I_c not there)
4. Accounting difference 12k / year

Question on basin boundary - excess wells since I not in cBCU calculation

HCL Evap split - under advisement
cREP / EDP www.dnr.ne.gov/download/rrca/rrca_06/

TOPIC: Engineering Committee Meeting - Topeka

DATE: 7·31·2007

FILE UNDER: Engineering Committee 2007

PAGE: 2 of 9

Attendees

Megan - is on the phone

George Austin
Scott ~~Rose~~
Jim Williams
Sam Perkins
Mike Thompson
Paul Koester
Jim Schneider
Dave Barfield

Dave

USER'S MANUAL

- An assignment from last year
- We have documentation for the model (GW Data (preprocessors, programs etc
- We will advise re changes in acdt
- We don't have non-model data documented so we need a cook book for future generations.
- Mostly the data on the input page
- → We are to create a memorandum & trade with the others

Me - we can do a page by RBCA
" a have a detailed memo by the end of the year

Megan - has nothing today; could get something by the 1st

TOPIC: Eng. Mtg in Topeka

DATE: 7-31-2007

FILE UNDER: Engineering Committee

Dave — KS has a single SW rights system

It would be nice to show some progress

Jim W — Committed to at least an outline by the meeting

Spreadsheet handoff –

Mike sent it out late Friday without model data. NE & Federal Data is in.

Agreed to finish with Preliminary data first; Paul still working to finalize info for NE

Megan agreed to add Harlan Canal info

Disputed Items

Dave — Non-Federal Reservoir below Harlan
– NE has not provided a memorandum formally – Our legal people should prepare a brief or memorandum on the subject to provide to the other members.
(I described overall thinking on this)

Dave — "We'll just have to let this playout."

Settlement talks were confidential
– Reports on model were developed States & Master chose to keep confidentiality in effect.
– Therefore we can't discuss why it reads the way it does – it's not inconsistent.

TOPIC: Engr Mtg. in Topeka

DATE: 7·31·2007

FILE UNDER: Engineering Committee 2007

Dave:

We need to see if we can exchange confidential briefs

Jim Cook was not involved in the settlement - it was Coelyon, Roger, & Ann

We have this assignment to do the accounting. An obligation of the settlement is to complete the accounting using the procedures in place at the time

Propose: follow the current procedure, and then document our disagreement with it.

(This is an order of the court and we do not want to be blamed for not complying with the order)

HCL Evap

KS view is that current accounting does not deal with situation where just one state takes H_2O

Reason why it's inappropriate to charge KS w/ 100% of evap. Evaporation will be born by the state in which reservoir resides

→ There are many benefits accruing to Nebraska aside from strict sw irrigation benefits.

→ Dave will send an email with bullet points to us.

George — Pointed out that if we remove the Imported H_2O from the model then we need to change the % recharge from pumping to remove the positive effects from imported H_2O

Dave — (discussion) We need to consider the proposal carefully to see if what NE is alleging is actually occurring

Willem — What is the result?

Jim — 16 K AF / year. The difference is Growing over the years

Willem — Why? & Where & when does it occur?

(discussion)

Phone Comment — Pumping consumption doesn't change - it's either on or off. What we have defined as I consumed is a difference in storage, ET, etc...

(discussion etc)

Dave — I need to have my modelers look at this. We'll have to be persuaded that there's a real problem here to fix. We're not there yet.

(Dave / Jim / Paul clarified where the mound area recharge is taking place)

Willem — The issue is not whether we're pumping imported H_2O or not - it's what difference does it make to the stream?

Sam, Willem — Discussion of storage, etc.?
<Discussion>

Willem — Lee Wilson came up w/ this way of doing the credit and the other states agreed to it.

In the accounting we are only interested in changes to stream flow.

Jim — (Described how we got to this point. Eg, turn off one NRD at ~~another~~ a time and add them up, then you get a different answer compared w/ turning them all off @ same time. --

<Discussion etc.>

Dave — <Settlement has the credit. We agreed. Some of this is technical, some is legal there is a legal question: what was the deal, how did we get there, what were the trade offs>

<Clarification of our proposed runs>

Willem pointed out that we are asking ~~wh~~ for a double accounting

Dave — Talked about confidentiality, etc.

Willem — May be something to this, but not convinced. Can you put together a specific runs showing exactly what we are proposing?

Dave — Procedurally we need more information to evaluate this. We'll have to evaluate - -

TOPIC: Engineering Committee Mtg in Topeka

DATE: 7-31-2007

FILE UNDER: RR Eng. Committee 2007

Dave

At this point were not convinced it's broken. We would have to be compelled to believe that it's broken.

12:55

Lunch

13:45 52

Mark Billinger joined us for a restart

Mike Thompson described our CREP & EQIP summary reports

discussion of start dates, lengths of contracts
→ who's checking on these & how we need to check

→ CREP: start in 2005 for a few
" " 2006 " many
EQIP: start in 2004, or at least by theend of 2004

* We need to proceed to a GIS coverage of CREP & EQIP - SCAN FIRST

Mark

d Are you tracking transfers of allocations eg- certified acres not included in CREP recombined into a windshield wiper pivot

~~Moving~~ Combining pieces together into offset for an ethanol plant

They are moving unused allocation off of CREP

Scott asked Megan about documentation
→ She'll provide a shape file of acres (soon)

→ Add documentation requirements to user's manual
Where we got the data from, etc.

George — ¿ How often do we need to update our databases?
Annually ?

Mike — These contracts bracket irrigation databases
We need to have a sunset date entered into the database. Then we just need to add to it each year

George — So can we include this information with 4/15 data exchange.

Mike — We can do this easily with a couple of fields added to our database

Return Flow Recharge Methodology

Dave — We don't believe 20% recharge is appropriate
KS uses 13.2%
KS believes their own # is too high
He doesn't have the data to press the issue at this meeting, but wanted to bring it up.
¿ Do we think it's reasonable?

Scott — ¿ Can we come up with a methodology to study the issue?

TOPIC: Engineering Meeting in Topeka | DATE: 7-31-2007

FILE UNDER: BR Engineering Meetings 2007 | PAGE: 9 of 9

In KS recharge is tied to % system

George

Dave asked if we're using meters - described
KS agreed that when they go to volume
meters they see a drop of 15% to 20%

KS: if an irrigator reports odd numbers
then they call them and ask.

Dave

Stipulation requires that CO meter 10%
of the wells starting in 2005.
→ Megan dropped off the call.

Willem's Contract - agreed to extend
another year

Non-federal reservoir evap below Harlan
- Mike Thompson showed where to
find the numbers on the website

Dave

Settlement requires that we submit
augmentation plan to engineering committee
prior to implementation of plan.

15:30 Adjourn