

1 *Draft minutes from June 2016 GC meeting in Cheyenne, WY – excerpt regarding the draft PRRIP First*  
2 *Increment Extension Proposal:*

3  
4 **PRRIP First Increment Extension**

5 LaBonde discussed the latest draft of the First Increment Extension Proposal. He would like GC members  
6 to put on the table today additional revisions, items to add, etc. so that the GC could take an action at the  
7 September or December GC meeting to endorse a plan for action after 2019. The next step after that is to  
8 get approvals and move through the appropriations process. LaBonde asked Kenny to discuss changes made  
9 by the EDO to the Extension proposal. Kenny said the EDO used the Extension document provided by the  
10 signatories and made a few modifications largely aimed at providing some details about how to accomplish  
11 what was laid out by the signatories.

12  
13 *General discussion points on the draft Extension Proposal:*

14 Thabault – Service did a redline strikeout and that will be provided to EDO. The Service wants to make  
15 sure there is connection between their red X and our milestones listing. Keep options for another bridge  
16 segment on the table (targeting Gibbon to Shelton); will request a higher level of commitment to choke  
17 point issues; Kenny asked for definition of what that means; is there an opportunity to support research on  
18 pallid sturgeon through the adaptive management program; Urie asked about the Missouri River program  
19 and whether it looks at pallids on the Platte; Thabault said they looked at all possible hypotheses for pallids  
20 and the importance of the Platte to that; it did not come out as a top-tier priority for the Missouri program;  
21 Barels said the hypotheses looked at whether the Platte is essential to the Missouri; it did not shake out as  
22 a high priority, but generally looking at the Platte is outside the Corps' purview; maybe money saved on  
23 tern/plover monitoring can be spent on pallid sturgeon items.

24  
25 Berryman – flow release for pallid sturgeon seems ahead of its time and should focus more on central Platte;  
26 concerned about language regarding “benefit physical processes”, need to focus on target species.

27  
28 Taddicken/Walters/Hovorka – need a working group working on this in an intense session; 10 years is a  
29 long time and the plus-ups don't meet 10 years of continuing on; consensus was if we go 10 years we need  
30 to focus on 150,000 acre feet instead of the range of 130,000-150,000; ultimate goal at end of Second  
31 Increment was 29,000 acres so 1,500 acres in 10 years won't meet the rub of 10 years; concur with Thabault  
32 about not focusing on complexes we have already and look at Gibbon-Shelton segment; find a way to give  
33 value to 10 years, not just a slight bump in course; add dates with milestones to show progress; see progress  
34 on negotiating a Second Increment and include milestones for that; Kraus said J2 should be online by 2022  
35 so 10 years will be here before you know it when you also count for analysis; LaBonde said the original  
36 proposal was developed before all the latest issues related to J2 and now that project has been pushed back,  
37 thus he might argue for a longer period of time than 10 years; Taddicken said he is worried about ever  
38 getting an agreement on J2 so using the 10 year time period would keep the pressure on, the environmental  
39 entities are not happy with the position Central is taking on the J2 project; Fassett said it will be important  
40 to keep looking at the whole range of water options; he is with LaBonde on probably needing a longer  
41 Extension; Barels said we need to have a good sound science argument for the Second Increment; that is  
42 going to mean more time to get answers, peer review, etc. in order to have information to convince people  
43 what is necessary for a Second Increment; Thabault said there is tension between best available versus best  
44 attainable; if there is not a solid plan to bring the Water Plan together there won't be an Extension, there  
45 will be re-initiation; needs to be acknowledgement that everything is being done to pull Water Plan together  
46 with solid assurances and commitments; Berryman asked about the inclusion of conservation lands;  
47 Thabault said the Service remains concerned about crediting conservation lands; Freeman said her  
48 recollection was the 10,000 acres were identified in the context of the conservation lands being out there.

49  
50 Strauch – is our land goal going to 11,500 or 12,000, or is it staying at 10,000 acres; Thabault said the  
51 Service wants to plus-up the land acreage goal for the Extension; there is a reasonable supplementation of

the land piece that will offset continued project impacts; Strauch said we already have about 12,000 acres, so is it moving those acres to other places or are we talking about more total acres than that; Thabault said those discussions need to be had, but the concept of adding additional Program acres is valid; Barels asked if that is in addition to Jeffrey Island; Thabault said in addition to that; Kraus asked about the SDHF release; Kenny said it was included in the documentation from the signatories; Thabault said their edits include striking the SDHF release (later clarification – Smith asked if this meant no SDHF releases, Thabault said instead it meant likely more than one SDHF).

Kraus – we were trying to lay out a schedule and get something firm by the end of this year; what does everyone think about that; Kenny said we didn't add a schedule to this because we needed to have this discussion but now we can start building a schedule and a budget; Thabault said we should get this nailed down by the end of the year. Fassett asked if we need a committee or more focused group to meet more regularly to get this done; Beardsley said budget will be a big issue; he needs to hear greater from the states about what the in-kind contributions will be because that will be a big influence on where Reclamation will come down on this so we need to get the budget formulation process started.

Fassett – has the Service had any early thinking about NEPA, EIS, and the BO; Thabault said he hasn't talked to Reclamation about the NEPA and EIS pieces; on ESA if everyone is in alignment the Section 7 items should be straight-forward; Freeman asked what form the Section 7 items would take; Thabault said there has not been a lot of thought about it, but it would likely be an amendment that would include an effects analysis of the new items; the result would be a continuation of the incidental take statement; Hines said we need to think about examining target flows as to whether that would be covered by an amendment.

Kraus – the current document says we can look at target flows; Rabbe said it is not that we don't want to look at target flows, the language about "updating the AMP" might be bigger than an extension.

Freeman said we need to work through these changes in a small group; Barels said that is fine as long as the whole GC is invited because everyone needs to understand the language and the changes.

LaBonde proposed that the EDO draft a new document based on comments today and the edits from the Service and then schedule a meeting to discuss the revised document; the full GC needs to be at that meeting; the next review meeting should be in the middle of July.

Barels asked if there is a timeframe in the Nebraska New Depletion Plan that has been exceeded; we need clarity from the Service as to what the needs are; Runge said they are on track but it just not final yet so that is where we need to be to check the box.

The GC agreed to the following schedule for moving forward with the Extension Proposal:

- All comments from GC members provided to the EDO by June 17.
- The EDO will revise the Extension Proposal and distribute it to the GC by July 1.
- The GC will meet on July 26-27 @ Denver, CO to discuss the latest draft of the Extension Proposal.