



**PLATTE RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**  
**Finance Committee Conference Call Minutes**  
February 17, 2011

**Attendees**

Mike Purcell, Chair – State of Wyoming  
Jerry Kenny – ED  
Chad Smith – ED Office  
Jason Farnsworth – ED Office  
Bruce Sackett – ED Office  
Beorn Courtney – ED Office  
Steve Smith – ED Office  
Larry Schulz – ED Office Consultant  
John Lawson – Bureau of Reclamation  
Brock Merrill – Bureau of Reclamation  
Ted Kowalski – Colorado Water Conservation Board  
Suzanne Sellers – Colorado Water Conservation Board  
Dennis Harmon – State of Colorado  
Jennifer Schellpeper – State of Nebraska  
Jim Schneider – State of Nebraska  
Mike George – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Welcome and Administrative**

Finance Committee Chair Purcell called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. Central time. No agenda modifications offered. Lawson moved to approve November 2010 FC minutes; Sellers seconded.

**November 2010 minutes approved.**

Purcell asked about the 2011 chair for the Finance Committee. Kenny agreed it is time to nominate a chair. No nominations offered; Purcell agreed to serve as chair for one more year. **Chair approved.**

**Groundwater Recharge**

Courtney discussed the contract amendment for groundwater recharge, as recommended by the Water Advisory Committee workgroup. Lawson asked what 2010 line item the original contract being amended falls under. Courtney said WP-6, Feasibility Studies. Lawson asked why the contract is being amended from a budget from a different line item. Courtney said the ED Office anticipates the work will be useful for several purposes and fits with more than just this feasibility study. Also, the approved 2011 budget for WP-6 will be used for other purposes. Sellers said on the second page of the scope of work, the verb tense in the second bullet needs to be fixed. Courtney said that change will be made. Lawson said it seems that there is plenty of money in WP-6 to cover this and that would make it fit with the existing contract under this line item. Kenny said in the past contract amendments for other contracts have been funded from multiple line items and the ED Office asks contractors to invoice accordingly. Kenny said the \$150,000 in WP-6 for miscellaneous work will be more for addressing the feasibility of a particular item; this amendment is for something with utility to the feasibility study at hand but is more of a general investigation that fits with WP-9. Lawson said he had no further concerns.

Schneider moved to approve the contract amendment; George seconded. **Approved.**

**Water Quality Monitoring**

Courtney discussed the contract amendment for water quality monitoring. Purcell said the sheet at the end of the amendment is very helpful.

George moved to approve the contract amendment; Lawson seconded. **Approved.**

**1-D Hydraulic Model**

Steve Smith discussed the 1-D hydraulic model contract amendment and the three tasks covered by the amendment (model extension, North Platte choke point modeling, and modeling support). Sellers said it would be helpful to define DTM (digital terrain model) in the document. Steve Smith agreed to include that in the final version. Kenny said the last two tasks are not in a form that can be presented to the FC for approval; Purcell agreed. Kenny said what the ED Office is now asking for is approval of the model extension task for \$149,826 out of PD-12; the other two tasks will be brought back to the FC for approval at the March meeting. Purcell asked if the amendment components are all with HDR. Kenny said yes, HDR is the lead on the modeling team. Purcell asked if the spreadsheet at the end of the second attachment is for the model extension task. Steve Smith said yes. Lawson said Kenny saved himself for the time being, but that modeling tasks seem to always become a money pit. But, just focusing on the PD-12 model extension item that is approved in the FY 2011 budget and work plan will work. Lawson said he still has major concerns about the third task (modeling support) coming out of LP-2, which is a habitat/land management actions. Kenny said it is for support to help use the model for habitat design. Lawson said that seems like it should be handled under a separate contract. Purcell asked if the staff can at some time take over the model and use it, so why would the ED Office need modeling support? Kenny said there was a 1-D model workshop this week. The model is close to being a completed tool and staff does have capability to utilize the model internally. But, the staff has many work items on their list so it was a case to find help so the ED Office can keep the momentum going. Sellers said she attended the model workshop this week and because of the nature of the model she can see the need to be able to engage the HDR team for assistance when necessary.

Sellers moved to approve the contract amendment for the model extension (\$149,826); Harmon seconded. **Approved.**

**Newark Sandpit**

Farnsworth discussed the contract for habitat work at the Program's Newark Sandpit. This is a unique situation because the mine remains active and that work is done by Broadfoot Sand and Gravel. Thus, contractors on site have to meet MHSA regulations and Section 404 permitting requirements. George wanted to confirm that the work is the same but the estimates from the FY 2011 budget don't match what actually is needed to do the work. Farnsworth said yes, the actual cost came out a little higher.

George moved to approve the contract; Schneider seconded. **Approved.**

Lawson asked if Kenny is going to provide the GC with a list of Program income from sources like this ongoing sand and gravel mining operation. Kenny said NCF reports and LIHE reports now contain income reporting.

**AMP Permitting**

Kenny discussed the second contract amendment related to assistance with permitting activities related to Program projects. Specifically, the services of HDR will be utilized to help the Program develop an application for a regional general permit, meet the requirement of a Section 106 NHPA programmatic agreement, and as-needed permitting support. Sellers asked if HDR is the subcontractor to the Flatwater Group. Kenny said yes, but all services will be done by HDR even though the contract is held by Flatwater. Sellers said it would be good to explain that relationship in the amendment. Kenny said that would be done. Sellers asked if the region that this permit would fall under would include the South Platte in Colorado. Kenny said it would be a regional general permit for the associated habitats in Nebraska. Sellers said there was a task listed that said HDR would consult with Colorado and Wyoming historical societies. Kenny said that relates to the task of developing a programmatic agreement for historic preservation and that has to cover the entire Program area, including all three states.

Lawson asked if this means there would be consultation with the Wyoming historical society for all North Platte activities. Kenny said it just applies to actions taken by the Program. George said the Section 106 issue relates to whether actions are federal or not. Kenny said the Record of Decision says a Section 106 programmatic agreement will be developed and there needs to be further discussion on this issue before moving ahead with items like state historical society consultations. Purcell said he would like to see the regional general permit and its conditions before submitting it to the Corps and have a chance to review permit conditions before things go too far. Kenny asked if there should be a briefing to the GC as these ideas come together. Purcell said yes. Lawson said the GC needs to be clear on what the programmatic will cover – for example, he thought the programmatic agreement would only cover areas of disturbance in central Nebraska. He is concerned about Task 201 and that meetings should be between the Corps and the GC and not separately with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Kenny said he wants to seek approval of the 100 series of tasks (regional general permit), remove the 200 series of tasks (Section 106), and keep the 300 series of tasks (on-call permitting support) and use the 300 series of tasks to report to the GC on the possible structure of the regional general permit and to help discuss the Section 106 issue with the GC. The total amendment would be for roughly \$115,000.

Kowalski moved to approve the amendment for the 100 series and 300 series tasks as discussed in the Second Amendment; 200 series tasks will be deleted from the Amendment; language will be added to clarify the relationship between HDR and The Flatwater Group; Schneider seconded. **Approved.**

**Elm Creek Complex RFP**

Farnsworth discussed the RFP for design technical support, monitoring, and data analysis at the Program's Elm Creek Complex. Purcell asked if the TAC has reviewed this. Farnsworth said yes; the TAC approved this scope of services and supported it as sole-source, but some parties decided after that TAC meeting they wanted to move this as an RFP so that is what is presented to the FC for approval. Lawson asked about Task 2, the 2-D model, and how that fits with Page 10 where mention is made of Reclamation's SRH-2D model. Farnsworth said the intent is to not start from ground zero, but instead modify and apply Reclamation's SRH-2D model. Lawson said the description of Task 2 needs to be changed to reflect we are asking for model application, not model construction. Kowalski asked if a Selection Panel has been developed. Farnsworth said no but that will be addressed at the next GC meeting. Kowalski asked what the budget is for this task. Farnsworth said \$250,000 out of IMRP-4. Kowalski asked who was originally identified as being uniquely qualified for this work. Farnsworth said



Bob Mussetter with TetraTech, who developed the 2-D model for the stage change study and is working on other modeling tasks for the Program.

Schneider moved to approve the RFP, subject to language changes offered by Lawson; Kowalski seconded. **Approved.**

#### **Pathfinder Agreement**

Purcell discussed two pricing options related to selling water from the Wyoming EA as food for thought for the March GC meeting. The optics of including the EA account in the budget bothered some on the WAC. The options presented now utilize formulas in the Boyle Report. Sellers said the formula used is appropriate but she wonders about whether the “commitment” portion is appropriate if the Program doesn’t need the water in a given year. There is a concern that the Program might end up paying for Wyoming’s contribution of water. Purcell said it is a dollar question, not a formula question. Sellers said the Program should not pay for the Wyoming account. Purcell said that is not what is happening. Kowalski said Colorado would talk off-line with Purcell about this, but Purcell’s re-working of the options addresses a large part of Colorado’s concerns.

#### **Closing Business**

The next FC meeting will be a conference call on **March 30, 2011 from 10:00 a.m. to noon Central time.**

**FC meeting adjourned at 12:28 p.m. Central time.**

#### **Summary of Action Items/Decisions from February 17, 2011 FC meeting**

- 1) Approved November 2010 FC minutes.
- 2) Mike Purcell approved as 2011 FC Chair.
- 3) Approved groundwater recharge contract amendment, with changes.
- 4) Approved water quality monitoring contract amendment.
- 5) Approved 1-D model contract amendment, with changes.
- 6) Approved Newark sandpit contract.
- 7) Approved the AMP permitting contract amendment, with changes.
- 8) Approved the Elm Creek Complex RFP, with changes.
- 9) Set the next FC meeting for March 30, 2011, from 10:00 a.m. to noon Central time.