

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Tuesday, October 13, 2009
Longmont, CO
Southwest Weld County Building**

Please send any corrections to the minutes to Lisa McVicker: mcvicker@gwestoffice.net

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

Minutes approved as presented.

Standard Reports:

- **IBCC Report:** Request to defer after Todd Doherty's presentation later in the evening; that presentation will summarize demands study.
- **CWCB Report:** Todd Doherty: September meeting: statewide SWRA request: highly competitive; Ft. Morgan canal received grant and loan for recharge project; Roundtable had approved \$250,000 from basin, from statewide: two grants to 650,000. Loan request to cover the project; proponents want to move forward on that basis. 15 grants from statewide account; all were at least partially funded; larger ones received partial funding.
Loan funds available? Yes. \$15 million. Kirk Russel still best contact. The question always exists that anything that is not committed might be pulled back. State wide account is empty; next increment would come in on Jan 1. Nothing before the board until cash is in hand. Moved state wide requests to May from March. July, January, March.
Yahn: Will all these projects go forward even if they only have partial funding?
Doherty: TBD
- **Legislative Report:** Mike Applegate: Interim water committee reported to Water Congress; basin of origin bill will be proposed again.
Shimmin: There is also a bill that will attempt to restructure some of the funding within DNR so that State's Engineers office will get some of the money 5% of tier one money to help fund State Engineer's Office.
- **Education Liaison Report**
Jim Yahn: Sat in on the Education meeting after the IBCC meeting; they are moving forward with education programs within the Roundtables; funding available; need for Bert to stay involved.
- **Phreatophyte Sub-Committee:**
Bob Streeter: No action on this at point.
Todd Doherty: Have put out reports and hoping to get Basin Roundtable input for reports. Needs assessments in all basins have been approved; looking to identify certain projects that can help meet those nonconsumptive needs.
- **Non-consumptive sub-committee:** Bob Streeter :report forth coming.
- **Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee**
Joe Frank: Funding, Todd?

Todd Doherty: Asking currently funded programs for their findings. Will help guide expenditure of \$1.5million; objective is to see if these alternative methods can be a reality. What are the knowledge gaps; what work needs to be done; early winter or spring for criteria guidelines; then Sept, board to consider where next grants will be found.

Joe Frank: Due date on existing grants?

Todd: Open. Concept of utilizing pre-1922 water rights on Western Slope...

Jim Yahn: Re: CO Corn Growers: Would this be a good item to bring here?

Joe: South Platte and the AK...

Todd: Six projects in all; could present each one in 10 minutes or so.

Jim Yahn: This would be a good presentation for one of our meetings.

Todd: Ask applicants to come and present and there is a possibility of finding funding. Will work on it.

Mike Shimmin: Re: Harris Sherman's status: approved by full senate: Undersecretary of Interior. Replacement likely to occur first of November.

Jim Yahn: Has Nature Conservancy replaced Tom Iseman?

Bob Streeter: Will follow up on that.

Jim Yahn: Industrial position is vacant as well. Would be worthwhile to let anyone of interest know about this position.

Presentation on CWCB's draft report on Demands to 2050

Todd Doherty:

Big picture of process and the IBCC: Quest on part of State for Basin Roundtables to help.

1177 process: water needs: basin roundtables have identified consumptive and nonconsumptive needs; in process of water availability of CO River Basin; how to meet needs...ag dryup, conservation, how to mitigate for risks as you develop water resources. One of successful IBCC efforts...finally getting to point of specific questions and tradeoffs...what does that do for ag...west slope impact. Close system...i.e. what do you do when you are using water to extinction. IBCC is building these portfolios and building vision goals. i.e. is it environmentally sound, economically sound, use of water efficiently; these studies will help in extrapolating these scenarios. RFP out for compact compliance study for CO River Basin Study for state's reaction.

Following draft reports are available:

State of CO 2050 Municipal and Industrial Water Use Projections

Nonconsumptive needs assessment Priorities Mapping

Watershed flow valuation tool pilot study roaring fork and Fountain Creek watersheds and site

Evaluation of water supply

Access the reports at: ccwcb.state.co.us

Janet Bell: Can get already printed?

Todd: We will fix the problem on the web.

Key findings of the reports:

--See Todd's reports

Discussion:

Julio Iturreria: If we go out to public, need glossary for this.

Gene Manuello: Ag shortages in reference to ag dryup...what about shortages of food? Need that included.

Mike Shimmin: From IBCC ...this discussion will come later in process. Right now looking at water impacts and then economic and societal impacts to have to choose from these.

Eric Wilkinson: Trying to define the demand that we are trying to meet. For example, ag shortages...not ag dryup, but to analyze in various basins in the state if there are shortages of ag water. For example: Yampa just trying to figure out irrigation, here we are trying to figure out our shortages.

Harold Evans: SWASI was only looking at 2030 ...now taking that out to 2050?

Todd: Yes.

Janet: IP&P...concern is to spell out specifically which project we are looking at instead of the group of projects?

Todd: Exactly: not only for trade-off tool but also to focus on certain projects. Need to be more realistic in terms of tradeoffs. SWASI generalized on the gap; so now can look at if water providers are looking at same source...then can call the question.

By mid-November wants feedback on demands by 2050.

M&I Demands, nonconsumptive needs

(See website referenced above for complete presentation)

Summary of basins needs reports by June of 2010

M&I Report: feedback on demands of 2050 report: population (state demographer out to 2035) plus demands

-updating state water demands: extrapolating from population

Water conservation is on supply side not on demand side; done this way because ag dryup and IP&Ps (fortification of supply) all on supply side of equation. Identified projects and processes...include ag drywup

-not a water shortage right now because of ag dryup

Janet Bell: update on Upper Mtn County Water study: all four counties (Jeffco, Clear Creek, Gilpin, Park) have provided information; now meeting with water providers to assess how much of their supplies are based on surface and how much on wells; this includes EPA and water wells; this data is being accumulated and doing an overlay; the Turkey Creek Basin Study is serving as a model; anticipate that by December that there will be an analysis of supply and demand; and then in the spring looking at sustainability of water within cracked granite.

USGS people being very helpful; advisory committee on which Roy Laes, Walt Knudson, Janet Bell and Bert Weaver have served...Rolf Topper from CO Geo Study is being helpful...so the study is moving forward.

Early spring for report to Roundtable. Problems are looking for an averaging report because the four counties do not deal with land use in the same way so therefore looking at all the basins in the study. Looking at topography and looking at newest satellite highest density definitions in order to make assessment to see if there is a study on that partial or not. Looking at status of well permit...refracted and redrilled...this is the kind of data...also using the Mines study. Roy Laes helped provide the Mines study as well; also looking at recharge.

Back to Todd Doherty:

See handouts on M&I forecasts by County

Email comments to Todd

Report is on line

Please pay attention to basin numbers and demands

Dinner

Eric Wilkinson:

Two reports from July CWCB in Crested Butte meeting; other is from September CWCB meeting in Steamboat springs...questions...call or email Eric.

Todd Doherty continues with report:

Overview of Scenarios, Portfolio, Strategies—demand side strategies and supply side strategies

New Projects and Methods: identified projects continue to be refined;

Development of Portfolios and Evaluation of Water Supply Strategies

--If we let water development to continue as the status quo...what will the state look like in 50 years...what can we do to ameliorate the situation.

Scenario Framework, portfolio framework, status quo scenario and supply portfolio

Questions after Todd's presentation:

Bob Streeter: Timelines for these proposals?

Todd: Summer or autumn to update SWASI; agenda still to be formulated to date. Needs assessment and demands ...comments by mid-November to incorporate into report.

Julio Iturria: Do any of the basins get any more money this year from WSRA?

Todd: Yes, statewide account 73% and Basins got 27%...5.7 million appropriated for this fiscal year. Tier two funding...split between January, March and July. Thus, we have been authorized 5.5 million; received first 40% on July 1; can get another 30% on Jan 1st, March 1...another 30%. Thus no more requests in front of the board until the money is there.

Julio: Therefore, is there a moratorium?

Todd: Yes.

Mike Shimmin: One project tabled for consideration in November.

Janet Bell: Metro, Yampa, AK and South Platte had sent a message to legislature to ask that Blue Mesa be sent back into the plan. Status? Did this roundtable take any action to request that Blue Mesa be added back in?

Mike Shimmin: IBCC Report: yes, this was phrased at IBCC meeting in Sept. Yes, AK sent another message about the resolution. Gunnison was asked for voice of opposition; no they said. Issue thus was diffused in that nothing was decided however Blue Mesa is back on the table to be considered in portfolio and scenarios etc.

Question is: Blue Mesa: part of Aspinall unit; main stem of Gunnison, upper most reservoir?

Most of last IBCC meeting was spent in seeing Todd's presentation about portfolio building tool and giving feedback to CDM and staff of CWCB and what is useful and could be changed. Ultimate question is whether or not we move forward in this direction. Some of scenarios that we looked at in the portfolio picture: example portfolios with IPPs at 25% 50% etc success. What changes the most in these scenarios is how much ag is dried up. CO River Development and Conservation input...IBCC...why is it set up that ag dryup takes the hit if we can't meet the other projects. All in all...pretty positive meeting because West Slope contentment was on-board because ag dryup affects them as much as us. Seemed to be IBCC consensus that ag dryup is problematic: Moffat Cty, Gunnison Cty and Weld Cty all began to realize where feedlots are, where corn comes up...west slope consensus beginning to understand the impacts. The portfolio building tool has helped put focus on helping people be realistic about their position and thinking about the future. Thus, consensus that we need to proceed and the portfolio building tool is a good tool and helps us put this in perspective. West Slope contingent did make clear that we need to know CO Water Availability Study and how much water is there. As that study moves

forward, we will understand better how much of the CO River is developable and this will help us evaluate the other pieces.

Eric Wilkinson: One other thing that was a surprise: 350,000 ac ft of water that would be available for development per the CO River Manager.

Mike Shimmin: Important that half of that water would be for West slope. We are all talking about how to use this water to meet state wide needs. This is helping make some progress..

Eric Wilkinson: After 3 years of discussion, finally getting to point of slow and steady progress. This tool provides a common platform that everyone can sink their teeth into. Can get response from everyone and is helping communications. Example of portfolios from middle of road scenario--no one is pushing a particular project: Sterling, Kersey, La Junta, Blue Mesa, Grand Junction, Mesa, Yampa pumpbacks and Flaming Gorge project. These projects will be evaluated as part of these scenarios.

At the CWCB meeting ... after the IBCC meeting, discussion as per life-cost per project...thinking about certain quantities of water delivered to Barr Lake, for example, as central receiving area of drinkable water supply...reverse osmosis to get water to point where you can run it through filter plant...Flaming Gorge and Yampa could be the most minimal unit cost alternatives because they cranked in the cost of the water rights: i.e., converted rights, brine disposal, refinement, reverse osmosis...divide this by amount of water introduced into the system as reuse...more refinement needed, but these discussions are coming together between CWCB and IBCC.

Mike: Rest of IBCC meeting was update of Phase II of CO River Availability Study and overview of study of CWCB making for municipal water conservation and to come to more detail on what is achievable and how it is achievable. Specific study of conservation possibility.

Harold Evans: Consultant?

Eric Wilkinson: being solicited right now.

Questions:

Gene Manuello: Would like to reemphasize that we need new figures about what drying up ag means to the state economically. We need more figures and a better understanding of what ag dryup looks like. If we use 42% dryup...devastating...

McVicker: "ugly fish and the bird," for one thing...referring to ability of the South Platte to provide habitat for endangered species because of the existence of agricultural irrigation.

Mike: This is why completing the nonconsumptive needs is important..we need the return flows ... this is why we need those return flows...and this can be a push back to the environmentalists on the west slope...can't assume that west slope nonconsumptive needs are more important than east slope. Thus, these discussions are going forward.

Gene: In agreement.

John Stencil: Thinking of Yuma County and the Republican River and the shutting down of the wells...the impact on the economy is significant. Several questions: ag transfer is on supply side...I would like to know what the demand is for ag water. Has anyone determined what the farmers want to keep irrigated agriculture? Also, when SWASI I came out in 2004, with year 2000 as base, this is a better base because of the drought from 2002-2007...better to keep this cycle...do we really know how much water is left in agriculture? We have said 90% 10 years ago...then 80% statewide...I think it is less. Would like to see these numbers. Much has happened in the last four or five years and has not been accounted for...so if you take 75% and then take 40% from that...leaves 30%left.

Jim Yahn: We did address ag in our consumptive needs...i.e. wells that are not pumping now and that there are people who could use that...so part of those numbers are there.

Harold Evans: On diversion basis based on 2005: 2030...short 360,000 acft...thus ag shortage is about 300,000 acft. Based on looking at acreage, and looking at an average of surface and sprinkler irrigation.

Jim Yahn: We did receive a resolution from Yampa White River Basin From 3-5 received. Yampa, White River expresses its willingness to continue its discussions with the Metro, South Platte and Arkansas Roundtables and any project proponent regarding the Maybell Pumpback proposal. I took it as a very positive gesture and that we should continue the discussions.

Eric Wilkinson: One worry is the designation of the Wild and Scenic designation...if the Wild and Scenic goes through, they would get a reserved water right. Seems like Yampa is giving up on pushing back on the Wild and Scenic. BLM was very far forward in eligibility determination on the segments of the river before anyone knew about it.

Janet Bell: This reminds me of the Two Forks issue and how Wild and Scenic was very much far forward. Would it be possible to apply that approach?

Eric: This is what the group was trying to do, but they have given up. Northern, Denver, CO Springs has been involved in a similar situation on Gore Canyon. This process has been in place since 2007; BLM and Forest Service are moving forward with Wild and Scenic evaluations and CO River is at suitability stage. We are attempting alternative to Wild and Scenic...but...

Jim Yahn: Is it worthwhile to offer help...lost cause?

Eric: Good to keep them up on their offer and keep communications open; if possible to build up enough political force and they go for designation...only way to go against it is to have Congress undesignated it...long shot.

McVicker: Go for it.

Shimmin: Salazar and Harris Sherman in Forest Service have a strong voice at that level.

Janet Bell: Even though Yampa is backing off, if we understood what made them back off, maybe to help understand what it takes to muster the political will; we are in a good place to be to help with an intervention. Does not hurt to try.

“Outstanding Remarkable Values” ...

Discussion of disseminating findings from the Consumptive and non Consumptive Needs Assessment:

Review of executive meeting that preceded this meeting. How to disseminate these findings to the four different areas. Mountains, Lower, Northern and High Plains...Republican Basin and Upper Mtn Counties still working on their needs. So Lower Platte and Northern counties will begin. Start with Northern Counties: Weld, Larimer and Boulder: December 17: Presentation to elected officials and water districts in those counties; media; legislators. Invite Metro roundtable members. Working on the agenda; please forward input on agenda or best way to present.

Location: Larimer Cty Fairgrounds facility (Doug Rademacher working on it) at about 1 in the afternoon. Once this presented, move to Lower Platte in 2010 for presentation.

John Stencil: Service clubs would be good to include; important to invite all of farm orgs.

Doug Rademacher: Have about 1200 invitations to be sent out; thinking 300-500 people to show up without some of these groups.

Jim Yahn: Might have to do this in stages; focusing at first on elected officials; perhaps have another one that includes all the ag groups and chambers of commerce.

John Stencil: Just important that we not leave out ag groups.

Jim Yahn: Inviting water districts would include some of the ag groups. In the lower river, there would not be so many people and all of the ag and community service would be important.

Harold Evans: Once we present to elected officials, then present to agricultural, community service.

Doug Rademacher: First the policy makers.

McVicker: Agenda: Where we have been, where we are going.

Jim: Who will present this? In lower parts, important for local to present. From Northern...

Harold Evans: presenters who are perceived as neutral ... we will be sensitive to this. Thanks to Doug for all the assistance in getting this together.

Jason from Boulder: Would it be useful to put on the invitation that there will be a series of meetings?

Doug : Yes, any suggestions: email to Doug.

John Stencil: Ag water alliance meeting is on Dec 1. Ag water summit; at Jeffco

Discussion of future role of the South Platte Basin Roundtable

Todd Doherty: For instance, number of meetings per year.

Then, direction. AK Basin heading in another direction. 1177 had the roundtables identify consumptive and nonconsumptive needs; then also to identify projects that will meet those needs. Basin might need to take a look at the IP&P in the basin and how can the basin assist each project and support those projects, and if there is a gap...how to go about filling that gap. AK Basin attempting this. Outreach to other basins (Yampa) or if IP&P is not successful and if new water not developed...if there is ag dryup how will the basin deal with that.

As per procedural issue, can look at alternatives. For instance, Gunnison is now meeting 9 months of the year.

Janet: Re: Issues around drought planning process...fits into portfolio, concern in going to task force on drought planning...no connection in the roundtable process and water availability; seems like we should devote a night to this process. These things work together, seems like they should be invited. Baselines in drought planning are not the same baselines being used tonight.

Harold Evans: Unless you are a water provider who has means to make a project happen, nothing can be generated. So what really is the role of the roundtable; real action seems to be at the IBCC.

Bruce Gerck: Brief time tonight when we were discussing realization of meeting needs on both sides of the mountain; would be a shame to slack up and not press the communication between the different round tables and basins such as responding to the Yampa...90% done and 10% finished. We can't let up too much. We don't want to lose our communication. Would hesitate to go to part time status. Not 12 meetings but not part time status. Finally there is some communication.

Todd: Several roundtables have met quarterly and if they needed a special meeting called special meeting.

John Stencil: As per 1177, communication and support for projects is clear directive ... but we cannot be an advocacy group; but if we are supporting projects and decide to meet 9 months a year and the other months meeting with other roundtables to communicate what our desires are...makes great deal of sense. Important to continue to inform the people; incumbent on this group.

Phyllis: The law does say we also provide a form of education.

Mike Shimmin: Act focuses on what jobs we need to do; we need to ask what jobs we have and what means do we have to get those jobs done. New task now that needs assessment are done. Now our efforts are less defined and we need to figure out what we are doing...we need to mesh our meetings with the IBCC meetings; I need and IBCC needs the feedback from this group. Next IBCC meeting is scheduled for Dec 2; thus would like to keep our meetings in consideration so that we have roundtable meetings before or after.

McVicker: opines a few less would not be detrimental.

Bob Streeter: go for fewer meetings; but puts more onus on subcommittees and executive committee; would like that on November agenda discuss role of subcommittee.

Adjourn meeting at 8 pm