Arkansas Basin Roundtable Meeting of May 12, 2010 Meeting Notes

Roundtable Business

Chairman Barber called the meeting to order at 12:34 pm. Members and visitors introduced themselves. Twenty four (24) members were present. There are 41 roundtable members at this time, so 21 is a quorum, 31 is a 75% majority. The agenda was reviewed.

Public Comment: none

John Wiener: They received 18 letters of support for their grant application. Thanked the Roundtable.

A motion was made by Michael Stiehl and seconded by Jim Broderick to approve the minutes of the April meeting, conditional on a minor change which has been made to the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

The June meeting will be a joint meeting with the Gunnison Basin Roundtable. The meeting will be Monday, June 7th at 12:30 pm, rather than the regularly-scheduled date of June 9th.

Subcommittee Updates

DSS Update – Phyllis Thomas, from Brown and Caldwell, Project Manager.

The first three chapters have been submitted to the State. Chapter 1 is an introduction. Chapter 2 reiterates Consumptive and Non-Consumptive Needs. Chapter 3 summarizes data that is available and data that is still needed. They would like to meet with the Advisory Committee in June.

Needs Assessment Committee Update/CWCB – A total of \$200,494 is available from Basin Funds at this time.

Non-Consumptive Use Committee Update - Reed Dils

The committee plans to have their next meeting in June, and hopes to wrap up their report by end of 2010.

IBCC Report

Jeris: Had an IBCC meeting about a week ago. Jay and Jeris were both disappointed in the progress of the IBCC – the discussion seemed to degenerate rather that move forward. Next meeting is June 17th. Next CWCB meeting is in July.

WSRA Grant Requests

Stakeholder's Cooperative Management Analysis for the Upper Arkansas River Basin – brought by Jim Broderick, presented by Paul Flack, Resource Based International. Paul was Water Resource Manager for Colorado State Parks until just recently. This grant came out of the Needs Assessment Committee with a vote of 4 for, and 1 against.

In order to better regulate flows, there is a need to understand how to better move water in the Upper Arkansas River. **Cost of project is \$42,000: \$33,400 from Basin funds,** \$9,600 matching funds from Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District and Upper Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy District.

- Identify "key" stakeholders very focused
- Develop stakeholder approved priority list of issues to be analyzed
- Collect information to address the specific issues (hydrological conditions, management policies, "non-consumptive" data)
- Develop "what-if" scenarios/alternatives
- Test the alternatives -
- Identify implementation criteria for alternatives Identify the tradeoffs

Potential Study Issues

- Timing and amounts of releases from Turquoise and Twin Lakes (Mt. Elbert Conduit, Clear Creek)
- Recreational issues involving streamflow, reservoir elevations, seasonal needs
- Biological water demands (fishery, riparian)

- Fill and Spill sequences at Pueblo Reservoir
- Upper Basin alluvial supplies/aug sources
- Exchanges (timing, yield analysis)

Deliverables

- Recommended alternatives to address Upper Basin water management issues
- Identification of stakeholders
- Description of Implementation strategy/planning
- Is there compensation? What is it?
- Final analysis of study results
- Collaborate with CWCB DSS Feasibility Study to develop upper basin management strategy
- Roundtable Assessment
- Integrated upper basin management plan

The Roundtable agreed by consensus to move this application forward.

Fountain Creek Fish Marking and Monitoring Study – brought by Anthony Nunez, presented by Merle Grimes.

This grant request will fund the study of the spawning behavior and movement patterns of the Flathead Chub fish species and provide information as to when they migrate, if they migrate upstream, and how far they migrate within the bounds of the sampling locations. In addition, data obtained about the Flathead Chub will be used to predict fish movement for the Arkansas Dartar and other plains fish species. *Grand Plan*

- 1. Design & planning of fish passage \$282,000. Partners are CDOW, CSU, USGS, USACE, Springs Utilities, LAVWCD, CWCB. Q4 2009 Q4 2010.
- 2. Flathead Chub Movement Study \$144,000. Partners are CDOW, USGS, CWCB **(\$35,000: \$7,000 from Basin funds and \$28,000 from Statewide funds)**. April 2010 to March 2011.
- 3. Construction of Fish Passage ~ 2011
- 4. Fish Movement Study
- * 5th highest priority project in FCW (USACE)
- * 1st passage design criteria for plains fish
- * 1st passage Arkansas darter & flathead chub
- * 1st plains fish movement study

Current Grant Request Timeline

April - October 2010

Tag fish at 9 sites (0-20 miles downstream)

Recapture at 9 + 1 sites

November 2010

Draft scientific journal report

February 2011

Final report

Discussion summarized:

Reed: Conservation actions carried out in the US under the Endangered Species Act have been successful in preventing extinction for 99 percent of the species that are listed as endangered or threatened. However, species loss on a global scale continues to increase due to the environmental effects of human activities. -US Fish & Wildlife Service.

Is there any economic value to this fish? Yes, in that if this species of concern becomes listed as 'threatened and endangered", it will cause restrictions that will be costly for water rights owners.

Isn't the City of Colorado Springs the main beneficiary of this project? No, this information will be used by DOW, USGS, Colorado State University, DOT, and USACE. Information also has statewide value, in that it can be extrapolated for other species of plains fish, regarding any diversions on any plains streams.

The location where this study will take place *has* been identified by the Non-Consumptive Use Needs Assessment Committee as a high priority needs area, and the Non-Consumptive Needs Committee

strongly recommends this project. This study will provide the information needed to address an environment need, which is part of the mandate of the roundtable.

If you build a fish ladder in order to allow movement upstream, what's the purpose of the upstream migration of these fish? They need to move upstream in order to spawn. Speculation is that diversion structures rather than water quality or predators are causing the demise of these species.

In other parts of the state (like the South Platte) lots of money is being spent retrofitting diversion structures to allow for fish passage. Here we have the opportunity to come up with a diversion structure design that includes fish passage to begin with, which will save money in the long run, for future diversion structures all over the state. Criteria will be developed for any diversion structure, that won't add any additional cost if constructed at the time the diversion is created.

How did they identify this species as a species of specific concern? The flathead chub was listed by the USFWS as a "species of concern, because its numbers have been dwindling. Smaller species of fish can't 'jump' upstream to spawn, and it is thought that diversion structure cause more problems for them, than some other species. These plains fish have not been studied yet to any degree.

Why do they need our money to fund their project? Why can't the feds fund this project?

After discussion, consensus was not reached. Bud Elliot moved to have a vote by supermajority at next month's meeting. Anthony Nunez seconded the motion, and it passed.

Discussion

Next month is a joint meeting with the Gunnison Roundtable. Alex Davis will be invited to come and talk about the Blue Mesa marketable pool. We'll show them our project and needs report and ask them about their projects and needs.

Education/Outreach Committee Update - Perry Cabot

The first "Public Progress Report" from our Roundtable to the public and to local water leaders will be held June 3rd, 2010, from 1:00 to 5:00 pm. It will be held at the Pikes Peak Room at Leon Young Service Center, 1521 Hancock Expressway, Colorado Springs, CO. Please attend if you can.

Review of the next meeting's agenda

Meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Jay Winner