

January 23, 2002

**San Juan River Basin
Recovery Implementation Program
Hydrology Committee
November 27, 2001
Conference Call Summary**



Members/Alternates Present:	Representing:
Errol Jensen	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Ray Alvarado	State of Colorado
Rick Cox	Water Development Interests
Steve Cullinan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Frick	Jicarilla Apache Nation
Randy Kirkpatrick	Water Development Interests
John Simons	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Pat Turney	State of New Mexico
Brian Westfall	U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
John Whipple	State of New Mexico

Others present:	Representing:
Shirley Mondy, Program Coordinator	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Marilyn Greenberg, Program Assistant	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave King	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Bernadette Tsosie	Navajo Nation
Brent Uilenberg	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

Welcome and Introductions.

Errol Jensen welcomed everyone. After introductions, the Committee reviewed the agenda items.

Budget & Schedule

At the November 2, 2001, Coordination Committee meeting, Dave King presented a new cost estimate for FY 2002. The Hydrology Committee was concerned that it was presented without their prior review and approval.

There was also some confusion about what Dave King/Reclamation sent out. There were a variety of tables and some members were not able to follow all of this; it seemed like the tables were inconsistent. Reclamation clarified that Table 2 is a revised table. It is the same table that went into the 2002 proposal that was submitted to the Coordination Committee in August. There is a WordPerfect and a spreadsheet version of Table 2. Column 2 shows what the Hydrology Committee's original target dates were, and now the new target dates.

There was a question about whether the money that was not spent in FY 2001 will still be available for FY 2002/2003. Various committee members explained that Colorado River Storage Project revenues is the source for the money that we spend. We cannot carry any over. In 2003 we need to ask for money again. If we ask for money and do not spend it, it gets reprogrammed. SJRIP has up to \$2 million per year of CRSP revenues per the authorizing legislation. If we do not accomplish the work in our work plan, we lose credibility. \$170,000 was actually spent in FY 2001. The Coordination Committee approved \$400,000 in FY01. The \$400,000 that was originally identified is now \$533,522 due to additional work days, new hardware, and training needs.

Prior to the Hydrology Committee approval of the current budget submitted by Reclamation, there were questions about whether the budget is deliverable and whether the staff days listed are realistic. Will the Committee be able to sign off and say yes, these tasks have been completed? Dave King and Brian Westfall agreed that it is hard to estimate these things ahead of time. Taking time to develop the spreadsheets in more detail has detracted from spending more time on modeling. The tasks have not changed so much, but the amount of detail being added has increased.

There were also questions about the management of the FY02 funds. Who is in charge of tracking and keeping control of time and money? There were concerns about being two months into the fiscal year and not having an approved work plan yet. Some members felt that it might be better to not overload this year. If it is not managed correctly this year, we are going to get even further behind. It might be easier to manage a smaller amount of money, with purer tasks, and spread it out over a longer period of time. ***Dave King agreed to send out a monthly expenditures report. Reclamation is tasked with tracking and managing the time and money.***

Dave King and Keller-Bliesner need a contract in order to keep their time available to complete these projects. ***Reclamation*** stated that they can complete the work by September if they ***receive the information from New Mexico and Colorado by February.*** New Mexico is still waiting on irrigated acreage and crop patterns information from BIA. New Mexico doubts that it can provide non-irrigation data by February.

Reclamation said they could probably work from the configuration if they know which nodes New Mexico wants in the model. The configuration is what is really needed, not necessarily the actual numbers. To recalculate new flows with new numbers is a simple task once the flows and calibration are complete. It is more of a data management issue now. Configuration needs non-irrigation numbers. Dave can begin working on the decision model without New Mexico's final numbers, as long as the configuration does not change.

The Hydrology Committee approved the budget, noting Randy Kirkpatrick's and John Whipple's comments that as soon as it is determined that we cannot make a schedule, the Hydrology Committee will be notified. With the budget approved, Dave King and Keller Bliesner can be contracted and get some of this work done. Since October, there has already been 2-3 months of slippage. A lot of time has been spent on progress reports in the last two months. It was suggested that there be a budget and schedule review in March, and the schedule will be modified as needed at that time. ***A percent complete and percent expended table will be provided by Reclamation and Keller-Bliesner and available for discussion at the March meeting.*** This will be updated monthly only if something is seriously out of line.

Subteam Summary

The subteam attendees included: Steve Cullinan, Ray Alvarado, Dave Frick, Mike Hamman, John Simons, Dave King, Brian Westfall, and John Leeper.

- A. Dave King and the subteam have provided comments to Colorado. Colorado is going to move forward.
- B. Dave King and Keller Bliesner can start working on this as soon as they get a contract.
- C. There is no budget to revisit the gage correction study.
- D. Incidental losses from projects since 1929 need to be included. Colorado handles incidental losses differently than New Mexico. Ron Bliesner will write a recommendation, the Committee will look at it, and make a decision about how to handle the incidental losses issue.***

New Mexico does not support modeling water rights administration in New Mexico with this model. They feel that there is not sufficient accuracy because there are daily diversion demands and water rights have not been quantified for the Navajo Nation. Is RiverWare capable of showing water rights? It was designed to aid in the development of flow recommendations and to determine if the flow recommendations were achievable. It is not our job to determine water rights. The question is: if shortages were distributed, where would you distribute them? Shortages will affect the water supply that would be used to make decisions. **Although RiverWare can model water rights as part of the new operating criteria, the consensus is to leave it out for now.**

Action Items from September 26, 2001 Hydrology Committee Meeting

A & B. The following Hydrology Committee meeting dates were selected for 2002: March 26, June 25, and Oct. 22. These are all the 4th Tuesday of the month.

The following dates (all Tuesdays) were selected for conference calls:

January 15, April 30, and August 20.

C. The Low Flow Test report is still being worked on. It will be placed on the website as soon as it is available.

D. Reclamation will extend the Arizona and Utah data back to 1929. This can be deleted as an action item.

E. New Mexico priorities on the mainstem have been discussed. Remove from action items.

F. Done. Remove from action items. Add - "Documentation will be provided to the Hydrology Committee regarding Colorado's implementation of the San Juan Basin Model.

G. Still out in the future. The model has to be done before we can do this. Remove from action item.

H. Modeling Approach

It was proposed that the Hydrology Committee vote on the overall general approach of how the model will be operated. What will the model look like and where will the data come from? The motion was to approve operation of the model, monthly upstream of Navajo, and daily downstream of Navajo on the San Juan mainstem. **The proposal is: We agree to operate the model on the mainstem below Navajo Dam, and on the Animas below Durango, on a daily basis, and monthly everywhere else, for evaluating impacts on meeting the Recovery Program's flow recommendations.** This was agreed to and approved by the Hydrology Committee.

J. Ray Alvarado will put the study on how Colorado did their disaggregation for both hydrologic inflows and diversions on the listserve. Still pending.

K. Dave King is waiting for some feedback from Ron Bliesner regarding a reasonable approach for diversion disaggregation. A document will be sent out to everyone after all comments have been received.

L. Same as page 3, D. ***Ron Bliesner will write a recommendation, the Committee will look at it and make a decision about how to handle the incidental losses issue.***

M. Brian Westfall has completed incorporation of comments on the model documentation. ***John Simons still needs to review his portion.*** All the comments have been included in the documentation. New Mexico had concerns that have not been dealt with as far as

what is in the model (data) versus what is being done with the model. John Whipple would like his specific comments about water rights and depletions addressed and added as a preface/disclaimer to the model documentation. **John Whipple asked that the June 14, 2001 version of the Hydrology Committee Model Disclaimer, as approved at the June 19, 2001 Coordination Committee Meeting, be used on Model documentation. Shirley Mondy will mail it out on list server.** If the documentation goes out as is, John Whipple is concerned that the Hydrology Committee buys off on everything in it. This way, the use of the model is put into the context of the Coordination Committee's disclaimer on it's use.

N. Errol Jensen has not yet sent out the letter to the water districts on Reclamation's ability to run the model.

O & P. Ray Alvarado has sent a progress report paragraph to Errol Jensen. **Errol will get the Draft Model Progress Report/Summary out to the Hydrology Committee by January 15, 2002. It will include a table with product deliverables/outcomes and delivery dates. He will send it to the Coordination Committee after that.**

Q. The Hydrology Committee decided not to include water rights for New Mexico in the model.

R. John Simons showed John Whipple the maps of irrigated acreage. The GIS data submitted to Reclamation is the same that was submitted to the other parties (San Juan Water Commission, etc). New Mexico sent out a memo with that data as well. If the data is passed around, the Metadata and the memo should go with it. New Mexico did not distribute the NIIP data. The BOR has incorporated the NIIP coverage and is including it in what NM provided. This action item is complete.

S. Reclamation has verified the FY01 budget and how much money was actually spent.

Review of Action items

Please get comments regarding the September 26, 2001 Draft Meeting Summary to Marilyn Greenberg by December 7 and then FWS will send out a revised copy.

The October Reclamation activities are on the Hydrology Model website. The November activities will be added at the end of the month. Please contact Dave King with any questions on the progress reports.

A Long Term Hydrology Committee Budget Proposal was requested by the Coordination Committee. Please provide your comments to Errol Jensen.

It was suggested that the word "all" in the second paragraph be taken out.

It was suggested that a list of subcontractors be included for full disclosure to the public.

CADSWES and Keller-Bliesner are the only outside parties and no other parties are proposed at this time.

For outyear 2003-2004, it is all Reclamation costs and no consultant costs (\$65,000).

There was a motion to approve the long term budget as modified above. ***Errol will put it into a format that is compatible with the work plan and will send it back to the Hydrology Committee for comment.***

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am.

September 26 th Action Items	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Due Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
1. The Hydrology Committee will finalize the meeting dates and set conference calls. (page 4, A and B)	Everyone.	Nov. 27	Done
2. When the report on the Navajo Reservoir Operations Low Flow Test is complete, a copy will be sent to Shirley to be sent out or linked to the San Juan website. (page 4, C)	John Simons		
3. Arizona and Utah historic irrigated acreage data need to be extended back to 1929. (page 3, D)	Reclamation		
4. Reclamation is tasked with tracking and managing the Committee's time and money. Pat Page and Dave King will work together to send out a monthly expenditures report if the schedule or expenditures are seriously out of line. (pages 2 and 3)	Dave King Reclamation	Monthly	
5. Reclamation can complete their work by September if they receive the irrigated acreage and crop mix information from New Mexico in February. (page 2)	New Mexico and Colorado	February	
6. New Mexico will provide non-irrigated acreage information to Reclamation.	New Mexico	March 31	
7. A percent complete and percent expended table will be provided by Reclamation and Keller-Bliesner and available for a budget and schedule review at the March 26 th meeting. (Page 3) (See number 4 above.)	Reclamation and Keller-Bliesner	March 15	
8. The Hydrology Committee will vote to determine if it is appropriate to move forward with the model as proposed, and to bring up concerns for the technical subcommittee to work on. (page 4, H)	Everyone	Nov. 27	Done
9. Dave King will prepare a concise summary report from the technical subcommittee for the Hydrology Committee. Drafts were sent out after the September 26 th meeting. Once Dave receives comments from New Mexico, he will send the summary to the full committee for discussion. If anyone has question, contact a subcommittee member and be ready to vote at the next meeting.	Dave King	Nov. 27 Jan. 22	
10. Ray Alvarado will discuss with Shirley Mondy and put the study on how Colorado did their disaggregation for both hydrologic inflows and diversions on the listserve. (page 4, J)	Ray Alvarado		

11. Keller-Bliesner Engineering will put together information on incidental losses for our next meeting, with a review of products for the committee's review. (page 4, L and 3D)	Keller-Bliesner		
November 27th Action Items	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
12. Dave King, with Ron Bliesner, will consolidate Committee comments and come up with a reasonable approach for diversion disaggregation, and then send it out to the listserve. (page 4, K) Proposed discussion on Jan. 15.	Dave King		Waiting for feedback from Ron Bliesner
13. All comments received to date have been incorporated into the model documentation and will be posted on the Model website when complete. John Simons still needs to review his portion. (page 4, M)	John Simons		
14. John Whipple suggested that the June 14, 2001 version of the Hydrology Committee Model Disclaimer, as approved at the June 19, 2001 Coordination Committee Meeting, be used on Model documentation. Shirley Mondy will mail it out on list server. (page 5, M)	Shirley Mondy		
15. Letter to the water districts has been sent, with copies to the Hydrology Committee members. (page 5, N)	Reclamation/ Errol Jensen	Oct. 31 Jan. 10	Done
16. Errol Jensen will get a draft Model Progress Report/Summary out to the Hydrology Committee. It will include a table with product deliverables/outcomes and delivery dates. It will be sent to the Coordination Committee after that. (page 5, O and P)	Errol Jensen	Jan. 15	
17. Please get comments regarding the September 26, 2001 draft meeting summary to Marilyn Greenberg by December 7. FWS will send out a revised copy. (page 5)	Everyone Marilyn Greenberg		Comments have been received
18. A Long Term Hydrology Committee Budget Proposal was requested by the Coordination Committee. Please provide your comments to Errol Jensen. (page 5) Errol Jensen will put the long term budget into a format that is compatible with the work plan and will send it back to the Hydrology Committee for comment. (page 6)	Everyone Errol Jensen		