

Rattlesnake Creek Partnership Meeting—July 21, 2009

9:30 AM

## **1. Introductions**

DWR: David Barfield, Chris Beightel, Tina Alder, Andy Lyon, Darci Paull, Tara Lanzrath, Jeff Lanterman, Lisa Allen

Kansas Water Office: Susan Stover, Diane Coe

GMD5: Sharon Falk, Kevin Shultz, Darrell Wood, John Janssen

Water PACK: Dennis Dutton

US Fish & Wildlife Service: Dan Severson, Rachel Laubhan, Carrie Cordova

KS Farm Bureau: Kent Askren

KS Wildlife Federation: Steve Sorenson

## **2. Budget**

The chief engineer informed the Partnership of ongoing changes with the agency. State General Fund has seen a 20% reduction since the beginning of last Fiscal Year. The State Water Plan has seen a \$200,000 reduction; 70% of water appropriation funds allocated from the State Water Plan. These reductions are being addressed with a combination of leaving positions unfilled and lay-offs. The Division is now understaffed by about 20%. Some work is being delayed or deferred. Some Basin Team staff has been laid off, and some have been reassigned to the Water Appropriations program.

The Basin Team will be focused more toward model development and data analysis. It will continue to collaborate with stakeholders, but will phase out its role in convening stakeholders. The chief engineer stressed that the Division is still in the development phase of creating these new team functions.

The chief engineer and Basin Team will also be more focused on coordination with the GMDs since they represent the public in many subbasins. Basin Team will still participate in public outreach, but the extent has yet to be determined.

Questions: (paraphrased)

Janssen: Does this mean you are going to be leaning more towards the priority system and not a method of cooperation?

CE: Not necessarily. I have started a dialog with the GMD Managers. We are exploring management options with and without IGUCA processes such as implementing a 5-year allocation plan with new regulations.

Janssen: I think we are just scared of losing control because it would just be easier for you to adopt existing regulations.

CE: We want to work as collaboratively as possible, but some instances may require management by regulations.

Janssen: Is it true that the USFWS has asked you to begin IGUCA proceedings?

CE: No, as I interpreted their letter, they asked us to look into the possibility, in the sense of, “let’s not wait until the subbasin gets dry again to look into the possibility.” We also have the model to help us with that.

Dan Severson: Yes, USFWS does not want to wait until the end of the 12 years to evaluate this.

CE: DWR outlined a process of management alternatives while the partnership looks at the model and future management options up till August 2012 (in the 8-Year Review).

### **3. Model Update (Sharon Falk)**

Chief engineer asked Sharon to update the Partnership.

The end of the year completion is still on schedule. The first review of data was conducted in May by the Technical Advisory Committee. Discussion consisted mainly of return flow, recharge, and calibration. A new well file and further explanation regarding the return flow values will be available before the next TAC meeting in September.

### **4. 8 Year Review – Most recent draft 6-16-09**

*DWR’s comments:* DWR has worked hard to incorporate all of the partners’ comments and would like to finalize the draft soon.

*USFWS:* Dan spoke on behalf of the service and is fine with the draft.

*GMD5:* On behalf of the Board, John felt that during the first 4 years of the plan, few programs were in place. Therefore, he believes the plan should be extended to 2016. The partnership may have underestimated the time frame needed to accomplish the goals. Also, it was impossible to predict the high price of corn and the high demand and price of water, both hindering some of the projects in the area. The Board also feels the Partnership has lost focus of the original goal of the Plan: to secure water for Quivira by reducing water use in the area. They believe other issues are clouding this major concept. GMD5 is currently drafting a “Minority Opinion.” They plan to review the document at the next board meeting and then send it to the chief engineer. Dan Severson asked what the side issues were. John stated the concerns with Kiowa and Edwards counties did not affect Quivira.

*Water Pack:* Dennis stated he agreed that the focus has expanded, wanted to still work in a cooperative manner with DWR and the partnership, and recognized the importance of Quivira. He said Water Pack agrees with GMD5 in the most part, but has not been able to read their “Minority Opinion”.

The chief engineer concluded that DWR will attempt to include everyone’s view in the 8-Year Review document in the most accurate way possible.

### **5. Next Steps**

Wait for GMD5’s letter and incorporate into the document & finalize.

Chief engineer plans to attend an upcoming GMD5 Meeting.

Await model results. Adjourn @ 10:15 A.M.