

South Platte Basin Roundtable

April 12, 2011

Longmont, CO

Southwest Weld County Building

4209 Weld County Rd 24 ½

Please contact Lisa McVicker at mcvicker@gwestoffice.net with any changes or corrections.

Jim Yahn calls meeting to order at 4:12 pm

Jim announces that the daughter of Bill Jerke, former President of the Roundtable, died last week and the funeral was today. Jim asks the Roundtable to honor the memory of this young woman with a moment of silence. The Roundtable will send a card of sympathy; Jim Yahn announces that there is a scholarship set up in her memory.

I. Standard Reports:

- **IBCC Report:**

Mike Shimmin: Has not been a meeting since the last meeting in March. Next meeting is April 29 in Westminster at same hotel where roundtable summit was held. The meeting will look at the statewide summit to reflect on what was learned. All subcommittees that the IBCC has formed will meet between now and the April 29 meeting; focus will be on next steps. Next meeting after that will be in June.

- **CWCB Report:**

Todd Doherty: Since meeting in March, CWCB has not met; May meeting is coming up. Nothing to report. New Board Members: Travis Smith reappointed; April McGomery (?) reappointed; Allen Hammel from AK; Russell George new board member for the Colorado.

Jim Yahn: Status on Governor asking that all government management reapply. Open competitive situation where all upper mgt is reapplying. Hickenlooper administration wants to open competitive process. Decisions will be by June.

Don Ament: SES Contracts: Senior Executive Service contracts; review panel that will review all applications for these positions; would be useful for us to know who is on these panels; the review team will report on these. Ament is on ag panel: state fair.

- **Legislative Reports:**

Dianne Hoppe: The legislature is within less than 4 weeks of adjournment; working on long bill—stage budget—has passed Senate now in House. Not too much to fight over; however, few bills of interest: SB 208: consolidation with Division of Wildlife with Parks—talking with sponsor, indicated that this bill simply combines the boards of these two divisions and then the two boards will work on issues. Wildlife has federal money and thus has to adjust to federal requirements; this is a request by the governor and should be a cost savings to the state. Funding issues still abound; another bill is for reducing allowable mileage for daily personal use; the authority is to give the State Engineer to adjust mileage so that it can be different from federal IRS rate. Adjusts it to 75% of current federal rate. Third bill is a new bill concerning the general fund for certain monies that take severance tax money and this would negatively affect the operations of the CWCB and could have a negative effect in the future. Finally, Conservation Trust Fund—every year the legislature authorizes money for focusing on endangered species issues. This money, since the 1990s, has helped with endangered species on South Platte and

other parts of the state. Colorado is close to meeting \$24 million commitment for endangered species requirements per federal government (within \$400,000). Another bill focusing on historical ditches.

Mike Shimmin: HB 1289 through house will be heard in Senate Ag committee: essence is to clarify process issues; what started this was a multiple property documentation form; history of Colorado had asked that irrigation ditches have historical recognition; they have backed off of this and instead now any such designation would have to go through the State Engineer and all public comment process would go through the State Engineer. Thus, the new bill is designed to prevent Historical Colorado from attempting to try to list any water structure on historical list that owner of structure must have notice and if there is objection, the water structure cannot be listed. Expected to pass. Version of the bill is a compromise that History Colorado has signed off on.

Jim Yahn: Status on bill for produced waters?

Has passed House now in Senate.

Joe Frank: SB 226; carried by chair of Joint Budget; Senator Hodge; separate from aug bill.

Sean Connin: Mileage reimbursement bill question.

Those who use personal vehicles will take a hit. West Slope this could be a significant impact as more of the commissioners drive private vehicles.

- **Education Liaison Report:**

Bert Weaver: EAP: Next Task: Education Action Plan: We want to accomplish this next year; this year, other basins are working with Colorado Foundation; Jim and Bert are working on a "plan for a plan." On Wednesday, April 13, conference call with other basins for anyone interested; contact Bert. Joe Frank did an excellent job on educating everyone on non-consumptive uses at the roundtable summit.

- **Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee Report:**

Bob Streeter: Vision of Wildlife Liaison has gotten technical information to mapping folks on all items approved last time. We have not met since.

- **Phreatophyte Sub-Committee:**

Nothing to report.

- **Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee:**

Nothing to report: Joe Frank.

II. **Basin Roundtable Re-Appointments**

The members who are appointed by the roundtable need to be reappointed as it has been almost 6 years. 10 members at large;

1) Environmental local domestic ag industrial then five other at-large that need to be owners of water reps

- 1) Jim Hall: Local domestic at large
- 2) Bob Streeter: Environmental
- 3) Gene Manuelo: Ag
- 4) Greg Kournehan: recreational
- 5) Amy Willhite: industrial but she has resigned: Rich Belt

Rich introduces himself; with Xcel Energy; prior to that water resource engineer doing work for ag folks; now at Xcel; we are a large industrial user in the basin; have watched from afar and if you will have me, I look forward to working with you.
Landed in Ft. Collins after moving around with father in

- 6) Gary Herman with Central CO Water Conservancy District
- 7) Adam Bergeron with
- 8) Mike Shimmin
- 9) Doug Rademacher
- 10) Jim Yahn

Joe Frank: Move to give a unanimous ballot for those mentioned.

Larry Howard: Seconds

No discussion.

Motion carries to reappoint all, including new appointment of Rich Belt.

III. Discussion on HB1051 (Water provider reporting requirement) implementation: Kevin Reidy, CWCB

This is a bill from last year.

Todd Doherty: Bill that covers water providers over 2000 acft to ask that there is a standardized reporting form.

Kevin not present. Will table until he is.

IV. Colorado Environmental Coalition presentation on “Filling the Gap”—not yet present.

V. Basin SWSI 2010 Report Progress Update: CDM : Sue Morea and Todd Doherty

Asking for guidance for description on every grant to be included in the report; wants to go through each grant for discussion. Also, Task Reporter with both parts. Migrating task order into the document.

Schedule for this report: End of June needs to be wrapped up; as we incorporate more material, we will republish on CWCB website.

Anyone else for the committee: Bert Weaver, Pete Condoance (?) (non-consumptive), Jim Yahn and Harold Evans.

Harold provided conclusions in December meeting; would like to review these.

2 Main Areas: Roundtable to work on an intersection of what roundtable identity; need to talk about conclusions and future of roundtable.

- 1) Todd Doherty passes out list of all WRSA activities and loans; Sue asks what information we need to have from these that we would like to migrate into the report. We discussed that Upper Mtn County report will be integrated into the report; think that we should append entire report; was not part of SWASI before. Yes.

- 1) Chatfield Reallocation: a description included; this is also in IPP; Harold: this would be a good study for how the mitigation costs more than the storage. But not to be included. Include description of the report. Todd: We have paragraph long summaries for this that we have included in legislative report. Sue: We will do this for all of them but we would like to know if there is more info we want to include. McVicker asks that this part be expanded to express partnership..

- 2) Clear Creek Water Banking/High Altitude Storage: Bert Weaver: Important to show relative cost feasibility study for 9 small storage reservoirs; this would be important to show how smaller sites at the headwaters of our water shed are feasible over large storage sites. Top quality analysts; also want to note that we have filed applications on these in water court.
(Harold: Our legislative task is to find projects although we have no authority to actually move forward; thinks that this would be a good chance for us to show where the roundtable has actually supported in terms of meeting our needs. i.e. Ovid Reservoir—hopefully will be built and roundtable has been supportive; so this is an opportunity to show how we have supported these actions to meet our needs.
Bert: With the 9 reservoir sites, we have opened Green Lake: 270 acft—partnered with Black Hawk and Clear Creek County—restored this one that is in addition to the 9 sites.
Sue: We will incorporate
- 3) Ovid Reservoir: Jim Frank will write a page in terms of filling gap.
- 4) Lower south Platte Wetland Initiative: Huge one for nonconsumptive; provide for water need AND providing environmental benefits; completed and report completed. Sue will include parts of completed report.
- 5) Stage Discharge Data Loggers and Telemetry: Helped with water management. Dave Nettles will write up a paragraph for Sue. This has been very effective to extent that is required for all.
- 6) Upper Mtn Counties: included
- 7) Weld County School Dist: This is similar to other Weld County, South Platte Water Cooperative; Central South Platte Wetland partnership. Ft. Morgan recharge..these are all Ducks Unlimited; contact Greg Kornhahan; many of these projects are similar and can write up a summary.
- 8) South Platte Edition of Headwaters: education
- 9) Arickaree River Well retirement program: nature conservancy district: Adam B. will supply a summary; this was done for environmental benefits on the Arickaree; John Sanderson needs a few months extension; McVicker says that this also had water management aspects and was one thing done for the Republican River basin; this was also the starting point for some other things that happened since.
- 10) Halligan Seaman Water Mgmt planning; complete; designed as an experiment; original intent to show that there is a different way of doing water planning using a collaborative planning for stakeholder involvement; include summary; real question now is whether or not it can be used to move into the EIS process; perhaps not yet, but as far as what was accomplished with the grant, we were able to show that stakeholder involvement is effective; metrics designed in order to show how to develop a management strategy. This is complete and has been presented to CWCB.
- 11) Zero Liquid Discharge Process—complete; any results? Not yet. Julio Iturreria: Because this includes other basins, perhaps important to show concept of regionalism involved. Better idea to show that we are reaching state-wide. Sue: will highlight challenges of treating water from lower Platte.
Mike Shimmin: Were they successful? Sue: Problem is that yes, can treat it, but very expensive and the problem really is on the brine disposal. Mike: But there was not supposed to be brine—zero discharge. Sue: There is waste discharge.

Mike Shimmin: Sensing need for more follow up; need to come back and come back to tell us what actually happened. What happened with the pilot study?

Sue: The technology is not complete and for this reason the CWCB has funded another larger study; Todd: Costs very high and still left a large amount of discharge.

- 12) Lost Creek Aquifer Recharge: Harold: part of this went with a USGS report—Lost Creek basin was a recharging basin; water being taken out was being replaced; the modeling that the USGS did was key; Lost Creek basin is a potential renewable supply for south metro; ground water recharge is a small element of filling the gap; thus this is a discrete basin with enough recharge—from ag water—to be used. Thus, this would be a renewable use for south metro.

Mike Shimmin: USGS did build a model but those who know Lost Creek Aquifer see only declining water tables; thus this work by USGS is suspect. This is separate from this study; this grant not complete. Attempt is to quantify how much space would be available.

- 13) Central South Platte: With DU

- 14) FMRICo Recharge & Wetlands: description; Shimmin will review. Sue adds that it would be great to include pictures of anything that is already built. Jim suggests pictures from DU.

- 15) NCWCD: Include with data logger; Dave will write.

- 16) Ag Meteorological Network: Could be included in data logger; financial support for ongoing network.

Mike Shimmin suggests that we put these in categories: water management and data acquisition; studies for new technology; wet water projects. Sue agrees: organize by categories.

- 17) Lower South Platte Water Cooperative: This was just approved; include description; Jim Yahn will review; this should go under wet water project.

- 18) Development of Wildlife Related Recharge: See Greg K. with DU

- 19) DWR: Alluvial Aquifer: just approved; water management administrative category.

Data; nonconsumptive; water supply—categories.

Mike asks for draft before next meeting.

Sue: What about ag grants? Alternative Ag Transfers:

These are very important: CO Corn Growers, for example, came out of this so need to include.

Mike: What are reporting on: Are we reporting on WRSA grants? The ATM are separate—do not come through the roundtable.

Sue and Harold: This is a roundtable report; so need different heading.

Sue: Important to point out challenges in our basin different and can work on that in the conclusions. Will migrate the ATM report that has been developed with CWCB and will migrate some of that to this.

Conclusions: Sue: One of the other places that we need roundtable work—List of Conclusions came out of public presentation in December 2009; one part of Harold's presentation and one from Mike Shimmin's presentation.

- 1) 2050 water gap growing—quantify this;
- 2) Future water supply gap: urgent problem; includes implementation of IPPs—are we talking about a recommendation for all IPPs in Platte? Harold Evans: last month discussed if we wanted to take formal actions to support IPP; we decided that this could be a negative in order to work with other basins; we have not been asked for support; thus, in December 2009, we concluded that without storage we will see more ag dryup.

Eric Wilkinson: In some instances, already tight; from a conceptual standpoint, that IPP need to move forward and need to be pursued but do not need to support specific ones.

Julio Iturreria: Important to create overall image with all four aspects—cannot focus on just one; important that we reiterate the whole picture; emphasize the four parts.

Kevin Lust: Concurrent development important.

Sue: We had proposed a portfolio—to propose in the conclusions that we have a recommended portfolio.

Todd: The SWASI mission statement might be useful to that end—

Jim Yahn: Roundtable chair conference call—all roundtables need to come up with this statement.

Sue: For next meeting then, we could bring the proposed portfolio to look at or we could propose amounts.

Jim Yahn: We propose the tool and then the proposal and then we can tweak as we go forward.

Mike Shimmin is working on proposal; needs to look at SWSI 2010 and needs assessment; difficult to translate to quantitative outcome. Conservation and new supply piece is developed but need the IPP piece, ag dryup dependent on those. Will have this drafted by next meeting. Idea of being able to plug in other pieces is good idea; not sure if this should be part of this report or should be a separate piece. Maybe this is a communication that we send to the IBCC as our expression of where we think roundtable needs to go.

Sue: Opines that parking it in conclusions could work.

Mike: But this is statewide...not specific to South Platte.

Harold: Agree, this is statewide.

Sue: But could develop the portfolio for south Platte basin—and then link to state.

Mike: Difficulty is in envisioning statewide concepts specific to basin.

Sue: On basin level—South Platte has had x% success rate, then conservation then dryup...interaction on state level.

Harold: Uncomfortable with quantifying that in this report. Existing report is good and has much of that info already.

Adam: Curious re: conference call with all basin chairs—please clarify

Jim Yahn: More of a focus on a separate report to take to IBCC; state wide view.

Interesting because several of the roundtables had never heard of the portfolio tool.

Sue: Another recommendation: efficient water use is already happening; additional conservation is important but not enough alone.

Harold: This is consistent with IBCC conclusions. From an ag standpoint, we are using our water repeatedly; sufficient conservation happening; we use 2.5 acft per acre; West Slope 6-8 acft per acre; thus part of the message is that we are already being efficient.

Mike Shimmin: We have already done this. Part 2, South Platte Basin Roundtable Needs Assessment, page 36 has 2.5 pages of conclusions; the concept we have discussed is general conclusion 6.A: efficient use of all existing water supplies is already happening....my recommendation is that we do not need to recreate what we have already concluded and approved.

Harold: part of the problem is that these conclusions never came into part 3. Part 3—we thought this was our consumptive needs report; take conclusions from part 2.

Sue: I will migrate these into the report.

Harold: There are 6 conclusions in Part 2. These 6 conclusions are all part of assessment.

Sue: I will migrate these in.

Harold: One of things that need to be in the conclusions, the competition from Denver Metro—this internal within the basin. We need to stake our ground on the fact that we face significant competition from Metro area for water supply. We therefore need this as an additional conclusion.

Sue: Presentation from Bill Jerke on South Platte ag and water stats; do we want to include on the amount the South Platte contributes to economic value. His presentation was 2007 data.

Doug Rademacher will forward the power point to Sue; Sue will caveat these numbers.

Eric Wilkinson: Need to show how this works into the state's ag economy; value per acre; cow-calf operations on west slope are tied to east slope packing plants; need to highlight this.

Sue: I need base presentation and will draw together for review.

Janet Bell: RE: competition for water from Metro; at summit, heard that private sector will be determiner of this. Would we want to look at creating a separate entity that could buy the water rights from an ag seller who wants to sell but hold these water rights for future ag use. Would like to suggest that a future goal would be to create an alternative buyer so that these rights do not move out of ag for the future. We are assuming that what has happened in the past with private water broker will continue, but perhaps we need to create another entity.

Harold Evans: Our biggest competitor has been the municipalities.

Janet: Thinking that if people know there is a separate buyer.

Eric W.: Five years ago, there was an effort between the municipalities and other water holders in this area—its purpose was exactly this. The framework that came out was somewhat like a water conservancy district, something Larimer Weld Water Conservancy District that would level an ad valorem tax, hold the water rights and lease back to farmers or municipal. Any use..as long as it stayed in the area. Shot down four or five years ago because the need was not seen; but only way to protect water rights is free market. Could present later if interest.

Jim Yahn: Only thing missing is the educational section: two meetings, headwaters mag.

Janet Bell: If you are interested in protecting water rights from ag dryup, but looking to create this...perhaps there is energy to look at it and maybe potential for looking at it. Take ownership of instream flow, for example...potential for exploring. Seems only way to move from this private buy-in.

Sue: Would like to schedule an hour to review and spend some time with portfolio tool and bring in upper mtn counties.

VI. Kevin Reidy, Discussion on HB 1051 implementation (Water provider reporting requirement)

HB 10-1051 Covered Entities' Water Efficiency Reporting

Attempt to have diverse groups weighing in: from west slope to east.

Reporting guidelines: including outreach to stakeholders from water providers with geographic and demographic diversity, NGOs, and water conservation professionals.

Water use data will be coming in every year—purpose of tracking is to keep tabs on water so as to be able to track out forty years.

Goals: ties in with statewide supply planning; other states have done this (GA, TX, CA); the goal is to produce reporting guidelines that result in data that is useful toward statewide water supply planning, while also limiting the level of effort required for the covered entities

in the reporting process. This balance will be achieved by developing the guidelines through public participation process and will be furthered through the CWCB producing tools such as the Basin Needs Decision Support System to further streamline the reporting process.

Next phase: technical advisory group will be meeting all next year, but will bring in a larger stakeholder group. Will be soliciting folks' participation to sit in on this and review documents that have been produced. Will then go through another public participation process.

Schedule: Needs to be wrapped up by early 2012 and report to legislature and signal readiness to roll out.

Time line is reasonable for all to participate.

Different customer classes, uses, etc—focusing on need to bring in good data but need participation.

Anticipates a local planning resource for planning.

Questions: Sounds like step one toward what CA is doing, yes?

Kevin: Already in existence: cannot access grant money if not complying; different from CA however. Some have expressed fear that this is a step toward regulation like CA—no, not this. This will help with better demand forecasting. Big step with SWASI 2010 but need to refine science.

Joe Frank: How often will the report be proffered?

Kevin: Annual. Will be summarized. Not sure how info will be accessed yet.

Harold: Weather changes will be a challenge to data.

Jim: Stakeholder group? How to announce? Will this go out to all roundtables?

Kevin: List of all water providers in state. This will not affect some roundtables as much. Not restricted to utilities.

Mike Shimmin: One of the recommendations from IBCC is to lower covered entities that threshold should be lowered to include more people in this reporting effort.

Janet Bell: Will you be looking at the water source? Wells or clean water providers that operate off of a well base? In the mountain areas, the amount of water per capita is different kind of structure...will you be making accommodations for topography, etc. and source.

Kevin: Right now we are at 2000 acft source. So we are looking more at the demand side not supply.

Dinner: No one here from Colorado Environmental Coalition; Dinner and Adjournment

Jim Yahn: Next meeting will be on May 10.

Jim Yahn adjourns at 7:00 pm