	PC .
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	ARKANSAS RIVER COMPACT ADMINISTRATION
8	
9	COMPACT YEAR 2014
10	ANNUAL MEETING
11	December 17, 2014
12	
13	HELD AT THE
14	LAMAR ELKS LODGE NO. 1319
15	28157 US HIGHWAY 287
16	LAMAR, COLORADO
17	Some 5. 2:334
18	James 5. 21334
19	
20	
21	Reported By:
22	ADVANCED COURT REPORTING SERVICES
23	Lee Ann Bates, CSR, RPR, CRR 27113 W. Mills Avenue
24	Plevna, Kansas 67568 (620)793-6555 or (620)664-7230
25	

1	APPEARANCES	
2	AFFBAKANCES	
3	CHAIRMAN:	
4	Jim Rizzuto	
5		
6	COLORADO:	
7	James Eklund	
8	Colin Thompson	
9	Scott Brazil	
10		
11		
12	KANSAS:	
13	David Barfield	
14	Randy Hayzlett	
15	Hal Scheuerman	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAYZLETT: I've got a few instructions for the audience and for presenters Good morning. My name's Randy Hayzlett. here. Vice-Chair for the Compact. First of all, we've got a court reporter, like we have every year. We want to make sure that she captures everything for the meeting, so if you're a presenter, come to the podium, state your name. If you have a business card, make sure you get a business card to her. That will help her out quite a bit. If you have a presentation, make sure you get one to Kevin Salter over here, if he doesn't have it already, so he can capture that. If you have a written presentation, we'd like to have more than one copy of those; probably four copies.

MR. SALTER: If possible.

MR. HAYZLETT: Yeah, if possible. So anyway, we're going to try to move right along this morning. We've got some weather coming in. We've got some guys going back to northeast Kansas that may run into some weather going home, so we'll try to keep moving right along. If we can sometime this morning, we'll take a break here, but so with that, maybe a few introductions here. We'll probably go

around the room and as you introduce -- we'll introduce, have you introduce yourself in the audience, too, but be sure and speak up so Ms. Bates can capture that as well.

So with that, it's my pleasure to introduce the new Federal Chairman, Mr. Jim Rizzuto, and so I think we'll go around the room, do some introductions, and then we'll get into the agenda.

MR. SCHEUERMAN: I'm the privileged one.

I'm Hal Scheuerman. I'm the Kansas -- one of the

Kansas representatives. I live at Deerfield. I'm

an irrigator, farmer. Some people think I'm

semiretired, but I have to show up to work like

everybody else, so...

MR. BARFIELD: David Barfield, Kansas Chief Engineer and commissioner, one of the commissioners for Kansas.

MR. BRAZIL: Scott Brazil, representative for Colorado from Pueblo.

MR. EKLUND: James Eklund, I'm the Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and I sit on the Administration.

MR. COLIN THOMPSON: Colin Thompson. I'm the District 67 Representative on the ARCA Commission.

MR. SALTER: Kevin Salter with the Kansas Division of Water Resources, Assistant Water Commissioner (sic).

I think we're going to go around the room.

We'll just go ahead and pass the microphone. Just hold it up about this level would be good. We'll also start an attendance list around the room. If you'd sign it, I'd appreciate it.

MR. COLIN THOMPSON: Just for time's sake, you can just introduce all the Kansas people and that way we can --

MR. SALTER: Okay. Sure. If you can stand up, Rachel Duran helps me out. She's a big reason for this meeting being as successful as it is. Dale Book sitting at the next table is our engineering expert out of Denver. Chris Beightel, Manhattan. Burke Griggs with the Kansas AG's office. Brandy Cole works the river for us in Kansas. Mike Meyer, Water Commissioner for Garden City Field Office, and Lane Letourneau is the program manager for our water appropriation staff.

MR. STEUER: Dan Steuer, Colorado Attorney General's office.

MR. MILLER: Steve Miller, Colorado Water Conservation Board, on James Eklund's staff.

MR. WITTE: I'm Steve Witte. I'm the 1 Division 2 engineer for the Colorado Division of 2 Water Resources and the Operations Secretary. 3 Brent Newman, Colorado Water MR. NEWMAN: 4 Conservation Board staff. 5 Donald Seufer, Amity Canal 6 MR. SEUFER: 7 farmer and LAWMA board member. MR. AHRING: Trevor Ahring, GMD-3, Garden 8 City. 9 Jason Norquest out of 10 MR. NORQUEST: GMD-3 in Garden City as well. 11 12 MR. ACKERMAN: I'm Brett Ackerman with Colorado Parks and Wildlife out of the region office 13 14 in Colorado Springs. MS. DAVIS: Alex Davis, Water Resources 15 16 Manager for Colorado Parks and Wildlife. Cindy Lair, the Colorado State 17 MS. LAIR: Conservation Board Manager within the Colorado 18 Department of Ag. 19 20 MR. LIECHTY: Sherman Liechty, Natural 21 Resources Conservation Service, area conservationist for southeast Colorado. 22 MR. VAIL: Richard Vail, Colorado Parks 23 and Wildlife, water resource engineer. 24 25 MR. HOWLAND: Terry Howland with the

Amity Canal at Buffalo. 1 MR. STEERMAN: Don Steerman of Shinn, 2 3 Steerman & Shinn, attorneys for District 67 Irrigation Canals Association and several of the individual ditches under them. 5 MR. WILSON: Glenn Wilson with the Amity 6 7 Canal. 8 MR. NILES: Kevin Niles, General Manager of AGUA, Pueblo, Colorado. 9 MR. STANLEY HINES: Stanley Hines for 10 Frontier Ditch in Coolidge. 11 12 MR. RUDE: Mark Rude, Executive Director 13 of the Southwest Kansas Groundwater Management District. 14 15 MR. MAXFIELD: Dan Maxfield, Amazon Canal, Lakin, Kansas. 16 17 MR. STEVEN HINES: Steven Hines, 18 Coolidge, Frontier Ditch. 19 MS. CHARTRAND: Laura Chartrand, Tri-State Generation and Transmission. 20 MR. LEE MILLER: Lee Miller, Southeastern 21 22 Colorado Water Conservancy District. 23 MR. BRODERICK: Jim Broderick, Southeastern Water Conservancy District. 24 25 MR. VAUGHAN: Roy Vaughan, Reclamation,

Pueblo. 1 Good morning. My name's MR. VANSHAAR: 2 James VanShaar. I'm with Reclamation in Loveland. 3 MR. GILMORE: Andrew Gilmore, Reclamation 4 in Loveland. 5 Garrett Markus, Southeast MR. MARKUS: 6 Colorado Water Conservancy District. 7 MR. MONTOYA: Jeff Montoya, Colorado 8 Division of Water Resources. 9 MR. SPADY: Lonnie Spady, Colorado 10 Division of Water Resources, District 17. 11 MS. NICHOLS: Rebecca Nichols, Water 12 Commissioner, Water District 67. 13 MR. ORTIZ: I'm Rod Ortiz. I'm with the 14 15 U.S. Geological Survey out of Pueblo, Colorado. MR. PAYNE: Bill Payne, U.S. Geological 16 Survey out of Pueblo as well. 17 18 MS. ROBB: Traci Robb, US Army Corps of Engineers, Trinidad Lake. 19 MR. GARCIA: Dennis Garcia, US Army Corps 20 of Engineers out of Albuquerque. 21 MAJ. MELCHIOR: Major Jason Melchior, 22 23 Deputy District Commander, Albuquerque District, Army Corps of Engineers. 24 Jason Woodruff, Army Corps 25 MR. WOODRUFF:

of Engineers. 1 2 MR. YUSKA: Mark Yuska, Albuquerque 3 District, US Army Corps of Engineers. 4 MR. TRUAN: Van Truan, Corps of 5 Engineers, Pueblo, Colorado. MR. BOLDT: Gary Boldt, a casual 6 7 observer. MR. GRASMICK: Bill Grasmick, Lower 8 Arkansas Water Management Association. 9 MS. SPADY: Bev Spady, Purgatoire River 10 Water Conservancy District. 11 MR. DANIELSON: Jeris Danielson, 12 Purgatoire District, and casual observer. 13 14 MS. WOLDRIDGE: Julianne Woldridge, 15 attorney for the Purgatoire District. MS. GONZALES: Stephanie Gonzales, 16 17 Arkansas River Compact Administration 18 secretary/treasurer. Justin Proffer, US Army 19 MR. PROFFER: 20 Corps of Engineers out of John Martin Reservoir. 21 MR. LANGSTAFF: Chris Langstaff, Corps of 22 Engineers, John Martin. 23 MS. DOWNEY: - Karen Downey, US Army Corps of Engineers, John Martin Reservoir. 24 25 MS. ZANCANELLA: Rachel Zancanella with

the Colorado Division of Water Resources. 1 MR. VALENTINE: Mike Valentine, City of 2 Trinidad. 3 4 MS. WALLACE-GROSS: Madoline Wallace-Gross, Lyons Gaddis, special water counsel 5 for City of Trinidad. 6 7 MR. REYNOLDS: Phil Reynolds, Division of Water Resources, Colorado. 8 MR. KELLEY THOMPSON: Kelley Thompson, 9 Colorado Division of Water Resources. 10 MR. SULLIVAN: Nathan Sullivan, USGS, out 11 of the Hays, Kansas field office. 12 MR. VAN OORT: John Van Oort, Colorado 13 Division of Water Resources. 14 15 MS. PEARSON: Julie Pearson, Colorado Division of Water Resources. 16 17 MR. TYNER: Bill Tyner, Colorado Division 18 of Water Resources. MR. McELROY: Brady McElroy, USDA-NRCS. 19 MR. AGUILAR: Jonathan Aguilar, Kansas 20 State University based in Garden City. 21 22 MR. SALTER: Did we miss anybody? 23 MR. GOBLE: Jack Goble, Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District. 24 25 MR. GEUBELLE: Doug Geubelle with

Syracuse Dairy.

MS. DICKEY-GRIFFITH: Meg Dickey-Griffith, CWCB.

MR. HAYZLETT: Anybody else that we missed? If not, welcome to the 2014 Annual Meeting of the Ark River Compact Administration. Kevin, where is the attendance list? You might start that. Do you have it?

MR. MILLER: There's two separate pieces of it, one on that side, one on this side, and they're going around.

MR. HAYZLETT: Bring them by the front table then. Very good. First item is review and revisions of the agenda.

MR. BARFIELD: I would have one revision.

MR. HAYZLETT: Mm-hmm.

MR. BARFIELD: Apparently Stephanie is going to need to be gone for part of the morning.

Normally under, under Agenda Item 4.C., we say we're going to defer that to Item 10. We are -- we're not going to -- I would suggest we not defer to Item 10 but go ahead and do that, her report at that time, so we would do it at that time and not do Agenda Item 10.B.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay.

MR. BARFIELD: I think that's the only change I'm aware of. With that, I'd move adoption of the revised agenda.

MR. HAYZLETT: Is there a second?

MR. BRAZIL: Second.

MR. HAYZLETT: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the revised agenda, moving one item. All in favor, say Aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. HAYZLETT: Opposed, same sign. (No response.)

Okay. We'll work off of this agenda then.

First item, or next item is report of officers, and I'm going to let --

MR. SALTER: Point of reference, the -- can you make the revised agenda Exhibit A and the attendance list Exhibit B, please.

MR. HAYZLETT: Yes, we'll do that. In the past, we've struggled with maybe keeping some exhibits straight, so Kevin, are you going to be responsible? Rachel's going to be responsible for -- you and Meg? Okay. You two can be responsible for keeping exhibits straight and helping us out on that up here.

MR. MILLER: I have a few more copies of

the agenda if someone didn't get it.

1.7

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. If you don't have an agenda, there are a few at the front table or the entry table, and then Steve Miller has a few.

So with that, Item 4 then, reports of officers, I'm going to let Mr. Rizzuto have a mic for a little bit.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Thanks, Randy. It's a pleasure to be here. I think I am six days into this federal rep appointment, but I wanted to tell you a little bit about myself. I was born and raised in southeastern Colorado, the La Junta area, and did most of my schooling, college here at the University of Colorado and Otero Junior College; then went on to graduate school. My background in education is economics and finance.

Ran a business in the La Junta, Lamar area; used to be called Mason Wholesale. Maybe some of you bought some stuff from us over the years.

I spent 16 years in the State Senate here in Colorado, most of those years on the Joint Budget Committee, and became very familiar with the Colorado-Kansas lawsuit as we were taking on that issue. I carried a number of pieces of water legislation while I was in the State Senate; some

good, probably a lot bad, now that I look back on it.

After I was term limited in 1998, I was appointed by Governor Owens to head up health care policy and financing, which is the Medicaid program in Colorado.

After that, I came back to La Junta and became president of Otero Junior College and for about almost three years was joint president of Otero and Lamar Community College. I'm now back at Otero and serving as president there.

I was fortunate. I married a young lady from Kansas, so I know when I cross the border what to call the river, so I'm sensitive to the Kansas issues as well as the Colorado issues and look forward to serving as the federal rep on this board. I do appreciate, and only being six days in, I'm wise enough to know you don't jump in and act like you know everything immediately, so I appreciate Randy chairing the meeting so I can learn and then at our next meeting, I'll be able to take over. So thanks for having me here and I look forward to working with all of you.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you, Jim, and certainly welcome you here, and especially being

Vice-Chair, be more than happy to hand this back over to you next year.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. We're ready for Item C, Stephanie. Are you available? You are? And we do only have one mic, so we're going to try to keep passing this thing around today, so if we miss that, let us know.

MS. GONZALES: Yesterday we discussed the option of relocating ARCA documents that are stored at the Prowers County Annex over to Southeast Colorado Enterprise Development. It would give us access to a desk, a phone, we'd have a place to set up a printer and have a laptop. That was just -- we are paid through June for the rent that we are paying for Prowers County, so at that point, I asked ARCA for direction as to whether we want to go ahead and move that. Currently the Prowers County Annex is just a storage room and it does not lend itself to meeting with people in that area.

The other issue was to purchase a laptop.

Currently, all of the ARCA documents that I take

care of paying monthly bills are on my personal

desktop at home. This would make it a little more

mobile. Should I need to be gone or someone else

should take over, it would be on its own equipment, and that was all I had.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Thanks, Stephanie, and we dealt with that item in a committee meeting yesterday, so we'll deal with that a little bit later in the meeting today.

Ready for Item 5 on the agenda, USGS report, and that's Bill Payne, I believe.

MR. PAYNE: My name is Bill Payne with the U. S. Geological Survey, the Colorado Water Science Center. Today I'm going to give you a summary of the 2014 flows for the Arkansas Compact gages. There's 11 gages associated with the Compact, nine in Colorado and two in Kansas, operated by the Kansas U. S. Geological Survey.

As you can see (Slide 3 in Exhibit C), beginning upstream and working down, the second column from the right, percentages of the 2014 to 2013 flows are considerably higher. The column to the far right is the comparison of the 2014 flows to the period of record average annual flow. As you can see, the percentages all the way down until we get below John Martin are not too bad, and then they drop between 23 and 50%.

These are some selected sites out of the

Arkansas Basin that shows the mean streamflow duration hydrographs. The green is the average and the black is 2013 and 2014, so you can see at Ark Leadville, and then the Arkansas River Parkdale just above the Royal Gorge and Arkansas River at Lamar. I think we missed one. No, the Avondale. Arkansas River at Avondale. You can see after the 2013 flood events along the front range, considerably higher into the 95 percentile, and then Lamar.

Granada and Coolidge, and then I added

Arkansas River at Syracuse, which again after the flooding in September, not a lot of flow, but you can see it increase its... (inaudible)

Issues of importance. In the operation of the gage, gages in the Lower Ark, we've had considerable...the beaver dam issues at Granada and Coolidge, or not Granada -- Granada and Big Sandy continue to cause the record to be poor quality. We attempted to have a trapper trap and remove the beaver dams at these sites but we could not get the permissions, so shifting to the base rating average from minus seven-tenths of a foot to a foot,

1.7 feet, so you can see that's all variable between measurements, so a lot of the record for these two sites are estimated, and that's, that's really the

most significant events that's...(inaudible)

This is a picture of Big Sandy. This is from last year. There's now a beaver dam over the monitoring site that's even worse, and beaver dams are all the way down to the mouth of the Arkansas.

In 2015, propose to continue the operation of the 11 gages associated with the Arkansas Compact. This month or early in January, we plan to move the Big Sandy gage further downstream into the easement for Highway 196 so that we can gain permissions to trap and remove beaver dams, so we hope to improve that record at that site.

Let's go back. We'll continue to try to work with the landowner at Granada and see if we can't improve that record as well.

Then beyond that, I think we've decided in this meeting to increase the number of measurements at Coolidge when water is being delivered to Kansas, so we've, we've agreed upon that. We do make additional measurements at Granada, Lamar, Las Animas, and Purgatoire during those times as well. Is there any questions? Yeah.

MR. MILLER: Bill, will you be here throughout the meeting?

MR. PAYNE: Yeah.

MR. MILLER: We want the details of what you're proposing for 2015 are in the actual agreements that have been signed with us and Kansas...help us with that.

MR. BARFIELD: I guess I have a question. With respect to his report, a lot of times when we get a written report, we make that an exhibit; right? Shall we print out a copy of the Power Point and make that an exhibit as his report or...

MS. DURAN: Yeah, we have done that in the past.

MR. PAYNE: Yeah, I'll provide that.

MS. DURAN: That would be Exhibit C.

MR. BARFIELD: Okay. Yeah, let's, while we have your presentation so we, we can print that. Then we'll make that Exhibit C, so thank you.

MR. STEVEN HINES: Randy, as a Frontier

Ditch water user -- I'm Steven Hines. Why can't we have measurements all done between, say, April 1 and November 15th, and not worry about the off season?

MR. HAYZLETT: I think that's maybe some conversation as we work on the USGS agreement that can be discussed and see if we can work that out.

MR. SALTER: From my perspective, working for the State Division of Water Resources, we care

about the record year-round. The USGS I know will tell you they also care about the record year-round, because they publish those streamflow records.

That's the reason why they're so intent about having the correct data, so...

MR. STEVEN HINES: But the water we're using comes during the Compact or the water season. If the Compact is going to pay for it, it ought to be done during the water use season, is the way I see it.

MR. HAYZLETT: Any suggestions?

MR. STEVEN HINES: If they want the records other times, maybe USGS needs to pay for them.

MR. SALTER: I imagine this is a conversation that we might need to have with Mr. Hines after. The Compact is a year-round. Our Compact Compliance is year-round. We rely on wintertime flows in Kansas for our water supply as much as we do the surface water flows that come across during the summer, so there is a year-round component to Compact compliance for Colorado, and like I said, we can talk to Mr. Hines afterwards. Maybe I suggest somebody from the Division of Water Resources of Colorado, myself, and maybe Nate and

Bill with the USGS, so we can go ahead and move on with the meeting.

MR. HAYZLETT: Good comments, Steve, and something to discuss, I think, so...

MR. STEVEN HINES: Thank you.

MR. HAYZLETT: Mm-hmm. 5.B. then is the US Army Corps of Engineers, Major Melchior.

MAJ. MELCHIOR: All right. We'll let it get fired up here. I do apologize. I'm from the South, so if I say Arkansas, it's just because of where I grew up. I'm aware of the different pronunciations on each side of the border, so...

MR. THOMPSON: Sounds appropriate.

MAJ. MELCHIOR: All right. Good morning,
Mr. Chairman and members. I'm Major Jason Melchior,
Deputy District Commander of the Albuquerque
District United States Army Corps of Engineers.
Thank you for the opportunity to present key topics
here today from our report from last year and items
of current interest.

Joining me from the Albuquerque District are Mark Yuska, my Operations Division Chief; Dennis Garcia, who most of you know is our Reservoir Control Branch Chief; and we also have Jason Woodruff here with us, the Arkansas River Basin

Coordinator; as well as Karen Downey from John
Martin Reservoir; and Traci Robb, along with Van
Truan, from our regulatory office in Pueblo. Excuse
me. Traci Robb is from Trinidad Lake, up in
Trinidad.

So, current items of interest. Within 2004
(sic), the Arkansas River Basin snowmelt runoff was
normal throughout the Basin. As of May 1st, the
basin wide snowpack was 99% of normal with the Upper
Arkansas Basin reporting 112 of normal and the
Purgatoire Basin reporting 88%. USACE did not
operate flood control at Trinidad, John Martin, or
Pueblo Reservoirs within 2014.

Operations and maintenance at the two
USACE-owned dams within the Arkansas River Basin is
an ongoing effort, as it always is. Besides
day-to-day work performed at both Trinidad and John
Martin, more notable efforts are periodically
undertaken to ensure continued safe operations of
these facilities.

At the end of the fiscal year for 2014, the Albuquerque District issued contracts related to the installation of new instrumentation along the main embankment at Trinidad. These installations will include eight piezometers and four inclinometers

located at four different locations along the dam.

Just to clarify, those are along the downstream face of the dam. This coming spring, temporary roads will be constructed to allow drilling crew access to those four points of interest.

1.0

Between April and May of next year, a specialist from the US Army Corps of Engineers will mobilize in Trinidad Dam location and begin the installation of that previously mentioned instrumentation. Once completed, the downstream face will be returned to its original state, and the project completion on that is no later than the end of FY 15.

In 2012, Telluride Energy applied for and was issued also a preliminary permit for hydropower studies related to both Trinidad and John Martin Dam. Over the three-year permitting period, the permittee is expected to carry out pre-filing consultations and study developments leading to the possible development of a license application. During this feasibility study development, the permittee is expected to coordinate with us at USACE to ensure that this study will result in a plan consistent with the authorized purposes of the Federal project.

In 2014, coordination with Telluride began on the proposed project at Trinidad and to date, no communication regarding John Martin has been had from the permittee at Telluride.

1.6

In 2014, the Lake Hasty Habitat Improvement
Project planning efforts continue. The current
objectives are to improve the fishery and
potentially expand the wetlands in an effort to
increase the recreational uses of the facility. The
Albuquerque District is currently partnering with
Ducks Unlimited, with Ducks Unlimited offering their
wetland engineering expertise in the preliminary
designs for the project.

The current design concept is looking at surface water diversions from the Arkansas River as a method of improving water quality and also coordination with the State of Colorado regarding the USACE-owned water rights is ongoing. The long-term goal of this is to have two -- have the Lake Hasty Project completed by 2018 to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the completion of the John Martin Dam.

I just want to bring this up. As you all are aware, we have important activity going on now outside the country and the world, as well as

inside, and I'd just like to conclude with a few words about our -- another priority mission within the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and that is our support to our Overseas Contingency Operations, formerly known as the Global War on

Terror.

I think I lost it. All right. I can speak loud. So while most of our Corps employees are not uniformed soldiers like myself, I'm proud to say within Fiscal Year 14, we had nine Albuquerque members who voluntarily deployed to Afghanistan, so we like to, we like to highlight that as a great asset to our employees; and as well, we also have currently three employees that are also deployed now. In addition, there have been four employees that have left Albuquerque District boundaries and responded to either Hurricane Sandy on the East Coast, as well as numerous FEMA taskings associated with our New Mexico floods in September of 2013.

So, sir, this concludes my report and I'm happy to answer any questions with the assistance of my staff.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you, Major. Are there questions from the front table for the major?

MR. BARFIELD: No questions. Go ahead.

MR. EKLUND: I was just going to say, 1 would you invite a round of applause for the service 2 3 of this young man and the several of his colleagues that he referenced in Afghanistan? 4 MR. HAYZLETT: Absolutely. I think it's 5 well worth it. 6 7 (Applause.) Thank you. I love my 8 MAJ. MELCHIOR: I love everything I do during the day. 9 10 great honor for me, as a uniformed service member, to work with my civilian colleagues and my civilian 11 12 employees, because without them, I just know Army stuff. 13 Thank you, Major. 14 MR. HAYZLETT: We appreciate that. 15 MAJ. MELCHIOR: Yes, sir. 16 17 MR. BARFIELD: Right, and so his report would be Exhibit D. 18 19 MS. DURAN: D. 20 MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Very good. 21 for Item 5.C., U. S. Bureau of Reclamation. Andrew, 22 is that you? MR. GILMORE: I think we'll let Roy go 23 first. 24

MR. HAYZLETT:

Okay.

25

MR. VAUGHAN: Good morning, everyone.

I'm going to go ahead and review the operations of the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project on the east slope.

Let's see. Who's going to advance? You? Okay. So this is for Water Year 2014. The imports were well above average at 80,300. That's about 150% of our 40-year average. Snowpack in the collection system was average through February. Then it continued to be well above average for the remainder of the snow season.

The collection system opened April 23rd and runoff began May 16th and continued through the middle of August, so the next slides are kind of the current status and then we'll go back and look at last year's Water Year, so go back one.

Turquoise, the blue line is 2014, the blue column. The silver line is currently where we're at and the heavy black line is average, so we're, in the Turquoise Reservoir, we're well above where we were this time last year and a little above average. Go ahead.

Twin Lakes, we're above average and well above where we were this time last year; and for Pueblo, it's the same thing. We have about 89,000 Acre Feet more in storage than we did this time last year. Go

ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The summary, Turquoise is 102%, Twin Lakes

105% of average, and Pueblo is 129% of average, so

this is last year's Water Year. The blue column is

2014 and the silver column is 2013, so you could see

we're in a lot better shape. This is Turquoise

again. All throughout the season, we had more water

than we -- a lot more water than we did this time,

or in 2013.

It's kind of the same story, not as extreme, for Twin Lakes. Pueblo Reservoir is a lot more noticeable towards the end of the water season. Go ahead, yeah.

These are our forecasts. February was 63-8 (63,800 AF); March was 73-1 (73,100 AF); April was 93-9 (93,900 AF); and May 1st was 64,040. what we anticipated bringing in from the collection system on the west slope. So this is just the way The heavy dark blue line is the way it it came off. The red line is average, so you can see came off. about February, we just continued to build snowpack above average, and then we had a few events late in the, late in the season, and this is the upper basin for the Colorado River. That's where we import This is the Arkansas Basin, how it looked. from.

It pretty much hovered around average and came off about average.

These were our total imports from the collection system were 80,300, and this is kind of the way it came off, so you can see in June, we were -- we pretty much peaked during that time and it really came off kind of gentle, which helps us to collect more water.

Winter operations, we're currently moving 200 CFS from twin to Pueblo. We plan to make space for about 60,000 and we'll adjust that according to our customer needs and the snowpack.

A few things I wanted to touch on again are the mussels that, that are of concern in Pueblo Reservoir. The facility assessment for the Fry-Ark system, east slope system is completed. The action response plans are completed if we were to find something, but to date we've found no adults, and this year, all the reservoirs tested negative for larvae, and this is the web site if you want to read that report.

The other thing we have going on is the AVC and the Master Contract. The Arkansas Valley Conduit and Long Term Excess Capacity Master Contract Environmental Impact Statement has been

completed. The Preferred Alternative has been identified. The Record of Decision has been signed and preliminary work has begun. This is our contact. It's Kara Lamb. Jim will do a little bit more in-depth presentation a little bit later on this, I think.

Southern Delivery System. The Southern

Delivery System is a \$1.1 billion proposal by

Colorado Springs, Security, Fountain and Pueblo West

to build a 62-mile pipeline from Pueblo Dam with a

capacity of 96 million gallons a day with an

anticipated start up of 2016, and they're about -
they're on schedule for that.

The installation of the fixed cone valve is complete and it's operational. That's one of the key components to them being able to get water out of the reservoir.

Construction has begun on their -- on the Juniper Pump Station, as well as two others. That's the fixed cone well. Questions? Questions?

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you, Roy. Is there questions from the front table for Roy? Hearing none, this will be Exhibit E, then.

MR. VAUGHAN: Anyway, at this time,
Andrew is going to speak to Trinidad, so I'll turn

it over to him. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GILMORE: All right. This is essentially the same presentation as yesterday. think I'll make a slightly different emphasis on a few points, and for Jim, you were educated, I guess. The -- so we'll -- this is an -- on the Trinidad Project. Go ahead, Kevin, and it's a background. As the Corps mentioned, it's a Corps of Engineers facility. It has multipurposes, including irrigation, and we, Reclamation holds the repayment contract on the irrigation portion of the construction cost. Currently, it's a 70-year payment at 0% interest, and Reclamation interest in the project is essentially our being in the contract and things like the Operating Principles, of which there are five signatories. ARCA, the Chairman of ARCA is one of the signatories, as well as the State of Kansas, the Corps of Engineers, Purgatoire District, and Reclamation.

The -- there is, in the Operating Principles, provision for review of them every 10 years, and the purpose of those reviews is to encourage optimum beneficial use with no significant increase in water use, and those Operating Principles are incorporated as an exhibit to Reclamation's repayment contract

with the District. Go ahead.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So an update on Reclamation's actions on this What we did have in the resolution for right now. ARCA today regarding the City of Trinidad's proposed amendments, we'll touch more on that in a second. We are working with the District to look at a request for using some of the joint use pool, the sedimentation pool in the reservoir for excess capacity, and our -- the District has been asking for this for a while, and we had a meeting with them in 2013 where we weren't all that. Our solicitor looked at it and was pretty concerned about our authority to do so, but we asked for the District to send us their legal analysis and we got that in July and our solicitor and us are working hard to look review what our position is and I think the outlook is rosy. I don't have a whole lot more specific information on that, but I think we have the -there is some hope there that I think we'll be able to get to. We looking at excess capacity into and at Trinidad Reservoir, and that is a benefit to Reclamation and the District, because the goal is there to help with the District repayment obligations.

As well as I mentioned the Ten-Year review, we

had a great project Review meeting in September with a tour of the project that went very well. We had also two technical meetings in February and July, and I think those are in good shape, and we do have a scheduled Annual Meeting. We'd like to have these the Friday morning after Trinidad board meeting in Trinidad, and so we're going to scheduled to have ours in 2015 in September, September 4th.

So the City of Trinidad a couple years ago came before ARCA and presented a suggested amendments to help with their use of their using of water for rotation and exchange, as well as a -- they have some water rights that they have access to that they would like to use for municipal use and the proposed amendments, and we are working with those and our current plan is to split the one that's more difficult and the one that's straightforward, and so there is that resolution to deal with that before you, I believe, today.

We do know that in revised Operating

Principles will require an amended contract to

recognize and adopt those as an exhibit, and so

that's a part of Reclamation's action and we are

working hard with the people who are interested, the

signatories to the Operating Principles, as well as

anybody else who has interest, Lower Ark, for example. I think Don's been -- Don Steerman's been doing a good job of presenting interest there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Point out quickly, one of the goals of the Ten-Year Review is to look at the impact of the project on downstream users. We have in the past used a double mass analysis where we compare the project, the flows of the over the Ten-Year period at the gage above and the gage below the project and the signal in the last 10 years. That Ten-Year period ended October 31st, 2014. The next Ten-Year Review period and the signal from this analysis is different in that Ten-Year period than the Ten-Year periods before that. So with that, we are looking deeper into the analysis and looking to work with the State of Colorado as they develop their division tools in the ArkDSS project to look at some modeling tools to help us investigate the and try to distinguish impacts from something else that can be occurring, climate change or a change in storm distribution patterns from impacts in the project.

So as well, you should have a motion, or I'm not sure if it's a resolution or a motion.

Reclamation in the past has conducted the Ten-Year Review, and that has been at the ARCA. We're making

that request has been one piece of that has been helpful, and so I've requested that if indeed the signatories are -- want Reclamation to continue to do that, that a resolution for ARCA would be very beneficial, and so we discussed the structure of the review.

1.0

If you have questions or concerns about that, please contact us, and there's my contact information and I double-checked the URL at the bottom because this is essentially the same information as was published in 2010. In this next review period we'll be printing some more information on there, but that URL still is working. There's my contact information, as well as James VanShaar, who is my supervisor, and as I said yesterday, I am going to be taking a new position starting in January with Western Area Power, so this is my last ARCA meeting and I want to compliment Colorado and Kansas (States) on their cooperation and I'm pretty impressed with you all.

So with that, I'd take any questions.

MR. HAYZLETT: Any question for Andrew?

MR. BARFIELD: No questions.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you for attending the meetings and what you've done in the past. We

appreciate it. We'll come back and see us. 1 MR. GILMORE: So Kevin's got my 2 presentation, so I would -- I don't have a printed 3 copy, so Roy showed me up, I don't know. 4 MR. HAYZLETT: Make those in conjunction 5 with Exhibit E then as well. 6 MR. BARFIELD: And as he mentioned, we 7 will deal with -- I think we have a couple 8 resolutions to deal with the two issues that ARCA is 9 going to act on related to this. So Andrew, I just 10 express a thank you for your years of service to the 11 12 Basin, so we appreciate it and wish you well as you 13 move on, so... 14 MR. GILMORE: Thank you. MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. 15 Item 5. D. then, 16 U. S. Department of Ag. Is that Sherman Liechty; 17 correct? Liechty. I'm sorry. MR. LIECHTY: It's a tough name. 18 Sherman Liechty. I'm with the Natural Resources 19 Conservation Service. I'm the area conservationist 20 21 for southeast Colorado --MR. HAYZLETT: Sherman, be sure to use 22 the mic, please. 23 MR. LIECHTY: So -- oh, closer? All 24

right. So I'm sure most of you know who we are.

25

We're in every county in every state in the union, so Kansas has their NRCS, we have our NRCS, and we fund projects for the farmers and the ranchers out there in the watershed, so water conservation is a big part of what we do. I mean, we fund irrigation systems that are higher efficiency irrigation systems. We fund pipelines, tanks for, you know, cattle and stuff like that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what I'm going to talk to you just a couple minutes about today is a new program that we came out with last year. It's called the Regional Conservation Partnership Program, RCPP, and I'll just call it RCPP from here on out, but this is really a perfect group for what that program is It brings together multiple partners from state, local, nongovernmental agencies that have a like cause, and with this group, I would assume water quantity would be an issue, you know, maybe water quality also, and what that does is it takes our normal funding program, which is EQIP, and that's the funding pool that all the farmers in the states go to to try to get money to put in irrigation systems and to put in tanks and watering facilities for their cattle, and it puts it into a smaller pool.

So this group, let's say, would apply for one of these projects, get their few million dollars, and it's a five-year program, so you would apply and this would be a five-year funding cycle. Then your farmers, instead of competing against the whole state, would only compete against farmers in the watershed right here.

Last year we had over 1200 applications for EQIP and we only funded like 250 of them, so it's very competitive. So if you have your own funding pool, you can get, you know, your farmers are first in line. They can still come into our office. They still sign up just like they would normally, but they're signing up in the, let's say, the Lower Arkansas Partnership Project or whatever you want to call it, but then they only compete against the farmers in that watershed, so they're more likely to get their project, and if you start getting a lot of these more energy or water-efficient systems out there, you know, you're going to use a lot less of the water that's coming in.

So the way the project works is you put in -it's a matching, matching grant project, but your
part of that could be in-kind services. It could
be, you know, putting on the field days; sending out

the flyers; getting the farmers into our offices.

Our part of that is a lot of the cash that goes into these systems. It's the engineering that -- you know, Brady over there, my engineer, he's a specialist in these, you know, energy or water efficient systems, and we still do the design. We still do the survey work on it. That's all part of our normal day-to-day business, but if you got this -- I think last year, we had eight proposals that have made it. We haven't got that finalized yet.

In January, we're going to find out how many of Colorado's proposals will get accepted, but there's eight of them that made the final cut, and so we're, we're just getting to that point where we're going to start taking proposals for next year, so this is pretty much a perfect opportunity, perfect time to get started on putting a proposal together and getting it up there, and then if it gets accepted, again it's a five-year project and we can extend that if we have to another year or two, but -- and the money again goes to your farmers and your ranchers in your watershed and it doesn't go to, you know, somebody up north of Denver. It stays

right here and across the Stateline into Kansas, so when you have a multistate, multipartner project like this, you know, that's what we're looking for. That's what this program's about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So all I can say is if, you know, go to our web site. Go to NRCS's web site. Look up the Regional Conservation Partnership Program, RCPP, and look up the material, look it over. There's a few out here that know about it and that could help lead you guys, you know, to the direction you need to get one of these proposals put together, and you've got plenty of time to get a proposal together right now. We're just, like I said, we're just now getting to that point where we're funding last year's proposals, so -- but consider it. It's a good opportunity for a watershed group like this, you know, to get some money into your watershed and, and we're here to help where we can, and that's all I have.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Thank you Sherman.
Ouestions?

MR. EKLUND: Can I borrow your mic?

Thank you, Sherman. I just, from Colorado's

perspective, on both sides of the line if you're in
the audience and you've heard this presentation, I'd

encourage you to explore this with us. We're going to make sure that we do all we can, working with our partners in Kansas, to figure out how to take advantage of this programming, so come up and talk to Mr. Miller or to Cindy Lair over at the Colorado Department of Ag and we'll make sure that we put our best foot forward for the next round of proposals that or applications that they'll be receiving that we just heard about here, so don't, don't forget that. Jot it down, and let's work together to make sure we can take advantage of this.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Questions?

MR. EKLUND: Cindy?

MS. LAIR: I just wanted to mention that I've been working with Steve Frost, who's with the Kansas Department of Agriculture, and --

MR. HAYZLETT: State your name, please.

MS. LAIR: I'm Cindy Lair. I'm sorry.

I'm the manager with the Colorado State Conservation

Board and the Colorado Department of Agriculture and

a few of us, Steve Miller and a couple others from

the Colorado Water Conservation Board, have worked

together with Kansas Department of Agriculture,

Steve Frost.

We put together a proposal, a pre-proposal

last year that wasn't successful. We were really looking at conservation measures for the Ogallala we share down in our corners and we, we tried to have a proposal that would work with Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico as well, but that kind of fell apart, but luckily, what we were able to hold onto was between Kansas and Colorado, so that wasn't a successful pre-proposal, but we have had discussions lately about ways we might be able to expand it and rather than focusing purely on the Ogallala, we may be looking beyond that on surface water and looking at water quality and we'll be bringing in the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment on that. But if you have any perspectives on this from Kansas's side, I think it would be great to talk to Steve about that, Steve Frost. He would welcome your comments, I'm sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for Cindy? Okay. Thank you, Sherman.

MR. GILMORE: Sorry, Randy. I -- one of the things I did not mention in our presentation, because it's certainly not directly connected to Trinidad, but as the NRCS has mentioned in some of their water conservation efforts, I know that we're working with Mark Rude and the folks in

Oklahoma-Texas Area office and sort of water smart and basin studies. It's a grant program and a cooperative funding program with Reclamation. may have heard some of the work that was done on the Colorado in the Biq Basin study that was done there, and we expect to be sending, and again, I believe Kansas will get one as well, a letter of requesting interested parties. I think we have \$2 million for basin studies this year for if there are people who are interested in participating in that, it's a, it's a quite a process to get involved, but those are 50% matching funds for studies in watershed development, mitigation of concerns of the climate change and water supply. That's a Reclamation program authorized in this area and we expect to see it continue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The question I would have, talking about these, this NRCS program as well as ours, especially to James and the folks in from CWCB is I wasn't sure this was ripe because of all the work that's currently going on with the statewide water plan, in terms of whether it would be premature to start working on a basin study on the Arkansas if through all of this internal work going on in terms of water planning for the State Water Plan, so I just want to

make sure you're all aware that I know the CWCB will be getting that letter in January soliciting interested people who are interested in a letter of intent, a letter of interest for the basin study program, so those come out every year, but not every year we have as much funding as we do this year, so I would point that out.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thanks, Andrew, for expanding on that. Appreciate that. I think that will take care of the reports from federal agencies. We appreciate the reports, as usual, from all the agencies there.

Item 6, Reports from Local Water Users and the State Agencies. The Purgatoire, I believe, is first. Mr. Danielson, I believe you're the first.

MR. DANIELSON: Thank you, Randy. Well, it's a pleasure to be here again in Lamar.

Mr. Chairman, I would really welcome you to the wonderful world of ARCA. I had the pleasure, when I was State Engineer, to work with Senator Rizzuto many, many times, both on water legislation and as chairman of the Joint Budget Committee, trying to preserve what little funds I had, and he was always very helpful and I think you're going to find he's going to be a great federal rep, so welcome.

MR. RIZZUTO: Thank you.

MR. DANIELSON: To the Major, I'm glad to see the blue suit, and I know it's not navy, and I thank you for your service.

It's amazing how soon we get old. I just met the Major this morning and I looked down at his badge and it's the 20th Engineer Brigade badge and wow, you know, I was in the 20th Engineer Brigade in 1968 in Vietnam, so he's what, three generations removed, I guess, from me; but anyway, glad to have him.

I'd like to just cover a few items that the Purgatoire was involved with this year. We had a good year. Snowpack was about 70% of normal, but it came out in a very reasonable fashion and it made 2013 look really bad, because we were able to get water on most of our lands this year and farmers had a good, good crop.

We did conduct a project tour last September.

We had 38 people. It was a day-long affair, and I

think it was very beneficial to everyone who

attended it to just kind of see what the project

looks like, how it operates.

We put in 12 new recording gaging stations this year on two or three cases, thanks to funds

from the Colorado Water Conservation Board and the District, and this is going to improve administration immensely on, particularly on the Picketwire Ditch.

Andrew mentioned the issue of excess capacity in Trinidad. If you've been coming to these meetings, you know I've been whining and howling about that for quite a few years now. Trinidad Reservoir has a pool, a joint use pool of 37,000 Acre Feet of water capacity and there's never any water there, and we're now actively pursuing contracts with third parties to put third party water in that excess capacity. It just makes sense to me. It's a federal facility. The taxpayer built it. Our District is struggling to repay the cost, and I'm glad to hear Andrew say there may be a light at the tunnel. I just hope it's not a train.

We revised our rules and regs and stayed out of any major litigation, to the chagrin of my counsel over here.

Yeah, let's -- I'd like to just go through a

Power Point here for you. This just gives you a

feel, and I know I hate engineers who put slides up
that nobody can read, but it sums up, from 1999 to

2013, what our average has been in terms of yield to

the project. You can see the average over that period has been 39,000 plus Acre Feet. A full supply is 62,000, so since 1999, we've averaged about 63% of a full supply.

This just shows it in another way. The red line is the full supply, and you can see what the river has -- how it's performed since that period in 1999. Only two years out of that did we ever come close to a full supply.

Well, this is the best of times and the worst of times. If you look at the green line at the bottom, that was 2001-2002, and you can see we've never got even close to an average of 50 CFS flow at the Madrid Gage, which is the inflow to the reservoir. '82-'83, the blue one, light blue, that is the best of times. '01-'02 were the worst of times.

There is a project that we got involved with about two years ago and it's an ongoing project.

Those of you who are familiar with the Purgatoire River as it flows through Trinidad, it's not as bad as the Chicago River. It never catches fire, but it basically was a trash dump for people living and operating businesses along through the city, along the river, so we decided it would be great if we

could do a river restoration project and see if we couldn't enhance the environment through the city, and we had a lot of good partners: Water

Conservation Board District, City of Trinidad, Trout
Unlimited. I think we had like 14 cooperating
agencies, and we decided let's create a cold water
fishery. Now, I think Parks & Wildlife was very hesitant to think this could happen, but they partnered with us.

So here's the president of the local Trout
Unlimited chapter, and you can see he didn't throw a
rock. He's got a fish hooked out there, and it's
not a carp. It's a trout.

This is what the channel looked like through the city. That's I-25. We hired a contractor, Finnup, and went in and created structures to hold the fish and enhance the fish population. These are just some shots of here's a structure that's in place and working. You can see it's creating holding water and also ripples for the fish.

We had I believe about 200 volunteers from the community to help in clearing vegetation, getting rid of phreatophytes, planting willows, that sort of thing, and that's the result. We do have a population of rainbow trout and brown trout that are

reproducing now, so we're kind of proud of it.

We've restored about 3500 feet of river through the city and we'll be doing more this coming year.

Any questions? Good.

MR. HAYZLETT: The permitting process to be able to do that work in the river, was that quite a challenge?

MR. DANIELSON: Well, I tell you what.

We are fortunate, and I don't say this gratuitously,
but we get to work with the Albuquerque District,
and those people are very, very good to work with in
terms of permitting and moving things ahead, and we
appreciate their efforts and hats off. No, we had
no problems.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Good.

MR. DANIELSON: Maybe we didn't ask them. I don't know.

MR. HAYZLETT: That's what I was wondering. Maybe you just did it and then told them. Thanks, Jeris, for your report and thank you for your service, too, to the country.

That exhibit would be Exhibit F then?

MR. BARFIELD: That's right.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Fountain Creek Greenway Watershed and Flood Control District.

Larry Small.

MR. SMALL: Thank you, and thank you for the invitation to come down and talk to you today about the Fountain Creek Watershed Flood Control and Greenway District and one of the projects that we have just recently kicked off associated with the flood control and water rights on the Fountain Creek and the Arkansas River Basin.

I'm Larry Small, Executive Director of the District. Today I'm going to talk to you about what the District is, what our purpose is, our governance and some of studies that have been done, and then talk to you about the water rights protection task.

Now, the District was formed by the state legislature in 2009. It's a Title 32 special District under Title 32-11.5. It was signed into law October 30th, 2009, so it's our fifth year of operation, and generally the purpose of the District, as established by the legislature, is to address flooding, drainage, sedimentation, water quality, water quantity, and erosion problems within the Fountain Creek Watershed and effectively protect, develop, and use the natural resources within the watershed and to authorize the District to primarily manage, administer, and fund the

capital improvements necessary in the Fountain Creek Watershed.

The boundaries of the District comprise the entirety of El Paso County and Pueblo County. The watershed management area is the Fountain Creek Watershed in El Paso and Pueblo counties, 127 square miles. The District has general powers within the area of the District, but special powers within the watershed management area. We do have land use authority that is restricted to the Fountain Creek Floodplain from the southern Fountain city limit to the northern Pueblo city limit.

The district is governed by a nine-member board. It's made up of four members from Pueblo County, four members from El Paso County, and the member of the Citizens Advisory Group is the ninth member, who is jointly appointed by El Paso County Commissioners and Pueblo County Commissioners.

Board members are appointed to a two-year term and there are no term limits on the board.

One of our biggest objective is flood control, and primarily flood control on Fountain Creek. Here are some examples of what has been experienced. This was the storm of 1999, 18,000 CFS. The storm of September, 2011, 13,000 CFS. These are at

Pueblo, and then another storm most recently,
September, 2013, which produced 11,800 CFS at the
Pueblo Gage.

Our flood control study was one of the projects that we initiated in 2011. It was completed in 2013. It was a joint study funded by USGS and the District. Total cost of the project was \$570,000 and it provides an analytic baseline to allow selection and conceptual design of mitigation projects from Colorado Springs and the Arkansas River confluence. That study looked at 14 different scenarios.

The first scenario was a baseline scenario that looked at a historic 100-year flood or 100-year storm in the Fountain Creek Watershed. It measured the impact at Pueblo Gage and it looked at the flows at that gage as baseline considerations. Then the other 13 were different alternatives. Generally, the alternatives were based on side detention methods of flood control, and when we looked at the hydrology at the Pueblo Gage, it was based on a 34,000 CFS. We were attempting to mitigate 14,000 CFS at that gage. It reduced the flows to 20,000 CFS, so that was the baselines that we had looked at in the study.

So as we begin moving forward, one of the things that we want to do in continuation of this study is look at the alternatives that were presented, find out which of those are feasible and which are not feasible and move forward to a preferred alternative; but to do that, one thing that is very important to us is to balance the need for flood control with the need to preserve and protect water rights of downstream users on Fountain Creek and the Arkansas River.

So to do that, we initiated a Water Rights
Protection Task, and the task is directed to
determine water rights that can be affected by
operating flood control facilities and then
establish credible alternatives for analysis and
determine if there are any fatal flaws associated
with balancing the need for flood control and the
production (sic) of water rights.

We are holding meetings with stakeholder groups, so the stakeholders, ditch companies, water right holders, the Arkansas Compact members, anyone who has water rights or associated with water rights in Fountain Creek or in the Arkansas River, either upstream or downstream of Fountain Creek.

We want to have the conversation and determine

what those rights are and how they could be affected if we were to clip that 14,000 CFS from the peak flows that are occurring with that 100-year storm. We want to look at methods for routing flows or augmenting the reduced flows through the use of any methods that we might use to control these flooding conditions.

We plan to produce a draft report for review by a technical team and other interested stakeholders and then a final report. We have established the technical team. We checked off our project at the Winter Water Forum and had our first technical team meeting November 3rd at the Southeastern Conservancy District office.

Our next one is going to be the first week of January. We're still trying to schedule a date that we can do that, but it will generally be in that period of time, so we have had good participation from the technical folks associated with the water rights in this Basin.

We funded the project through self-funding with our partners. There's \$26,500 cash in the project, 24,000 in-kind from Colorado Springs Utilities and 4500 from the District, so the total project is \$55,000.

As I said, we kicked it off in October, had our first meeting in November, and we're hoping to finish it up in April of 2015 with a six-month project, so we're in the process of putting our consultant under contract. We have that discussion ongoing and we want to compile and finalize a report, so that's in progress.

We want to discuss who's out there, who's involved in this, and develop selection criteria for that consultant. We have done that. We have two candidates in mind now, so hopefully we'll have an individual under contract in early January, at the next meeting in January, 2015.

So if you're interested in participating in this, we welcome everyone to do it. Our e-mail is fountainckeist (sic), that's one string, at aol.com, so if you want to participate in this, you can do it either in person. (Email actually is fountainckeist@aol.com) We'll hopefully have a teleconference meeting set up for the meetings, but we are soliciting your support in this. We think it's very important, and not only important, but it's critical to balance any flood control activities we might have with preservation of water rights downstream.

We've had a lot of support from Steve Witte on our first demonstration project in Pueblo. That was a 21-acre side detention facility, 42 Acre Feet associated with that. It is in operation. We do have a substitute water supply plan that's done in conjunction with the City of Pueblo, the owner and operator of the facility, so we've at least done one project to see how we would do it, what effects it might have, and what do we need to do to protect the water rights associated with these facilities.

So again, thank you for allowing me to come down and speak to you today, and I appreciate all that everyone here is doing for the preservation of our Arkansas River Basin water. Thank you. Any questions?

MR. HAYZLETT: Any questions for Larry?

MR. THOMPSON: Are you going to plan on having any meetings down in this end of the neck of the woods, Larry, when you come down to talk to the District 67 folks?

MR. SMALL: Yes, we can. We can schedule those, and if you'd let me know when you would like to do that, we'll be glad to do that. We'll go anywhere, anytime, to have these meetings.

MR. HAYZLETT: Any other questions?

1 2

4 5

MR. SMALL: I appreciate Kevin Salter.

He just agreed that he was going to participate in our technical committee, to be sure that we have
Kansas representation in this activity.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you, Larry.

Appreciate that.

MR. SMALL: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. HAYZLETT: Next item is Southeast Colorado Water Conservancy District Jim Broderick.
Oh, yes. Exhibit G for his presentation.

MR. BRODERICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Vice-Chairman and Compact representatives.

Staying away from the Arkansas-Kansas debate there.

I'm Jim Broderick, the Executive Director for the Southeastern. I would really like to thank you for allowing me to come down and talk to you about what Southeastern's doing. More importantly, I'm really pleased that you moved the dates of this meeting so I could be here. Normally I'm unable to be here, and I want to say thank you very much for doing that. I hope it just wasn't for my benefit, but I surely appreciate it.

I'd like to go through what Southeastern is doing since the last time I was here and the projects that you were interested at that point in

time and give you an update of where we are on all those projects, so I'll start with that. The puzzles, as I refer to it, talks about the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision that Roy talked about, and I'll talk a little bit more about that. The second piece is the Arkansas Valley Conduit, which that Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision is about.

The Long-Term Excess Capacity Master Contract at Pueblo Reservoir, enlargement of Pueblo Reservoir, and Hydroelectric Power will be the discussions.

Basically, from the last time, we made a lot of progress. We were still struggling with trying to get the project moving. This is the original project of the 1962 legislation. I've been trying to move it for a long time, finally got it moving, and what you see up there are comments within the Basin of people wanting to move forward.

This one was a pretty important slide, the President coming to Pueblo and making it fairly clear that a project that was authorized when he was born probably should be built before he took the presidency. We concurred with that, and we use this all the time back in Washington, as much as we can.

The NEPA-EIS had three components or three federal actions, as they're known: The construction of the Arkansas Valley Conduit and the repayment and conveyance contracts; the interconnect conveyance contract; and the long-term excess capacity master contract.

1.8

That gives you kind of a map of the District itself, and most of all that activity is occurring at Pueblo Reservoir and down.

The purpose and need, and if I didn't learn anything in this whole process, its purpose and need. Thank you, federal agencies, for that. It's to deliver municipal and industrial water to the 40 communities within the Lower Arkansas Valley. The need is for the quality water that meets primary and secondary drinking water regulations and to provide sufficient water for existing infrastructure and water demands in the future.

That's an example of the interconnect. Any time that you have a facility as large as we do at the Pueblo Reservoir, we only had one outlet, if you will, and that would be the south outlet, so we had some work with the Southern Delivery partners. We worked on the north outlet, got the north outlet flush, and so what we'll do is put a connect between

the south and north in case we have to have one out, we'll have (trailing off).

(Interruption for reporter clarification.)

MR. BRODERICK: Let's go back. The north outlet and south outlet, the interconnect will allow us to interchange water back and forth so that when one is out of service, we have the ability to provide service to all the communities.

The Master Contract. Roy told you about 80,000 more Acre Feet in Pueblo Reservoir, give or take. The purpose of the Master Contract is to allow you to store water in Pueblo Reservoir for the 37 or 40, depending on what area you're at, participants with their water. This allows them to have long-term contract we're looking at is 40 years, ability to store their waters and take them out of a short-term contract situation. It allows them to have reliable water supply to meet the demands for through 2060.

Those are all of the parties that are involved there. I brought the slide for no action so you know kind of what it was before we started and so you'll be able to see all the entities that are in the project. Next slide.

There's the preferred alternative, called the Comanche North alternative, and that's starts at Pueblo Reservoir and skirts the west side of Pueblo and then brings it down through the valley.

The appraisal cost for the project is sitting at \$400 million. Started at 500 million and we brought it down to 400 million. The cost sharing is 65-35 at that point.

Probably one of the most important days that we kind of look at for this project was February 27, when the Record of Decision was signed which allowed us to start moving forward and got us out of an appraisal perspective and moved us into a feasibility perspective.

This is the second slide and the second comment that the President spoke that we use all the time as well, that we want to make sure that want to move that project forward.

(Interruption for reporter clarification.)

MR. BRODERICK: The second piece of the puzzle is storage, and when I look at storage, where everybody's always talking about storage, and so we'll talk a little bit about the preferred storage option plan, long-term excess capacity master

contract, and the enlargement of reservoirs.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The preferred storage option plan is one that I've come here and spoken many times about. done a little switch on that one for trying to move this forward in the next slide. Let's go to the Really used to be looking at enlarging Pueblo Reservoir. We switched it a little bit and said why don't we go ahead and start working on excess capacity master contracts to use the existing facility that we have, fill that up, and then show the argument of we filled it up. Now we need some We have done that with this contract more room. that we'll be working on in the near future. bring almost 100,000 more Acre Feet of storage into Pueblo Reservoir and it's under contract.

So when we get to the excess capacity piece, we're really had to wait for the ROD (record of decision) for the NEPA, and then we will go into negotiations with Reclamation on the contract.

We're right now having 37 participants involved in this and we'll have to schedule memorandums of agreements with those participants. We're scheduled to do starting those negotiations in the second quarter of 2015. The contract will be set up for 2016, so those long-term contracts will start at

that date for 40 years.

The second piece of that puzzle is to allow us to look at storage in general, and there's three ideas that are floating around. Since the last time I was here, there was only the one big discussion and that was Phase 2, which was the enlargement of Pueblo Reservoir and the enlargement of Turquoise Reservoir. There's another piece that's being added, and that's starting to look at small to medium reservoirs in the Basin, and one of those projects is the Upper Water Conservancy District looking at some of their storage projects and starting to work.

A third piece is looking at lower basin storage, possibly in gravel pits to be able to capture (inaudible) which is small recovery of yields are known as ROY projects, and so those two are moving. The enlargement project also is moving. As I told you, we were trying to get the excess capacity in place.

The next project is the hydrofacility that originally was a part of the Arkansas Valley Conduit when we brought the whole picture together. We broke it out just because we thought we could get this done a little bit quicker, but in 2011,

Reclamation published a request in the Federal
Register for hydropower generation and Pueblo Dam
was in the top ten. We partnered with our partners,
the Board of Water Works and Colorado Springs
Utilities, to utilize it. The facilities at Pueblo
Dam on the north outlet, it consists of 7.0 megawatt
at Pueblo, will be running at 18.6 million kilowatt
hours, and we estimate the cost of this at 19.7, so
normally I just say 20 million, but somebody at my
accounting decided we better get pretty right on the
numbers.

So the issues associated with this is three pieces, again, is the lease of power privilege permit, the construction and the operations.

Phase 1 of the lease of power permit (LoPP) is the financing and economic review, of which we have accomplished; our partnerships and contracts and the power purchase lease agreement. Stage 3 is the technical. We're walking through the planning and all the associated with the planning permit and design.

The schedule sits this way. The preliminary
LoPP was granted in February of '12; feasibility
study update was in March of 2014; preliminary
design, July of 2014. We believe that we'll get the

execution of the final lease of power privilege in May of '15, and then we will start looking at final design in October of '15. We will start construction in March of '16. We believe that we'll be completed with construction in March of '18 and it will be commissioned in 2018.

For those of you that wonder where in the world are you putting this thing, that arrow is the place we're putting it. It's on the north side of Pueblo Reservoir. As you can see, Roy was talking about the fixed cone valve. You can see that in the background, which is a little bit further forward.

The engineers, I've always said I have to have some kind of diagram so they can see what it looks like. That's as close as it can be, and yes, Jeris, you can't see it.

There's the next one. That's for the engineers as well, so you can see what it kind of looks like. For the rest of us, that's kind of where it looks like and that's where it will be sitting, where the green area is.

That's the picture of what it will look like the housing and the structure associated with. With that, those are the major projects that we're undergoing. The projects that were sitting in place

is somewhere close to \$460 million in process, and I think it's starting to take the project's intended purpose and starting to put it into place.

We have finished our 50th anniversary since I've been here before and we've celebrated that, so the project is starting to finish up the original design, the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to take any questions.

MR. HAYZLETT: Questions for Jim?

MR. BRAZIL: On the hydropower, is the power generated you're going to use in the Arkansas Valley Conduit, in the SDS to pump it, or are you just going to sell it on the open market?

MR. BRODERICK: At the present time, we will be negotiating with Black Hills. They're the ones that have the surface territory associated with Pueblo Dam. We will put together a contract with them and they'll determine what their best uses are. We anticipate that to happen later next year.

MR. HAYZLETT: Any other questions?

MR. BARFIELD: Jim, appreciate your report. I think it's been a few years since you've been here, so I'm glad you've been able to make it. Your Phase 2 storage options, what are the general

timelines for looking at those sort of storage options you outlined?

MR. BRODERICK: Right now we're trying to finish up those phases ahead of it, or right now we're looking at, as you're aware -- I'll do the enlargement piece first. I'm assuming that's what you're referring to, but I'll do the other two if you'd like.

While the enlargement piece is we're looking at most likely '16 to start moving that one forward. We're still doing some work on it, but preliminary we'll be doing probably '16, to start moving that in some discussions on that piece, and that's at Pueblo Reservoir. Turquoise Reservoir was always intentioned to be -- in the report, it says 25 years later, so I'll stick with 25 years later and see what that looks like.

The second one you're looking at is, I'm assuming you're talking about the Upper Water Conservancy District's small pits, and those are looking -- they're starting to move that forward right now and I'm assuming it will be somewhere between '15 and '18 and '19 before that gets moving.

The third one I put up on the slide having to do with the recovery of yield, which is water that's

flowing through Pueblo through agreements and 1. capturing that yield and moving it back up. They've 2 been looking at it for the last three or four years. 3 Conceptually, they'll start looking at a site in 4 2015 and probably start looking at design in '16 5 through '18. Most of those facilities are not, are 6 7 still have gravel in them, so you have to do it in phasing and my guess, I think it's going to be a 8 three to four phase, but I haven't seen the complete 9 10 final engineering report on that, and those are the -- sorry. Those are the three that I showed up 11 12 there. 13 MR. BARFIELD: Right. 14

MR. BRODERICK: Assuming that's what you're referring to.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARFIELD: Yes, it was. Thank you.

MR. HAYZLETT: Any other questions for Jim? Thanks for coming to the meeting this year, Jim.

We're ready for the Lower Ark Valley Water Conservancy District, Jack Goble.

MS. DURAN: Will his presentation be an exhibit?

MR. HAYZLETT: Oh, yes. Exhibit H. on that.

6

1

8

9

7

10

11

12

15

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. GOBLE: Jack Goble. I'm the engineer for the Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District, and I apologize. Our executive director, Jay Winner, had a prior commitment today. I actually didn't even know that I was presenting today, but seeing our District's name on the agenda, I wrote down a few notes just to kind of hit some highlights, so this probably won't be as entertaining as Jay would be, but I'll go ahead and go for it.

So the District is continuing to participate in numerous activities. Some of the highlights are this lease-fallowing pilot project that we're proposing for 2015 on the Catlin Canal. We've had a couple of goes at this that haven't happened, so hopefully, the third time's a charm. It will be a consisting of six farms under the Catlin Canal and with the goal of moving up to 500 Acre Feet of water to the communities of Fowler, Fountain and Security. It's still in the comment period. Tomorrow, there will be an engineer's meeting in Denver to go over the specifics, but we're still in the comment period as of now.

This summer -- I gave a presentation yesterday on the two recharge ponds we're planning on using

that we tested this summer, and they, those were successful tests. We recharged on the one a little over 100 Acre Feet and the other around 330 Acre Feet, so those were successful.

One of the other major things that our
District handles is we oversee two Rule 10 Plans and those are for the irrigation permit rules, also known as the sprinkler plans, and we have the Fort Lyon Plan and the Non-Fort Lyon Plan. So far this year, we made replacements of about 1900 Acre Feet. We're eight months into the plan now and so we'll continue those out for the rest of the year and we plan to do those, both of those plans again next year.

The Fort Lyon Plan, a group has actually been formed. The Fort Lyon Rule 10 Association filed with the Secretary of State, and the idea is to eventually have them take over their own plan, and so they actually elected their directors earlier this week and so that's moving forward nicely.

We did, the Fort Lyon group, actually, the Fort Lyon Canal had something new happen this year. They requested their first right of refusal and all of their Fry-Ark return flows, and so the Rule 10 Plan benefited from that. That will go a long way

to satisfy a lot of their replacements and they were real pleased with that, and we appreciate the Southeastern District working with us to make that happen.

I

We continue to accept conservation easements.

That's kind of another big part of what our District does. We're closely involved in this Fountain Creek master plan. I've been attending those, that first meeting, and plan to do that going forward.

One of the other thing I'd like to mention, we're looking at doing a -- well, we are going to do a irrigation efficiency study under the Fort Lyon Canal to look at the 65% irrigation efficiency for flood irrigation, so that will be a two-year study and, well, the Phase 1 will be two years and we'll be looking at starting that here shortly, so that's kind of some of the highlights. Any questions?

MR. HAYZLETT: Any questions for Jack?

MR. BARFIELD: No.

MR. GOBLE: Thanks.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you. Appreciate the presentation. I think we're ready for the Arkansas River Basin Roundtable. Is that Brent Newman or Jim Broderick? Jim again?

MR. BRODERICK: Mr. Chairman and

Mr. Vice-Chairman and Compact representatives, for the record, I'm Jim Broderick, chair of the Arkansas River Basin Roundtable. I won't go into a lot of great detail of the Colorado Water Plan, because Mr. Eklund will come right behind me and do an outstanding job on that.

1.2

I do want to make a couple of comments, however, from the Roundtable perspective.

Ultimately, the Roundtable intended for a grass root impact for the Colorado Water Plans to be meaning -- to be a meaningful document, and I believe we accomplished that; not only just for the Arkansas Basin, but I think that could be said for all the basins.

I think it's important that we understand that what I think it did was foster the collaborative solutions to responding to the looming gap between supply and demand. I think it gave us the ability to ensure that we fortify the prior appropriation doctrine and not undermine it. I think it identified and tests cost-effective alternatives to the discussion of permanent or buy and dry of irrigation lands. I think it is certain that Colorado will protect its Compact entitlements and demonstrate effective state-based policy to prevent

federal erosion of state and water and local authority.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think it encouraged strong cooperation by interested stakeholders to move regulatory and permitting efforts more quickly through the process, and probably the biggest issue associated with it was by front-loading the State involvement. Everybody, you know, talks a whole lot about, gee, you've really been spending a long time on this, but the reality of that is the State of Colorado needed People needed to understand what the other person at the other table was thinking and how they felt and, more importantly, to educate all of us on the different issues of each basin, and not only each basin but within the basin, because there's a lot of people that sit in different pieces of the basin that not everybody understands their issues, so from a Roundtable perspective it was, I believe, well worth it.

The last piece that I will talk about is I also think it aligns the State policies and the resources and the funding of Colorado's water values and allows us to start putting in those projects and programs in a priority, and that's what the Roundtable is working on now. We've submitted the

draft Basin Implementation Plan. It was published.

Mr. Eklund will talk with and we're still working on
finalizing that, but it is -- it has been a, a, a
dialogue of everyone.

There are 56 members of the Arkansas Basin
Roundtable. Some people say it's like herding cats,
but most of the time, we don't have those issues.

Most of the time we're able to get to where we need
to get and have a pretty good dialogue.

So with that Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice-Chairman,

I'll stop my comments and allow Mr. Eklund to

(Inaudible). If there's any questions, I'll be glad

to answer any on behalf of the Roundtable.

MR. BARFIELD: No questions.

MR. HAYZLETT: Any questions? Okay.

Thank you, Jim. Were we discussing a break? Okay.

We were discussing a break and thinking maybe this might be a good time before we get into Item B, if that's okay. Okay. We'll take about a five-minute break that will turn into 10.

(A break was then taken from 11:25 a.m. to 11:39 a.m.)

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. We'll get started.

I'll try and get us through the rest of the agenda.

At this time, I'd call upon James Eklund to go over

the Colorado State Water Plan. James.

MR. EKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome and thank you for your service to Colorado

and then on this board. I think I echo everybody

else that this is going to be a good tenure under

your leadership.

Governor Brownback and Governor Hickenlooper are developing a very fast friendship. They talk about water issues but they also talk about economic development and, you know, other agriculture and other issues when they get together, and as a result I think, you know, that there's a lot of similarities that you're going to see between the Colorado Water Plan and the Vision, Kansas's Water Vision as they move forward here.

The governors both called their respective water machinery into action in both States. In May of 2013, Governor Hickenlooper issued his executive order directing the Colorado Water Conservation Board to complete a draft Water Plan for the State by December of this year. We delivered that last week on Wednesday, a week ago today, to the governor, and we were on time with that document. I'll talk a little bit more about that.

Similarly in October of 2013, and I know

Kansas will go into this, their plan in greater detail, but Governor Brownback directed a process to be overseen by what he called the Vision Team, consisting of the Kansas Water Office, Kansas Department of Agriculture and the Kansas Water Authority and, you know, they're very similar and they share, they share some commonalities, and I just wanted to go over those in brief. Those of you from Colorado have had to sit through my presentation. It usually lasts 30 to 40 minutes, so I'm, I'm sparing you that, especially in concern of the time and the travel in front of the folks from Kansas.

But the first similarity or common theme is
the, you know, the Vision in Kansas and the Plan in
Colorado recognized the importance of interstate
compacts and comity and obviously, that's very
important to this Compact Administration and the
work we do every day for both of our states. So our
Plan says the State of Colorado will continue to
uphold Colorado's water entitlements under
Colorado's compacts, equitable apportionment decrees
and other interstate agreements, and Kansas's Vision
says their goal is to improve interstate cooperation
so that Kansas's water needs are met and protected.

The second point of commonality is that both plans, both the Plan and the Vision, contemplate greater collaboration among the respective State agencies. So Governor Brownback in Kansas called on his agencies that I just listed to work together and collaborate more and Governor Hickenlooper did the same thing in Colorado. So the synchronization of your agency permitting process in Kansas is kind of the hallmark there, and on our Plan, we recognize the same need around permitting processes and, as a result, that's led to coordination with our sister agencies including, you know, the Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment, where we have all of our water quality business living in Colorado, so we're trying to cross this, you know, recognize the quantity-quality nexus and it's no longer something that we can think of in isolation, one from the other, moving forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The third commonality is we talk about transfers within water basins in both the -- you know, Kansas talks about it in the Vision. We talk about it in our Plan. That's not a controversial topic at all in Colorado, so we, we -- our -- we're proud of the path that we're crafting toward resolving some of the conflict in Colorado around

which basin is, is, you know, has water for development and which ones don't. The basin of origin topic, you know, both in Kansas and in Colorado recognizes and focuses on the, you know, the feasibility and acceptability to those basins of origin, so that's, that's important. I think that's moving the conversation along, I know in Colorado anyway.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Last but not least, the grass roots efforts are the real hallmarks of these, of these two efforts. Kansas, you've got regional planning In Colorado, we call those Basin Roundtables. The -- and I'd be remiss if I didn't just pause real quick and highlight the person you The chairman of the Basin just heard from. Roundtable in the Arkansas Valley is Jim Broderick, and his leadership and the leadership of that Basin Roundtable has been important statewide as we talk about these conversations, you know, these topics of water issues, and he in particular and that, this Basin that you're sitting in today, are responsible for really moving the state forward on several topics, from watershed health to project permitting and really to what we're going to do in terms of closing a gap between supply and demand that we're

witnessing in our state, and I assume it is also prevalent in other western states, including Kansas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I saw or I heard, and I bet if the transcript was read back, Madam Reporter, that Roy Vaughan from Reclamation said there were no adults in the Arkansas Basin. He was referring to mussels, but I just wanted to clarify, and usually Chris Woodka from the Chieftain is here, so I really wanted to clarify for him, when he's here, that there are adults in the Arkansas Basin and they're having tough conversations that are -- you know, it would be easy to kick the can down the road on all this stuff, and people have done that in the past because it is the easy thing to do, but we're not doing that anymore, and it's exciting because we're having adult conversations that need to be had on this topic in Colorado and it sounds like that's the direction things are headed in Kansas, and so we're leading to finalized products in both States, a Plan in our State in 2015 and a Vision in Kansas in 2015.

So if you didn't know it already, and all of you sure as hell know it because you're here, water is important and now is a wonderful time and opportunity to make your voice heard in both of our respective States. So with that, I'll answer any

questions.

MR. RIZZUTO: Any questions from the board? Any questions from the audience? Okay. Thanks, James.

MR. EKLUND: You bet. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIZZUTO: Now to the Kansas Vision, and if I have the name correct, Lane Letourneau.

MR. LETOURNEAU: Correct, yeah. Thank you.

MR. RIZZUTO: Sounds Italian.

MR. LETOURNEAU: I'm French Canadian from Brookville, Kansas.

MR. RIZZUTO: Close.

MR. LETOURNEAU: And I do have my business card and I'll give you my presentation, and I won't take a lot. James did a wonderful job touching the highlights that I was going to touch on, and really, what I would do is just talk a little bit about our process.

It was probably well over a year ago the governor did tell the Department of Agriculture and the Kansas Water Office to go out and talk to stakeholders and develop a 50-year Vision with our water resources, and we ended up over 300 meetings

and talking with over 10,000 people, so in our document, everything in this document, you can go to the Kansas Water Office web site, www.kwo.org, and get this 80-page document. It's got 101, I believe, action items, and like James had mentioned, as a result of this, we had a year of meetings, 10,000 people.

Then we came up with a first draft of everything that we heard and we went out and did a week-long tour, at least three or four meetings per day in every region of the State, and the result of that is this second draft, and as James had mentioned, we've got these planning regions and right now, we are building those goal-setting teams, and we asked for nominations and we were overwhelmed with nominations.

We ended up with over 350 people nominated, so Monday in Wichita, Kansas, then we will be establishing those teams with -- Chairman Hayzlett is on the Kansas Water Authority, so we will be finalizing those, and then those goal-setting teams then will come up with a third draft. We see this as a living document and 'cause with each meeting we have, better ideas come out of that and, you know, I will stand for questions.

As I said, James, I appreciate you covering the highlights for me, so I'll stand for just a few questions. For the sake of keeping the meeting moving I can, I can move forward. I do have business cards. I'm in the back of the room if anybody wants to get my contact information.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Questions from the board? Seeing none, any questions from the audience? Okay. Thank you, Lane.

MR. EKLUND: One point of clarification,
Mr. Chairman. I've neglected to mention, and there
are copies of this out on the table back there, but
this is the executive summary of the first draft
Plan that Colorado delivered to the governor last
week, so pick one up. Let us know what you think.
We have a product now.

The full version of this is 400-plus pages, so it's in this binder right here, so coloradowaterplan.com is the web site for Colorado's Plan, and I apologize for not mentioning that earlier.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Thanks, James.

Next, Ground Management District 3, Mark Rude.

Mark.

MR. RUDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's

good to be here this morning and I recognize time, and so I am Mark Rude with the Southwest Kansas Groundwater Management District in Garden City, covering most of the 12 counties in southwest Kansas. Most of that is predominantly Ogallala Aquifer water supply but also we, of course, have members utilizing the Ark River.

Just a couple of items. For the benefit of brevity, I've got a written report here and I'll put some copies back on the table. I did want to touch on a couple of things. I think I was put on the agenda not only as a local area but one that, as was mentioned earlier, is involved with the Bureau of Reclamation on a basin Plan of study, so just a couple of comments on that, on some Stateline groundwater gages we had installed and then a concept on a rule, because we are in the process of updating our administrative rules applicable to southwest Kansas wells, and that includes a concept of water usability depletion, so open to comments on that.

Let me just read a couple of things here.

Water quality issues that are occurring along the upper Ark River in Kansas have been identified in various reports. Reclamation recently completed a

Public Water Supply Alternatives Viability

Assessment for Hamilton, Kearney and Finney Counties

that discussed various infrastructure and treatment

methods that could ensure that quality water is

supplied to this area from the Stateline to Garden

City, so that's been completed. It's really sort of

a scoping study.

On the Ark River Basin Plan of Study, right now we're kind of referring to it as a work Plan, but it's, again, it's under their basin planning program.

GMD-3 applied to and was selected by

Reclamation's 2013 Basin Study Program for a plan of

study or work plan to develop a scope of a study

which would cooperatively develop strategies to

address the water quality issues in the Ark River

and as we have put in our application from John

Martin Reservoir in Colorado to Garden City.

Through the basin studies program, Reclamation solicited state and local partners to conduct comprehensive water supply and demand studies of river basins in the western United States. This selection provided funding to Reclamation to assist GMD-3 in the preparation of this work Plan.

GMD-3 and Reclamation are currently in the

process of developing a work Plan which describes the objectives and study tasks for a basin study. It is expected that the work Plan will be completed in the next few months. After completion of the work Plan, it will be shared with others in the Basin in the hopes of attracting additional partners in Kansas and Colorado that would provide input and assistance in addressing these water quality issues.

That's essentially all I have for a report on that process. Again, intended to be collaborative in seeking the assistance of Reclamation under their Basin Planning Program.

On this Stateline groundwater gages installed, Stateline groundwater gage sites have been established through a cooperative agreement with the USGS through a process of probing the tributary groundwater formations along the Stateline by GMD-3 in cooperation with the Kansas Geological Survey and subsequent drilling of groundwater gage sites for the alluvial aquifer and the Paleo-River Channel Aquifer near the Stateline. This activity will provide additional continuous monitoring of waters of the Ark River Basin and the water quality near the Stateline. Information on the water quality and usability can aid in serving the interests and

concerns of local water users on both sides of the Stateline and the purposes of the Ark River Compact Administration, and on this, I have those two web sites of those continuous reporting gages.

б

Regarding a draft GMD-3 rule definition relating to water quantity and water quality in southwest Kansas for comment, I just included that here because, really, this quality and quantity are two sides of the same coin. It's good to hear both in the discussions of the Kansas water visioning process as well as the Colorado water visioning process, that that's -- we're making headway in recognizing that.

In southwest Kansas, we have that reality of fresh Ogallala water and then the wonderful recharge, but the quality concerns that we get from various sources, including the Ark River. For instance, we have an area in -- down in Meade County where, as we pump down the Ogallala and the upper Permian, chlorides are upwelling or can upwell into that fresh water supply, degrading these local farmers' water supplies for their pivot systems, so we're trying to stay on top of that and define the issues.

Along those lines, we have this draft water

usability depletion definition, and with the great minds I've known for years in this room, we're open to suggestions on how to craft this, this definition. Right now we've proposed this definition as: Water usability depletion means the degradation or reduction in the quality of a water supply without compensation for cost of treatment and a corresponding increase in quantity, as needed to materially restore the usability of a water supply in volume, value and function.

1.5

That's that challenge I think we all face as water managers as we utilize our water supply, make better use of it, more efficient use of it. There's that quality side of the coin that we have to address to the extent that we may have an effect on other water users and other water rights, and I think Steve Witte addressed that question in the Holly meeting, that special Compact meeting that we had, where there was some concern expressed that routinely we consider both quality and quantity in these changes to water rights.

That's some quick comments, trying to stay -I went over the three minutes, Hal, so I stand for
questions if there are some.

MR. RIZZUTO: Any questions from the

board?

MR. THOMPSON: Mark, have you got this paleo reservoir mapped out?

MR. RUDE: The Paleo-River Channel, in fact, we're proposing to study it further with the Kansas Geological Survey. It's not defined well. It's just sort of written in, I think, in a USGS publication a number of years ago and so, you know, the how it exists is a notion locally, but I don't think it's well-defined, and particularly from the standpoint of sustainability, we really need to define that more, so I think there's work to come on that.

MR. RIZZUTO: Any other questions from the board? Any from the audience? Okay. Thank you, Mark, very much, and for the record, Mark's report will become Exhibit I.

And next, Brett Acreman. Did I get that right, Brett?

MR. ACKERMAN: Ackerman.

MR. RIZZUTO: Or Ackerman, sorry. John Martin Reservoir Permanent Pool Report.

MR. ACKERMAN: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. Also in the interest of time, I'm going to be very, very

brief and hit just the highlights here, and particularly since the board is generally aware of the plight of the Permanent Pool, as are most people in this room, can we just flip to slide number 6, Kevin, for me please.

Essentially the Permanent Pool was created by federal legislation and a subsequent resolution by ARCA, and my agency, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, is the agency charged with maintaining the Permanent Pool for the benefit of recreation to ensure the investment in the fishery and in the recreational amenities at the reservoir.

Currently, there are two approved sources for the Permanent Pool, the Muddy/Rule Creek decree that we have and then Colorado River water. It takes about 1200 to 1800 Acre Feet to cover the evaporation of the full Permanent Pool in John Martin, and you can see here the Muddy Creek Decree, we're priority number 46.5, and then we certainly try to acquire transmountain water when and where we can.

But in the end, if you'll flip to slide number 10 please, Kevin, essentially what's happening is that instead of providing that Permanent Pool buffer when water levels are low throughout the Basin, it's

tracking the water levels throughout the Basin, so when there's not any water, there's no water in the Permanent Pool. When there is water, then we do have water in the Permanent Pool, which is great, but that makes it so it's not fulfilling its intent of providing that insurance policy, and the consequences of that, especially when we draw the lake down quickly, are we lose a lot of fish through mortality and evacuation of fish out of the reservoir. We estimated in a year like this year, we lose about 75% of the sport fish in the reservoir, and it takes a number of years to recover those fish, leading to a significant economic expense. Roughly, we estimate about a million-dollar expense each time we have this type of an event happen.

If you would then please, Kevin, flip to the end of the presentation, number 18, please. So essentially what we'd like to do is we'd like to fill up the Permanent Pool when water is abundant and not, you know, we're not struggling to get water throughout the Basin, and then just create a significant or a consistent source to cover the evaporation, consistent source of 1200 to 1800 Acre Feet each year that we can run in there and maintain

the Permanent Pool so that it can function as it was originally intended by the legislation and by the ARCA resolution.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what we'd like to do, this is just informational at this stage, but what we'd like to do, if you flip to the next slide please, Kevin, is back in 2008, Mr. Barfield's office created a list of criteria against which some suggested sources for the Permanent Pool would be evaluated. What we'd like to do is offline, with the approval of the board, touch base again with Mr. Barfield's office and make sure that this list of criteria is still valid and still in effect, and throughout the course of this next year -- the next slide, Kevin -- we'd like to examine a number of sources throughout the lower basin against these criteria, and essentially, those criteria are set up to ensure lack of injury against lower water users, and come back to you in the summer with a due diligence package and try to narrow down some of these sources that we think would meet those criteria and then come back to the ARCA meeting next December with a list of sources that we would ask for a resolution for approval then going forward.

In a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, that's our

proposed process going forward, with your approval. 1 Questions? 2 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. MR. BARFIELD: Don't have any questions: 3 Appreciate Barry (sic) coming and the presentation, 4 understanding the importance of the fishery 5 resources and the need for more water. We'll seek 6 to be responsive as you move forward to identify 7 8 some sources. MR ACKERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Barfield. 9 10 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Any other questions from anyone in attendance? Hearing none, thanks a 11 lot. 12 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. ACKERMAN: 13 Okay. Now we'll move on to MR. RIZZUTO: 14 Compact Compliance, and if I have it correct, coming 15 16 from higher ed, I know how to look over and kind of cheat and see who's next, but Kelley Thompson, I 17 call you forward to do the Ten-Year Compact 18 Compliance, okay. 19 20 MR. MILLER: I forgot to ask one 21 question. Did Mr. Ackerman's Power Point, did you want to make that an exhibit? 22 MR. BARFIELD: Yeah, we can do that. 23 Yeah, the full Power Point, that would be fine. 24

MR. RIZZUTO:

So that would be Exhibit J.

25

Kelley Thompson is the next speaker.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KELLEY THOMPSON: Thank you, Vice-Chairman Hayzlett and Chairman Rizzuto. my name is Kelley Thompson with the Colorado Division of Water Resources, and I can report that the H-I Model was successfully updated with the 2013 data as a collaboration between the experts in our two States, and the display table shows the 2013 annual result, which was approved and agreed to by our two States, which was a 4099 Acre Feet depletion usable Stateline flows for 2013; but the table also shows the Ten-Year Accounting, which results over 10 years in a net accretion of 58,118 Acre Feet to the Stateline, and so I -- this credit does demonstrate that the State of Colorado is meeting their Compact Compliance terms under the Kansas v. Colorado decree, so on behalf of the Colorado and Kansas experts, I'd like to recommend that this table be accepted by the Administration and that we are able to record it in the minutes, and I believe Kevin and Rachel have produced four copies that we can add to the minutes.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Any questions for Kelley? Any questions from anyone in attendance?

Okay. Thank you, Kelley, and I assume this becomes

an exhibit, which would be K.

MR. HAYZLETT: Correct.

MR. RIZZUTO: All right. Next, implementation of the Irrigation Improvement Rules, Bill Tyner.

MR. TYNER: Thank you, Chairman Rizzuto and Vice-Chairman Hayzlett and members of the Compact Administration. My name is Bill Tyner with Colorado Division of Water Resources and I work from the Pueblo office.

Jack Goble did an excellent job of giving a summary of the two Rule 10 or Surface Water Improvement Rule Plans that the Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District works with, in terms of the approximately 1900 Acre Feet of return flow maintenance that they have achieved this year under those two plans.

I'll only make a few more comments about those two. He did reference the Fort Lyon Canal Plan that serves farmers exclusively under the Fort Lyon Canal, and the other Plan that is sponsored by the Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District serves seven canals from the Bessemer Canal near Pueblo all the way down to the Amity Canal below John Martin.

The breakdown of obligations so far for this year for those two plans is 687 Acre Feet for the Non-Fort Lyon Plan and a return flow maintenance obligation. Those plans do continue through April of 2015, so they'll have some further obligation once the irrigation season starts back up in the spring.

1.0

The Fort Lyon Plan had a total so far through the year of 1140 Acre Feet of return flow maintenance that had to occur. Jack's releases of water generally will exceed that by a little bit because of the river loss involved.

A third Plan that was added in 2014 was sponsored by the Lower Arkansas Water Management Association or LAWMA, and it was to serve sprinkler improvements that went in under the Lamar Canal that GP Resources developed on the west farm and on the Grasmick farm, and that Plan, it was designed to maintain return flows of approximately 650 Acre Feet.

The Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy
District, along with farmers, completed a two-year
study. This was the second year of data collection
on pond seepage for head stabilization ponds that
allow water to be delivered just ahead of the

sprinkler system and debris or silt settled out in those ponds, under the Irrigation Improvement Rules, there was a conservative assumption about how much pond seepage might occur in those ponds.

This two-year study provides some actual data by measuring inflows and outflows from those ponds in order to see what the actual seepage was from those ponds. They conducted the study on 25 ponds and are beginning to work on the final report that will make recommendations about ongoing seepage estimates for head stabilization ponds.

I think that's all I had. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer those.

MR. RIZZUTO: Any questions from the board?

MR. BARFIELD: No questions from Kansas. You know, appreciate working with the Division 2 on these issues. Obviously we still have, you know, just our normal cycle of those reviews and working through questions and issues. Obviously, we have a number on GP farms that we're working through in that first year of operation, so but we'll continue to work with you on those issues. Thanks.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Colorado, anything?

Anyone from the audience?

MR. STEVEN HINES: Yes.

2.0

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay, sir.

MR. STEVEN HINES: Steven Hines, Frontier Ditch. Is return flows considered augmentation? Is that how the augmentation comes about?

MR. TYNER: You might recall Eve

McDonald, who was our Attorney General's office

attorney, who has been here at many Arkansas River

Compact Administration meetings. Eve hammered into

Steve Witte and I's head that we should separate the

description of what we do under the Irrigation

Improvement Rules from what we do under the well

augmentation Plan, so she would hammer us if we

referred to return flow maintenance as augmentation,
but in effect, functionally, it ends up being the

same type of thing.

It's a mechanism to make sure that there's water available to the river system to keep the river system whole, whether it's from the reduced return flows from using the sprinkler or drip system instead of flood irrigation or whether it's using a well that needs to be augmented because it's out of priority there. The operations are still the same. It's putting physical water back into the river system to keep the system whole so the Colorado

water rights aren't injured and the Compact isn't violated.

б

7.0

MR. STEVEN HINES: Is the return flow measured then back into the river through the augmentation stations?

MR. TYNER: There's a mixture of return flow maintenance sources. Part of those sources are transmountain agricultural return flows so, for example, under the Fort Lyon Plan that Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District manages, the deliveries of Fryingpan-Arkansas Project water that come from the west slope to the Fort Lyon are fully consumable sources and the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District can sell those agricultural return flows for use either for well augmentation or as maintenance of native return flows.

However, that's usually not enough, and so then the other return flow maintenance operations are either releases out of reservoirs and deliveries down to the place in the river where the return flows are owed; or in some cases, under the LAWMA Plan, for example, they used Lamar Canal shares delivered back out through the augmentation station to maintain return flows for those sprinklers, so

it's a mixture of how that water gets back into the system.

MR. STEVEN HINES: Thank you.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Any other questions?
Okay. Thanks, Bill. Thanks, Mr. Hines, for the question.

MR. STEVEN HINES: Thank you for allowing me.

MR. RIZZUTO: Next, Colorado's presumed depletion factor evaluation, Kelley Thompson.

MR. KELLEY THOMPSON: Thank you again,
Mr. Chairman. Again, my name's Kelley Thompson from
the Division of Water Resources, and the Amended
Appendix A.4 of the Kansas v. Colorado decree
directs the State of Colorado to conduct an annual
evaluation of the Presumptive Depletion Factors for
the supplemental use of flood furrow irrigation, and
so I'd just remind you that the Presumptive
Depletion Factors, or PDF's as we call them, relate
the groundwater pumping amounts to stream depletion
amounts that must be replaced, and if you'll recall
from last, the last ARCA meeting, we recommended
that a value of 36.5% be used for this year.

The 2014 PDF evaluation indicated that a supplemental flood furrow irrigation PDF of 36.0

would be most appropriate to apply in 2015, so we made that recommendation to Kansas and the Kansas experts agreed with the results of our evaluation, with an informal stipulation that we still evaluate two final issues with the evaluation methodology, so the State of Colorado has committed to work with the Kansas experts to try to come to an agreement on these last two issues and develop and finalize our document on the evaluation methodology, and we commit to do that before the 2015 evaluation.

б

1.0

1.1

So for administration in the 2015 Plan, plans, we do recommend that the Division of Water Resources use a value of 36.0 for the PDF, and I do have four copies of the evaluation report. I don't know if we want to submit that to the minutes or --

MR. BARFIELD: I don't think it's necessary.

MR. RIZZUTO: All right. Questions of Kelley?

MR. BARFIELD: No questions.

MR. RIZZUTO: Anyone from the audience?

And don't wander too far, Kelley. I think you're

next up. Okay. 2014 Colorado proposed -- is it H-I

Model?

MR. KELLEY THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Revisions, Kelley.

MR. KELLEY THOMPSON: Right. Thank you again. In October -- excuse me. Again, my name's Kelley Thompson.

б

In October, Colorado submitted a report to the Kansas Chief Engineer and the Kansas experts regarding two proposed revisions to the H-I Model. The first revision is to the methodology that's used to calculate H-I Model tailwater factors, and Colorado contends that they currently do not correctly consider drip irrigation.

The second revision is to incorporate new area capacity curves for John Martin Reservoir that have been developed by the Army Corps, US Army Corps of Engineers and is now being applied for administration of the reservoir.

As the proposed revisions do cause changes in the H-I Model results, they would be qualified as substantive changes pursuant to Amended Appendix A--B.1 of the Kansas v. Colorado decree. Therefore, Kansas does have six months to review and respond to the proposal and we do have a set way to proceed with these, but from what I understand from the Kansas experts, I believe we should be able to agree to these revisions relatively easily and relatively

soon, so that we can document them and use them into the future.

I do really want to thank Jason Woodruff with the Army Corps and the rest of the Army Corps staff for helping us come up with the area capacity, really digging up a lot of old area capacity information for John Martin Reservoir, and that really helped us sort out how that's represented in the model, so thank you.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Questions of Kelley, board?

MR. BARFIELD: I don't have a question.

I would just concur. Kansas has completed its review and is willing to approve the changes. I think we're -- so it's sort of moving on to how to document that approval, and we're actually starting to sort of work on a document to document the approval and determine if -- I know last time we did an approval of a model change, it affected some of the appendices. We're sort of looking to see if any of the appendices are implicated, so we'll move forward with that.

MR. KELLEY THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Any other questions? Thanks, Kelley.

Update on LAWMA Colorado Water Court decree,
David Barfield.

1.0

1.4

MR. BARFIELD: Yeah, I'll go ahead and handle this. Thank you. David Barfield.

You know, LAWMA has, has moved forward with these two, this, these decrees and Kansas has, I think, responded with various objections and concerns and in various ways, and then we've also sort of tried to take the list of issues and come up with a Plan for moving forward. That, that effort is not -- has languished a bit, and so there was some discussion last night in the Administration and Legal Committee as to sort of how to move forward, whether to ask the Special Engineering Committee to maybe take a shot at trying to help move it.

After discussion, there was agreement that really the two States, through the state engineers, are probably the best venue, and I guess I committed to try and seek to find a way to move these issues forward, so we'll do our best to, to reach out to Dick Wolfe and sort of try and come up with a Plan forward.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Questions of David?
Board or anyone? Okay. Next we'll move on to
committee reports, and the first report is the

Engineering Committee and it's back to you, David.

1.0

MR. BARFIELD: Okay. We had a very productive committee, I guess, in terms of reviewing information and presentations. I'll just sort of --we actually, for each of these committees, we put together a brief summary of what we heard, and then and the focus also of this is to document any particular action items.

I won't read the whole report. It will be available, but we heard from Kelley Thompson on the -- Colorado's work to continue development of its Decision Support System in the Ar-kansas River Basin or the Arkansas River Basin, as you wish. We heard an update from Madoline Wallace-Gross on the City of Trinidad's proposed amendments to the Trinidad Operating Principles.

Two of those, there was a resolution approved by ARCA 2012 that anticipated two amendments. One of those is ready to move forward, and we'll be discussing a resolution essentially approving that amendment on behalf of ARCA here later.

Steve Miller reported on the work of the Water Conservation Board on the status of CWPDA's request for a new storage account in John Martin. We heard from Dennis Garcia and Jason Woodruff on the Corps

on a number of topics, Trinidad Operating

Principles, the Madrid Gage, the hydropower at

Trinidad as we heard about this morning, stream bank

stabilization on Fountain Creek, Lake Hasty

improvements, and the Trinidad Project maintenance

again that we heard about this morning.

Andrew Gilmore provided a report on behalf of the Bureau that was on topics that we heard about again this morning. Bill Payne provided a report on -- by the USGS, again covering many of the issues we heard about this morning.

Bill Tyner provided a brief overview on sort of how the well augmentation process works in Colorado, for our general education. We actually also heard from Bill on GP farms in particular, and again, Kansas's concerns with some of the -- some of that was expressed, and we'll again continue to be working with them on that, what happened in '14 and going forward.

Heard a report from Steve Witte on the progress or the consideration of a rule-making process for post-1985 groundwater pumping, and we heard a progress report from Bill Tyner and Jack Goble on the Catlin Canal pilot project that again we heard a little bit about this morning.

Finally, we heard about the Permanent Pool issue that we heard about this morning, and the only action item we had was essentially recommending that the Bureau -- that the Bureau's requests that ARCA request it to conduct the next Ten-Year Review in some form, a resolution or some form, but we deferred that to the Admin and Legal Committee, so if you can consider that an action item, that was our sole action item, so that's my report.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Any questions of David? Okay.

MR. BARFIELD: And I -- will we make all the, I guess I would suggest that the following exhibit number, which whatever it is.

MR. RIZZUTO: I think we're to L.

MR. BARFIELD: To L. That maybe all the committee action items would be in that single exhibit, so...

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. All right. Report of Operations Committee, call on Hal Scheuerman.

MR. SCHEUERMAN: Thank you. My report's not as long as Dave's. The committee received the Compact Year 2014 reports of the Operations Secretary, which is Steve Witte, and the Assistant Operations Secretary, Kevin Salter. Kevin Salter

4 5

requested that the issue that arose in the 2014

Kansas releases be added to the Water Issues Matrix

and be referred to the Special Engineering

Committee. Steve Witte agreed that the 2006 Section

2 Agreement be referred to the Special Engineering

Committee and recommends that the Offset Account

Crediting Agreement also be referred.

Witte also asked the committee to approve accounting for the Kansas releases as set forth in his 2014 report. The committee received the 2014 report of the Offset Account from Bill Tyner. The committee received the Colorado's Presumptive Depletion Factors evaluation report from Kelley Thompson. The committee heard an update on the implementation of the Irrigation Improvement Rules from Bill Tyner, noting that the conclusion of the pond study and how the plans after 2015 will be handled, and I'll wait and give the action items after the reports. Oh, is that my deal?

MR. RIZZUTO: Go ahead. Sure

MR. SCHEUERMAN: I guess the next thing is Operations Secretary's report from Colorado, Steve Witte.

MR. WITTE: Good morning. My name is Steve Witte. I'm the Operations Secretary for the

Arkansas River Compact Administration. The

Operations Secretary's report was mailed to or -was mailed to members of the Administration,

particularly the members of the Operations

Committee. As per the provisions of the 1980

Operating Resolution on December 1st, and also, a

copy has been sent to the Recording Secretary of the

Administration.

1.5

Before getting into the details of the operations of your reservoir in the past year, I'd like to publicly acknowledge some of the folks that helped make that happen, and in particular, I'd like to acknowledge Josh Kasper, who is the Water Commissioner for Water District 67 who recently relocated to a different water district and has been replaced by Rebecca Nichols, who these folks are instrumental in, in ushering water to Colorado head gates and to the Stateline, pursuant to the provisions of the Compact. Also, I'd like to acknowledge Mr. Phil Reynolds, John Van Oort and Bill Tyner, also.

Over the course of the 2014 Compact Year, the net change of storage in John Martin Reservoir was a negative 10,000 plus Acre Feet. We started the year with a content of 16,828 Acre Feet and by year's

end, the content was only 6,193. We made an adjustment on November 1st to reduce the content of all accounts pro rata by the amount in each of those accounts, a total of 2185 Acre Feet, in order to implement the provisions of a resurvey of the area capacity of the reservoir. That procedure had been agreed upon previously with the State of Kansas and, as I say, reduced the capacity to 16,828 Acre Feet at the beginning of the year on November 1st.

Over the course of the winter storage period, a total of 11,145 Acre Feet was stored in conservation storage, and within that period, there was a total of 12,712 Acre Feet stored pursuant to the winter storage program or the Pueblo winter storage program in Section 3 accounts. That was then transferred into those accounts on March 16th. Throughout that period, the inflow split between Colorado Section 3 account water and Compact water was 80-20.

The Offset Account is the account that's used to provide water by the Colorado well associations, making it available to Kansas for their call, to be released at their demand. It requires a storage charge. A transfer of 144 Acre Feet was made during the month of March to complete the fulfillment of

those storage charge requirements and, during the year, there was 381.8 Acre Feet transferred from Section 2 accounts into the Offset Account, as well as 3800 Acre Feet that was delivered into the Offset Account. That water then was released in the months of -- the month of August, resulting in a release from the Offset Account of 4,342 Acre Feet.

The Permanent Pool decreased by 1,347 Acre

Feet over the course of the year, due to

evaporation, primarily. There was one incident in

2014 where Colorado Parks and Wildlife was able to

store just under 200 Acre Feet pursuant to the Muddy

Creek Decree.

Taking advantage of some precipitation events that began in June, Kansas determined to make a release of its, from its Section 2 account. This was the first opportunity that Kansas had availed itself of since Compact Year 2011, and over the course of three separate runs, a total of 22,536 Acre Feet was released from the Section 2 account.

Using a Transit Loss Determination Agreement that had been approved in 2006, actually two agreements that were approved in 2006, it was determined that there were transit losses of 712 Acre Feet associated with the first run, 354 Acre

Feet associated with the second run, and 62 Acre

Feet with the third run. These being transit losses

or deficits of deliveries from the Section 2

account, Colorado is required to restore or repay

for those transit losses, and transfers were

subsequently made to retire that obligation to

Kansas; so at this point in time, we have fully

repaid Kansas for those losses that were experienced

during those Section 2 runs.

During the year, releases from Colorado accounts totaled 19,000 Acre Feet, just a little over 19,000, and there were three storage events where additional water was able to be stored for conservation storage and distribution into Section 2 accounts totaling 20,909 Acre Feet. There were also three -- or excuse me -- five other occasions when Amity was able to exercise its Great Plains Storage Decree and store additional water in John Martin Reservoir Section 3 account, accounts totaling 19,640 Acre Feet.

There was only one meeting of the Operations

Committee in Compact Year 2014. There were three

meetings of between the Assistant Operations

Secretary and his staff and me and my staff. We

continued to work on trying to resolve a number of

issues that are included in the matrix of issues that have been brought up in recent years.

I believe that a number of these issues will be referred to the Special Operations Committee in the report of action items from the committee meeting yesterday, and we in particular look forward to receiving or working with Kansas on resolving those issues that have been referred to the Special Engineering Committee and as well as the remaining issues on the Water Issues Matrix, so thank you.

Unless there are questions, I think that completes my report.

MR. RIZZUTO: Any questions, Board?

None? Any questions? Okay. Steve, thank you, and

Kevin Salter, I think you're next.

MR. SALTER: In my other role first, I know in the past, we've made the summary from the Operations Secretary report an exhibit. Do we want to do the same this year?

MR. BARFIELD: Yes.

MR. SALTER: Okay. Now in my role, I'm
Kevin Salter. I'm the Assistant Operations
Secretary for the ARCA. I will kind of brief
through my report. I will just kind of touch the
highlights. I do have a couple limited copies of

hard copies. I can e-mail the report to you if you would like.

As Steve noted, we did meet on three occasions during 2014. With water issues, we find that things move pretty slow, but we are making good progress on a number of issues, I think. We also have regular communications with the Division 2 office on various issues as they arise during the year.

As Steve noted, we did make three releases in 2014, taking advantage of the improved river condition. Two of the releases ended on precipitation runoff events. Unfortunately, those runoff events didn't really last long enough to -- it did help the system. As we went through the releases, you'll see it would have been nice to see a little longer release on some of those runoff events.

Our first release, we called for on

June 27th to start. That was a Friday morning.

Working with the Division 2 staff, we determined to use about 450 CFS; in the beginning, a mixture of

Kansas Section 2 and Transit Loss, front-loading the release to try to get that water pushed down through the system, but not putting so much water into the system that we had to have that kind of primary

channel up into the weeds and the -- outside the channel. Our desire was to get about 350 CFS at the Stateline.

That Sunday morning as I reviewed the conditions along the river, I added up the release, the diversions from the river and then accretions and measured returns, the measured flows back into the river through augmentation stations, and looked at the flow at Lamar. When I looked at the flow at Lamar, there was 41 CFS more than the accretions and the release less the diversions. So at that point in time, I contacted Division 2 staff on Sunday and talked to them by phone and also in an e-mail and started looking at, you know, what's happening in the river system that we're producing water?

Well, we really decided it wasn't producing water. It was just the gage was not reflecting the water that was actually there at Lamar, and as the USGS measured these sites, we found out exactly how bad we were off, as far as those initial USGS ratings, due to changes in the channel.

So at Lamar, that was measured on July 1st and the flow indicated before the adjustment was 544 CFS; after the measurement was made, 388, or a difference of about 156 CFS. We saw similar results

at Granada and Coolidge, so what was happening is because the water -- the channel hadn't been exercised, there was some growth in the channel that caused the water to slow down, pile up, and indicate in the gages that there was more water than was actually there.

7.0

That caused a little issue with the accounting of the release, and that's something that Steve and I have discussed, you know, over the several months, but this is the Colorado accounting of the release using the provisional data. There's the Kansas accounting using the approved corrected data of the USGS after measurement, so the issue came to the hump that you see at the beginning of the release, because that water wasn't in fact there.

There's the provisional -- we talked about provisional data, so when as I was putting together my report and talking to the Kansas team, we would say, well, we ought to take a look at all the releases and see what would happen if we used the corrected data to account for the releases. And this first table, you can see that, you know, we came up with a difference of about 1380 Acre Foot of delivery deficit that was water that we didn't actually get in that first run.

But then we looked at the second release, and Steve and I were in agreement on using the provisional data on the amount of water that we didn't receive of the 354 Acre Feet. When we used the corrected data, there was no delivery deficit during that run, so actually, Colorado paid back 354 Acre Foot of water that it really didn't have to repay if we used the corrected data.

similar with the third release. Steve and I were in agreement with the numbers used in the provisional data, but when you go back and re-evaluate using the corrected data, there was some additional water that was, you know, there that wasn't reflected in the gage, so they made a 62 Acre Foot delivery deficit payment to us, and using the corrected data, it wasn't really necessary, but this really comes down to it showed an issue that we didn't expect to happen.

In the past, we had seen provisional data be incorrect, but it wasn't on the order of magnitude that we saw with this particular year. Given that we may have similar years moving forward, it was my recommendation that we add the provisional data in the Water Issues Matrix, and the Operations Committee will go ahead and address that.

1.8

One of the issues that we had talked about, moving away from the releases, is the Pueblo Winter Water Storage Program. This has been a long-standing issue. It's preventing some Operations Secretary reports from being approved. We did make some progress, both States reviewing the pre and post Winter Water Program storage periods, and we're still working on that.

Recognitions. I can't do what I do without
the support of the DWR staff, and that includes
staff from our Manhattan office and our local Garden
City field office. Again, I appreciate the efforts
of the Colorado Division 2 staff in working with us
on the various issues as they come up during the
year, real time administration, and as Kevin calling
up and asking him, this gage looks a little funny,
can you tell me kind of what's happening in the
local area?

Andrew Gilmore kind of dropped a bomb on us last night, saying that he was leaving the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. I'm kind of concerned that maybe it was the Trinidad Ten-Year Review that he's been stuck with that kind of forced him out. I know he changed positions at one point in time and the review followed him, so I really appreciate all

the efforts that he's made. Appreciate the ability and the coordination in trying to get the States to come together, as well as the other interested parties in the Purgatoire District, and sit down once a year and air the grievances and the issues, rather than waiting for the Ten-Year Review and then everything gets dumped over a period of about six to 10 years.

Stephanic Gonzales, I really appreciate you arranging a little different room. I know we just came back from the Community Building and I appreciate your efforts in getting us into a new location; and then Megan and Rachel sitting over at this table, if you don't know it, these two gals have really done a lot of things to make this meeting work the way it has in generating documents, printing, copying, keeping track as far as the exhibits and that, so I really appreciate their efforts as well.

In summary, it will be up to Steve and I to schedule some additional meetings. We'd like to shoot for about four additional meetings, or four meetings, two that are called for then two additional meetings, and see if we can't get that done and address some issues related to the Kansas

release using provisional data, continue our work on the Winter Water Storage Program, and other issues as they come up. That's my report.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Questions? Thanks, Kevin, and thanks, everyone you recognized. Next, either Steve or Bill on the Offset Account Report. Bill Tyner.

MR. TYNER: Steve's report highlighted many of the major aspects of the operation of the Offset Account within the context of the overall account operations in John Martin, but I'll just highlight just a few others very quickly. I'll highlight a few of the key elements very quickly for the Administration.

The account began the Compact Year after the adjustment that was made for the stage area survey for John Martin with a content of 2323 Acre Feet.

The Offset Account has a, an obligation by Colorado to provide a storage charge. In order to be able to operate, that storage charge is a 5% storage charge, and 500 Acre Feet has to be provided to enable the Offset Account to be used up to the first 10,000 Acre Feet of storage, and the Lower Arkansas Water Management Association provided all of the water for that storage charge for this Compact Year, partially

from transfers that occurred from their Article 2 accounts in 2013 and from physical inflow deliveries from LAWMA's Highland Canal water right on the Purgatoire River in 2013, September of 2013, and then finally, as Steve mentioned, through a final transfer of Article 2 water in March of 2014 to complete the 500 Acre Foot storage charge.

7.0

1.2

LAWMA also delivered other water to the account via several other Article 2 transfers in 2014 and fully consumable water from Pueblo Board of Water Works, City of Salida, Colorado Springs
Utilities, as well as from their Keesee and Highland Canal water rights that are decreed to allow storage in the Offset Account; and as Steve mentioned, the total deliveries to the Offset Account were 4,164
Acre Feet. 4,113 Acre Feet of that was fully consumable water and 51 Acre Feet was return flow water and return flow maintenance water owed to Kansas associated with the water rights used from the Article 2 accounts.

Steve described the single release that Kansas had made that occurred August 1st through

August 7th involving the total release of 4,342 Acre

Feet. Of that, 3,390 Acre Feet was fully consumable water that was eligible to be used as a credit by

the Colorado well associations against Stateline depletions, and pursuant to the agreed upon delivery accrediting, 2728 Acre Feet of that amount is going to be a credit in the next Ten-Year Accounting at the Stateline, and the ending content of the account on October 31st, 2014 was 1103 Acre Feet. Any questions?

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Thank you. Wrap-up on committee recommendations, Hal?

MS. DURAN: Mr. Chairman, Rachel Duran.

If I may interrupt, are we going to make the

Assistant Operations Secretary report an exhibit?

MR. RIZZUTO: Yes.

MS. DURAN: Okay.

MR. RIZZUTO: So it would be --

MS. DURAN: That would be Exhibit N.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Is that -- Steve?

MR. MILLER: I know it was mentioned making it part of the Operations Secretary report, but I think the word summary was used. Is there a particular piece, Steve, that you think? Is it the text, the first 10 or so pages? There's a lot of tables and numbers in Steve's report. I'm not sure what part of it you want to make an exhibit.

MR. RIZZUTO: Any idea?

MR. MILLER: There is an abbreviated report, but it's still probably 30 pages or so and includes a CD. Is that what you were intending or -
MR. BARFIELD: What have we done in the

MR. BARFIELD: What have we done in the past; do you know?

MR. MILLER: Honestly, I don't think
we've included it as an exhibit. I think we may
have included the cover page to signify that we had
seen the report and so people could find it using
that information. You know, some of this goes away
with the web site, eventually, but for the time
being, we're kind of feeling our way, so -- I have a
short form of his report. Maybe defer to Steve what
he thinks ought to be in the --

MR. RIZZUTO: Kevin, and then we'll come back.

MR. SALTER: Yeah. What we have included in the past, I know, is the letter report that Steve provides without the tables added, and it is referenced that we -- here's the ability to access the full report other places.

MR. MILLER: About the first 10 pages or so? Okay. I think we can adequately find what we just talked about and get it to the reporter.

MR. BARFIELD: Why don't we let Steve determine what he thinks ought to be included, so that would be just -- so the committee reports and recommendations was L; is that right?

1.5

MR. RIZZUTO: Correct.

MR. BARFIELD: And then Steve's report.

MR. RIZZUTO: Was M.

MR. BARFIELD: Was M, and then the Assistant Operations Secretary's was N, and then do we do a part of the Offset Account Report? Again, is there a summary of that? We don't want -- that thing is a -- is there a summary portion of the Offset Account Report? I should know this.

MR. RIZZUTO: Bill?

MR. TYNER: There's a narrative portion at the front, similar to the Operations Secretary's report, yes.

MR. BARFIELD: Why don't we include that, and again, we -- we're going to hear about the web site soon, and obviously, we'll have all of these reports available via the web site, so we can --

MR. SALTER: Yeah. One other thing is for some large reports, we've just been said the exhibit was Exhibit X, for example, and then the sheet behind it would say Report Available

Electronically.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Makes sense. Okay Hal?

MR. SCHEUERMAN: I should also note that Colin Thompson also helped on this committee and we very briefly come to all these conclusions. The action items for the Operations Committee include: The committee recommends that the issue that arose in Compact Year 2014 with regard to the use of the provisional data included in both the Section 2 Agreement and the Offset Account Crediting Agreement be referred to the Special Engineering Committee.

The committee acknowledged receipt of the Compact Year 2014 reports of the Operations Secretary and the Assistant Operations Secretary.

The committee approved the accounting under the Compact Year 2014 report of the Operations Secretary for the Kansas releases.

The Ten-Year Compact Compliance table,

Accounting Table for 2004 through 2013 were

presented. The committee recommended that this

table be an exhibit to the 2014 ARCA Annual Meeting

transcript and included in the Compact Year 2014

Annual Report.

And the last recommendation is: The committee

refers the Compact Year 2006 through Compact Year 2013 Operations Secretary's reports to the Special Engineering Committee for resolution of the various issues that are holding up the approval of those reports, and that's all I have.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Questions? Okay. Thank you, Hal.

Report of Administrative and Legal Committee, and feel free just to call upon those that follow you, Randy.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Thank you. The Administrative and Legal Committee met yesterday; James Eklund, the other member of the committee, and myself. The committee heard reports from Stephanie Gonzales, the Recording Secretary, in regards to the location of materials of ARCA and maybe the possibility of moving those to a new location, as well as looking at maybe some equipment for the office there.

We also heard a report and saw a demonstration from Rachel Duran and Meg Dickey-Griffith on the new ARCA web site. The committee heard an update from Steve Miller on the status of the transcripts from prior years. The 2013 transcript will be presented to the committee in February of 2015.

The June 10th, 1994 special meeting was presented to the committee by Steve Miller and Kevin Salter as ready for ARCA approval. Committee also heard an update on the status of the ARCA annual reports from '94 through 2014 and the process that's being done to get those completed.

Committee heard a report on the updates of the status of efforts of Kansas concerns with the LAWMA change, and you heard a report on that in the engineering report awhile ago and the status of that moving forward. Committee also received an update to the USGS Cooperative Agreements from Kevin Salter with the comments by Bill Payne with USGS and the agreements with USGS. Steve Witte also noted an amendment to the 1980 Operating Plan, Section 3-A, and that it would not be ready for any action at this time.

That brings us up to the action items, but first we have a presentation from Meg and Rachel on the ARCA web site.

MR. EKLUND: Mr. Chairman, we need to go back to the Operations list of action items and adopt those, because we didn't take a vote on that.

MR. RIZZUTO: All right. We can do that. What the issue is, is we didn't adopt the

recommendations on the Operations, so before we have the two reports, we'll go back to that. I need a motion, Hal.

MR. SCHEUERMAN: I guess I need to make a motion that we accept the recommendations of the Operations Committee. Is that the correct wording?

MR. RIZZUTO: Good. Second?

MR. THOMPSON: Second.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay: In favor?

MR. THOMPSON: Aye.

MR. BARFIELD: Aye.

MR. RIZZUTO: Passed. Now, you called on Megan and Rachel, okay.

MS. DICKEY-GRIFFITH: Okay. We'll be going over briefly the new web site, as you saw yesterday. We'll just start looking at the home page. This just has information about the annual meetings up front for everybody.

In general, this web site is designed to make ARCA mission and documents available and easily accessible for anybody. The overview page is put in a question and answer format, just giving the background, the technical information about how the Administration is put together. The Administration page lists all of the members and their pictures,

which we will take this afternoon.

7.0

Documents is where you'll find the meat and potatoes of the web site. This is, we'll provide links to all these different items. Some of them will link just directly to a PDF. Others, such as the annual reports, will link to another page where all the years are listed and where they're each linked to the report.

Resources page provides essentially external resources and links all in one place, and then there is finally a contact page where you can get in touch with the Administration, and I believe this was recommended yesterday and we are looking for approval to go live.

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Questions? None by the Board?

MR. HAYZLETT: No.

MR. RIZZUTO: I'll turn the mic back to Randy and we'll take care of the motion. Okay.

Thank you so very much.

MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you, and Rachel and Meg, you've done an outstanding job on making that web site. I think it's going to be a great improvement and a great addition to ARCA.

That brings us up to some of the action items.

I think I will defer those to Item 12, if there's no new business.

MR. RIZZUTO: All right. Any new business? Hearing none, now we'll go to the Ark River Compact Administration action items. The first is a recognition in memoriam of Frank Cooley, and I'll call on James Eklund.

MR. EKLUND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that the Administration adopt and direct staff to appropriately number the following resolution:

In memoriam Frank Gideon Cooley III.

Whereas, the Administration was saddened to learn of the passing of Mr. Frank Gideon Cooley III on August 3rd, 2014; and whereas, Frank served as the Federal Representative and Chairman of the Arkansas River Compact Administration from 1976 to the 1995, a period spanning the terms of five U.S. presidents; and whereas, Frank fervently represented the interests of the United States and was a true friend of the States of Kansas and Colorado; and whereas, Frank served the Administration with grace, elegance, skill, and a great passion for the waters and people of the Arkansas River Basin and treated all who appeared before the Administration with respect and equanimity; and whereas, the current

members wish to express their gratitude for his service and their condolences at his passing.

1.0

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Arkansas River Compact Administration that this statement be placed into the record of the 2014 Arkansas River Compact Administration Annual Meeting and a copy be sent to his son Andrew and daughter Karen.

Adopted by the Arkansas River Compact

Administration at its 2014 Annual Meeting on

December 17th, 2014 in Lamar, Colorado, and then
there are signature blocks for you, Mr. Chairman,
and for our secretary, Ms. Gonzales.

MR. RIZZUTO: That is a motion? A motion and second?

MR. BARFIELD: I would second the motion.

MR. RIZZUTO: Discussion? Kevin?

MR. SALTER: Yeah. If I could, I knew
Frank. I sat through his meetings that he chaired.
It was always an interesting and learning
experience. I sent out an e-mail to some of the
staff that aren't here with the Division of Water
Resources, and Lee Rolfs, an attorney for the Kansas
Department of Agriculture, provided an e-mail back
that really kind of wrapped up a lot of things. He
was quite the character, and Lee Rolfs worked with

the minutes, and many times, Lee would have to go to the dictionary to look up the meaning of a word that Frank had used in the meeting, just to make sure that it was right, and it was, all the time.

So he also noted that Mr. Cooley, and I didn't realize it 'til after reading his obituary, the breadth and the depth of the man that was Frank Cooley. He was at D-Day. He was actually born and raised in New York, as I understand from his obituary, and then moved to Colorado; was a journeyman for several different things before settling into the law profession.

Lee said that he remembered him being an avid skier, and he was really excited to hit that age where he could go and get a lift ticket for free, so he ends with Frank -- and this is true -- he was a real gentleman and just generally a nice guy, so thank you.

MR. RIZZUTO: Thank you, Kevin. Any other comments? Okay. There's a motion and a second to adopt the memoriam for Frank Cooley. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

MR. BARFIELD: Aye.

MR. EKLUND: Aye.

MR. RIZZUTO: Pass. Resolutions, and

I'll call on you David, David Barfield, to go through each one of them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARFIELD: Okay. Pursuant to discussions we've had this morning, the first resolution that ARCA is to consider today is a resolution with respect to requesting that the Bureau of Reclamation take the lead in the Trinidad Project Ten-Year Review, so let me just -- it's very brief. Let me just go ahead and read it.

It's Resolution Regarding U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and Trinidad Project Ten-Year Review for 2005 to 2014. Whereas, pursuant to the Trinidad Operating Principles, Article VI and the State of Kansas condition 4, there is to be a Ten-Year Review of the Trinidad Project; whereas, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has taken the lead in past reviews to conduct such a review with participation of those interested parties including the States of Colorado and Kansas; whereas, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's role as lead has resulted in the completion of previous reviews, now therefore, be it resolved that the Arkansas River Compact Administration requests that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation conduct a Ten-Year Review for the period 2005 to 2014 with the cooperation of the States.

The next item

Adopted by ARCA today. 1 2 I guess I would move adoption of this resolution on behalf of ARCA 3 4 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Second? 5 MR. BRAZIL: Second. MR. RIZZUTO: All in favor, signify by 6 7 saying Aye. MR. EKLUND: Aye. 8 9 MR BARFIELD: Aye. 10 MR RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 11 Okay. That passes. 12 MR. BARFIELD: I think we need to number these, so the resolution in memoriam of Mr. Cooley 13 14 would be 2014-01, correct, and then this resolution 15 that we just passed then would be resolution 2014-02, correct? Okay. 16 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. And then do I hand 1.7 it back to you? 18 19 MR. BARFIELD: Yes. Okay. 20 on the agenda references a potential resolution regarding an Amendment to the 1980 Operating Plan 21 22 regarding Section 2.A. (Note: speaker says 2.A but 23 agenda says III.A) The States have done some work

24

25

on that, but there's additional work that -- and

dialogue that needs to occur related to clarifying

those provisions, and so we are not acting on that today, but the States are committed to continue to work through that process, so that's agenda Item 12.B.ii. we're not acting on today.

The next agenda item is regarding an amendment to the Trinidad Operating Principles. The States have been working together on this issue, and Madoline Wallace-Gross actually did a lot of work to spearhead this through, and just in the -- just in economy of time, I'm going to go ahead and read the end product of that resolution and ask that the Administration act on it. Again, a resolution approving similar action was done in 2014 (sic), but it envisioned two different amendments to the Operating Principles, but only one of them is ready. I'll go ahead and read the resolution into the record.

Amendment to the Operating Principles Trinidad

Dam and Reservoir Project, amended last in 2014

(sic). Whereas, the Arkansas River Compact

Administration adopted Resolution 12-01 at the

Annual Meeting on December 6, 2012 in Garden City,

Kansas; whereas, Resolution 2012-01 related to two

distinct amendments to the Operating Principles of

the Trinidad Dam and Reservoir Project as last

24

25

amended in 2014; and whereas, the first amendment approving -- approved in Resolution 2014-01 (sic) (should be 2012-01) concerned the issue of whether water stored in the City of Trinidad's account in the joint use capacity of Trinidad Reservoir could be used outside of the Purgatoire River Water Conservancy District; and whereas, the City of Trinidad is still negotiating with the Bureau of Reclamation regarding the First Amendment proposed in Resolution 2012-01; and whereas, the second amendment approved in Resolution 2012-01 concerning the amount of water attributable to the historic consumptive use on acreage removed from irrigation that may be stored in the City's account in the joint use capacity, as limited by Article IV.B.4(a)(1) of the Trinidad Operating Principles; and whereas, the second amendment proposed in Resolution 2012-01 is agreeable to all the signators -- signatories of the Trinidad Operating Principles; and whereas, on behalf of the City of Trinidad, the Purgatoire River Water Conservancy District has requested this 2014 Resolution; and whereas, the Administration is a signatory to the Trinidad Operating Principles and all signatories must approve amendments to them. Now, therefore, be

it resolved that the Administration hereby approves 1 the amendment to the Trinidad Operating Principles, 2 as set forth in Exhibit A of this Resolution, which 3 is identical to Exhibit B of the Resolution 2012-01; 4 and be it further resolved that the Administration 5 authorizes its Chairman to sign the Trinidad 6 7 Operating Principles as amended by Exhibit A of this Resolution, subject to approval by all signatories. 8 9 Adopted by ARCA today. 10 I would move adoption of this resolution that we'll number 2014-03. 11 12 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Second? MR. EKLUND: Second. 13 14 MR. RIZZUTO: James seconds it. 15 Discussion? All in favor, signify by saying Aye. MR. HAYZLETT: Aye. 16 17 MR. EKLUND: Aye. MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 18 19 Okay. That passes. 20 Now, for the purpose of adopting procedures for approval of annual reports, I'm going to call on 21 22 Randy. 23 MR. HAYZLETT: Thank you. I missed that 24 on item 10.E. there, procedures for approval of There was some discussion on that 25 annual reports.

8 9

1.0

at the Administrative and Legal as to where that status is at on that. Kevin or Steve, do you want to comment on that?

MR. MILLER: I gave a very brief report indicating that no progress had been made, but I think the action could be or should be that you and James have set some new deadlines. I've agreed to provide you some information by February, and I guess the one thing we didn't talk about is you could authorize, if you're satisfied with the product and Kansas's review of the product, that we go ahead and publish before the next Annual Meeting, particularly take advantage of the new web site, so rather than wait a whole year for you to approve the work that I'm supposed to get you in February.

MR. HAYZLETT: You're going to have something to us in February and we can take a look at it?

MR. EKLUND: Mr. Chairman, I'd move that we are provided with that authority to publish, subject to our approval of what we get from Mr. Miller.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Second.

MR. BARFIELD: Could I clarify? "We," meaning that we authorize the Admin Legal Committee

to take that action? 1 2 MR. EKLUND: Yes. Sorry. MR. RIZZUTO: Okay Amended. 3 MR. EKLUND: It's amended, and if it's 4 okay with the second. 5 MR. HAYZLETT: Yes. 6 7 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. In favor, signify by saying Aye. 8 9 MR EKLUND Aye. MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 10 11 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 12 Okay. Now to financial matters under the 13 agenda. 14 MR. HAYZLETT: Actually, action items for 15 the Administrative and Legal, and I have several of those, so it kind of tells me what committee does 16 the most work around here. 17 The action items, the committee asked ARCA for 18 19 the authority to work with the Recording Secretary 20 and Treasurer on moving the location of the ARCA office and records. This would also include giving 21 the committee authority to approve any necessary 22 23 office supplies, and I would move that ARCA give us, Administrative and Legal, that authority. 24 MR. BRAZIL: Second. 25

MR. RIZZUTO: All in favor? 1 2 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 3 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 4 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 5 Okay. The committee recommends MR. HAYZLETT: 6 to ARCA that the web site be approved and be 7 published and that the committee be granted the 8 9 authority to implement the web site, and I would so 10 move. MR. RIZZUTO: Second? 11 12 MR. BRAZIL: Second. MR. RIZZUTO: You didn't jump very fast. 13 14 MR. BRAZIL: Well, I thought somebody 15 might jump in there. 16 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. 17 18 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 19 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 20 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) MR. HAYZLETT: Committee recommends that 21 ARCA adopt the June 10th, 1994 minutes. So moved. 22 23 MR. BRAZIL: Second. MR. RIZZUTO: Second? Okay. In favor? 24 25 MR. EKLUND: Aye.

1 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 2 MR. HAYZLETT: Committee directs the 3 4 Colorado State Engineer and the Kansas Chief 5 Engineer to work to resolve Kansas's concerns with LAWMA change of water rights decrees. I would move 6 7 that. MR. BRAZIL: Second. 8 9 MR. RIZZUTO: Second? Okay. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. 10 11 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 12 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 13 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 14 Okay. 15 MR. HAYZLETT: Committee recommends the 16 approval of the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year FY 2013-14; July 1, 2013 to June 30th, 2014. 17 MR. BRAZIL: Second. 18 19 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Second. All in favor, say Aye. 20 21 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 22 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 23 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 24 Okay. Passes. MR. HAYZLETT: Committee recommends the 25

approval of the revised current fiscal year, FY 1 2014-15, July 1 from 2014 to June 30th, 2015 budget. 2 So moved. 3 4 MR. BRAZIL: Second. 5 MR. RIZZUTO: Second? All in favor, signify by saying -- oh, question? 6 7 MR. BARFIELD: Steve. MR. RIZZUTO: Steve. 8 9 MR. MILLER: I just would offer an 10 exhibit that might help document your actions regarding the budget and the audit, and so there's 11 12 four copies of this. I reviewed this with the committee last night. I can find more copies, but I 13 know I have four here, so I'd offer that as an 14 15 exhibit and then you don't have to go into the numbers that --16 17 MR. HAYZLETT: We're not going to. The committee recommends adopting the Fiscal Year 18 19 FY 2015-16 proposed budget. So moved. 20 MR. BRAZIL: Second. MR. RIZZUTO: All in favor, signify by 21 22 saying Aye. 23 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 24 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 25 Opposed? MR. RIZZUTO: (No response.)

1 Passes. MR. HAYZLETT: Committee heard an update 2 from the Colorado Satellite Monitoring System 3 contract and recommends renewal of that contract to 4 ARCA. So moved. 5 MR. BRAZIL: Second. 6 7 MR. RIZZUTO: Good. Just, okay. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. 8 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 9 10 MR. BARFIELD: Aye: 11 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 12 Passes. Committee heard an update 13 MR. HAYZLETT: 14 on the CoAgMet funding status and cost-share 15 agreement and recommended ratifying the renewal that was done in FY 2014 and 15 and authorize renewal of 16 that \$5,000 contract in FY 15-16. So moved. 17 MR. BRAZIL: Second. 18 19 MR. RIZZUTO: Second? 20 MR. MILLER: I didn't realize you were going to go quite this rapid fire. 21 22 MR. RIZZUTO: Oh, okay. 23 MR. MILLER: There was a couple of pieces of this that --24

MR. RIZZUTO: Sure, Steve.

Go ahead.

25

1 MR. MILLER: Let me just clarify, 'cause it will help down the road. On the CoAgMet 2 3 contract, Stephanie, the Recording Secretary, actually signed an extension agreement pursuant to the original contract, which did expire on 5 June 30th, so I think it would be appropriate for 6 7 the Administration to ratify that action by Stephanie; and then the other piece of that would be 8 9 to authorize her to sign the next extension agreement, which would come up in October, 2015 10 before we meet again. So I quess that's one single 11 motion, but there's two things, two actions. 12 MR. EKLUND: That's how the motion is 13 14 written, Number 9. 15 MR. MILLER: Oh, I didn't hear Randy say 16 it that way, but is that -- okay. 17 Yeah, it's two pieces. MR. EKLUND: 18 MR. MILLER: Okay. 19 MR. HAYZLETT: So are we good? 20 MR. MILLER: Go for it, I guess. I don't 21 have a copy of the --22 MR. HAYZLETT: You want me to read the 23 motion again? MR. RIZZUTO: Read the motion as it's --24 25 MR. HAYZLETT: Let me read the motion

again. The committee heard an update on the CoAgMet
funding status and cost-share agreement and
recommended ratifying the renewal that was done in

FY 14-15 and authorized renewal of that \$5,000

contract in FY 15-16.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MILLER: That's perfect. I'm sorry. Oh, okay. On the SMS contract satellite monitoring system, that contract did lapse on June 30th. You've authorized a renewal, and I'm -- just to clarify, the renewal would be from July 1 of 2014 for the next three years, and assuming you do that, they have billed us for the five months or so since They continued to do the work for us, it lapsed. even though there was no agreement, so I'd like you to ratify Stephanie paying the invoice for the current fiscal year of 14-15, understanding that the first five months of that period, we technically did not have a contract obligating us to do that. Hope I didn't confuse that, but I think you understand what I'm saying.

MR. HAYZLETT: I think that's what it said in the motion, isn't it?

MR. SCHEUERMAN: To me, it did.

MR. EKLUND: It doesn't have the dates, but it's -- I think it's broad enough to cover what

l you're talking about. 2 MR. MILLER: Item 8, Randy? MR. HAYZLETT: 9. Item 9. 3 MR. MILLER: No, I'm talking about the 4 system, satellite monitoring system, Number 8. 5 MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. I'm sorry. б MR. MILLER: So we need to renew the 7 contract, but we also need to agree that we'll pay 8 9 for the entire year, even though we didn't have a 1.0 contract for a portion of the year. 11 MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Okay. And I so move that we pay for the contract that expired that 12 we didn't get taken care of. 13 14 MR. BRAZIL: Second. 15 MR. RIZZUTO: That's second. Now, is 16 that all incorporated? We got two different issues, 17 or we adopted the issue already that Steve brought 18 up initially, correct? Okay. So now we're to this, 19 okay. Motion and a second. Discussion? 20 favor? 21 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 22 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. 23 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 24 Okay. That passes. 25 And all of that was built MR. MILLER:

1 into the budgets that you just started to approve. MR. RIZZUTO: 2 Okay. MR. BARFIELD: Did we actually adopt the 3 one, Number 9? 4 MR. EKLUND: Yes. 5 MR. RIZZUTO: We did. We had adopted 6 7 that and then Steve brought up a question to it, but --8 MR. BARFIELD: All right. 9 10 MR: HAYZLETT: Okay. We're clear to The committee recommends that Stephanie 11 there. Gonzales sign the Colorado USGS Cooperative 1.2 Agreement and the Kansas USGS Cooperative Agreement 13 14 with the new provisions that were discussed with the 15 committee last night. So moved. 16 MR. BRAZIL: Second. MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Discussion? 17 All in 18 favor, signify by saying aye. 19 MR. EKLUND: Aye. 20 MR. BARFIELD: Aye. MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.) 21 22 Passes. MR. HAYZLETT: Committee received a 23 proposed resolution memorializing Frank Cooley and 24 25 recommends ARCA adopt that resolution. We've

already taken care of that. I don't know that we need an action there.

The committee received an update on the City of Trinidad proposed amendment to the Trinidad Operating Principles, along with the new resolution.

I believe we've taken care of that.

Committee received a resolution requesting

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation conduct the Trinidad

Operating Principles. We've taken care of that, I

believe.

So then the committee recommends the following slate of officers and committee chairs for the coming Compact Year 2015: ARCA officers,
Vice-Chair, Randy Hayzlett; Recording
Secretary/Treasurer, Stephanie Gonzales; Operations
Secretary, Steve Witte; Assistant Operations
Secretary, Kevin Salter. I would move that those members be appointed.

MR. BRAZIL: Second.

MR. RIZZUTO: And a second. Discussion?
All in favor, signify by saying aye.

MR. EKLUND: Aye.

MR. BARFIELD: Aye.

MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? (No response.)

Passes.

g

MR. HAYZLETT: And committee chairs for next year, Administrative and Legal would be James Eklund as chair, Randy Hayzlett as member.

Operations, Colin Thompson as chair, Hal Scheuerman, member. Engineering, David Barfield as chair and Scott Brazil as member. Do we need an action on that or just appointments?

MR. MILLER: I think those are fine, but I forgot one other thing. The audit report should be made an exhibit, and I've got four copies of that.

MR. HAYZLETT: Okay. Action on the chairs or just appointments? I think just appointments.

Committee recommends to ARCA that the 2015

ARCA Annual Meeting dates be December 9th, and we -and for the committee meetings and December 10th for
the Annual Meeting, and we would certainly invite
you to Garden City and make the motion that we have
the meeting in Garden City next year.

MR. BRAZIL: Second.

MR. RIZZUTO: Second? Okay. Discussion?

So the meetings for next year would be

December 9th and 10th in Garden City, Kansas.

MR. HAYZLETT: Yes.

1 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. All in favor, 2 signify by saying Aye. 3 MR. EKLUND: Aye. MR. BARFIELD: 4 Aye. 5 MR. RIZZUTO: Opposed? So moved. 6 MR. HAYZLETT: That completes my report. 7 MR. BARFIELD: Okay. Just to tidy up the exhibits then, Steve, what specific exhibits do we 8 need related to financial matters? 9 MR. MILLER: The spreadsheet table, I'm 10 11 actually working that out with Rachel. MR. BARFIELD: Okay. 12 13 MR. MILLER: We're calling it the Budget 14 and Assessment Summary 2010 through 2019, and the 15 audit report for Fiscal Year ending June 30th, 2014 16 from Anderson and Company. 17 MR. BARFIELD: Okay. So the Budget Summary would be Exhibit P? 18 19 MS. DURAN: Right. 20 MR. BARFIELD: And the audit would be Exhibit Q? 21 22 MS. DURAN: Right. 23 MR. BARFIELD: Okay. Is that all we need 24 to do then? Okay. All right. 25 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. All right. Any

discussion under committee meetings or special 1 meetings of ARCA in the future? I think, David, you 2 may have a recommendation. 3 Oh, yeah. Let me back up. Public comment. 4 Are there any comments from the public? Hearing 5 none --6 7 MR. BARFIELD: We didn't cover agenda Item 12.D., approval of transcripts. Are there 8 none -- are there any ready to approve? 9 MR. MILLER: Only the one you did 10 11 approve, a June 10 of 1994 special meeting. Found that as a missing -- we were missing an approved 12 13 copy of that, discovered it while we were putting the web site together. We've agreed on the version 14 and (inaudible) --15 16 MR. BARFIELD: All right. Oh, okay. 17 We're just so efficient, here I missed that. MR. RIZZUTO: 18 Okay. 19 MR. BARFIELD: Okay. 20 MR. RIZZUTO: Are we down to committees and special meetings? I asked for the public 21 There was none for public comment. 22 comment. Okay. Any future meetings, other than the 23 Annual Meeting next year? 24 25 MR. MILLER: I think we've committed to

1.0

holding a Special Engineering Committee meeting at some time, but we haven't set the date, and I think there's some discretion in the resolution as to who the actual members of that committee would be at any one time, so we probably need to have some phone calls, but I don't think there's an action item today.

MR. BARFIELD: Correct. I think the resolution says each State will appoint two, at least one will be, and it anticipates the state engineers and at least one member of ARCA from each, so I'll, I'll work with Mr. Wolfe to figure out when we would have that meeting and I guess each state is going to need to appoint the second member, but we can, we can correspond about that, I think, in due course.

MR. HAYZLETT: Then the Administrative and Legal would have some information given to them in February, but I don't know that there would be a -- any special meeting.

MR. MILLER: And I believe under the by-laws -- Kevin will maybe correct me or (inaudible). I think the committee's going to meet without. It could be telephonically, so --

MR. HAYZLETT: Without notice?

MR. MILLER: Yeah. I think you and James could just have a phone call and get it and decide what you want to do.

MR. HAYZLETT: And the only other,
Mr. Chairman, is with your new appointment, there's
been discussion about a tour of the Basin sometime
this summer. Kevin, you want to comment on that?

MR. SALTER: Yeah.

MR. HAYZLETT: You jumped up really quick.

MR. SALTER: I did forget one other thing that was pretty important for us in Kansas to recognize, too.

In 2004, we did a two-day tour of the Basin.

We started at Rocky Ford and we saw various

different sites along the river from Rocky Ford down

to Garden City, Kansas; and then following that, we

actually had an Operations Committee in Garden City,

an Operations Committee meeting in Garden City in

August of 2004. I think it would be appropriate for

the Administration to conduct a similar tour of

extents that maybe we could talk about where we

start, where we end, but for the benefit of

Mr. Rizzuto and Scott Brazil and others on the

Administration to see some of these sites that we're

dealing with on a daily basis.

б

MR. RIZZUTO: Okay.

MR. SALTER: Another thing on the tour, I did forget that one of the important things that we wanted to is recognize that Hal Scheuerman and Randy Hayzlett were reappointed as Kansas Compact representatives, and one of the things that should become part of the exhibits is their credentials.

We have the credentials for Mr. Scheuerman.

Mr. Hayzlett, lost in the mail is all I can say at
this point in time, but maybe we can go ahead and
make that the last exhibit to this meeting minutes,
and we'll provide Mr. Hayzlett's as they're
received, so I'm sorry. That's something probably
should have done at the very front end of the
meeting, recognize their reappointments, and we
appreciate their service to the State of Kansas.

MR. RIZZUTO: So done.

MS. DURAN: Exhibit R.

MR. RIZZUTO: R, so that will be made a part of the record.

And as far as the tour, I think at least from my standpoint, very open to it. It's been a number of years. I did a tour from Garden City all the way past Rocky Ford a number of years ago with a

Steve or Kevin?

gentleman some of you probably remember, Frank

Malinski, who was very much involved in water, and

of course, I got his point of view at that point in

time, so I think it's timely and if staff can work

with us to come up with a date that works, I think

that would be great and summer is a good time for

1.0

wanted to suggest is if we cut the tour off, whether it's Rocky Ford or Pueblo, had Jim Broderick still been here, he could have -- we could have firmed this up, but he routinely conducts a tour of the headwaters in the transmountain facilities that you heard something about.

MR. RIZZUTO: Right.

me, and so who will manage that?

MR. MILLER: And that could be a separate tour. He would be the host and I'll try and find the particulars out of when he does that. It is in the summer. We may have to choose which one we want to do or schedule so you can do both, if you have that much time.

MR. RIZZUTO: Yeah, if you could -- go ahead.

MR. BRAZIL: Broderick's tour is a two-day deal, so --

1 MR. MILLER: Yeah. 2 MR. BRAZIL: -- it's pretty intense. 3 MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Why don't we work on first getting this one scheduled and then we can 4 look on later doing the second one with the upper 5 headwaters. I was thinking of ending it at Swink, 6 7 because that's where I live, so --MR. SALTER: I'd be willing to be that 8 point person. 9 MR RIZZUTO: So Kevin, you'll work to 10 11 put that together? Okay. 12 MR. HAYZLETT: Mr. Chairman, since we 13 haven't used up the entire alphabet on exhibits, 14 maybe we should have yours as well, your appointment 15 and credentials as an exhibit. MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. That's assuming 16 17 there are credentials. 18 MR. MILLER: They're forthcoming, is my 19 understanding, but we have the e-mail from the White 20 House designating. It doesn't quite say appointing. 21 MR. RIZZUTO: I got something in the mail 22 last night, which I did not read, sorry, but -because I got home late, but I'll get that to you, 23 Steve, and if it's okay, then we can make that as 24 25 part of the record as well. Okay.

Jim, I thought it was 1 MR. THOMPSON: great that you got appointed. I just thought that 2 on the e-mail, it was somewhat symbolic that you 3 were one notch above the representative for the Inter-American Tuna Council. 5 MR. RIZZUTO: Yeah, I had a son-in-law 6 7 I wished I who asked me why I didn't go for that. did but I don't eat sushi, and part of that is 8 getting bluefin tuna out of Japan for sushi 9 10 restaurants. 11 So nonetheless, anything else to come before 12 the board? Any last public comment? Okay. With 13 that, a motion to adjourn? MR. HAYZLETT: Move. 14 MR. EKLUND: Second. 15 16 MR. RIZZUTO: Second. All in favor, Aye. 17 MEMBERS: Aye. MR. RIZZUTO: Okay. Safe travels to 18 19 everyone and happy holidays. 20 (Proceedings concluded at 1:29 p.m. 21 Mountain Time.) 22 23 24

1		EXHIBIT LIST
2	Exhibits	accepted by ARCA follow in the order
3	introduc	ed:
4	A.	Revised Agenda
5	В.	Attendance List
6	C.	USGS Printed Power Point Presentation
7	D.	USACE Report
8	Ε.	BOR Power Point Presentations
9	F	PRWCD Power Point Presentation
10	G.	Fountain Creek Greenway District Power
11		Point Presentation
12	н.	SECWCD Power Point Presentation
13	I.	GMD #3 Report
14	J.	CPW Power Point Presentation
15	К.	Ten-Year Accounting Table
16	L.	Committee Action Items
17	М.	Summary of Operations Sec'y Report
18	N.	Assistant Operations Sec'y Report
19	Ο.	Offset Account Report Summary
20	Р.	Budget & Assessment
21	Q.	Audit Report
22	R.	Randy Hayzlett & Hal Scheuerman Credentials
23	S.	Jim Rizzuto Credentials
24		

1	ADOPTED RESOLUTION	
2	ARCA adopted following resolutions:	
3	1. Resolution 2014-01 In Memoriam for Frank	
4	Cooley	
5	2. Resolution 2014-02 Request to USBR to Conduct	
6	Trinidad Ten-Year Review	
7	3. Resolution 2014-03 Amendment of Trinidad	
8	Operating Principles	
9		
LO		
11		
12		
L3		
L4		
L 5		
16		
17		
18		
19		
2 0		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF RENO

This is to certify that I, Lee Ann Bates, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Kansas, reported in shorthand the proceedings had at the time and place set forth on the title page hereof and that to the best of my ability, the above and foregoing pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the said proceedings.

Certified to on this 18th day of October, 2015.

ADVANCED COURT REPORTING SERVICES LEE ANN BATES, CSR, RPR, CRR 27113 West Mills Avenue Plevna, Kansas 67568 (620) 793-6555 or (620) 664-7230