

NPBRT Minutes: 9-20-11 Meeting
NFS Conf. Room (7-9PM)
100 Main Street, Walden, CO

Members/Liaisons Present

(* Voting members)
Mike Alpe
*Mike Allnutt
*Jimmer Baller
Paula Belcher
*James Carothers
*Kent Crowder
*Tom Hackleman
Debbi Heeney
*Kay Meyring
*Randy Miller
*John Rich
Ann Timberman
Carl Trick II
*Ty Wattenberg
*Rick Wyatt
*Barbara Vasquez

Guests Present

Greg Johnson
Caid Waldron

Members/Liaisons Absent

Deb Alpe
Pete Conovitz
*Scott Fischer
*Mike Honholz
Hunter Townsend
Michael Wright

I. Agenda Review:

The agenda was accepted as published.

II. Approval of NPBRT Minutes: July 19, 2011 Meeting

The minutes were approved as submitted.

III. Scenario Development-Water Supply Future Portfolio and Trade-Off

Tool- Greg Johnson, CWCB, Water Supply Planning

The results (excel spreadsheet) of the NPBRT work with the Portfolio and Tradeoff Tool is distributed with these minutes. The bottom line from NPBRT sends a strong message against AG transfers to solve East Slope water needs.

Greg Johnson handed out worksheets and will spend most of this meeting working with us to capture the NPBRT ideas, which will be integrated into the statewide input to the IBCC. He started us out with the 'Good Neighbor' approach established by the Colorado Basin with the midlevel supply, midlevel demand. It dialed in 150,000AF

from the available water in the Colorado system each to East and West Slope. The oil shale option is 'on'. Replacement of non-tributary water was 'on' at 30k AF. Greg explained that many IPPs already have some level of Ag transfers integrated into them, and the only way he could entirely eliminate these Ag transfers would be to turn off all IPPs. All Colorado Basin scenarios contribute to Ag dry-up. We agreed to leave the IPPs 'on' to mirror the IBCC 'alternative base'. The default level is 100% success for Windy Gap and Moffat Firming. When we told Greg not to include any Ag transfer for any trans-basin IPPs, he explained that wasn't really possible with the Tool as it's configured. The reduction in Ag area is assumed to be approximately 10% statewide and approximately 20% in the S Platte. Greg said there were many examples already in the pipeline or completed where municipalities have bought up farms to transfer water from Ag to cities.

The Conservation strategy is set at medium with 50% applied to the gap as the default level. Questions such as how much is passive versus active conservation and how much is applied to the gap are being dealt with by the IBCC Conservation Committee. There are potential consequences (intended and unintended) of future laws on conservation which are being considered by the legislature this session. When Greg drew our attention to Reuse, Carl interjected that reuse is not well understood: how it works, how it is to be implemented, how it will affect the basins. Barbara mentioned there are potential impacts of reuse on Nonconsumptive Needs. If water is reused to extinction, that's less water in the river channel downstream for habitat and aquatic species. The default reuse in the Tool is 50/50 direct reuse and reuse by exchange.

We agreed to turn the Oil Shale option from 'on' to 'off'. For IPP success, Carl asked if we could set it at 50% and thereby hold Ag transfer to a minimum. Greg agreed that the % success determines the amount of Ag transfer in the IPP for the S Platte and the Arkansas. For in-basin IPPs, you can't 'see' how much Ag transfer is involved with this Tool. We asked Greg to dial in 90% success of projects involving reuse. Then we settled on 65% success for IPPs in the S Platte, Arkansas and Metro because they are already pretty far along, and 50% for the rest of the basins. For Conservation, we asked Greg to dial it in at low (160AF) with 30% for Metro, Arkansas and S Platte and 0% for the rest of the basins. For Reuse we chose East Slope 210k AF -new supply 75% and West Slope 90k AF – new supply 10% reuse.

After making all these changes, Greg showed us that the S Platte dry up was dropped to approx. 15%. Regarding the charts, both Ty and Barbara suggested that the N Platte be pulled out from the current combination with the Rio Grande. Greg said he'd try. The NP version of the Tool dropped the cost below the status quo down to approx. \$11k/AF. Looking at potential NC impacts, the gages on the S Platte show higher flows because of the lower reuse for the 210k AF brought over from the West Slope.

IBCC/CWCB Update

Carl said the IBCC IPP Subcommittee was drafting a letter to the Governor to initiate a task force to get projects off the ground. The CWCB has discussed the possibility of tying WSRA \$\$ to the amount of water produced by a project. The Nonconsumptive

advocates have asked for some specific items added to address non-consumptive needs. CWCB is focused on the process of integrating NCN into the Portfolio Tool. Melinda Kassen has asked the CWCB to fund a project to look at a hypothetical NC project. At the CWCB Board meeting, they considered a WSRA grant application from the Arkansas and Metro to form a task force to examine the Flaming Gorge project. There was considerable negative public feedback. The first request for WSRA funds to run this taskforce was \$240k, which was rejected. A second proposal for \$72k was approved. Peak Facilitation will run the task force with 2 members from each affected basin. For the unaffected basins (Rio Grande or North Platte), it's up to the BRT whether they want to send a member to participate. Kent suggested that the NPBRT would benefit from having a representative participating on the Flaming Gorge Task Force, even though the North Platte Basin is not directly impacted or involved in the movement of water from the Flaming Gorge Reservoir to the Front Range by the proposed project. He asked for and got the support from the majority of the NPBRT to allocate \$1000 of Basin Funds to support Carl Trick's travel to participate in this Taskforce.

IV. Old Business

In Deb's absence, Barbara reminded everyone that a draft of the text for the North Platte Basin Report has been sent by email. Kristin Maharg needs feedback by 9/27.

V. New Business:

Non-consumptive Needs Assessment Committee: To sunset or not. This topic was raised at the last meeting by Rick Wyatt and Kent Crowder. They felt that the NCNA Committee had completed the tasks previously assigned to it and was no longer needed. Barbara suggested we postpone this topic till next meeting because of the Statewide NCN meeting planned for Oct. 13. Ann agreed, saying it would be good to hear the conclusion of the Statewide meeting before proceeding. Kent said he wanted to proceed this month to make a decision. There was considerable discussion, with several people expressing the opinion that the Committee should continue to function to provide a forum for discussion of environmental and recreational topics which could then be brought in more concise form to the full RT. Kent reviewed verbally the status of NCNA Committees under different RTs and, since there was no uniform practice across the other 8 RTs, he stated that the NPBRT was at liberty to decide on this Committee. Rick Wyatt made a motion to sunset both the NCN and Consumptive committees. A vote was taken, and the NCN as well as the Consumptive Committees were both sunsetted. It was agreed they can be reconstituted if/when there are additional tasks to be accomplished for the NPBRT.

VI. Set Next Meeting: The date for the next meeting is set for Tue, Oct 25, 7-9PM

ATTACHMENTS:

Spreadsheet incorporating the input from the NPBRT

Portfolio and Trade-off Tool SWSI 2010v_09-12-11-North Platte 9-20-11-1.xls