



1                   **PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**  
2                   **Governance Committee Meeting Minutes**  
3                   DIA Marriott Residence Inn – Denver, CO  
4                   December 1-2, 2009

5  
6                   **Tuesday, December 1, 2009**  
7

8                   **Executive Director’s Office (ED Office)**

- 9                   Jerry Kenny – Executive Director
- 10                  Bridget Barron
- 11                  Chad Smith
- 12                  Beorn Courtney
- 13                  Jason Farnsworth
- 14                  Bruce Sackett
- 15                  Steve Smith
- 16                  Laura Belanger

17  
18                  **Governance Committee (GC)**

- 19                  Don Ament – State of Colorado, Chair
- 20                  Brian Barel – Nebraska Public Power District
- 21                  John Kolanz – Greeley Water and Sewer Department
- 22                  Alan Berryman – Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District
- 23                  Kevin Urie – Denver Water
- 24                  Deb Freeman – SP WRAP/Colorado Water Users
- 25                  Ted Kowalski – Colorado Water Conservation Board
- 26                  Mark Czaplewski – Central Platte Natural Resources District
- 27                  Don Kraus – Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District
- 28                  Mike Purcell – State of Wyoming
- 29                  John Lawson – Bureau of Reclamation
- 30                  Kent Miller – Twin Platte Natural Resources District
- 31                  Jennifer Schellpeper – Nebraska DNR
- 32                  Dennis Strauch – Pathfinder Irrigation District
- 33                  Michael Thabault – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 34                  Bill Taddicken – Audubon Rowe Sanctuary
- 35                  Felipe Chavez-Ramirez – Platte River Whooping Crane Maintenance Trust

36  
37                  **Participants**

- 38                  Brock Merrill – Bureau of Reclamation
- 39                  Greg Wingfield – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 40                  Matt Rabbe – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 41                  Jeff Runge – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 42                  Bob Harms – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 43                  Lindsay Vivian – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

---

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 Governance Committee before approval.



44 Cory Steinke – Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District  
45 Jim Schneider – Nebraska DNR  
46 Eric Dove – Olsson Associates  
47 Pat Engelbert – HDR  
48 Tom Riley – The Flatwater Group  
49 Brad Anderson – Anderson Consulting  
50 Chester Watson – Brevenharn Group  
51 Mike Drain – Central Nebraska Public Power & Irrigation District  
52 Matt Lindburg – Brown & Caldwell  
53 Deb Ohlinger – Olsson Associates  
54 Don Beesley – Olsson Associates  
55 Doug Yadon – AECOM

56

### 57 **Welcome & Administrative**

58 Ament called the meeting to order and the group proceeded with introductions. Ament asked for  
59 agenda modifications; none offered. Purcell moved to approve the October 2009 GC minutes;  
60 Berryman seconded. **Minutes approved.** Schellpeper moved to approve the November 2009  
61 GC Special Session minutes; Lawson second. **Minutes approved.**

62

### 63 **Program Committee Updates**

#### 64 *Land Advisory Committee (LAC)*

65 Czaplewski provided an update on the latest LAC activities. The LAC last met on November 18  
66 in Kearney. Scott Woodman was re-elected as LAC Chair; Czaplewski was re-elected Vice-  
67 Chair. Most of the discussion focused on Complex and Tract Land Management Plans and their  
68 associated work plans and budgets. LAC members will submit comments on these plans by  
69 January 8 and the plans will be discussed again when the LAC meets on January 29. LAC  
70 approved Land Exchange Plan that the GC will discuss tomorrow.

71

#### 72 *Water Advisory Committee (WAC)*

73 Steinke provided an update on the latest WAC activities. Steinke was elected Chair at the last  
74 meeting on November 17. Olsson presented on the re-regulating reservoirs that will be discussed  
75 at the GC meeting tomorrow. WAC supports the J-2 alternatives and recommends moving  
76 toward full feasibility analysis. Steve Smith and Bill Hahn (Hahn Water Resources) presented  
77 on groundwater recharge. Courtney provided a Water Action Plan update.

78

#### 79 *Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)*

80 Smith provided an update on the latest TAC activities. The TAC last met on November 23.  
81 HDR presented on the stage change study and provided an example of how Program water  
82 activities could influence the lower Platte. TAC discussed the draft 2008-2009 Program tern and  
83 plover monitoring report, wet meadows RFP, 1-D modeling RFP, and FY 2010 Program budget.  
84 Next TAC meeting is scheduled for January 21; one primary discussion topic will be the draft  
85 Complex and Tract Land Management Plans.

86



87 *Finance Committee (FC)*

88 Purcell provided an update on the latest FC activities. The FC met on November 9 and discussed  
89 the FY 2010 Program budget. The FC recommended several changes and Kenny was directed to  
90 make those changes and present the revised budget to the GC for approval. The FC reviewed the  
91 wet meadows information review RFP and the 1-D modeling RFP.

92

93 **Program Outreach Update**

94 *Recent Presentations:*

- 95 • Program was very involved in the Platte River Symposium, including coordinating two  
96 keynote panel discussions (Kenny, Schellpeper, Anderson, Czapplewski, Jenniges; ISAC  
97 members); ED Office staff led a field trip to Cottonwood Ranch; UNL staff said it was one of  
98 the most well attended events they have hosted.
- 99 • Ron Bishop presented at the American Water Resources Association in Texas in November.

100

101 *Upcoming Presentations:*

- 102 • Smith is presenting to the 70<sup>th</sup> Annual Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference in Springfield,  
103 IL on December 7.
- 104 • ED Office will host a meet and greet for anchor point landowners in Kearney on December  
105 10 to discuss geomorphology/vegetation monitoring efforts during the summer of 2009.

106

107 *Press Coverage:*

- 108 • Kearney Hub featured a large piece on the Program and Cottonwood Ranch related to the  
109 Platte River Symposium.
- 110 • Kenny was interviewed for Kearney Hub story on the Platte River caddisfly.

111

112 Barron presented Christmas gifts from Headwaters Corporation to all GC members.

113

114 **FY 2010 Program Budget, Work Plan, and ED Office Contract**

115 Kenny discussed the latest versions of the FY 2010 Program Budget, Work Plan, and ED Office  
116 contract. With the exception of line item ED-1, all budget line items and associated numbers  
117 have been previously presented to the GC and have been discussed in detail with the WAC,  
118 LAC, TAC, and FC. The FC directed Kenny to reduce the number for ED-1 by at least 3.5%.  
119 Kenny reduced the number by 3.6% and the total is now under \$1.6 million; background  
120 information is contained in Exhibit B, the ED Office Contract amendment for 2010. The budget  
121 out to 2019 does not indicate an ED Office budget increase.

122

123 Two numbers need to be revised based on late-breaking information:

124

- 125 • PS-2, Lower Platte River Stage Change Study – This report was to be presented to the GC in  
126 December but has been pushed back to March 2010 because of additional analysis, meetings,  
127 and discussion to wrap the project up. Kenny asked for a new money allocation of \$50,000  
128 for FY 2010.



129 • PD-11, AMP Reporting – The Program will host an AMP Reporting Session on February 17-  
130 18, 2010 in Denver, CO. Program contractors will be required to attend and present, so  
131 meeting costs (including contractor staff time and travel and ISAC time and travel) need to  
132 be covered. This is an important event for Program-related science communication and will  
133 likely save the Program money down the road. Kenny asked for an additional new money  
134 allocation of \$80,000 for FY 2010 (budget line item should total \$100,000). Urie asked is  
135 this would happen every year. Kenny said we would see how valuable this meeting is, but it  
136 is likely to be an annual event. Barels said this seems like a lot of money that will take funds  
137 away from other projects. Is there a more cost effective way to do this? Kenny said we have  
138 never had all Program contractors together in one place, but that it is a lot of money so there  
139 needs to be something valuable coming out of this. Barels said one potential downside is that  
140 certain work will have to be put on hold. Kenny said an important reason for this is to bring  
141 everyone together to hear what Program efforts are on the ground and what work is being  
142 done. Kraus asked what group would be invited. Kenny said contractors with work  
143 underway and recently completed projects would be part of the session. Ament said the idea  
144 has value but the price tag is high. Kenny said he agreed and he hates bringing surprises to  
145 the GC like this. One alternative would be for the GC to set a number and the session would  
146 be held within that budget limit. Urie asked if the intent was for contractors to be aware of  
147 other data collection efforts. Kenny said that was part of it, but that it is also to help identify  
148 efficiencies, communication gaps, and other items. Chavez-Ramirez asked where additional  
149 budget savings might come down the road from this effort. Kenny said it is hard to identify  
150 that now. Purcell said it might be better to just seek a \$50,000 increase and then manage the  
151 session within that budget. Kenny said that would be workable.

152  
153 Purcell moved to approve the FY 2010 Program Budget as presented to the GC, with a \$50,000  
154 increase to PS-2 and a \$50,000 increase to PD-11 and associated revisions to the FY 2010  
155 Program work plan. Kowalski seconded. **FY 2010 Program Budget, Work Plan, and ED  
156 Office Contract approved.**

157  
158 **Kenny agreed to revise the budget spreadsheet and work plan accordingly and re-  
159 distribute to the GC.**

160  
161 Schellpeper asked if more detailed explanation could be provided regarding ISAC  
162 recommendations and associated tasks/budget implications. Kenny said that would be completed  
163 expeditiously. Kraus asked what we have expended on land acquisition. Kenny said roughly  
164 \$6.7 million in FY 2009, which are largely all the expenditures on land to date. Kraus said it  
165 seemed like there was a much larger budget number in the Land Plan that was originally  
166 estimated. Kenny said that is true, but that the Land Plan estimates also included land  
167 management costs.

### 168 **Program RFPs**

169 Wet Meadows RFP – Smith discussed the status of the wet meadows information review RFP.  
170 TAC discussions during 2009 have stalled on the issue of how to define a wet meadow in the



172 context of this project – focused on whooping cranes or inclusive of wet meadows as a system.  
173 The ED Office will provide the GC with a briefing document for the March 2010 GC meeting  
174 that will discuss both points of view and provide information for the GC to consider. Purcell  
175 asked Smith to provide a brief synopsis of the situation. Smith discussed his interpretation of  
176 both viewpoints as discussed at the TAC level. Lawson said a key question is to address whether  
177 the choice of wet meadow definition results in an expansion of what was envisioned and  
178 intended for the Program. Czaplewski said one option may be to start with the priority definition  
179 and be sure not to preclude broader-scale work in the future. Wingfield said this is an issue that  
180 folks have been struggling with for some time but that as things move forward, we need to start  
181 on the right foot. Purcell asked if there will be monetary implications depending on direction.  
182 Smith said it is likely that a broader-scale information review will cost more than the estimated  
183 \$50,000. Thabault said the Service believes it is important to capture the full range of wet  
184 meadows first to help save time and money in the long run.

185  
186 1-D Modeling RFP – Steve Smith said the ED Office recommends Jeff Runge, Mike Besson, Jim  
187 Jenniges, Steve Smith, and Jason Farnsworth for the Proposal Selection Panel. Doug Hallum  
188 and Crystal Lesmeister were added to the panel from Nebraska; Alan Berryman was added from  
189 Colorado. Strauch moved to approve the Panel; Thabault seconded. **Proposal Selection Panel**  
190 **approved.**

191  
192 **Platte River Caddisfly**

193 Bob Harms with the Service provided a presentation on the status of the Platte River caddisfly.  
194 Barel asked why the species is in decline. Harms said there is no exact answer yet but  
195 investigations are ongoing to determine that information. Harms noted that of six historic known  
196 sites, four were gone. Barel asked if the historic sites were there but no caddisflies were  
197 present. Harms said that is correct. Ament asked if phragmites is a factor. Harms said there are  
198 suspicions that phragmites is choking out wetlands but there are no numbers yet to support that  
199 suspicion. Freeman asked about the role of recent dry conditions and potential correlation with  
200 fluctuating population numbers. Harms said drought could certainly play a role in population  
201 numbers; other natural factors could be at work as well. Kolanz asked about variations in  
202 surveying methods and timing. Harms said for the caddisfly, surveys generally include being on  
203 your hands and knees looking for larvae in the wetland/grassland interface. Most of this survey  
204 work is done May-August. Freeman asked if surveying has been opportunistic by access or is  
205 there a survey plan. Harms said some of both, but much of it is opportunistic. Freeman asked if  
206 there is a method yet for extrapolating survey results to population estimates. Harms said not at  
207 this point.

208  
209 Thabault said part of the Service's job is to base decisions and actions on the best available  
210 science. The Service also tries to balance conservation and stressors. The Service is still waiting  
211 on funding to continue the Species Status Assessment. Thabault said he knows there are  
212 concerns about major Program redirection based on a potential caddisfly listing. He said the  
213 Service does not think this is the case, and even if the species fell under the Program umbrella  
214 there would not be a major impact on Program actions. Czaplewski asked when the Service



215 would be done with the assessment. Thabault said if there is money in FY 2010, the assessment  
216 must be done by August 2010 by law. Harms said the good news is that Vivian is on staff and  
217 continues to do surveys and monitoring. Freeman asked how the Service envisions looking at  
218 issues related to current Program actions. Thabault said there is continuous and ongoing  
219 dialogue as to where Program actions could potentially interface with the caddisfly. Harms said  
220 the Service has provided comments on Program land actions through consultation under the Fish  
221 and Wildlife Coordination Act. Farnsworth said as soon as a Program property comes online  
222 those properties are surveyed for caddisflies by Vivian.

223  
224 Kowalski asked what the status of the caddisfly is in Nebraska under state law. Harms said the  
225 species is not state listed but is a species of concern. The Service works hand-in-hand with the  
226 Nebraska Game and Parks Commission on issues like this. Freeman said one concern she has is  
227 that if there is a listing, it would complicate on-the-ground actions of the Program (for example,  
228 issues of take). There is also a concern about how the Program would interface with a newly  
229 listed species. Thabault said the Service recognizes those concerns but there are ways to  
230 navigate the regulatory roadmap. In the end, there seems to be a high affinity between the  
231 Program and the needs of the caddisfly. Farnsworth asked if the Service has received any  
232 information yet from caddisfly DNA samples taken near Sutherland and in Holt County near the  
233 Elkhorn River. Harms said not yet; Vivian said hopefully by the end of December.

234  
235 Barels asked about the funding mentioned by Thabault earlier and how much of that would be  
236 used for surveys (and where). Thabault said that funding would not be used for surveys but for  
237 staff time to prepare listing documents and other supporting information. Barels asked how  
238 broadly the Service would look in the assessment. Thabault said the Service has to use best  
239 available science and follow a strict timeline. The status assessment will portray the uncertainty  
240 around the science. Barels asked if it is on the Program's Species of Concern list. Thabault said  
241 it is; Farnsworth said it is listed as the "Platte River stonefly". Freeman asked how difficult this  
242 species is to survey for. Vivian said it is a 3, meaning the surveys are easy to survey when in  
243 water compared to other species. Purcell asked how far in terms of spatial scope DNA testing  
244 will occur (for example, caddisflies in Colorado). Thabault said that will be driven by an  
245 assessment of the best available science.

246  
247 **Harms agreed to send Chad Smith a copy of the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission**  
248 **caddisfly survey for distribution to the GC.**

249  
250 Meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m. Mountain time.

251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257



**Wednesday, December 2, 2009**

258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300

**Welcome and Introduction**

Ament called the meeting to order and the group proceeded with a roll call.

**Program Document Water Plan Reference Materials**

Courtney discussed proposed changes to appendices (A-5 and E) in the Program document Water Plan Reference Materials. Barels asked what the appendices are for. Courtney said A-5 is used for scoring Program water activities. Appendix E is a single table trying to provide a more streamlined presentation of the information represented in Appendix A-5. Barels said the downstream water users think this would result in a change to the Nebraska New Depletions Plan and needs further discussion. Courtney said discussions with Don Anderson and Jon Altenhofen indicated that there was an oversight in Appendix E that needs to be corrected as proposed. Purcell asked if what Courtney wants is GC consensus that Program water projects should be evaluated using Appendix A-5. Courtney said that is correct. Purcell said he is hearing concerns on the part of the downstream water users about changing Appendix E at this time. Barels said Appendix A was prepared by the Service as reference material, so the intent was never for the Program to use this appendix. Appendix E was prepared by the GC and was the appendix to be used by the Program. Drain said that is correct, but that Appendix E was meant to clarify the flow targets in Appendix A-5.

Purcell asked if the WAC recommendation is to use the A-5 criteria for evaluating Program water projects. Courtney said that is correct, and projects to date have been evaluated using Appendix A-5. Wingfield said that Don Anderson's recollection was that Appendix E may have been created to provide a table that did not unnecessarily repeat similar numbers several times. Courtney said one of the reasons the WAC wants to use A-5 to score water projects is that the OPSTUDY model will use A-5. Schellpeper asked if this becomes a scoring issue for Program projects. Drain said it is an issue of scoring projects on a daily basis and not having to re-score them on a monthly basis. Barels asked if Appendix E represents how we are going to operate approved water projects. Kraus agreed. Kenny said at this point the issue is scoring but it is also about consistency in the documents and how they are applied. Appendix E is supposed to reflect A-5. Barels said he did not think E is supposed to reflect A-5. Lawson said concepts changed after the Boyle Reconnaissance-Level Water Action Plan report was completed and that we need to come to grips on how we are going to start scoring in the future. Lawson thought the Service was going to go back and look at these scoring issues in the future and provide the GC with some recommendations. Wingfield said the issue was scoring projects for target flows and/or Short Duration High Flows (SDHF). The targets in the appendices now incorporate higher pulse flows than the smaller, shorter duration SDHFs. Lawson said the scoring decision needs to be made because of how much water something like a SDHF can use. Barels said Appendix F lays out the calculation process for the May-June period. Lawson said he is not sure that is meant for scoring purposes. This issue seems to be important for scoring projects like the proposed J-2 reservoir that can contribute to SDHF. Kraus said that is a different issue because Appendices A-5 and E seem to be related more to operation than to scoring. Berryman said the concept of

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 Governance Committee before approval.



301 SDHF came in late and they were not really scored; this is an issue that needs to be addressed.  
302 Lawson and Purcell agreed.

303  
304 Purcell asked Wingfield how EA releases have been scored and/or evaluated. Wingfield said he  
305 is just using Service target flows as a guide. Drain asked if he is using a daily target. Wingfield  
306 said that is correct. Purcell said we are now trying to achieve things that were not envisioned  
307 when these appendices were created. The WAC is correct in using A-5 to score projects at this  
308 point. Besson said in the future the difference between scoring projects and operating projects  
309 will lead to crediting problems and needs addressed. Wingfield sees two needs from the Service:  
310 1) working with Don Anderson to look at how the Service considered daily targets for scoring  
311 and 2) how projects will be scored in regard to SDHFs. Barels said the Program is based on  
312 species flows, which includes target flows and annual pulse flows. Besson asked about the  
313 volume difference between the two appendices. Courtney said 1,800 acre-feet in wet years only.  
314 Lawson said there needs to be additional follow-up through the Service and the WAC.  
315 Berryman said target flows are important because we have always thought excess to target flows  
316 would be important for the Program. Scoring is a second step, but we need to develop water that  
317 is excess to target flows.

318  
319 Purcell said a small group with a cross-section of GC members and WAC members needs to  
320 tackle this issue and bring a recommendation back to the GC in March 2010. **Ament appointed**  
321 **Lawson (Chair), Altenhofen, Berryman, Purcell, Besson, Barels, Schellpeper, Drain,**  
322 **Anderson, and Courtney.**

### 323 324 Water Action Plan Update

325 Courtney delivered a presentation on proposed updates to the Water Action Plan. The update is  
326 finding that there are likely combinations of projects that can produce amounts needed to meet  
327 the Program water objective within the Water Plan budget. The updated Water Action Plan will  
328 be a living document, with information updated as feasibility studies are completed. Kraus asked  
329 about updates to the yield number. Courtney said it jumps from an average annual of 64,050  
330 acre-feet to 83,400 acre-feet for WAP projects based on updated information. Lawson asked if  
331 this includes new or different projects. Courtney said it is largely the same projects with a few  
332 changes to certain projects. A final report with suggested updates will be presented to the GC in  
333 March 2010.

### 334 335 2010 Environmental Account AOP

336 Wingfield delivered a presentation on the 2010 Environmental Account (EA) Annual Operating  
337 Plan (AOP) and a short summary of results from the 2009 Flow Routing Test. The highest  
338 priority for the EA in 2010 is carryover into 2011 to prepare for SDHF in 2011, 2012, and 2014.  
339 Ament asked if there was any comparison completed between the May 2008 high flow event and  
340 the Flow Routing Test. Wingfield said there was no money spent on specific monitoring because  
341 the Flow Routing Test was focused more on water conveyance and coordination. Farnsworth  
342 said there was some anecdotal evidence that the Flow Routing Test did not scour vegetation but





343 that the geomorphology/vegetation monitoring protocol was not yet in place; future events will  
344 be captured by this annual monitoring effort.

345

### 346 **Reservoir Feasibility Study Report**

347 Farnsworth introduced staff from Olsson Associates attending the meeting who developed the  
348 reservoir pre-feasibility study. Eric Dove delivered a presentation on the study results. Next  
349 steps are a final report to the GC in March 2010 and moving into full feasibility on J-2  
350 Alternative 2 (Area 1 or 2) and a low release rate option for target flows from Elwood Reservoir.  
351 Kraus asked if excavation of Area 1 is similar to Area 2. Dove said it is similar, but it is a ring  
352 dike that requires a bridge from the canal. Area 1 is 100% gravity fill without pumps; storage  
353 could be increased with pumps. Kraus asked if release rates to the river are similar between  
354 Areas 1 and 2. Dove said they are the same. Purcell asked what Farnsworth wanted to  
355 accomplish. Farnsworth asked the GC if Olsson could punch holes in February in potential sites  
356 to get data on soils in the areas. Purcell asked if Olsson's contract includes this second phase.  
357 Farnsworth said the contract is only for Phase I but says it can be modified into Phase II once a  
358 scope is developed. Kraus asked about landowner contacts. Kenny said there have been some  
359 initial conversations but not a full methodical approach yet. The plan is before moving forward  
360 the ED Office will take the lead on landowner contacts in this area, coordinating closely with  
361 Central. Purcell asked if the report will be made public soon. Kenny said it will not come to the  
362 GC until March and will not be posted until then. Purcell said geotechnical drilling will alert  
363 landowners. Also, there are issues about project sponsorship and the relationship of the sponsor  
364 with the Program that still need to be worked out. Lawson asked if there is a proposal to do  
365 geotechnical investigations without going ahead with full feasibility. Farnsworth said we can do  
366 an amendment to the original agreement, but that we also need to detail a scope of work for full  
367 feasibility that could begin with GC approval in March 2010. Purcell said one possibility is to  
368 hold a GC Special Session to discuss this later. Farnsworth said a full feasibility scope could be  
369 drafted prior to the Special Session. Purcell said the GC also needs to see a cost estimate for  
370 February geotechnical work. Kraus said he has not discussed this item with his Board of  
371 Directors and may need a presentation like the one at the GC meeting to keep moving forward.  
372 Purcell said the GC needs to see at least a proposed sponsorship agreement from Central since  
373 they would own the project. Purcell asked if there could be a fatal flaw that might show up in  
374 the geotechnical work. Dove said any issues could be resolved with money.

375

376 Purcell said the ED Office should work with Olsson to develop a cost estimate for the  
377 geotechnical work and also costs for implementing a Phase II scope of work. A GC Special  
378 Session to discuss these matters as well as Central progress on a sponsorship agreement. **Kenny  
379 and Kraus agreed.**

380

381 Kraus asked if the south channel option for J-2 was still viable. Farnsworth said for several  
382 reasons it had fallen down the list of viable options. Kraus asked if the WAC was still reviewing  
383 the report; Barels asked about the timing of those comments. Dove said the final report will go  
384 to the GC in March, so Olsson will do some revisions of the report over the next two weeks, ED  
385 Office staff will review the report, and the report will be discussed at the WAC meeting in



386 February. Barels said it would be good to have WAC input before convening a GC Special  
387 Session. Courtney said that a special WAC meeting could be convened. Lawson asked where  
388 the geotechnical work would be done. Farnsworth said proposed Areas 1 and 2 only. Taddicken  
389 asked if water levels would be a problem at the cemetery near Area 1. Dove said it will require  
390 sheet pile, drain tile, and seepage ditches to keep the water down there. Geotechnical work will  
391 help to determine what actions will need to be taken to protect the cemetery.

392

### 393 **Public Comment**

394 Ament asked for public comment. None was offered.

395

### 396 **Executive Session**

397 The Governance Committee took a short break and re-convened. Berryman moved to enter  
398 Executive Session to discuss land issues; Schellpeper seconded. **GC entered Executive Session**  
399 **at 11:30 a.m. Mountain time.**

400

401 Wingfield moved to end Executive Session; Chavez-Ramirez seconded. **GC ended Executive**  
402 **Session at 11:50 a.m.**

403

### 404 **Program Land Tracts & Issues**

405 Schellpeper moved to approve the Land Exchange Policy with the change of the word “before”  
406 to “by”; Lawson seconded. **Land Exchange Policy approved.**

407

### 408 **Future Meetings & Closing Business**

409 Purcell nominated Lawson as 2010 GC Chair and Schellpeper as Vice-Chair. Strauch moved to  
410 close nominations and elect the Chair and Vice-Chair by unanimous consent. **Chair and Vice-**  
411 **Chair approved.**

412

413 Upcoming GC meetings are scheduled for:

414

415 March 9-10, 2010 @ Kearney, NE

416 June 8-9, 2010 @ Cheyenne, WY

417 September 14-15, 2010 @ Kearney, NE

418 December 7-8, 2010 @ Denver, CO

419

420 **Meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m. Mountain time.**

421

### 422 **Summary of Action Items/Decisions from December 2009 GC meeting**

- 423 1) Approved October 2009 GC minutes  
424 2) Approved November 2009 GC Special Session minutes.  
425 3) Approved FY 2010 Program Budget, Work Plan, and ED Office Contract, including  
426 revisions to PS-2 and PD-11 and associated changes to spreadsheet and work plan.  
427 4) Kenny agreed to revise the budget spreadsheet and work plan and re-submit both to the GC.



- 428 5) Kenny and Smith agreed to prepare a “Response to Comments” document for the 2009 ISAC  
429 report and submit it to the GC for review and discussion.
- 430 6) GC approved Proposal Selection Panel for 1-D Modeling RFP – Steve Smith, Farnsworth,  
431 Jenniges, Runge, Besson, Berryman, Hallum, Lesmeister
- 432 7) GC appointed small group to address proposed changes to Water Plan Reference Materials  
433 and bring recommendation back to GC in March 2010 – Lawson (Chair), Altenhofen,  
434 Berryman, Purcell, Besson, Barels, Schellpeper, Drain, Anderson, and Courtney.
- 435 8) GC directed the ED Office to work with Olsson Associates to develop a cost estimate for the  
436 geotechnical work related to potential re-regulating reservoir sites and also a scope of work  
437 and cost estimate for Phase II of the reservoir study. A GC Special Session to discuss these  
438 matters as well as Central progress on a sponsorship agreement will be convened in January  
439 or February.
- 440 9) GC approved Land Exchange Policy with wording change.
- 441 10) John Lawson elected 2010 GC Chair; Jennifer Schellpeper elected 2010 GC Vice-Chair.