

**Meeting Notes**  
**Aqueduct Stakeholder Committee**  
**November 14, 2013**

**Attendance:** Jeff Grossenbacher, Producer, Vice Chair, Missouri BAC ; Darci Meese, Water One of Johnson County (participated by phone); Brad Loveless, Westar Representative, KWA (participated by phone) ; Curtis Tobias, Kansas Water Authority, GMD 2 & 5 Representative; Joe Pajor, Wichita Representative ; Gregg Graff, Kansas Water Authority, GMD 1, 3 & 4 Representative; Mark Rude, Executive Director, GMD 3; Clay Scott, Producer, GMD 3 Board Member ; Lou Hines, Farmers and Merchants Bank, Colby; Randy Hayzlett, Kansas Water Authority, Representative of President of the Senate

**Not in Attendance:** Clark Rusco, Chair, Upper Arkansas BAC, Barton County Engineer; Steve Cadue, Chairman, Kickapoo Tribe in Kansas, Horton; John Kaufman, Leavenworth Water Department General Manager

**Others in Attendance:** Kate Wilkins-Wells, GMD 4; Jan King, GMD 1; Tim Boese, GMD 2; Jason Norquist, GMD3; David Brenn, Kansas Water Congress

**Staff:**

Earl Lewis, Diane Coe, Margaret Fast, Erika Stanley, Tracy Streeter - Kansas Water Office  
Scott Gard - Kansas City District Corps of Engineers

1. Introductions – Self Introductions
2. Review Purpose of Committee – Earl reviewed the overall purpose and highlighted the update of the southern Kansas aqueduct route portion of the 1982 Corps of Engineers study, part of the larger Six State High Plains Aquifer Study.
3. Review 1982 study – Scott Gard overviewed the Planning Assistance to State study which is being used to support a state interest. The Corps had hired CDM to develop the water transfer component of the 1982 study. The study had looked at 4 routes; the south route is the only one being reevaluated in the current PAS. It should be noted that the Kansas south route is the shortest, cheapest, lowest energy and most efficient of the ones studied at the time.

Items of discussion:

- Variations on the original scope are covered in the SOW; i.e. alternates on route to small degree, orientation and terminal reservoir
  - Original did not consider dropping off water along the way
  - In response to a question, the study will identify the obstacles that will be encountered, social, environmental, and political.
  - This discussion segued into the next agenda item.
4. Review Scope of Work – in working through each task, each task was discussed and the following comments were captured.

Task 1

- Consider existing legislation aspect that may relate to dropping water off into existing water bodies – water quality, appropriations.
- Consider stream obstructions issues
- Consider institutional options to construct, operate, maintain an aqueduct that has taxing and eminent domain authority
- consider flood control aspects of Pick Sloan

#### Task 2

- Add clear statement about interstate coordination
- consider proactive engagement of landowners along the route, pr, etc

#### Task 3

- Pull numbers out of the scope
- Demand for other needs should be captured – i.e. dairies, swine, etc.
- expand demand to other areas, i.e. Wichita, Hays, etc
- look at “order of magnitude demands along the way
- consider whether to address “new” irrigation as it could help with costs

#### Task 4

- Add language that alternative route may raise different issues.
- Issues may show routes to avoid.
- Add time frame for environmental clearances as some may be lengthy

#### Task 5

- ok

#### Task 6

- Add in the italic statement that this task will be closely coordinated with task 4 and task 7; somewhat iterative

#### Task 7

- Scott has copy of the cost methodology used in the 1982 study; will provide.

#### Task 8

- This task should move to be a state task (will need to modify language under Purpose and Scope).
- This task will also be suspended temporarily. The direct impact area will be defined iteratively by alternatives that are evaluated.

#### Tasks 9

- There will be components of this that are state tasks as well

#### Task 10

- Primary report will be generated by Corps, but components may also be produced as state task.

These comments will be incorporated into a revised scope of work that will be shared with the committee.

There was a discussion of how information will be managed. How much detail will be available when? How detailed maps will be. Who will handle PR.? The KWO will have an Aqueduct page on kwo.org and will be the main media point of contact.

5. Overview WIK agreements – Margaret handed out a form but stressed we will make it easy to track time; anyone involved in a meeting that is not counting time or being paid by a federal source can be counted in our work in kind total.
6. Identify additional members as necessary – All the GMD managers want to be kept involved and informed. Water Assurance district manager should be represented. Livestock should be represented.

7. Review Draft Schedule – This was passed out. Committee meetings will be held periodically, some by teleconference. Regular updates will be provided to the KWA and BACs.