

Arkansas Basin Roundtable  
Work Session of December 10, 2008  
Meeting Notes

**Roundtable Business**

Chairman Barber called the meeting to order at 12:43 pm. Members and visitors introduced themselves. Nineteen (19) members were present.

The agenda was reviewed. Since this is a work session only, no official actions will be taken. Our purpose is to begin to review projects that may help us address our needs.

Mike Bordogna gave an update on a potential grant application from Lake County. They hope to have a proposal by the next meeting. They are broadening the scope to include a watershed-wide strategic plan.

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

Lawrence: The Transfers Guidelines committee met again. They will make a presentation to the Colorado Water Congress in January. They will talk about the background of the committee, the process, the guidelines, and the roundtable discussions that followed. Other groups have requested the report, ie: Family Farm Alliance, Western States Water Council. They have been sent the report upon request.

Gary: We agreed to accept the report with the sub-title off. The report was submitted to Eric Hecox along with a transmittal letter. Gary's thought is that we need to hear from those that took issue with the report before disseminating it.

Reeves: supports the dissemination of the report, and thinks that public input would be valuable.

Jane: If the definition of approval is that we love the report and are ready for others to use it then she is not ready for approval.

Chris: Has disseminated the report to his county commissioners. Could ask them for feedback.

Gary: It appears that the issue may be with semantics. We have accepted the report. Next step would be to adopt the report. The roundtable would stay away from the word approval until after feedback has been received.

Jane: What forum do you see this going to next? How do you see it being used?

Dan: Next step is getting it out to as many people as possible. Need to have it adopted by the roundtable, not just accepted by roundtable. Would like to see it adopted by the roundtable so the committee can present it from the roundtable, not just the committee.

Jeris: agrees with Dan. We should adopt it, and then disseminate it to the other roundtables. Let them do whatever they wish. They may have great ideas.

Tom: Thought we released the committee to take it to the CWCB.

Wayne: At the micro level, county commissioners, planners could use the report in any way it might be beneficial to them. At the state level, it could be used as one piece of the puzzle that we are trying to solve.

Jane: This is where her conflict lies. Thinks its worth more than just letting anyone do whatever they want to with it. If it's good enough to be used, then it should be enforced.

Ken: It's like a recipe. We can't tell you to use it, whether to use it, or whether to have a banquet.

Mike: Found that the acquiring entity didn't want to go through the guidelines process because of the perceived increase in cost. He thinks it needs to be elevated and enforced.

Tom B: If the part of the report that's unacceptable is the last paragraph, which states that the use of the guidelines is voluntary, then we do need to go back and look at it again.

Wayne: Agrees with Dan that the report should be adopted, not just accepted, in order to present the report to others.

Gary: Let's have our presentations, then go from accept the report to adopt the report. When we adopt it, we adopt it with some language that states some of our issues. Then we can get feedback from a wider audience.

## **Presentations:**

### ***Central Colorado Project: Dave Miller***

Union Park Reservoir. Supreme Court ruled that 20,000 acre feet of additional water was available from the Aspinall pool. This concept would use the Aspinall pool, plus water that's available downstream. Six major river basins can be reached by gravity only from this location. When there is surplus energy available, this power will be turned into high-altitude water storage. It stores water and energy by holding the water up high. Surplus runoff in wet years, surplus energy in low-use times. Water is stored for use where it's needed the most.

Will cost 2.5 to 3.5 billion dollars to build. It is a concept that stores energy as well as water and increased the productivity of both.

### ***Flaming Gorge Project: Gary Barber***

Colorado/Wyoming Coalition. Uncertainty analysis for the South Platte Basin shows a gap of 200,000 AF possible. They studied the range of potential change in irrigated acres and population change between now and 2030. The South Platte basin has the largest projected population increase, nearly 2,000,000 people by 2030. The project is similar to one you may have seen before. They are looking for Colorado water providers that are interested in joining the coalition at this time. Denver Metropolitan Water Authority is sponsoring this project.

### ***IBCC 50 Year Vision Process: Jay Winner***

Framing the conversation: We envision a Colorado that sustainably meets municipal, industrial, agricultural, environmental, and recreational needs by promoting cooperation among all water uses.

Jay thinks that the IBCC is jumping ahead and looking at projects rather than at strategies. He would like us to come up with our own visioning process.

Come up with goals first, then strategies, then define success in a measurable way. For example:

Sustainably meet municipal demand:

- Through reuse and conservation
- Through waterscape
- Through cloud seeding
- Through watering restrictions

Define success

Must be measurable

Sustainably meet agricultural demands – how do you define? Prevent any net loss of irrigated agricultural economy.

- Through urban dry-up
- Through irrigation efficiency
- Through agricultural leasing/fallowing
- Through lease back
- Through new technology
- Through new/alternating cropping patterns
- Through integrated management of groundwater and surface water

Gary asked for input from Wayne and Jeris. Wayne described the IBCC process. Jeris described the historical perspective. The biggest benefit to the process is to promote understanding between historically opposed basins. To promote statewide solutions rather than basin-limited solutions that place basins in opposition to each other. Jeris urged the roundtable to go on the IBCC website and read the latest visioning documents.

Last month we talked about the executive committee coming up with strategies to meet our needs. As we come up with that vision, transfer guidelines become a method and strategy that meets our basin needs. For ourselves, how do we define “good enough”?

As we’re working on our strategies and methods, we need to press IBCC and CWCB to finish the Colorado River water availability study. We need to all be using the same data when projecting the effects of a possible call on the Colorado River. We should have an educational process regarding the Colorado River, so that we better understand those issues, and create our visioning statement with all pertinent information.

Jay asked to get a by-laws committee together and review the by-laws. Anyone that would like to join the bylaws committee is welcome to do so.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Jay Winner