

Barfield, Dave

Cc: Scott Ross (E-mail); George Austin (E-mail)
Subject: conference call agenda

Not Sent

Ann and Ken,

Attached are some issues we need to discuss when we talk. I have prioritized my list. You may have other issues.

Immediate:

- Assumptions for recharge due to groundwater pumping..
- Exchange format (inputs to RRPP).

Pressing

- Review assignments; what are we doing to discuss with the commissioners on January ... Specifically:
 - Review of Accounting procedures. Process. CO data exchange requirements.
 - Model fix
 - Model housing
 - Model documentation - Willem's work on the web site can be adapted once we agree on when the model fix will start, whether we will in fact do year-by-year runs, etc.

"To do" items that can wait:

- Arikaree return from review.

Accounting procedure review

We have not done a comprehensive review of the Accounting procedures but we have been marking up our copies as we find issues. Our mark-up includes a) typos and minor corrections that we should likely not have much trouble agreeing to, b) technical issues that we need to discuss and resolve or perhaps take to the RRCA commissioners, and c) issues that likely should be discussed with the Commissioners to start with as they clarify the deal in some way. I have separated my list in this fashion. I would like to deal with my list under items c in January.

I have attached a red-line, strikeout of my proposed changes on the final copy of the AP that includes the first class of changes only.

Typos and minor changes.

- Title page. Remove Appendix C. Change date of the document.
- Table of contents - should we add page numbers?
- III.E. - We should clarify "for that year" as the computations done each year are for the preceding year but this is not clear from the text. I have made a stab but it still needs more work. Is the "current accounting year in the next sentence the previous year?
- III. I., first introductory paragraph. The sentence should end with a period, not a comma.
- V.A.5 - I have removed three tick marks that are in the listing of gages for some reason.
- V.A.8. intro - I deleted a stray parenthesis.
- V.A.8.h - I fixed a couple of typos.
- V.D. - I have made this a new section V.E. as it is not part of the regular accounting is everything else under V.D.

- Attachment 7, Column 11. The formula should be Col 10/ Col2.
- I have dropped Attachment 8 as part of the Accounting Procedures and referenced instead the final model approved by the States or future changes to the model approved by the RRCA.

Issues we need to discuss

- Specific formulas - There is some inconsistency in the formulas. I have done some thinking about the general form of the equations, esp the CBCU equations. If you agree, we can review each formula and check them.
 - For CBCU, there are three classifications of terms: a) the GW term should be written for every state and sub-basin, b) the terms % x P and EvNFR should be included on a state CBCU formula if the state has a part of the sub-basin within its borders (the .6 x D term - is it only for named ditches or is it a general term?), and c) the terms % x D would be included if a state has a named ditch, the Ev would be included if there is a federal reservoir within the sub-basin, the term % BRF would be included if there is an irrigation district, and IWS would occur for NE in each sub-basin. RF occurs in special cases only.
 - VWS is generally gage + CBCU for the three states - IWS and includes dS where there is a federal reservoirs.
 - CWS is always VWS - FF.
 - Allocations and unallocated are straightforward enough.
- The mainstem formulas need some extra checking, perhaps in concert with our review of the accounting spreadsheet.
- IV.A.2.e.1 - Regarding the Harlan County evaporation split, what are we doing to do if there are no releases from HC next year? I assume Kansas diversions will be measured at the Courtland Canal stateline plus its share of the losses from GR to the Stateline and that Nebraska's will be the sum of Naponee, Franklin, Franklin Pump, Superior, and its share of the Courtland diversion. Do we need to write this into the procedure or is it clear enough.

Issues for the RRCA commissioners

- V.A.8.h - We would like to discuss the substance of this provision with the commissioners with respect a requirement that in addition to the regular requirements of moritorium reporting, we are also required to provide "copies of any other information that is required to filed with either State or local agencies..." We would like to discuss the appropriateness of the additional requirement to provide such copies of such filings.
- Colorado data requirements.

David Barfield
KS Department of Agriculture
Division of Water Resources
785-296-3830