

Arkansas Basin Roundtable
Meeting of April 8, 2009
Meeting Notes

Roundtable Business

Chairman Barber called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm. Members and visitors introduced themselves. Thirty one (31) members were present, 5 members were excused, sufficient for a quorum.

A motion was made by Tom Florszak and seconded by Tom Verquer to approve the minutes of the March meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The agenda was reviewed. Under new business, Wayne Vanderschuere reported that he had received a request from the Colorado Basin Roundtable. They would like us to come visit them and update them on our Basin on April 27th, if possible.

CWCB/IBCC Report

Jeris Danielson: The legislature is taking approximately \$44 million from the CWCB. Phase I of the Colorado River Study is projected to be finished in December. They have begun an analysis of large projects, including the Yampa River Pumpback and the Flaming Gorge Project. A Compact Compliance Study has also been funded.

Wayne Vanderschuere: Thought they would have preliminary findings in July for Colorado River Study. Also looking at groupings of smaller projects.

CWCB meeting will be in Pueblo May 19th and 20th, location to be determined.
The money in basin funds is still available. The \$700,000 in the State fund has not been lost.

PRESENTATIONS

Mississippi River Import Project – Gary Hausler

A Sustainable Source of Water for the Western United States.

Sources of “New” Water in the West: Desalination, Conservation & Re-use, Ag Dry-up and Importation.

The Eastern Slope currently receives import water from the Colorado River Basin. Mr. Hausler maintains that the Colorado River will not be able to provide all of the future water needs of Colorado. He explained this position in detail.

Alternative Importation Source: The Mississippi River. Mr. Hausler explored the water available in the Mississippi River, and some of the history and nature of water law that would be applicable.

The First Phase Proposal: Central Plains Compact would build a series of pipelines, canals, and storage starting near Hickman KY, ending near Monument, CO. 1600 MW of power would be required to transport to Colorado (1800 MW is created by Hoover Dam).

22.5 billion dollars is estimated for permitting, right of way, engineering and construction based on Colorado River Return Reconnaissance Study costs, adjusted to 2008 dollars. This project could provide new water for \$22,500 per AF.

Debt service, 30 yrs, at 5% equals \$1,400/AV/year. No federal dollars would be required.

Water is administered by US Army Corps of Engineers under Law of Riparian Rights. The water is owned by United States. Water would be provided to multiple states for Ag, municipal, industrial and environmental use. No new engineering or construction technology would be needed for project.

Challenges:

Political. A hard sell to potential partner states. Changes paradigm of Southwestern States view of the Colorado River System. Provincial concerns must yield to regional water solutions.

Permitting

Environmental concerns: water quality would have to be as high as the water already here.

Project would take 25 to 30 years to complete.

Reconnaissance Study Topics include the physical and legal availability of water, permitting, demand for water, and water quality including sedimentation, chemical, and biological issues, alignment and right of way, conveyance types and sizes.

Projects and Methods to Meet the Needs of the Arkansas River Basin

Gary Barber

- Discussion about IPPs
 - Our cap was around 32,000 AF, much of that in northern El Paso County
 - Infrastructure needs
 - Storage needs
 - If any of our IPPs do not happen, the gap would increase greatly.
- Table format (see *Identified Plans and Projects* chart)
- Schedule to complete work on identifying projects and methods to meet our needs – May 3 joint roundtable meeting, June meeting in Salida – will talk about non-consumptive needs there, July meeting will be skipped for 4th of July week, although the executive committee would meet and put together a draft report. In August we'll discuss a draft report and we will ask roundtable members to get feedback from the public in their constituency. In September, will look for final approval of the report at that meeting. October is the annual meeting, officer election, and another opportunity to finish up the report if it's not finished.
- Discussion:

Lindsay Case: would like to suggest that Huerfano County be included with Purgatoire on the chart.

Jeris Danielson: Agrees that the orphans ought to join the lost souls in Purgatoire.

Reed Dils: On the projects that are in process, we need to assume the Conduit will happen. Now PSOP needs to be looked at. Need to reacquaint everyone with what that's about. SDS has a strong chance of happening. A lot of the rest of this is projects that we've accomplished, and we should feel good about that.

Tom Young: I represent 160 acres out of one of the largest counties in the state. Their needs are pretty well satisfied by the Upper Ark Water Conservancy District.

Terry Scanga: Not sure how we should be ranking this? PSOP is very important. Tamarisk removal is very important to us as well.

Patricia Alderton: Would like more time – can think of a couple of projects that maybe should be on the chart.

Name?: Can also think of a project or two that should go on the list. Emphasized the Zebra Mussel issue and containing that in projects that move water from one place to another.

Jay Winner: Leasing/fallowing should be on the list. All of these projects are solutions that originate in our basin and take care of our needs in our basin.

SeEtta Moss: Conservation, reuse & efficiency should be on the list.

Jim Broderick: Agrees that we're about 90% there. This is an opportunity for you to look at the chart and see if there are projects there that we need to define a little bit more or projects that need to be added. I also think that it's projects to reduce the gap, whether consumptive or non-consumptive. We need to see the non-consumptive and how it fits into the equation. Need to see some specific projects there.

Lindsay Case: It would be really optimal to see when these projects came on line, how much money we allocated to them, to try to track the capital investment in these particular projects. Urban/Agricultural balance.

Lissa Pinello: Agrees that the subjects of conservation and efficiency haven't been addressed.

Alan Hamel: Thanked Gary for giving us a method for having the dialogue. Thinks the roundtable has gone a long way toward identifying projects and methods. Storage is really a critical component to the future of this basin for municipal and Ag use. It deserves a high priority as we move forward. Other potential projects might be additional small storage solutions along with PSOP, as there were 35 other storage projects studied as part of PSOP. Don't forget the statewide projects that address other needs. Should encourage the state, other roundtables and the IBCC to push the CWCB to move forward with finishing the first phase and move forward with the second phase of the Colorado River Water Availability Supply Study. One thing we haven't discussed is how will the state administer compact shortages on the Colorado River in the future? We need to understand how this will be handled in the future. Look at different ways to administer more junior rights on the Colorado River.

Jeris Danielson: Doesn't see any projects that bring new water to the watershed, only new ways to move old water around. The Colorado River Availability Study does show that there is un-allocated water in the Colorado River Basin, yet the western slope insists that there isn't any water available. Jeris thinks we should add a Colorado River import project to the list. The water belongs to the people of the State of Colorado. It does not belong to the West Slope. We need to figure out how much is there, and how we can develop it to better serve the needs of the State of Colorado.

Dan Henrichs: On the statewide projects, wants info about the rehab of state and federal projects. Dan would like to add the Lysimeter research, which we helped to fund.

Tom Brubaker: Thinks there is a significant need in the basin that the roundtable hasn't been discussed, which is the need to protect the investment value of Ag water rights. 85% of the water rights in the value are owned by Ag interests. If you stop all Ag to Urban transfers, you destroy the investment value of Ag water rights.

Tom Verquer: Has concerns about SDS, and where the water will be taken out. This location may have significant impact on Ag water integrity. Also emphasized the importance of Tamarisk removal and prevention. Has concerns about our food production moving farther and farther away – will we become dependent on 3rd World countries for our food production in the future?

Jonathon Fox: Thinks that the projects should be ranked as to how well they meet the gap. He echoes other's concerns about growth in the State of Colorado.

James Fernandez: Represents Las Animas municipalities. We've got a real concern about what the State Water Engineer is doing about the shortage of water going to Kansas.

Dave Stone: A new water source is primary. Dave supports a change of theory regarding the issue of if you use conservation, and then use less water, you then face the risk of losing that water.

Tom Florszak: Tom thinks the addition of small storage units would be beneficial. The column that states the sub-basin is apparently where the need is. It would be nice if there was a column next to that stating where other impacts occur.

Wayne Vanderschuere: I suggest that we go to the next step and look at the analytics of this. Identify how much of the gap is met by each project. Thanked Elise.

Michael Stiehl: On the column Sub-basin, I think that there is a lot more cross-over than is listed. The Transfer Guidelines work has made great strides towards protecting the investment value of Ag water rights.

Reed Dils: If you want to keep up with what's going on with the Colorado River Water Availability Study, please go to the CWCB website regularly for updates on that.

Reeves Brown: Overarching all the projects on this list is the possibility that meeting the gap will come out of agriculture. It seems like it would be appropriate to put a project on the list to provide alternatives to water rights owners rather than sale, perhaps an in-depth kind of study that would bring new ideas that would help meet the gap, but not just from Ag.

Gary Barber: Please email additional comments to Elise and Gary. The goal is that by September we'd be feeling pretty good about what we've come up with.

SeEtta: There is other water that is for sale that is not from Ag.

Jonathon: Industrial needs occur in rural areas too.

Terry: We need to find a way to meet the gap, not just find new water. An important component of this is efficiency, rehab of existing dams, and learning to better use what we already have.

Jay: The top part of the chart above the statewide projects is how to meet the gap between now and 2030. Between 2030 and 2050 is another animal, which will need to be addressed by statewide projects.

Lissa Pinello: Her concern is for water customers that are hauling water from outside of water districts. Well owners that can't rely on their water source. When regulations get tighter, and water quality goes down, these people may be underrepresented.

Karen Dietrich: Yes, we are concerned about water quantity and quality, and even if the conduit comes through, not all entities will be able to afford to join that project.

SeEtta: CWCB is trying to tie in land use planning in new legislation.

Meeting adjourned 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jay Winner

Links:

Arkansas Basin Water Forum: www.abwf.org

Fountain Creek Vision Task Force: www.fountain-crk.org

IBCC: <http://ibcc.state.co.us>

Colorado River Water Availability Study: <http://cwcb.state.co.us/>