

**DRD Hydrology Committee Notes:** Held at 8:00 AM Wednesday September 1, 2010 at the DWCD Cortez Office.

Attending: Ken Curtis, Shauna Jensen, Amber Kelley, David Graf, John Porter, Andy Logan, Peter Mueller, Mike Preston & Jim Fisher. Doug Pickering and Marty Robbins also attended from DWR as observers. Their positions do not allow them to participate as stakeholders.

After introductions we reviewed the agenda and briefly discussed the DRD Hydrology Committee Purpose as stated by DRD from the retreat and as outlined in the Framework questions. The Committee will re-visit these Committee guides in subsequent meetings.

John Porter started his review of the existing hydrology report and information by reviewing history. He started with Escalante and proceeded to cover early MVIC irrigation, historical “dry” river, Ute Settlement, Dolores Project Development, ISF below McPhee and all pressurized delivery on new agricultural acreage. The pressurized system allowed for the water allocation to downstream purposes. He further described the March 1 determination practice for downstream flows that first hit a dry year in 1990. Releases were down to 20 CFS and this caused problems for the trout. Some leasing provided a temporary solution that was followed by a 6 year negotiation and the current fish pool as the second largest DP allocation managed by the Biology Committee. John then covered the first discussions under DRIP that looked at Plateau for additional fish pool allocations, but ended around 2002 when the drought hit. Later Steve A. and Chuck Wanner re-started discussions bring us to the present DRD. John then reviewed the Riverend graphics through 2009, discussed Appendix B of the DPR and went through his modeling of 77 years of simulated DP operation with recorded hydrology that yielded the likely DP operational hydrology including expected spills. This information remains the best available information and was used in the DRD Correlation Report.

David Graf proceeded to cover his additional hydrologic information, more from a geomorphologist view point. Reach 1 is more alluvial than lower downstream, the Q is the controlling hydrologic force/input for the reach. Historically, 2000 + CFS was the controlling 1.5 year recurrence interval, which is now 800 – 1200 CFS based on controlled rafting releases. What are the expected changes? David tracking the D50 & D84 sediment sizes to see what will move it and ultimately create habitat. All relates to Q amplitude and duration.

Doug mentioned a previous DWR study estimated 55% stream losses by Paradox.

David saw that 78 CFS appears as 60 CFS at Bedrock. David reviewed pre versus post dam flows, trying to model possible impacts using Indicator of Hydrologic Alteration (IHA) from TNC. The IHA shows more difference on the Dolores than similar comparisons at the Cisco gage near the CO/UT state line. Pre dam dry years saw minimal flows by late June, wet years lasted into August and average years somewhere in between. Average flows pre-dam were between 3 – 8 CFS. One effort has been the Big Gyp pools. These pools collect mud that is periodically flushed out providing an additional 6 – 7’ of habitat. David referred the group to an email from Ann Oliver on hydrologic impacts for the group to review.

After a break, we reconvened and turned the discussion over to Peter Mueller who was attending to make a request for the Legislative subcommittee. He reviewed their plan to conduct a six month review of the native fishery. The group is setting up a water & science oversight panel to guide that process and review results. They would like representation from the Hydrology Committee. With outside contractors they hope to identify potential impacts and opportunities around water quality, predation, spill management, riparian and structural restoration. Peter with help from Amber & Mike reviewed goals and panel make-up and how the Legislative Group came to this point.

After discussion and request for volunteers, the Committee decided that Shauna and Ken would participate in and support Legislative Oversight Panel.

The Committee discussed the remaining items as our time was running short and agreed to defer the other house cleaning items, Hydrology Report Update, regular meeting schedule, Hyd. Comm. coordinator & notes, to a future meeting when more participates could attend. At least four individuals expressed interest, but had conflicts. Additional topics were added to the future discussions list including:

- Water quality
- Boundaries; how do they overlap & coordination between various Committees including Spill, Biology, Science and Hydrology.
- DWR training on CDSS and Aquamap

No next meeting has been set. Initially, Shauna & Ken will attend and support the Legislative Subcommittee Oversight Panel as requested and report back to the Hydrology Comm. when appropriate. Ken will schedule a Hydrology Committee meeting before the end of the year, probably November.