

# **Surface Water Coalition Rebuttal Expert Reports Exhibit List**

IN THE MATTER OF DISTRIBUTION OF WATER TO VARIOUS WATER RIGHTS HELD BY OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF A&B IRRIGATION DISTRICT, AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR DISTRICT #2, BURLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MILNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MINIDOKA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NORTH SIDE CANAL COMPANY, AND TWIN FALLS CANAL COMPANY

**PREPARED BY**  
BROCKWAY ENGINEERING, INC.  
ERO RESOURCES CORPORATION  
HDR ENGINEERING, INC.

November 7, 2007

## **Rebuttal Report Exhibits**

### **Rebuttal Reports**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Exhibit 8190 | Rebuttal Report by SWC to King Expert Report                 |
| Exhibit 8191 | Rebuttal Report by SWC to Brendecke Expert Report            |
| Exhibit 8192 | Rebuttal Report by SWC to Sullivan and Franzoy Expert Report |
| Exhibit 8193 | Rebuttal Report by SWC to Carlson Expert Report              |

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Exhibit 8194 | Rebuttal Testimony by Norm Young to Sullivan and Franzoy Expert Report |
| Exhibit 8195 | Rebuttal Report by Joel Hamilton to Church Expert Report               |

### **Exhibits Used for Rebuttal Report to Sullivan/Franzoy Expert Report**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Exhibit 8200 | Comparison of SWC Field Efficiencies   |
| Exhibit 8201 | Comparison between Sullivan's assumed conveyance losses and SWC estimates  |
| Exhibit 8203 | Combined reservoir storage for the Palisades Project from Table 21 in Reclamation's 1946 Palisades Project Planning Report |
| Exhibit 8204 | Comparison of Sullivan Calculation of Excess Supply or Shortage (AF) with SWC Calculation (AF) and Historical Curtailment  |

### **Exhibits Used for Rebuttal Report to Brendecke Expert Report**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Exhibit 8211 | Reach gain decline in the near Blackfoot to Milner reach (Figure 7-31)   |
| Exhibit 8212 | Comparison of monthly-average Snake River reach gains showing the decline between historic and recent periods including the 1930s drought and the more-recent drought in 1992, 1994 and in the 2000s.      |
| Exhibit 8213 | Reach gain declines in the nr Blackfoot to Milner reach (from Table 7-4)   |
| Exhibit 8214 | Relationship between declining TFCC monthly natural flow diversions and the declining reach gains in the near Blackfoot to Milner reach during the middle of the irrigation season. (Figure 7-32)          |
| Exhibit 8215 | Correlation of Blackfoot to Milner reach gains and permitted ground water irrigation on the ESPA.  |
| Exhibit 8216 | Double-mass curve analysis for Blackfoot to Milner for May to Sept reach gains (upper graph) and July-Aug reach gains (lower graph) compared to unregulated Snake River flow into the America Falls reach. |

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Exhibit 8217 | Comparison of TFCC Daily and Cumulative Daily Natural Flow Diversions – 2003 (Figure 8 - 1)  |
| Exhibit 8218 | Comparison of TFCC Natural Flow Diversions - Dry Years (Table 8 - 1)   |
| Exhibit 8219 | Comparison of NSCC Daily and Cumulative Daily Natural Flow Diversions – 2003 (Figure 8 - 2)  |
| Exhibit 8220 | Comparison of NSCC Natural Flow Diversions – Dry Years (Table 8 - 2)   |
| Exhibit 8221 | Comparison of total SWC natural flow diversions – dry years (Table 8 - 3)  |
| Exhibit 8222 | Comparison of TFCC natural flow diversions in the 1930s and 2000s drought.   |
| Exhibit 8223 | Comparison of NSCC natural flow diversions in the 1930s and 2000s drought.   |
| Exhibit 8224 | Comparison of SWC natural flow diversions in the 1930s and 2000s drought.  |
| Exhibit 8225 | Table reproduced from USGS Water Supply Paper 774 (pg. 197) showing reach gains in the near Blackfoot (Clough) and Neeley reach.                         |
| Exhibit 8226 | Reclamation Palisades Reservoir Project Planning Report Operation Study Results  |
| Exhibit 8226 | Modeled and observed ground water levels from ESPAM model calibration.   |
| Exhibit 8227 | Modeled and observed reach gains from ESPAM model calibration.   |
| Exhibit 8228 | Transmissivity distribution in ESPAM model showing cell-by-cell variations in transmissivity to account for varying hydraulic properties in the aquifer. |

