

Williams, Jim

From: Barfield, Dave [DBARFIELD@KDA.STATE.KS.US]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2007 5:10 PM
To: Williams, Jim; Megan.Sullivan@state.co.us
Cc: Ann Bleed; Ross, Scott; Austin, George; Knox, Ken
Subject: RRCA engineering committee meeting, June 27
Attachments: KS Proposal on Splitting HC Evaporation 2006-11-15.doc

As per our discussion of June 13, we will have an engineering committee call tomorrow morning at 10:30 Central. Below is call-in information.

Below is the background for and the proposal we provided last November on the Harlan County evaporation split when only one state takes a release (as occurred in 2006). This remains our proposal on the matter.

Talk to you in the morning.

David Barfield

Date: Wednesday, June 27, 2007
Start Time: 10:30 AM Central Daylight Time
Dial-in Number: 1-712-429-0505
Participant Access Code 50711

From: Barfield, Dave
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 12:50 PM
To: Mike Thompson; Knox, Ken
Cc: ableed@dnr.state.ne.us; Pope, David L.; Ross, Scott; Austin, George; Rolfs, Lee
Subject: RRC - HC split when only one district takes a release

Mike, Ken, and others,

One of the assignments made to the Engineering Committee this year was as follows:

By November 15, 2006, develop a resolution regarding the Harlan County Lake evaporation split when only one state takes a release.

Attached is our proposal. The red text are additions to the current language in the accounting procedure.

<<KS Proposal on Splitting HC Evaporation 2006-11-15.doc>>

The procedure would only be used when one District takes a release. For years when both District take releases or neither District takes a release, the current procedure for splitting the evaporation would be the same. At least that is our intent.

Essentially, in years when one District takes a release, the pool below the annual shut-off elevation would be shared 51.1 % KS and 48.9 % NE. The pool above would be split according to the diversions by the Districts when releases are being made.

Mike, we built this version off a draft document we provided NE on March 10 in connections with our discussions

6/27/2007

of the time. Changes from that draft are:

- Rather than fixing the percentages of the split on the lower pool based on 2001-2003, for simplicity's sake, it uses the 51.1% / 48.9% split of the compact mainstem allocations. It is about the same as 2001-2003 and we have seen historically. Alternatively we could use the same procedure to split this pool as for years when there are no diversions.
- We have substituted the annual shut-off elevation for the minimum shut off elevation of 1927.

Let us know what you are thinking. If you want to have a call do discuss, please let me know.

David Barfield

Interstate Water Issues
Division of Water Resources, Kansas Department of Agriculture
785-296-3830
dbarfield@kda.state.ks.us

Can you present the Vg paper?