

Draft Agenda

Rattlesnake Creek Partnership 12-Year Review Kick-off Meeting Part 2 – Roles, responsibilities, and report development

Thursday, March 22, 2012 | 2:30 PM CST

Conference call and computer desktop sharing (TurboMeeting)

1. Welcome / announcement of attendees

2. Designation of note taker

3. Changes to the agenda

4. Approval of the minutes from last meeting (February 23, 2012).

5. Follow up on action items from last meeting

- Updated timeline for the 12-year review – Attachment 1

6. Roles and responsibilities of the partners

- Review Attachment 2

7. What the data are showing

- Review data files and analyses posted on the RSC 12-year Review webpage
 - DWR – 'RSC12YR_provisional_20120320.xlsx'
 - GMD 5 – 'RSC12YR_GMD5_Provisional_web.xlsx'
 - USF&W – 'RCP12-2.pdf'

8. Report Development

- Similar to 8-year review report format
- Review Attachment 3
- Any other data or report sections we should consider at this time?
 - Consider a section for each partner to state their perspective on the management program, process, and next steps in one page (~500 words)

9. Recap of action items

10. Next steps

- DWR will begin drafting the report
- Please communicate your ideas/concerns early and often
- Do we want to schedule another meeting now?

Attachment 1 – Revised timeline for 12-year review

First suggested timeline

- 23 February Kick-off meeting, part 1: Introductions, updates and expectations*
- 08 March Kick-off meeting, part 2: Roles, responsibilities and report development*
- 05 May Draft report is circulated to the partners for review*
- 07 June Initial comments and suggested revisions due*
- 28 June Updated draft sent to the partners*
- 06 September Final discussions regarding any changes to the review report*
- 27 September Final Report is completed, signed by Partnership, and submitted to the chief engineer*

Revised suggested timeline

- 23 February Kick-off meeting, part 1: Introductions, updates and expectations*
- 22 March Kick-off meeting, part 2: Roles, responsibilities and report development**
- 19 April Draft one-page statements from each partner due to DWR for inclusion in draft report**
- 27 April Draft report is circulated to the partners for review**
- 31 May Initial comments and suggested revisions due to DWR**
- 28 June Updated draft sent to the partners*
- 20 August Meet to discuss next steps**
- 06 September Meet for final discussions regarding any changes to the review report*
- 27 September Final Report is completed, signed by partnership, and submitted to the chief engineer*

Attachment 2 – Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and Responsibilities of the Rattlesnake Creek Partnership Partners

Draft Outline

- A. DWR
 - a. Convene meetings of the partnership to conduct the reviews
 - i. Draft agendas
 - ii. Provide meeting invitations and arrangements
 - iii. Record and distribute notes from partnership meetings
 - b. Maintain web site for 12-year review data and documents
 - c. Compile and analyze data
 - i. Water level measurements
 - ii. Water use
 - iii. Streamflow
 - iv. Precipitation
 - v. Water rights
 - d. Draft the review report
 - e. Incorporate suggestions and edits from the partners
 - f. Seek consensus on the report
 - g. Submit the 12-year review report, signed by all partners, to the chief engineer
- B. GMD #5
 - a. Provide data on enrollment and quantified water savings from:
 - i. WTAP
 - ii. AWEP
 - iii. EQIP
 - iv. Water Banking
 - v. Other
 - b. Data and analyses generated by employing the GMD #5 hydrologic model
 - c. Any other data and/or analysis
 - d. Review and comment on draft report
- C. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
 - a. Any other data and/or analysis
 - b. Review and comment on draft report
- D. WaterPACK
 - a. Any other data and/or analysis
 - b. Review and comment on draft report
- E. Other interested parties
 - a. Advisory to one or more of the partners
 - b. Input should be sponsored by one or more of the partners

Attachment 3 – Table of Contents from 8-year review

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction 3
- II. Four-Year Evaluation of Management Program 3
 - A. Precipitation 4
 - B. Streamflow 6
 - January 10-Year Rolling Average of 25 cfs: 6
 - Minimum Desirable Streamflow (MDS) at the Zenith Streamflow Gage 7
 - C. Groundwater Level Trends..... 8
 - D. Water Use..... 10
 - Stream Corridor Area..... 10
 - Groundwater Management Area..... 11
 - Basinwide Area 12
- III. Management Strategies 14
 - A. Water Transition Assistance Program..... 14
 - Other Purchase Programs..... 14
 - B. Water Banking..... 14
 - C. Flex Account 15
 - D. Conservation Practices and Irrigation Management 15
 - E. Voluntary Removal of End Guns 16
 - F. Enhanced Enforcement and Compliance..... 17
 - G. Water Appropriation Transfers 18
 - H. Mineral Intrusion Area-Replacement Wells 18
 - I. Augmentation 19
 - J. Low Head Dams 19
- IV. Alternative Action Management Strategies..... 19
- V. Recommendations for meeting Next Four Years Goals 20
- VI. Summary..... 21

Figures & Tables

- Figure 1: National Climatic Data Center Precipitation Stations 5
- Figure 2: Precipitation for the Rattlesnake Creek Subbasin 1939-2007 5
- Figure 3: January Streamflow for USGS Zenith Gage 6
- Figure 4: Zenith Streamflow and MDS 7
- Figure 5: Priority Areas and Monitoring Network 8
- Figure 6: Average Water Level Change by Priority Area 10
- Figure 7: Stream Corridor Groundwater Use..... 11
- Figure 8: Groundwater Use for Groundwater Management Area 12
- Figure 9: Basinwide Area Groundwater Use 13
- Figure 10: Groundwater Use and Precipitation 13
- Figure 11: Average Annual Zenith Streamflow vs. Precipitation 1974-2007 23
- Figure 12: Net Change in Water Levels 2001-2008 23
- Table 1: MDS values for Zenith gage (cfs) 7
- Table 2: Average water level change by priority area 9
- Table 3: GMD No.5 End Gun Checks 17

Table 4: Summary of Estimated Water Conservation (*denotes short-term savings)..... 22
Table 5: Change in water use by Priority Area..... 24
Table 6: Authorized quantities (acre-feet) 24
Table 7: Summary of Progress..... 25

Rattlesnake Creek Partnership 12-Year Review Kick-off Meeting Part 2

Minutes

March 22, 2012 2:30

DWR library- remote access & Turbo meeting

Meeting called by	KDA-DWR
DWR	Jeff Lanterman, Cameron Conant, Tara Lanzrath, Andrew Lyon, Darci Paull, Chris Beightel
GMD 5	Wes Essmiller, Orrin Feril, Darrell Wood, Kevin Schultz, John Janssen, Tom Taylor, Fred Grunder, Bob Standish
USFWS	Meg Estep, Rachel Laubhaun, Carrie Cordova, Peter Striffler, Steve Karel
Balleau	Peter Balleau, Dave Romero, Steve Silver
WaterPACK	Dennis Dutton, Mike Lamb, John Mundhenke
KWO	Diane Coe, Chris Gnau
KFB	Kent Askren
KDA-Division of Conservation	Steve Frost

Agenda topics

[**TIME ALLOTTED**] AGENDA/MINUTES CHRIS BEIGHTEL

DISCUSSION	Changes to the Agenda and/or Approval of the minutes from the last meeting (February 23, 2012)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No changes to agenda - No changes to February 25, 2012 minutes – now considered final 	
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[**TIME ALLOTTED**] FOLLOW UP ON ACTION ITEMS CHRIS BEIGHTEL

Discussion	Follow up on action items from last meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DWR presented an update timeline – attachment 1 - none of the partners had concerns about the update timeline - considered a working timeline

CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[TIME ALLOTTED] ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EACH PARTNER CHRIS BEIGHTEL

DISCUSSION	Roles and responsibilities of the partners	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DWR presented a list of roles and responsibilities of each partner – attachment 2 - no concerns or additions to this list 		
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[TIME ALLOTTED] DATA DISCUSSION DARCI PAULL/ORRIN FERIL/PETER STRIFFLER

DISCUSSION	What the data are showing	
<p><u>Darci Paull presented DWR's data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pointed out the two misrepresentations of precipitation data. Future spreadsheets will have the updated precipitation values. The updated spreadsheet will be posted soon. - Chris B's previous email explained the differences between DWR and GMD 5 data. - 2011 water use data will be available in late April and DWR will coordinate with GMD 5 to re-query the water use data and come to a consensus. This data will be included in the 2012 report. - GMD5 (KS) had concerns about how the 2011 data would be represented due to drought term permits and the fact that some producers used more water in 2011 and would be using less in 2012. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should we handle annual water use differently vs. 2-year drought term permit or 5-year multi-year flex account permit? ▪ The 2011 high water use will skew the data - DWR responded that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ it would be appropriate to calculate actual water use for the year and the rolling-average will take care of the multi-year permits. ▪ 2011 water use does not skew the data because it is actual water use ▪ the "forgiveness" authorized by the 2011 multi-year flex account legislation is not a 		

- factor in this data analysis because the water was still pumped.
- DWR and GMD 5 used data from the same NCDC weather stations but the numbers were slightly off due to State Climatologist Mary Knapp's use of provisional data.
- based on conversations with Mary Knapp DWR felt confident in her data and recommended the use of this data
- the partners agreed and Knapp's data will be used in the 12-year review report
- Chief Engineer, David Barfield wanted to see additional precipitation data analysis
- this data is included on the following tabs: Precipitation, Stream Corridor GW Use & Precip, Zenith 10-Yr Roll Ave & Precip and Zenith MDS & Precip
- GMD5 (WE) – commented that the timing of precipitation matters
- Zenith MDS and Monitoring Well Measurements
- DWR and GMD 5 have worked together and have come to a consensus on this data
- GMD5 suggested that several monitoring wells be removed. DWR completed an identical analysis omitting the wells GMD5 suggested (tab:MWN_WellsRemoved)
- DWR found few and insignificant differences in the overall data and trends
- GMD5 will explain more about the suggested removal of the monitoring wells
- DWR is considering changing the Net Change analysis on the MWN table to something that compares water level changes
- David Barfield also suggested an analysis of irrigated acres and depth of irrigation over the time of the program
- irrigation inches and irrigated acres have remained static over the duration of the management program
- this data will be updated in April also

Orrin Feril presented GMD 5's data

- would like to include GMD 5's weather stations into the precipitation data
- record dates from 1997 to present
- two stations fall within subbasin and two are outside the subbasin but close
- DWR (CB) – is there any bias in the GMD weather station data relative to the NCDC data?
- (OF) No real bias except for 1997
- showed a chart with GMD 5 data and Mary Knapp data
- Dave Romero – What is the difference between GMD5 stations and NCDC stations? Is the location causing the difference?
- Yes, this could be the reason for the difference
- DWR (JL) – What four stations are used for Mary Knapp's data?
- Bucklin, Greensburg, Trousdale and Hudson
- USFWS (ME) – Can we get some quality assurance documentation before the partners decide whether or not to use GMD5 weather stations?
- (OF) yes, will send that out to the partners
- Removal of monitoring wells
- water quality wells drilled at different depths and into different aquifers
- DWR (CB) Is there any documentation?
- WWC5 data from KGS
- DWR (JL) – No. 1 wells are drilled into the Permian bedrock and only shallow drilled wells should be used
- Partnership's consensus is to remove the wells from the analysis
- Water savings
- concerns about how water savings were calculated and how to be consistent
- EQIP – 4-year program
- wells are now back in production, savings are only available for contract period
- WTAP – permanent retirement
- 3 within priority areas and one outside in Ford County

- discrepancy between GMD5's number based on authorized quantity and DOC's number based on historic consumptive use
- further discussion and analysis will be needed to come to a consensus
- GMD5 (JJ) – If a water right is for sale it is probably not being used, but the buyer will use the water right; therefore, the entire authorized quantity should count
- Balleau (PB) – authorized, actual reported and consumptive water use are 3 different numbers
- USFWS (ME) – Partnership decided on 72% in 2000
- GMD5 – Meg has the right number
- Water Right purchase
- GMD 5 bought 3 water rights and 0 are in production right now
- concern again on how to determine water savings
- Water Right Transfers
- transfers out of the stream corridor
- DWR (CB) - need to distinguish between stream corridor savings and basinwide savings
- AWEP
- 2008 files were calculated differently than 2012 files
- again concern about calculating savings
- USFWS (ME) – What is AWEP?
- DWR (JL) – Acres are reduced but authorized quantity is not reduced
- USFWS (ME) – Is there a guarantee this water will not be used?
- GMD5 – Yes
- Water Banking
- still some unanswered questions about savings calculations, GMD 5 will work with the other partners so there is an understanding. Wes will call Meg next week to discuss.
- GMD 5 (KS) - has spent \$247,000 on these programs

Peter Striffler presented USFWS's data

- tried to show how close to goals the partnership is
- simple statistics
- went through each chart and summarized his conclusions
- Groundwater use summaries: management objectives were not met, hydrologic conditions moved further away from the goals and management programs are ineffective
- Figure 8: state goal of MDS at 15 cfs will not allow USFWS to get the water they need
- January 25 cfs was agreed to because it would show adequate recovery of aquifer and a measure of stream health
- Figure 9: calculation of the days in a row that MDS criteria was not met
- GMD5 (OF) Can we have the analysis to review?
- USFWS (PS) – yes, will send that out.
- Figure 10: Zenith annual discharge, Quivira water use, Authorized Quantity for WR 7571
- this chart brought up discussions about how USFWS measures their water use
- DWR (JL) invited GMD5 (WE) to visit their office and review the maps
- GMD5 – When does Quivira want water?
- (ME and RL) start taking water in spring, maintain during the summer and refill in fall
- provide for spring and fall bird migrations but maintain habitat all year
- USFWS (ME) – USFWS is not happy

CONCLUSIONS	
--------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GMD5 will provide documentation regarding the GMD 5 weather stations and their methodology and quality assurance - GMD5 will provide updated water use savings numbers for the various management strategies 	Orrin Feril and Wes Essmiller	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - USFWS will provide MDS analysis for GMD5 and DWR review. 	Peter Striffler	

[TIME ALLOTTED] 2012 REPORT DEVELOPMENT CHRIS BEIGHTEL

DISCUSSION	Report Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DWR (CB) – suggested that each partner write a short summary (~500 words) on process, program and future steps - all partners agreed with this - originally, DWR was not going to submit a summary to maintain impartiality and continue in the role of facilitator - after discussion including all partners it was decided that DWR would write a short summary - USFWS – DWR is a partner, signed as a partner, can still remain neutral, can write 500 words without digging a hole - GMD 5 (WE) – preferred that DWR not write an opinion in case this leads to an IGUCA - GMD 5 (JJ) – DWR has an opinion even if they do not write it in a summary. Would prefer to see it written in a summary since DWR’s chief engineer said that we are not doing anything right. Feel that the minutes (February 23, 2012) did not accurately portray the conversation and statements made by the chief engineer - DWR (CB) disputed JJ’s characterization of the chief engineer’s comments - all partners agreed to write a report similar in structure to the 2008 review - DWR will adjust 2008 review structure to reflect the 12-year review process, esp. IV. Alternative Action Management Strategies - DWR will begin drafting a report soon - DWR asked if the partners wanted to schedule another meeting at this time around mid-May. No meeting for that time unless DWR hears otherwise. 	

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
One page statements	All 4 partners	4-19-12
Draft report	DWR	4-27-12

[TIME ALLOTTED] NEXT STEPS CHRIS BEIGHTEL

DISCUSSION	Next Steps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steve Frost suggested that all partners consider finding common objectives and a 	

consistent standard with which to represent savings from participation in various programs.

- this led to a discussion regarding changing objectives
- USFWS (ME) and GMD5 feel that if you change one objective you must change them all
- concern with USFWS and GMD5 that the state (KDA-DWR) historical knowledge is gone
- further discussion on how to report water use saved
- authorized vs. historic consumptive water use
- it was briefly decided to use the 72% metric used in the original program, but as the discussion continued that decision was tabled for the time being
- partners feel further analysis needs to be completed

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE