Arkansas Basin Roundtable Meeting of November 12, 2008 Meeting Notes

Roundtable Business

Chairman Barber called the meeting to order at 12:36 pm. Members and visitors introduced themselves. Thirty (30) members were present, sufficient for a quorum.

A motion was made by Terry Scanga, seconded by Lawrence Sena to approve the minutes of the October meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The agenda was reviewed. A South Fork, Lake Creek future grant application was added to the agenda.

Public Comment: John Wiener mentioned 2 new reports released at the Governors Drought Conference. One was "Citizen's Guide to Climate Change" the other "Climate Change in Colorado". He highly recommends both reports.

CWCB/IBCC Report

Reed Dils: He appreciates what the IBCC reps are doing. Amendment 52 was defeated, so severance fund dollars will be available in 2009.

It is estimated that ten million dollars will be available. CWCB will be voting next week to release an additional \$300,000 per roundtable in 2009. The remainder will go to the state fund. If more than ten million dollars is received it would be divided between the state fund (73%) and the basin fund (27%). They also may be applying an 80/20 rule to requests of the state fund. Applications to the state may have to be funded 80% by state, 20% by basin or local funds. The criteria will also be updated. The Roundtable basin chairs will need to include a description of how the proposed project will benefit the basin and meet either consumptive or non-consumptive needs in their letter of recommendation.

Jeris Danielson: The IBCC is still wrestling with the issue of coming up with the vision statement for the IBCC Visioning Process.

Jay Winner: Would like to see our roundtable come up with its own visioning process and take that back up to the IBCC level.

Sub-Committee Reports

Non-Consumptive Water Needs Subcommittee - SeEtta Moss

At the state level, work at this point will be devoted to basins that are still in the mapping phase. Because our roundtable is ahead of the other basins, our funds are put on hold for now. We are working with CDM for a work proposal, to try to fund the quantification work another way.

Projects and Methods to Meet Our Needs - Gary Barber

The executive committee will bring a draft report to the roundtable to start this process in the next couple of months. Today we'll bring reports from the grantees of monies thus far, in order to see where they're at.

Gary spoke about the pending applications from Upper Black Squirrel Water Balance and Bedload/Sediment Removal and Collection System. These applications were originally approved out of statewide funds, since we were down to approximately \$100,000 left in basin funds. Gary asked for approval from the roundtable to go ahead and split the monies requested between basin and state funds for these two apps. He suggested offering 20% of the request from basin funds. Discussion ensued. There was consensus to move the applications forward as suggested.

Jay spoke about the Fowler applications, which were sent forward to the state, and then pulled before they went to CWCB. Jonathan asked for assistance from the Needs Assessment Committee to reapply.

Presentations

1. Upper Black Squirrel Recharge Study – Ralf Topper

Study Objective: to evaluate and define the hydrogeology of the alluvial aquifer system in the Upper Black Squirrel River Basin for the purpose of identifying prospective sites to conduct a recharge test study.

Groundwater is the principal source of all water used in the Upper Black Squirrel Basin. Ralf described the alluvium and how he quantified the depth and thickness of the alluvium. Data was gathered from historical data and test wells. Several areas were identified as good candidates for aquifer storage and recharge. In addition, land ownership and existing infrastructure were identified. Possible water source was not addressed in this study.

2. Groundwater Policy issues related to underground storage – Kat Shrier Watercat Consultant LLC/Aquifer Storage Issues LLC

The technical issues have largely been worked out. Remaining issues are on the public policy side. There's been an increased call throughout the entire country for aquifer storage. Groundwater and aquifer storage are often misunderstood. Public water awareness is based on surface water language and culture. Colorado's water law adds further complexity to the issue. In order to implement aquifer storage, it requires interactions between agencies that don't often work together. EPA/UIC permitting program was designed for disposal not storage. A lot of states have created streamlining legislation/regulatory programs in order to implement aquifer storage. Each state is "reinventing the wheel", since water law differs state by state.

Kats group is working to develop a road map for Colorado, understanding what the criteria are and looking at specific measures that will be acceptable to governmental agencies.

3. Colorado State University Decision Support Tool: Dr. Tim Gates

There is a need for broad and reliable information that will allow the addressing of many different issues. That requires a database to identify current conditions and to support existing and future modeling tools for future decision-making.

Objectives:

Discuss with individuals and organizations and understand the needs for data.

Assess data needs to characterize and model stream aguifer system.

Identify and compile existing data.

Gather selected new data representative of regions of upper and lower basin. Develop a database for collected data with access through GSS-based web data.

Describe data statistically.

Synthesize data and make recommendations for additional work needed.

CSU has been involved in this work in the Lower Arkansas Valley for the last ten years, and is now ready to extend those efforts into the Upper Arkansas Valley. For now, this is projected to be a two-year project. The socio-economic layer of this project has been dropped for the time being. The focus is on gathering data.

4. Round Mountain Water System Improvements - Chris Haga

We have the power in place over to the site. The new well is dug. They are in the process of soliciting bids, to get the water from the well to the treatment facility. These funds are combined with a DOLA grant. Now we're focusing on the well itself and hope to see this finished up by next spring. Chris will bring back a presentation when they're done.

5. Arkansas Valley Conduit - Phil Reynolds

State and Tribal Assistance Grant for the Arkansas Valley Conduit (STAG). The roundtable granted \$200,000 which matches a portion of the Federal grant received. The purpose of the grant was to provide the necessary additional engineering and other work in preparation for the Environmental Impact Statement and Design of the Conduit. Work funded by the grant will lead up to the EIS for the project.

6. Rotational Land Fallowing-Water Leasing Program – Jay Winner

This grant was for \$150,000 and was funded from the basin account. They have gotten their contract in place for the grant, and are proceeding with work as planned.

7. Lake County Colorado Water Quality Mitigation - Mike Bordogna

The Lake County Board of Commissioners would like to seek Roundtable funding for the purpose of studying methods of mitigating sources of pollution emanating from naturally occurring mineral concentrations in the South Fork of Lake Creek, in Lake County, Colorado, with the goal of improving fisheries and water quality in Twin Lakes and the Arkansas River.

At this time, the grant request would be to find a solution to the problem. They are aware that they are at the beginning of the application process, and will update the roundtable as they progress.

Discussion – Water Transfers Guidelines (some, but not all comments have been included)

Following the feedback from last month's roundtable, the committee had decided to give a presentation to CWCB and the Colorado Water Congress in January regarding the report. Discussion ensued.

Jane Rawlings: has a problem with taking the report to the IBCC. Thinks it should not go forward until there is a way to enforce the guidelines.

Jay Winner: We have a potential volunteer, but that volunteer is reluctant to use this report publicly.

Gary Barber: As a subcommittee of the roundtable, it is really the business of the roundtable to agree to forward the report, not up to the committee. Also thinks we owe a copy of the report to the funding entity, which is different than making a presentation to CWCB. He will include a letter that makes clear that the roundtable does not have consensus about the use of the document.

Lawrence Sena: Farmers have the right to sell or lease the water if they want to. They put the guidelines together to mitigate consequences of transfers, not to condone them.

Jeris Danielson: Pandora's Box is already open. West Slope people are very curious about the findings. Justice Hobbs has asked to see it.

Jane: is concerned that the guidelines just will not be used in order to mitigate third party interests, and is concerned that it will be used once it is in the public sector but won't be effective.

Lawrence: The committee didn't feel authorized to put teeth in the document. The committee was not given that power.

Jonathan: Could we just change the title, which appears to condone transfers by sounding casual?

Lawrence: Doesn't think the committee has a problem with changing the title and/or adding an executive summary.

Dan Henrichs: Last month, the roundtable accepted the report from the subcommittee. He believes that it needs to be given to CWCB.

Jane Rawlings: this should be submitted before the end of the year to fulfill our legal requirement. If we change the title page and put in an executive summary, I would agree to send this forward. Turn it in as a work product of the group.

Gary: Asked for consensus to forward the report without the subtitle. Consensus was given. We have recognized as a roundtable that we need to continue our work on this report.

Meeting adjourned after 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jay Winner