

## DRAFT

### Water Acquisition Committee

#### Summary Meeting Notes

October 17, 2000

The Water Acquisition Committee met on October 17, 2000 at the offices of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Lakewood, Colorado. Present were George Smith, Chairman, Bob Norman, Vice Chairman, Randy Seaholm, Ray Alvarado, Michelle Garrison, Brent Uilenberg, Angela Kantola, Bob Muth, Malcolm Wilson, Robert Wigington, Tom Pitts, and Ray Tenney.

#### 1. Status of the Coordinated Facilities Study.

Randy Seaholm reviewed the recently completed Phase I report and identified tasks that will continue into the Phase II study. Alternative that will continue into Phase II are the expanded coordinate reservoirs, CBT, and other trans-mountain diversions that relate to power and efficiency facilities, and some form of new storage.

CWCB has been having trouble getting the Phase II contract completed but the contract has been signed. Randy will get Leo started on putting the model together to analyze scenarios and we will have a meeting of the Management Group when initial model runs are completed. Phase II will be completed in about six months and will provide an alternative or alternatives for providing the 20,000 AF of water identified in the Colorado River PBO. When the Phase II report is completed and approved by the Management Group, the report will be forwarded to the Management Committee to implement the alternative identified. The Management Committee will then need to find funding for any structural alternatives recommended. Brent reminded the WAC that there is not much money in the Recovery Program budget if the Yampa plan proceeds.

Tom requested that Randy and George present a briefing at a future Management Committee meeting on Phase I and how Phase II alternatives will affect the 2001 budget and future budgets. The report should address when the study will be completed; and when it will be presented to the Management Committee. Randy mentioned that the CWCB may try to send out a news letter that highlights where the study is in developing alternatives and recommendations and what the deadlines are in completing the study.

Ray Tenney presented information on a number of letters/issues that the River District has regarding CBT and other trans-mountain diversions relating to CFOPS. Ray recommended that CFOPS be put on hold until these issues are resolved. Alternatively, the River District would like CFOPS to explicitly include the 70,000 AF identified in Helton Williamson in CFOPS. Randy reviewed the tasks in the Phase II study and identified linkages to issues identified in the River District letters. Ray expressed that the current wording in the tasks for Phase II is not sufficiently explicit to make the River District feel that it will be adequately addressed in CFOPS. The WAC discussed the tasks included in Phase II and felt that the issues identified in the River District letters are included and should be included in CFOPS Phase II. **Ray further requested that the better use of CBT east slope decrees be included in the CFOPS suite of**

alternatives as an alternative equal to any other. (Rays comments on the WAC draft notes are included below)

## **2. Section 7/PBO Depletion Accounting.**

The WAC had a long discussion of the Section 7 accounting list and issues of accounting for depletions under the Colorado River PBO. The solution the WAC came up with is to take all of the PBO depletions out of the Section 7 accounting list and add two new lines to the Section 7 list. The first new line will reflect the one million acre-foot of historic depletion. The second line will reflect the 120,000 acre-feet consulted on under the PBO. The second new line will not have a total of the depletion amounts but will have dollar amounts to keep track of the depletion charge. An appendix will be added to the Section 7 accounting sheets that clarify accounting for Ruedi and Green Mountain under C1 and C2. The appendix will include Appendix B from the PBO and have a tally sheet for the 120,000 AF of new depletions. Recovery Program staff will periodically review BO's completed under the PBO umbrella to determine the allocation of depletions between C1 and C2. Angela will revise the documents and circulate the draft for comment before the next Management Committee meeting.

## **3. Management Committee letter to Reclamation Re: HUP Management Issues.**

Malcolm Wilson addressed the issues identified in the Management Committee letter to Reclamation and described how the AOP process worked and clarified the procedure of developing AOP's. One of the problems is that the CBT AOP is put together in January and the OM Check settlement required a June deadline. Malcolm also mentioned the t due to staff shortages the CBT AOP has not happened for the last 3 years. He said that they were adding staff to correct the problem and that perhaps the CBT AOP could include the necessary info for the O.M. Check settlement operation plan. The other issues in the letter were addressed by a detailed description of how the water in Green Mountain Reservoir is administered from each pool based upon decrees and legal framework for the use of water under state law.

Malcolm reported that the municipal contract is in the Washington office for review and that the basis of negotiations has been approved and should be approved by Reclamation. Brent reported that he had talked with Alice Johns who felt that negotiations should go very smoothly and if the municipalities are comfortable with the draft contract, it can be signed and no formal negotiations will be necessary. Some NEPA work will be needed but should fit easily under the right categorical exclusion. (FYI The Grand Valley Water Users Association has requested that a formal public negotiation process be held, Letter dated October 20, 2000)

## **4. Yampa Management Plan.**

The WAC discussed the need to get moving on Elkhead enlargement in light of the consensus created last month. After considerable discussion, Ray was asked to come up with a scope of work for actions necessary to cover the cost of work for the next field season. The WAC will hold a conference call in early November to work out the details of the scope of work before the next Management Committee meeting. Ray next ask to clarify what was agreed to at the consensus workshop. Ray reported that the River District will insist that a annual average of

50,000 acre-feet of new depletions be included in the Yampa PBO/plan in contrast to the 28,000 acre-feet that was identified in the CRDSS model. There was concern over this insistence since the general belief was that there was consensus at the Steamboat meeting in the 28,000 acre-foot number. The issue was discussed at length and Tom Pitts stated that he would schedule a meeting of the Yampa Hydrology Work Group to work out an answer to the depletion question. At that point all work on developing a scope of work and budget was put on hold by the WAC.

## 5. Next Meeting.

The next meeting was not scheduled but it is anticipated that a conference may be needed after the Yampa Hydrology Work Group meets.

Hi George,

Looking at the meeting summary I have a couple of comments.

I am sure the tape is more accurate than my memory but:

On the CFOPS issue I was trying to make the point that the River District wants the CFOPS alternatives to include more efficient and complete use of the CBT East slope decrees. The Helton work shows an average of 19,000 AF available in priority to the CBT from their east slope decrees in years where CFOPS would occur. If CBT reduced their trans mountain diversions by that 19000 AF we would essentially have the 20KAF CFOPS target licked w/o reducing yield or building other storage. I did not believe (nor yet) that the task which includes looking at the non-charge program or power operations scheduling includes considering the more complete use of CBT east slope decrees.

I have attempted to distance the River District's broader objective of reducing the use of west slope water on the front range in CBT via the non-charge program from the CFOPS discussion as I do not believe that the issue of whether the CBT is a supplemental water supply only should be decided in CFOPS. I have never thought that the result of CFOPS should be to get the entire 70KAF that the non-charge program takes in CFOPS years delivered to the fish or left on the west slope. Unless the tape has me clearly stating that as our objective I would request the meeting summary be revised wrt that issue. Waiting to realize the yield from the east slope decrees may limit the non-charge program from operating in some months due to tunnel capacity and may result in more spills of Granby - the benefit being more water on the peak in the 15 mile reach.

I question the origin of the statement attributed to me that the River District would litigate to protect west slope water. Of course we have and will in the future where appropriate. I do not think that would be in the range of the CFOPS scope.

I did request strenuously that the use of CBT east slope decrees be an alternative examined and still think it appropriate. I am disappointed after speaking with Brown and Caldwell today that they think they have no tools to do that with and therefore will not. They seem to think their ability to analyze this CBT operations is limited to CRDSS which does not include the east slope, and looking at the BOR and NCWCD annual operating plans. I do think the CFOPS analysis is defective and incomplete as long as the better use of available water on the east side of the hill is not considered as an alternative. I believe that is what I told the WAC at the

October meeting.

I ask that the summary include my requests that the better use of CBT east slope decrees be included in the CFOPS suite of alternatives as an alternative equal to any other. I also would like to see some inclusion of the discussion of whether the BOR and Sec. Int. are "willing project owners" of CBT, willing to participate in CFOPS and that the BOR will be getting back to the WAC on that issue.

I know the summary is accurate wrt the River District's position on the 50 KAF in the Yampa Management Plan, at that time. It is encouraging that we seem to have reached a compromise which will satisfy the District and the other participants.

I hope this is in line with what is on the tape and not an unreasonable request.

Thanks,

Ray

I:\ELLEN\meetings\wac\WACOct2000.wpd