



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 4-13-11 TIME 10:36 am

SERVED BY Brian Drypolcher

RECEIVED BY Miller

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

City Councilors' Conference Room, City Hall

200 Lincoln Ave, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

505.955.6840

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 22, 2011
4. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
 - a. Information and discussion, staff presentation regarding spring river runoff projections, reservoir management and storage capacities. (Alan Hook)
 - b. River Commission review and discussion regarding the drafting of the administrative procedures for the proposed ordinance to formalize the City of Santa Fe's commitment to bypass target flows in the Santa Fe River below Nichols Reservoir (Brian Drypolcher)
5. MATTERS FROM COMMISSIONERS, MATTERS FROM SUB-COMMITTEES
6. MATTERS FROM STAFF
7. CITIZENS COMMUNICATION FROM THE FLOOR

ADJOURN

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

River Commission – INDEX

APRIL 19, 2011

	Cover Sheet	Page 1
Roll Call	Roll Constitutes a quorum. 1 absence	Page 2
Approval of Agenda	<i>Mr. Ellenberg moved to approve agenda as presented, second by Mr. Bove, motion carried by unanimous voice vote</i>	Page 2
Approval of Minutes – March 22, 2011	<i>Mr. Ellenberg moved for approval of the minutes as presented, second by Mr. Cutropia, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i>	Page 2
Discussion Items a. Information and discussion, staff presentation regarding spring river runoff projections, reservoir management and storage capacities. (Alan Hook) b. River Commission review and discussion regarding the drafting of the administrative procedures for the proposed ordinance to formalize the City of Santa Fe's commitment to bypass target flows in the Santa Fe River below Nicholas Reservoir. (Brian Drypolcher)	<i>Mr. Ellenberg made a motion to ask the Chair to appoint a sub-committee to design and work with the Watershed and Staff to design a monitoring program that doesn't over burden city staff, second by Mr. Cutropia, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i>	3-14
Matters from the Commission	Informational	
Matters from Staff	None	
Citizen's communication from the floor.	None	
Adjournment and Signature Page	There being no further business to come before the River Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 pm	

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

City Councilors' Conference Room

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

MINUTES

1. ROLL CALL:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jacobi at 6:15 pm at the City Councilors' Conference Room, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Roll call constitutes a quorum.

Present:

Jerry Jacobi, Chair
Phil Bove
Dale Doremus
Melinda Romero-Pike
Jim Cutropia
Richard Ellenberg

Excused

John Buchser
Samuel Gerberding

Staff Present:

Brian Drypolcher
Claudia Borchert
Brian Snyder, Water Division
Allan Hook, Water Resource Analyst for the Water Division, City of Santa Fe
Marcos Martinez, City Attorney

Others Present

Anna Serrano for Fran Lucero, Stenographer

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Ellenberg moved to approve agenda as presented, second by Mr. Bove, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 22, 2011

Mr. Ellenberg moved for approval of the March 22, 2011 minutes as presented, second by Mr. Cutropia, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

4. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. Information and discussion, staff presentation regarding spring river runoff projections, reservoir management and storage capacities. (Alan Hook)

Fishing Derby – Alan Hook provided the River Commission members with a memo dated April 15, 2011 detailing the status for the Fishing Derby event.
(Exhibit B)

Alan Hook detailed the estimated volume of expected runoff for the spring of 2011 and the estimated stream flow inflows from the Santa Fe River above McClure Reservoir which are forecasted to be <25% of the historical 1966-2007 USGC gauged daily means inflows. With the required specifications for the Children's Fishing Derby and taking in to consideration that it has been a dry year within the Santa Fe Watershed, the snowpack is below 2 ft. and the lower elevation snow pack has evaporated, plus the extended forecast for precipitation is below average, the Water Division cannot guarantee on June 4th the required daily stream flow and total quantities of flows necessary to assure the public the successful realization of the Children's Fishing Derby. Alan Hook said his suggestion is to bring it to the Public Utilities Committee meeting on May 4th. Chair Jacobi clarified that in bringing this suggestion forward, was Alan Hook stating that they cannot guarantee. Alan Hook confirmed, "That is correct." Ms. Doremus asked Alan Hook if it was his recommendation to cancel it and he said, yes, that it should be postponed until next year.

Mr. Ellenberg stated that the plan adopted at the retreat was to do the Fishing Derby so two things seem to have happened, 1) the by-pass constraint is a problem and 2) Fishing Derby seems to require more water over a longer period of time than we understood at the retreat. So the by-pass hopefully this year, 5 years from now in the legislature will get passed. The problem with the amount of water in a drought is one we need to revisit at some point as we thought we were putting in enough water in that release to do the Fishing Derby.

Ms. Borchert said that the Fishing Derby is mandated to be early in June when really on a dryer month this peak of the run-off would most likely be able to match out flow to in flow you would have to time it in mid-May.

Alan Hook said one other variable to understand about the Fishing Derby River Festival resolution wide the day of the 1st Saturday, that is an amnesty day for Game and Fish for fishing licenses so anybody can fish during that period. If we

moved it up, Brian and I talked about May 15th, Game and Fish said, “Now you are going to have to check any child over 12 and adults that are fishing to see if they have their license. Alan Hook said they are not Game and Fish Rangers. It was stated that maybe we should ask them to change the amnesty day. Alan Hook said this is statewide so they probably would not change.

Mr. Ellenberg said that the way the flow is it should be cancelled. You can’t spend money planning on it when the odds are so high that you won’t be able to do it.

Ms. Borchert came to the realization that the information that the core working group had was not the information we started working with in the same procedures. So we had a list of things to consider one being should there be a certain flow allocation now at the low ridge if the River Festival doesn’t happen. It doesn’t have to be just because of the by-pass problem but there is also a perception problem. It is a very dry year and yet we are going to play with fish in our River.

Alan Hook state that one of the Councilors comments was that he would rather have water for his constituents than water for the Fishing Derby.

Mr. Ellenberg asked the 5 present to echo or correct the statement made at the retreat that the Environmental flow objectives were much more important than the fishing derby. Ms. Borchert stated that is not listed as one of the four objectives. Ms. Doremus stated that we wanted that cultural and the River blessing but I think you are right, it was lower down in an ideal situation.

Mr. Drypolcher stated that he believed there would be time to reconcile what this ordinance is trying to do and what now, 2008 resolution was trying to in formalizing the city’s commitment to a Fishing Derby because it is a very straightforward resolution. It says, “there shall be, unless there is a drought or water emergency, there shall be a Fishing Derby on June 4th.” Now we are trying I think to add a finer tune approach to when the derby might happen and how it might happen and also have some guidelines. I can envision that as this ordinance gets fleshed out that there is some derby language in there that includes the repeal of the earlier resolution.

Alan Hook stated that he had mentioned before and had sent the River Commissioners, the Rio Grande Basin run off meeting was schedule for next week and they changed it to May 17th. That will be the meeting of all the Federal experts like NRCS, National Weather Service, what is their 30-day, what is their 90-day outlook for the whole Rio Grande Basin which includes our basin and the Santa Fe Watershed and that will be held in Albuquerque from 9-12.

Thank you Alan for his presentation.

- b. River Commission review and discussion regarding the drafting of the administrative procedures for the proposed ordinance to formalize the City of Santa

Fe's commitment to bypass target flows in the Santa Fe River below Nicholas Reservoir. (Brian Drypolcher)

Mr. Drypolcher said that they have been working on the administrative procedures for the ordinance and they were submitted to the River commissioners last week. There is of course, a significant portion of this that is carrying forward the same guidelines representative of the summary report of recommendations that we are looking to serve as the guidelines for the resolution that is now working its way through Council. That summary report of recommendation is the set of guidelines that came out of the public process, that came out of the working core group and were approved by the River Commission and we are hoping that they will be approved by Council or the interim resolution. Yet, there is also in the administrative procedures lots of new language and lots of new guidelines and guidance having to do with some guidance for decision making, for contingencies that might arise, that have to do with the role of flow manager, that have to do with some of the things we have just been talking about like Fishing Derby. So we need to get the consideration and input from the River Commission. Mr. Drypolcher said that in the e-mail he sent the Commissioners, in addition to whatever might stand up for the commissioners, or if they have questions or concerns, he highlighted a few that he and staff would like to hear guidance about. One was this idea where we have a target hydrograph for a normal and wet year and we also produced a hydrograph for guidance for a critical dry year. We didn't produce example hydrographs or reference hydrographs for other years, so is that something that the River Commission might think is a good idea. Claudia Borchert has produced some of those examples for 500 acre foot years, 600 acre foot years, etc.

The language about the duties for the Flow Manager, Flow Operator, what ideas or concerns you might have for that. Other guidelines for adaptive management; how the city might conduct different decision making protocols for adaptive management. Start date for the hydrograph, that is less substantive but I see the new hydrographs that Claudia worked on rather than looking at a hydrograph with a start date of a calendar year going ahead for the graph core presentation of our hydrograph starting with our water year, April 15th. There is some language about monitoring, what do you think of that? What do you want to monitor and why? My intent was to get this draft to the River Commissioners and provide you with this presentation for your consideration and your discussion.

Mr. Snyder: As far as target hydrographs, I think Richard mentioned it in an e-mail, hydrographs shouldn't dry. We have to have some control in the Water Division to make adjustments. We can come up with a hydrograph for every possible situation and I don't think that is the objective. The hydrograph is a concept and we have three, dry, wet and normal and we have to leave some control of decision making within the Water Division based on current conditions, don't we?

Mr. Ellenberg stated that the hydrograph was an estimate. In here you have some discussion of the objectives about general hydrograph, and I think there are other

objectives that are not included in here. Objective one is the constant flow for the upper reach; by the way the upper reach here is defined as the upper reach. I think it means the area above Cerro Gordo or something like that. The definition needs to be revisited. Objective two was the spring flow that would get all the way down to 599, would clean out the river, move the seeds because that is the time of year for seeds might change with global warming. It would also maybe provide some flow for the blessing and we knew it might not, we thought we would have some water in the river and it would provide for the Fishing Derby. Mr. Ellenberg stated that he thinks it is those objectives that drive the hydrograph which as we learn more, they hydrograph gets adjusted to meet those objectives. It is a very different structure and it started with a hydrograph.

Mr. Ellenberg stated that he had two other minor comments. 1) Defined terms should always be capitalized, that is just basic drafting so that you don't mistake using common words in defining definitions; 2) the author did not accept all changes in the document so when he went to do track changes he had several people's comments on his document. When you send it out if you don't accept changes it shows all the comments people have made on the way. Mr. Drypolcher said he intended to send a clean copy but he did not intend to not have the tracking or changes available.

Mr. Ellenberg said that the main thing is that the structuring of hydrographs is an initial example of what one might achieve in results.

Mr. Jacobi said it is just a graphical representation that is what the definition is and this is what we would like to see.

Mr. Drypolcher asked as a matter of process, we talked about the concerns another would be to go through the document and that would provide the structure in talking about parts of the document, to edit whatever is needed or change or explore or continue in the review process as is. Another comment, Mr. Drypolcher said that what he is hearing is that some of the structure is in the document; what is being suggested and maybe it just needs to be strengthened, this does start the objectives first and then goes to hydrographs second.

Mr. Ellenberg said that these were the objectives that guided the study group, the study group tried to implement those objectives with specific targets for the purpose of releasing the water which has been below the hydrographs and not all included. Those objectives for how many hydrographs need to be up there in the hydrograph as an initial example clearly to be modified with experienced monitoring. I want to go back to the minutes of the meeting, I am not the water expert, my brain would not hold on to all of the purposes that the people who understood that stuff reiterated. I would really like to see that to make sure we have it right.

Ms. Borchert said that one example for change to address that is that there is a whole section under Target Hydrograph that talks about sprinkles, summer flows,

year round trickle and moving that up just after objectives. Here are some general objectives and here is the way that the hydrograph is going to be considered in four different parts so there is a transition between broad objectives that have no flows associated with them which are in the objective section right now and more direction towards time frames, flow regimes are meant to address the objectives above. When they show up in the target hydrograph you kind of know how those four different timeframes link objectives to the target.

Mr. Jacobi made the comment that reference had been made to the upper river which was the little reserve section, is that correct? That is somewhat wet right now and we want to keep that as a seed source.

Mr. Ellenberg said that it is meant to be in the area east of Cerro Gordo and west of Nichols Reservoir. Mr. Ellenberg said that he was unclear where it reaches Acequia Madre.

Mr. Jacobi said he thought that it would be carried further down almost to the head gate because that is wet right now.

Mr. Ellenberg said that was the definition that to him was indescribably met. It should probably be east of the Acequia Madre head gate or east of Cerro Gordo.

Mr. Drypolcher said he had talked to Mr. Ellenberg and Mr. Drypolcher thought that it was east of the head gate and Mr. Ellenberg thought it was east of Cerro Gordo.

Ms. Borchert stated that she was thinking more about the quantity of water. Ms. Borchert knew that amount of water could sustain that and so to her it was not locality driven as much as flow amount.

Mr. Ellenberg said that the purpose is to achieve wetting the upper reach which is what is stated in the document so I think that the definition of upper reach is important to know when you get to this. My sense is that a lot of the water between the Acequia Madre head gate and Cerro Gordo comes in from acequias and underground sources that enter the river below Cerro Gordo. Except for a few days in the 2 year drought the area in front of the Great Sky Studios at 1519 Canyon has always been wet without any releases because it has other sources coming in. Mr. Ellenberg said that there are flows coming out of Nichols Reservoir.

Ms. Borchert said that they are holding the sustaining water that is coming out of Nichols Reservoir which is coming out of the leak.

Mr. Jacobi stated that looking at the river biologically that area at Andrew Armijo Park; that is wet I would say 99% of the time because biological life has developed in there. It is less than ½ cfs but the community is involved there takes a year to complete its life cycle. You have those organisms there and something is keeping

it going, it may wet or dry a little bit above there but the critters kind of move with the flow. There is enough water there to keep them going.

Mr. Bove said that he has seen that and actually the flow is less than a ½ cfs. Right now you can barely see any movement.

Mr. Drypolcher made the statement that they were trying to institutionalize the leak, there was an estimate of the leakage.

Mr. Ellenberg interjected that they were going back 300 acre feet.

Ms. Borchert said that it is not 3 cfs it is less than ½ cfs.

Mr. Ellenberg said that if the 1000 acre feet isn't producing something in the order of what was envisioned, he felt that the group would need to reconvene with that information. If it is 10 acre feet, great, that obviously is not a problem, but if it is 600 acre feet obviously that is a circumstance that if it hasn't been contemplated, it needs to be contemplated.

Mr. Jacobi said we are talking about 300 acre feet.

Mr. Ellenberg said we are not going to see it because of the bypass constraints; we may not get to try it. We will have to deal with all those things, I understand that.

Ms. Doremus referred back to the hydrographs for clarity as to what the answer is to the question. As I understand from what we have just talked about is that we want flexibility, the hydrographs are already kind of an example of what we anticipate. We want to make sure that this document reflects that there needs to be some flexibility to meet the objectives and Claudia's suggestion that, first you talk about the non-quantitative objectives which are there and then you talk about the four periods of time. It is clear that the hydrographs aren't; and I think Brian used the unfortunate term, "off the shelf," guidance in his e-mail. Oh we don't want it to be so regimented that the pro manager feels constraints on the hydrograph. Back to Brian's question, would it be helpful to have additional hydrographs to help guide that for different flows, we are not opposed to that as long as it is clear in this document that the goal is to meet these objectives and to be able to be flexible to meet these objectives, right?

Mr. Ellenberg said that the hydrographs right now are guesstimates to be developed over the years. They may be different in different years.

Ms. Doremus asked if there is a way to build that sort of. Mr. Ellenberg responded before Ms. Doremus ended her sentence, "well the monitoring is in here and that is one of the things." Ms. Doremus said that the monitoring is but the iterative process to adjust. Mr. Ellenberg said that he thought it had to be put back in to this document. Ms. Doremus said, monitoring, I am curious as to what that is.

Mr. Drypolcher clarified, under adaptive management and adaptive management goals, it says that the goal of the ordinance is to provide flows in the river while providing the city with flexibility and managing both the water supply system and river flows. The target hydrograph, dry year hydrographs and critical dry year hydrographs were designed to match daily target flows with the objectives. However, it is also the intention of the ordinance that these administrative procedures that the flows to the river be managed in a manner to optimize the benefits of the flows to meet the objectives. Hence, these procedures allow for and encourage adaptive management provided that the annual target is not impacted.

Mr. Ellenberg said that objectives are what you have. The objectives of the hydrographs are meant to meet are the implementing objectives.

Mr. Drypolcher said that he believed that they could clear this. I am trying to point out and respond to your comments that we are not slaves to the hydrographs we are actually trying to meet a set of objectives. Whether we are using a term objectives too loosely here, in the preamble set up for hydrographs, it says; target Hydrograph contains the following elements and it goes in to a low trickle (page 6), maybe this is where we need to tune up the language a little bit. We are trying to maximize the benefits to these goals and objectives. It does say that the purpose of these flows, the low trickle is to provide flows for the upper river and we have talked about a different definition for that, to maximize river and repairing ecological health. We are saying that there is a purpose here and so I think there is a breakdown in purpose, objectives; let's clean that up and have stronger linkage between the adaptive management provisions so that we really are trying to get to our attempt rather than be slaves to the hydrograph. Each one of these does state a purpose, the spring flow has a purpose, the summer flow has a stated purpose.

Mr. Ellenberg said that there are two points to consider, 1) he would like to go back to the minutes and make sure we have the corrections. He believe there are things that were talked about that are not in the implementing objectives and 2) there is some priority in the meeting objectives.

Mr. Drypolcher said there are also sacrifices. You may have a priority that is seed dispersible, but you find out that seed dispersible, let's say is in June, you find out like this year it is all going to be gone before June. You don't hold out for June and then find out you can't make the release. You go ahead and sacrifice seed dispersible for a wetting of the bed earlier in the season. So it is not just priorities, it is what can you do with what you've got.

Mr. Ellenberg stated that the by-pass constraints as he had said earlier would be rid of in 5 years.

The Commission had questions on the monitor. Mr. Jacobi asked, "Where do we get a monitor?" Do we have photo points for vegetation?

Ms. Borchert said that she took a first stab at this, it is very softball for a number of reasons, 1) I tried to firm up things that we are already doing which is mostly stream flow monitoring, 2) the other additional monitoring is a very sensitive issue these days because of budget. Councilor Dominguez said at the Finance Committee said, "every time we pass legislation we are simply directing staff to do more." City Manager concurred and at the same time we are trying to cut the positions that we have open. They are making that connection so we can't heavy load the monitoring that is going to require Brian to give up all the other things he does in his job to go out and monitor, the money is just not there. I just want to frame it; there are a bunch of ideas on what we can monitor. I think we should be cautious on what we can do; we should identify what we can do.

Mr. Ellenberg stated that we probably would not have the minimum monitoring that it is needed for adaptive management. What is the monitoring we should do which is more than that and then in terms of staff resources we may have to make decisions about what we can do. Hopefully we can do enough for what is required for adaptive management. At a minimum I think we should identify what that is.

Mr. Jacobi said that if we wanted to find out how far the water is going and how much there is someone watching stream gauges right now.

Ms. Borchert said that would be once every quarter.

Ms. Doremus suggested that a sub-committee of this group with some of the people that have been involved, like in the core group that have expertise, come up with an ideal monitoring plan and then from there figure out what we can do with a combination of staff resources and community resources. We should be able to engage community groups and maybe even help find funding for them to do this work. But it needs to be consistent, it can't be grant by grant, you want to have a project for it to be successful. This is a problem that the state has had a lot with their watershed restoration project. They have this wonderful watershed restoration project but who is monitoring to see that they have been effective. You exceed a standard in the reach of the river, you throw this money at it but did it work.

Mr. Jacoby asked about the statement made of receiving stream flow quarterly, are these staff gauges that are set up at those sites calibrated so that someone can just look at them with a binocular and say it is at this level.

Ms. Borchert said, absolutely, they have a translation of the height to the stream flow. I have been thinking of making a laminate copy of that table and putting it next to the stream gauge. Anybody who walks up to it with instructions can read it = so much flow. We keep referring to it but we don't explain it.

Ms. Doremus said they have 4 students from the Western Polytechnic Institute in Massachusetts and they are very sharp, high level Engineer students. They have

been working on a phone application that would be a monitoring program that anyone could download on their phone and participate by taking a picture at certain photo points and it would get loaded to this data base and then get put in to the data base and then arrange it over time so that we could keep track of it. We are trying finding out if that is useful and who would use it and how do we inspire them to use it and to what level do we ask them to use it. Is it to go and shoot a picture or is it also with binoculars read the flow meter and enters that in. We are trying to figure out the design for that and how that would work. Using technology to interest people and is it going to stay interesting over time or are people going to just get bored. There are still a lot of questions but we are really excited because these students are really smart. They are here for the next 3 weeks and some of them want to come back for internship if we can arrange for that and continue this conversation and process.

Claudia said that they will be making a presentation on May 3rd at noon and everyone is invited.

Mr. Ellenberg made a motion to ask the Chair to appoint a sub-committee to design and work with the Watershed and Staff to design a monitoring program that doesn't over burden city staff, second by Mr. Cutropia, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Borchert suggested Danny who was at the second meeting, he is a LANL hydrologist wanted to be involved and I actually called him out and said, why you don't get involved in the monitoring. Ms. Doremus said that a Biologist will be needed.

Ms. Borchert said she wondered how this would feed into the process on whether this parliamentary procedure wants to point to a document called the monitoring plan so that the time and effort needed to develop it will not be constrained by the Mayor driven; let's get this on the committee schedule for at least 1-2 months from now.

Ms. Borchert directed a comment towards the capitalization, we have actually checked with our ordinance writers on that and they said that it is true that most places use capital letters to define terms and the city tends to use lower case as much as possible. So we were following direction from our ordinance writers.

Mr. Ellenberg stated that there is a good reason why most places capitalize them. Because often you will use the defined term in a colloquial way and nobody will know which one you are referring to. It is going to happen sooner or later as you draft documents.

The Chair asked if they should re-open the conversation now that Marcos had arrived or revisit it. Marcos said he has committed to setting a meeting with DL and having the discussion we had a year or so ago as well as getting some insight

from Denise Fort on other applications around the state. The Chair asked to keep him informed of any progress. The Chair asked Mr. Ellenberg to be a part of this.

Mr. Drypolcher stated that the revised hydrographs needed to be considered.
(Handouts)

Ms. Borchert said that these are the figures that are already in the administrative procedures but staff is suggesting replacing them. The reason why she struggles is as one day Alan comes in and says, what number should we plug in to this table to fill out this year for a 300 acre foot allocation. Ms. Borchert said that they had to make them up because this year they didn't go back to the critical dry year. There are some policy level questions that are addressed in the one that has the 4-hydrographs which is actually, how do you want to produce it. We talked for example about maintaining a trickle. We can't maintain a trickle at the same level as they maintain it on a target year. It has to get reduced so even a low trickle gets reduced by some amount. The question is how does it get reduced or your pulse has changed, how does it get changed. Ms. Borchert said if the River Commission could make recommendations and ultimately the city council can adopt and guide it, which makes it a whole lot easier to implement the will of the elected officials and the River Commission as an advisory committee vs. shooting from the hip between 750 and 300. Ms. Borchert said she would like the commission to think about coming up with some target hydrograph, whether the ones distributed or another version thereof, but the 700, 600, 500, 400th year. For example, one thing I have done is shifted the pulse so between 600 acre feet, the sprinkle occurs on the cusp of late May or early June. In the next hydrograph it moves it closer to middle of May. Based on the observations that when it is a dryer year it is normally a hotter year which means that your runoff is coming earlier which means that the natural eco-system function is to actually have the run-off in mid-May vs. late May. This is an example of an adaptation that I think we should anticipate.

Mr. Drypolcher pointed out that where it says, no summer flows it should be lower summer flows.

Ms. Borchert asked the commission to review and to provide her with feedback, any typos, any inconsistencies, any ideas, etc., please send to her by e-mail. Ms. Borchert said that next steps might be to bundle this up and send it to the sub-committee.

Mr. Ellenberg said that we should go back to some of the members of the core group by e-mail and get their input.

Mr. Drypolcher stated that he would bring a draft back next month as the Mayor is looking forward to receiving this soon.

Mr. Drypolcher said he needed clarification, he now has heard a few different themes. One is this theme of adaptive management to meet objectives to meet

purpose to meet the intent of these flows and I think I have enough guidance to work with the way this is structured and work with the language. There was a question about a definition, there was a comment about providing quite a bit more detail in terms of what our ecological objectives are, our purposes and we were going to give bunches of examples. I could talk to a couple of Biology and restoration people. I am hearing themes but I am having trouble in my mind as to what the next steps are. If there is an e-mail going back and forth between members of the core working group, I don't feel like I have enough guidance for the next steps at this point. Can you summarize for me where you see the next phases of work being directed for this document.

Mr. Ellenberg said he would see three; 1) Take the four points on the target flow and get the biologist and those folks in the core group to comment and elaborate on each one of those so that the purpose of seed disbursement or whatever else they want the flow manager to think about managing the flows are theirs, as Claudia said, for educational purposes. 2) To restructure with a little bit so that your implementation objectives or some other term and hydrographs as examples and the objective being monitoring over time to adjust those hydrographs for the need for additional information. (Mr. Drypolcher: these being the examples?) Mr. Ellenberg said, right, these are the initial guesstimates. 3) Set priorities for the summer flows and I think they called it the shoulders to the first flow to achieve those reductions.

Ms. Doremus asked, in terms of the actual document here you're talking about the hydrographs? Mr. Ellenberg said he would restructure that too. Here are implementation objectives for targets and the reasons for them. The hydrographs have initial guesstimates to be adjusted with monitoring and the priorities for cutting as we go from 100% to 75% down to the general flow targets for approximately 300 acre feet to meet.

Marcos stated, so what you are saying is prioritizing and as the flow goes down start slashing objectives at the line in order of lowest priority to the highest.

Ms. Borchert said she thought that was in there. Marcos said that this is more defined. Mr. Ellenberg didn't think it was a radical change he said it is a reasonable restructuring. Language amplifications for the purposes of the flows.

Mr. Ellenberg said that he thinks it needs a flow manager 10 years from now, from what he has read.

Mr. Drypolcher said, given that the committee meets monthly we will come back next month which we hope is very close to a final draft in terms of getting it to the Mayor.

Ms. Doremus said that at certain points when she was involved in the core group, somehow she is going to be asked certain questions about flushing out more detail in the four elements of what we are looking for. How are we going to take this on.

Mr. Drypolcher said that if this is a matter of making a few phone calls to likely suspects, he can do that. Mr. Ellenberg offered to help.

Mr. Drypolcher asked for confirmation that that idea of addressing the Fishing Derby in the administrative procedures for the target flows makes sense to people. Confirmed yes from the commissioners.

The Chair appreciates all the hard work staff is doing.

5. MATTERS FROM COMMISSIONERS, MATTERS FROM SUB-COMMITTEES

Reminder to purchase the book Return of the River on May 6th.

6. MATTERS FROM STAFF

7. CITIZENS COMMUNICATION FROM THE FLOOR
None

8. ADJOURN

Ms. Romero-Pike moved to adjourn at 8:10 pm, second by Mr. Ellenberg, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Signature:

Jerry Jacobi, Chair



Fran Lucero, Stenographer