

www.dnr.ne.gov/download/RRCA/RRCA\_06

7-31-2007

RRCA Engineering Committee Mtg  
Topeka, KS 10 AM

Sam Perkins, Scott Ross, George Austin,  
David Barfield, Jim Williams, Jim Schneider,  
Paul Koester, Mike Thompson (Megan Sullivan  
via phone) (Willem Schreuder will join @ 11:30 AM)

"Glance" software was used so Megan could  
see George Austin's computer screen.

Dale Book (KS consultant) will join @ 11:30 AM for <sup>GW</sup> discussion  
Free flow agenda

### Agenda 1

#### User Manual -

States will document the methods &  
data sources used for the rest of  
the accounting (model is already  
documented) i.e. a cookbook  
with pointers to cells in the input  
page on the worksheet  
Nebraska would be able to produce by  
the end of the year  
Colorado - almost ready  
Kansas - needs to work on it still, especially  
the SW, diversions, evap etc.

End of Year - could we produce something by  
meeting? Drafts or cut line one  
by Monday morning August 13.

# Agenda 2 - Accounting for 2006

Megan will put Haigler ~~model~~ stateline & preliminary model results.  
Nabraska will finish its "traditional" model run

## Disputed Items

a) Non-Fed Evap Legal Committee meeting  
we are waiting for their Memorandum  
At that point the Commission will have to determine what to do. KS & CO have weighed in. They must be waiting on Nabraska to put their position.  
Ron Theris, Lee Rolfs, Pete Ampe

FSS discussions are confidential & it makes it difficult to discuss. That is why we wanted the attorneys to handle it. We should see if we can facilitate more discussion.

b) Harlan County Evap. Split  
KS has one view & NE has another  
KS would like to see evap. charge based on the benefit from the reservoir. Recreation, carry over of irrigation water. David will send a bullet point summary to us on the KS view of the Harlan split issue.

David Bradford thinks the settlement amounts to a "court order" to come up with accounting numbers every year. He would interpret the settlement to require an accounting even if there were disagreement as to the appropriateness of parts of the accounting.

7-31-2007 Topeka, KS

page 3

Date Book + Willem Schreuder joined via phone

Agenda 3 - Nebraska's description of problem with GW model computational runs. Jim Schneider ran through the four figures. (see FSS III F sentence #1)  
Figures are titled:

Base Run

No NE Import Run

New No State Pumping Run

Old No State Pumping Run

George was wondering if we did as Nebraska would desire; would we need to also adjust the recharge from the portion of the water pumped that is imported water. I.e. would we need to reduce the recharge from pumped Imported water as part of the "new" computation method?

Barfield is not convinced there is a problem as we have described it.

(Notably - George was not making notes as vigorously as he was when KS was speaking of its own contentious issues.)

unit response  
function

What does KS + CO need in terms of helping them assist their consultants in analyzing our need to correct the computational.

Scheider:

Consumption of Imported Water is not to be accounted as consumption of Virgin Water Supply.

Austin: A deal is a deal. He is a little irritated

- Willem - Lee Wilson insisted on this method of accounting.
- David Barfield admitted to not understanding our position until today.
- David Barfield admits we have a point, but he can't comment on the discussions he was a part of during the settlement which it was SEALED by court order. He is not willing to risk violation of the requirement to keep the negotiations confidential.
- Willem wants more explanation + run information. We will work with him.

RRPP still leaves irrig. recharge on, even when we do the proposed mound off pumping off.

David Barfield: NE has the right to put forth a proposed change to the accounting procedures. There is a mechanism in place. What does he specifically mean here?

http://www.dnr.ne.gov/download/RRCA/RRCA006

Williams recapped our position that we are trying to see that the accounting procedures implement what is in the settlement, particularly the exp + VWS Imported water accounting.

Barfield is not convinced the VWS Imported computations are broken. We would need to be convinced.

LUNCH BREAK after lunch

Mark joined the KS mtg after lunch

- recharge + return flow issues
- acres retirement accounting
- what final accounting needs to look like

CREP - Expedited Transfers URNRD moving allocations from CREP land to other land - Maddux Cattle Company Dec 2006

Mark has been going to URNRD meetings + seems to be concerned about some of the board actions.

Regular Transfers

could the users corners of pivots that are not part of

CREP contracts be retired + used as part of the offset for ethanol. + could the allocation be transferred to another

USERS MANUAL - Procedures for documenting acreage retirements would like to be part of the April 15 data sharing

could the allocation be transferred to another?

Recharge Issue - 20% for Nebraska  
US ~13? for Kansas & ~17? for CO  
for recent ~~year~~ year(s)

William's contract - does it need to be  
extended this year or was it a  
two year contract? → we need to recommend  
extension of contract.

Paul explains distribution of meters & certified  
acres ~~for~~ for 2006. Documentation  
on this.

Meter vs Power Record method comparison question.

KS looks @ AF/acre per operation compared to regional  
values to look for out ~~liers~~ for possible investigation.

Colorado meter requirement - 10% by <sup>Dec 31</sup> 2005  
or measurement device