



PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
Water Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams
August 6, 2024

PRRIP Water Advisory Committee Meeting Attendees		
Name	Affiliation	Member or Alternate
Department of the Interior (DOI)		
Brock Merrill	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Member
Matt Rabbe	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Alternate
State of Wyoming		
Jeff Cowley	Wyoming State Engineer's Office (WY SEO)	Member
George Moser	Wyoming Water Development Office (WWDO)	Alternate
Michelle Hubbard	WY SEO	
State of Colorado		
Kara Scheel	Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)	Member 2024 WAC Vice Chair
Don Baggus	Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW)	
State of Nebraska		
Jennifer Schellpeper	Nebraska Department of Natural Resources (NeDNR)	Member
Jesse Bradley	NeDNR	Alternate
Kari Burgert	NeDNR	Alternate
Avery Dresser	NeDNR	
Ryan Kelly	NeDNR	
Caitlin Kingsley	NeDNR	
Jim Ostdiek	NeDNR	
Mike Archer	Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (NGPC)	
Upper Platte Water Users		
Dennis Strauch	Pathfinder Irrigation District	Member
Colorado Water Users		
Jon Altenhofen	Northern Water	Member
Kyle Whitaker	Northern Water	Member
Joe Frank	Lower South Platte Water Conservancy District	Alternate
Rich Belt	South Platte Water Related Activities Program	
Jason Marks	Denver Water	



PRRIP Water Advisory Committee Meeting Attendees		
Downstream Water Users		
Cory Steinke	Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District (CNPPID)	Member 2024 WAC Chair
Brandi Flyr	Central Platte Natural Resources District (CPNRD)	Member
Jeff Shafer	Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD)	Member
Mike Drain	CNPPID	Alternate
Nick Lee	NPPD	
Nolan Little	Tri-Basin Natural Resources District (TBNRD)	
Travis Preston	North Platte Natural Resources District	
Randy Zach	NPPD	
Environmental Entities		
Jacob Fritton	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	Member
Abraham Kanz	The Crane Trust	Member
Rich Walters	TNC	Alternate
Executive Director's Office (EDO)		
Justin Brei	Engineering/Colorado Coordinator	
Libby Casavant	Hydraulic Engineer	
Jason Farnsworth	Executive Director	
Nicole Fijman	Geospatial Analyst	
Quinn Lewis	River Scientist	
Seth Turner	Water Plan Coordinator	
Other Participants		
Matt McConville	HDR	
Mark Mitisek	LRE Water	
Jon Mohr	LRE Water	

Welcome and Administrative: *Cory Steinke, CWCB – 2024 WAC Vice Chair*

Meeting participants were shown in Teams. Turner requested permission to record the meeting to assist with the minutes; there were no objections. Steinke noted issues with securing a venue for an in person meeting. Turner said the EDO elected to have a virtual-only meeting so that everyone would be in the same virtual space rather than split between in person and virtual. It was hoped this would facilitate better discussion of the Expanded Recapture Reconnaissance Study to be presented by LRE Water.

Turner noted a change in the order of presentation for the Brief Water Updates (Wyoming Property flow split would be first) and that he planned to include an overview of 2022-2023 Program water projects accounting following the discussion of recent water projects operations. Turner also said a break would likely be added after the LRE Water presentation and discussion.

Two versions of the February 2024 WAC meeting minutes were put forth for consideration, the original March 6 version prior to any committee edits (document 1a) and a May 14 version incorporating changes proposed during the May 2024 WAC meeting (document 1b). The latter

This document is a draft based on one person's notes of the meeting. The official meeting minutes may be different if corrections are made by the Water Advisory Committee before approval.



version moved the entire Perkins County Canal discussion to the end of the minutes with language added to state that there were committee disagreements over content and therefore that section would not be considered part of the formal meeting minutes. Committee members continued to voice various concerns and perspectives on what should and should not be included in meeting minutes. Several people noted that minutes should just be a record of what was said, regardless of whether there is agreement on those statements. Scheel made a motion to approve the May 14 (document 1b) version, second by Marks. No objections, February minutes approved.

There were no edits to the original draft of the May 2024 WAC meeting minutes. Flyr made a motion to approve, second by Strauch. No objections, May minutes approved.

Expanded Recapture Reconnaissance Study: *Jonathan Mohr and Mark Mitisek, LRE Water*
To provide context for this study, Turner explained that the Program has 3 recharge projects in the CNPPID system: Phelps County Canal, Elwood Reservoir, and Cottonwood Ranch. Absent controllable elements, these projects are inefficient at reducing deficits to target flows at Grand Island because roughly half of the accretions (return flows) occur during periods of excess. Recapture wells can accelerate the return of water to the river and pump specifically during periods of shortage when the water is needed in the river. The Program has 8 existing recapture wells, including the Cook well that was installed in 2016 and 7 newer wells near Cottonwood Ranch. The Program has an agreement with Tri-Basin NRD for the operation and maintenance of these wells. Additionally, the Program has agreements with CNPPID and has pre-paid for more than 200,000 AF of excess flow diversions into the 3 recharge projects.¹ The team led by LRE Water has been working on the Expanded Recapture Reconnaissance Study for the last year to find ways to optimize the benefit that the Program can generate for the Platte River through these projects. Turner added that the NeDNR contributed funding to the study, so the analyses also included potential recapture well options for the State of Nebraska.

Mohr and Mitisek of LRE Water presented on the study. Their team also includes Inter-fluve and RJH. Key elements of the study include an assessment of conveyance capacity in Plum Creek and potential mitigation required to accommodate higher flows; evaluation of gravity outlet options to convey water from Elwood Reservoir to Plum Creek; potential siting and quantities of new recapture wells; and tradeoffs between Elwood outlet concepts and additional recapture wells to maximize the potential score in terms of reductions to target flow deficits at Grand Island. Mohr recapped specific questions the study sought to address for the Program and for NeDNR.

¹ In Water Service Agreement (WSA) between the Program and CNPPID dated December 7, 2022, the Program prepaid \$9,154,956.24 for excess flow diversions totaling 50,000 AF into Phelps County Canal at \$35.92/AF and 134,927.7 AF into Elwood Reservoir at \$54.54/AF. The initial term of the agreement is through December 31, 2032 but can be extended through successive one-year agreements for up to another 10 years or until the full volume of water is delivered (whichever is sooner). There is a separate WSA concerning excess flow deliveries to Cottonwood Ranch, with an estimated 28,000 AF to be delivered based on the remaining pipeline cost balance and a term through December 31, 2032.



Plum Creek

The Plum Creek assessment was completed by Inter-fluve and included analysis of gage data, field surveys, 1D HEC-RAS modeling, risk assessment, and planning level costs. Inter-fluve surveyed more than 40 cross-sections across 4 representative reaches of Plum Creek. Baseflow in Plum Creek was determined to be about 12 cfs and the ordinary high water line is at about 50 cfs. The risk of impacts such as bank sloughing and erosion increases with duration and magnitude of flow, particularly above 100 cfs. Inter-fluve estimated mitigation costs for the surveyed sub-reaches based on proposed Elwood outlet capacities of 50 cfs or 100 cfs and extrapolated to the more than 28 miles of creek between Elwood Reservoir and the Platte River. At least 2 public and 11 private stream crossings would need to be upgraded to accommodate additional flows for the Program.

Elwood Outlet

RJH developed both open channel and pipeline alternatives for the Elwood Reservoir gravity outlet. At the request of the EDO, these were designed to convey either 50 cfs or 100 cfs. The presentation and Executive Summary memo provided to the WAC include maps showing the proposed outlet alignments. The open channel option would utilize the existing 42-inch emergency evacuation pipeline from Elwood Reservoir and discharge to a 5,900 ft riprap lined channel through a natural drainage to a culvert crossing at Hwy 283. This may require 404 permitting and would potentially impact 3 private property owners.

The pipeline option would involve construction of a new control structure and turnout in the existing E65 Canal between the pump station and the outlet of siphon 3. From the turnout, a 4,500 ft pipeline would convey water to the culvert crossing at Hwy 83. RJH estimated costs for both steel and PVC pipe, both of which are more expensive than the open channel option. There are 2 private property owners along the proposed pipeline alignment. Conveyance of Program water to the pipeline turnout via the E65 Canal could be a potential issue during periods of high irrigation demand.

The current outlet designs are considered feasibility-level and cost estimates include 30% contingency (excluding permitting, land, O&M, and conveyance from the Hwy 83 culvert to Plum Creek). Costs range from \$2.8 million for a 50 cfs open channel to nearly \$9.5 million for a 100 cfs steel pipe.

Recapture Wells

Mitisek described the various elements of the recapture well assessment, which included completion of hydrogeologic cross-sections; evaluation of the potential to utilize natural conveyance or drains to return water to the river; defining recapture zones and conceptual recapture well areas based on COHYST stream-depletion factor (SDF) zones and proximity to the Platte River (maps were included in the presentation and memo); determination of well and



pipeline capacities and infrastructure requirements; and estimation of costs. In general, wells close to the river are shallower, require less conveyance, and are therefore less expensive. Wells more distant from the river are deeper, have greater conveyance requirements, and are more expensive. However because of the timing of depletive effects from recapture well pumping, wells closer to the river produce less net benefit (i.e., score) than those wells farther away.

Trade-Offs and Cost Estimates

For the trade-off analysis, LRE Water developed a GoldSim model that closely replicated the EDO's spreadsheet score models. There are 3 main components of the GoldSim model: an Elwood storage balance (inflows from excesses, outflows as seepage or gravity release) with separate accounts for the Program and NeDNR; an aquifer storage balance (inflows from recharge, outflows as accretions or recapture pumping); and a score model that routes net river returns to Grand Island to determine reductions to target flow deficits. The model uses the Program's actual recharge/recapture data through 2023 to define antecedent conditions, includes the standard 1947-1994 model period used for score analyses, and adds the 1995-2023 period to get an idea of project performance under more recent hydrology. For the Program, the GoldSim model was used to simulate a baseline scenario (existing recharge/recapture operations), 3 scenarios with no Elwood outlet and new recapture wells in different zones, and both 50 cfs and 100 cfs gravity outlets from Elwood Reservoir with no new recapture wells. Model runs for NeDNR included a recharge-only baseline and 3 recapture well scenarios.

The Program's baseline score of 6,800 AF includes Phelps recharge (approved 2,700 AF), Elwood Recharge (approved 2,800 AF), and the 8 existing recapture wells (estimated 1,300 AF). Incremental scores of a new Elwood outlet or additional recapture wells were estimated by subtracting 6,800 AF from a new total score with existing and proposed recharge/recapture projects. For the Program, a 100 cfs gravity outlet with existing recapture wells results in the highest incremental score increase (5,009 AF based on the 1947-1994 period). For both the Program and NeDNR, new recapture wells in Zone 3 south of Phelps County Canal would generate the highest incremental score increase.

The cost analysis considered both initial capital costs and 50-year lifecycle O&M costs. Total costs were calculated and divided by 50-year deficit reductions to estimate unit costs per AF of score. The 50 cfs Elwood outlet has unit costs as low as \$33/AF for the open channel option. Total 50-year life cycle cost for this scenario was estimated at around \$7.4 million. The lowest unit cost for recapture wells would be in Zone 3, ranging from \$141/AF to \$167/AF depending on conveyance pipeline material (PVC or steel). Life cycle costs exceed \$25 million. Wells closer to the river have lower life cycle costs but higher unit costs due to reduced net benefits to the river in terms of deficit reductions.

The presentation concluded by summarizing responses to the key questions that were identified at the start (see presentation and Executive Summary memo, both available on the meeting



website). LRE Water also identified a few important considerations for potential future phases of this study.

WAC Discussion

Turner said the EDO is looking for direction on what to do next. The presentation was a summary of what was evaluated and potential infrastructure projects to consider. Substantial infrastructure costs are involved, is this something to pursue further? The EDO is not seeking a specific motion from the WAC, but feedback is needed to inform discussion with the GC in September. The Executive Summary memo provided to the WAC will be expanded to a full report over the next month, with expected distribution prior to discussion at the September GC meeting.

Rabbe asked for clarification regarding controllable project elements. Turner said the idea behind the gravity outlet or recapture wells is that they are entirely controllable and can be operated when needed to reduce deficits. A gravity outlet from Elwood would release 50 cfs or 100 cfs to the Platte River via Plum Creek. With 8 existing recapture wells running, the Program can deliver 10-12 cfs to the river, so adding 6 more wells might get us near 20 cfs.

Steinke noted that with the proposed new E65 gravity inlet to Elwood Reservoir, there would be less need for CNPPID to hold water in storage for irrigation. That would free up space for storage of excess flows and allow the Program to better capitalize on big flow events. Steinke later added that he is 90% sure CNPPID will proceed with construction of the new inlet, and that will allow more efficient operation of Elwood for the Program. Mitisek said that having a gravity outlet reduces the need for Program recapture wells because the volume of ongoing recharge (as Elwood seepage) is reduced.

Strauch suggested that the unit costs per AF should include the initial costs of excess flow diversions for comparison to other water projects. Turner agreed that should be considered and confirmed that the unit costs shown by LRE Water in the presentation and memo account for the capital costs of new infrastructure, 50-year life cycle O&M costs, and 50-year score contribution. Farnsworth later added that since the Program has already pre-paid CNPPID for a large volume of excess flow diversions, caution would need to be taken to make sure those costs are incorporated in a useful way.

Altenhofen asked if there would be competition between projects for excess flow deliveries. Turner said the modeling for this study, which was based on the original Elwood recharge score model, includes partitioning of available excess flows so that all recharge projects within the CNPPID system can receive water. This partitioning was based on examples included in the Cottonwood Ranch water service agreement.

Drain asked if the scoring subcommittee would be convened to review the analyses, or if the GC would just use the scores as currently presented. Turner said these reconnaissance-level analyses



will need to be refined before presenting to the scoring subcommittee for formal review, and that is not expected soon. In response to a question from Altenhofen, Turner reiterated that the score estimates developed by LRE Water represent the potential incremental gain above the 6,800 AF baseline score for the existing recharge/recapture projects that would be integrated with an Expanded Recapture project. That includes 2,700 AF for Phelps recharge, 2,800 AF for Elwood recharge, and 1,300 AF for the 8 existing recapture wells based on 160 AF score for the Cook well extrapolated to 8 similar wells.

There was some additional discussion of the unit costs per AF of score increase. Farnsworth stated the intent to pursue a project such as this during the Extension as part of ongoing efforts to achieve the First Increment Water Objective (120,000 AF per year average reduction to target flow deficits at Grand Island). Altenhofen asked if this would fit within the existing Water Plan budget or if other items would need to be trimmed. Farnsworth said it likely fits in the budget and has been contemplated as part of the Water Action Plan, but it would also depend on the final mix of Elwood outlet and/or recapture wells.

Steinke made additional points about the advantages an Elwood outlet would provide for the Program because of operational flexibility and quicker timing for making releases back to the river during shortages then refilling the reservoir during excesses. There was a question about the effects of different operations by the Program and NeDNR. Turner said that all inflows of excesses were split 50/50 in the model. The availability of excess flows (capped at 30,000 AF annually) and finite capacity of the reservoir (around 37,800 AF) were more significant limiting factors than operational differences. The Program would be able to make gravity outlet releases until the reservoir reached dead pool level (about 12,000 AF), below which any remaining Program water could continue to seep from the reservoir as groundwater recharge.

The discussion turned to Plum Creek and Inter-fluve's conclusion of limited erosive impacts from 50 cfs releases. Mitisek again noted the significance of the frequency and duration of flow releases in terms of causing potential channel impacts. Turner emphasized that for this reconnaissance-level study, the objective was to get a sense of whether it was even reasonable to consider using Plum Creek for conveyance from Elwood Reservoir to the Platte River and to get insights as to what should be studied in greater depth. If the GC recommends moving forward with this project concept, it is expected that the next phase would include a more refined study of Plum Creek.

Further discussion returned to the low unit costs, particular for the Elwood outlet options, the importance of controllable water, and the ability to much more efficiently convert divertible excess flows into deficit reductions during shortages at Grand Island. Farnsworth noted that making a formal or informal recommendation or otherwise advising the GC about this project was at the discretion of the WAC. Several committee members made or agreed with recommendations to move forward with a similar presentation to the GC in September.

**Brief Water Updates:** *Libby Casavant and Seth Turner, EDO***Wyoming Property Flow Split:**

Casavant presented a recap of the purpose and history of this project on Program land downstream of Kearney. Around 2019, a narrow strip of land separating the middle and north channels of the Platte River washed out. This resulted in a loss of flow from the middle channel to the north channel and a decrease in flows through Rowe Sanctuary, particularly during dry periods. The project purpose was to restore the separation between channels.

A wetland delineation was completed in August 2023, followed by issuance of a permit in March 2024, bid selection in April 2024, and construction in May-June 2024. The winning bid was less than the engineer's estimate. Casavant showed several photos of the construction progress. A berm was built using sand from the river channel, stabilized with trees and rootwads. Trees were sourced from the west end of the Wyoming Property at the request of a neighbor; this was a different location than shown on the original design plans. Seeding of the berm is expected to be completed during wetter conditions in winter 2024. Analyses indicate that middle channel flow through Rowe Sanctuary should be about 35% higher than without the restored berm.

Platte Basin Hydrology:

Turner presented a year-to-date flow summary for the Grand Island gage, which has been below the USFWS target flows for most of the year except for brief periods of excess flows in early February and early July. The real-time hydrologic condition was normal from January through July but switched to dry for the August-September period. This was despite 4-7 inches of rainfall in July across much of the central Platte valley from west of Lexington to east of Grand Island. The on-site weather station at the Program's Cottonwood Ranch property recorded more than 9 inches of rain from July 1-16. Overall the prevalence of abnormally dry to severe drought conditions across the Platte Basin increased from April 30 to July 30. Although much of central Nebraska remains largely drought-free, drought has expanded across far western Nebraska, southeastern Wyoming, and along the Front Range of Colorado. Some of the driest areas in northern Colorado experienced recent wildfires.

Leasing, Recharge, and Recapture Projects:

The Program was able to take deliveries of excess flows totaling about 250 AF at Cottonwood Ranch from July 2-7, bringing total 2024 deliveries to nearly 800 AF. Storm-related damages knocked out the controls for the north outlet valve, and repairs are in progress. Most of the recapture wells ran from mid-February to early July, with 2024 cumulative pumping now at 2,440 AF. The GC once again approved 1-year lease agreements with CPNRD (max 15,000 AF) and NPPD (max 3,306 AF) at \$90/AF. The GC is expected to discuss approaches to longer-term agreements in September. Both the Pathfinder Municipal Account and Pathfinder Environmental Account filled in early June. The Program is leasing 9,600 AF from the Municipal Account at \$65/AF and will receive all remaining EA water after deducting summer evaporation losses. Deliveries of water from Pathfinder to Lake McConaughy are expected in September.

**2022-2023 Water Projects Accounting:**

Turner explained the purpose of Program water projects accounting and how it differs from scoring. Accounting is an assessment of deficit reductions at Grand Island based on real operations data; doing so is specified in the Program Document. Accounting for 2007-2018 was first completed in 2019, followed by updates in November 2021 to include 2019-2020 and in February 2023 to include 2021 operations. New updates for 2022-2023 include Lake McConaughy EA accruals and releases and integrated accounting of Phelps recharge, Elwood recharge, and the Program's 8 existing recapture wells. At this time, the Program has no means of evaluating accretions from NPPD recharge (252 AF in 2023) and Cottonwood Ranch recharge (2,750 AF in 2022-2023).

The Program has 7 sources of water that contribute to the Lake McConaughy EA: 10% of October-April Storable Natural Inflows (SNI, an in-kind contribution from the State of Nebraska), the Pathfinder EA (in-kind contribution from the State of Wyoming), No-Cost Net Controllable Conserved Water (314 AF annually), the Pathfinder Municipal Account Lease, CNPPID irrigator lease, and CPNRD and NPPD surface water leases. Contributions totaled about 76,700 AF in 2022 and 92,200 AF in 2023, with the largest volumes by far coming from SNI and the Pathfinder EA.

Releases from the Lake McConaughy EA totaled 79,359 AF in 2022 and 49,870 AF in 2023; both releases were made for germination suppression. Deficit reductions from EA releases are calculated but are ultimately incidental to the scientific or species-related purpose of the release. Calculated deficit reductions at Grand Island were much smaller than the volume of EA water released in both years because the target flow for germination suppression (1,500 cfs) was much higher than the USFWS target flows at the time (800 cfs because of dry real-time hydrologic conditions). Only the EA water up to the 800 cfs target flow counted as deficit reduction. Altenhofen emphasized this point that the EA is operated for specific purposes that are different from the way it was evaluated during the development of the Program (i.e., for deficit reductions) but that doesn't mean anything needs to change. Turner added that with a 3,400 cfs target flow at Grand Island during the first 3 weeks of June, much more of this year's EA release will count as deficit reductions.

For the first time, the EDO completed a fully-integrated accounting of the Phelps and Elwood recharge projects and the 8 existing recapture wells. All are located within the CNPPID system south of the Platte River. Diversions of excess flows into both projects were limited in 2022-2023 due to both hydrology (limited excess flows, including for only about 48 hours in 2022) and operational factors (ongoing design and construction of a seepage control system at Elwood Reservoir). The Program added 7 new recapture wells in the spring of 2022, and all 8 wells were pumped extensively due to dry conditions and persistent shortages throughout 2022-2023.

Total invoiced diversions for the two recharge projects totaled 101,300 AF through 2023, with recharge totaling 97,200 AF. The total volume of recapture pumping since the Cook well was installed in 2016 is 6,140 AF, with more than 80% of that occurring during 2022-2023. Total



river returns from both recharge accretions and recapture pumping were about 52,000 AF through 2023, leaving the Program with about 45,200 AF of intentionally recharge groundwater still in the aquifer as of December 31, 2023. Despite this volume remaining in the aquifer, accretion rates from the recharge projects have declined in recent years as the volume of new recharge has declined. The Program's pool of excess flow water stored in Elwood Reservoir was 1,440 AF as of the end of 2023 and is likely zero as of August 2024 with no new diversions this year. Given the close proximity of the Program's recapture wells to the Platte River, the net benefit of water added to the river is only 1,989 AF from 6,140 AF of pumping.

North Platte Chokepoint Study:

The Chokepoint geomorphology report was distributed to the WAC and the North Platte Chokepoint Planning Workgroup in early June. Comments received by the EDO were returned to the project team to address and finalize the report. The EDO has also developed a supplemental memo supporting the conclusions of the geomorphology study.

Alternatives analysis is underway, with a conceptual design and cost assessment for a bypass canal concept nearly complete. The team led by Anderson Consulting Engineers is working on 1D hydraulic and sediment transport modeling of several in-channel alternatives, including a no action scenario, dredging, and modification of the Tri-County Diversion Dam. At least 1 alternative will be evaluated further with more refined 2D modeling. A permitting assessment focused on potential impacts to wetlands is also in progress. Altenhofen asked whether a South Platte storage alternative will be concluded. Turner said it's been discussed and will be included in the report, but the concept is not expected to move forward.

The alternatives report is expected to be distributed prior to the WAC meeting, followed by a modeling report in November or December. The Anderson team will present the alternatives analysis to the WAC in October and the GC in December.

EA Release for Germination Suppression: Seth Turner, EDO

This year was the 5th consecutive year for a release from the Lake McConaughy EA for germination suppression, with the goal of achieving 1,500 cfs at Grand Island for 30 days from June 1-30. The release was made from May 22-June 23 and totaled 77,950 AF at an average release rate of 1,191 cfs including ramp up/down. The EA release was held at 1,300 cfs for 23 straight days in June. Average flow at Grand Island for June 1-30 was just under 1,800 cfs (USGS keeps making slight adjustments to the provisional data), with about 28 days exceeding 1,500 cfs. Turner showed comparative plots of the 2022, 2023, and 2024 EA releases for germination suppression to emphasize how different the hydrology has been from year to year.

Turner also showed a figure to illustrate the routing of EA water through the Sutherland Canal versus down the North Platte River during the EA release. Overall, less than 20% of this year's EA release for germination suppression was released down the North Platte River (and through the North Platte Chokepoint). During the extended period of 1,300 cfs release, 1,150 cfs was routed through the Sutherland Canal with only 150 cfs going to the North Platte River. For this



EA release, the North Platte Chokepoint was a non-factor. In 5 years of germination suppression releases between late May and early July, there have been only about 10 days (all in 2022) in which the North Platte Chokepoint has been a constraint on the EA release. Altenhofen asked if this means the Chokepoint may not be an issue for germination suppression in the future. Turner said Chokepoint constraints on the EA release have been limited to date. Rabbe said his perspective is that the historical record indicates that the Chokepoint is a big issue and will remain that way because the most capacity is needed during drier times.

Turner thanked USFWS, CNPPID, NPPD, and NeDNR for their help in coordinating and managing another successful EA release for germination suppression.

Elwood Reservoir Seepage Repair Update: *Cory Steinke, CNPPID*

Steinke said the seepage project is about 75% complete, with some weighted filter blankets still to be installed over the next few weeks. Substantial completion of the project is to be on September 14, with a final walk-through on October 1. At this point in the process, limitations on Elwood operations are probably gone if there were to be excess flows available.

Additional Business: *Kara Scheel, CWCB – 2024 WAC Vice Chair*

The next WAC meeting will be on October 29. A presentation on the North Platte Chokepoint Study alternatives analysis and modeling is planned, so this meeting will most likely be in person at the Lake McConaughy Visitor Center. Details will be confirmed as the meeting approaches.

Action Items

General WAC

- N/A

ED Office

- N/A