

**South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting
Tuesday, October 11, 2011
Southwest Weld County Building
Longmont, Colorado
4 pm – 8 pm.**

Please contact Lisa McVicker at mcvicker1@q.com with any changes or corrections.

Education Committee and Municipal Reps met from 3 – 4

Members present: Bert Weaver, Allyn Wind, James Ford, Mike Applegate, Joe Frank, Jim Hall, Eric Wilkinson, Sean Cronin, Rich Belt, Keven Luskin, John Stencil, Bob Streeter, Gene Buerelo, Julio Iturreria, Jim Yahn, Harold Evans, Lisa McVicker

Standard Reports

--IBCC Report: Eric Wilkinson: No report since September. No meetings since September report.

--CWCW report: Eric Wilkinson: No report since September. No meetings since September report.
Eric: Next CWCW meeting at Northern headquarters on afternoon of Monday Nov 14 through Nov 16.
Public invited.

--Legislative Report: Water resource review committee meeting next Monday or Tuesday; no agenda set yet. Interim water committee will look at legislation proposed; will vote to decide to go forward; need super majority to go forward;

Don Ament: First three bills have to be turned in by December 1; we should be in touch with our legislators to see if they are working on anything.

John Stulp: Discussion on the toilet efficiency bill.

Jim Yahn: 1.6 to 1.28 to be implemented by 2016. For all new construction and retrofits; few exemptions such as prisons and hospitals, etc.

Eric W: Draft for cost benefit study of nutrient discharges; proposed statewide nutrient monitoring, northern; update on SWASI and roundtables; and state wide efficiency on toilets.

--Education Report:

Sean Cronin: Met today at 3; good meeting. An email was distributed: working on education action plan; draft was submitted; we will meet as a committee to review the draft.

Public Education Participation Outreach (PEPO) will meet soon and will report on that next meeting.

Kristen Maharg: CFWE

Jim Yahn reminds us that our Education Action Plan must be ready by December.

Joe Frank: First task is to develop tasks for Water 2012; we need to think about how to dovetail for that. Water 2012 Display Board. We have much of this already in place.

Harold Evans and McVicker: December of 2009—public presentation at Ranch in Loveland for Basin. Series of display boards; Todd has all of these boards. Would be excellent if we could get these in electronic format.

McVicker: Report on New Water Center at Metropolitan State College of Denver. Anonymous gift of \$1million to found One World One Water Center for Water Urban Education and Stewardship; will develop a curriculum in water studies. Very important to remember that Metro serves students from all

over Colorado and we are all pleased with this development; hope that South Platte Basin will contribute to energy and support to the Center.

Julio Iturreria: Janet Bell and I are on Metro board for Water 2012 and education outreach. Kristen and her group are trying to do a full program year of outreach. Request from CFWE to Metro and South Platte to join forces in these educational outreach efforts. Thus beneficial for us to have ongoing discussions that our water needs are about the entire basin. Thanks to Jim Yahn for his dynamic presentation last year that helps us realize that the entire South Platte Basin is one; would like to encourage all of us to join with Metro in ongoing efforts.

Sean Cronin: Yes, the draft language of our PEPO does include language that points to our basin and watershed.

Julio: Important that all of our elected officials also see that we are joined in our educational outreach efforts.

Janet Bell: We are discussing the ability to break out in separate discussion groups where we can have discussions on issues about the entire basin and watershed with our elected officials so that they are able to get a better view of the issues at hand.

Jim Yahn: Reminds us of the South Platte Forum in Longmont on Oct 19 & 20.

Harold Evans: Points to language in summary of portfolio roundtable and that we still have ongoing controversy in terms of the Metro area looking at North CO water as a supply.

Bert Weaver: Expresses thanks to Sean for stepping in.

--Nonconsumptive: Bob Streeter: Statewide nonconsumptive use water on October 13 in Colorado Springs; will look at status of all the roundtable's studies; then proceed with discussion on how to go forward. Sustainable funding for nonconsumptive needs projects; also discussion on portfolio and how the tool can address the nonconsumptive needs; then will summarize the next steps for addressing nonconsumptive needs.

CO Ag Water Alliance: Will speak about environmental needs and our roundtable has excellent examples. If anyone has examples of what we have funded already would be welcome.

-- Phreatophyte: Bob Streeter: No money right now to do phreatophyte control other than what counties are doing; thus no action at this point.

Question: Todd Doherty: Money at CWCB?

Eric W: Board will address this in November.

--Alternative Ag Transfer Methods: Joe Frank: Several important reps in state discussion on alternative ag transfers present today for our meeting; several discussions at IBCC level here today. Aug 30 meeting: IBCC Chair, John Stulp from Governor's Office; Todd Doherty: CCWCB section manager; Jay Winner from AK ag transfer; Eric Wilkinson, Charlie Bartlett: President of Colorado Water Alliance.: South Platte Ditch Company, president of ag transfer committee. Mike Shimmin and Gene Manueto also on COLO; Kevin Luskin there representing Twin Lakes; Reagan Waskom there too.

Would like to put someone on spot to discuss some of the key issues for ag transfers:

Eric Wilkinson: Discussions that have spanned two meetings with front range water council to discuss what municipalities want from ag transfer; if municipalities signed up for water supply from a rotational following situation; they need to be make sure that is in place and would not be terminated. Long term relationship—need to put in infrastructure was discussed—there must be a permanency associated with

that and enough involvement with a particular arrangement with that infrastructure—discussions explored whether this would be only available in drought years or if it would be done on a base water supply basis—lease backs were discussed (stays in ag, ag owns it then leased back); interruptible supply contract looked at as a benefit to ag; one of biggest questions is cost of doing rotational fallowing, or any other type of arrangement; from a legal standpoint—these are comparable to buy and dry because you still need to go through court for a change of use—needs to be the permanency associated with it for future planning.

Joe Frank: Intent is that the roundtable can hear about the ongoing discussions about this topic; this is just the beginning. There have been two meetings, anything scheduled?

Todd D.: No, not at this point. Great that we have smaller municipalities that may be looking at ag at the table. We have had some very productive conversations with various groups; and certain concepts such as permanency must be discussed. “One size fits all” will not work; thus discussions are moving forward. There is a workshop: Western Governors received a grant to conduct a survey of all western states for what everyone is doing on ag transfers; there will be a meeting in the next few weeks to focus on this study. Oct 27 and 28.

Harold Evans: Front Range water council: rally represents just the municipalities that have transbasin water; but northern municipalities do not have a seat at the table. This is an important discussion because this issue is very specific to each municipality and until issue of permanency is handled difficult.

WSRA Grant: Rotating Agricultural Fallowing Public Policy Grant: Jay Winner

AK Roundtable.

(Salvage water bill to be revisited in 2012. Also wants to mention that to make leasing fallowing work is one must have storage and with storage these projects work. Trying to put together Super Ditch (fallowing)—currently, 7 municipalities have signed up. Yes, the leasing / fallowing is one of the topics; we all know that we need to keep agriculture whole for food supply.

After last year when a bill on fallowing died, we have been told to continue to study.

Grant proposal is to partner;

4 main objectives of this grant:

- 1) Review existing statutory law concerning ag transfers;
- 2) Identify pertinent citations that might be modified for expediting ag transfers;
- 3) Conduct a facilitated dialogue with the stakeholders; and
- 4) Produce a summary report of the process.

Amount requested: \$20,000.

From basin account: AK basin: \$10,000 and then asks South Platte for the other \$10,000.

Todd D.: AK has voted for \$20,000 so every bit of contribution would lower this.

Joe Frank: Opines that we need to have a seat at the table.

Harold Evans: Can you help us understand the total capacity of the ditches, etc.

Jay Winner: 43,000 ac ft gap; in AK we think that lots of what we can do could be transferable to South Platte; so as per lease and fallowing, AK basin can absorb the total amount.

Harold: So in the AK, you think you can solve your gap with lease and fallowing. Thus this is part of the AK strategy...

Joe: And for South Platte, also that this could lessen gap?

Jay W.: Yes, this is the panacea.

Joe and Jim: The portfolio showed that we would not be able to meet our gap with this.

Jay W.: During dry years, like in 2002, fallowing is movable – how much you will fallow – alternative is buy and dry.

Joe Frank: The alternative is used water supply.

Jay W.: Agree.

Sean: Jay, please elaborate what you mean by “seat at the table”; stakeholder involvement.

Jay: Yes, want to see how this would apply in other basins.

Joe Frank: As painful as it will be we must have attorneys at the table for wordsmithing; these people must be part of the solution.

Jay: Our plans would be to get a framework and then to go to attorneys. We need to decide what we need; don’t need to go

Kevin Luskin: As rep from El Paso County, I want to support this and it is timely and we should participate.

John Stencil: If we put in 10,000 like AK would we have the same procedures and goals?

Jay: yes.

Ken: Why are we the only other basin? Is this not a state wide concern?

Jay: Because the money is not huge, going after basin funds first; lease and fallowing is going to be focused on east slope not so much on west slope.

Joe Frank: How do you go about selecting interested stakeholders?

Jay: Would have both basin roundtables choose.

Julio Iturreria: Why are you not going to Metro?

Jim W.: In my opinion this is a South Platte/AK issue; they are the roundtables that will be doing leasing and fallowing in the future. I do not see that metro will lease and fallow...they will be a recipient; but AK and SP would be the ones that will do the leasing and fallowing.

Joe Frank: But the metro is at the receiving end.

Julio: Please clarify. I will reiterate from the education committee that we are trying to break down barriers; and it seems that the Metro should participate because they may be a participant in the future.

Jim W.: Our executive committee decided that we should set this up this way.

_____: As a farmer, I might decide to dry up.

Jay W.: In a drought year, will you farm anyway? Probably not. Seems to me that lease and fallowing is another tool to keep ag alive.

Sean Cronin: Seems like the super ditch concept is coming farther along, I am concerned that if we do have a seat at the table, we might need time to wrap our minds around it.

Jay W.: A good facilitator will make sure that the discussion goes forward. I think this is a shot to keep ag alive.

Joe Frank: I would recommend that even if you are not asking Metro to put money in, there must be Metro reps at the table even without money.

Janet Bell: I was concerned of the cost; believes that it is important to have Metro at table because of the costs of infrastructure if leasing/fallowing goes forward.

Jay W.: This study is only to look at legislation; the CO Water AG Alliance has a specific view towards infrastructure, so that conversation is happening.

John Stencil: I move that the South Platte Roundtable contribute \$10,000 from our basin account

Joe Frank: Seconds

Allyn Wind: I cannot vote because our area is not involved.

Jim Yahn: Clarifies: This study is to discuss what is on the table; that we participate in the discussion; last year we did not agree with HB 1068.

Joe Frank: We might discuss the legislation and may or may not agree but the legislation is on the table whether we agree or not.

Jim W.: Must educate our current elected officials. In AK, we believe that we need to educate the future elected official.

Jim Yahn: Calls question; motion passes.

Portfolio Tool: Review

Todd Doherty: Subcommittee meeting and findings.

Harold Evans: At the last roundtable meeting, decided that we needed a subcommittee re: portfolio tool.

2 questions: For municipal reps: Did we think conservation would be low, medium or high and what percentage of savings might be available to meet new demand.

Meeting today before 4: There has been a tremendous amount of work since SWASI 1; various consultants have produced two or three reports that have been incorporated into portfolio tool and SWASI 2010 report; Appendix L—on a statewide basis, looked at a 2008 baseline which incorporates demand reductions since 2002. On a statewide basis, demand has dropped 18%; that 18% reduction has been incorporated in new baseline numbers. Thus we are starting with 2008 numbers. Other piece is 2050 demand projections; looking at conservation numbers, IBCC has decided to take 154,000 acft off for passive conservation methods (low flow appliances and replacement of existing items) will generate this amount. So in gap calculations, this amount has been subtracted. Thus, what are the active settings from conservation going to be?

Low, medium and high: Shimmin said probably cannot meet medium number but politically need to go forward with this.

Harold opines that we are doing a disservice by doing this. System wide savings enumerated: key is implementation and penetration rates.

Tension between environmental group and water providers; theoretically all of this could happen, but what really will happen is a key question. Keeping in mind that the providers are pragmatic vis a vis the theoretical water savings.

Reams of paper written on this, comes down in terms of what will really work for a water provider.

On statewide 314,000 acft of savings (160,000 active;

485 total

High: Active projections are 3 times what passive would be.

Key point to remember: This is from 2008 baseline; we have already achieved about an 18% saving; thus if you double this, high rate: 47% savings, or half savings from where we were in 2008.

Consensus: Probably should put the low number in the portfolio tool; monitor progress in the next 5 then 10 years. Would then have low number for conservation.

This will be provider specific. Every provider will be unique; thus statewide number will be different.

Metro area has a high percentage of reusable water because it is transbasin.

In the northern area, very little reusable water.

Storage is crucial.

Savings are coming from existing customers; do you take this and say you will use for new customers or do you those savings for reliability come from existing customers.

As a roundtable, we need to discuss low, medium high use. Probably down to low at this point.

Joe Frank: Discussed the importance of meeting with other roundtables; we want to meet with reps from Metro and AK to have a unified voice in this issue.

Eric W.: I will emphasize the last think that Harold said: very important that eastern roundtables have a uniform voice.

Joe Frank: Real numbers in Greeley that would help illustrate that the medium numbers are difficult to reach.

Harold Evans: Since 2002—our approved conservation plan (submitted to CWCB and approved) between now and 2030, we went through total conservation plan to show that we could save another 8%; thus, by 2050 we would be at 26%...low looks achievable. We would have to find another 8%—or through penetration: how fast do you change out appliances, combined with audits and replacing turf. We have a water audit program—you can sign up for an audit to help you approve the efficiency of your sprinkler system.

Joe Frank: To contrast that, to get to medium, you would have to almost double that to get to the medium level.

Harold Evans: What is the right answer? You really have to read through this to see what is possible: penetration and implementation are the keys.

Sean Cronin: Maybe take another look: third level as per regulatory restrictions such as limited blue grass or licensed plumbers to replace appliances. To really figure out if these are achievable seems like we need to have a value discussion as per what might be the values of these different levels—if we are choosing low, medium or high—we need to discuss the various value system of different communities.

Harold: Good point; four or five years ago in Greeley we had a discussion about licensed sprinkler installers. City Council said no, we will not do this. Another example, official from Ft. Collins – discussion about differences between Greeley and Ft. Collins—Greeley's approach to drought protection is that you want to build storage; in Ft Collins, we will go dry instead of building storage. So Sean's comment is right on.

Todd D: Thanks to Harold for comments; reminds us that Mike Shimmin also felt strongly about the need to “dig into” conservation.

Handout: Portfolio tool simplified worksheet:

Five major questions:

- 1) Define demand levels in 2050
- 2) Define IPP success levels by basin and by project type.
- 3) Define conservation level & how much can be applied to the gap.
- 4) Define amount of new supply and ag transfer water for West & East Slopes
- 5) If desired, define percent of water that can be reused.

Will pick up from our last meeting.

Harold Evans: Basin roundtable summary report that was distributed a few weeks ago.

Nicole from CDM and Todd:

Gunnison: Have visited there 2 times; slow to get started.

AK: Only an initial visitation; will be there tomorrow.

Metro: Working on their portfolio—have been focusing on conservation. Will send out their five page memo on conservation.

Yampa and Green: Have met and have developed three portfolios throughout whole scale.

North Platte: Has in common with South Platte wanting to turn off all ag transfers.

Harold Evans: We want to minimize ag transfers; it is unrealistic that we will not have ag transfer over and above urbanization; thus this is misleading.

Todd D.: Apologies.

Harold E.: I think we want to do the other items with an intent of minimizing ag transfer.

Noticed also that the Metro wanted to meet with the CO and I think we need to tag along. We could be left out.

Joe Frank: We developed two scenarios; one was a status quo scenario. All based on conservation and ag dry up.

Harold: I think that we were playing with it and learning from it; I don't think we will get there tonight. We are still learning from it.

Todd: This is a tradeoff tool; no one will be held to this; the point is to see the various costs from the various approaches.

Per schedule: Hope is to bring these to IBCC December-January timeframes. Something to keep in mind as we work through this.

We are flexible, can do another webinar and CWCB and CDM here to help.

Todd and Nicole from CDB walk roundtable through the portfolio with a focus on Status Quo scenario.

See simplified worksheet totals.

Harold: 80% reuse? Need more discussion on this.

Todd: This is existing reuse plans, another tool looks at new supply. This is based on what providers are telling. Providers said in the interviews the amount of water they plan on reusing. Things that require permitting might be somewhat in doubt.

Joe Frank: The metro's success rate has a huge impact on South Platte.

Julio I. and Janet Bell: Metro has created a subcommittee to look at this further. Important that we know that we are still "playing with this"; still learning about the tool.

Todd: How can we be a judge of success rate; cannot know; but very important in terms of the input on all portfolios. Note that as you work with the portfolio you can also look at other basins, such as the Metro, to see what the impact might be. Currently Metro has looked at 75% success rate.

Janet Bell: Have the other basins been able to produce conservation numbers? I would be interested in knowing what the per capita use is on a statewide basis. Seems like everyone in the state should operate off of the same per-capita use.

Harold: All these numbers come from SWASI 2010; these are statewide. These numbers are based off of more than 20 plans submitted to the CWCB.

Todd: In SWASI, we have this by basin and by provider.

Harold: Now these are in appendices and per county; more data than can be easily comprehended.

Todd and Nicole continue walkthrough with portfolio. Todd makes note that the low, med, high levels can be tweaked with gap.

Reminder that the passive is out of the conservation. Reminder that someone said east and west slopes will agree that any new supply (transbasin or ag transfers) must have same reuse...but only if decreed.

Eric W.: this is going to affect any possible compact call. If they reuse and it goes back to the stream, it goes back to compact entitlement. So if they are going to have reuse of CO water, lots of variations.

Question is whether water on west slope can be reused, no, only if it is decreed; if West slope reuses their water, problem with compact entitlement...we could bring over here, but huge ramifications to doing that.

Todd: Returns to portfolio choices from last month meeting.

Portfolio Tool: (See report summarizing the Basin Roundtable's Approach to the Portfolio tool development sent on 9/29/2011)

Dinner: Break at 6:20 pm

Portfolio discussion on how to go forward. Small subcommittee will meet with reps from Metro and AK then return to our basin roundtable and work in small groups on portfolio options.

Yes, all agree good procedure.

Sean Cronnin: Opines that we should focus on some of the other four legs of this portfolio so we could get an idea of the extremes that would exist if we were to go forward with 100% or 0% on any of these assumptions. Joe Frank had suggested that it would be helpful to summarize these before our next meeting so we could conceptualize what we are dealing with.

Colorado River Water Availability Study: Matt Brown, Rey Alvarado, Erin Wilson

Refined Study Results. Will demonstrate how we can extract the data from the study.

--Study recap; StateMod—easy to use online tool for general public in order to download any results from study--; then examples useful to South Platte Basin

Draft Phase 1 available online, posted in March of 2011; now, refined report and modeling, this will be reposted by the end of 2011. (CWCB website).

--Study recap: 120 day public comment period; one of requests was a desire for comment response matrix; posted online on CWCB website—this included 400 comments from 40 entities; over 125 pages here.

--Purpose of the study was to look at water availability on western slope; used states' decision support tools; looked at revised ag demand, based on climate studies; looked at surface model and new hydrological tools.

--StateMod: Models that CWCB has developed for decision support includes all demands and all water rights.

--StateMod: Generic water allocation model based on same model as how water is allocated per priority system.

--"Linked node model"

--Four different inputs: inflow hydrology, five climate scenarios up through 1940; then represent physical systems, then water demands (present and future), and administrative conditions.

--Between draft report and the revised report—major issues: fish flows and endangered species; looked at fish obligations and then had to refine model which increased water requirement.

--Reservoir operations were looked at again; found that as climate changed and the demand for water increased—took big reservoir accounts and divided them into individual accounts.

--took close look at Blue Mesa—looked at Bureau of Reclamation to look at demands for power—this was revised with help from Gunnison basin.

--big change in model availability to public; CRWAS Web Viewing tool created—can get to results with a web browser.

--What kinds of results can be looked at through StatMod: model represents stream locations, diversions, reservoirs, ... any location where you might want information.

--thus when looking at the tool, can choose where you want to look—diversions, stream gauge; can look at diversions at each points;

--storage components can be looked at at each point.

CRWAS Web Viewing Tool: "how to" guide

--Information platform will bring you all info on the project itself, the report, the technical resources, model parameters per inflow and outflow,

--Tool is based on google earth so you can zoom in on any area you are interested in;

--More than 2000 model locations on western slope;

--Contrast to seven basin states has all of CO in 29 model locations.

Example: Roberts Tunnel

Note report builder—drop down menu.

Can zoom into location, time, and see how water availability changes.

Goal is that we can grab results ourselves.

Base question: What is the potential water availability for future development?

Studies show historic and future scenarios with climate change hydrology; in most cases, less water.

In general, in late season, July-September, uses draw reservoir storage down.

In early season, more flow, but when fish need it later...less.

Emphasis is on user-friendly tool that anyone can use on their own.

Questions:

Bob Streeter: What would it take to use this tool on the South Platte system? Or is this only fixed for CO River.

Ray Alvarado: This allocation tool can be used anywhere; it has been used on North Platte and Rio Grande. Have to put the water rights, etc. in it, but we are implementing this now on the lower end of the South Platte. Plan on implementing this on other basins; our focus has been on the ground water of the South Platte but plan on inputting other data for surface water.

John Stencil: will the final product show us how much is available for transfer?

Erin and Ray: Yes, with caveats, for example if there are some water rights in development stage.

Emphasis on the fact that this is Phase 1 and the next phase would include a focus on infrastructure and build-out; under the SWASI effort, this could be another use of this tool. See impact of IPPs, for instance.

Harold Evans: Earlier this evening we talked about the portfolio tool; one question was how much is available for new supply; we are looking for availability; is this possibility?

Ray: This is what is available under current conditions; Phase 2 would be under future conditions.

Harold: Schedule for Phase 2?

Ray: Has put in application and the board will take it up in November; they are asking for a demonstration of phase one and to understand how this ties in with SWASI effort and the portfolio tool and how this all ties in.

Harold: If you got the funding, how long to complete this?

Ray: At least a year because we need to work with roundtables to try to understand what is needed and wanted and implementation process.

Joe Frank: This looks at existing conditions, but you project climate change...so what are you looking at in terms of change?

Matt: This is a supply and availability study; the demands are looking at today's demands but climate of 2040 not at future demands.

Joe Frank: So do the roundtables have to do our portfolio study first? Need clarification on water availability on CO river.

Eric W.: What you did was take current demands, current water acreage; then took 10 other climate model runs; then imposed a range on the irrigated acreage then looked at water rights system, and if that caused an increase of the CU on the acreage, this ripples through the water rights system; so a

senior user will need more water, and this ripples to the next and next, and this impacts the water availability; so hotter and drier it gets, then upstream junior will have less water available. This is showing that. If phase 2, this will impose additional demands such as development of a conditional water right, nonconsumptive needs, etc. and will determine the water availability at that time. This water availability is based on instate water system, does not take into account the 7 basin state needs and availability. This does not take into account these demands; this study only looks at the four major basins on the west slope, not at the entire state or the other 7 basins.

Ray: Must look at the physical water available in our state and modeled after our state water rights so that we have some idea of future scenarios, before you look at the demands of the compact.

Joe Frank: So phase 2 inserts an entire new range of demands.

Erin: Phase 1 will be useful because it will illustrate the legal and physical water availability.

Joe Yahn: Can you tell us where the most water is at any one mode? What we need to know is how much water is available over there that we could bring over here—reasonably--? Can we see that here?

Ray: Yes, you can look at what water is available (does not take into account the existing infrastructure) but gives you some idea of how much water is there and what could potentially come over.

Jim Yahn: If we are working on our portfolio tool, we need to know what would be reasonable or attainable as per possible storage and transbasin diversion.

Ray: This tool will help determine the feasibility of that.

Janet Bell: Thus looking at where is the maximum amount of water available at any point in time, does that help determine where we might need storage or enlargement of storage?

Ray: Yes.

Eric Wilkinson: Another aspect of phase 2, as you grow into water projects, you could see, for instance, Denver Water developing the 65,000 acft of potential water that they have not taken yet because they have not grown into it. (Has infrastructure in place and the water rights but does not have the use for it yet). Phase 2 will be a step towards that in terms of perfecting those water rights.

Eric: Compact compliance study, phase 2, combination of bureau of rec studies on 7 basin states—all these needed before we can have answers to Jim's questions.

John Stulp: Governor suggested a five year time line; still doable but roundtable planning and assessments need to be done first.

Janet Bell: Does this mean that I have to do four or five years of study before we can take any action towards building or expanding storage. Does it not mean that we should start now for building to capture the water?

Eric W: Building storage for storage sake, if the state or a water purveyor could afford to do it, would be good. But now, if we could identify where water would be available, and if we found that (that would be Grand Junction now) then next question is how do you get that water to the point of demand. This is why we must study how we connect the storage to the demand—pipeline, etc. Another issue is that you must find someone to build that project and no one is going to build the project unless they see a direct benefit to the entity that is building it. If the state builds it, they know the demand will be there, they know how to get the water to a beneficial use, then the state sells allotment contracts to it, and eventually recaptures their investment--this is not the mechanism that exists now. Now, an entity builds a project for its own use. Perhaps the state will sooner or later realize that they need to take a step towards building a state water project that is not focused on a particular situation; better NEPA results—broader base and wider support, but right now, this is not going to happen. Opines that what this study is is a building block that can help eventually even a statewide project. But right now, this will not take just a few years to do this. The state needs to look at how we move water projects forward and we need a paradigm shift.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Next meeting: Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont, CO: Tuesday, November 8: 4pm.