

→ Aug plan
Non Fed Below HC
10/20
→ NO date
NE Power vs
Mud det

EC call of June 27, 2007

Assignments:

1. Complete the user's manual for accounting procedures and provide a resolution for its adoption.
2. Complete the accounting for 2006 using the preliminary information provided by April 15, 2007 and the final exchange by July 15, 2007.
3. Continue to work to resolve different recharge and return flow methods.
4. By November 15, 2006, develop a resolution regarding the Harlan County Lake evaporation split when only one state takes a release.
5. Add documentation requirements of acreage retirement to the user's manual.
6. Retain Principia Mathematica to perform maintenance of the groundwater model.

Agenda

- Not sure what I will do about KS EC rep. me for the time being.
- Should we be inviting the Feds?
- Status of accounting work? What can we do to facilitate
 - Users manual documentation.
- Resolving issues:
 - Non-fed evap below HC. Who is NE attorney?
 - HC split
 - Approval of new uses that go from one state to another.
- NE proposal
 - Not assigned by the RRCA.
 - Willing to continue to discuss and work to understand.
 - A significant change; will take time to consider.
 - Needs to be assigned by the RRCA.
 - Need to see model runs and accountings that allow us to understand it fully.

→ Final agreement

Position on NE proposal

Questions:

- Proposal not clear. Are you saying?
 - AP: what runs are you advocating?
 - Mound credits to be computed in the same way as historically
 - NE and other states CBCU to be computed in a new way. Create a run with no pumping or imports and compare it vs. a run with one state pumping?
 - What is the "base" run you are referring to?
 - How will other states be evaluated?
 - Paper:
 - We are not counting use of the imports; only impacts to RRC are considered as CBCU.
 - What is I consumed? All beneficial use of imported water?
 - Are you considering storage, ET, outflows to Platte in this formulation?

- Additional analysis:
 - Believe NE should show us with model runs and accounting the reasons why your proposal is a better formulation.

Possible comments for this discussion:

- Don't agree that there is a problem. A lot of thought was put into the current methods.
- There would be pumping with or without the imports. These methods allow NE to have a credit for the part that gets to the RR unconsumed.

Additional comments, most likely for the next discussion:

- We believe state depletions should be determined as difference in current conditions (calibrated run) and current conditions without pumping as opposed to comparing it to an un-calibrated base.
- The deal was NE would get the net credit for imports that get to the RRC with pumping evaluated as in the AP.