Arkansas Basin Roundtable Meeting of August 12, 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, sufficient for a quorum.

A motion was made by Jim Broderick and seconded by Tom Verquer to approve the minutes of the July meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The agenda was reviewed. Jay would like to add a by-laws recommendation to today's agenda.

Public Comment: none

CWCB/IBCC Reports

Danielson, Winner, Vanderschuere, Dils, Doherty

There was an IBCC meeting July 20th. The following technical reports are available at the IBCC website for your review: State of Colorado 2050 Municipal and Industrial Water Use Projections, Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment Priorities Mapping, NCNA Priorities Mapping Appendices, Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool Pilot Study for Roaring Fork and Fountain Creek Watersheds and Site-Specific Quantification Pilot Study for Roaring Fork Watershed, and Evaluation of Water Supply Strategies. Find them at ibcc.state.co.us. Over the next several months CWCB will be soliciting and receiving feedback on these drafts.

Wayne Vanderschuere gave an abbreviated version of the slideshow shared at the last IBCC meeting, including the following points:

- Review Technical Products
- WSRA Criteria and Guidelines
- Next Steps for Water Supply Strategies and Needs Assessment (Colorado River Water Availability Study-CRWAS Phase II)
- Joint Meeting with Interim Water Committee

Key findings:

Colorado's population will nearly double by 2050 requiring between 830,000 and 1,700,000 million acrefeet of additional water to meet M&I needs.

Environment and recreational water needs have been identified statewide. Identifying projects and methods to meet these needs will continue to be a priority.

In order to meet these consumptive and non-consumptive needs, Colorado will rely on a mix of conservation, agricultural transfers, and new water supply development.

Meeting Colorado's water needs will require substantial investment. For example, a new water supply project yielding 250,000 acre-feet will cost between \$7.5 million and \$10 billion. This exceeds previous cost projections.

Objective Moving Forward - build portfolios

Identify different mixes of conservation, ag transfer, and new supply development.

*Changed statewide request schedule to May and September to coordinate with availability of funds.

Non-Consumptive Needs Assessment Overview Results/Conclusions:

- Methodologies differed based on basin-specific needs.
- Mapping provides framework for prioritization of recreational and environmental needs.
- BRTs now have a tool to assist in determining focus areas where quantifications may be developed.

 Mapping also may be used to support future implementation actions for protecting water for nonconsumptive needs.

Water Supply Strategies

- Conservation
- Ag Transfers conventional and non-conventional
- Development of new supplies West Slope M&I and Energy

Transbasin

(these address M&I needs; options to address agricultural and

non-consumptive needs will be added as strategies are evaluated.)

- Linking land use planning and water supply planning - Colorado report and WSWC Symposium

Engineering Evaluation Elements for Strategies

Purpose – ability to start comparing tradeoffs between strategies

Identification of

Project benefits

Implementation issues

Opportunities

Potential attributes/additional options

Acceptability

Other evaluation elements

Capital costs

Annual O&M costs

Additional elements needed (water rights or storage)

Incorporate other conservation methods

Qualitative description of how each strategy meets the Vision Statement and Vision Goals

Jeris: Mentioned that the resolutions that were passed at our last roundtable meeting were not addressed at the IBCC meeting. West Slope has 10 reps on the IBCC, East Slope has 6 reps. Both legislators are from the West slope. South Platte and Metro resolutions were also unaddressed.

Jay: We are ahead of all the other roundtables in our needs assessment. We have actually followed HB1177. We're doing what we were supposed to do.

Reed: Bruce Whitehead has been appointed to take the place of Senator Isgar. Leaves a seat open on the IBCC. Is discouraged by the east-west slope split. The IBCC will be looking for collaboration between basins. The funding process will now be highly competitive.

Animas-LaPlata project has been completed. 12,000 af of water they want the state to purchase. There will be pressure for that to happen in the future.

The Aurora loan has not been sold. Jennifer is trying to dissuade legislators from doing this. The CWCB needs to see real progress made, including east-west slope collaboration.

The roundtable agreed to send Alan Ward of Pueblo BWW and Beverly Spady, IT person for the Purgatoire WCD as our DSS participants. They will receive technical training.

Sub-Committee Reports

Non-Consumptive Needs Subcommittee - SeEtta Moss

Huerfano-Cucharras Ditch Company had asked for some assistance with recreation needs, however they have a contract on their reservoir, so are not interested at this time. Meeting on pilot study for Watershed Evaluation Tool. It has great utility for areas that have a lot of data available. SeEtta introduced John Smiens, new liaison to the roundtable.

Consumptive Use Needs Subcommittee – Gary Barber

Now is your chance to update numbers used in the final document.

Water Supply Reserve Account Grant Requests

Review of status of requests pending for September CWCB meeting

Applications that were approved last January were reviewed again. Those apps were pushed back to September 09 by CWCB. We contacted folks that had applications approved to see if they wanted to make changes in their apps to make them more competitive.

Jay: Thinks that 2 of the 3 apps would not go through as proposed. The three apps are the Upper Ark Hydrological Water Balance Study, Pueblo Bedload Sediment Collection & Removal, and Upper Black Squirrel Water Balance Study. The Groundwater ASP application was withdrawn voluntarily. We had approved \$20,000 in basin funds contingent on other basins also supporting the application.

The roundtable discussed re-distributing basin funds in order to make the applications more attractive to the CWCB, hoping to get as many apps approved as possible.

Consensus was reached to added \$30,000 in Basin funds to the Upper Ark app, send the Pueblo app as is, and hold back the Black Squirrel app for the time being. Saves \$15,000 in last year's basin funds, and keeps the \$69,200 in new money for future apps.

Presentation

Upper Big Sandy Water Balance Study – Dave Stone (report was handed out to RT members)

Phase 1 was funded by the roundtable, and has been complete for some time. This report is about Phase 2.

- 282,000 acres are in the district.
- 400-450k acre feet of storage in the alluvial aquifer.

Monitoring wells shown on a map.

1991 – 2008 have monitoring data available. Half of the wells are equal to what they were. Half of the wells show a loss.

Shallow alluvial aguifer: 30-100 feet at the most. Most flow is sub-surface.

What we learned – is that the Big Sandy is an under-appropriated basin. In a wet year, the basin will recharge some. However, if all the wells were pumping at capacity, the basin would be used up in 32 years. At current water projections, the life of the aquifer is approximately 93 – 150 years.

Phase 2 Water Balance Report Conclusions

The water balance evaluated both inflows and outflows to the aquifer. The water levels in the Basin and maintenance of these levels is of high importance to the longevity of the aquifer resources. It is recommended that the District implement an ongoing water level monitoring program and that the data collected be tabulated and reviewed on a regular basis.

Bylaws Discussion - Jay Winner

Jay wants to eliminate term limits so that Gary can remain Chairperson in perpetuity. Announcing this proposed change now to be voted on at the next meeting.

Discussion

Projects and Methods to meet the needs of the Arkansas Basin - Gary Barber

Sustainability Values

Economic, Social, Environment – if all are present, the project is sustainable.

The questions at each intersection:

Economic/Social – Is it equitable?

Social/Environmental – Is it bearable?

Environmental/Economic – Is it viable?

Discussion:

Buy & dry should be on the list. Brine disposal needs to be addressed.

Will have folks take the chart home and think about what projects and methods might need to be added. There is a quantitative aspect to the gap, but judging which projects and methods should be used to solve it is a subjective matter.

Elise will email the charts out.

The roundtable discussed changes that should be made to the matrix.

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/

Ag to Urban Water Transfers Report: www.secwcd.org