



**PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**

**Governance Committee Meeting Minutes**

Wyoming Water Development Commission – Cheyenne, WY

June 2-3, 2009

**Tuesday, June 2, 2009**

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

Jerry Kenny – Executive Director

Bridget Barron

Chad Smith

Beorn Courtney

Jason Farnsworth

Bruce Sackett

**Governance Committee (GC)**

Don Ament – State of Colorado, Chair

Brian Barel – Nebraska Public Power District

Alan Berryman – Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District

Mark Czaplewski – Central Platte Natural Resources District

Felipe Chavez-Ramirez – Platte River Whooping Crane Maintenance Trust

Norm DeMott – Upper Platte River Water Users

John Kolanz – Greeley Water and Sewer Department

Don Kraus – Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District

Harry LaBonde – State of Wyoming

John Lawson – Bureau of Reclamation

Kent Miller – Twin Platte Natural Resources District

Jennifer Schellpeper – Nebraska Department of Natural Resources

Dennis Strauch – Pathfinder Irrigation District

Bill Taddicken – Audubon Rowe Sanctuary

Kevin Urie – Denver Water

Deb Freeman – Colorado Water Users

George Williams – Upper North Platte River Water Users

June DeWeese – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Independent Scientific Advisory Committee (ISAC)**

David Galat – USGS/University of Missouri Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit

Robb Jacobson – USGS

Kent Loftin – HydroPlan, LLC.

David Marmorek – ESSA Technologies

John Nestler – Environmental and Fisheries Services

**Participants**

Mike Besson – State of Wyoming



45 Mark Czaplewski – Central Platte Natural Resources District  
46 Brock Merrill – Bureau of Reclamation  
47 Jim Jenniges – Nebraska Public Power District  
48 Brad Anderson – Anderson Consulting Engineers  
49 Larry Schulz – Consultant  
50 Ken Knox – URS  
51 Diane Hoppe – MWH  
52 Don Anderson – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
53 Matt Raabe – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
54 Matt Hoobler – State of Wyoming  
55 Tim Martin – Riverside  
56 Bill McCarthy – WTE  
57 Tekla Taylor – Brown & Caldwell  
58 Matt Lindburg – Brown & Caldwell  
59 Jim Schneider – Nebraska DNR  
60 Pat Goltl – Nebraska DNR

61

62 **Welcome & Administrative**

63 Ament called the meeting and the group proceeded with introductions. Kenny requested time on  
64 the agenda for Schellpeper to discuss the Nebraska New Depletions Plan. DeMott moved to  
65 approve the April 7-8, 2009 GC minutes and the April 17, 2009 GC special session minutes;  
66 Berryman seconded. **Both minutes approved.**

67

68 **ISAC Presentation**

69 Smith provided an update on recent ISAC activities and introduced the ISAC Chair, David  
70 Marmorek. Marmorek introduced the members of the ISAC attending the meeting and provided  
71 the GC with a Power Point presentation detailing ISAC progress answering the list of priority  
72 questions and recommendations for Program action. Kraus asked about updating sediment  
73 transport and how it fits with rapid prototyping. Marmorek said rapid prototyping is used to just  
74 rough out potential actions and consequences. Jacobson said sediment transport is assumed to be  
75 a fundamental process but also an expensive management action and the existing sediment  
76 augmentation RFP can cover this. Ament asked what is meant by a “mock report”. Marmorek  
77 explained how it would come together and what might be included – example charts, graphs,  
78 differences between FSM and MCM, data analysis and organization, etc. Marmorek showed a  
79 Power Point slide detailing the steps of simulating AM actions/experiments and how to pull  
80 information into a mock report.

81

82 Purcell said in essence what we have in front of us is a proposed habitat design (site distance for  
83 whooping cranes, nest availability for terns/plovers). He is certain with the right amount of  
84 materials that habitat can be built; habitat might be created by flows and sediment. He asked – if  
85 the species response is to the design, or how the habitat was created? Marmorek said there is  
86 doubt about which way is best to build habitat, and that should be part of the assessment. The  
87 Program can also assess species response to FSM habitat versus MCM habitat. Purcell asked –  
88 do the birds really care which way the habitat was build? Marmorek said the issue is not how



89 you built it, but what the habitat is. FSM may differ from MCM in how the habitat was created,  
90 as well as other features (connection to water, other parameters). Loftin said this is a good  
91 question and the best way to describe it is as humans we have our perceptions about how the  
92 habitat was built (FSM vs. MCM), but the birds have their own perspective that we do not sense.  
93 The birds can provide important information and you should let the birds tell you which they  
94 prefer. Purcell said if we are going to do a mock report, who will work on it? Smith said he will  
95 draft it with input from Program staff, all Program Advisory Committees, the ISAC, and the GC.  
96

### 97 **Program Committee Updates**

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

99 Czaplewski provided an update on the latest LAC activities. Several tracts were discussed at the  
100 May LAC meeting. A sub-committee of the LAC met to discuss a potential policy for exchange  
101 lands. The LAC decided the sideboards needed more work and discussion will continue. The  
102 Program is now a landowner and a landlord, and the ED Office is working with the Nebraska  
103 Community Foundation (NCF) to deal with issues related to income generated off Program  
104 lands. The ED Office reported on potential Program fund availability for Phragmites removal  
105 near the choke point. The next LAC meeting will be in Kearney on July 15, 2009.  
106

107 Purcell asked about leasing versus purchasing and if the LAC is discussing terms that would  
108 suggest a lease. Czaplewski said that discussion is happening as potential lease tracts come  
109 before the LAC. So far, potential lease tracts have seemed to be on the expensive side. Sackett  
110 said the LAC discussion included thoughts about completing a complex with a lease versus  
111 trying to start a new complex with a lease.  
112

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

114 Courtney provided an update on the latest WAC activities. The WAC met on May 19 and the  
115 WAPS met following that conference call. Anderson and Kenny gave an overview of the 2009  
116 flow routing test and discussed the report now in production from that event. The WAC  
117 discussed some discrepancies in the Water Plan Reference Material, as well as whether there  
118 should be an adjustment to the hydrologic condition that accounts for EA water released during a  
119 flow routing test, short-duration high flows, or other releases. The WAC decided no adjustment  
120 is needed now, but the WAC and ED Office will investigate this issue more and review the entire  
121 hydrologic condition analysis. Three proposals were received for the Elwood Reservoir RFP and  
122 five were received for the J-2 Reservoir RFP. The WAPS has reviewed all projects in the Water  
123 Action Plan Reconnaissance Study and has begun ranking the thirteen projects to identify  
124 priorities. The WAC requested that states give presentations on the state depletions plan reports  
125 to the WAC to ask questions before providing official comments on them. Colorado and  
126 Wyoming will make presentations at the July 21 WAC meeting. The WAC will officially make  
127 comments on the plan, as per GC direction.  
128

129 Purcell asked about the report on the flow routing test – how much EA water used, ramping,  
130 conveyance loss, etc.? Anderson said that information is included in the report outline, which  
131 also includes mechanics, logistics, problem areas (flooding, phragmites, etc.), water balance,



132 attenuation and losses, and lessons learned/recommendations. Barels asked when that report will  
133 be complete. Kenny said a draft will be available for the October GC meeting.

134

135 *Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)*

136 Smith provided an update on the latest TAC activities. The last TAC meeting was in April in  
137 Denver and the TAC acted on the following items:

138

- 139 1) Approved minutes of February 2009 meeting.
- 140 2) Agreed to keep biocontaminants monitoring piece in the water quality monitoring protocol
- 141 3) Approved the aerial photography RFP.
- 142 4) Approved the sediment augmentation feasibility analysis RFP, with changes.
- 143 5) Agreed to focus on tern and plover habitat and monitoring issues at the June 2009 meeting.
- 144 6) Did not approve the sole-source recommendation for the wet meadows information review;  
145 instead agreed to discuss wet meadows at the July 2009 AMWG workshop.
- 146 7) Did not support funding for the UNL phragmites research project.

147

148 The next TAC meeting is June 17 in Kearney and the discussion will focus on tern/plover habitat  
149 criteria and measurements.

150

151 *Adaptive Management Working Group (AMWG)/ISAC/Peer Review*

152 Smith provided an update on the latest AMWG activities and the status of Program peer review.  
153 The AMWG had a workshop on short-duration high flows (SDHF) in May and developed an  
154 objective for implementing SDHF over the next several years, with tentatively planned flows in  
155 2011, 2012, and 2014 (see workshop notes). Smith reported that all four monitoring protocols  
156 are now out for peer review. Initial comments from all peer reviewers are due back to Smith by  
157 the end of June. The TAC will review and discuss peer review comments and make  
158 recommendations to the GC for how or if to make changes to the four monitoring protocols:  
159 geomorphology/in-channel vegetation, forage fish, water quality, and terns/plovers.

160

161 *Finance Committee (FC)*

162 Purcell provided an update on the last two FC meetings. The FC provided comments and  
163 approved as amended the two reservoir RFPs, the sediment augmentation RFP, and the aerial  
164 photography RFP. The last meeting was a discussion of potentially increasing the budget for  
165 PD-13, Sediment Augmentation. Purcell said the FC will be discussing how to allocate revenues  
166 from Program lands. Kraus said it might be helpful to have a monthly list of contracts and where  
167 we are at on budget, schedule, where we are at on contracts, etc. for the FC to review. Kenny  
168 said the ED Office provides regular updates on distribution of the NCF funds, a one-page  
169 summary of the budget, and an updated budget spreadsheet. Kenny and Schulz are working on a  
170 contract list that will be shared with the FC and GC. Purcell said that would be helpful. Kenny  
171 said he is working through the mechanics of tracking land-related items for audits and providing  
172 a better trail with Schulz and the NCF. **Kenny requested a brief meeting with the Program  
173 signatories at the end of the meeting today to discuss this issue.**

174

175



176 **Wyoming Depletion Plan Amendment**

177 Purcell said Wyoming is seeking an amendment to their depletions plan because the depletions  
178 plan had to be completed before final conclusions were made on what land was being irrigated  
179 by non-hydrologically connected groundwater wells. Some minor mistakes in sub-basin  
180 definitions will be cleaned up as well. Purcell requested this be referred to the WAC.

181 **Schellpeper moved to refer the amendment to the WAC; Chavez-Ramirez seconded.**  
182 **Motion approved.**

183

184 **Nebraska Depletion Plan**

185 Schellpeper provided the GC with information about proposed changes to the Nebraska  
186 Depletion Plan (these changes were not provided to the GC prior to the meeting). One change  
187 Nebraska is seeking in the plan is to extend the date of implementation of the plan until  
188 December 31, 2010. This change is largely due to the pace of implementation of Program Water  
189 Action Plan project feasibility studies. The second change is similar to changes made by  
190 Colorado and Wyoming regarding the Recovery Agreement. Schellpeper did not seek action  
191 from the GC at this time but will at the next GC meeting. Purcell said he is sympathetic to  
192 Nebraska's situation regarding the conflict between the schedule for the feasibility studies and  
193 the schedule in Nebraska's depletion plan. Purcell moved to approve the two proposed  
194 amendments to the Nebraska Depletion Plan.

195

196 Freeman asked if the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is comfortable with the language. DeWeese  
197 requested time to review the changes. Barels said these are policy issues that need to be decided  
198 at the GC level. Purcell withdrew his motion and requested that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
199 Service review the amendments. **Ament added this item to the agenda for Wednesday.**

200

201 **Considerations for Reservoir Feasibility Studies**

202 Lawson provided an update on the status of discussions about considerations on proceeding with  
203 feasibility studies for Water Action Plan reservoirs. The group has been working since March  
204 and has not yet reached full consensus. The group's understanding is the idea of the Elwood and  
205 J-2 Reservoir feasibility studies are going to be conducted in two phases. The group did get to a  
206 point of agreeing to recommend that Phase 1 should proceed (screening analysis, cost estimates  
207 of the alternatives). The second aspect is that the group learned institutional issues and  
208 negotiations will be much more complicated than originally anticipated. The reservoir feasibility  
209 will involve not only CNPPID but also FERC. That has to be taken into account before the  
210 group can recommend moving forward into Phase II. The ED Office will be investigating  
211 potential landowner issues, controversy, or other matters involving landowners at the location of  
212 potential reservoir projects.

213

214 The group had considerable discussion about ownership of the portion of the facility that the  
215 Program will participate in and what happens if the Program discontinues. The group will not  
216 recommend moving forward to Phase II until these items can be worked out. Freeman asked the  
217 group how some of the hard questions about the exit strategy and the term of benefits will be  
218 handled in Phase I. Lawson said he does not believe the term of benefits will enter into issues  
219 related to costs and benefits estimated in Phase I. The term will indeed be an important part of



220 deciding whether to go to Phase II, but more detail is needed to make these determinations.  
221 Lawson said a key phrase is “options for a potential contract” between the Program and CNPPID  
222 will be detailed and discussed before moving into Phase II. Kraus said CNPPID believes the  
223 group was getting into too much detail before the appropriate amount of information was in front  
224 of everyone. Barels asked if we have gone into enough detail to match what is in Phase I with  
225 Water Action Plan guidance for assessment of items like socioeconomics. Kenny said Phase I is  
226 basic information. Barels asked when a change in water operations gets evaluated. Kenny said  
227 that is Phase I. Barels said that it seems like there needs to be clearer guidance on the flow of the  
228 process for investigating all of these items. Purcell said in reviewing the scope of Phase I,  
229 successful resolution of the questions that the sub-committee faced is not required to successfully  
230 complete Phase I. Lawson said Phase I is going to have to address water operations to the extent  
231 that we know what the benefits of a potential project are.  
232

233 Ament said the sub-committee needs to continue with membership staying the same. **Lawson**  
234 **moved to proceed ahead with Phase I of the feasibility studies on the J-2 and Elwood**  
235 **Reservoirs. DeMott seconded. Kraus abstained and the motion was approved.**  
236

### 237 **FY09 Budget Items Updates**

#### 238 *PD-13: Sediment Augmentation Conceptual & Construction Design*

239 Kenny discussed the recommended budget increase for sediment augmentation feasibility. The  
240 current budget for this was developed last fall. Further definition of need over the course of the  
241 past year indicates the need for a greater budget requirement. Program staff worked to develop  
242 specific budget estimates for each task identified in the sediment augmentation RFP. In  
243 particular, the thinking behind sediment transport modeling is that the Program needs a design  
244 analysis tool that will be used to focus and organize information for the alternatives but also test  
245 the sensitivities of key design parameters under our control related to sediment augmentation and  
246 transport. This will also be a predictive tool for indicating how introduced sediment will behave  
247 in the river as it moves downstream. We are not talking about developing a new model, but  
248 rather apply an existing model to fit the conditions for the central Platte and for this management  
249 action. As directed by the FC, potential contractors were made aware during the pre-proposal  
250 meeting that we wanted proposals to reflect applying an existing model (not new model  
251 development); to indicate if contractors could complete Phase II; and that Phase I was  
252 appropriately documented in case that information needed to be transferred to another entity.  
253

254 Kenny said the RFP closed last week and we received six proposals. This is a qualifications-  
255 based RFP and the proposals do not include cost information. Negotiations will proceed once  
256 the most qualified contractor is selected. The existing budget is inadequate to cover the tasks in  
257 the RFP, so the budget increase recommendation is intended to be able to cover these tasks.  
258 Purcell said the FC discussed this in depth and the main concern was the potential cost of  
259 modeling. Those concerns were met by discussing the model issue at the pre-proposal meeting  
260 as requested by the FC. Barels asked if we think this budget will be adequate. Kenny said he  
261 believes it will be more than adequate. Ament asked where the money will come from. Kenny  
262 said this is a request to increase the Program budget. Kraus asked how that kind of increase  
263 works. Kenny said it would be committed this year but not fully expended, so the portion not



264 spent would be carried over to FY10 as Unliquidated Obligations. Lawson said Program  
265 expenditures do not really occur until the NCF makes payment. This is the same process in the  
266 Bureau of Reclamation (until the money is actually sent to the NCF). Lawson will discuss this in  
267 more detail with the FC and then come back to the GC. If expenditures don't start increasing  
268 dramatically, the large amount of obligated Reclamation funds that have not been spent are  
269 starting to raise red flags.

270

271 **Purcell moved to approve the budget increase for PD-13 from \$75,000 to \$400,000 for**  
272 **FY09; Schellpeper seconded. Motion approved.**

273

274 Purcell requested that Mike Besson from the State of Wyoming be added to the Proposal  
275 Selection Panel for the sediment augmentation RFP. Schellpeper requested that Pat Goltl from  
276 the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources be added to the Proposal Selection Panel. **Miller**  
277 **moved to approve the new Proposal Selection Panel members; Urie seconded. Motion**  
278 **approved.**

279

280 *PD-8: Database Management System*

281 Farnsworth updated the GC on progress on DBMS development. Riverside, the contractor  
282 developing the DBMS, wanted to discuss data needs for the GC. **Farnsworth asked if any GC**  
283 **members wanted to volunteer to talk to Riverside with thoughts on data needs. No**  
284 **volunteers were noted.** Purcell asked if the Program got a credit back from the previous DBMS  
285 contractor. Kenny said a credit of \$75,000 has been received.

286

287 *PD-3: IMRP Peer Review*

288 Smith discussed the need for the GC to approve a replacement member for the Peer Review  
289 Panel for the geomorphology/in-channel vegetation monitoring protocol. Urie commented that  
290 Peltz seemed to be young and did not have much experience. Smith said he came highly  
291 recommended and has particular experience with riparian vegetation monitoring. **DeWeese**  
292 **moved to approve the substitution; Taddicken seconded. Motion approved.**

293

294 Meeting adjourned until 8:00 a.m. Mountain time on Wednesday, June 3, 2009.

295

296

**Wednesday, June 3, 2009**

297

298 **Welcome and Introduction**

299 Ament called the meeting to order and the group proceeded with introductions.

300

301 **Nebraska Depletion Plan**

302 **Miller moved to approve the two changes (date change to December 31, 2010 and change in**  
303 **Section 7 process to remove requirement for a Recovery Agreement) to the Nebraska**  
304 **Depletion Plan; Chavez-Ramirez seconded. Motion approved.**

305

306

307



308 **Colorado Depletion Plan**

309 Freeman updated the GC on the North Platte Basin portion of the Colorado Depletion Plan.  
310 Current benchmarks are specific to agriculture and population numbers and not to federal water  
311 uses. Colorado intends to come back to the GC with a proposed update that groups all  
312 benchmarks into a “bucket” to be able to cover water uses that are not directly linked to  
313 agriculture or population. Ted Kowalski will develop proposed language for GC consideration;  
314 that language will be developed jointly with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This will not  
315 change any assumptions (not a hydrology issue). Ament recommended that Colorado bring this  
316 issue first to the WAC at their July 2009 meeting before coming back to the GC. **Purcell moved**  
317 **that this potential amendment be referred to the WAC; Schellpeper seconded. Motion**  
318 **approved.**

319

320 **Program Outreach Update**

321 Barron provided an update on several recent Program presentations:

- 322 • Smith presented at a NGPC brown bag luncheon.
- 323 • Kenny and Schellpeper presented at a Nebraska Water Resources Roundtable.
- 324 • Schellpeper is presenting at the Nebraska Water Law Conference.
- 325 • Smith and Kenny will be presenting at the AWRA adaptive management summer specialty  
326 conference in Utah in June.
- 327 • Smith is part of a national team presenting an adaptive management workshop at the National  
328 Conference on Ecosystem Restoration and will represent the Platte River on a panel  
329 discussion at the same conference.
- 330 • Kenny is presenting to the Four-States Irrigation Council in Kearney in July.
- 331 • The Program will be exhibiting at the AWRA conference and will be sponsoring an  
332 afternoon break session at the NCER.

333

334 The Program was mentioned in local newspapers for its role as a partner in the revitalization of  
335 the Crane Meadows Nature Center. Barron mentioned that Smith has an article on adaptive  
336 management in the latest issues of the AWRA journal “Impact”. Save the Date cards for the  
337 Platte River Symposium in Kearney were distributed to the GC.

338

339 **GC Meeting Schedule**

340 Purcell said the Program is “graduating” and maturing and the GC could go to quarterly  
341 meetings to conduct its business. The Advisory Committees can help bridge GC meetings, and  
342 conference calls could be held when the situation warrants. The budget is a major task that has  
343 to be approved in December, so the proposed 2010 meeting schedule is March, June, September,  
344 and December. Ament said we have an August, October, and December meeting scheduled for  
345 2009. Miller said the downstream water users do not think it is time to move to quarterly  
346 meetings, with everyone having different reasons. Purcell requested that this change be  
347 considered seriously soon to help save costs and staff time, and because it seems like the GC can  
348 function well on four meetings per year. DeMott said quarterly meetings would be fine with  
349 conference calls when necessary. **With no consensus, this issue will remain a discussion item**  
350 **for the GC.**

351





352 **Public Comment**

353 Ament asked for public comment, none was offered.

354

355 **Executive Session**

356 The Governance Committee took a fifteen-minute break and then re-convened in Executive  
357 Session. Williams made a motion to enter executive session to discuss land offerings. Berryman  
358 seconded and the **GC entered Executive Session at 8:40 a.m.**

359

360 Purcell made a motion to exit Executive Session after a ten-minute break. Miller seconded and  
361 the **GC exited Executive Session at 10:35 a.m.**

362

363 **Program Land Tracts**

364 Strauch moved to cease pursuing Tracts 0808, 0902, 0904, 0913, and 0914; Berryman seconded.

365 **Motion approved.**

366

367 Miller moved to move forward with appraisals and negotiations of Tracts 0903, 0910, and 0915;  
368 Williams seconded. **Motion approved.**

369

370 Purcell moved to purchase Tract 0850 as presented and authorize the deposit check be released  
371 upon signature of the contract and the closing money be released upon completion of all  
372 necessary closing documentation, respectively. DeWeese seconded. **Motion approved.**

373

374 Schellpeper moved to purchase Tract 0849 as presented and authorize the deposit check be  
375 released upon signature of the contract and the closing money be released upon completion of all  
376 necessary closing documentation, respectively. The intent would be to develop a land exchange  
377 with the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, failing that the excess lands disposal option  
378 would be exercised. Lawson seconded. **Motion approved.**

379

380 Taddicken moved supporting that the PRRIF grant limited Power of Attorney to Bruce Sackett,  
381 Jerry Kenny, and Tim Tunnell as signatory to Farm Services Agency agreements on Program  
382 lands. Berryman seconded. **Motion approved.**

383

384 **Future Meetings & Closing Business**

385 Remaining 2009 GC meetings include:

- 386
- 387 • August 11-12 in Denver, CO
  - 388 • October 13-14 in Kearney, NE; followed by Platte River Symposium on October 15
  - 389 • December 1-2 in Denver, CO

389

390 **Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.**

391

392 **Summary of Action Items/Decisions from June 2009 GC meeting**

393 1) GC approved minutes for April 7-8, 2009 GC meeting and April 17, 2009 GC special session  
394 conference call.

395 2) GC referred Wyoming Depletion Plan amendment to the WAC.



- 396 3) GC approved moving ahead with Phase I of the feasibility studies for Elwood Reservoir and  
397 J-2 Reservoir.
- 398 4) GC approved FY09 budget increase for PD-13 (Sediment Augmentation) from \$75,000 to  
399 \$400,000.
- 400 5) GC appointed Mike Besson (State of Wyoming) and Pat Goltl (State of Nebraska) to the  
401 Proposal Selection Panel for the sediment augmentation feasibility RFP.
- 402 6) GC appointed Chris Peltz to serve as a member of the Peer Review Panel for the  
403 geomorphology/in-channel vegetation monitoring protocol.
- 404 7) GC approved two changes to the Nebraska Depletion Plan (date change to December 31,  
405 2010 and correction in Section 7 process to remove requirement for a Recovery Agreement).
- 406 8) GC referred potential amendment to the Colorado Depletion Plan to the WAC.
- 407 9) GC agreed to continue discussion of potentially moving to quarterly GC meetings each year.
- 408 10) GC agreed to cease pursuing Tracts 0808, 0902, 0904, 0913, and 0914.
- 409 11) GC agreed to move forward with appraisals and negotiations of Tracts 0903, 0910, and 0915.
- 410 12) GC agreed to purchase Tract 0850 as presented and authorize the deposit check be released  
411 upon signature of the contract and the closing money be released upon completion of all  
412 necessary closing documentation, respectively.
- 413 13) GC agreed to purchase Tract 0849 as presented and authorize the deposit check be released  
414 upon signature of the contract and the closing money be released upon completion of all  
415 necessary closing documentation, respectively. The intent would be to develop a land  
416 exchange with the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, failing that the excess lands  
417 disposal option would be exercised.
- 418 14) GC supported that the PRRIF grant limited Power of Attorney to Bruce Sackett, Jerry Kenny,  
419 and Tim Tunnell as signatory to Farm Services Agency agreements on Program lands.