

**Interbasin Compact Committee
June 23, 2011; 8:30am-4:30pm
Hotel Colorado, Glenwood Springs, CO**

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Members

Marc Caitlin
Stan Cazier
Carlyle Currier
Jeris Danielson
Jeff Devere
Steve Harris
Melinda Kassen
Rod Kuharich
Eric Kuhn

Doug Monger
Peter Nichols
Mark Pifher
John Porter
John Rich
Sen. Gail Schwartz
Mike Shimmin
Travis Smith
Rep. Jerry Sonnenberg

John Stulp
Bill Trampe
Carl Trick
Wayne Vanderschuere
Steve Vandiver
Eric Wilkinson
Jay Winner

Staff

Heather Bergman – Peak
Facilitation
Jacob Bornstein – CWCB
Viola Bralish – CWCB
Alex Davis – DNR
Todd Doherty - CWCB
Jennifer Gimbel - CWCB

Mikaela Gregg – Peak
Facilitation
Eric Hecox – CWCB
Greg Johnson – CWCB
Sue Morea – CDM
Dori Vigil – CWCB
Mike King – EDO

Dick Wolfe – DNR
Nicole Rowan – CDM
Rep. Randy Fischer John
McClow - UGRWCD

Members of the public were in attendance

Welcome and Introductions: John Stulp

Director Stulp opened the meeting by acknowledging the dedication of IBCC members and their commitment to the group, to the state, and to advancing the dialogue in order to develop balanced solutions. Additional notable comments include:

- From the basin presentations provided during this meeting, IBCC members should take notice of the common themes emerging throughout this conversation, highlighting similar needs, interests, and concerns throughout the state.
- There are “zones”/phases in every collaborative decision-making process. The middle phase, where people work to understand each other’s interests, perspectives, goals, etc. has been referred to as the “groan zone” because the amount of communication, learning, and dedication required is difficult and often tedious. It seems like that the IBCC is moving out of this “groan zone” and into the “convergence zone” where heightened levels of understanding lead to the identification of commonalities, shared interests, and creative options for decision making.
- There are high expectations for the conservation and nonconsumptive efforts outlined in the basin reports.
- IBCC Subcommittees have been active and productive moving forward ideas and developing new dialogues and partnerships.
- The development of the Colorado River Cooperative Agreement provides a model for how differences in opinions and interests can be addressed and developed into a win-win solution.
- The updates made to the CWCB portfolio tool are exciting. While this is not an end-all solution, it will help direct attention and efforts toward identifying a statewide process and solution.

IBCC members introduced themselves and offered comments regarding the water supply in their basin. These comments highlighted the diversity of water concerns throughout the state, ranging from a surplus of water and potential flooding in some areas to limited water supply and near-drought conditions in other areas. The vast diversity of inter-basin water conditions demonstrates the advancing need and opportunities for developing diverse partnerships and creative solutions for statewide water management.

Overview: Revised Gap Technical Work--New Supply and IPP Subcommittee

In a New Supply Subcommittee meeting, a request was made for additional analysis of the state’s predicted municipal and industrial (M&I) gap. New Supply Subcommittee members shared with the IBCC why this request was made, the findings, and how this information was addressed in the joint New Supply/IPP Subcommittee meeting.

- The Subcommittee was seeking additional data to help build a better foundation from which to assess the gap in more detail in order to better guide discussions regarding new water supply needs and opportunities.
- The new information will help highlight the tradeoffs and the fact that a project appropriate for one area may not be appropriate and/or beneficial for other areas.
- Feedback regarding the IBCC framework asked for more detail and more specifics, and for the group to begin to look at and identify potential solutions. The Subcommittee thought that a more detailed and basin-based understanding of where the gaps are and when they will occur would facilitate identification of specific multi-purpose project/solution options.
- The hope is that this additional gap information will also help facilitate the basin roundtables in advancing their efforts and suggestions for developing a statewide solution.
- The purpose of the data request was to provide a report that identified where the water is, where the demand is, and when the demand will occur. This information will also help identify where the infrastructure is and where new infrastructure is needed and can realistically be built. It is important to look at the geographical components regarding the need, availability, and options for new water supplies.

- It will be important to clearly differentiate between an IPP and new supply when discussing water supply project development.

Eric Hecox, CWCB staff, provided a handout and overview of the information developed in response to the New Supply Subcommittee request. Highlights from this overview include:

- The information identifies the gaps and demand at county and regional levels and outlines the predicted timing of gap occurrences.
- It is important to remember that the term “status quo” refers to the current state--if nothing different is done to address the pending statewide water shortages.
- Summary tables were developed to help outline comparisons between basins. The tables include:
 1. IPP success rates by basin
 2. A summary of the information provided in the maps (note the Front Range regions are highlighted as one category)
 3. What the IPP options are and where they are located
 4. A list of all IPPs by basin

Discussion: Revised Gap Technical Work

- This information further identifies that there is a need to start developing or modifying projects immediately in order to have them on line in time to address pending 2030-2050 M&I gaps. This is something that needs to be explained to the public—that while it may seem like there are 20-30 years before M&I gaps are realized, it will take that long (if not longer) to initiate projects and have systems in place to actively mitigate the gap.
- It is interesting to note that while the Front Range has the largest predicted gap—which draws a great deal of attention—the Yampa/White Basin has the earliest gap occurrence.
- It might be useful to outline what elements make up the gap-- i.e., how it is assessed in this report versus SWSI and what the influencing elements are (M&I, IPP, population growth, etc.).

Discussion: New Supply and IPP Subcommittee Next Steps

- It would be valuable to share the new gap information with the basin roundtables to help them identify potential project options.
- It would be valuable if the basin roundtables each assessed Table 4 (regarding IPPs) to make sure the numbers are up-to-date and realistic.
- There is a need to begin more focused conversations regarding new supply development needs. The IBCC needs to address what new supply means (where and what kind), how to ensure potential projects are optimized, and how potential impacts can be mitigated in a more area-focused manner.
- There seems to be a need for scenario planning to look at how to balance interests based on the information in SWSI in conjunction with the additional gap information.
- It is time to start talking about specifics—not specific new supply projects, but basin needs and area-specific projects to outline what options are viable for different regions based on the gap information.
- Risk assessments will be a key component to the new supply/project dialogue.
- It is important to keep in mind that new supply development does not necessarily mean one solve-all project but also a portfolio of projects and state efforts.
- There is concern that the IBCC is not talking about the Flaming Gorge project or any other specific project.
- It will be important for the IBCC to keep pace with and up-to-date regarding the work being done by the basin roundtables.

- There seems to be a need to streamline all the data the IBCC has been presented. There may be a need for the IBCC to “approve” a specific version of how the gap is characterized. The public is receiving information from a number of sources, which is not going to help gain support for IBCC recommendations and public engagement in future statewide initiatives. Additional comments on this topic include:
 - The CWCB approved SWSI 2010 and therefore this is the data that is used for the IBCC. The scenarios outlined in the report are all based on the same foundational data; it is how the data is used (high, medium, and low thresholds) that alters the characterization of the gap.
 - It may be valuable for the IBCC to identify a central scenario from which to focus its planning efforts.
 - There may not be a need to identify a specific quantity or scenario for the gap but rather identify a range or bracket of data to work from.
 - If the IBCC clarifies the data it uses, it will help lay a foundation for clear public education and outreach.
 - It may be valuable to guide planning efforts based on basin-specific needs rather than the statewide gap.
 - There is concern that if a specific gap quantity is “approved” by the IBCC and that quantity ends up being inaccurate, it could harm the IBCC’s credibility and delegitimize any efforts and/or products that were developed from that information/data.
 - It will be important for PEPO to help educate the public regarding the complexities of the water issue and modes of quantification.
 - It may be valuable to think about the issue of information/data based on the following two levels:
 1. Information and data used within the water community—this includes the IBCC—where the complexities are better understood and can be discussed
 2. Information/data for the general public that needs to be kept simple, effective, streamlined, and focused on the facts (i.e., there is a water shortage and a need for action to address it)

Next Steps: New Supply Development Subcommittee

- Staff will disaggregate the data on the gap to identify the constituent elements (e.g., self-supplied industrial, municipal, population growth, etc.).
- The Subcommittee will discuss how to build on the additional gap and IPP data to advance the new supply discussion. Options for this discussion include:
 - Isolating the size, location, and timing of one or more gaps and outline a package of tradeoffs for addressing that/those gap(s) with new supply.
 - Developing two or more packages of tradeoffs for addressing the gap under different success rates for IPPs (e.g., if IPPs are 100% successful, then X approach to new supply; if IPPs are 75% successful, then Y approach to new supply).

Overview: Portfolio Tool and Basin Roundtable (BRT) Portfolio Development

CWCB staff provided an overview regarding updates made to the portfolio tool. As outlined in the IBCC roadmap, basin roundtables (BRTs) will work with this tool through the end of the year to develop one or more statewide portfolios to share with the IBCC. Additional information regarding the portfolio tool includes:

- It is important to recognize that this tool was developed based on data and information in the SWSI 2010 report. The IPP data was compiled from the basin surveys conducted last year for the SWSI 2010 report.

- It is important to remember that IPPs and conservation can be used as options for meeting remaining gaps from agricultural transfers and supply gaps from the Colorado River.
- CWCB staff will attend upcoming basin roundtable meetings to review the tool and initiate the portfolio discussion. Staff will also be available to help support basin roundtables as needed throughout the process.
- The portfolio tool and supplementary documents will be available on the CWCB website.

Suggestions: Portfolio Tool

- There is concern that the data regarding passive conservation seems high and may need to be reassessed.
- The rounding of data in the table should be removed.
- There is a need to include an additional column (or additional table) that associates the total percentage of irrigated acres with the corresponding quantity of acre-feet.
- There is a need to take development/population growth and expansion over agricultural land into consideration when addressing fallowing. It would be valuable to have an option that allows for agricultural land to be subtracted from agricultural use and the associated water demand.

Discussion: Portfolio Tool and Basin Roundtables (BRTs)

The IBCC discussed how to help the roundtables with their portfolio development efforts, how to encourage cross-basin dialogue and collaboration during the portfolio process, and what the role of the IBCC should be in supporting and assisting the basin roundtables throughout this exercise. Notable discussion points include:

- Basins have the option of developing their ideal portfolio in addition to developing a more “realistic” statewide portfolio that attempts to balance the needs of all basins. It is important for the roundtables to look beyond the interests of their basin and think about the needs of the state as a whole.
- It is important for IBCC members on the roundtables to lead this effort and to encourage roundtables to acknowledge the complexity of building a portfolio and the impacts and consequences of trade-offs throughout the state.
- The process suggested by CWCB staff includes the following:
 - Each BRT will work with the portfolio tool over the next 6 months to whatever degree each roundtable determines.
 - CWCB staff will be available to help with the technical questions and elements of the portfolio tool and can also help organize meetings between roundtables.
 - During this time, the IBCC will not be developing a portfolio but will be prepared to review and assess the portfolios developed by the BRTs.
- It may not be realistic to expect the BRTs to develop a statewide portfolio when the roundtables were developed under 1177 to address basin-specific issues.
- It may be valuable to have the BRTs develop a portfolio and share it with other basins—specifically those directly affected by their suggested trade-offs. There may be more accountability for the process and the development of a balanced portfolio if a basin has to explain and rationalize their approach to other basins.
- It is important to remember that there has been feedback that the IBCC/BRT process is too top down. The portfolio development process is an opportunity to address this concern and to engage the BRTs, which may help lay a foundation for greater support of IBCC recommendations and future processes.
- It may be valuable to ask the BRTs to “role play”—take on the perspective of a different basin and build a portfolio from that perspective.
- There is a high level of value and opportunity for the BRTs to gain a better understanding of others’ needs and concerns and the complexity of developing a win-win solution for the state.

- There is concern that this phase moves the IBCC process away from advancing IPP implementation.
- It may be valuable to have representatives (3-5) from each of the BRTs meet together (round-robin style) to discuss the portfolios developed by their BRTs. This would create an opportunity for all the portfolios to be shared and discussed without an overwhelming number of people. The representatives could then report back to their roundtables regarding the comments and suggestions heard, discuss them, and determine how to proceed. This type of meeting would also help identify overarching themes that could help inform subsequent IBCC discussions.
- It may be valuable to allow the BRTs to independently reach out to other roundtables as they develop their portfolio(s) and then coordinate a more formal, all-basin meeting after portfolios are in a more final or complete state.
- It is important for the roundtables to address this process one step at a time to fully understand the components and trade-offs and hopefully gain a better statewide perspective. It may be valuable to introduce this to the BRTs and allow them to work with it for the next few months and then for the IBCC to readdress the overall process and next steps in September based on the progress and discussions emerging from the roundtables.
- It is important not to prejudge the outcomes and the responses of the BRTs regarding how they will respond to this project and what types of portfolios they will develop. It is critical for the basin roundtable representatives to demonstrate a perspective that supports this process and the significance of working toward a productive outcome. This is an opportunity for the BRT representatives on the IBCC to help educate and focus the roundtables on statewide cooperation. It will be valuable for people to step away from their basin-focused perspectives and try to look through the lens of other basins and stakeholders.
- There is a need to be careful regarding how this exercise and information is delivered to the BRTs and how much is asked of them. It is important to first see how this request is received and then allow each BRT to determine the direction they want to go and how much time they want to dedicate to it.
- It is likely that each roundtable will have a different reaction and response regarding how to address this project. It will be valuable for staff to help accommodate the various needs and interests of the BRTs depending on the extent to which they want to understand the tool and the breadth of portfolio options.
- It is important that this process focuses on meeting the needs of the state as a whole. It may be valuable for the basins that are in need of additional water supply to offer incentives to other basin to encourage a greater willingness to engage. Some of the information in the tables prepared for the New Supply Subcommittee (see above) regarding the expanded gap analysis could serve as a reference point for an incentives/give-and-get conversation.

Next Steps: Portfolio Tool

- Staff will make changes to the portfolio tool to reflect IBCC feedback.
- Staff will work with roundtable chairs to schedule presentations on the portfolio tool.
- Staff will schedule one or more webinars for roundtable and IBCC members who are interested in an in-depth discussion of the mechanics of the tool.
- Roundtables should discuss how they want to proceed with the portfolio tool and whether/how they want to engage with other roundtables on this topic. IBCC members will report on these discussions at the IBCC meeting in September.

Presentation: Roaring Fork Watershed Plan

Mark Fuller, Ruedi Water and Power Authority and Rick Lofaro, Roaring Fork Conservancy, provided an overview of the Roaring Fork Watershed Plan. Highlights from this presentation include:

- The Watershed Plan is the product of a four-year project designed to bring together a broad range of stakeholders to discuss watershed issues in a joint effort. The Plan originated out of the Roaring Fork Watershed Collaborative in 2002 and joined efforts with the Ruedi Water and Power Authority in 2006.
- The purpose of the plan is to work toward an environmentally and economically healthy watershed that benefits all stakeholders.
- Benefits of a watershed plan include:
 - Opportunity for input and dialogue between all stakeholders
 - Improve understanding, interest, and leadership in watershed issues
 - Encourage partnerships
 - Efficient use of resources
 - Guidance for protecting water resources while providing for a viable economic community
 - Information sharing
 - Public outreach and education
- The Watershed Plan consists of:
 - *The State of the Roaring Fork Watershed Report 2008*—a comprehensive compendium of watershed conditions
 - Two supporting guidance documents:
 - *Why the Roaring Fork Watershed Plan Matters* (2008)
 - *Illuminating the Way Ahead* (2010)
 - From these documents, a series of goals, objectives, and actionable recommendations will develop as Phase II of the Plan.
- The recommended action plans identify coordinating entities, key participants, and prioritizes over 200 action items based on area and priority level (urgent, high priority, priority).
 - Urgent actions areas include:
 - Regional water management
 - Surface water
 - Groundwater
 - Water quality
 - Riparian and instream areas
- The next phase of the Watershed Plan includes circulation and discussion of the findings and long-term implementation strategies.

Questions and Answers

- How were existing diversions and future requests addressed?
 - Representatives were included in the conversation and planning process. An effort was made to avoid making specific recommendations that could potentially conflict with existing projects or water law.
 - It was essential to develop a strong regional voice from which the region could address issues (especially urgent issues) and protect all interests.
- How were the issues of forest fires and threats to watersheds addressed?
 - The Forest Service (and other stakeholder agencies) was included as an important part of the planning process.

For additional information, visit the Roaring Fork website at: www.roaringfork.org.

Presentations: Basin Reports

Basin roundtable representatives were asked to discuss their basin reports, including how their roundtable approached different aspects of the report, major findings, and a summary of what their roundtables identified as next steps. Highlights from these presentations include:

Arkansas

- Identified issues regarding distrust and the need for greater education as central areas to address
- Looked at how to protect the basin and meet the basin's gap
- Outlined projects and graded/analyzed the projects based on viability and equitability
- Used House Bill 1177 to guide efforts and keep conversations on track

Next Steps: Arkansas Basin Roundtable

- Four central focus areas:
 - Agricultural viability
 - In-basin augmentation
 - Water quality
 - Water quantity
 - Ensure future M&I needs
- Assess groundwater issues
- Address IPPs and storage

Southwest

- Focused on projects and methods with sponsor-based initiatives
- Used the data and information provided in SWSI to help develop a list of projects for which other stakeholders were asked to contribute additional information and project lists
- Initiated a similar process to identify nonconsumptive projects and sponsors
- Identified the value of having 10 different parallel rivers within the basin which allow projects to move forward without overlap and interference
- Identified sponsors for almost all of the IPPs

Next Steps: Southwest Basin Roundtable

- Continue to advance efforts to integrate consumptive and nonconsumptive needs
- Address M&I needs without agricultural dry-up
- Need for better public education and outreach
- Need for the State to closely monitor Compact usage

Colorado

- Identified size of need as a central issue regarding how to address nonconsumptive needs
- Developed a watershed flow evaluation tool and subcommittee to facilitate a flow analysis process

Next Steps: Colorado Basin Roundtable

- Assess the following issues:
 - The need to discuss overarching needs with the Metro and South Platte Roundtables
 - Basin economics and future partnerships for infrastructure development
 - Oil shale development
 - Compact administration and management
 - Climate change

Metro

- Looked at current IPPs, reuse, agricultural projects, etc., but did not have many nonconsumptive projects to evaluate
- Looked at alternative agricultural transfers and their economic impacts, the willingness to supply water but the concurrent significant need for infrastructure, and the dynamic between finance and yield
- Identified the importance of conservation to meet the gap
- Reduced consumption by 20% since 2007
- Identified that new supply will be necessary as a result of new development on the West Slope and alternative agricultural transfers; several new supply possibilities were explored including the concept of a Flaming Gorge pumpback as a long-term solution
- Discussed that the need for water and the ability to advance creative solutions are contingent on the ability to develop expansive partnerships
- Made progress advancing basin projects in areas of reuse, conservation, and regional partnerships
- Discussed that it would be valuable to have more research and data regarding reuse availability and reasonability; access to this information could help facilitate the basin roundtables' portfolio development

Next Steps: Metro Basin Roundtable

- Conservation:
 - Consistent messaging
 - Indoor plumbing codes
 - Executive Order directing State agencies to reduce their water demand
 - Funding to pursue best available technology
 - Adoption of water efficiency standards
- Exploring alternatives to agricultural transfers
- Consider nonconsumptive recommendations from the South Platte Surface water storage and aquifer storage and recovery (ASR); regional ASR
- New supply options, including new projects and agricultural transfers

Yampa/White

- Addressed the lack of sufficient information regarding agricultural needs and the current and potential viability per-acre irrigation; a committee was developed to lead research efforts
- Looked into the issue of return flows from surface irrigation and determined that past studies did not address high-altitude efficiency needs and land that could be irrigated if the local economy could support the expansion
- Addressed issues of climate change in relation to agriculture

Next Steps: Yampa/White Basin Roundtable

- Look into what problems could potentially occur if a major new supply project were to develop in the basin
- Assess the relationship between M&I and the power plant

Rio Grande

- Addressed the sustainable use of aquifers for agricultural use; determined that due to changes in irrigation methods, an aquifer-based water supply method is not sustainable
- Began looking into groundwater sub-district development in order to manage the aquifers sustainably;
- Addressed river restoration, reservoir maintenance and use, and relationships with ditch companies in order to make the use of ditch water more viable; restoration will require the dry-up

of some agriculture to reduce demand/use with the hope of returning supply with recharge from diversions

Next Steps: Rio Grande Basin Roundtable

- Work with the State to ensure Compact forecasts are reliable and to keep the river well-maintained to ensure water can move efficiently through the system
- Address sustainable water management strategies for the basin's aquifers
- Advance water management strategies with high-consumptive entities in the region
- Address irrigation infrastructure needs

South Platte

- Focused on developing methods for deterring agricultural transfers as a default method addressing increased water supply needs
- Worked to quantify the agricultural gap
- Discussed that a good deal of agricultural dry-up is from the development of agricultural land and to meet M&I demands
- Discussed the need to demonstrate the connection between agriculture and nonconsumptive, recreational, and environmental needs
- Acknowledged that agriculture will have to contribute to meeting the gap, but if done with alternative dry-up methods, there may be more balanced solutions to develop

Next Steps: South Platte Basin Roundtable

- Focus efforts on surface and ASR efforts
- Areas of concern include:
 - The state needs to move forward with developing solutions with a sense of urgency as population growth and agricultural dry-up are advancing.
 - Storage needs to be incorporated into all framework components.
 - There is a need for more analysis of appropriate levels of conservation in order to determine what levels of implementation would be realistic and economically feasible.
 - There is a need to advance maximum implementation of IPPs and to look at encouraging municipalities to prioritize IPPs that do not include agricultural dry-up.
 - It is critical to find ways to increase cooperation between the East Slope and West Slope in order to find solutions that will meet everyone's needs.

North Platte

- Addressed agricultural demands, economics, and the connection between the basin's agricultural industry and that of other basins
- Discussed the interconnectedness of nonconsumptive attributes
- Discussed the effects of the North Platte Decree on the basin and potential future use; the basin has the ability to expand its agricultural land use, but doing so will require investments and funding

Next Steps: North Platte Basin Roundtable

- Areas of concern include:
 - The need for the roundtable to look at community-specific needs
 - The need to advance public education regarding food security and water use
 - The need to develop public education in a manner that directly relates to the specific needs of each basin
 - The need to develop basin-specific conservation strategies

Gunnison

- Discussed agricultural shortages and concerns regarding how the SWSI model addresses agricultural water supply and use; it is important to recognize the difference between when a water source is unavailable and the calculation of a capable growing season
- Discussed the need for better/more water storage capacity in order to ensure the availability of water required to irrigate a full-crop season
- Began a series of joint meetings with the Arkansas Basin Roundtable which have demonstrated the potential for productive inter-basin dialogues and progress
- Formed a subcommittee to investigate concepts and options regarding leasing land from the Bureau of Reclamation for a water storage facility
- Planned a circulation of talks/meetings with other basin roundtables to develop a better understanding of basin issues across the state

Next Steps: Gunnison Basin Roundtable

- Key areas of concern include:
 - The future of agriculture in relation to population growth
 - Risk management regarding the potential for overdevelopment of the Colorado River

Progress Report: IBCC Subcommittees

Nonconsumptive Needs

- During the last Subcommittee meeting, the following items were discussed to help develop Subcommittee next steps:
 - The Nonconsumptive Needs Assessment Phase II results
 - The role of the IBCC/Nonconsumptive Subcommittee in supporting basin roundtables' nonconsumptive efforts
 - Quantification of nonconsumptive data with the help of basin roundtables

Next Steps: Nonconsumptive Needs Subcommittee

- CWCB staff will organize a meeting of environmental and recreation representatives to the nine basin roundtables to discuss:
 - How to advance efforts relating to nonconsumptive needs. The Subcommittee will draft several options to present at this meeting for the group to work from in order to develop an effective strategy.
 - The best mode to 'request' action from the basin roundtables regarding addressing basin-specific protection gaps.
- The Subcommittee and CWCB staff will work to compile a list/table outlining current information and resources to help guide next steps.
- The Subcommittee and CWCB will begin to assess options for gathering additional methodology for further protection and nonconsumptive needs assessments and analysis.
- The Subcommittee will assess the options for meeting with the other IBCC subcommittees to assess how to integrate the topics and to develop joint next steps.
- The Subcommittee will discuss sustainable funding options for nonconsumptive projects.

Suggested Additional Next Steps

- The Subcommittee could ask the basin roundtables to analyze their nonconsumptive needs, projects, methods, and available data in order to address the adequacy of current protections and projects. This information could be used to develop a qualitative and quantitative assessment and/or a map of protections, projects, and gaps.
- Data that could contribute to this exercise includes:

- A Liekert scale-based assessment (1-5 ranking) of the effectiveness of protections of each basin's projects and methods
- An assessment of where there are no nonconsumptive projects in each basin and why (if there is no need or no project has yet been developed where there is a need)
- Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) protection information
- Additional stream-based data that local environmental, community, or government entities may possess

Progress Report: Alternative Agricultural Transfer Methods Subcommittee

- The Subcommittee had a meeting with the Colorado Agriculture Water Alliance (CAWA). Central issues discussed include:
 - Infrastructure/storage
 - IPPs
 - The role of the State
 - Ownership
 - Water/agricultural transfer fee
- The Subcommittee met with the Front Range Water Council. Notable discussion points included:
 - Water conversation extends beyond the issue of water supply and therefore needs to also address (1) drought response and mitigation, (2) base supply, and (3) interim supply.
 - Storage and infrastructure are central issues/needs to address Colorado's water needs and use.
 - There is a need to expand the alternative agricultural transfer discussion to include more water providers in the Front Range area and the agricultural community in order to expand the conversation and potential for creative and viable solutions.
 - The value of developing broad and diverse relationships to help address the complexity of issue and better understand potential opportunities.

Next Steps: Agriculture Transfer Methods

- The Subcommittee will work to plan a joint meeting with the Colorado Agricultural Alliance (CAWA) and Front Range water providers. The Front Range water provider community will include not only FRWC members but also other large and/or growing water providers. The discussion will focus on how alternative transfer methods can be applied to address different kinds of demand (base, drought, etc.), storage, and future venues/opportunities to continue dialogue.

Conservation/PEPO

- During a joint Conservation Subcommittee and PEPO meeting the following central issues were discussed:
 - The State is awaiting results from a study about messaging and water issues. Once the study is complete, PEPO and the Conservation Subcommittee will meet to discuss the study findings and outline methods for integrating the findings into current and future IBCC/PEPO efforts.
 - There is an interest in addressing the lack of unified messaging regarding state water issues and developing a suggested foundation from which to approach public communication efforts in the hope of creating prospective legislation to advance messaging statewide. There is a need to develop a unified message before engaging other stakeholders and advancing statewide education campaigns and engagements.
 - The group understands the need to assess how best to engage additional stakeholders in the community to share and expand public messaging, education, and outreach.

Comments: Conservation/PEPO

- It may be valuable to address public outreach messaging with the IBCC in order to avoid messy/mixed messaging. There is concern that misinformation will develop misconceptions and distract from the recommendations of the IBCC.
- PEPO would like to work with each subcommittee to discuss and develop a specific and efficient foundation for messaging on their topic.
- PEPO would like to support (where appropriate) the activities of smaller groups, forums, etc. and continue to work with the roundtables to ensure education efforts are continued and effective.

Next Steps: Conservation Subcommittee

- Plan a joint meeting with PEPO to discuss the findings from the State's study on messaging needs and determine how to proceed in light of the findings of that report
- Develop an action plan for engaging stakeholders, key groups throughout the state, and the public regarding messaging and the other specific recommendations from the December 2010 report (including legislation)

Next Steps: PEPO

- Plan a joint meeting with the Conservation Subcommittee to discuss the findings from the State's study on messaging needs and determine how to proceed in light of the findings of that report
- Consider if there is a need for PEPO to help to begin to educate the public regarding the complexity of water issues so they have a better understanding of why there are so many reports circulating and different quantities being referenced
- Schedule meetings with all of the IBCC subcommittees to discuss joint work to address education outreach needs and how to craft effective and unified messaging

Update: Colorado River Water Availability Study

- CWCB staff is working to improve the study.
- As requested, staff will meet with each basin roundtable to gather feedback prior to completion of the study. Staff is hoping to have the next phase of the report completed by the end of the year; however, completion will depend on when feedback can be gathered from all the roundtables.
- After the report is finalized, staff will share the report with basin roundtables to help facilitate its use.
- In response to concern regarding the water availability range provided in the previous study, it was decided that the final report will not provide a range and instead outline the variables involved in developing a range and discuss what was learned in attempting to do so in the previous study.
- The Reclamation Basin Study might be a helpful resource to address the range of water availability based on hydrologic models as well as show how other states are addressing this issue.

Update: House Bill 1051 Advisory Stakeholder Group

- In 2010, the Colorado General Assembly adopted House Bill 10-1051 which requires covered entities to report, on an annual basis, water use and conservation data to be used for statewide water supply planning. Data reported under HB10-1051 will support statewide water supply planning efforts by improving the quantity and quality of data available.
- A technical advisory group has been created to address the details regarding how to gather appropriate data without collecting too much or unnecessary information and overwhelming/distracting from the intended goal/purpose of the bill.
- The technical group will submit recommendations for review by the Board. There will also be an opportunity for a public review before the guidelines are submitted to the legislature.

- There is a plan to provide all the basin roundtables with an update regarding the bill and process.

Closing Remarks: John Stulp

- It is important to recognize the overarching themes that were identified during the day's presentations and discussions. Such themes include:
 - The need to finish/move forward IPPs
 - The value of cross-basin discussions and need to advance these efforts
 - The importance of conservation in conjunction with the need to advance the level of knowledge, information, and data regarding how to effectively address conservation issues and efforts
 - The value of addressing nonconsumptive needs
 - The significance statewide for protecting agriculture.
- The work of the IBCC is important and critical. The basin reports and the advancement of the portfolio tool are a significant step forward for this discussion. The IBCC is responsible for making the portfolio project a successful and productive process through strong leadership and guidance with the basin roundtables. The basin roundtables and IBCC are the leaders of the discussion on how to address the future of Colorado's water situation. This is the beginning of important conversations and developments, setting the stage for critical next steps.