

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Tuesday, January 12, 2010
Longmont, CO
Southwest Weld County Building**

Please send any corrections to the minutes to Lisa McVicker: mcvicker1@q.com (NOTE: Change of email address.)

Jim Yahn calls meeting to order at 4:20 p.m.

Standard Reports:

- **IBCC Report:** Eric Wilkinson: Last meeting was on Dec 2 in Denver. Continuation of looking at models developed by CDM and the CWCB, looking at the different models for water needed by CO by 2030: IP&Ps, conservation, ag dryup, new water development. Breakout groups all had similar results—each group had a slightly different variation on the choices but all results evidenced that there would be a direct trade-off between, for example, development of new water from Western Slope and ag dryup or conservation and ag dryup or IPPs and ag dry up; all models did include some ag dryup. Careful look at conservation. Approach was the middle supply, middle demand of model.

Also on agenda was discussion of the Colorado Water Availability Study; some results were discussed; study considers output of range of water; shows that Southwest parts of state will be impacted the most by climate change; Phase 2 will commence this year to determine water availability now that needs assessments have been completed. Looking at range of climate models evidences range of studies.

Next meeting of IBCC is March 5 in Denver.

Eric Hecox: During the breakout sessions of the IBCC, all groups came back with slightly different portfolios, yet, the group as a whole did indeed begin to coalesce around some of the same options. Thus we will reduce this to a portfolio that we can present.

Eric Wilkinson: Highest conservation percentage was about 30% on 2000 levels, meaning that if one looks at the 2008 levels (from 2000-2008, statewide was 11%, slightly higher for South Platte) therefore consensus that conservation is not the panacea; also, West Slope water limited, most was in agreement; from IPPs 75% was an optimistic level by many of the groups.

- **CWCB Report: Eric Wilkinson:** Meeting in Denver, Nov 16-18; first date was focused on in-stream flow; focus on several tributaries of AK (Cuchara); CWCB filed in 2009; contested in area; stipulation reached that during 2010, those filings would be restudied and not filed with water court any earlier than Dec of 2010, giving the people there a chance to file water rights for existing water rights. Stipulation had been reached with entities there as well.

Second, looked at the portal on the Roaring Fork of acquisition of the 54% of the Stapleton Brothers Ditch. Significant opposition at hearing; Board did not find it to be persuasive; therefore, moving forward on this; will include a change of water rights on that ditch; the ramifications and results from the Water Court will impact the in-stream flow on the river. Actions taken on Water Supply Accounts, state wide funds depleted by ...several questions on application, answered all questions.

Basin wide account approvals for South West basin: conserving Farmers Land Trust for community effort to keep irrigated productive farmland in production rather than being dried up for municipal use.

Also, other items of interest for SP Rdtale: controversy on in-stream flow and CWCB taking more active role on these rights. None in Platte so far. Gunnison basin, AK;
CO River Compact Fund (attempts to help CO provide for litigation over CO River Compact Fund)
Also, presentation on CO River Water Availability.

Several construction loans approved and increased.

Consideration of the non-reimbursables that will go into CWCB project funds; cut back significantly as 107 million taken by legislature; therefore not as many discretionary funds;
Proposed for this year's legislature: satellite monitoring system reduced a bit; weather modification has stayed in because of our contribution by downstream states in CO River Basin.
Weather modification studies could increase benefits.

Flood plain modification program also still in because of favorable federal contribution.

Watershed restoration money allocated as well.

CO Water Education Foundation also included in non-reimbursables at usual rate.

Appropriation for additional engineering for in-stream flow program because of number of recommendations for in-stream flow more than what staff can attend to.

Last presentation was on water conservation to Water Conservation Board, Western Resource Advocates presented saying that 40% contribution could be achieved in 40 years; science was lacking; mathematical representation per reduction of demand; the presentation had not been vetted to water purveyors to see if it was practical. Impractical amount of conservation was consensus from water providers.

Phyllis Thomas: Historical data?

Eric Wilkinson: None presented.

Next meeting on Jan 26, 27 in Denver, adjacent to where CO Water Congress will be held.

Jim Yahn: Decision on split of Water Supply funds?

Eric Wilkinson: yes, meeting between IBCC and CWCB; revision proposed to both IBCC and CWCB on that; split will remain the same, but there will be an emphasis on the statewide accounts that there needs to be demonstrated a benefit between at least two basins; also a cleaning up of the need to demonstrate more benefits on basin wide accounts; no more carte blanche. Will be a rewrite of the criteria guidelines that will be proposed for its consideration and for IBCC at next meeting; once adopted, those would be the guiding criteria

Hecox: Also, because we are not changing the formula between the state and basin accounts, we will go to a once-a-year approval at Sept board meeting for state-wide accounts (to avoid legislative session uncertainty).

Wilkinson: Basin accounts will then be decided in September.

Yahn: Money in basin account for South Platte?

Hecox: Yes, 26,000. No money in state-wide account.

Yahn: Thus, next infusion of any money into that would be...

Hecox: Not sure if there will be a small increment from Jan 1 and again on April 1, or if this reflects that.

Wilkinson: We did get the 40% on July 1?

Hecox: Yes. Bad news on general fund is being offset some what by the severance tax projections; thus, if left only to formulas in statute now, we will get full amount this fiscal year and then cut next fiscal year to help with general fund issues, but intent is to keep the money in the Water Account...thus, can count on money this fiscal year, reduction next fiscal year.

Wilkinson: re: email on ramifications if legislature decides to take \$1.7 million from CWCB (nothing in severance task because still owe AK conduit \$35 million, thus still in hole); CWCB was effective in responding to the general assembly in articulating the impact on projects and the ability of CWCB to have construction fund projects, including in-stream flow activities. If no

money, cannot do anything. Some money spent on consultants (i.e. engineering for in-stream flow filings...this will be some of the first to go); thus everyone has an interest in what will happen to the funds in CWCB (all water users).

Sean Conway: \$1.5 billion shortfall is what we are now looking at.

Legislative report: Dianne Hoppe: Changes in committee assignments: Rep Curry has changed party affiliation and thus she has lost ag committee chair; New Ag Committee Chair is Rep. Fisher from Ft Collins, Vice Chair: Rep Pace from Pueblo. New Senate Chair is Senator Hodge. Senator Isgar has resigned and has been replaced by Bruce Whitehead. Speaker Pro Tem replaced by Rep. _____ from Pueblo.

Hecox: Recall that the IBCC is set up that each of those chairs appoints someone to the IBCC' thus, Bruce Whitehead will be rep from Senate.

Interim Water Committee has proposed 3 bills, drafts, subject to change: 1) increasing funding for Division of Water Resources from Severance Tax Fund; 2) Concerns long term funding for water efficiently grant program; several municipalities have grave concerns for this program; these grants could be in jeopardy; 3) concerns evaluation of new hydro-electric facilities for property tax purposes; hydro-electric generation would be added to property tax bill passed last year.

Others: basin of origin bill sponsored by Rep Pace; not much support from water users for that bill; could disrupt our roundtable process; purpose of 1177 was to get away from basin of origin bills.; 2) Rep Curry: Right to Float bill: right of navigation on rivers: limited to guides of river outfitters; 3) Senator Hodge is proposing a bill concerning the use of usable effluent; 4) Senator Brophy proposing a bill for groundwater basin to alter designation of the basin.

Also, 3 constitutional amendments proposed: 1 concerning property taxes, concerning debt limitations, and one regarding motor vehicle taxes and fees.

Overall, most serious issue that legislature will face will be the budget issues.

Mike Shimmin: Re: Rep Pace's Basin of Origin bill: in Water Congress State of Affairs Committee has appointed a subcommittee to evaluate it; last week, that committee voted 20-1 to oppose the bill. Am encouraging the CO Water Congress to propose a bill that articulates why we oppose that is because we are proponents of this process—roundtable bill—as the way to approach basin of origin conflicts. Thus, we are proponents in Water Congress of the roundtable process and that it is working and that, although slow, is the way to approach the disputes.

The way that the bill is written says that every issue about water export (every change of use case) must go to the water judge or a water conservancy district that would make the decision.

Whereas here in the roundtable process, we have representatives from every corner of the state and it is working. Thus, working on a resolution to counter the basin of origin bill to reiterate the effectiveness of the roundtable process.

Shimmin: RE: Groundwater bill: lingering issue about when (this coming from surface water users)... saying that maybe some of the water in the groundwater basin is tributary. The statute currently says that the boundaries of a basin can be altered. This bill attempts to draw bright lines. Real issue is after 40 years, when is it not fair to change the designation of the basin. Point is to try to protect the existing designated basins.

Don Ament: There is a bill for fines for knowingly taking surface water...

Mike Shimmin: This came from the State; in 2004 there were amendments in the statute that authorizes the State Engineer to impose \$500/day fines; was limited to ground water; this bill amends the bill to add surface water; this bill impacts the authority of the State Engineer to sanction a user. Distinction of use of surface water rights and ground water rights at issue. Existing law allows fine to be imposed for ground water enforcement. Key is well measurement

rules. Has been important because of the AK and Republican compacts and well use. State's view is that by a certain date you must have a water measurement device on your well; reporting requirements as well; these are required and violations met with fines. State sees need for these kind of sanctions in order to enforce the rules.

Joe Frank: Point is that the rules should be enforced fairly.

Shimmin: Before you are fined, the State has to take you to court and the judge has to affirm that; State Engineer by himself cannot impose the fine without the judge's final say.

Harold Evans: In Weld County, a case where someone refused and the judge jailed him.

Jim Hall: This was after several years of refusal on the part of the water user; long process; judge actually found him in contempt of court. Man owed \$100,000: 200 per day. Within five days, the man came up with full amount and was released from jail. Engineer only files complaint; judge's order holds.

Eric Wilkinson: The three initiatives have been certified with the ballot; important to pay attention to the Constitutional Amendments because these are very onerous to any water providers, water conservancy districts. Important to pay attention.

Education Liaison Report: Bert Weaver: Nothing to report. One point, there is a significant contributor to the severance tax, one in our basin: Henderson Mine (largest molybdenum producer in the U.S.)

Eric Hecox: One of the reasons there is little to report; we have finally seen successes with the Colorado Water Education Foundation as the liaison with the Roundtables education liaison (Burt); thus for next meeting, there will be more activity.

Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee: Bob Streeter: We participated in the progress update meeting in December and will participate in the non-consumptive meeting later this afternoon.

Phreatophyte Sub-Committee: Bob Streeter: Some of the grants we proposed have all come out of the CWCB and some work has commenced.

Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee: Joe Frank: Group has not met, however, the grant that we supported through our sub-committee and involved CO Corn Growers and DU, among others, will present at the CWCB meeting. 75 minute presentation.

Jim Yahn: One of the ideas was a water coop in the lower basin area; have begun to meet with ditch companies and the process is ongoing; so far, have been received well. Going from the riverside headgate to the state line, presenting to all ditch companies. Had five meetings last week alone. This came out of this roundtable process.

Jim Yahn: Amend Agenda to include election of officers: Per our bylaws, we are required to elect officers before Jan 31 of each year. IBCC officers hold 2 year terms.

Entertain a motion to elect officers:

Allyn Wind: Move to retain officers currently have

Doug Rademacher: Second

Current officers: Jim Yahn, Chair; Harold Evans: First Vice Chair; Bob Streeter: Second Vice Chair; Recorder: Lisa McVicker; IBCC officers: Mike Shimmin and Eric Wilkinson.

Discussion: Doug Rademacher: Opines that officers have been doing a good job and would move that we retain them; Sean Conway agrees.

Report on December 17th Needs Assessment Presentation.

Jim Yahn: Thanks to Harold Evans for pulling off an excellent job (applause).

Harold Evans: Many thanks to all presenters, to Larry Howard of Larimer; to Ken Huson of Boulder; more than 175 attendees.

Thanks to Kathay Renals; Bob Streeter on non-consumptive; Harold covered consumptive; update on NISP; Eric Hecox covered state level; Mike Shimmin did outstanding wrap up—one of the things that Mike did is to bring it back to a security issue (food grown close to home or far away). Good questions; large representation from Save the Poudre; would have liked to have had a bit more press coverage but we achieved what we set out to do. More work and effort than anticipated and it really paid off. Have had several follow-ups from people asking for additional info. Udall's rep, for instance. People listened, good questions.

Joe Frank: Did an excellent job of presenting the issues and possible solutions; one of the points was that there is a supply and demand challenge; but that it is tied to growth.

Harold Evans: Power point presentations should be posted on the website.

Bob Streeter: I was impressed that so many people made comments about not knowing so much work was going on. Thus, there really is pressure on the education committee to get the word out.

Doug Radecmacher: Thanks to all the presenters; outstanding job. We anticipated the questions; we accomplished what we set out to do; would have liked to see some more reps there; but great job.

Bob Streeter: Smart to do it again while fresh in our minds.

Jim Yahn: Next will be lower river and now we have the displays;

Joe Frank: Important to show the entire gap but the gap specific for the lower river as well.

Sean Conway: It was excellent to see representatives from legislature from both sides of the aisle.

Although we did not have county representation from Boulder, but had key reps. Larimer County reps were not there because they were in budget meetings and passing budget that day.

Eric Hecox: Was there a plan put in place for next steps? Follow-up from that Dec 17 meeting?

Jim Yahn: As we have decided to break the basin up in 4 areas, next will be the lower river presentation; Republican is not ready nor upper counties because study not done.

Harold Evans: Also, we could condense this for service club presentations; have basics so could condense to 25 minute presentation.

As per costs: not sure at beginning: Doug and Sean from Greeley, Eric Hecox, Corn Growers, but final bill came in less than \$800. Hecox' office able to cover all of it.

Sean Conway: Would like to acknowledge Larimer County's use of the building.

Harold Evans: Some cost of the set up of the facility and the cookies, etc., but still less than our proposed budget.

Jim Yahn: Press release for December 17, shortly thereafter, Save the Poudre put out a press release saying that the Roundtable process was faulty. Bothered because so much of it was not true.

Mike Shimmin: One of the things that surprised me about doing this is that many people came up and said they had no idea that this process was going on, that this problem was so severe. While I was delivering comments at end, was amazed at how many people were nodding their heads in agreement (drying up ag not an alternative, must pursue IP&Ps, etc.)...thus, despite Save the Poudre, was very surprised at how many people in agreement. Surprising that so many people have no idea about this public effort ongoing.

Jim Yahn: Agree; doing course of the meeting, a Save the Poudre person actually came up and said I did not realize you were looking at nonconsumptive needs; Bob Streeter's emphasis on nonconsumptive needs struck home.

Harold Evans: One of the Save the Poudre people had their brochures out; they were of course welcome. Did get good press before the event; radio interviews (Jim Yahn and Harold Evans); so did get good publicity ahead of time. Chandler Peter, Corp project leader for NISP and Halligan Seaman was there.)

Patron: Older people at these meetings; thus, it would be useful to reach out to younger people---high school, college. Potential with these processes that older folks have so much knowledge to transfer to younger people and this could cause a big gap. Thus, as you reach out, it is important to include and reach out to younger people.

Mike Shimmin: This is something important for education subcommittee to work on technological mediums to reach out.

Eric Hecox: Wish that the Education Foundation contract would have been in place, but hope is that moving forward, these kinds of activities will help jumpstart and bolster these efforts.

Dough Rademacher: Are we the first roundtable to do this kind of presentation?

Eric Hecox: Yes; other roundtables have done some ... but nothing like a presentation on the progress of the roundtable.

Jim Yahn: Could we reach out to CSU or CU?

Wilkinson: CSU in Spring semester, there has been a general water course in which students from different disciplines come to study. Reagan Waskam could perhaps get us on the agenda. Usually a class of 30-40.

McVicker: Center of CO Water Conservancy District and CUSP has worked with scouts and brownies...never too young to start thinking of water issues...

Evans: Barn Show, for instance; traveling display

Streeter: Rotary group.

Gary Herman: Water Festival

Eric Hecox: Time frame for Sterling presentation?

Jim Yahn: Not yet.

Eric Hecox: Will work with you on that. Also will work with Bert Weaver on producing some printed materials that can be distributed and also condensing into a shorter presentation.

Jim Yahn: Before March, before irrigation season starts.

John Stencil: Hay Days?

Jim Yahn: No more hay days; hay days are gone.

Stencil: Would like again to commend all the speakers and I came away feeling very proud; so would like to volunteer to present once materials available.

Harold Evans: Intent was to really emphasize what future could. Larry Howard, admin assistant at Greeley Water, McVicker for help; thanks to everyone.

Discussion of Arkansas Basin Roundtable's "Projects and Methods to Meet the Needs of the Arkansas Basin"

Harold Evans: After careful review of the document, does not really think that we need to do this because there seems to be quite a bit of duplication on what we have already done. Also, our IP&Ps are more developed on the AK Basin; fits the AK and commend them for doing it, but opines that we should spend our money elsewhere.

Eric Hecox: One thing that AK did is that by putting this out by a formal vote of the Roundtable they have now endorsed their preferred IP&Ps so can say to community these are the IPPs we will pursue. Other roundtables have enumerated the IPPs that the water providers in their basins have in the works. Would agree with Harold that it may not be useful for South Platte but that the official vote of the IPPS would propel progress. Actually say that these IPPs are on our list and critical for moving forward; have focused not only on projects but on methods as well (i.e.: moving forward rotational fallowing); thus AK has said, as a package, this is what we are moving forward.

Harold: In the summary of our needs assessment (part 3) we did do this; we officially endorsed that our IPPs need to move forward.

Mike Shimmin: Analysis of the IPP list that was compiled for our Roundtable came out of SWASI (173,000 acft of yield); ask what projects are in this list other than the three we know about (NISP, Halligan, Seaman); thus reality is that 93,000 come from these three, yet 80,000 come from a vague list that CWCB enumerated from survey of water providers. Apparently in the next phase of study, they will attempt to survey again with the water providers. Thus, when we say we want the IPPS to move forward, don't know what those are. At the beginning of this process, we said that we should not inject Roundtable process into water provider progress; do not favor that we should take the initiative.

Eric Wilkinson: CWCB has authorized the development of a data base of IPPs statewide so they can be tracked by proponent; idea is to track where they are in the process and what can be done to facilitate their development. Some in South Platte do compete for same source; some depend on ag dryup; so this data base will provide a better picture of what the IPPs are and reduce some of the redundancy.

Harold Evans: When they do the update for the SWASI list, they will find that most of the 73,000 acft projects, really do not exist; personally is not aware of any projects in our basin that will yield much water. Thus will probably find that the gap is actually bigger than what we think it is. Will not be surprised if DNR study finds this.

Eric Hecox: Yes, our study will focus on current projects.

Ralf Topper: I sit on the AK Roundtable in same role as here as technical liaison; I did receive this document; when I read, I thought it was fantastic; in 20 pages, the summary was excellent. It must be available to general public. In 21 pages they have summarized total picture. I think that every roundtable should do this. I have real problems with the IBCC website; next to impossible to find information; therefore, important to present something like this.

Shimmin: Is there a single document that contains our consumptive needs and nonconsumptive needs assessment? Needs to be compiled into a single document and thus would be almost 80% of what is here. We should at least do that at a minimum

McVicker: Will this take some of our \$26,000?

Hecox: Credit to Gary Barber; he wrote this and did all of substantive work. If we want to do a robust approach, could use some of your funds, or wait until education liaison is up and running and we could do a document that summarizes what was presented at the Dec 17 meeting.

Hecox: A year from now, Oct-Nov 2010—cumulative update of SWASI work, both consumptive and nonconsumptive reports as well as IBCC work; will have state wide report as well as individual basins. This will be a big binder, very technical in nature; thus can work with you to create summary document with just the South Platte info.

Mike Shimmin: Tangible suggestion: 2 things done: 1) Printed version of consumptive and nonconsumptive needs assessment and 2) CD rom created with a 45 minute version of "what does it mean" so that any one who might go to service groups could play the CD rom and hand out the summary. Thus, through education subcommittee group: is there money available for this? Seems like printing up our needs assessment should not cost that much; CD roms...not much. The idea comes from Justice Hobbs CD rom about CO Water law. Would these two pieces put us in a good position to help anyone present our progress, and if there is not money from state, then we could ask CWEF come to us for grant and we could approve it and have the tangible pieces for educating.

Doug Rademacher: Another critical part would be to also include the projects that we have had and name the projects we have approved.

James Ford: Who is on the educational subcommittee?

Jim Yahn: Bert Weaver. Anyone else?

Harold Evans: This is one of the reasons I wanted to do this is because of the SWASI reports were excellent but most of it has been on a shelf and few know it is out there.

Patron: Really like the video idea in educating the younger people—high school, college level; could take it in a realm outside of science. Debate classes.

Harold Evans: What is the distribution for the AK document?

Hecox: Other roundtables and IBCC. The end of the document also lays out future endeavors.

Patron: One other idea: use public television and cover entire state. Would bet that very few in the state know about basin roundtable.

Dinner

Eric Hecox: Update on money situation. What is reflected on balance sheet is only 40% that has been appropriated...thus, the \$26,000 does NOT include the additional 60% we anticipate for the rest of the year; therefore, would get 52,000 on Jan 1 and 52 on April 1; thus about \$131,000 to work with between now and July 1.

Yuma Conservation District presentation on the Republican River Water Balance:

Brian Starkebaum: Proposed project attempting to get funding. One of the priorities of our district focused on the water supply, the aquifer, the sustainability of water supply. Possible water projects; met with engineers from Brown and Caldwell in what is being done in Nebraska. Would like to create a water balance supply for the Republican basin; looking for net recharge of the aquifer. By extrapolating this info and applying to the Republican, would allow us to resource management for the basin. Recharge in Burkens County found to be small percentage of aquifer. In our basin, irrigating ag folks getting hammered with settlement. Thus, want scientific base for annual water usage to sustain aquifer. Submitted the project to large grant but missed the cutoff; current goal is to break it up in three phases: data gathering, contracts with USGS, w; 2) Brown and Caldwell study; 3) educational outreach. For us as a district, believe it is something that will drive our projects in the future. If we can find something that would add an inch or two to recharge, would be a huge increase to the aquifer.

_____: Once we are getting this started in CO, and given that NE already doing this, we are hoping that KS and NE would use as well and is something that could be used over the entire Ogallala Aquifer in the future.

Brian: Would perhaps like a letter of support in future; will perhaps apply for loan or grant to CWCB but would appreciate support of the roundtable. Questions?

Bob Streeter: Timeline on final results?

Brian: 18 months to 2 years; because most of the data has been collected but has not been compiled for this purpose.

_____: Intent is to build on existing models and look for detailed weather patterns.

Joe Frank: Perkins County, NE—5-8% of total water supply is from recharge?

Brian: Yes; the supplemental irrigation is much smaller than dry land, and this is why this is small.

Bethleen McCall: Also will focus on different grasses being used, so if we can identify certain practices that add even just an inch over the million acres of the Ogallala aquifer, it is critical. We are trying to solve 100% of the compact problem with the most important element of our economic base.

Mike Shimmin: What is the budget for all three phases?

Brian: \$150-175,000 for all three phases.

Mike Shimmin: Anything in this study that would work on the compact agreement. We are locked into a settlement.

Brian: That is our attention and hope is to get all three states on a similar base for data, and can all agree that this is common, could be useful. We are limiting our study to 7 counties in CO: all of Yuma, Kit Carson, Sedgwick, and portions of Philips, Washington, Cheyenne...

Part of the study will look at land use; where is the water being used and where is it being wasted.

Perkins County, NE, for example, found that high usage on range land and waste; some simple land uses could ameliorate that.

Ralf Topper: Has CSU been doing some of these studies?

Brian: yes, we will be using this. We do not recreate that information, but rather bring it together and make it user friendly.

McVicker: You will let us know when you need a letter of support and provide an outline of what is needed.

Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment—Discussion of February 10th meeting:

Bob Streeter: Silverthorne, Feb 10, 10-3, Silverthorne

1-5 steps:

Present data and tables for info that has been collected.

--Seek input on next steps to meet these goals; develop list of resources that staff and consultant can use to answer these questions.

Meeting for anyone interested in nonconsumptive needs assessment; we will find out if we can assist them and what direction

Bob, Larry Howard, Bert Howard..anyone who wants to go from roundtable

Eric Hecox: background and purpose of this: Going out and talking to each of the water providers and finding what their projects or methods are for meeting the environmental or recreational needs and gathering and compiling the information and map back to the areas that the different roundtables have already mapped in the Phase I of nonconsumptive needs assessment. Each roundtable can then determine if there are areas where they need to focus attention; thus attempting to capture data on who is pursuing recreational projects or other environmental projects.

Other questions or comments?

Harold Evans: Question on December 21 progress report which listed the organization of the final report, under strategies: "Update current information" on Green Mountain and Blue Mesa...please comment.

Eric Hecox: It is currently in the scope of work, my mistake to send this out with that comment. Have asked CDM to do study on Blue Mesa concept and to refine the Green Mountain project so that the detail matches the other IPPs.

Mike Shimmin: Comment: Reason that this is helpful, in the small group that I was part of during the IBCC, we in essence got down to recommend in the portfolio builder tool, that we could look at a scenario that the IPPs go forward with 80% success in Metro, 60% in our basin, 30% conservation, develop the potential CO River water...split it half in half...they only need 141,000 acft of that for consumptive purposes, then identify and earmarked the remaining acft to meet that for nonconsumptive needs on Western Slope. In that scenario, the portfolio shows that ag dryup in our basin works would be only 11%; looks like both West slope and our basin's goals being met. Therefore, as we move forward, have optimism that there are real possibilities; using the portfolio building tool we can be optimistic.

Harold Evans: We are seeing the same thing with the Shared Visioning model; we are making progress in meeting our municipal needs and yet maintaining environmental and rec goals. The models are very powerful tools to be used. Need to be prepared that the tool will be challenged for accuracy.

Bob Streeter: Indeed, moving that water around from West slope can benefit nonconsumptive needs.

Shimmin: Indeed, if we had wide spread dry up of irrigated ag, it would take away nonconsumptive benefits...slews, wildlife, etc.

Jim Yahn: Next meeting: May 11, 2010. In the meantime, we plan on having the Sterling meeting in the March time frame and will therefore be in contact to bring this together.

Adjourn: 7:30 pm.

NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY, May 11, 2010 WELD COUNTY SERVICES BUILDING, LONGMONT, COLORADO