

**IBCC Colorado River Basin  
Minutes of Meeting on March 28, 2011**

**Main Topics: Energy Needs Study-Phase II Final Report, Final Report of the Roundtables  
Due June 30, 2011, OMID Grant Application**

- 1. Next Meeting: Monday, April 25, 2011.** Glenwood Springs Com. Rec. Center
- 2. Reporter: These minutes were prepared by Keri Wagstrom** 970.945.8522,  
[kwagstrom@crwcd.org](mailto:kwagstrom@crwcd.org)
- 3. Approval of January 2011 Minutes.** The minutes were approved unanimously.
- 4. Upcoming Meetings and Dates of Interest:**
  - Public Rollout of Global Negotiation Settlement is 4-28-11
  - Non-Consumptive Committee Meeting in Frisco 4-19-11
  - Request for 4 Roundtables Meeting on Thursday, May 26<sup>th</sup> @ Ute Water Conservancy District (Tentative)
  - Final Report of the Roundtables due 6-30-11
  - Three day Colorado River Basin Tour June 13-15
- 5. Updates and Announcements.**
  - A. Jim Pokrandt gave a brief river report, concluding that it looks to be a good water year in the Basin. There are concerns of flooding in Grand County.
  - B. In other news, Jim Pokrandt announced that Governor Hickenlooper will be on the West Slope and visit the River District Office on Thursday, March 31. Following will be a luncheon at the Glenwood Springs Chamber of Commerce.
  - C. Rick Sackbauer inquired about the Global Negotiation. Jim notified the group that public roll-out would take place the week of April 18<sup>th</sup>, but stressed that the roll-out is likely to be a roadmap, implementation of the agreement may take longer. There will be a full presentation of the agreement at the April meeting; public comment will be accepted. The agreement is seen as a collaborative approach to water development and environmental mitigation. It accounts for:
    - Water for consumptive uses
    - Water for non-consumptive uses
    - Plans for Shoshone
    - Dillon Reservoir Agreement to Protect Summit County
    - Environmental Mitigation to help in late summer months
    - Stream Mitigation and funding for environmental enhancement projects in Summit and Grand County

- D. It was also noted that the Colorado Water Law still take precedence in this new agreement and its elements are under review by the State Engineer's Office and the Bureau of Reclamation.
- E. Louis Meyer inquired what extent comment could be provided, and expressed concerns that a broad, diverse group be represented during public comment.

## **6. Energy Needs Study: Phase II Final Report**

- A. Before introductions, announcements were made by Greg Trainor. He noted that Governor Hickenlooper will help Grand Junction cut the tape on a compressed natural gas fill station that was supported by Encana & the state Department of Local Affairs. He also shared that Garfield County Commissioners will attend the event, and return home in vehicles fueled by the new station.
- B. Next Ben Harding and Shaden Musleh of AMEC were introduced to present the Energy Needs Study: Phase II Final Report. Greg Trainor explained that the Phase I report quantified how much water was available to meet needs, and that Phase II outlined where water would come from, reported improved data and access to oil shale, and explained that revisions were made to Phase II because of decreased oil shale need.
- C. The presentation by Ben Harding and Shaden Musleh is attached to the end of this document. The report highlights:
  - Oil shale development direct water use
  - Oil shale development indirect water use
  - Population increase due to oil shale development
  - In situ and above-ground industry use of water
  - Water supply modeling
  - White River water supply projects and modeling scenarios
- D. Conclusions made:
  - The 120,000 acre feet demand at top production is based on the original assumption regarding the industry scale
  - Uses refined assumptions about unit water use
  - There are uncertainties — the size of the industry, what the mix of above ground and in-situ extraction will be, the type of heating used for in-situ extraction, the amount of byproduct water and what its use or disposal will be.
  - Demand can be met without impact on existing (absolute) water rights
- E. Questions to Ben Harding and Shaden Musleh:
  - Dave Merritt asked if the Exxon Mobile Ruedi Contract was used. Mr. Musleh said there was no need to.
  - Mr. Musleh also answered that they thought these would be the three most likely areas of energy development

- Mr. Musleh & Mr. Harding reported that Tracy Boyd of Shell Oil said that there would likely be two approaches — a cooperative approach or a scramble; they modeled the cooperative approach with as little impact as possible.
  - Greg Trainor pointed out that the idea was to recognize as many processes as possible. He also noted that Yellow Jacket Water Conservancy District in Rio Blanco County was also doing a study.
  - Louis Meyer asked why non-tributary groundwater as a potential supply was discounted, and Musleh & Harding answered it had to do with the poor quality of the water, that there were challenging formations, they might be able to generate groundwater, but surface water is easier to get and the number of wells would be a lot.
  - Jim Pokrandt inquired what “take homes” from the report were, and the group was told: Demand can be met without impact on existing absolute water rights; that the study presents a few specific water supply alternatives out of many, that it is likely to be all or nothing and demand will be great; issue of by-product water re-use or disposal will likely be a cost-basis manual.
- F. A motion was made by Greg Trainor to Accept the Phase II Energy Development Water Needs Assessment and Water Supply Alternatives Analysis, seconded by Dale Tooker. The report was accepted unanimously.

## 7. **Reports**

- A. Jim Pokrandt announced the appointment of Russ George to the Colorado Water Conservation Board and thus a seat on the CBRT.
- B. Jim also reported that there have been many contributions to Headwaters magazine, and that materials should be distributed soon for the RT to review.
- C. The Itinerary for the Colorado Foundation for Water Education 2011 Basin Tour was made available. The tour is June 13-15.
- D. There will be a Non-Consumptive Committee Meeting on April 19<sup>th</sup> in Frisco from 12:30-3:30
- E. Jim then invited a brief discussion of the Roundtable Summit. He said there was still a lot of discussion and a focus on the need to understand values and develop common facts. Louis Meyer reported that his group was the Ag-Urban Divide where there was discussion of the need for change to Colorado Water Law to keep Ag viable while allowing for municipal transfers. Mr. Meyer said that all basins seemed to support these changes. Greg Trainor commented that there was a piece of legislation focused on the Ag-Urban Divide discussion but that it was still in the making. Mark Fuller expressed that based on survey results there seems to be a lot of distrust between the West Slope and Front Range and that there may be a disconnect between roundtables and legislative processes. Discussion followed, Jim expressed that meetings like the

Roundtable Summit advance issues by allowing stakeholders to get past venting so productive work can be done. Louis Meyer made a concluding remark that the Roundtables really need to get together, and asked if it was up to the Colorado River Basin to initiate the process. Jim pointed out that Roundtable meetings might be more effective after June 30 when there is clarity of vision and mission.

8. **Final Report of the Roundtables: June 30** presentation by Jacob Bornstein of the CWCB staff and Sue Morea of consultant CDM.
  - A. Jacob prefaced the conversation with the common themes of the Roundtable Summit and noted a report will be sent out later this week. Themes were: More Specificity, Building Trust between Basins, Cross-Basin Education, Funding, Implementation, More Participation from Roundtable. It was shared that having these statewide conversations is a good set up for thinking about Basin reports, as conversations highlighted three years of cross-basin issues.
  - B. Sue Morea walked the group through the Colorado Basin Report Outline:
    - Introduction of Relevant Issues
    - Non- Consumptive Needs Assessment
    - Non-Consumptive Projects and Methods
    - Consumptive Needs Assessment
    - Projects and Methods to Meet Basin Municipal and Industrial Needs
    - Water Availability
    - Basin Roundtable's Strategies to Address Consumptive and Non-Consumptive Needs
  - C. She noted Components of Colorado River Basin's Needs Assessment Report:
    - SWSI 2010- which was adopted by the Board in January. Note: The IBCC report was parallel to the SWSI demands to 2050 extracted or the basin, but though they information was similar, they are not the same.
    - Energy Study
    - WFET and Site Specific Mainstem Studies
  - D. Action Items:
    - Brainstorm Reports to Migrate in
    - Form a Subcommittee to Work on the Report
    - By Mid-April Notify Roundtable of Technical Work (any grants or studies or projects that should be noted)
    - Frame the Conclusion
    - By May-June Produce Basin Reports
  - E. Data was shared for: Colorado Basin Current Agricultural Demands (with help from Alan Martellaro deciphering Water Divisions), Colorado Basin Municipal & Industrial Demands, Colorado Basin M&I and SSI Demands, M&I Gaps in the Colorado Basin. All data is attached to these minutes.
  - F. Feedback from the group:

- Chuck Ogilby suggested the conservation discussion from January be noted, as one strategy to fill the M& I gap--stressing that active conservation was the cheapest source of water
- Mel Rettig noted that salinity was an issue in the Grand Valley and asked if there were any thoughts on how Water Quality is affected when it's moved around and diverted so much. Sue Morea confirmed that it can be noted -- also mentioning the Selenium Control Program. Dave Kanzer shared that the USGS has quantified key findings between water quantity and water quality.
- Mark Fuller brought up another possible solution -- designating or identifying recreational use areas
- Sue Morea added it would be good to include the Energy Study, non-consumptive needs and water availability
- Jacob Bornstein asked about Wild and Scenic work in the Lower & Upper Basin
- Jim suggested the Grand County Streamflow Management Plan be included
- Sue Morea also asked if the group wanted to provide information about the Global Negotiation or Colorado River Coalition-Denver Water Agreement which will be available in April
- Jacob Bornstein and Mark Fuller agreed a summary of the Roaring Fork Watershed plan may be beneficial
- Sue Morea and Jacob Bornstein both confirmed they could meet with the Vision Sub-committee when they meet and are available to provide assistance

#### **9. Orchard Mesa Irrigation District Grant Application and Approval**

- A. Max Schmidt presented a grant application for approval of the project Canal #1 Check Structure Pilot Project @ Dalton, Kiefer and Springer Properties. The total amount requested was \$25,212. The approval of the application allows for installation of a Rubicon Gate that is solar-powered and automated; project completion may lead to an estimated 20% in water savings. The amount requested will cover installation of the first gate; the rest of the project will be funded by other organizations. Design work is being completed by the Bureau of Reclamation.
- B. Time for discussion and questions was allotted. Rick Sackbauer motioned to approve the grant request. Motion was seconded by Louis Meyer. Approval of the grant request was unanimous.