

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Tuesday, April 14, 2009
Longmont, CO
South Weld County Building**

Jim Yahn calls meeting to order at 4: 15 p.m.

Any corrections to minutes, please contact Lisa McVicker: mcvicker@qwestoffice.net

Standard Reports:

1) IBCC Report:

Eric Wilkinson: last meeting in Longmont. Good meeting; good exchange; future visions of the state; IBCC looking at various scenarios: five different scenarios: ranging from high/low water demand and high/low water supply. Looking at these projections and trying to find ways to meet these projections. Not claiming that one scenario will be more likely to occur, however, if plan around all of the ranges, and then prepared for all possibilities. Idea is to make decisions that are common to our future, not to branch off until future scenario changes.

Development of strategies: transmountain diversions, for example, will depend on how successful we are on identifying IP&Ps.

Discussion of strategies and alternatives to address the gaps based on developing increments of supplies—looking to how to develop between 100,000 and 150,000 ac ft of new supplies; this new supply would be a combination of projects.

Focus on methods to analyzing these alternatives. Looking at costs as well as implementation. New alternatives for new water supply lower South Platte basin pump back lower Arkansas pump back near La Junta; Green Mountain pump back; big straw from below Grand Junction; Yampa project and Flaming Gorge project.

Risks and alternative: West slope water bank—looking to pre1922 water rights to make available in case of compact call; Blue Mesa Delivery: Colorado has written to Bureau of Reclamation asking of 200,000 ac ft pool and how it could be utilized for compact call; conjunctive use in Denver basin; system wide augmentation in Co River basin (i.e. cloud seeding or desalinization—participate in project in CA and then take like amount of water in CO; Future IBCC meetings: July in Crested Butte; September in Steam Boat; Basins continue to move forward on consumptive and nonconsumptive. Western Slope talking about additional Ag development (ironic given dry up on eastern slope)

Colorado River Compact Water Availability Study: Boyle Engineering: Phase I: looks at historic operations of river – perfected water rights—trying to quantify how much water would be available under the Compact; Phase II will look at impacts of climate change, tree ring studies in trying to synthesize the flows on the river; looking at projected development in CO river basin in CO and other factors that could impact the Co River. This study important to this basin because it will quantify how much CO water might be available to the South Platte Basin. Factors to consider: energy development (385,000 ac ft to develop oil shale), additional consumptive needs in the basin because of growth; climate change that could cut back in amount of water that the river produces and cuts back on the water to which we have a right, and how that water is developed—developed incrementally would make a difference on how this water would be available because of the economy of scale—this could preclude a number of projects that would be precluded because of economic feasibility.

Bert Weaver: Water Bank on West Slope...who are players?

Eric: CO Water Conservation District and Southwest Water Conservation District are taking the lead; Tom Iseman and Nature Conservancy working with them as well to try to define the needs of the water bank and who would participate in order to focus on pre 1922 water rights at this time.

2) CWCB:

Eric Wilkinson: March 17 & 18 in Longmont; workshop that covered same topics at IBCC (see above); remainder of meeting included different discussions: use of Blue Mesa Reservoir for compact compliance; regarding CO's financial woes and impact on CWCB programs; water supply reserve account—CWCB is allocating funds only from individual basin accounts...not enough money for state account; will consider applications at Sept meeting; For South Platte Basin: Partnership with Central for \$105,000 and Northwest Council of Govt's grant from Colorado River Basin—needs assessment--\$315,000 to apply to Nature Conservancy for nonconsumptive.

Colorado River Water Availability study money approved.

Grant to South Metro Water Supply for capacity in east pipeline \$5million to buy capacity in that pipeline.

Financial position of the state and vis a vis the projects that CWCB construction fund funds—will look at this during May meeting; CWCB may be challenged for prioritizing of loans—will look at old prioritization of loans because more requests than money.

Perpetual basin account may not be funded.

54 segments recommended for 2010 investigations; two in South Platte on Clear Creek—recommended by City of Louisville—

Recommendations by CO River—confluence of the Blue to the Eagle—large instream flows that could impact development of the CO River. These are important to east slope because of the diversions.

In 2009, instream flow moved forward: 19 more, 2 in AK, none in South Platte

Discussion on Wild and Scenic on these same reaches of the river; BLM wants alternative to Wild And Scenic submitted by June 30—this is becoming a hardship for participants in this study; the board decided to direct staff to write a letter to Sec. Salazar to grant an extension to the stakeholders in this group allowing time to develop alternative to Wild & Scenic; BLM has decided they need to do an air quality study which means that this process will be extended by one year.

Looking to extend instream flows in the Roaring Fork Basin; this would be the first one under the new statute.

Budgetary problems of CWCB: talk about selling the loan portfolio estimated that the \$340 million portfolio would be sold for about 40 cents on the dollar. Significant “uprising” within the water community and enough political pressure that this alternative not pursued, but it is not off the table, but this would be devastating for water projects because this is a revolving fund and the interest and principal is recycled to other loans, thus, if this was sold, there would be no money for loans.

This fiscal year (from now through July 2009) there will be \$45million cut from construction funds; now \$27million cut from combination of construction funds and severance tax for next fiscal year. Thus, hit of \$72million over two years. Also talking about taking back committed funds for loans for projects that have not been commenced. Will take about \$60million committed to AK Valley pipeline. Ironically, last month, Congress authorized the building of the pipeline and now CO is taking back \$30million that would have been used as matching funds to the federal funds...hopefully this will be refunded in 18months to 2 years. At present, estimates

are that \$10million in funds will be available in construction loans. This will affect nonreimbursables such as the state engineers' stream monitoring system, flood emergency response fund.

Thanks to South Platte Basin Roundtable for support of his reappointment.

Jim Yahn: If the interest rate goes up on the loan program, when will that take effect?

Eric: Next fiscal year, start of July (if any money available for loans). Amount of money available: 40-50million for July 2009-July 2010.

Jim Yahn: Republican River Pipeline: is that under contract or can they pull that money?

Eric: KS is saying that this is not adequate; negotiations between NE and KS to build pipeline; KS saying that can't put this in only the North Fork, needs to be in both the North Fork and Republican; so at this point, on hold. If KS is okay with this, that money is still there.

3) Legislative Report:

Dianne Hoppe: Little bit of good news; legislature will adjourn on May 6 ☺ but might be a special session around June 20. Wilkinson's information correct as per money for loans; other item: was a proposal to fund the State Engineer's office out of the increases—

Most of water bills are in appropriation committees or have passed; long bill did pass; House Appropriations was hearing that today and expected to pass.

Construction fund bill is in house appropriations today.

Precipitation harvesting bill is in Senate appropriations.

Species Conservation Trust passed House on 3rd reading and will go to committee shortly.

Doug Rademacher: HB 1067 any info? This is inflow stream flow incentives

Dianne: This in House appropriations; not sure how it will come down.

Bert Weaver: Rain Water harvesting:?

Dianne: passed out of house waiting to be heard in Senate appropriations; they will take this up after the long bill has passed; because of the revenue projections and downturns in revenues the budget has been opened up three times; long bill considers the budget for 2009 and 2010; The pilot study is the House Bill—this one passed and is in Senate appropriations.

SB80 –no fiscal impact; this went back to Senate for concurrence on amendments, Senate concurred; waiting for governor.

Allyn Wind: Status on Pennacol Insurance?

Sean Conway: Governor has a plan to backfill that 300 million with stimulus bill; has told college presidents that he will veto the Pinnacle plan and that governor will use the stimulus money to backfill the higher Ed and that the governor plans to veto the Pinnacle bill

Don Ament: Impacts on ag arena: sales tax exemptions (special fuel tax exemption), sale of farm equipment, sale of dairy equipment, sale of live fish for stocking...elimination of indirect cost caps, potato inspection, eliminate the entire ag marketing division.

Dianne: Are these in the current long bill?

Don Ament: these are mentioned by JBC as to what needs to have a second look if Pinnacle does not go through.

Mike Shimmin: Water Congress has been told that State Engineer's office has 33 open vacancies, ask Jim Hall how that will affect South Platte.

Jim Hall: We have 5 open positions, all important...have 2 commissioners that are due to retire this summer and if these positions cannot be filled, will not have a commissioner on Big Thompson, for instance. Can backfill temporarily. But hopeful that the freeze won't last too

long. Good thing is that overtime was frozen, and the legislature saw how important it is to have the overtime especially during certain times of the year.

4) Education Liaison Report:

Bert Weaver: Invite Nicole to speak about results of the survey that we completed; perhaps she would like to come to the May Joint Basin meeting. If not in May, in June.

Reagan Waskom: Not sure that the results are ready.

Ralf Topper: CWCB severance tax fund project—public workshop in Clear Creek County – objective to enhance groundwater recharge through best management practices and to mimic the preconstruction hydrology of the site...once date is firm, we will offer to the roundtable.

Dianne Hoppe and Reagan Waskom: Colorado Water Foundation Education tour: San Luis Valley June 18-19; go to www.cfwe.org/tour to see information on the tour.

5) Non-consumptive – later in meeting.

6) Phreatophyte Sub-Committee: Bob Streeter:

\$900,000 funding available, grant program. 5-7 proposals that will be put forward; great that we have so many projects to come forward

Under plant-invasive – Go to Weld County Web Site under weeds; this is the overall plan for entire basin; Upper Tributaries (Boulder County, City of boulder, Longmont, Lafayette, Louisville) (maximum is 200,000 minimum is 10,000)—proposals due by April 27, decision will be made by May 21; North Poudre will put forth \$50,000 for Larimer Cty area on North Fork of Poudre; Larimer County Youth Conservation Board (all require 50% match..half of that cash); Front Range Community College—professor has ongoing project, has put together a partnership—Ft Collins, Loveland, Open Space (25,000), Weld County – 40,000 total with 2 projects; Morgan Cty Conservation District with DOW on Main Stem; Logan County looking for match; folks are gearing up for work in the field—

Harold Evans: Will all 900,000 be granted at the same time?

Bob Streeter: Depends if there is significant money left after the proposals than will ask if that money can be reserved.

Eric Wilkinson: Similar situation with Ag dry up, we held up 500,000 for subsequent applications if indication if there are projects there, then board would look favorably and hold back money.

Bob Streeter: Will be developing and maintaining a database for proposals that can be used as examples of proposals in the future; also will maintain data base of maps of projects that have been completed.

Jim Yahn: Great that Morgan County is on board.

Bob Streeter: Conservation district has exceptional employee who is willing to help.

Jim Yahn: Brandy Bueller in Logan County might be able to use some help.

Bob Streeter: Looks like this will be a piece meal approach but this is a good beginning.

7) Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee:

Matt Lehmberg: Project Director for the Grant. The contract has been signed and we are waiting for full execution; want to keep everyone up to speed as it progresses.

Jim Yahn: Projects?

Don Ament: Scope of work has been laid out;

Platte River Recovery Program—University of NE—found sturgeon upstream endangered Pallate Sturgeon—might have habitat in the Platte River; new issue—if we are habitat for the sturgeon—new issue.

II: Announcements: combined meeting on Wednesday, May 13: 10 am to 3 pm in Tech Center; focus is to be on Ag transfer, conservation, new projects—Metro, AK and South Platte. Lots of brain storming thus would be helpful if as many of us can show as possible.

III. Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment

Tom Iseman: Good feedback from last meeting on Non-consumptive needs and data on maps; thus subcommittee has been working on addressing comments; CDM assisting; new set of maps; have been working on the data that describes the attributes on the maps.

Executive committee meeting prior to this meeting decided that the best way to progress is to divide into four different areas:

- 1) High Plains: Lincoln, Kit Carson, Cheyenne, Yuma and Phillips (NE)
- 2) Lower Platte: Morgan, Sedgwick, Logan and Washington,
- 3) Northern: Boulder, Larimer, Weld and Broomfield
- 4) Upper Mtn: Gilpin, Clear Creek, Park and Teller

Because Jefferson County is in both Metro and South Platte, Jefferson County will be part of Metro needs assessment; this important for statewide perspective is that it gets included in one area—Metro—for both consumptive and nonconsumptive

We will break into these groups: 1) look at maps and see how presentation of data has been changed and then look with local knowledge about anything missing and 2) what environmental and recreational aspects are important. Go from the set of maps with many different attributes—to narrow four or six places or attributes that are important. For example, in lower South Platte: migrant birds and need for water. So look at places or issues that are important so that we can narrow this presentation to

Jim Yhan: the executive committee met today, beginning at 2, so that we could focus on this so it can be done by the end of June.

Harold Evans: When you look at maps, lots of data and lot of it site specific...how do we identify important needs that we want to include in our needs assessment—appeared that there would be a few areas that will be important—for example, the Arikaree we have funded, the lower South Platte that we have done with Ducks Unlimited and the Ovid project. We have to leverage what we have already spent. So we will look at our areas and see if there are overlaps—for example, in the North area we have funded the Shared Vision Project—this is a defined stretch of the river, so we might focus on the fish habitat or the riparian habitat on this stretch of the river. So ask if there are specific stretches of river in our areas where we can make a difference in environmental and rec needs while also focusing on M&I or Ag needs. Arikaree, for example, we can help with the compact as well as put water in river while helping water fowl.

So look at your areas to see if there are areas of concern; for example, in the lower part of the river, are there areas where we know we

- 1) Feedback on maps and 2) priorities in our communities then we will come back together for feedback.

Groups met for 35 minutes.

Dinner Break.

Reconvene at 6:45.

Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment comments from four areas.

Tom Iseman: Reports from the four different areas, also ask that someone from each of the areas work with the Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment to write report.

1) Lower Platte Group:

Jim Yahn: Not a lot going on that shows up until the map on the wetlands, water fowl.

One comment: need for definitions;

Tom Iseman: yes, we will have a sheet that accompanies each map that says what the attribute is and how the data was collected.

Jim Yahn: Want to note that the fact that the very fact that agriculture has developed, these attributes are there—i.e., fish, water fowl, and wetlands were not there before agriculture. Thus, we are concerned that if there is a lot of Ag to muni transfers, this will affect all of these attributes that currently exist and how this will add to the threats to the endangered or threatened species in CO and in NE. Also, want to know what is the baseline for these species; curious about how many data points.

Tom: CO DOW does have this info, and we will explain it better.

Joe Frank: Also want to make sure to emphasize that these species of concern are there because agriculture is there and was not before.

Tom: not sure if any data is there in terms of evidence to show the connection between agriculture and rec/environmental values.

Jim Yahn: Not many other comments about the other attributes.

Dianne Hoppe: Also true about development of several of other areas in Weld and Larimer that these species would not be there without Ag.

Jim Yahn: this would also apply to flat river boater; without Ag, not as much water.

Sean Conner: as per issue of return flow, is there info?

Harold Evans: no records.

2) Northern Area:

Les Williams: Northern area: species of concern: frogs, snake, etc., are these areas where they have been found?

Tom: yes, this indicates where they have been found.

Harold Evans: we need to be concerned about these species of concern that these do not become listed as endangered and then we are prohibited from doing anything. In Poudre Basin, these areas of concern already have draft EIS under way and not sure that we want to get into this; because the proposed reservoirs have drawn attention for these studies, not really needed.

Tom: Is there anything that this group could do to help solve some of the issues surrounding the reservoirs, specifically Halligan-Seaman. If areas where we could mitigate risk, we could add these.

Tom Iseman: Main theme: avoid listings.

3) Upper Mountain Counties:

Bert Weaver: Bald Eagle habitat: circles vs. squares; important to look at the data base of the map; the rec map is important...no rec areas at all in Park, Clear Creek or Gilpin. But the data

base shows that the info was gathered from metro areas; so this rec area is very incomplete: this is a map of South Suburban Metro and Boulder.

Tom: Therefore, can we get data from this. And we do have another set of maps that show fishing and boating.

Bert: Suggest then that as per boating: Clear Creek is the 2nd most rafted stream in the state. Suggest going to rafting association. Clear Creek has a paved bike way. Open space commissions, economic and tourism boards, maybe we should add this info to your maps. Incomplete as per recreation. Gold panning.

Janet Bell: There is a master plan that was done for Hwy 19 all around the kayaking for Golden, Jefferson Cty Open Space Master Plan...this area goes up into Clear Creek. JeffCo Open space plan could help as well.

McVicker and John Tighe: Recreation is the biggest attribute; extend designations on Tarryall, on North Fork of the Platte as fishing areas; wild and scenic designation on South Platte? But this has process has already been pursued and there is an effective coalition in place, so need to have a different color or designation in order to show that the Wild & Scenic designation was put on hold because of the coalition that resulted.

Bert Weaver: Recreational in general very important.

Harold Evans: maybe the map on rec goes out because each county has all of these attributes;

Tom: Nevertheless, this is an important value that we highlight.

4) High Plains:

Gene Bauerle: Water supply is limited; our concern with the dry up is that the species such as the turtles and snakes may become endangered. Good to see the pheasants in Yuma county;

Tom Iseman: Nature Conservancy is looking about how to ameliorate the environment for them. Thus, pheasants and a note on shifts because of water management.

Tom Iseman: In conclusion, we will take this info back, narrow the focus and provide better description for the data.

Bert Weaver: Thanks for the changes on the maps and listening to us.

Janet Bell: As each of the Roundtables finishes their non-consumptive use map, will there be a prioritizing of these maps and attributes...how will this be worked out on a state wide basis. How will we weight one attribute over another in terms of how our water is distributed?

Tom Iseman: Each basin started with a common set of data; from there, it is up to each basin as to what they do with each set of information. What is important to people with these rec/env values.

Bert Weaver: Will be interesting to see where we have success in working with projects...look at what we have done with our basin money and to see how the habitat has been improved because of our projects. Would like to see success stories.

III. Consumptive Needs Assessment

Harold Evans: Recap: 1st part one was adoption of SWASI Needs I; part two was refinement done as a task order; part three is the finalization of the 2050 demand numbers that State is working on now; doing this on a county basis. Looking at four areas broken out in the South Platte (High Plains, Lower Platte, High Mtn, Northern)...these would look at demands and supplies in these areas. Will be also important to look at unmet Ag demand. Have thus asked the State consultant to look at unmet ag demand...all irrigation ditches short, wells shut down...but important to quantify the unmet ag demand. This will give us the demand piece; then look at 2050 supply: identified supplies and any new possible projects. For example, in Northern, Halligan-Seaman, = 110,000 ac ft of yield as to what these three projects would yield—not storage. So we need to look at the 2050 supply and demand, and then need

to calculate the unmet need—"unmet gap". The IP&Ps need to be a range of possibilities...such that if 25% of our projects are successful the gap would be x, if 35%, gap would be y..etc.

Once we have a gap we need to look at the strategies for filling that gap; three major areas if one assumes that there are no new IP&Ps. 3 areas: 1) conservation; 2) continued ag transfers; 3) transmtn diversions. Have concluded that there is no unappropriated water; water supplies tapped out. As per conservation, do we take our best informed guess on what our conservation is or do we put forth a range. Executive committee says we should put forth a range. Between 2000 and today, projections are that by 2030 we have saved about 12%, but this was easy to attain. This would be only one piece of the gap. Consultants and State think they can have that done by June, end of fiscal year and end of consultant contract. Thus, 2 discussion points:

- 1) In your areas, any ideas of how to meet that gap and
- 2) What will the conservation be.

John Stencil: Presentations on Miss and Missouri river projects; these are far fetched but should we consider any of these projects that are way out there? We know we need to look at need, but there will not be enough supply.

Harold Evans: State is not looking that far out and this is beyond our reach as a roundtable so we probably ought to leave these to State.

Eric Wilkinson: State is looking to the Yampa and Flaming Gorge; this is under consideration.

Bert Weaver: 385,000 for oil shale.

Eric Wilkinson: Oil shale industry owns ownership of absolute conditional water right to 7.5 million acre feet in Colorado. Historic conditions, the least on compact entitlement is about 308,000 acft for development. River compact say less than 150,000 ac ft with need for development on Western Slope plus global warming...so estimates all over the chart. But 51.7% of upper basin's entitlement and look at historic consumptive use, the higher estimate would be that could be about 400,000 acft to develop.

Joe Frank: We don't know what these answers will look like. Right? That last strategy – transmountain diversions – thus we need to be pushing the other roundtables and the IBCC to look at these other options. Thus, come June we need to push forward on these.

Harold Evans: Once the needs assessment is done with this strong message, what do we do with this? Suggest that we take these four geographic areas and the roundtable invite our elected officials: county commissioners, senators, representatives, mayors...and present this needs assessment to them so that they understand and have a solid knowledge of this. We need to proactively present this needs assessment so that our elected official understands how serious this is. If this presentation comes from the roundtable...grass roots up...diverse group from all over—this would carry more weight. It would be more effective if we could have separate meetings and have these meetings in the four individual areas.

Don Ament: The Colorado Depletions Plan must present at the end of the month and is due to the recovery program which will deal with loss of Ag land, population growth...would be wonderful if we could dovetail with this. Ted Zolkowski putting this together.

Harold Evans: Todd and Nicole should be able to coordinate on this with Ted.

Mike Shimmin: On topic of conservation, to stimulate thought, one thing raised at the IBCC, they studied these alternatives and found a range from 20-40%. Some places have seen this; Denver has adopted the 20% goal. But where 40% came from, not sure. At IBCC, have suggested that we look at this in a dual scenario and separately analyze conservation from existing uses from conservation in future; look at what might be technologically possible in the future as something separate from what we can do now. So, new developers, for example, should be made to build with less water...whether cities will do this, questionable, however, this distinction is out there and these numbers may evolve to draw this line of distinction. In last IBCC meeting, the 40% savings in conservation is the answer to our problems...problematic.

Patron comment: maybe worth looking at actual demand rather than conservation; I am from Aurora...best to look at absolute demand as per indoor and outdoor water use, and then could compare this...

Harold Evans: Fatal flaw...too much difference in cities. Look at Denver...all growth is in dense lower downtown; Greeley, on the other hand, we are warmer, Ft Collins gets more rain...when you look at future demand, you will look at what conservation can do for you. Look at SWASI Phase II has a white paper, good detail analysis of conservation, don't need to revisit this. Find the Conservation Efficiency Report; this is important enough that would be worth to get this copied for people.

Entire menu there from toilets to replacing turf; this is a very complicated area; everyone thinks it is a silver bullet.

Patron: With this conservation, some of this won't mean anything because so many cities are already doing so much of this.

Harold Evans: Our question is how much below 180 per household can we get; City of Greeley already spending significant amount on conservation; dilemma as a provider: my demand number is 150...then in 30 years, your demand is 170..population has grown...fiduciary duty to err on conservative side.

Janet Bell: Mtn areas, wells..important to keep in mind this upper mountain county portion where there are large areas that are not lot based; conservation is possible there, but it is important to look at different types of land use that we see that this goes beyond municipally provided water and to look at smaller areas that operate in our mountain areas.

Larry Howard: Loveland conservation started in 1981 and has been effective, ours is among lowest in State and not sure we can go lower.

Harold Evans: In Greeley, similar; if we could get another 10%, would be lucky. Unless we can change our urban landscape. We will see this change in new developments...will look more like Santa Fe than our towns look now.

Larry Howard: We have made some changes in our municipal codes.

Harold Evans: In the presentation we received earlier, there is a range that shows what can be achieved in these different ranges.

Harold Evans: We need a number to give the State that what we need to close the gap.

Colorado Springs—El Paso rep: We have a huge use of our return flows, and when you have a huge savings via conservation, you are reducing your return flows.

Harold Evans: One of key points in SWASI Phase II – need to look at everything that you do as per what you can do to conserve water. Greeley, for instance, gets a 20% credit for historic return flows, if we did no lawn watering, we would have to get a change plan to get water to the river.

Jim Yahn: Water is used so many times and the return flows are returned so many times, this use is important. South Platte Ag uses is very efficient; the question is how much will we conserve.

Ralf Topper: Water conservation, Ag...as per water demands...85% of water in South Platte used by agriculture; water rights issue. So if you used less water in the Platte, you don't have the return flows in the river.

Eric Wilkinson: In regard to irrigation efficiency in South Platte Basin...75-85% efficient; we consume 75-85% consumed; only 15% goes across state line. Most of water systems downstream of Denver are water short systems; when efficiencies are increase; this is a redistribution of return flows. So if you are flooding a quarter acre, you get the return flow. The inefficiencies of irrigation—crop consumptive use is being met by irrigation techniques...rest of water is running off. If sprinkler is on the same quarter, you actually increase the consumptive use on that land...when move from flood to sprinkling. Wet surface evaporation on flooded irrigation vs. sprinkler probably similar. Aquifer will start to drop, no return flows, no surface runoff, stream flows will drop because return flows are dropping. You are consuming more water. So seniors are fully satisfied but as you progress down the list of priorities the juniors will be dried up because the return flows are not there. The more efficient you make South Platte basin, the

more the lower end of the river will look like it did historically. Inefficient irrigation at the headwaters is what made the lower South Platte basin, with the use of water conservation, junior rights...which in many cases will be munis—will be more water short, rights will not yield, so we will hasten the turn from Ag to munis.

Patron: Sprinkler technology has changed so efficiencies with sprinklers even higher.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55.