

Subject:
Attachments:

FW: Discussion of RRCA considerations of Nebraska Augmentation Plans
Discussion of RRCA considerations of Nebraska Augmentation Plans.docx

WSY/RC
N20024
1 of 3

From: Ross, Scott [mailto:Scott.Ross@KDA.KS.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2012 11:56 AM
To: Schneider, Jim; Ivan <> Franco (Ivan.Franco@state.co.us); Juricek, Chelsea
Subject: Discussion of RRCA considerations of Nebraska Augmentation Plans

Jim and Ivan,

These are some initial questions Kansas would like to discuss. The intent is to open a discussion on the concept of augmentation and how it might be most efficiently be implemented. This document will hopefully facilitate a dialog to answer the questions raised and undoubtedly identify others.

Let me know if you would like to schedule further discussion on this topic.

Scott

Discussion of RRCA considerations of Nebraska Augmentation Plans
September 27, 2012

Basic information that should be provided with the plan

- Basics of plan:
 - Quantity requested to be authorized
 - Source locations to be converted to augmentation
 - Augmentation delivery point
 - Computations to substantiate no increase in consumptive use.
 - What depletions are augmentation flows under the plan meant to replace?
 - Basics of envisioned operations.
 - When will the augmentation be used? Will it be operated only during Compact Call Years?
 - How the amount of water that will be allowed for augmentation credit in any year be determined (limited).
 - Operating season envisioned:
- Proposed Groundwater modeling
 - Of groundwater pumping
 - Of augmentation flows
- Proposed accounting
 - How will the RRCA accounting reflect the operations?
 - Surface water leases
 - Rock Creek calculations
 - Mainstem calculations
 - Tables 3, 4, 5
 - Examples would be helpful to work through.
- Proposed reported and monitoring data
- Accounting for deliveries made beyond those allowed under the plan (or before approval)?

Questions for discussion (Rock Creek focus)

1. To what extent does this “non-native water” need to be tracked separately from native flows in the accounting? How does the storage of these waters in federal reservoirs effect VWS, CVS calculations?
2. What are the potential fates of the water delivered? (Storage and NE use from Swanson; pass through Swanson to HC; reserve for Kansa use, groundwater depletions; unaccounted for loss, etc).
3. If NE surface water users divert the flows, will this receive any specific treatment in the accounting?
4. If there are unaccounted losses in the mainstem of e.g. 20%, will that not reduce the mainstem allocations of both KS and NE (as the entire amount will be subtracted in the determination of the mainstem).
 - a. Will NE factor this into its IMP credit to the project sponsor?
5. Will water be passed through to Harlan County and reserved for Kansas use during CCYs?

- a. How does NE propose for these augmentation flows to affect the Harlan County evaporation split?
 - b. What if these waters are retained in HC beyond the year? Will there be any special accounting?
6. Long-term viability of the source of augmentation water?
7. Percent of water pumped the manifests itself in stream depletions after: 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years.