

Arkansas Basin Roundtable
Meeting of January 14, 2009
Meeting Notes

Roundtable Business

Vice-Chairman Broderick called the meeting to order at 12:36 pm. Members and visitors introduced themselves. Thirty six (36) members were present, sufficient for a quorum.

A motion was made by Terry Scanga, seconded by Michael Stiehl to approve the minutes of the November meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The agenda was reviewed.

No public comment today.

CWCB/IBCC Report

Jeris: The IBCC continues to work on the visioning process. Progress is slow.

Wayne: working to pull together various scenarios, see what different combinations of solutions look like. Next meeting will be a March 16th joint CWCB/IBCC meeting. The new criteria/guidelines were approved.

Todd Doherty, CWCB: Developing 3 major strategies: conservation, Ag dry-up alternatives, and new water development. They added 300,000 per basin for upcoming fiscal year, starting July 2009. There will now be a 20% match required, when statewide funds are requested. That 20% can include basin funds. Please see the new criteria and guidelines on the CWCB website. They are asking for grants to have a direct relationship to the basins needs assessment. At this time however, funding is uncertain for the entire program. Will find out in February or March. The priority now is to fund what has already been awarded. Todd has been assigned to our basin.

Sub-Committee Reports

Non-Consumptive Water Needs Subcommittee – SeEtta Moss

Our committee is still on hold for funding for CDM. Arkansas Basin Water Forum has been scheduled for March 31st and April 1st. It will be held here at CSU-Pueblo. www.arbwf.org

Needs Assessment Committee – Jim Broderick

Will wait until next month to hear from Gary on this subject.

Presentations

1. Phantom Canyon Project – Mark Morley

The project also includes Stonewall Springs and Brush Hollow Reservoir. 70,000 AF is the built-out size of Brush Hollow. These projects are for water and energy production. The pump-back project means that during low-energy demand times (at night), energy is used to pump water uphill, water is stored uphill, then released during peak energy-demand times. Stonewall Springs includes three reservoirs that can hold 25,000 AF of water. This solution offers firm storage, the need for which has already been established. The Brush Hollow location is also a good candidate for wind and solar. Stonewall Springs site is a good candidate for hybrid solar/thermal generation.

A Carbon Savings Analysis has been done, showing that Phantom Canyon can produce 400 MW for 6 hours per day. This equates to 876,000 MW/year. The annual peaker emissions offset by Phantom Canyon would be 502,824 tons of CO₂ per year.

These are multi-purpose projects. They are possible solutions to our need for water and energy independence. They are projects that address social, economic and environmental impacts, and are sustainable.

Water Supply Reserve Account Grant Requests (pending applications)

Hydrologic Water Balance Study at the Headwaters of the Arkansas River in all of Chaffee and parts of Lake and Saguache Counties, Colorado - Terry Scanga

Goal of the project: to quantify surface and ground water, characterize the interaction between surface and ground water and estimate aquifer recharge rates, and to use results to estimate effects of changes in water use and/or climate. The project will also define available storage.

Phase I: Buena Vista-Salida Basin in Chaffee County (delineated roughly by the Granite gage at the north and the Wellsville gage at the south)

Showed how data from this study would be used in the DSS for the Arkansas Basin.

USGS has committed 33% of the cost, IF they get matching funds from basin and statewide funds. The USGS money is time-dependent, which is why Terry is bringing the application to the roundtable before the needs assessment committee. They are asking for \$36,000 from basin funds and \$144,000 from statewide funds for a total of \$180,000.

Jeris would be reluctant to pass this through without having it go to the needs assessment committee.

Since we won't know until March whether state funds will be available, what is the hurry?

Terry would like to have approval from the roundtable contingent on review and approval by the needs assessment committee.

SeEtta reminded the roundtable that they intended to save remaining basin funds for non-consumptive needs.

App would need to be reworked to make it obvious that it meets the criteria of closing the gap.

SeEtta would not give consensus to using basin funds, and they are not needed to meet the criteria of needing 20% funding from other sources.

Pete Dawson wondered if the needs assessment committee would be determining whether this emergency is equal to the zebra mussel emergency.

Jim Broderick: we need consensus. Do we have it? Sounds like this proposal could move forward as long as all other proposals that have already been forwarded get their funding first, and as long as the needs assessment committee reviews the package, and as long as the application is modified to make clear that it meets the criteria of meeting the gap, and as long as basin funds would be removed. Basin fund request would be replaced by increasing the statewide request to \$180,000. Consensus was not reached.

Reed: need to make clear that the urgency is because of funding deadlines, not because of the urgency of the mission of the project.

Terry: If we don't have the availability of USGS funding, the project would die and would have to be re-applied for at a later time.

Jim: Added an additional stipulation that the application would be contingent on USGS funding remaining available and that if the grant is not activated within 6 months that the money would be released back to CWCB.

Reed: Think we need to realize that the core of the application is good, but that there are a lot of issues that need to be worked on, in order for it to be a viable CWCB application.

Pat: would like our submittal to the state to include verbiage that makes clear that basin funds were taken out in order to reserve them for non-consumptive needs, not because we don't support the project.

Todd: The draft he received is on an old application. Could they go back and use a newer app from the website before they submit to the State?

At this time, consensus was reached for the app to go forward with the above-mentioned conditions.

A motion pass unanimously to approve alternative locations for meetings (see agenda).

New business:

Perry Cabot: has a survey that he would like us all to participate in. Some folks stayed after the meeting to complete the survey immediately. Others are asked to complete the survey online.

Meeting adjourned 2:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jay Winner