



1
2
3
4
5

PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
Water Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Virtual Meeting – Microsoft Teams
February 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 | | |
| George Moser | Wyoming Water Development Office | Alternate |
| Michelle Hubbard | Wyoming State Engineer's Office | |
| State of Colorado | | |
| Kara Scheel | Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) | Member |
| Amy Ostdiek | CWCB | |
| State of Nebraska | | |
| Jennifer Schellpeper | Nebraska Department of Natural Resources (NDNR) | Member |
| Jesse Bradley | NDNR | Alternate |
| Kari Burgert | NDNR | Alternate |
| Justin Ahern | NDNR | |
| Mike Archer | Nebraska Game and Parks Commission | |
| Avery Dresser | NDNR | |
| Ryan Kelly | NDNR | |
| Caitlin Kingsley | NDNR | |
| Jim Ostdiek | NDNR | |
| Upper Platte Water Users | | |
| Dennis Strauch | Pathfinder Irrigation District | Member |
| Colorado Water Users | | |
| Jon Altenhofen | Northern Water | Member |
| Kyle Whitaker | Northern Water | Member |
| Rich Belt | South Platte Water Related Activities Program | |
| Craig Brownell | Lower South Platte Water Conservancy District | |
| Jason Marks | Denver Water | |
| Kevin Urie | | |
| Downstream Water Users | | |
| Cory Steinke | Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District (CNPPID) – 2023 WAC Chair | Member |
| Brandi Flyr | Central Platte Natural Resources District (CPNRD) | Member |
| Jeff Shafer | Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD) | Member |
| Nolan Little | Tri-Basin Natural Resources District (TBNRD) | |
| Scott Shaneman | North Platte Natural Resources District | |
| Tyler Thulin | CNPPID | |



| PRRIP Water Advisory Committee Meeting Attendees | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Environmental Entities | | |
| Jacob Fritton | The Nature Conservancy | Member |
| Melissa Mosier | Audubon Great Plains | Member |
| Josh Wiese | The Crane Trust | Alternate |
| Executive Director’s Office (EDO) | | |
| Jason Farnsworth | Executive Director | |
| Seth Turner | Water Plan Coordinator | |
| Justin Brei | Engineering/Colorado Coordinator | |
| Libby Casavant | Hydraulic Engineer | |
| Ed Weschler | Water Resources Engineer | |
| Other Participants | | |
| Pat Engelbert | HDR | |
| Matt McConville | HDR | |
| Jonathan Mohr | LRE Water | |

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Welcome and Administrative: *Cory Steinke, 2023 WAC Chair*

Meeting participants were identified from Microsoft Teams. There were no agenda modifications. There were no revisions to the original draft of the October 2023 WAC meeting minutes. Shafer made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Scheel. No objections, minutes approved.

Altenhofen nominated Steinke as 2024 WAC Chair and Scheel as 2024 WAC Vice Chair. No objections, both approved.

Perkins County Canal: *Jesse Bradley, NDNR*

Some members of the WAC do not agree with the content and/or minutes for this agenda item. As such, the committee has agreed to include an informal summary of the discussion at the end of this document but it is not part of the approved meeting minutes.

Brief Water Updates: *Ed Weschler, Libby Casavant, and Seth Turner, EDO*

Platte Basin Hydrology:

Weschler provided an update on Platte Basin hydrology. Based on flow volume (812,888 AF) and average flow rate (1,123 cfs), the annual hydrologic condition for 2023 was normal. Platte River flows at Grand Island were below targets for much of the late fall and early winter; there were ice conditions for most of January.

Compared to late October, abnormally dry conditions spread across much of the South Platte Basin in Colorado and into the North Platte Basin in Wyoming. Aside from these areas and a few small pockets of moderate drought, much of the rest of the Platte Basin is not under drought conditions.



34
35 As of February 5, Colorado snowpack in the South Platte and North Platte was at 91% of median
36 or higher despite tracking below median for nearly the entire season to date. Wyoming
37 snowpack in the North Platte subbasins was generally lower, ranging from 65% of normal in the
38 Lower North Platte to 84% in the Sweetwater and Upper North Platte. North Platte snowpack
39 likewise had tracked below median for nearly the entire season to date.

40
41 ***Wyoming Property Flow Split:***

42 Casavant said this project would involve closing a breach between river channels on the
43 Program's Wyoming property east of Kearney that is allowing water to flow into the north
44 channel and away from whooping crane habitat in the Rowe Sanctuary area. There were no
45 substantial changes to the project approach or design from what was presented at the October
46 WAC meeting. A more detailed design and bid package were developed and presented to the
47 Finance Committee for review on January 19; approval is pending. The permit application was
48 submitted to the Corps of Engineers in early January. They provided some feedback and
49 requests for clarification, and a decision on that is also expected soon.

50
51 Shafer said he'd been reviewing old aerial photos, which show that sometimes flow goes from
52 the north channel to the south. Are we worried about consequences if the north channel gets
53 more flow and we can't move it south? We don't want to cut off flow from north to south.
54 Casavant and Farnsworth both acknowledged that this is a potential concern but there are likely
55 issues that would present elsewhere first. Brei added that flow just doesn't often move from
56 north to south at the specific project location. Farnsworth noted that the north channel elevation
57 is lower.

58
59 Whitaker expressed some of the same concerns. When you start to mess with the hydraulics of a
60 sand bed river, nature is going to win. How durable is this berm supposed to be? Is it strong
61 enough to hold up to the next event that might engage the other channel? Casavant responded
62 that the berm elevation matches islands on either side. The berm would be under water in a
63 5,000 cfs event. Toe protection should help mitigate the risk, but the berm is not hardened. Brei
64 said the actual overtopping flow is likely higher than 5,000 cfs and that similar projects last 5
65 years or more. Overtopping is rare, scour happens over time, and a full washout is unlikely to
66 happen without warning. A project to protect an outside bend at the Spiedell property lasted
67 about 7 years. Other locations would have significant permitting hurdles, but the flow split on
68 the Wyoming property is something we can actually fix since the Program owns it. The non-
69 concrete design also has fewer permitting hurdles. Casavant added that this is a wide flow area,
70 so we won't see scour here like on an outside bend.

71
72 Altenhofen said if the berm provides benefits for 7 years then washes out, just rebuild it. Sand
73 dams wash out all the time on the lower South Platte in Colorado. Altenhofen also asked who is
74 handling permitting? Farnsworth said HDR and that it will be a Nationwide 27 permit.
75 Farnsworth added that the Program has a sponsorship agreement with Rowe Sanctuary and gets
76 to count associated habitat acres. The flow split upstream at the Kearney bridge evolves over



77 time, but the Wyoming property provides greater bang for buck in terms of restoring flows to
78 whooping crane habitat. Flow splits elsewhere are beyond the Program’s capabilities.
79

80 Casavant showed a chart illustrating flow increases at Rowe with the restored berm, about 35%.
81 Altenhofen asked about costs. Casavant said about \$79,000, which was increased a bit from
82 previous estimates to help establish vegetation on the berm. Steinke summarized this as the
83 cheapest option to help protect habitat downstream, for however long it lasts.
84

85 Rabbe added that we’re also considering the germination suppression flow. At 1,500 cfs we’re
86 losing a lot of flow to the north channel and not seeing germination suppression being as
87 successful at this location. This project can be thought of as a way to offset costs of disking and
88 spraying the river.
89

90 Farnsworth said this project will be discussed with the Governance Committee in March to
91 address concerns.
92

93 ***Leasing, Recharge, and Recapture Projects:***

94 Turner reported on recent water projects operations and activities. Excess flow diversions into
95 four groundwater recharge projects (Cottonwood Ranch BSR, Elwood Reservoir, Phelps County
96 Canal, NPPD Dawson County Canal) totaled 6,130 AF in 2023. Pumping from 8 recapture wells
97 totaled 2,768 AF. Temporary recharge permits for CNPPID and NPPD will expire March 1;
98 both entities plan to apply for new permits.
99 Enrollment in the CNPPID irrigator lease for 2024 totaled 1,053 acres, which will result in a
100 credit of 790 AF to the Lake McConaughy EA in October. This is the 2nd-lowest enrollment, just
101 above the 1,037 acres in the first year of the project (2016).
102

103 Excess flows were declared available on February 2; CNPPID was diverting water into Phelps
104 County Canal and then delivering to Cottonwood Ranch. There was potential for excesses
105 through February 14, after which the target flow at Grand Island increases to 3,350 cfs.
106

107 ***North Platte Chokepoint Study:***

108 Turner reported on progress made by the Anderson Consulting Engineers project team. Field
109 work in October included sediment sample collection, floating the Chokepoint reach, and touring
110 the Tri-County Diversion Dam with CNPPID. A subcontractor completed extensive cross-
111 section surveying around the same time. A geomorphic assessment is underway, and the EDO
112 reviewed preliminary findings. Baseline hydraulic and sediment transport models were updated
113 based on the 2017 bathymetric LiDAR and calibrated based on the new cross-section surveys.
114 Development and review of potential alternatives to achieve and maintain 3,000 cfs conveyance
115 capacity through or around the Chokepoint is ongoing. An alternatives memo was recently
116 prepared by the consultant and will be discussed with the Chokepoint Planning Workgroup on
117 February 13. The team has also started planning for the final phase of the study, which is
118 anticipated to be completed in the summer.
119



120 ***Expanded Recapture Reconnaissance Study:***

121 Turner reported on work progress by the consultant team led by LRE Water. Field surveying
122 and data collection in Plum Creek were completed by Inter-Fluve and LRE Water in November,
123 followed by desktop data analyses and modeling of Plum Creek. Results identifying a safe
124 conveyance capacity in Plum Creek are expected soon. RJH developed preliminary Elwood
125 Reservoir gravity outlet concepts and presented those to the EDO in January. LRE Water is
126 evaluating potential recapture wells sites in the floodplain south of the Platte River and along
127 Plum Creek. Tradeoff analyses are expected to proceed soon, with study completion anticipated
128 in late summer.

129
130 **Lake McConaughy EA Spring Release: *Matt Rabbe, USFWS***

131 Rabbe discussed tentative plans for a spring whooping crane release from the Lake McConaughy
132 EA. USFWS would be aiming to have 1,000-1,200 cfs through the Associated Habitat Reach
133 during the first 2-3 weeks of April, so releases from the EA would be initiated around March 25.
134 Anticipated release rates/volumes TBD depending on conditions at the time; USFWS is trying to
135 balance EA carryover volume while still ensuring adequate supplies for germination suppression.
136 Steinke noted that CNPPID plans to start pumping about 150 cfs into Elwood Reservoir on April
137 1. This may require increased EA release to make up the difference for reduced releases back to
138 the river at the J-2 Return.

139
140 **2024 Water Plan Tasks: *Seth Turner, EDO***

141 Turner outlined Water Plan tasks that the EDO plans to work on in 2024, including several
142 related to the Cottonwood Ranch broad-scale recharge (BSR) project. Cavitation in the valves of
143 the delivery pipeline outlets has limited the range of operations for project water deliveries since
144 the first test fills in 2020. To avoid cavitation, the outlets have to be operated at 20% open or
145 less or greater than 65% open, effectively eliminating mid-range operations. Funds were
146 budgeted for this task, and the EDO plans to work with Miller & Associates and/or others to
147 diagnose and repair this issue. Rabbe asked if the current excess flow deliveries could be used
148 for the diagnostic work and evaluating potential solutions. Turner said the excess flows came up
149 too quickly and unexpectedly, so there was no time to coordinate the effort to do that. The EDO
150 is hoping to do the diagnostic testing in the April/May timeframe, ideally if there are excess
151 flows after Phelps County Canal is already filled.

152
153 There are also plans to install additional monitoring wells at Cottonwood Ranch, in particular to
154 have surface water level readings in Cell 7, which doesn't have a Rubicon gate outlet, and on the
155 east side of Cell 8, where groundwater emerging at the surface in an adjacent alfalfa field on
156 private property is problematic.

157
158 Additionally, the EDO is pursuing development of a groundwater model for the project in order
159 to develop unit response functions for both BSR and recapture wells for use in score analyses
160 and operations accounting. This will involve coordination with NDNR and eventually the
161 Scoring Subcommittee. A preliminary model was developed using COHYST but the effort is
162 currently on hold after the recent departure of the EDO's groundwater modeler. In response to a



163 question from Rabbe, Turner clarified that the BSR project and recapture wells have NOT been
164 scored yet.

165
166 The EDO recently contracted George Oamek to conduct an updated economics and alternatives
167 analysis for the CNPPID irrigator lease project. The work is just getting underway and Oamek is
168 coordinating with CNPPID to plan a workshop with irrigators to gather information and
169 feedback on the lease project.

170
171 **Elwood Seepage Repair and E65 Canal/Siphon Projects:** *Tyler Thulin, CNPPID*
172 Thulin presented an overview of the E65 Canal and Elwood Reservoir system operations. E65
173 diverts from the Tri-County Supply Canal just upstream of Johnson Lake as an open canal that
174 then passes through 3 siphons. A gate can be closed at Hwy 283 to back up water to pump into
175 Elwood Reservoir. The existing siphons limit conveyance capacity to 350 cfs but irrigation
176 demand can exceed 500 cfs; releases from Elwood Reservoir are used to make up the difference.

177
178 Seepage issues were identified at the toe of the Elwood Reservoir pump station dam in 2019.
179 After several years to diagnose the problems and design appropriate repairs, construction of
180 repairs finally began in September 2023 but is proceeding slowly. The contractor is supposed to
181 complete work by mid-July but is behind schedule, having installed only 660 ft of more than
182 7,000 ft of pipeline as of the February 6 WAC meeting. They are currently excavating around
183 and below the existing inlet/outlet pipeline, work which has to be done by April 1 in order to
184 start pumping into Elwood for irrigation. Brei asked about operational water levels in Elwood
185 Reservoir. Thulin said water levels in have been restricted to 2597 ft (10 ft below normal full
186 pool) in recent years and confirmed that they will return to 2607 ft full pool once the seepage
187 repair is complete.

188
189 The new E65 canal and siphons will have a capacity of 450 cfs or more and will allow gravity
190 flow into Elwood Reservoir. Total cost for the project is now estimated to be about \$20 million.
191 Access agreements with landowners caused a one-year delay, so design is about a year behind
192 schedule. Construction is now anticipated to start in mid-2025 and conclude in 2026.

193
194 Schellpeper asked about sources of funding for these projects. Thulin said CNPPID received
195 funding for the seepage repair from the State of Nebraska and the Program, so that is covered.
196 Steinke said CNPPID received a major grant from the state for E65 and they are applying for a
197 \$5 million WaterSMART grant in April.

198
199 **Additional Business:** *Cory Steinke, 2024 WAC Chair*
200 The next WAC and TAC meetings will be held back-to-back in person in Ogallala on May 7-8, location
201 and schedule/agendas TBD. The WAC meeting must end at noon to allow an adequate lunch break
202 before starting the TAC meeting, so start time will be worked out backwards depending on material to be
203 covered. More information to be provided as the meeting dates get closer.

204
205



206 **Action Items**

207
208 **General WAC**

- 209 • N/A

210
211 **ED Office**

- 212 • N/A

213
214 *End of official meeting minutes.*

215
216 *The following summary of the Perkins County Canal agenda item is included solely as an*
217 *informal record of the discussion. This record reflects the statements of individual speakers only*
218 *and does not represent the position of the WAC on any of those statements nor the agreement by*
219 *any WAC member of the accuracy of those statements.*

220
221 **Summary of Perkins County Canal discussion (as revised by the State of Nebraska and Colorado**
222 **Water Users):**

223
224 Bradley introduced a presentation on the proposed Perkins County Canal (slides were made
225 available to the WAC after the meeting via the Program website), noting that this is the same
226 presentation used to start permitting discussions, including preliminary talks with the Corps of
227 Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and USFWS. Following up on this point at the end of the
228 meeting, Altenhofen asked about DOI involvement in Perkins. Rabbe confirmed that Bradley
229 gave the same presentation to USFWS and that the agency is just taking in information, not
230 making any preliminary judgments or decisions. Merrill likewise said the same presentation was
231 given to Reclamation regional officers in Billings but Reclamation is not involved in funding or
232 permitting the project in any way.

233
234 Article VI of the 100-year old South Platte Compact explicitly allows for construction of a South
235 Divide Canal (aka Perkins County Canal) for purposes of irrigation in Nebraska. That canal
236 would divert water from the South Platte River in Colorado, follow an alignment generally along
237 the South Platte, and convey water across the state line into Nebraska. There is not a lot of
238 flexibility in the route the canal can take. Elements of the project are dictated by the terms of the
239 Compact. Since this would effectively involve diversion of water for irrigation during the non-
240 irrigation season, construction of a reservoir in Nebraska would be needed. Nebraska is
241 currently moving forward aggressively with project design and development.

242
243 Bradley said Colorado's position is that Nebraska has no protection of water during the non-
244 irrigation season and cannot call for water without construction of the canal. The Western Canal
245 can call for water during the irrigation season. Bradley added that Nebraska's concern is the
246 proliferation of water use upstream in Colorado. Augmentation was scaled up after a Colorado
247 court decision in the early 2000s mandated mitigation for depletions. Nebraska sees about
248 90,000 AF of diversions (depletions + pumping) during the non-irrigation season in Colorado,



249 including about 1,000 existing groundwater wells and equating to about 270 cfs. There are also
250 increasing demands and shortages in Colorado, with various projects at different stages of
251 development. Colorado's South Platte depletions are allowed to increase by about 100,000 AF
252 because the new depletions are mitigated by Colorado's New Depletion Plan as approved during
253 PRRIP negotiations.

254
255 Without the canal, i.e., a No Action scenario, Bradley outlined information contained in
256 Colorado legislation and planning documents that indicate the only future water crossing the
257 state line will be the (up to) 120 cfs required for the Western Canal during the irrigation season.
258 Nebraska sees the Perkins County Canal as the only way the state can preserve some portion of
259 South Platte water for current users that rely on those flows. The project would result in less
260 reduction of future flows at the Colorado-Nebraska state line. There is no new irrigation
261 development proposed, as the water would be used to support existing irrigation demands
262 downstream, including potential exchanges to North Platte River irrigation canals. The Compact
263 requires that the first use of Perkins County Canal water be for irrigation; there would be no
264 expansion, just support for existing surface water irrigation in excess of 100,000 acres.

265
266 Bradley reported that an evaluation by the consultant Zanjero for the Nebraska legislature found
267 that there would be roughly 75,000-100,000 AF available to Nebraska during the non-irrigation
268 season with the canal. The Perkins County Canal could also potentially help to address issues
269 with the North Platte chokepoint (a concern for USFWS) by moving more water down the South
270 Platte River which cannot be done currently.

271
272 Bradley noted that the Perkins County Canal is expected to require NEPA and ESA analyses.
273 No federal funding is proposed for the project, only state funding. A 404 permit would likely be
274 needed for the South Platte River diversion structure. The PRRIP Second Increment would also
275 require NEPA and ESA analysis but NEPA for the Perkins County Canal is expected to proceed
276 first. Bradley stressed that the Perkins County Canal is not a Program project, and he is not
277 suggesting it is, but it could still provide potential benefits to address the North Platte chokepoint
278 and secure water supplies.

279
280 Altenhofen said he has many questions about Bradley's presentation and Nebraska's
281 assumptions (Altenhofen provided additional clarifying comments and details that are appended
282 to the end of this discussion). How would this not be a Program project if it is benefitting the
283 Program? He recommended that everyone read the Nebraska New Depletion Plan, which
284 includes a moratorium on storage development in Nebraska. Nebraska also cannot negatively
285 impact another state's (i.e., Colorado's) project(s) for the Program. Altenhofen also noted that in
286 mid-winter, such as now, Colorado diversions are all frozen except for the 30 wells pumping for
287 recharge to benefit the Program.

288
289 Whitaker noted that new foothills reservoir projects in Colorado such as Chimney Hollow and
290 the Gross Reservoir expansion are storage facilities for Colorado River water and benefit the
291 South Platte through return flows. Whitaker asked how Nebraska envisions non-irrigation



292 season diversions to occur given excess flows availability, river dry up, and other factors.
293 Bradley said the plan is a direct surface diversion. Nebraska anticipates their impacts to the river
294 would be similar to what's already occurring. Bradley added that Program provisions can't
295 supersede the South Platte Compact and that Nebraska has a superior right to the water.
296

297 Altenhofen said a 1985 Nebraska Supreme Court decision held that a prospective Perkins County
298 Canal would have to address ESA issues, but Bradley disagreed with that interpretation.
299 Altenhofen said that a 1921 call for the Perkins County Canal would shut down the junior
300 Tamarack wells. Bradley suggested that the canal could accomplish what Tamarack does more
301 efficiently. He said everything is still conceptual, with design only about 10% complete, and
302 collaborative discussions with Colorado are ongoing; Nebraska simply doesn't want to miss out
303 on the opportunity to secure its water. Altenhofen asserted that there is much to discuss and that
304 it needs to start at the Governance Committee (GC) level sooner than later.
305

306 Whitaker asked for clarification that other uses are not to be expanded, that Perkins would just be
307 a firming project. Bradley confirmed that there are no plans to bring new lands into irrigated
308 production as part of the project.
309

310 Steinke asked how to move forward with discussions of this? How do we keep WAC
311 discussions Program-related and not political? Keep Perkins County Canal as a standing agenda
312 item? Shafer suggested that as the Water Advisory Committee, the group should remain silent
313 until the GC asks for advice, and only then do some work on it. Responding to Shafer,
314 Altenhofen said that as a Colorado stakeholder and WAC member, he's not just going to wait for
315 Nebraska to address mitigation for Tamarack, we need to understand how this would impact
316 Tamarack.
317

318 Farnsworth asserted that the March GC meeting would be the right time to start discussing the
319 project at that level. Farnsworth asked Bradley if the project Purpose & Need has anything to do
320 with the Program. Bradley said no, not even irrigation, the Purpose & Need is just to secure
321 water rights under the South Platte Compact. Altenhofen said there needs to be discussions with
322 the Corps. Bradley questioned if the WAC is the right place for that discussion. Farnsworth
323 replied that there needed to be a GC discussion about how and when to engage the WAC vs
324 policy vs inter-state issues. There needs to be a major conversation to figure out how to proceed
325 over the long term. This project is increasingly "real" every quarter, and the Program needs to
326 figure out what to do. Steinke said the WAC should wait for direction from the GC, that we
327 want to keep the WAC out of the politics if possible. Responding to Altenhofen, Farnsworth
328 said the GC meeting is March 11-12 (Monday-Tuesday) at the Holiday Inn in Kearney.
329

330 Perkins County Canal Additional Discussion (provided by Colorado Water Users):
331

332 Altenhofen raised numerous questions concerning the Nebraska's Perkins Canal
333 presentation. To Altenhofen, a main question yet to be answered by Nebraska is will the Perkins
334 follow the obligations/requirements of the Nebraska New Depletion Plan (NNDP) approved by



335 PRRIP (by NNDP, Perkins is a new water related activity begun after July 1, 1997) OR operate
336 with no consideration for negative effects on PRRIP because it is a “Compact allowed”
337 project? Nebraska argues that the Perkins canal project is not a “Program Project” even though
338 they claim it will benefit the Program but what about the negatives when the Perkins diverts
339 during times of shortages to target flows? Altenhofen reminded the WAC that if Perkins does
340 benefit PRRIP that it must be scored by the WAC scoring committee.

341
342 Bradley stated that no federal dollars will be used for the Perkins Project but newspaper articles
343 about the Nebraska legislature note the use of federal dollars for the Perkins from the American
344 Rescue Plan Act and the federal infrastructure bill. Altenhofen noted that PRRIP has the “Good
345 Neighbor Policy” that states “All lands and water will be acquired from willing sellers or
346 lessors.” The J-2 reservoir in Nebraska was eliminated as a Program project because unwilling
347 seller and PRRIP cannot condemn.

348
349 Whitaker noted that two of the Colorado projects being developed and shown in the presentation
350 (Chimney Hollow Reservoir and Gross Reservoir enlargement) are transmountain projects from
351 the Colorado River and do not deplete South Platte River flows. Whitaker also noted that if the
352 Perkins Canal is not drying the river at its diversion point, it cannot put on its December 17, 1921
353 call (for October 16 through March 31) against upstream junior rights in Water District 64 per
354 Colorado’s right to regulate and control the Perkins diversion. Altenhofen stated for this day of
355 February 6, 2024, that 16 recharge wells at Tamarack with 1996-1998 priority are pumping 55
356 cfs to develop Colorado’s Tamarack I Plan obligation of shortage reductions and that if the
357 Perkins was diverting today it would call out this Colorado PRRIP approved project and
358 therefore Colorado would not meet its PRRIP obligations. Bradley stated that the Perkins
359 Project will benefit and improve Colorado’s Tamarack I score but with no details
360 given. Farnsworth noted that many of these issues need to be discussed at the GC level.