PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
Water Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Headwaters Corp – Kearney, NE
May 15, 2008

Attendance
Frank Kwapiszki – WAC Chairman, NPPD
Jerry Kenny – Executive Director, Headwaters Corp
Becky Mitchell – Headwaters Corp (conf call)
Beorn Courtney – Headwaters Corp
Blaine Dwyer – Boyle Engineering Corp
Chad Smith – Headwaters Corp
Cory Steinke, CNPPID
Dennis Strauch – Upper Platte Water Users
Duane Woodward – Downstream Water Users/Central Platte NRD
Frank Albrecht – Nebraska Game & Parks Commission
Jennifer Schellpeper – Nebraska DNR
Jeff Bandy – Boyle Engineering Corp
Jesse Bradley – Nebraska DNR
Jon Altenhofen – Colorado Water Users/NCWCD (conf call)
Kent Miller – Downstream Water Users/Twin Platte NRD
Mahonri Williams – Bureau of Reclamation (conf call)
Mark Butler – US Fish & Wildlife Service (conf call)
Matt Hoobler – Wyoming State Engineer’s Office
Mike Besson – Wyoming Water Development Commission
Mike Drain – CNPPID
Pat O’Brien – Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality

Welcome and Administrative
On May 14, 2008, in preparation for this workshop, several members of the Water Advisory Committee (WAC) joined staff from Boyle Engineering Corp and the Executive Director’s office on a field tour of the system from Lake McConaughy downstream to the Kearney Canal. The group was guided by Cory Steinke, Jeff Shafer, and Mike Drain of CNPPID. The primary focus of the meeting on May 15, 2008 was on Phase II of the Water Management Study (WMS), with a workshop led by Boyle Engineering. Following the workshop, the Executive Director’s office provided updates on two other water-related Program matters: potential new stream gage locations and depletions plans.

Water Management Study
Jerry Kenny provided an overview of the Phase II Water Management Study purpose and scope. The purpose of the workshop was to identify up to 25 alternatives for consideration in Phase II which would be screened at a broad level to evaluate the ability to contribute to the pulse flow and annual average flow objectives of the Program. Boyle will present the results of the initial screening to the WAC in a workshop to be held in Lakewood, CO on July 16, 2008. With
consent from the WAC, Boyle will then move forward with 3 alternatives that will be investigated at a reconnaissance level with more detailed analyses including site visits. A draft report will be provided mid-October and Boyle will present the final results at the December 3, 2008 Governance Committee (GC) meeting in Denver, with the final report provided by end of 2008.

Boyle presented a preliminary matrix of screening criteria and recommended that weights not be applied to the individual screening criteria. The WAC discussed ways to evaluate the benefit-to-cost ratio of individual alternatives. Boyle indicated that they could evaluate cost per acre-foot of yield or cost per cfs yield toward the pulse flow. This led to discussions on clarification of the WMS Phase II objective. Phase I focused on evaluating how a release from the Lake McConaughy Environmental Account could contribute to the pulse flow. Mike Drain emphasized that Phase II is focused on the pulse flow analysis. Frank Kwapniszki recommended that alternatives should be evaluated comprehensively, considering opportunities for conjunctive management and cooperative/coordinated projects. Boyle suggested that alternatives could be evaluated with respect to contributions to the pulse flow and additional broader benefits. The WAC agreed that alternatives should be screened individually as well as considered in a combined approach. The WAC further agreed that while the focus of Phase II is on the pulse flow, the extent to which excess flows could be credited toward annual reductions to target flows should also be quantified.

Boyle presented a table of potential alternatives which were identified from several sources: individuals interviewed in Phase I of the WMS, comments from WAC members on the Phase I report, CNPPID Depletion Mitigation Study (2000), and the Boyle Water Conservation/Supply Reconnaissance Study (1999). The draft table identified whether alternatives were most suited to (a) meet the pulse flow objective; (b) provide water for management in Lake McConaughy, Johnson Lake, or other storage; and/or (c) contribute to the 800 cfs irrigation season flow/reduce shortages to annual target flows.

Several additional alternatives were added to the initial table. The WAC discussed each alternative and agreed to strike several alternatives which did not warrant further screening under Phase II objectives. The table is attached, including general information provided through discussions. The direction from the discussion was to move forward with projects that are most suited to contribute to the goal of a pulse flow.

All of the projects discussed are included on the attached table. Those projects that will not be evaluated as a part of Phase II of the WMS are shaded gray in the table. It is important to note that these projects were not removed from consideration for the overall objectives the Program; only that they will not be considered in Phase II. The WAC agreed that several projects could be evaluated outside of the Phase II as part of Program operations. Several projects were also removed from the focus of Phase II because they are already included under the draft Water Action Plan.
**Stream Gage Station Locations**

Jerry Kenny distributed a map showing current gage locations and proposed two new gage locations in areas where there is currently a significant distance between stream gages.

The first potential gage location would be near a bridge at Lexington, the upstream side of the critical habitat reach. Lexington was previously gaged and abandoned due to the formation of multiple channels. This location would benefit the Program during times of nesting and would assist in planning efforts with the pulse flow — to predict flow attenuation and aid in the timing of any coordinated releases from CNPPID's system. Cory Steinke indicated that this would assist in CNPPID operations, however it is not absolutely critical for CNPPID to coordinate their operations with Program pulse-flow objectives.

The second potential gage location would be near a bridge at Shelton below the Kearney power return. This location is specified in the Geomorphology Protocol, and would provide data in an area that currently has a large distance between gages at Kearney and Grand Island.

Frank Kwapisniski inquired whether Jerry had received feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) or Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG) committees. Jerry indicated that he is approaching the WAC first, and will be approaching these other committees next.

Jerry reported on costs to install and monitor. He obtained cost information from the USGS and Nebraska DNR (NDNR). NDNR estimated a stage/flow gage could be installed this year and monitored for approximately $5,000 to $6,000 per site; these two sites would each have roughly the same costs. Annual monitoring costs would be half or less of these first-year costs. USGS indicated installation and monitoring for the first year would cost over $20,000, with subsequent annual monitoring costs around $3,000 to $6,000. Jerry recommended having NDNR install both gages this year; NDNR indicated they could get both installed if the Program provided a formal request soon as they get busy starting mid-July. NDNR also confirmed that they can make continual real-time data available on-line; this was also confirmed by Cory Steinke.

General discussion was in support of the plan to install gages at both sites with the advice that the TAC and AMWG also be consulted. Frank Kwapisniski inquired whether anyone on the WAC was opposed. With no opposition, Jerry took this as approval of the plan and will proceed to have similar discussions with the TAC and AMWG.

**Depletions Plans Reporting**

Beorn Courtney provided an update of the status of depletions plans reporting. At the April 2008 GC meeting, the GC clarified that standard annual depletions plan reports will be directed to the WAC for review, with the WAC reporting to the GC. Amendments to the depletions plans are to be brought to the GC first and only referred to the WAC if necessary. Colorado presented an amendment to its depletions plan at the April 2008 GC meeting.

The Executive Director’s office has received a standard annual report from Wyoming. Prior to circulating this report, staff from the Executive Director’s office is reviewing the depletions
plans in the Program document and developing a tracking spreadsheet to assist the WAC in (a)
tracking information as it is reported, and (b) determining whether the information meets
obligations committed to under the Program document. This information will be provided to the
WAC when reports are distributed. The Executive Director’s office will circulate the tracking
information and the Wyoming report prior to the June 2008 GC meeting.

Report to the Governance Committee
Frank Kwapnioski will report the conclusions of this meeting to the Governance
Committee and can do so even if the minutes of the meeting have not been approved.

Future Meeting Dates and Locations
A follow-up WMS Phase II workshop meeting was set for 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Mountain time on
July 16, 2008 at the USFWS offices in Lakewood, CO (doors open at 8:30 a.m. Mountain time):

1st floor Wolf Conference Room
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
134 Union Blvd
Lakewood, CO 80228