# PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
## Water Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
C'Mon Inn – Casper, WY
October 25, 2011

## Meeting Attendees

**Water Advisory Committee (WAC)**

**State of Wyoming**
Mike Besson – Member
Matt Hoobler – Alternate

**State of Colorado**
Suzanne Sellers - Member

**State of Nebraska**
Pat Goltl – Alternate

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)**
Tom Econopouly – Member
Jeff Runge – Alternate

**Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)**
Mahonri Williams – Member
Brock Merrill – Alternate

**Downstream Water Users**
Cory Steinke – Member (WAC Chair)
Duane Woodward – Member
Jeff Shafer – Member
Mike Drain – Alternate

**Colorado Water Users**
Jon Altenhofen – Member

**Environmental Groups**
Duane Hovorka – Alternate
Larry Hutchinson – Alternate

**Executive Director's Office (EDO)**
Jerry Kenny, Executive Director (ED)
Beorn Courtney
Steve Smith
Sira Sartori
Matthew Welsh
Bruce Sackett (call-in)

**Welcome and Administrative***: Cory Steinke, WAC Chair*
Introductions were made. There were no agenda modifications. Sartori stated that all requested changes to the Draft July WAC Minutes were incorporated into the current version. Altenhofen requested a grammatical revision to lines 74 and 75. **The July WAC Minutes were approved with modifications discussed during the meeting.**

**Hydrologic Conditions Data***: Sira Sartori, ED Office*
Sartori explained the Draft Hydrologic Condition Designation Memorandum that was distributed to the WAC by the ED Office prior to the meeting. The ED Office has compiled annual and periodic hydrologic designations that are used to determine Service target flows. Periodic designations are at monthly to tri-monthly time-steps. Sartori explained the methodology that was used by the Service to develop the annual designations from 1947 to 1994 data. Since 1994 the hydrologic condition has been based on designated flow thresholds for the applicable period. Periodic designations from June 2007 through present are available on the PRRIP website under "Hydrologic Conditions." Don Anderson, formerly with the Service, calculated the periodic designations from 1994 to 2009, and the ED Office has calculated the periodic designations since December 2009. Altenhofen requested that the ED Office post the Memorandum on the PRRIP website.

Woodward stated that CPNRD requested this information from the ED Office. Courtney added that several other Program partners have also requested the historical monthly designations and explained that monthly information is not available before 1995. Econopouly asked whether the ED Office could compare Anderson's pre-2006 monthly designations to the designations that would be calculated using the current methodology. Sartori was unsure whether the necessary data would be available. Econopouly requested that the ED Office attach Anderson's 2006 Journal of American Water Resources Association (JAWRA) article explaining the periodic hydrologic condition designation approach as an appendix to the Memorandum. Steinke asked about the current "normal" designations given the relatively wet conditions. Sartori explained that there are only "dry" and "not dry" designations for some periods; in these instances the ED Office labels "not dry" as "normal" as was done by Anderson. **The ED Office will update the Hydrologic Condition Memorandum and post it to the PRRIP website on the hydrologic conditions page.**

**WAP Project Updates***: Beorn Courtney, ED Office*
Courtney thanked Besson and Hoobler on behalf of the WAC for yesterday's tour of Pathfinder Reservoir.

***J2 Reregulating Reservoir*** – The Program and the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources (NDNR) are continuing to negotiate a three-party sponsorship agreement with the CNPPID. Courtney explained that Olsson and the ED Office have been evaluating CNPPID's request to use the J2 Reregulating Reservoir during the irrigation season to improve system efficiency. The recommended alternative for meeting CNPPID's request is to dedicate Area 2 of the Reregulating Reservoir to irrigation operations from June 15 to August 31. If Area 2 is

unavailable to the Program during that period, Olsson's model shows the average yield will be reduced by approximately 6%. The costs associated with this alternative are relatively small as compared to the other alternatives presented by Olsson. The J2 Reregulating Reservoir project will continue into the feasibility design stage with short duration high flows (SDHFs), target flows, hydrocycling mitigation, and irrigation season uses by CNPPID. The yields from a total of nine scenarios have been compared to the baseline yield, evaluated at an hourly time-step with Olsson's model. Courtney stated that the hourly analyses are maximizing the capabilities of the current models. Olsson is evaluating incremental costs related to the expansion of the J2 Reregulating Reservoir.

The next step of the project is a feasibility level design and opinion of probable costs, anticipated to be complete in early 2012. CNPPID and the ED Office have started working on the water supply permitting process. Altenhofen asked about the capacity of the pumping plant. Steinke reported that the capacity would be 300 cfs. Several scenarios are still being considered and the ED Office will be following up with Olsson and the workgroup in the coming week.

***Ground Water Recharge*** – Courtney reported that Bill Hahn, special advisor to the ED Office, has completed the numerical modeling for the project. The excavation of the recharge basin was completed in late September. Recharge operations commenced on October 3rd. CNPPID and EA Engineering, Science, and Technology (EA) are collecting the monitoring data. The preliminary data suggests that the infiltration rate of the recharge basin is approximately one-half of what was predicted, while the infiltration rate of the Phelps canal is approximately double what was predicted. The meter on the line to the recharge basin will be replaced since the pumping rate is at the low end of the operating range for the meter currently installed. Courtney discussed the status of the proposed Data Evaluation Plan. EA will complete the Data Evaluation Plan with preliminary check point submittals. The workgroup has a field visit to the project site scheduled for November 8th. Steinke has agreed to provide intermittent preliminary field data to the workgroup as often as possible. Altenhofen asked about the details of field work to date. Steinke elaborated on the observed problems with the propeller meter that is being used to measure flows to the recharge basin and explained that the new meter will be installed soon. Steinke reported that the infiltration rate in the canal is approximately 5 cfs per mile. There is approximately 40 to 50 cfs being diverted to the Phelps canal, as measured with the Parshall flume. The water level in the canal is approximately 0.5 feet below the top of the canal to provide a buffer for precipitation events.

***Water Leasing & Water Management Incentives (WMI)*** **–** The Water Leasing and Water Management Incentives workgroups had a combined conference call on October 3, 2011. The purpose of the call was to discuss the general status of these two Water Action Plan projects, to receive input from workgroup members on future activities, and to discuss methodologies to evaluate yield from potential projects. Two landowners with property located in NPPD's system are interested in leasing water to the Program. The water right is under NPPD, and therefore NPPD would need to submit a temporary transfer for the relinquished acres to an instream use for the PRRIP. Woodward has been assisting with the analysis of these potential lease

agreements because the parcels will subsequently be irrigated with groundwater. The workgroups agreed that it will be beneficial for the ED Office to continue working through the water leasing process for these projects. The workgroups discussed opportunities to collaborate with Platte Basin Habitat Enhancement Project (PBHEP). Kenny stated that the ED Office has a meeting with PBHEP scheduled in January 2012. Woodward suggested that Kenny speak with Mark Czaplewski at CPNRD about PBHEP collaboration. Kenny stated that PBHEP collaborates with NRCS programs that provide incentives and funding to farmers for removing lands from irrigation or crop production on a temporary or permanent basis. Most Federal programs usually have a 10 to 15 year agreement, while PBHEP allows for more permanent agreements. Kenny stated that most PBHEP agreements have been tied to acreage and that water yields still need to be quantified. Altenhofen asked whether the NPPD water could be stored in the Environmental Account in Lake McConaughy. Shafer stated that the surface water available for lease is a natural flow right and could not be stored in Lake McConaughy.

Altenhofen asked if CPNRD would evaluate the effects of increased groundwater pumping associated with the irrigation of the lands formerly irrigated with NPPD surface supplies. Woodward responded that wells have existed on these lands for a number of years. Since groundwater use will increase, they will use COHYST to evaluate the stream depletion associated with historical and future conditions.

**WAP Projects & Lake McConaughy Storage***: Beorn Courtney, ED Office and Mike Drain, CNPPID*

Drain described the types of permits that CNPPID has for the Environmental Account and other storage rights in Lake McConaughy. He also explained that in Nebraska you need an additional permit to actually use the stored water. The Environmental Account is a storage use permit. There is not a separate storage permit for the Environmental Account, as all of CNPPID's storage rights are pooled together. NPPD has a storage appropriation that allows water to be exchanged from Sutherland Reservoir to Lake McConaughy. CNPPID had to modify their storage use permit to allow use for fish and wildlife and instream flows. The volume of Environmental Account storage in Lake McConaughy is calculated as 10% of the storable natural inflows with 100,000 ac-ft and 200,000 ac-ft caps. Drain added that the Program Agreement also has language regarding the storage of water from Tamarack, Net Controllable Conserved Water (NCCW), and Wyoming projects. For example, water from the Pathfinder Reservoir will be released and stored in Lake McConaughy. When Lake McConaughy is spilling, the Environmental Account resets to 100,000 ac-ft. Drain reported that NCCW has been stored in the Environmental Account for seven years. Drain indicated that there are legal questions with regard to whether NPPD's water can be transferred to CNPPID's Environmental Account. All water stored in the Environmental Account is lumped together regardless of the source, as it would have been difficult to fairly account for which water was spilled when the account resets to 100,000 ac-ft after spilling.

**Choke Point***: Steve Smith, ED Office*

Smith gave an update on the analyses of the North Platte choke point and Kearney area flow capacity. Flow capacity is important because it may limit SDHF releases from the Environmental Account in Lake McConaughy. Smith indicated that the goal is to have a SDHF release in 2013. Smith reviewed the ranked alternatives that were presented at the July WAC meeting. As requested at the July WAC meeting, Smith completed sensitivity testing with the sediment transport model. Smith summarized the recent shifts to the stage-discharge curve for the North Platte River at North Platte gage and stated that the NDNR plans to revise the official rating table in November. The shifts suggest that capacity at the flood stage of 6.00 feet increased during high flows of summer 2011. The maximum flood stage capacity was approximately 2,300 cfs and the current capacity is approximately 1,800 cfs. Drain noted that the increased capacity may have been a short-term phenomenon and may not exist after flows decrease and the stream bed aggrades.

The Program document states that releases, whether for SDHF or to reduce shortages to target flows, cannot cause river flows to exceed the flood stage. The Army Corps of Engineers has been documenting flood levels in North Platte, and Smith will compare their observations to the 6.00 feet flood stage that was defined by the National Weather Service. This will shed light on who gets wet at what flows, and help to pinpoint problem areas. Drain stated that Nebraska law requires reservoir owners to pay for damages caused by flooding. Therefore, releases from the Environmental Account that have the potential to increase flows above the flood stage are concerning for CNPPID. Sellers suggested that flood leases be considered for lands that would potentially be flooded by Program reservoir releases.

Smith reported on the results of the sensitivity analysis of the sediment transport model. Sensitivity test results indicate that aggradation/degradation is consistently sensitive to sediment inputs, but that results vary with hydrologic inputs (i.e., less aggradation in some areas but more aggradation in other areas). Additionally, differences between sensitivity runs seem to equilibrate near the Highway 83 Bridge, suggesting that the system is in sediment equilibrium. This indicates that sediment management would not necessarily lead to an increased capacity at the choke point. It was speculated that the proliferation of Phragmites in the 1990s may have trapped the sediment. Steinke reported that the maximum flow through North Platte in 2011 was 5,700 cfs.

Smith outlined potential structural and institutional solutions to the choke point. Structural options include drainage improvements and levee construction. One drainage improvement involves increasing the capacity of culverts along North River Road west of Highway 83 to convey ponded water that gets trapped behind driveways to private properties in the area. These new culverts could potentially restore a historic flow path along the north bank of the river, and increase capacity at flood stage. The flows would be routed to the east under Highway 83 and to an existing ditch that runs west to east along Hall School Road toward Whitehorse Creek. Lincoln County Roads has discussed this option with landowners who are agreeable to such a project. But Lincoln County Roads does not have funding for these types of projects, and the

federal government will not provide assistance because they are county roads. Smith estimated that the improvements would cost approximately $1,500 per culvert site, and assuming approximately 10 driveways, the total cost would be less than $20,000. If pursued in greater detail, then Smith suggested that a local engineering firm be hired to evaluate potential sites and complete preliminary design during 2012. The landowners may be willing to cooperate and potentially share the cost given the recent flooding problems on their property. Kenny stated that capacity increases associated with Phragmites removal has largely been maximized.

Besson asked whether this would subsequently flood downstream landowners. Kenny stated that there is a large undeveloped wet-meadow area downstream. Runge pointed out that a 404 permit may be needed for this type of project, and if there are enough sites then an individual permit may be required.

Smith presented earthen levees as another potential structural solution. Given that part of the flooding issues in this area are a result of ground water, the overall effectiveness of levees may be limited.

Institutional solutions include developing flood easements, modifying the Program document to allow flows to go past initial flood stage to moderate or major flood stage; or modifying the National Weather Service flood stage. Smith recommended pursuing drainage improvements and modifications to the NWS flood stage. Smith will follow up with the Lincoln County Roads Department about the feasibility of the drainage improvements.

The flood stage at the Kearney gage is also 6.00 feet. Flows have exceeded flood stage in 2008, 2010, and 2011. Smith indicated that local officials view 6.00 feet as overly conservative and they do not get concerned with river levels until the stage exceeds 7.00 feet. The last event with a stage in excess of 7.00 feet was in 2008. Even during 2008 high flows above 7.0 feet, there were only minimal effects (access limited to some properties) that property owners were not overly concerned about. The USGS doesn't plan to update the Kearney rating curve because they do not think there is a trend in the data. Smith will follow up with the USGS on the shift trends he is seeing, and get the USGS' interpretation of the trend.

Runge asked about the level of interest by Program participants to consider the acceptable level of risk associated with EA releases for SDHFs. Given the five day travel time to Kearney, there is potential for other operations or runoff events that could add to a Program release enough to increase flow above flood stage at Kearney. Runge noted the long-term decline in flood channel capacity at flood stage near Kearney. The channel capacity at flood stage was at 12,340 cfs in 1984, and there was a steady decline in capacity to 5,900-7,090 cfs in 2010. Runge also stated that, since the decline in channel capacity is long-term, the observed short-term improvements may be temporary similar to what was observed at the North Platte gage. Runge asked Smith to continue monitoring trends in gage shifts at Kearney. Runge asked how much of the change in capacity is related to sediment transport versus Phragmites removal through flows and weed

removal. Kenny agreed that we should continue monitoring gage shifts. Goltl suggested that Smith also look at 2009 and 2010 seasonal shifts at Kearney.

Kenny pointed out that the North Platte choke point has been the focus on ED Office's efforts since it is more restrictive than Kearney. The ED Office will continue to monitor other choke points, but will focus on the bigger issues.

**Study of the Platte River Appropriation Status***: Duane Woodward, CPNRD*

Woodward presented on CPNRD and NDNR's investigation of the approach for fully appropriated (FA) and over appropriated (OA) designations. This presentation was postponed during the July 2011 WAC meeting due to time constraints.

Legislature Bill 962 that was passed in 2004 requires that appropriation statuses must be evaluated annually before January 1st. If FA status is determined then an Integrated Management Plan (IMP) must be completed within 3-5 years. CPNRD started working on the IMP in 2009 and needs to quantify the difference between FA and OA as required by LB 962. The existing methodology does not determine the OA-FA difference, so CPNRD and NDNR have led the effort to develop a standardized methodology. Their approach was to research what is being implemented elsewhere in the western U.S., identify the desired elements of the method, and develop a system for testing the method.

The proposed method involves creating a virgin flow hydrograph that is meant to reflect the water supply without any diversions. Virgin flow is calculated by adding surface water consumptive uses and ground water depletions to gaged streamflow data. The virgin flow records are then used to create flow duration curves. All surface water and ground water demands, including instream flows, are then compiled into a demand hydrograph and demand flow duration curve. The demand curve is then compared to the virgin flow curve to evaluate the percentage of time that the virgin flow exceeds the demands. If demands are less than the supply, then the system is not fully appropriated. If demands exceed supply then the system may be fully or over appropriated and additional analyses are required.

The interim report will be available for review and comment soon. Woodward expects the report to be posted on the NDNR website. Once approved, the rulemaking process will begin.

Hutchinson asked whether there would be a peer review on the report being completed by HDR and Flatwater. Woodward responded no, but public comment will allow for review during rulemaking. Hovorka asked whether there would be a specific exceedance value that represented OA and FA. Woodward explained that Texas uses a 75/75 exceedance rule (i.e., 75% of the demands would be met 75% of the time) to define fully appropriated (total demands versus virgin supply). Woodward's presentation is available on the NDNR website.

**2012 Draft Water Plan Budget***: Jerry Kenny and Beorn Courtney, ED Office*

Kenny reviewed the budget work plans that were distributed to the WAC prior to the meeting. Some of the work plans have subsequently been updated since being distributed. **The ED Office will distribute the updated budget to the WAC.** The 2012 budget will need to be approved at the December Governance Committee (GC) meeting. There will be a preliminary GC meeting on November 18th. There will be a Finance Committee session on the 2012 budget prior to the November meeting. **Kenny requested input from the WAC prior to the Finance Committee meeting.** Kenny summarized each of the Water Plan (WP) Implementation line items in the 2012 budget.

**WP-1**: This task relates to active channel capacity improvements and has two sub-tasks.
WP-1(a): This sub-task pertains to the North Platte choke point. As evidenced earlier during the meeting, future investigations are needed to evaluate opportunities to increase channel capacity through North Platte and other choke points. Drainage improvements discussed above may require the hiring of a local engineering firm. Another consultant may also be needed to evaluate the hydraulics of the north channel. The budget request for this sub-task is $200,000.
WP-1(b): This sub-task pertains to the reach from the CNPPID diversion dam to Grand Island. The budget request would provide for an additional year of contributions to the Platte Valley and West Central Weed Management Area. The budget request for this sub-task is $200,000. The Program contributed funds in 2010 and 2011. The 2012 funding would allow the project to be largely completed. Funding after 2012 will be related to maintenance activities with a funding requirement between $50,000 to $100,000, declining over time to $50,000 and then remaining at that level.

Altenhofen requested that the ED Office include a summary of previous expenditures in the WAP work plan summaries. Kenny referred Altenhofen to the GC summary spreadsheets that have the expenditures from previous years (distributed at each GC meeting). Kenny indicated that the work plan formats currently distributed reflect what was requested by the GC in previous years. **The more detailed spreadsheet with previous expenditures will be distributed along with the future drafts of the Work Plan summaries, but not included in the work plan summaries themselves.**

In an October 18 e-mail, the Service requested additional funding under WP-1(b) to develop a monitoring program, similar to WP-1(a), to ensure that channel capacity improvements are providing the desired channel conveyance. Runge noted that, given the long-term decline in channel capacity, it may be beneficial to have this monitoring in place. Members of the WAC asked for clarification on the additional studies, and revisited the monitoring that was conducted for the 2009 flow routing test. Kenny also noted there may be places in the budget as drafted to support such studies upon further clarification by the Service and input from the WAC. **The ED Office will continue monitoring trends in gage shifts at the Kearney gage.** Runge and Drain discussed whether other choke points would warrant similar investigations in the future even if 3,000 cfs at North Platte is achieved.

**WP-4**: Advancing WAP projects from the feasibility stage. Kenny indicated that the numbers are hard to estimate due to unknowns of how far projects will actually advance, such as if the J2 Reregulating Reservoir project progresses. The Program has historically asked for a maximum value in case projects advance faster than anticipated. Funds are disbursed very conservatively, which leads to the perception that additional funds are not needed. There is a federal reserve that needs to be drawn down or else it will be reassigned to other projects. The current estimate of $2,200,000 includes $2,000,000 for the J2 Reregulating Reservoir and $200,000 for ground water recharge. Altenhofen asked what was spent in 2011. Kenny responded $0. The J2 Reregulating Reservoir work to date has been under WP-6 since it has not progressed past the feasibility stage. Drain deferred to the recommendations being provided by the GC regarding the best approach to maximizing federal funding. Williams inquired about the definition of new money requested. Kenny explained that any unexpended money is not rolled over to the next year. However, there is a "reserve" of unexpended federal dollars. As previously discussed, that reserve will need to be drawn down before a large sum of new funds is requested. Colorado keeps its money in the Nebraska Community Foundation holding entity. Wyoming keeps their funds in their own account and disburses quarterly as requested by the Program. Federal funding is appropriated, but an expenditure request must be submitted for a specific amount and then it is electronically transferred.

**WP-5**: Management tool. Upon completion of COHYST, the Program may need to buy or be trained to use software, or to build additional components into the model for the ED Office to make such runs. COHYST will reportedly be completed before end of year with peer review thereafter. Modeling will be useful for the Water Leasing and WMI projects. COHYST may not provide the resolution required for specific projects. The budget request for this task is $200,000.

Altenhofen asked where Runge's discussion items that were emailed to the WAC would be included in the budget. (Runge's discussion items pertained to hydraulic modeling and probabilistic modeling). Kenny stated that these types of projects could be funded by WP-2 or under the special advisor task (WP-8) if they were completed by someone other than the ED Office. The projects could also be viewed as a feasibility or miscellaneous study. Runge would like to gauge the level of support for these projects prior to categorizing the requests.

**WP-6**: Feasibility studies. The Program will continue to evaluate water leasing and WMI projects ($100,000) and groundwater management ($100,000).

**WP-7**: Water acquisitions. If Pathfinder Reservoir is completed and the municipal agreement is executed, then the upfront payment will be $1,958,400. Other acquisitions may also become available, so the total budget request for this task is $2,500,000.

**WP-8**: Water advisors. The program intends to continue using three special advisors: Bill Hahn for ground water modeling, George Omeck for economics, and Tara Schutter for civil. The budget request for 2012 was reduced to $150,000 based on previous expenditures.

**WP-9**: Miscellaneous Water Resources Studies. The budget request for this task is $50,000.

Kenny completed the 2012 budget discussion. Kenny encouraged WAC members to discuss the budget items with their GC representatives.

Runge reinitiated the choke point discussion. Runge suggested potentially using HEC-RAS to back-calculate release flow targets and confirm a realistic estimate for the SDHF target at Overton. Hovorka recalled that 3,000 was a rough estimate at the time it was selected. Courtney discussed similar investigations that were completed in the past. These were not hydraulic models, but water budget models. Courtney asked if the objective was defined well enough to warrant a new tool as opposed to modifying existing tools. Drain feels that the ED Office has always been able to complete these types of analyses in an acceptable manner in the past. Runge believes the new model would help identify other choke points. Smith noted that an unsteady hydraulic model already exists. The consensus was that another consultant does not need to be hired to complete this work. The ED Office will complete these types of analyses with cooperation from involved entities.

Runge initiated a discussion about the willingness of the WAC to approach flood stage flows with the SDHF and other Program releases. Econopouly added to the discussion about the time lag between the release at Lake McConaughy to the habitat, and the potential effect of a precipitation event during the transit period. Runge and Econopouly would like to quantitatively evaluate the potential for a significant rainfall event during the transit period to determine what buffer may be required between the SDHF release and the flood capacity for the Kearney, North Platte, and other potential chokepoints. Runge believes such an analysis would be useful for policy makers. Smith asked how much of this modeling has already been completed by the NWS. Econopouly indicated that while NWS may be completing the analysis, it would be helpful to have a consultant to advance the analysis. Drain stated that the Program has historically assumed that NWS would evaluate the precipitation effects and define the buffer required. Besson agreed. The WAC is reluctant to be involved with defining the buffer due to liability concerns. Besson pointed out that this issue will need to be discussed extensively if flood leases are pursued. Flooding was a major concern for all parties when the Agreement was reached. Drain noted that the J2 Reregulating Reservoir has been the focus for SDHFs since it does not involve flooding issues at the North Platte choke point. Econopouly is recommending the development of a hydrologic model that uses a range of precipitation design storms to route the flows to see the effect of precipitation. Steinke believes that these types of analyses were completed for the flow routing test. The WAC requested more time to think about this issue, and Steinke pointed out that the issue will come down to the GC's level of comfort with the buffer size. Regarding future SDHF implementation, the WAC pointed out the importance of the J2 Reservoir project.

Hovorka asked what budget task includes NCCW funding. Kenny and Drain indicated that water acquisition discussions are still underway.

**Additional Business***: Cory Steinke, WAC Chair*

*2012 Meeting Schedule*

The draft 2012 meeting schedule was discussed. **The next WAC meeting is scheduled for February 7, 2011, from 9:30 am – 3 pm (Central Time) at the Lake McConaughy Visitors Center. The ED Office will update the schedule on the WAC website.**

**Action Items**

General WAC

- WAC members are to provide input on the Draft 2012 water plan budget work plans prior to the Finance Committee meeting on November 9, 2011.

ED Office

- The ED Office will update the Hydrologic Condition Memorandum and post it to the PRRIP website with Anderson's 2006 JAWRA paper as an attachment.
- The ED Office will continue monitoring trends in gage shifts at the Kearney gage.
- The ED Office will distribute the updated Draft 2012 water plan budget work plans and attach the previous budget and expenditure spreadsheet.
- The ED Office will update the October 2012 WAC meeting date on the schedule and post on the WAC website.
-