

**South Platte Basin Roundtable**  
**Tuesday, June 9, 2008**  
**Longmont, CO**  
**Southwest Weld County Building**

Please send any corrections to the minutes to Lisa McVicker: [mcvicker@gwestoffice.net](mailto:mcvicker@gwestoffice.net)

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

Introductory remarks:

**Jim Yahn:** Best wishes to Les Williams for speedy recovery.

**Harold Evans:** Introduces Pam Shaddock, Regional Representative to Rep. Udall. Has toured water projects. Ms.Shaddock distributes info on **Grants Workshop** on June 25, 2009, 11:30 to 5, Evans Community complex, 1100 37<sup>th</sup> Street, Evans, CO, with purpose of providing info on available grants from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) as well as other grant opportunities from the federal government. Local officials, local staff, members of non-profits and small businesses encouraged to attend. RSVP to [Grants@MarkUdall.senate.gov](mailto:Grants@MarkUdall.senate.gov) or by calling Judy Eaton, City of Evans at 970-475-1165. A similar workshop will be presented at Morgan Community College in Fort Morgan on July 30<sup>th</sup>. Ms.Shaddock can be reached at [Pamela\\_Shaddock@MarkUdall.senate.gov](mailto:Pamela_Shaddock@MarkUdall.senate.gov) or at 970-290-7720.

**Pam Shaddock:** Good teacher in Harold Evans for water tour; thanks for invitation and we look forward to helping in any way they can.

**Standard Reports:**

- **IBCC Report:**

**Mike Shimmin:** Next IBCC meeting in Crested Butte on July 20, held back to back with CWCB. No report.

**Jim Yahn:** Question to Todd: Will you report to IBCC the information presented at the joint meeting in May?

**Todd Doherty:** Yes; will have summary of those.

- **CWCB Report:**

**Eric Wilkinson:** Had meeting in Pueblo on May 19 & 20; discussed budget crisis; will hit CWCB to tune of \$271million over next two years; also had discussion about future water supply, similar to that during joint meeting. Election of officers; Eric is now Vice Chair.

In stream flows: Board authorized a total of 16 reaches in Division 2, Division 4, and Division 5. 19 proposed on three instream flows in Division Two;

Water acquisitions for instream flow: Roaring Fork hearing in November; also, at confluence of Fraser and CO; also instream flow donations that have been made in Division 5, changes need to be made there in accordance with Statute.

Changes in the lending rate for construction fund and perpetual base account: Have deviated from guidelines in past; compromise between 2009 and in 2010—commercial and industrial at 6.25% (up ¾%), high municipal at 5.25%, municipal middle income at 4.5%, municipal low percent, 4%, ag at 2.75%. All these for 30 year loans; drops .25% for each 10 year reduction in term.

Deauthorized loan for Dolores District: \$3.5 million; therefore, able to make additional loans. Two loans for South Platte area: North Sterling: spill way improvement and dam improvement and Riverside spill way project, both 30 year loans.

CWCB undertaking review of Water Supply Reserve Account: Considered five applications, none in South Platte; all out of basin accounts as not enough funds in statewide account.

Tamarisk Control Program: \$900,000 of grants for 13 different projects; \$10,000-100,000; three not funded; four: Republican Basin: \$225,000; very good applications, thanks to Bob Streeter, should be complimented for work he did for South Platte.

Board approved \$150,000 to CFWE, look at their strategic plan; recommendation to CFWE is that plan should be stepped up to educate legislators early in the session.

**Bert Weaver:** How do state flood plans look different from state?

**Eric Wilkinson:** Not significantly, example on high emergency locations like hospitals. Effects of levies; federal guidelines looking at discounting the benefits of levies because of recent experience with levees.

**Jim Yahn:** You are on the subcommittee about how the funds are split between basin and statewide, yes?

**Mike Shimmin:** Perhaps this roundtable should raise the topic about how much money should be designated to statewide and how much to basin wide. CWCB will be addressing this; therefore, two tiered approach to this; we need to address this in order to give Eric Wilkinson some input on this on how to allocate next year's money.

**Eric Wilkinson:** 27% to basin funding, 73% to statewide; some roundtables want more put into basin accounts so that basins can use it within their own basins. However, if you look at historic use of funds, before shortfall, the split was very close to the applications that were being received. It would help me if the roundtable would give me indication. I have felt that the historic experience shows this is okay and the spirit of the water supply basin account is to be used to go to projects for statewide benefit but I will carry whatever message you direct.

**Lisa McVicker:** Moves that we continue with the approximately the 27%/73% split between the basin and state accounts per the spirit of HB 1177.

**Harold Evans:** Seconds.

**Jim Yahn calls question; motion carries unanimously.**

- **Legislative Report:**

**Dianne Hoppe:** Legislation out of session; next week, Water Resource Review Committee will be joining the Water Education Foundation for Rio Grande tour; good place to lobby the legislatures; dates: June 18-19; will leave from Alamosa;

Water committee schedule is in Crested Butte to meet with CWCB and IBCC; public hearing there to discuss issues; will meet throughout the summer re: proposed legislation;

Basin of Origin Bill has been introduced by Rep. Pace; considering that HB1177 was passed in order to preclude Basin of Origin bills that were so contentious, this proposal will be interesting to see.

Committee's focus will be on budget issues for Division of Water Resources.

**Jim Yahn:** Governor signed a few bills into law; one of them was funding of Roundtable Process.

**Todd Doherty:** June 22-23, subcommittee that reviews criteria guidelines for that program will meet to decide best allocation between basin wide account and statewide; previously, basically, it was 30/70%—basin to statewide. Rep Curry had opined that more should be allocated to basin; will discuss that along with review \$5.7 million is total amount of money, thus, some money coming to roundtables.

In March, statewide funds at about \$1million; also, statewide funds and requests will be looked at in May instead of March because of tier of funds.

Also, projects bill has another \$1.5 million for permanent ag transfer; this is money that funded the corn growers project; thus, this is a sign that the state is supporting the future of ag and looking at some different water management devices.

**Jim Yahn:** Other bills that Governor signed: rain water harvesting program bills—both, the rural and the urban pilot project which is a 10 year study; rural rain harvesting bill only applies to properties that already have an exempt well or could have one; theory is that as long as the limits on use are the same, it should not change total consumptive use.

**Don Ament:** If you collect rain water from roof, can you use exempt well for domestic use?

**Mike Shimmin:** Depends on well permit; in-household only or domestic use; the way that bill is written, you are limited to use the water depending on your well permit: 1 acre of lawn or garden.

- **Education Liaison Report**

**Bert Weaver:** CFW is analyzing the results of the survey and will present the results on July 14 meeting at our meeting; July 9 is an education workshop for educational liaisons in order to hone into duties and responsibilities; Chairs of Roundtables are invited, although not required. Regan Waskom: The meeting is in Frisco the idea is to meet with the liaisons and to look at the Science standards for K-12 including water education.

- **Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee**

Tom Iseman will present later.

- **Phreatophyte Sub-Committee:**

**Bob Streeter:** All of the suggestions went forward for a total of \$325,000: Boulder County project: 85,000, Sedgwick 10,000, Weld Cty 30,000, Yuma Cty: 100,000—split between South Platte Roundtable and Republican; thus, proposals in and accepted.

NRCS has projects that are funded under Stimulus Program: Beaver Creek (Morgan and WA counties) received \$2.5million Russian Olive and Tamarisk Control; others approved as well.

- **Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee**

**Joe Frank:** Todd, what are the details of the grant?

**Todd Doherty:** The first grant program was AK/South Platte; CO River Water Conservancy District and Southwest are putting together a pre-1922 water bank; this type of project could fall under the grant program.

**Joe Frank:** When are applications due?

**Todd Doherty:** November for application deadlines for consideration in January or March of CWCB meeting; now is the time to ask public to think about new concepts; criteria guidelines

will not differ hugely from existing program. “alternatives to permanent agricultural water transfer competitive programs in AK and South Platte Basin.”

**Don Ament:** Please expound on third tier. Summary: First kickoff meeting with all participants on June 15 to review scope of work; 2 demonstration projects that include water (Ducks Unlimited program), will do accounting up and down the river, and examine how the details will work.

Third project will be to examine a look at the excess credits that have been generated in existing aug programs and see how those might be move around to those in need. Corn Growers Association has interest in this program and in final numbers as per excess credits and how these excess credits could be utilized.

**Joe Frank:** When study first put together, Ducks Unlimited looking at provider and end user; we wanted to look up and down the entire river—this will look at the real effect on the river.

**Harold Evans:** Key is exchange potential to get excess to places where there are shortages.

**Jim Yahn:** When first started, looking for ditch company to step up, no success, so DU came in as water owner; what this does is that it represents a group further down the river, from Kersey on down, thus, more of a water coop and one of the first things we will do is to look at the use of credits in agriculture or looking to perhaps moving the credit further up stream where a muni could put it to use; first look is at exchange.

**Harold Evans:** Will this be an additional scope of work?

**Don Ament:** No, DU allowing us to incorporate this and Brown & Caldwell working to include this in original project.

**Harold Evans:** Still does not get us to overcome basic problem of how to get a ditch company involved?

**Jim Yahn:** Our group is a coalition of ditch companies; specific ditch companies that have come together and spearheaded this; once we have a plan on how the potential credits can be used. One of the next steps will be to approach farmers who might look at exchange;

**Joe Frank:** This study will help with the numbers that then we can use to go forward to approach other farmers and ditch companies.

**Jim Yahn:** We are doing this because we know that munis are coming to us, so we need an alternative mechanism rather than drying up the land.

**Harold Evans:** I commend you for being willing to tackle this.

**Allyn Wind:** We support this.

**Mike Shimmin:** If we can get a water coop off the ground, it will be a chance to bundle individuals and water so that if a muni comes looking for the water, the coop can try to put the water together and then the muni can deal with the coop which has bunched up the credits; our preliminary numbers 20,000 acft a year of excess credits, some have been leased, but some not; thus, this coop is a mechanism that would be able to negotiate retiming of credits or release of credits for municipalities.

**Harold Evans:** Would this potentially be a source for the Endangered Species program in NE?

**Mike Shimmin:** All kinds of potential; but this grant will provide number crunching vis a vis details that are important to see if it will work.

**Don Ament:** As per 3 states endangered species, this is moving forward well.

**Jim Yahn:** Over 3,000 acft going out of state today at Julesberg. Kersey leveled off at about 6,000 and stayed there.

**Harold Evans:** Five days of free river in May, now about 6 days of free river now.

**WSRA Grant Presentation and Request—Alluvial Aquifer Storage and Recovery Program (Gary Barber—Chair Arkansas BRT)**

Objective: Provide technical support for the Director of Natural Resources to move the statewide dialogue on underground water storage forward by drawing on the experience of the of the National Academy of Sciences 2007 report on Managed Underground Storage.

-- Groundwater Dependence of AK Basin:

- Denver Basin; many communities that are 100% dependent on groundwater supply;
- depletion around Douglas and Arapahoe counties;
- designated basins: Upper Black Squirrel is focus of supply

Two pronged approach: 1) base study of Upper Black Squirrel Designated Groundwater Basin (CO Geologic Survey, Dec. 2008) 2) peer review of document

--Basin sits atop a bedrock layer of Pierre shale; surface channels are offset from underground channels. 10 years for a water molecule to migrate from one end of basin to the other;

--Depletion began in 1960s: sod farms.

--1964- 2004: 60 ft to water table to 130 ft to water table

--If one were to recharge the aquifer in space that is currently unoccupied, 218,000 acft of storage

--Reports are on IBCC website: conference in Sept. 2007 and peer review: entire reports are series of questions to presenters and opinions and answers

--Replacement = Storage? Differing opinions;

--State engineer's rules for recharge of Denver Basin do not apply to AK.

Future:

--How do quantity and quality work together; how will state permit such a project; should we ask general assembly to give us opportunity to do pilot project.

--Peer Review by DNR of the Conference Report stated:

--organize a small working group with reps from different state agencies to look at aquifer recharge and recovery issues (DWR, Ground water Commission, AG, CGS, and CWCB); some of the questions:

--to what degree can aquifer recharge and recovery projects be implemented in the current reg and legislative environment?

--what are the main hurdles to overcome under current laws and regs?

--how might the development of an alluvial recharge and recovery project differ depending on whether the proposed project is in a designated basin or not?

--would a "road map" showing potential steps to be taken by an applicant be useful?

--would new legislation be helpful?

**Harold Evans:** Point of order: Per our bylaws: we were to get this grant request one week before our meeting; perhaps should postpone decision until July meeting.

**Gary Barber:** When I approached the Roundtable several months ago, was told we had no money.

**Jim Yahn:** Still don't have money; won't know until after CWCB meeting, correct?

**Todd Doherty:** Correct, will not know basin funds until after July CWCB meeting.

**Gary Barber:** Has presented to Rio Grande; reaction...maybe. Rio Grande opined that this could be useful for answering CO River call.

**Julio Iturreria:** Will you be presenting tomorrow at Metro meeting?

**Gary Barber:** No, will be chairing the AK meeting; Courtney Brand may be approaching. Thank you and would take to the CWCB meeting at their July meeting. Basin only account.

**Bert Weaver:** Move that we postpone action on this until September because of money and bylaws, per members who are not present.

**Harold Evans:** Please review money situation, Todd.

**Todd Doherty:** We need consent from CWCB board and IBCC; thus, will know in July after meetings in Crested Butte.

**Mike Shimmin:** Another contingency, we are waiting for economic update to see about next year's budget; if more grim than expected, some of this money could go away.

**Mike Applegate:** When do submittals have to be made to CWCB—60 days?

**Todd Doherty:** Yes.

**Lisa McVicker:** Has heard presentation at joint meeting and heard presentation at groundwater forum in 2007. Opines that it is a good project.

**Mike Applegate:** Also think that support of it would send signal to water board that we are interested in pursuing groundwater possibilities.

**Mike Shimmin:** I have not had the chance to read the application as it was sent out this afternoon. I have strong opinions about this concept; recently, involved in Lost Creek Basin where there are multiple proposals being made in a speculative context in trying to find ways to use the unsaturated capacity; putting water in aquifers that are not contained, is not storage; my client in Upper Black Squirrel is an underground river; water does not stay put; these projects, in my opinion are not abstract concepts; they can be done; these are not unfamiliar concepts. Personally, it will be a hard sell to study the concept—as to whether we can do this? Yes, I believe, we can do it. The question comes forward as to will some one do it; question is where will the water come from; this is not an abstract question. Each is a site-specific project – these are not abstractions; puzzled, thus, about the need to spend money to talk about this as an abstraction. I have only seen these documents for the first time tonight.

**Jim Yahn:** Motion on the table to postpone until October. No second. Motion off the table.

**Bert Weaver:** I will make a Motion to continue until July.

**Mike Shimmin:** Second.

**Jim Yahn:** Discussion?

**Gary Barber:** I don't disagree with Mike Shimmin; however, I don't believe that Black Squirrel has resources to manage the aquifer like Orange County, for example. 65 groundwater act, 69 administrative act: Is prior appropriation, one lawsuit at a time, the right way to manage groundwater? The purpose to push forward is to try to get state agencies to understand that this is being done in KS and OK; would like to see 30,000 acft that is lost to evaporation in my basin being able to put in aquifer.

**Kevin Lust:** Agree with Mike Shimmin that laws are in place but don't believe that we have the administrative will to go forward with this. Challenge is that something this innovative will ever happen.

**Harold Evans:** Motion is to consider this in July; this gives us time to have any application to CWCB in September and gives us time to look at this and think about this; members of this Round Table need to give this due consideration; waiting to July makes sense: leaves issue open for consideration and gives us time to think about it.

**Jim Yahn calls question:** Wait until July meeting to consider the application; motion carries unanimously.

#### **Discussion of Blue Mesa Resolution**

**Harold Evans:** At joint meeting with AK and Metro, there was a presentation entitled "Overview of Strategies to Meet CO's Future Water Supply"; new supply development: new reservoirs, newsources, transbasins; four concepts: Green Mt Pumpback, Yampa Pumpback, Flaming Gorge Pumpback, CO River Return. My understanding that these are being discussed by IBCC; felt a glaring omission of Blue Mesa; when asked why Blue Mesa not considered; Jennifer Gimbel stated that the State was holding it back for compact compliance; this is a disservice to CO based on political needs; not fair to our roundtables (South Platte, AK and Metro); if we are unable to put project forward, we will suffer tremendously; thus want to put Blue Mesa back on table.

After discussion of language of the original resolution presented (see below),

**Harold Evans moves:**

#### **Blue Mesa Resolution:**

The South Platte Roundtable hereby requests that the IBCC and the CWCB, as part of developing "Strategies to Meet Colorado's Future Water Supply," include Blue Mesa Reservoir as a potential source of supply. Blue Mesa would be part of the "New Development" analysis that is currently being conducted. This analysis already includes the following: Green Mountain, Yampa River, Flaming Gorge, and Colorado River Return.

The South Platte Roundtable feels that a comprehensive look at future water supply should include Blue Mesa Reservoir. It is recognized that the Colorado River Availability Study and input from the Gunnison Roundtable will be part of evaluating Blue Mesa.

The South Platte Roundtable also requests that the Arkansas Roundtable and the Metro Roundtable make a similar request that Blue Mesa be part of a study to meet Colorado's future water needs. The Chairman of the South Platte Roundtable shall formally request the Arkansas and the Metro Roundtable to consider such action.

**Julio Iturreria:** Seconds

**Bob Streeter:** Could we have a presentation on this before voting on the resolution because I would like to know how this does fit with the CO compact?

**Harold Evans:** Part of the Aspinall project, federal project, US Bureau of Reclamation project built to help

CO use its entitlement out of CO compact; could be up to 200,000 for CO; now, we will consider Blue Mesa for compact but not for future water supplies; understanding is that this is driven by one individual rep in legislature; my position is why should this be taken off the table to at least be looked out not only for CO compact but also for the possible sources of water.

**Tom Iseman:** Nature Conservancy has worked for endangered species on CO River Basin; this includes both west slope and Front Range; one of the things we are looking at is how to use Aspinall Unit and how to meet flow recommendations to try to recover endangered fish. Thus, we raise concern about how this would affect recovery, same as Yampa pumpback. That said, I don't see why there should not be a study of it; endangered fish would be one concern, however.

**Harold Evans:** The resolution addresses that the Blue Mesa needs to be studied along with the others; all the projects have issues. Mike, as rep on IBCC, this would give you direction; your comments?

**Mike Shimmin:** Two questions: 1) as per timing, in terms of what is already underway with the CWCB and water resources, if we ask to include Blue Mesa, how will this fit with what is already in progress? And what concept do you have in mind for Blue Mesa? I heard Jennifer's answer; seems like it is there as a concept: to meet the compact call and to meet endangered species calls.

**Todd Doherty:** At this point, probably will take off Big Straw project, through Roundtable and IBCC feedback, not feasible. Thus, this could be possible.

**Harold Evans:** I am open to wordsmithing; I used the word concept because of the presentation at the joint meeting.

**Mike Shimmin:** Everyone making clear that the studies being done are not of a particular concept; for example, the Green Mtn pumpback is well developed per where water would come from and where would it go, likewise with Yampa and Flaming Gorge, based on past work, are fairly well developed. Thus, I think we need to be more specific about what we are talking about when we say "concept."

**Harold Evans:** My intent was that it should be considered as a potential source of supply. I don't disagree with Mike's comments. This roundtable process is to be grass roots; do we want to give some feedback or hear only from the government agencies in a top down approach? (Harold Evans amends resolution to delete word "concept" such that it reads as it appears above.)

**Jim Yahn:** With the changes to the resolution (as it reads above), calls for the vote: In favor of adopting this resolution and encouraging the Metro Basin and AK Basin to do the same: Unanimous.

**Mike Shimmin:** Question: Is it your intent, Harold, that we wait for the other two roundtables, or do we carry this back to the IBCC?

**Harold Evans:** No, it is not my intent to wait for the other two roundtables; I think that we should take this to the IBCC and that the Metro or AK will see our intent and lead.

**Janet Bell:** It is on the agenda for the Metro Roundtable tomorrow.

**Gary Barber** acknowledges passage of the resolution by this roundtable.

#### **August South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting:**

**August 11, 2009**

**Jim Yahn:** During our August meetings in the past years, we have met at a different location and have had a tour; we have been to Ft. Morgan and to South Park, previously. Perhaps a meeting on the Poudre; tour the Seaman reservoir site and the Glad Reservoir site; Harold and Eric (from Northern) would be available to speak with us.

**Harold Evans:** Windy Gap site, then travel to Seaman and Glade. Ft. Collins has a park, we could start at the park and have lunch and then travel to Glade and Windy Gap. Also, picnic site at Flat Irons.

**Jim Yahn:** Start at lunch and take the afternoon. Northern has done these tours and would have an idea of time; briefing over lunch time; 15-20 minutes at each location; future reservoir sites, although at Seaman, spillway is there. Todd said that state could contribute money for lunch or van.

**Lisa McVicker:** Will ask Viola to send out announcement and request for RSVP asap.

#### **Dinner**

**(Eric Wilkinson presents CWCB report; see above.)**

#### **Status of Consumptive Needs Assessment**

**Todd Doherty:** By beginning of July, should have the needs assessment wrapped up. Hal Simpson working on this.

**Jim Yahn:** Will this be ready before July meeting?

**Todd Doherty:** We will shoot for that; a bit close.

**Harold Evans:** Everything falling in place okay?

**Todd Doherty:** Yes.

#### **Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment—Request for BRT Approval**

**Tom Iseman:** Will not ask for approval at this time as per agenda.

Update: At last meeting here, in April, we broke into areas of the basin that correspond to the areas c  
Upper Mtn Areas

High Plains Area

Northern Area

Lower South Platte Area

We wanted to break out the subareas and look at the most important attributes in each area, in order to find focal areas for nonconsumptive areas; took feedback and worked to find focal areas; met with executive committee; decided to break maps in four different focal areas and to describe them separately. Have four maps, corresponding to the different areas; note title: "Candidate Environmental or Recreational values (acknowledging that this is the first phase of the process; thus showing that we are only at the first phase and will later move into what we will actually do.)

Note that there is a table for each map: areas highlighted and the reason why they are highlighted; this is based on the feedback received from the roundtable in April.

Will put the maps around four different corners of the room; please review.

Our goal is to have first phase maps approved in July and be ready to ask for approval in July; therefore, asking for feedback tonight, then we will circulate your feedback, then have it to the roundtable before July meeting.

**Harold Evans:** Need to define terms and be very clear in the definition of the key specific terms.

**Tom Iseman:** Currently also have a package that will describe the process, it will include definitions, information on the species themselves and how the data was gathered.

Asks for people present at the meeting to take 10 minutes to look at maps and give back feedback.

Comments on review?

**Harold Evans:** Note comments written on maps; important to get them revised and out to membership as soon as possible, most likely at least one more iteration, so the earlier you can get them out, the better, so that we could actually vote on them in July.

**John Stencil:** What is the time table for the consumptive and nonconsumptive needs assessments?

**Todd Doherty:** For consumptive, shooting by July meetings.

**Tom Iseman:** We hope to complete this phase of the project and then move forward, but there is no deadline.

**Mike Shimmin:** My understanding is that the fiscal year is over on June 30, and we are attempting to finish as soon as possible. One comment: when big map was broken into four parts, there are parts on certain maps that appear on another map without the key, so it is important to grey out the peripherals and make sure that the titles are correct.

**Bert Weaver:** Will you provide the narrative?

**Tom Iseman:** Yes, we will send out the data and the narrative that describes the process, the terms, etc. package of material in addition to the maps.

**Bob Streeter:** More info that you can actually put on the maps would be beneficial to the viewer.

**Janet Bell:** This is phase one; if all basins are doing this, this means that much rec and environment across the state; is there money with what will be happening in Phase 2 which will be studying which are the best fish, or the best waters for rafting, etc. How will the comparison of the various attributes for priorities of nonconsumptive use go forward?

**Jim Yahn:** We, as a roundtable, will be the one to set our priorities. It is a similar process of working through the consumptive use—is the west slope farm more important, is the west slope fish more important...this is not the focus of our needs assessment.

**Janet Bell:** On a state wide basis, how will the criteria be determined as to how to prioritize these attributes?

**Bob Streeter:** It will not be a matter of what is more important but rather that as a basin, in this basin, we will point out and determine what are the most important attributes and then we will be able to go forward in order to maintain or enhance these attributes. This effort is being put forward to help enhance these attributes through partnerships in the basin.

**Janet Bell:** But if we import water from somewhere else, will this be at a detriment of another basin?

**Ken Huson:** We will not be making allocation decisions; the value of what is happening is the fact that the State put forward the SWASI report and identified municipal water demands; after this, we all identified other important demands; thus, to make all of the decisions that need to be made, we have to get past understanding only municipal demands, but agricultural demands as well. We have never looked at nonconsumptive uses of water and our citizenry is saying that these values are important to us. Thus, on a statewide basis, we are attempting at least to understand these attributes, and we have to have this on the table before we can even begin the conversation about allocation. We have to be careful that we are not pulling water off of the Platte and ag lands, and the loss of the return flows will destroy some of these nonconsumptive, important attributes. Thus, it is critically important as a roundtable that we trumpet our needs and values. This effort to identify our needs must be pushed forward.

**Tom Iseman:** Thanks to Ken for eloquent summary.

**Bert Weaver:** This latest iteration is great; getting better all the time.

**Harold Evans:** Thank you, Tom Iseman, for all the time you have put into this effort.

**Jim Yahn:** Other issues?

**Bert Weaver:** Update on Upper Mtn County Study: Counties are putting in info, data development under Hal Simpson's direction.

**John Stencel:** As per announcement from Udall's office regarding federal stimulus money (see above announcement), could this roundtable secure any of these monies for a project?

**Jim Yahn:** Seems possible. Any ideas for agenda items for July meeting, please let Todd or Jim know.

**Harold Evans:** Once we get nonconsumptive needs done, whether we need to meet monthly or not.

**Next meeting: July 14, 4-8pm**

Adjourn: 7:25 p.m.