

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Monday, April 12, 2010
Special Meeting
Longmont, CO
Southwest Weld County Building**

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

NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY, MAY 11, 2010 4 PM WELD COUNTY SERVICES BUILDING, LONGMONT, COLORADO

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

Change to Agenda: Garry Barber/AK Basin Roundtable report will be moved to 5 pm

New member: Sean Croain replaces Les Williams for St Vrain & Left Hand Water Conservancy District.

Standard Reports:

- **IBCC Report: Mike Shimmin:** IBCC met on March 5th; all day meeting; small work groups attempted to delve into details for projection tools to project water demand to 2050; attempt to specify IP&Ps potential success; conservation large focus; discussion focused on how to make conservation focus effective; previously, had used 2000 as baseline; now baseline is 2008; has been up to a 10% reduction per capita since 2000; therefore, now additional conservations savings on top of this present challenge to municipalities; thus, baseline starting point significant; one idea: possible to have standardized approach for goal/requirement for future conservation; if this conservation applies both to existing and future development very different; Shimmin has been advocate of separating existing and future development such that future development could be built with more stringent conservation requirements; common agreement is to focus on 15-20% conservation on top of base line into future; still no consensus; Shimmin pushing to have technical requirements on table for discussion; basis must be in technical fact and economic reality; CWCB staff working on additional information "Best Management Practices Handbook for Water Conservation"; quantitative basis predicted to come from this; water supply planning efforts have ways to go for building on specifics of technical realities; work in progress. IBCC also heard presentation from State demographer; look toward 2050 projections needed demographer model. IBCC also had presentation on completion of Phase I of CO River Water Availability Study: 0-900,000 acft might be available from river in future☺; general consensus is that the study needs to be more focus and that some number in that range is more probable; CWCB staff is working with consultants to come closer. Draft of written report on CO River report is available on website for comment; public comment period has at least 45 days to go. Phase II shall be postponed because of lack of funding availability. Work in progress. Last issue: revisions to Water Supply Account Criteria and Guidelines; subcommittee has made recommendations; no final vote; language revisions were discussed.

Next meeting of IBCC: April 22: Shimmin will be unable to attend; Shimmin has asked Jim Yahn to attend in his place; Eric Wilkinson will attempt to attend; but Yahn can attend to represent South Platte Basin.

- CWCB Report: Shimmin on behalf of Wilkinson:** large session was canceled because of budget issues; working meeting, not policy meeting. Will be 3 day meeting in May 18, 19 in Denver.
 Todd Doherty: Special telephone meeting re: purchase of 10,000 ac ft of Animas La Plata water; Board has decided to contract for that water for \$12million per year for next 3 years; marketability study ongoing to look at potential for market availability
 McVicker: who would be potential buyers?
 Doherty: smaller municipalities in that area.
 Dough Rademacher: Was anything discussed about flood plain issues?
 Shimmin: Probably on May agenda.
- Legislative report: Dianne Hoppe:** Water Conservation Board bill still alive; minimal amount for authorization for many projects; will be heard in Senate on 15th if anyone wants to testify. Species conservation bill (important to this basin) will be in House Ag committee on Wed., April 14. Funds have not been diverted. New bill passed out of house last week that repeals interim committees (possibly interim water resource committee as well as highway committee); Sen. Whitehead will carry bill to try to keep water conservancy bill committee because of lack of funds; no money for staff or travel; legislature set to adjourn on May 6, possible they will adjourn earlier.
Jim Yahn: Status on rafting bill?
Dianne Hoppe: Bill was amended and referred bill to Water Congress for October; in the mean time several ballot initiatives; as of this morning, four of the proponents for that bill have gone forward this morning; opposition's bills will be heard soon.
Jim Yahn: Todd: See that Eric Hecox received a letter from Sal Pace that states that this rep. believes that roundtables are working on legislation...status?
Todd: Eric's response was that no, roundtables are not working on legislation but that if there is a need for that, the roundtables are willing, but that we (CWCB) do not see a need at this point. Hecox is responding.
Dan Ament: Jim Lockhead was appointed chief CEO of Denver Water; move from DNR to Denver Water.
Janet Bell: There was a bill out on conservation, that there would be a demand for report of savings...status?
Todd: Unaware of the status of that bill? Might be some environmental entities sponsoring that; but have talked to some providers that say it might be reasonable, but not sure of status.
Dianne Hoppe: Bill was amended; scheduled last week for House Ag Committee; Shimmin will have more details on that after next IBCC meeting.
Shimmin: Only know from Water Congress communications; do think that some water entities have proposed it; has been significant work about what categories of information, details of reporting, etc; result was that there is agreement on need to focus on details; focus on guidelines on how to report data, what categories, and what standardized format for reporting; reporting guidelines by 2012 and reporting requirements by 2013. Conservation reports by identified water providers might be deciding factor as to availability for loans; but this is a work in progress.
- Education Liaison Report: No report**
- Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee: Bob Streeter:** Meeting of all nonconsumptive committees and individuals organized by CWCB in mid February; draft report to be finalized in May or June. Next meeting perhaps will have a report.

- **Phreatophyte Sub-Committee: Bob Streeter:** Report planned to be finalized in May of next steps.
- **Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee: Joe Frank:** Met in Denver with CWCB workshop to see what project sponsors were; what barriers of alternative methods exist; draft report should be final in late spring/early summer and will be included in final report due in November.

Report on March 25th South Platte Progress Update Meeting for Lower River December 17th Needs Assessment Presentation. Comments:

Allyn Wind: Well done.

Jim Yahn: 65 people present; well attended for area; good coverage in radio and newspaper.

McVicker: Any different questions or comments?

Shimmin and Yahn: more of a quiet crowd; more questions were agriculture in nature.

Gary Barber/Arkansas Basin Roundtable Chair: Flaming Gorge Task Force Assessment WSRA grant request;

See attached “talking paper” that Barber distributed: The Flaming Gorge Task Force: A Collaboration—APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT OF VIABILITY AND PROTOCOL TO CONVENE THE INITIAL MEETING OF A FLAMING GORGE TASK FORCE—history is that vision taskforce approach has been successful in past

Full Application will be forthcoming.

--Following suit of South Platte progress report public meetings—during meeting of planning this, Eric Kuhn mentions that all of the water rights in AK are dependent on voluntary water agreements from CO Water River. Realization that future of both consumptive and non-consumptive uses on AK are tied directly to the CO compact.

Realization that the impacts on the CO River impacts AK tremendously. Meanwhile, the Flaming Gorge plan would impact AK tremendously.

--Approach asks if vision task force would be an appropriate process for this.

--Collaborative assessment report also gives a bit of anonymity. AK roundtable approved in March; Metro Roundtable asked for assurances that South Platte Basin be invited to participate.

Review of talking paper (see attached)

Phase One: Talk to all stakeholders and party of interest and get their perspective.

Phase Two: How to fund task force. Lesson from Fountain Creek, there were multiple stakeholders many of who put in small amounts to push assessment forward. From nonconsumptive stakeholders to property owners, etc.

Budget: Page 2: Opines that we are getting close to a response to Rep. Pace’s letter per legislation (public meetings, AK report, etc). Budget includes for assessment, stakeholder interviews; draft summary of results; review of summary and revisions based on stakeholder feedback; preparation of final summary; roundtable presentation; limits on hours per task; convene task force for initial meeting—

Total hours estimated: 296 at about \$40,000 for report plus \$5,000 for first meeting of taskforce.

Barber not asking for money (AK and Metro have funded) however, would open to participation.

Thanks for time on agenda.

Questions:

Don Ament: Would WY be considered a stakeholder? Would be very helpful if WY is included.

Barber: Yes; original write-up to Corps of Engineers points out the impact of the CO River on AK; also pointed out how WY and environmental groups are important stakeholders to process.

Yahn: Is Erin Million (Flaming Gorge planner) interested in this taskforce?

Barber: At first, yes; after more and more stakeholders signed up, his commitment waivered. Barber's letter to Corps that shows 20,000 ac ft deficit in roundtable but that not interested in Flaming Gorge project. Changed opinion and told Barber to send letter to Corps in January 2010. Next, misunderstanding of positions. Barber therefore here at our roundtable to explain his view that this situation is about the roundtables and about WY and CO and that this assessment is a first good step to determine what is at stake, who is involved and how to go forward. AK is at bottom of the pipe, wrong side of hill.

Joe Frank: WY and CO why not involved yet?

Barber: Feasibility study not done yet.

Yahn: Three roundtables involved? AK, Metro, South Platte?

Barber: Yes, but also have calls to Yampa, CO and Gunnison. Have a joint meeting with Gunnison on June 7; that could be a good opportunity for those two basins to participate. Definitely want CO involved.

Doherty: May 10 west slope roundtable meeting.

Barber: Won't make that one.

Streeter: To clarify: money there to carry you through....

Barber: We have all money to do everything; basin money--so hopeful that statewide review criteria won't be an obstacle. But we would be more than open to sharing costs; what is important is when Metro approved funding that their criteria was that South Platte meeting be included.

Yahn: We did not get this proposal to everyone in time to act on this; but we could discuss this at May 11 meeting.

Shimmin: Despite reading the report, I still ask exactly what the consultants are doing in 300 hours. Seems like what they are doing is that they will help us to decide to have a meeting. So what is actually being purchased for \$45,000. So the budget is really for Phase One?

Barber: Yes. I went from being a skeptic to a believer because, going back to Fountain Creek: we were at a standstill; Sierra Club suing, etc. County Commissioners said none of suits will help the county or the group. Was decided that we needed a neutral facilitator; so stakeholders represented—environmental community, military, thus much of the process really was working on the stakeholders; ended with a 28 person consensus committee—a bit unwieldy; but with this project, when you stop and ask who will represent WY, agriculture, Flaming Gorge, Yampa---time intense. Back to Fountain: once our committee was organized, we then had studies to organize and report. Thus, looking at the fact that we are coming up on 5th year of the Roundtable Basins, made me realize that the Roundtables need to talk to each other. Time to move past collecting data and going back to our assessment reports. Might seem like “fluff” but all the pieces came back to a strategic, detailed plan for Fountain Creek—integrates water quality, water quantity, ag, environmental, etc....thus, experience of going through the process for 2 years, we ended up with a good roadmap to fix Fountain Creek and we got an Intergovernmental Agreement between two different counties that came to an understanding that two very different constituencies realized they were in the same watershed. Therefore, looking at a project of this scope is so large that need for Flaming Gorge Task Force seems evident.

Adam Bergeron: Is this a specific per pipeline from Flaming Gorge will work or are we looking at what is the most viable transfer from Flaming Gorge?

Barber: both; need is to determine what are the right questions to ask; and, my understanding of the original Water for 21st Century Act was that the roundtables would figure this out...how will we share the last water available...example: is underground storage on the table? Is ag on table? We are mining ground water but Pueblo spills; what should be on the table before someone sticks the last straw. If we are really worried about climate change, we should have two pipes on the CO River...maybe that we say, no pipe until we are at 65 gal/per person/per day...all questions on table. For example: Trout

Unlimited...we will come to the table but only if...temperature of water. We have drawn so many lines in the sand, time to move forward.

Janet Bell: I support what you are saying, just like I did at Metro, however, having a facilitator like Keystone as facilitator, makes sense; the neutral facilitator, not being a water provider, enables someone to ask forthright questions because they “don’t have a dog in the fight”; thus, no competition with the facilitator who is moving process forth is best bet. Thus better to work with independent organization that has experience with environmental issues; also, working on this also might get things moving again with roundtables; like you said, five years later...not moving forward. Thus, I strongly urge South Platte to support this in every way you can because it is the best way to move forward.

Barber: Can’t say it better; thank you for your time.

Shimmin: One more question: back to title of this; what I just heard you describe is a summary of what the roundtables and the IBCC are wrestling with---how do we develop “the last straw” as a state; this sounds like a different question than evaluating flaming gorge; I think flaming gorge is one piece of that puzzle; but this sounds like the study is to evaluate Yeager’s proposal and Million’s proposal.

Barber: In our assessment report, we asked three basic questions: Viable? Sustainable? Economical?

Example: recycling: viable? Sustainable? Economical?

We took everything we heard (including piping from CO River) and we ranked them.

Green Mountain Pumpback sounds viable, does not result in water; Gunnison, Aspinall—already done that; left: Flaming Gorge...that is how we got to the top of the list. But better answer to Shimmin’s question: the flaming Gorge projects are ready to go and they are looking at it for everything, and opines that the State of CO needs a voice in this conversation; AK roundtable will be vociferous about this; if this happens, and river is ruined, no rafting, no economy in Chaffee County; cannot be a spectator to this.

Jim Ford: Outcome of altercation with Million?

Barber: yes, he would like to be part of it, but Yeager does not want to be part of it.

Ford: Is it not important to be part of discussion?

Barber: yes, he says it is too soon...

Gary Barber email: barbergl@aol.com

McVicker will send electronic version of Task Force report with minutes.

Sean Cronin: I agree with Mike that, as written, this is written solely focused on The Flaming Gorge, not state wide.

Yahn: This was also Adam’s question.

Adam: Just feel that we need a better feel; although as the project goes forward, the focus will be widened and that the larger report would be much more than \$45,000.

Shimmin: Probably a 300 person stakeholder task force for really looking at every option available for remaining CO River water available. Would like time to think about this.

Yahn: Reminded me of how IBCC was to bring all roundtables together with neutral facilitator. Look at an analogy with the Shared Vision Plan that was a \$100,000 grant. Again to spend this money to get to the meeting, does not make sense. Want a task force, have a meeting. But again, I have never done one of these, and can understand that there is a real value to have a facilitator get these going.

Yahn: Keep in mind that they are going to do this; it has been funded.

Shimmin: Seems to me like they should do Phase I and then once they are ready to move to Phase II...

Sean Conway: Barber did not mention that Phase II is \$400,000.

Don Amendt: Early handout shows that March 2010-September 2010, then through 2012, total is \$400,000.

Kevin Lusk: I think that many of the questions that Gary is trying to ask in Phase I, is really scoping...who needs to be at the table, what are the questions to ask. Belief that Barber is really trying to push forward

intent of the roundtables and pushing with grass roots on implementation; look at task force deliverables is to implement a project.

Sean Conway: Are these processes not ongoing? Look at NISP, look at Million; feasibility of these projects will go forward. Believe that the Fountain Creek issues not analogous to Flaming Gorge projects.

Janet Bell: Speak to two things: 1) to Mike's concern about need for Phase I, always found that it was very helpful to know all of issues that I would need to confront, and what were ways that I could see some similarity in these issues; but doing this in a consensus such as this allows this to expose much more information, therefore, makes sense to bring much of this information forward to begin with; by talking with big stakeholders (including Aurora and Denver in terms of sharing infrastructure) allows a decision maker to see all these parts; independent facilitator asks questions in a nonthreatening environment; by reducing competition can move people closer together.

Doherty: Reiterates what Kevin and Janet saying: they are going forward, but they want to be sensitive to all players involved.

Yahn: Please would like to put this on next month's agenda.

Dinner

Jim Yahn: Budget report (see attached)

Todd Doherty: Discussion and Input on Agricultural needs of South Platte Basin to 2050.

Hardcopy of presentation distributed; power point on website

Nicole Rowan and Hal Simpson with CDM present to help clarify and answer questions.

--Presentation Overview: current ag acres; current ag demands; current ag shortages; range of 2050 irrigated acres; climate change affects on ag demands; preliminary M&I Gap analysis

--Looking at Ag demands out to 2050

--M&I Demands: CWCB Staff will respond to comments and revise report, available May/June 2010; report will be included as an appendix to statewide update of consumptive and nonconsumptive needs by Nov 2010.

--Nonconsumptive Focus Areas mapping: CWCB will respond to comments and revise report, available May/June 2010; report to be included as a section in the statewide update of consumptive and nonconsumptive needs in Nov 2010

--Nonconsumptive Projects and Methods: CWCB will examine past studies: existing studies and plans by instream flows recommending entities; watershed restoration plans and flood decision support system for identified restoration projects; other relevant restoration and quantification studies, plans and processes; other WSRA funded studies or basin roundtable; results all to be included in November 2010 report.

--Agricultural Shortages: CWCB to update ag shortages from SWSI 1; CWCB to summarize results of Yampa WSRA study; info to be included in Nov report
CWCB will also review the alternative Ag Transfer Methods Grant Projects

--Consumptive Gap Analysis: CWCB to update SWSI 1 (this gap was at 118,000) M&I gap analysis using updated IPP database; update ag shortages statewide; review info with roundtables in 2nd quarter 2010 and will include report in Nov 2010 report.

--Report Summarizing Needs Assessments (November 2010); CWCB will provide update of statewide consumptive and nonconsumptive needs based on recent reports and target completion date is Nov 2010

Agricultural Demands:

(Team: CDM putting results together; results have been put together by AE team as this team has been looking at West Slope; using consistent method for water availability; also Ed Harvey with Harvey Economics working on state population numbers working with state demographer; look at economic indicators looked at and how these will impact ag demands)

--Current Ag Acres, Demands and Shortages:

Ag Acres: Ag acres estimated based on aerial image data from CO DSS (2005);

Ag Demands: State CU model used to estimate irrigation water requirement (IWR) and water supply limited (WSL) consumptive use values

Ag Shortages: shortage = IWR-WSL

Suggested Approach-Future Demand and Supply with Climate Change: use CRWAS results in CO River basins; treat other basins (east slope) qualitatively: no downsized climate models from CRWAS for east slope; Front Range Study currently in draft form

South Platte Basin 10-Year Summary Ag Demands and Shortages: See graph on page 6.

Current Ag Acres, Demands and Shortages by Water District: South Platte and Metro BRTs minus

Republican River Basin: Percentage Shortage=25% (See page 5 of graphs)

Summary of Water Districts: Ag Demands and Shortages

Comments: Graphs do not show affect of pumps shut-down; appears to be a double error: if water pumped through wells that made these graphs: in 02 and 03—wells were pumping; the acres irrigated by these wells are not here (acres are smaller but water budget is bigger) then in 2005, reverse; graphs show double error.

Comment: Would it help if these graphs had more info?

No: need to figure out how many acres were shut down in 2005 and then also eliminate the amount of water that was affected; but even though those acres were not being irrigated, they could have been irrigated. Also, another way of looking at this, looking backward, water understated, looking forward acreage understated.

District by District summaries:

District 1: South Platte Greeley to Balzac

District 2: South Platte Denver Gage to Greeley

District 3: Cache La Poudre (highest shortage—2002)

District 4: Big Thompson

District 5: St Vrain Creek

District 6: Boulder Creek

District 7: Clear Creek

District 8: South Platte Cheesman to Denver Gage

District 9: Bear Creek

District 23: Upper South Platte: (comment: huge shortage in 2002—no storage, driest year on record; only storage is for municipal use;)

District 48: Laramie river

District 64: South Platte: Balzac to Stateline (in 2004: depend on storage, and North Sterling, for example, delivered 60% of normal, Pruett was at 40% of normal; graph does not look right)

District 80: North Fork of South Platte

Summary: 10-Year Average by Water District Ag Demands and Shortages: Irrigation Water Requirement: 250,000acft WD49 to 540,00 acft WD65

Comments: Need to look again at Districts 1 and 64, especially, as graphs do not reflect reality of irrigation, wells being shut off.

Nicole: Yes, will go back to revisit these. Any other specific districts that need us to “go back to drawing board again”?

Current Ag Acres, Demands and Shortages by Water District—Republican River Basin: impact of compact; 30,000 acft were beginning to be retired and this needs to be noted on slide and graph
25% shortage

Republican River Basin 10-year period: demands increased in 2002 and 2003; shortages reflected correctly? Gene Bauerele: yes, mostly

Joe Frank: How does compact impact these?

Hal Simpson: The consumptive pumping is input in groundwater model to indicate the percentage of shortage. In the compact, CO is responsible to offset those depletions.

Joe Frank: Does this graph indicate this gap?

Simpson: No, this graph is only about irrigation. When we look for instance of all dry-up (another group has dried up 14,000 acres...) should make a comment.

Shimmin: Does this show an artificially high shortage because in Republican Basin, all comes from pumping?

Simpson: Look at amount irrigated vs. amount pumped, state comes up with 25% shortage.

Yahn: In southern part of Republican Basin, wells don't produce enough; one year pump on one pivot, not on other...maybe some explanation of the deficit.

Shimmin: Is this an expanded acreage viewpoint? Perhaps this is skewing the data a bit? Seems like this is a shortage that should not be shown here either. Seems like we are looking at a groundwater system that is 25% short every year...seems not right.

Simpson: Agree, need to take another look at this.

Gene Bauerele: Lot of these wells might be good in the spring and then taper off.

Simpson: Something going on, to extent you could help us, would welcome it.

Narrative of climate change approach.

Todd: Right now east slope does not have climate change modeling; some of these slides come directly from climate change efforts of CO Water River studies; we are using these ranges to see effects on consumptive use. Currently, front range vulnerability study being produced by Aurora, Denver...now looking to get a qualitative description of what effects might be on east slope ag.

Shimmin: Indeed, we cannot criticize it altogether, but need to make point that we don't have data.

Nicole: So, what the study has done is to use existing data and to see how it might apply to east slope.

Yahn: You could use 0-990,000 acft...☺

Joe Frank: Is there a range?

Nicole: For crop irrigation, 2.6-2.7 inches per year for pasture grass;

Shimmin: In northwest corner—more, in southwest corner—decrease up to 37%. Result of scaled down predictions.

Nicole: Temperature much more certain than hydrology.

Any other questions on climate change?

Nicole: Would like help in how to paint picture of agriculture over next 40 years. (See page 16 forward: Prospective Changes in the Number of Irrigated Acres in CO by Year 2050:

--History and context: Seeing a change of 10% fewer acres of irrigated acres 1987-2007

Potential influences on changes for the number of CO's irrigated acres:

Urbanization of irrigated lands, ag water transfers to urban uses; demographic factors; biofuels production; climate change; farm programs; subdivision of ag lands; yield and productivity; opens space and conservation easements; economics of agriculture. (assumeing hydrologic conditions and current water provisions under existing CO water law)

--What will cause the change?

Urbanization of irrigated lands: See page 18 for formula

Ag to municipal transfers: Page 18 slide

Summary: Decrease in irrigated Acres due to urbanization: low: 41,888; high 51,517;

Current irrigated acres: 830,545; decrease in acres due to muni transfers: 13,850 (based on what munis are reporting; comment: seems very low); decrease due to other factors: 14,000; 2050 irrigated acres: low: 751,178/high: 760,797

--What direction and magnitude will each influence have on irrigated acreage?

--Net effects and outcomes

Hal Simpson: Explanation of other factors

--Demographic Trends: "who will take over the farm"? Assumption: Farmers will sell to neighbors or corporate operators, but operation will continue in some form.

--Biofuels production: Assumption: upward pressure in irrigated acreage, but mostly a trade-off with other crops

--Climate Change: Assumption: Highly uncertain effect. Might discourage irrigated ag, spur to ag water transfers, could benefit West Slope ag.

--Farm Programs: Assumption: no net effect on number of irrigated acres in CO (In year 2050, food production to feed world in one year will be same as all food produced up to that time)

--Subdivision of Ag lands and lifestyle farms: Assumption: contradictory effects. Difficult to determine net effect on number of irrigated acres.

--Yield and Productivity: Assumption: Continued gradual improvements likely. CO farmers will produce more per acre long-term.

--Open space and conservation easements: Assumption: rush to purchase open space and put lands with easements transitioning to lower sustainable levels. Will continue to be a factor, although modest in total irrigated acres impacted.

--Economics of Agriculture: Assumption: Farming, especially irrigated ag, will remain a resilient economic sector. Without incentives to reduce this activity irrigated acreage will remain steady. (World food demand increasing from developing countries; acceptance of genetic modified crops; trends toward locally produced foods, irrigated ag more resilient; prices more firm; costs keep pace with prices, net income stable; government policies have major impact on ag economics)

If any thoughts, please contact us with any comments:

Please email Todd: Todd.Doherty@state.co....

M&I Gap Analysis: By 2050: Low: 27, 100; High: 90,800

Methodology: Interviewed largest water providers in basin to determine plans, projects and processes (IPPs: identified projects and processes) to meet 2050 water demands; aggregated this info at the county level; estimate 2050 low, medium and high gaps: use water provider interview, SWSI1 to address info gap; and need assistance from roundtables to identify additional gaps; future activity: summarize future methods for meeting needs by major categories. No interview info yet from upper mtn counties or high plains; numbers have not changed since SWASI1. High Plains—assumption is that the need will be met with aquifer.

Per basin areas:

Northern: low: 19,500/high: 80,100

Upper Mtn: low: 1,300/high 1,700
Lower Platte: low: 6300/high 9,000
High Plains: low and high: 0

These numbers will change over the near future based on revised population numbers; new interviews of water providers; also working on passive conservation estimates from SWASI I.

Gap Analysis: By 2050: Low: 27, 100; High: 90,800

(Assumes all IPP in permitting phase will go through.)

Comments: This seems a bit lower than our initial assumption.

Joe Frank: 44,000 for low, 117,00 for high (excluding Metro area)

Nicole: I kept the same assumptions but assumed that 10% of mountain counties would come into play and also high plains—assume all needs met through aquifers. Used some of the assumptions from SWASII; -- these are only M&I, not ag.

Nicole: Key question: what providers said they were “good for” for SAWSI1, still good for?

Shimmin: These numbers are similar to the same numbers as for 2030....

Nicole: That is because these numbers do not include Metro area, and SWASI1 does include Metro area.

Shimmin: Returns to the question: We compiled our consumptive needs assessment in three pieces and these need to be compiled into one single document. If these will not be compiled in this report, then we need to do this; need to compile those three different pieces of information.

Also, how does that effort compare to this effort, and will they say different things?

Todd: Our effort is to do that; as per funding, CWCBC can fund that, would like to see that our section could do that, to bring that together. Agree, needs to do.

Shimmin: Yes, and needs to be done soon; when we did our presentations, we did not have that report all together to distribute. Actually, two, because we adopted by reference, SWASI1, 2nd piece: different questions; and then third piece—population demand to 2050 and then also ag needs.

Todd: Yes, we need a discrete document.

Janet Bell: To suggest: know that Metro not included in this, but seems like this interrelationship, especially pull on ag, there needs to be a way to have these interfaced, so that awareness of pressure of this gap is related to where the pressure is coming from—and must be related to Metro demand.

McVicker: Reiterates and emphasizes need for a holistic view of statewide numbers. So important to bring all of the picture together. But your efforts are evident and thank you.

Comment: Counties vs Water Districts: Any way to look at these responses together?

Doherty: Because of two different basins: Metro and SouthPlatte, but at the end, will work to showing picture of needs assessment all at once.

Jim Yahn: Next meeting: May 11, 2010.

Adjourn: 8:05 pm.

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