

**COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

**Keystone Conference Center
Castle Peak Room
21966 Highway 6
Keystone, Colorado**

Advisory Council Beginning Time: **Wednesday, June 8, 2016, 1:00 p.m.**

Designated Federal Officer: Kib Jacobson

Presiding: Chairman David Robbins

I. Welcome and Introductions Robbins

Advisory Council (Council) Chairman David Robbins called the meeting to order. As there was no one in attendance who had not been previously introduced at the Forum meeting held earlier, he decided to dispense with introductions. A roster was circulated to take attendance for the meeting. A copy of the attendance roster is attached to these minutes as [Appendix A](#).

II. Opening Comments, Acceptance of letters of substitute members Jacobson

Kib Jacobson welcomed the group and thanked Colorado for hosting the meetings in Keystone. He mentioned that he had letters designating alternates for Council members who could not attend. Alternates sitting in for Council members included Steve Wolff for Pat Tyrrell from Wyoming, Paul Harms for Tom Blaine from New Mexico, Patrick Dent for Marie Pearthree from Arizona, Angela Slaughter for Jayne Harkins from Nevada and Andrew Burns for John Entsminger from Nevada.

III. Review and Approval of proposed Agenda Robbins

Chairman Robbins asked for any suggested changes to the agenda. As there were none, a motion was made to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved and a copy is attached as [Appendix B](#).

IV. Draft Minutes of 201 Fall Council Meeting – Tucson, AZ Jacobson/Robbins

Jacobson reported a draft of the minutes had been sent out to the Council. He asked if there were any suggested changes to the minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The motion passed.

V. Election of Chair and Vice-chair Robbins

Tanya Trujillo was nominated as Chairperson of the Advisory Council. The nomination was seconded. There were no additional nominations. The Advisory Council voted to approve the nomination. Eric Millis was nominated to the position of Vice-Chairperson, which was also approved by the Advisory Council.

VI. Charter Renewal Jacobson

Jacobson explained that the Advisory Council operates on a charter that has to be renewed every two years. It was last renewed in 2014. In the past, the renewal occurred in October, which was just days before the fall meeting. To avoid any timing issues with the fall meeting, it was determined that the renewal should be moved back to July. An effort was made in 2014 to make that happen, but it got hung up in EPA. It was finally signed in September. Jacobson reported that he started the process this year in January and is hopeful that it will be finished by July.

VII. Report on the Responses to the Advisory Council Report

Robbins

Chairman Robbins verified that all agency responses to the Advisory Council Report had now been received. He asked the Council if there were any comments or questions about those responses. As there were no comments, he noted that they were generally well satisfied with the responses from the six agencies.

VIII. Items from the Forum

Tanya Trujillo

Tanya Trujillo noted that there were no items from the Forum to be addressed at the Advisory Council meeting.

IX. Basinwide Program and Agreement Status

Jacobson/Brad Parry

Jacobson explained that Reclamation's Basinwide Program provides grants for projects in a competitive process. They do a broad solicitation with their Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA). There are certain criteria that must be met. They receive a number of applications which are reviewed and ranked by the Applications Review Committee (ARC). Ten applications were chosen from the 2015 FOA, totaling about \$35 million. They have been executing agreements with those that were selected, with two remaining to be completed. There is an allowance to move some applications over for funding under the BSP. The ARC recommended five projects to be funded under the BSP for a total of about \$5 million. Three of those were provided to the State Ag agencies in Utah and Wyoming. The others were contracted directly from Reclamation. All but one of those have been executed. Jacobson explained that sometimes Reclamation receives projects to fund from NRCS. These are good projects which cannot be funded under EQIP because of certain rules. Reclamation does the NEPA compliance for those projects and then turns them over to the State Ag agencies. They have some of those projects which are in Colorado.

Brad Parry reviewed the status of projects for FY 2016 from a slide (attached as [Appendix C](#)). He noted that funding for the year was \$8.423 million. They have been notified that they will be getting an extra 15 percent for the fiscal year to help out with the funding status. This is end-of-year money that can't be expended in other Reclamation programs. Don Barnett noted that if you add the cost share to the \$8.423 million and then add the 15 percent plus the cost share for that, the total ends up at \$13 million. Parry pointed out that funding drops as the projects move ahead over the next couple of years, so they will be looking to do another FOA probably in 2018. Jacobson added that of the ten applications they selected, the average cost effectiveness was about \$49 which was lower than the average in the 2012 FOA. These entities have learned that to be competitive, they need to bring in outside money, which was a greater amount in this FOA than in the past.

X. Update from Reclamation's LC Region

Rich Eastland/Stacy Wade

Stacy Wade noted that she had an answer to a question that was asked earlier. She reported that the mills will be assessed as they have been in the past to all contractors. The impact on the current users would be a function of calculation. The allocation for current users is being reduced by 5 percent.

Wade noted that reservoirs in the Lower Basin are extremely low. Based on a 24-month study and some good hydrology reporting, they should be above the shortage mark at the end of the calendar year, which would avoid the need to go into shortage operations. Drought contingency is taking up a lot of time. Terry Fulp has been out meeting with stakeholders, tribal partners and others talking about the drought situation. There is no formalized drought plan at this stage, but they are working on something.

Wade reported that they are working on a new minute with Mexico, which is being negotiated. It is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2016. She also mentioned that the Boulder Canyon Project (BCP) negotiations are wrapping up and should be signed and go into effect by the end of the fiscal year. This is a renegotiation of a 30-year contract that has to do with energy rates coming from Hoover Dam.

Eastland reported that Lake Powell was currently at 50 percent of capacity, with a forecasted inflow of 91 percent of average. Lake Mead was at a historic low of 1073.11 feet. It was projected to continue to decline through the end of June, at which point agriculture demand starts to drop off and it should start to pick back up with some releases from Lake Powell later in the year. System storage for the whole Colorado River Basin was about 50 percent of capacity, similar to the previous year. Regarding natural flow, Eastland reported that since 2000 there have only been three years of above average hydrology. The way that our region views the ongoing drought is since 2000 this has been the driest 16-year period in history. Eastland noted that the 24-month study is projecting normal conditions for the Lower Basin and Upper Basin balancing tier going into 2017.

Wade reported that coming out of the Yuma office the annual salinity differential for calendar year 2015 was 127 ppm. The projection for 2016 is in the range of 135-145 ppm. with a target of 139 ppm. The volume of groundwater from the South Gila well field discharged to the river is approximately 25,000 acre-feet, which flows from the Yuma/Mesa conduit to the Southerly International Boundary with Mexico. Eastland explained the differential to be the level of salinity measured at Imperial Dam versus the salinity level measured at the Mexican border, which is allowed to be up to 145 ppm.

XI. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

The Advisory Council was scheduled to recess at this point on the agenda, but as they were running ahead of time, it was determined that they would continue with the meeting.

XII. Basin States Program (BSP)

Jacobson/Marcie Bainsou

Jacobson noted that Marcie Bainsou had been given the specific assignment of the BSP and she has done a great job of managing that program. The BSP was authorized by a 2008 Amendment to the Salinity Control Act. He explained that as Reclamation and the NRCS expend appropriations, the Act provides for cost sharing from the Basin Funds at 30 percent. Fifteen percent of the cost share comes from the Upper Basin Fund and 85 percent from the Lower Basin Fund. In the Basinwide Program, Reclamation combines the appropriations and the cost share at rate of 70/30 in the agreements. NRCS does not combine the cost share with the appropriations in their agreements. The cost share earned on the NRCS appropriations expended are obligated through agreements under the authority of the BSP.

Bainsou showed a couple of charts on the screen (see [Appendix D](#)). The first chart covered the new 2015 FOA projects that are being passed off to the states or being done by Reclamation. The total of the projects is \$7.5 million, with a savings of approximately 5,600 tons of salt. The second chart covered contracts with NRCS under the BSP. She reviewed the contracts and agreements mentioning that some of the contracts will need new contracts the following year, with one being extended to allow for completion in the spring.

She noted that there were some invoicing problems that needed to be resolved by NRCS. She also reported that she is looking for other funding sources for some of the projects to help relieve the pressure on the Lower Basin Fund, and she has found alternate funding for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife contract. She pointed out that costs for stream gaging had reduced from \$341,000 the previous year to \$107,500 for the current year as a result of negotiations and additional funding sources. She reported on the two new state agreements, anticipating that Colorado's agreement would be obligated by the end of the week and Utah's agreement by the end of June. Bainsong noted that a new salinity consultant contract would be out by the end of the week for competing proposals and would end in two weeks. All the older Studies, Investigations and Research (SIR) projects are moving along well. She mentioned that paperwork has been submitted for the four new SIR projects that were recommended, but she is holding those until she gets the green light to move ahead on them.

Bainsong reported total expenditures for the year in the BSP at \$6.7 million, of which \$5.5 million came out of the Lower Basin Fund. This was equal to the amount earned by NRCS. She had to pull an additional \$300,000 out of the Lower Basin Fund accrual to cover project costs. Looking at the following year, Bainsong explained that all of the projects will be under construction and will need the bulk of their money up front. So, in addition to the amount earned by NRCS, she will need an additional \$2.8 million from the Lower Basin Fund accrual to cover all the project costs. The year after that the BSP budget will decrease again as the projects wind down. She pointed out that from 2019 on, the state amounts decrease significantly. She suggested that from 2019 forward, there may not be any SIR projects. She explained that with all the Basinwide needs and the O&M required, there should be some major cutting back in the BSP as spending cannot continue as in the past. Bainsong explained that this was just her first cut at finding a solution and she was open to discussion on the subject.

There were some comments about the serious impact the budget cuts would have on the Ag programs in Colorado and Utah. Cindy Lair commented that, with the budget proposed for 2018-2019, it would be difficult to just operate her own staff that runs the program. In Colorado their program is run through the conservation districts and they would not be able to partner with the conservation districts at all. It would be wonderful to look ahead several years and foresee money coming back into the system, but it may be too late to be able to bring those conservation districts back in as partners after they have had to let their staff go and ramp down their programs. Utah stated that they would have the same problem. Basically they would not have a program with so great a reduction in funding.

Chairman Robbins suggested that this be discussed on the Forum agenda the next day and that the Forum potentially ask the Work Group to begin discussions with Reclamation on possible options. This is an issue with lots of moving parts and there may be other ways to cut back. Patrick Dent agreed that the Work Group could look at this. He suggested that they continue to look at the forecasted funding in the Lower Basin Development Fund for accuracy. They could also review the out-year forecasts and the options. Robbins suggested that perhaps they could come up with some sort of a simple matrix that shows what happens as money is moved back and forth between programs and how it affects different areas such as research, salinity control, etc. He asked Trujillo to take that back to the Forum for discussion.

Dent then addressed the new SIR recommendations. He reported that the TAG's last two meetings were mostly focused on evaluating the SIR proposals submitted by the Science Team. He expressed appreciation to Marcie Bainsong for the spreadsheet she developed which provides a complete picture of all expenditures within the BSP. It will be a very helpful tool in understanding where things are as larger funding issues are evaluated. Dent reported that they targeted approximately \$400,000 in available funding for SIR projects. Barnett noted that there were additional studies totaling about \$1.5 million that were not recommended for funding. Other needed studies costing around \$300,000-\$400,000 were all specific to Paradox and Reclamation offered to pick them up with Paradox O&M funding without the need of using BSP dollars.

Dent added that they have been very aware of the cash status in the BSP and have been more judicious in recommending projects for funding. Following are the four projects they were recommending.

Economic Damages Model Update – This project was recommended for funding at the Tucson meeting. It involved a 50/50 cost share with some additional economic damages investigation to be done by Reclamation’s Temecula office. This project has been waiting for the Temecula Office to identify the other \$150,000 for the total study amount of about \$300,000. Barnett added that it is pretty critical for the Temecula Office to get moving on making their funds available since the matching funds from the BSP have been sitting for about a year and there are other opportunities for the dollars to go to if the Temecula Office funding is not available soon. Reclamation promised to look into this and check on the status.

Desert Lakes Salinity Control Monitoring – There is a significant salinity project in Emery County, Utah, that has been ongoing for several years where they are trying to measure improvements that can be seen in the return flows through the washes. Dent noted that they have funded phases of this monitoring going back 4-5 years, and a report was made at the Forum meeting in May 2014. They have pulled back the scope on it and just have a few key monitoring points. This is a Reclamation effort and they would like to continue with this phase of monitoring for an additional year.

Enhancement to the 20-gage Network for Real-Time Salinity Load and Calculations – Susong explained that this request was from Jim Prairie. He uses the estimated loads from the 20-station network in his CRSS modeling. This proposed effort would enhance the software so he can actually get real-time loads which would facilitate his modeling efforts.

Evaluation of the Hydrology at Pah Tempe Springs – This is a fairly significant study to evaluate the hydrology at Pah Tempe hot springs in Utah. The investigation is in partnership with the Washington County Water Conservancy District (WCWCD). Susong explained that this is a continuation of some previous work where the Forum has partnered with WCWCD. The real objective is to determine the feasibility of actually pumping the groundwater system near the Pah Tempe hot springs as a way of capturing the hot springs discharge. About 10-12 cfs of hot springs discharge goes into the Virgin River and carries about 90,000 tons of salt per year. This would be the final phase of actually drilling some test exploratory wells into the fault zone, which is the conduit for the thermal waters as they move up and discharge into the Virgin River. The project is structured with about \$200,000 going to USGS as they run the investigation. WCWCD has committed an in-kind contribution worth about \$120,000-\$150,000 to do the drilling associated with the project. This would finish up the final piece of the effort and then the Forum and Reclamation could look at the feasibility of treating that point source. USGS expects to have a report out in about two years. Trujillo commented that she sees this as a potential next “Paradox” site which would allow an opportunity to do a point source treatment that also has a water supply benefit for the local district. Susong noted that WCWCD is putting up a significant amount of funding on this effort because they are interested in looking to the future and perhaps partnering on a salinity control project.

A question was asked about if this study would estimate how much of this water actually makes it to Lake Mead. Barnett explained that Reclamation did a scoping study in the 1970s and, based on the hydrology at the time and the information available, a significant portion of the salt that would be saved at Pah Tempe wouldn’t make any difference at Lake Mead. However, the hydrology has changed and water flows through the Virgin River almost year-round. USGS came in to evaluate that and it was noted that about 80,000 tons of the 90,000 tons from Pah Tempe ultimately make it to Lake Mead. With that knowledge, there have been several phases of these studies to look at the feasibility of capturing the brine. The next step would be to determine what treatment options are available. Dent added that the TAG felt this particular study was important to continue, and perhaps Pah Tempe would be identified as a potential salinity control project. So the total is \$465,000, but \$150,000 of that was identified for funding six months previous.

A motion was made to support the TAG's recommendation to fund the four projects identified. The motion passed. Chairman Robbins noted that the Advisory Council members should have received a copy of a draft letter to be sent to Reclamation conveying those recommendations. With the Advisory Council's approval, he requested that letter be sent to Reclamation under his signature.

Dent wanted to give a little more background on one other study that was not recommended for funding. It came from the State of Wyoming as a hydrosalinity study that would essentially provide an updated or better qualified salt number whereby producers in that area might be able to apply under Reclamation's Basinwide Program for funding for a particular salinity project. He reported that this study was not recommended for funding in part because they wanted to maintain some appearance of fairness. The TAG felt that such a study does have merit, but they decided to take a step back and kind of go through a ranking criteria of all of the areas within the Basin that might have interest in a similar hydrosalinity study and create a prioritization from those. Dent noted that this subject would become an action item for the Work Group to review.

Dent noted that he will continue to work with the TAG and the federal agencies to find efficiencies in spending within the BSP and help prioritize those expenditures.

Jacobson then explained that, as a result of two studies done in the Lower Gunnison and the Uinta Basin, salinity coordinators were hired in those two areas. These coordinators were a big help in assisting the entities in those areas prepare for Reclamation's Funding Opportunity Announcement. Their work in those areas is greatly appreciated.

Cindy Lair reported that they have had great success with Beth Karberg as the salinity coordinator in the Lower Gunnison Basin. She is very familiar with a lot of the irrigators there. They have two conservation districts in that area which are very different in the way they are laid out geographically. The Delta Conservation District has maybe a couple hundred ditch companies with varying levels of sophistication in their organization. It is difficult to work with all of those ditch companies. On the other hand, the Shavano Conservation District has the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association which is a large organization encompassing many smaller companies. Karberg has been out working with the different entities and helping them to prepare for FOAs or work with NRCS in the EQIP program. As it was determined that more assistance was needed for the ditch companies to work with engineering firms, Karberg worked with Steve Miller to draw up a guide book with guidelines to help walk the ditch companies through that process if they weren't able to hire their own project managers. Lair reported that there is some synergy between Karberg's efforts in Colorado with her counterpart Brett Prevedel's work in Utah. The type of work they do is really different because their clients are different, but they collaborate quite a bit and interface frequently to make sure they are consistently delivering a similar product. All in all it has been a really favorable program, and the users on the ground are extremely happy to have someone who can speak their language and understand their needs and help them sort through the minutia of bureaucracy with all the federal and state agencies. Lair reported that they have spent about \$70,000 in the first year for the coordinator's salary and related expenses.

Robert Hougaard reported on what Brett Prevedel has been doing as the salinity coordinator in the Uinta Basin. He has helped to develop two RCPP proposals, one with the Ute Tribe and one with the Uinta County Water Conservancy District. He continues to help with Reclamation's FOA process. He has helped with several canals and has also assisted Uinta County with their Community Impact Board grant to help deal with flood irrigation. He is coordinating with NRCS EQIP with on-farm projects, helping participants sign up and move ahead. He is also helping the Ute Tribe to develop their water plan, which is new and unique. Perhaps a FOA project would come out of this work. He hopes to have the draft plan completed by mid-July. He has also helped landowners in the Ute Tribe to do some work on water quality issues with some 319 dollars. Hougaard indicated that they are very happy with the work that Prevedel has been doing,

and they feel it has been a benefit to the salinity program, as well as the Duchesne and Uinta Counties and the water conservancy districts in that area. He has made huge strides with the Ute Tribe and that has been very successful.

Jacobson added that they have been very fortunate with these two coordinators. Originally when this was set up, the recommendation from the Advisory Council was that it would be for two years. Prevedel's two years end at the end of the 2016 calendar year, and Karberg's end in April 2017. Robbins noted that a vote can be taken in October on extending the time for these positions, but he suggested that the Advisory Council needed to give the coordinators a sense of whether or not they feel the program should be continued for another year or two. The funding comes from BSP funds, and it would be \$120,000 for both coordinators per year (\$70,000 for Karberg and \$50,000 for Prevedel). Robbins stated that he felt the advantage of these coordinators and why they are really good dollars spent is they are organizing entities that otherwise would not have a doorway into the program, such as ditch companies and farm areas that otherwise would probably not be able to participate in salinity reduction measures. He thought it was well worth the investment. He asked if there was anyone on the Advisory Council who would object to giving the indication to Reclamation that they would be willing to fund the coordinators for two more years. Hearing no objections, Robbins indicated that Reclamation could go forward with this understanding and that the Advisory Council would deal with this on a more formal basis at their fall meeting.

XIII. Items for Forum

Trujillo

Robbins suggested to Trujillo that it might be good to have someone on the Forum share more information about the new Minute with Mexico and what that would involve. There could be a brief discussion on that subject. Trujillo reported that they were also going to ask the Work Group to set up a process for consideration of alternatives to address the budget shortfall proposals and work with Reclamation on those.

XIV. Additional Items

Robbins

There were no additional items to discuss.

XV. Public Comment

Robbins

There was no comment from the public.

XVI. Other Business/Actions

Robbins

As there were no additional items to be discussed, Chairman Robbins adjourned the meeting of the Advisory Council at 3:20 p.m.

Advisory Council Meeting
Castle Peak Room—Keystone Conference Center
21966 Highway 6
Keystone, Colorado
June 8-9, 2016

	Name	Entity	Phone Number	E-Mail Address
1	Kib Jacobson	USBR-SLC	501-524-3753	kjacobson@usbr.gov
2	Patrick Paltzgraff	COPHE	7208688816	patrick.j.paltzgraff@state.co.us
3	Paul Harms	NM ISC	505-827-6126	paul.harms@state.nm.us
4	Bill Haren camp	MWD of SC	213, 217, 6570	on file
5	Tanya Trujillo	CA	818-500-1625	ttrujillo@crb.ca.gov
6	David Water Street	WY DEQ	307-777-6709	davidwaterstreet@wyo.gov
7	STEVE WOLFE	WY SEO	307-777-1942	STEVE.WOLFE@WYO.GOV
8	Chad Espenscheid	WY	307 231 2389	chad.espenscheid@gmail.com
9	Jack Barnett	FORUM	901-292-4662	jbarnett@barnettwater.com
10	Barb Osmundson	US Fish+Wildl.	970-628-7189	Barb-Osmundson@FWS.gov
11	Dave Canzler	CRD	970 945 8522	dcanzler@crwcd.org
12	Travis James	NRCS	801-524-3831	tjames@usbr.gov
13	Dave Mason	NRCS	202-260-9232	dave.mason@wdc.usda.gov
14	UIC NGUYEN	CA	818-500-1625	THANG.NGUYEN@CRB.CA.GOV
15	Pedro Ramos	UT NRCS	801-360-5801	pedro.ramos@ut.usda.gov
16	Dave Brown	UT NRCS	801-524-4551	dave.brown@ut.usda.gov
17	WAYNE McALLISTER	UT NRCS	435-789-2100 ext 135	WAYNE.McALLISTER@UT.USDA.GOV
18	MIMIOSHI STITH	BLM	202 912-7136	mstith@blm.gov
19	WARREN TURKETT	NV	702 994 6669	WTURKETT@CRC.NV.GOV
20	Mary Schrader	WY NRCS	307 233-6757	Mary.Schrader@wy.usda.gov
21	Brenna Mefford	WY SEO	307-777-6151	brenna.mefford@wyo.gov
22	MICHAEL THOMAS	WY DEQ/WQD	(307) 777-2073	michael.thomas@wyo.gov
23	Keenan Hensler	USDC	307-777-7626	Keenan.Hensler@uyo.gov
24	Harry Ruzgerian	MWDSC	213 217 6082	hruzgerian@mwds20.com
25	Matthew Gann	UT DEQ	801-536-4381	mgann@utah.gov
26	Robert Kay	Utah	801-538-7259	Robert@utah.gov
27	Robert Hougaard	Ut. Dept. of Ag	801-538-7180	rhougaard@utah.gov
28	Cindy Lair	Co Dept of Ag - CSEB	303-869-9039	Cindy.Lair@state.co.us
29	RANDY RANDALL	NRCS	720-544-2824	randyrandall@co.usda.gov
30	CASEY COLLINS	SNWA	702.862.3798	Casey.collins@snwa.com
31	Scott Mcgettigan	UT Div of Water Res	801-538-4754	scottmcgettigan@utah.gov
32	BOB BOYD	BLM	303-236-5428	rboyd@blm.gov
33	DAVID SUSONG	USGS	801-908-5062	ddsusong@usgs.gov
34	Ken Leib	"	970-628-7150	kjleib@usgs.gov
35	MARIE BAINSON	UC-BOR	801-524	Marie.Bainson@usbr.gov
36	BRAD TWEED	" "	801-524-3723	brad.tweed@usbr.gov
37	JEFF INWOOD	ADWR	602-771-8515	jinwood@azwater.gov

Appendix A

	Name	Entity	Phone Number	E-mail Address
38	Clint Chandler	ADWR	(602) 771-3500	cchandler@azwater.gov
39	David W Robbins	Colorado	303-296-3100	dawitrobbins@hillandrobbins.com
40	Tom Buschatzke	ADWR	602 771 8012	tbuschatzke@azwater.gov
41	LINDA TAUNT	ADEQ	602.771.4416	lct@adeq.gov
42	GAWAIN SNOW	Ut	435-790-1780	gsnow@uwed.org
43	ERIC MILLIS	UDWR	801-538-7250	ericmillis@utah.gov
44	Leah Ann Lamb	UDWG	801 536-4988	llamb@utah.gov
45	Angela Slaughter	CRCN	702-480-2072	akslaughter@crc.nv.gov
46	Andrew Burns	SIWA	702-862-3772	Andrew.Burns@siwa.com
47	MARIE BRINSON	USBR	801-524-3747	mbrinson@usbr.gov
48	DON BARNETT	FORUM	801 292 4662	dbarnett@barnettwater.com
49	Ken Leib	USGS	970 658 2100	kyleib@usgs.gov
50	PATRICK DENT	BOR	623-864-2581	pdent@cap-az.com
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				
61				
62				
63				
64				
65				
66				
67				
68				
69				
70				
71				
72				
73				
74				
75				
76				
77				
78				
79				
80				

AGENDA
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Keystone Conference Center
Castle Peak Room
21966 Highway 6
Keystone, CO

Advisory Council beginning time: **Wednesday, June 8, 2016, 1:00 p.m.**

Designated Federal Officer: Kib Jacobson

Presiding: Chairman Dave Robbins

- | | | |
|-------|---|--------------------------|
| I. | Welcome and Introductions | Robbins |
| II. | Opening Comments, Acceptance of letters appointing substitute members | Jacobson |
| III. | Review and approval of proposed Agenda | Robbins |
| IV. | Draft Minutes of 2015 Fall Council Meeting – Tucson, AZ | |
| | a. Review | Jacobson |
| | b. Action | Robbins |
| V. | Election of Chairman and Vice-chairman | Robbins |
| VI. | Charter Renewal | Robbins/Jacobson |
| VII. | Report on the responses to the Advisory Council report | Robbins |
| | a. USDA-NRCS | d. USGS |
| | b. Reclamation | e. FWS |
| | c. BLM | f. EPA |
| VIII. | Items from the Forum | Tanya Trujillo |
| IX. | Basinwide Program and Agreement Status | Jacobson/Brad Parry |
| X. | Update from Reclamation’s LC Region | Rich Eastland/Stacy Wade |
| XI. | Public Comment | Robbins |

Recess Meeting: **Approximately 3:30 p.m.**

Agenda Continued on Next Page

Reconvene Meeting:

Thursday, June 9, 2016, 8:30 a.m.

- XII. Basin States Program (BSP)
 - a. Program status Jacobson/Marcie Bainsou
 - b. Basin Funds status and accounting Parry/Eastland
 - c. Contracts w/ Federal and State agencies Bainsou
 - d. Accounting of past Studies, Investigations, and Research (SIR) Bainsou
 - e. Technical Advisory Group (TAG) BSP Funding Recommendations
 - i. Continuing Recommendations Patrick Dent
 - ii. Studies, Investigations, and Research (SIR) David Susong/Dent
 - f. Recommendations of the AC
 - i. On items i and ii above Robbins
 - g. Lower Gunnison Basin Coordinator Jacobson/Cindy Lair
 - h. Uinta Basin Coordinator Jacobson/Robert Hougarrrd
- XIII. Items for Forum Trujillo
- XIV. Additional Items Robbins
- XV. Public Comment Robbins
- XVI. Other Business/Actions Robbins

Adjourn Meeting:

Approximately 10:30 a.m.

FUNDING FORECAST FOR THE BASINWIDE PROGRAM FY 2016 - 2017

Date as of 10/16/2015

Contract Name	Contract Amount	Obligated to Date	Balance To Obligate	Expended to Date	Balance to Expend	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
						Appropriations & Cost Share + 15% End of year	Appropriations & Cost Share + 15% End of year	Appropriations & Cost Share + 15% End of year
Grand Valley - Canal Improvement (A) 2010	\$ 2,819,228	\$ 2,420,000	\$ 399,228	\$ 2,419,545	\$ 455	\$ 399,228		
UVWUA East Side Laterals Project Phase 8	\$ 3,542,157	\$ 1,795,000	\$ 1,747,157	\$ 1,264,682	\$ 530,318	\$ 1,747,157		
Cattelman's - Cedar Canyon, Iron Springs	\$ 2,007,225	\$ 1,272,644	\$ 734,581	\$ 200,786	\$ 1,071,858	\$ 734,581		
GVIC Canal Improvement 2012	\$ 4,581,825	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 3,011,825	\$ 191,270	\$ 251,620	\$ 1,880,000	\$ 1,131,825	
Blue Cut/ Mammoth Unit	\$ 5,704,670	\$ 3,204,926	\$ 2,499,744	\$ 3,016,667	\$ 188,259	\$ 2,499,744		
Huntington Cleveland Project Continuation	\$ 1,109,913	\$ 216,293	\$ 893,620	\$ 216,293	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
FOA 1	\$ 5,363,078	\$ -	\$ 5,363,078	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 520,501	\$ 1,362,074	\$ 1,644,367
FOA 2	\$ 4,835,391	\$ -	\$ 4,835,391	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,845,581	\$ 1,565,257	\$ 1,424,553
FOA 3	\$ 3,153,410	\$ -	\$ 3,153,410	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 410,551	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,662,859
FOA 4	\$ 2,814,499	\$ -	\$ 2,814,499	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 73,000	\$ 353,000	\$ 1,246,000
FOA 5	\$ 3,514,847	\$ -	\$ 3,514,847	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 287,500	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,650,000
FOA 6	\$ 2,671,305	\$ -	\$ 2,671,305	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111,000	\$ 1,065,000	\$ 1,495,305
FOA 7	\$ 1,280,720	\$ -	\$ 1,280,720	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 155,412	\$ 1,125,308	
FOA 8	\$ 2,954,512	\$ -	\$ 2,954,512	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 736,367	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 1,068,145
FOA 9	\$ 5,564,809	\$ -	\$ 5,564,809	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 714,717	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,712,061
FOA 10	\$ 3,634,242	\$ -	\$ 3,634,242	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,734,242	\$ 700,000
TOTALS	\$ 55,551,831	\$ 10,478,863	\$ 45,072,968	\$ 7,309,243	\$ 2,042,510	\$ 13,315,339	\$ 12,866,706	\$ 12,603,290
PROJECTS THAT ARE FULLY OBLIGATED - NOT YET CLOSED OUT								
Farson/Eden Pipeline Pjct	\$ 6,453,072	\$ 6,219,417	\$ 233,655	\$ 5,969,189	\$ 250,228	\$ -	\$ -	
Minnesota Canal Piping Project Phase II	\$ 3,028,762	\$ 3,028,762	\$ -	\$ 2,946,409	\$ 82,353			
Slack/Patterson Laterals Piping Project - R-Mesa	\$ 3,324,849	\$ 3,324,849	\$ -	\$ 3,031,313	\$ 293,536			
Austin/Wall Off-Farm Irrigation Project	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 1,350,000	\$ -	\$ 163,126	\$ 1,186,874			
South Valley Lateral Salinity Project - Sheep Creek	\$ 4,026,265	\$ 4,026,265	\$ -	\$ 3,071,667	\$ 954,598			
Huntington Cleveland Irrig Co.	\$ 22,006,423	\$ 22,006,423	\$ -	\$ 22,006,423	\$ -			
Cottonwood Creek Project 1	\$ 6,509,548	\$ 6,509,548	\$ -	\$ 6,509,548	\$ -			
Lower Stewart Pipeline Project	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,806,126	\$ 193,874			
Crawford Clipper Irrigation Project	\$ 1,214,140	\$ 1,214,140	\$ -	\$ 1,207,822	\$ 6,318			
CONTRACT COSTS						\$ 13,315,339	\$ 12,866,706	\$ 12,603,290
NON-CONTRACT COSTS						\$ 522,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
TOTAL OPEN AGREEMENTS	\$ 109,464,890	\$ 64,158,267	\$ 45,306,623	\$ 58,020,867	\$ 5,010,290	\$ 13,837,339	\$ 13,466,706	\$ 13,203,290
Appropriations S10						\$ 8,423,000		
Cost Share X10						\$ 3,609,857		
Recoveries S10								
Recoveries X10								
Additional Appropriations S10						\$ 1,263,450		
Additional Cost Share X10						\$ 541,479		
TOTAL						\$ 13,837,786		
Appropriations/Cost Share Totals						\$ 13,837,786		
Contract/Non Contract Totals						\$ 447	\$ -	\$ -

Application Name	Sponsoring Entity	Enable On Farm	Project Type	Project Cost - Total	Reclamation Funding	Tons Controlled	Acres Enabled	Eligible Acres	Cost \$/Ton
Minnesota L75 Lateral	Minnesota L75 Lateral Company	No	Irrigation Pipeline	\$153,412	\$153,412	129	0	0	
Farson Lateral - F2, F3, & F5 Project	Eden Valley Irrigation and Drainage District	No	Irrigation Pipeline	\$4,048,827	\$2,024,413	1,619	0	0	
Antelope and North Laterals Project	Sheep Creek Irrigation Company	No	Irrigation Pipeline	\$1,947,930	\$1,947,930	1,474	0	0	
Uinta - Rock Point	Rock Point Irrigation Company	Yes	Irrigation Pipeline	\$1,422,849	\$976,549	740	467	619	
Uinta - Whiterocks	Rock Point Irrigation Company	Yes	Irrigation Pipeline	\$4,376,862	\$2,412,463	1,635	0	1,216	
				\$11,949,880	\$7,514,767	5597	467	1835	\$54.65
				Basin States Weighted Cost/Ton			3.375%	50	\$55.96

Funding Forecast BasinStates Program

Appendix D-2

Date as of 6/17/2016

FUNDING FORECAST BASIN STATES PROGRAM

Contract Number	Contract Name	End Date	Contract Amount	Obligated to Date	Balance To Obligate	Expended to Date	Balance to Expend	FY 2015 Obligations	FY 2016 Obligations	FY 2017 Obligations	FY 2018 Obligations	FY 2019 Obligations	FY 2020 Obligations
R15PG00008	NRCS COLORADO	9/30/2019	\$ 4,926,760	\$ 1,959,228	\$ 2,967,532	\$ 1,118,793	\$ 840,435	\$ 985,352	\$ 973,876	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000
R13PG40026	NRCS UTAH	3/31/2018	\$ 5,146,031	\$ 4,497,477	\$ 648,554	\$ 2,803,344	\$ 1,694,133	\$ 700,000	\$ 859,967	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000
R15PG00011	NRCS WYOMING	3/2/2020	\$ 121,434	\$ 79,106	\$ 42,328		\$ 79,106	\$ 24,595	\$ 54,511	\$ 42,328	\$ 24,533	\$ 25,218	\$ 26,000
R12AC40018	State of Colorado	4/17/2017	\$ 5,960,000	\$ 5,960,000	\$ -	\$ 3,733,512	\$ 2,226,488	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 626,600				
R12AC40019	State of Utah	9/30/2016	\$ 7,325,000	\$ 5,400,000	\$ 1,925,000	\$ 4,573,289	\$ 826,711	\$ 975,000	\$ 700,000				
R15AC00054	State of Wyoming	5/30/2020	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 310,000	\$ 2,490,000	\$ 5,192	\$ 304,808	\$ 10,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 900,000	\$ -	\$ -
R14PG00069	US F&WS (3024)	9/7/2019	\$ 567,374	\$ 318,095	\$ 249,279	\$ 183,331	\$ 134,764	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,473	\$ 63,166	\$ 65,000	\$ 67,000
R11PX40081	Barnett Intermountain - Salinity Consultant	8/31/2016	\$ 534,769	\$ 534,769	\$ -	\$ 470,695	\$ 64,074	\$ 110,750					
R12PC40009	University of Colorado -Prairie	8/31/2017	\$ 250,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 182,950	\$ 17,050	\$ 6,250	\$ 6,250				
R11AC40025	Uncompahgre Eastside Lateral Phase 7	12/30/2016	\$ 3,183,983	\$ 2,958,983	\$ 225,000	\$ 2,814,422	\$ 144,561	\$ 1,383,983					
R15PD00074	EVAP Ponds CRB	2/4/2016	\$ 103,540	\$ 103,540	\$ (0)	\$ 101,083	\$ 2,457	\$ 103,540					
R14PG00159	SIR14-1 LowGun Model Enhancement USGS	9/30/2015	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -						
R14PG00161	SIR14-2ab Pah Tempe USGS	9/30/2016	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	\$ -	\$ 93,000	\$ -						
In House	SIR14-5 Desert Lake Monitoring BOR	9/30/2015	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ -	\$ 43,000	\$ 5,000						
R14PG00104	SIR14-7 Rangeland Salt Mobilization Watershed Modeling	12/31/2016	\$ 225,009	\$ 225,009	\$ 0	\$ 134,883	\$ 90,126						
R13PG40038	SIR Rangeland Salinity Mob and Transport ARS	9/30/2015	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -						
R15PG00123	SIR15-1 MOD1&2 Effects of Vegetation Treatme	9/30/2018	\$ 221,613	\$ 221,613	\$ -	\$ 28,322	\$ 193,291	\$ 223,719					
R15PG00125	SIR15-2 USGS Salinity loading from groundwater	9/17/2017	\$ 81,605	\$ 81,605	\$ -	\$ 20,679	\$ 60,926	\$ 81,605					
R15PG00126	SIR15-3 USGS Stream Chemistry	9/30/2018	\$ 233,400	\$ 233,400	\$ -	\$ 74,814	\$ 158,586	\$ 233,400					
R15PG00127	SIR15-4 USGS Watershed Characteristics	9/2/2016	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ 5,804	\$ 58,196	\$ 64,000					
R15PG00128	SIR15-6 USGS/BOR Assessment of Regression	9/27/2017	\$ 112,777	\$ 112,777	\$ -	\$ 110,236	\$ 2,541	\$ 112,777					
In House	SIR15-7 BOR Desert Lakes Monitoring	9/30/2016	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ -	\$ 29,451	\$ 18,549	\$ 31,998					
R13PG40010	SIR13 14 15 Desert Seep Wash	3/20/2017	\$ 123,215	\$ 95,144	\$ 28,071	\$ 67,073	\$ 28,071	\$ -	\$ 28,072				
R16AC00019	Minnesota L-75	9/30/2020	\$ 153,412	\$ 153,412	\$ -	\$ 5,728	\$ 147,684		\$ 153,412				
NEW	FOA #12		\$ 2,412,463		\$ 2,412,463				\$ 222,000	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 815,463		
R16AC00023	State of Utah		\$ 6,000,000		\$ 6,000,000				\$ 700,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
R16AC00001	State of Colorado		\$ 6,000,000		\$ 6,000,000				\$ 1,300,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000
NEW	Salinity Consultant								\$ 115,000	\$ 117,500	\$ 120,000	\$ 123,600	\$ 127,308
NEW	SIR Salinity Economic Impact Model (SEIM)		\$ 150,000		\$ 150,000				\$ 150,000				
R13PG40010	SIR 3-2016 Desert Seep Wash MOD 3		\$ 28,071						\$ 28,071				
In House	SIR 3-2016 Desert Lakes Monitoring		\$ 27,628						\$ 27,628				
NEW	SIR 4-2016 Enhancements 20 station network		\$ 38,500						\$ 38,500				
NEW	SIR 5-2016 Pah Tempe Springs Hydrogeology		\$ 221,500						\$ 221,500				
NEW	SIR Projects in Future				\$ -					\$ 342,000	\$ 342,000	\$ -	\$ -
	Reclamation T/A				\$ -		\$ -	\$ 12,243	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
	Advisory Member's Travel				\$ -		\$ -	\$ 8,599	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000
R13PD40066	RiverWareIDIQ				\$ -		\$ -	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
	Streamgaging Contracts w/ USGS				\$ -		\$ -	\$ 340,990	\$ 107,750	\$ 110,000	\$ 113,300	\$ 116,700	\$ 120,000
	Non Contract Costs				\$ -		\$ -	\$ 69,701					
					\$ -		\$ -						
Costs	Contract/Non Contract Totals		\$ 42,604,325	\$ 22,067,930	\$ 20,220,696	\$ 15,810,808	\$ 6,257,122	\$ 7,996,502	\$ 6,740,137	\$ 7,875,301	\$ 5,705,462	\$ 3,211,518	\$ 3,221,308
Funding	Upper Basin Cost Share							\$ 731,386	\$ 978,846	\$ 771,428	\$ 771,428	\$ 481,728	\$ 483,196
Funding	Lower Basin Cost Share based on NRCS FA							\$ 3,850,000	\$ 5,546,792	\$ 4,371,428	\$ 4,371,428	\$ 2,729,790	\$ 2,738,112
Funding	TOTAL UPPER & LOWER BASIN FUNDING							\$ 4,581,386	\$ 6,525,638	\$ 5,142,856	\$ 5,142,856	\$ 3,246,780	\$ 3,221,308
Funding	Carryover Basin Funds							\$ 3,220,864	\$ 92,902	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000		
Funding	From Recovery							\$ 287,154					
Funding	From Accrual							\$ 300,000	\$ 2,820,000	\$ 664,000			
Funding	ALL FUNDING TOTAL							\$ 8,089,404	\$ 6,918,540	\$ 8,052,856	\$ 5,896,856	\$ 3,246,780	\$ 3,221,308