

**Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC)**  
**February 29, 2012; 1:00 – 5:00pm**  
**Broomfield, CO**  
**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees**

**Members**

Stan Cazier  
Carlyle Currier  
Jeris Danielson  
Jeff Devere  
T. Wright Dickinson  
Steve Harris  
Frank Jaeger  
Melinda Kassen  
Eric Kuhn

Olen Lund  
Doug Monger  
Peter Nichols  
John Porter  
John Rich  
Senator Gail Schwartz  
Mike Shimmin  
Travis Smith  
Representative Jerry  
Sonnenberg

Joe Stibrich  
John Stulp  
Bill Trampe  
Carl Trick  
Wayne Vanderschuere  
Steve Vandiver  
Eric Wilkinson  
Jay Winner

**Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) Board Members**

Barbara Biggs – City and County of Denver  
Geoff Blakeslee – Yampa/White Basin  
Diane Hoppe – South Platte Basin  
John McClow – Gunnison Basin

**Staff**

Heather Bergman – Peak  
Facilitation  
Jacob Bornstein – CWCB  
Viola Bralish – CWCB  
Todd Doherty – CWCB

Jennifer Gimbel – CWCB  
Mikaela Gregg – Peak  
Facilitation  
Eric Hecox – CWCB  
Greg Johnson – CWCB

Sue Morea – CDM  
Dori Vigil – CWCB  
Dick Wolfe – DNR

Members of the public were also in attendance.

**Welcome**

IBCC Director John Stulp opened the meeting with the following introductory comments:

- There has been a great deal of activity from and progress made by the IBCC Subcommittees, the basin roundtables (BRTs), and other water-focused efforts occurring across the state over the last few months.
- Today's meeting focuses on preparing for the Basin Roundtable Summit. We will look specifically at the work of the BRTs in completing this phase of portfolio work in preparation for the Statewide Summit, during which members of the IBCC will serve as discussion moderators to help facilitate information sharing and gathering from various group conversations. The Summit is a great opportunity for participants to share and listen to different points of view and try to draw out information and ideas that will help the BRTs finalize their portfolios and lead the IBCC in identifying commonalities from the various portfolio scenarios.
- On a parallel track to the work of the BRTs and IBCC, the Governor's office has developed the "To Be Determined (TBD)" program, a Colorado-based civic engagement effort that will engage citizens in 40 locations over three months. This effort will focus on discussing five key social topics. Those that are willing are encouraged to join this effort in order to help share information regarding water and the 1177 process.

## **Scenario Planning and Portfolio Development**

Eric Hecox (CWCB) provided a presentation outlining the timing and process of the basin roundtable portfolio development effort and use of the Portfolio and Trade-off Analysis Tool, specifically addressing where the process is headed, its purpose, and desired outcome.

The basin roundtable (BRT) portfolio and trade-off analysis exercise is a statewide effort that will help with the development of the State Water Plan and the Statewide Water Supply Initiative (SWSI) 2016. Since July 2011, the BRTs have worked with the Portfolio and Trade-off Analysis Tool to develop various statewide portfolios. The BRTs completed draft portfolio work in early March in order to share and discuss their portfolio(s) with other BRTs and stakeholders at the Summit. From the information and feedback gained at the Summit, the BRTs will have until the end of April to further refine and finalize their portfolio(s). CWCB staff will then summarize the BRTs' portfolio work and provide the IBCC with a summary of scenario information to review and discuss at the May IBCC meeting. The IBCC will work through a scenario planning process to identify portfolios for different scenarios and then identify commonalities across the portfolios as a "no regrets" set of solutions. The IBCC will also work through an adaptive management framework for addressing the scenarios. The goal of scenario planning and the adaptive management framework is to identify common "no regrets" implementation elements for implementation and an adaptive management plan that addresses a range of future water supply needs and outcomes. BRTs will have an opportunity to provide feedback during this process. While the IBCC works through scenario planning, the BRTs will begin to work with CWCB staff to identify nonconsumptive and consumptive projects for implementation.

## **Discussion**

***Will the nonconsumptive metrics requested by the Nonconsumptive Needs Subcommittee be available for the May IBCC meeting? There is concern that the process is moving forward without metrics available to assess all the framework components ("4-legs of the stool").***

While staff has outlined what is needed to develop the requested metrics, staff is still working to determine what information is currently available and how and when staff will be able to dedicate resources to this project.

***Not all of the roundtable portfolios incorporate all components of the IBCC framework. How will that affect the IBCC's work on portfolios?***

This issue may need to be discussed at the May IBCC meeting after all the roundtable portfolios are finalized.

***Will the modifications to the Portfolio Tool suggested throughout the process be made prior to the May IBCC meeting?***

CWCB has decided that the Portfolio Tool will not be modified at this time in order to avoid disrupting the completion of portfolios and the scenario analysis process. However, this does not mean that additional options for analyses will not be considered in the next phase of the process, based on IBCC and BRT progress, suggestions, and developments. Some IBCC and BRT members have said that it might be helpful if CWCB staff considered refining the Portfolio Tool after the BRTs complete their portfolios and before the IBCC begins refining the scenarios. This may need to be discussed at the May IBCC meeting.

## **March 1<sup>st</sup> Summit**

Jacob (CWCB) provided an overview of the Summit goals, agenda, logistics, materials, and expected role of IBCC members serving as table discussion moderators. All Summit materials are available on the CWCB Website ([here](#)).

### **Basin Roundtables' Portfolios**

Jacob Bornstein (CWCB) provided an overview of the 32 portfolios developed over the past six to nine months. Jacob summarized the key commonalities and differences that have emerged from the portfolio work. A write-up of the different portfolios (entitled “Roundtables Portfolio Summary Technical Memo”) is available [here](#).

### **Implementation**

Todd Doherty (CWCB) provided a brief overview of how the IBCC and BRTs are moving toward implementation and what the next segment of the process will entail. Highlights from this presentation include the following.

- The Summit and the May IBCC meeting mark a culmination of a year of portfolio-focused work by the IBCC and BRTs and a significant amount of progress made in the overarching process. The IBCC and BRTs are now moving into an implementation phase in which efforts are aimed at 2016 as a key milestone in the water planning process. The central tasks that lie ahead include:
  - Implementation of the SWSI 2010 recommendations
  - Identification and implementation of consumptive and nonconsumptive projects
  - Development of implementation plans
  - Evaluation of SWSI 2016 methodology
  - Development of SWSI 2016 to look at different demands and gaps and expand on current information and approaches
  - Finalize SWSI 2016 and the state water plan
- The next phase of IBCC, BRT, and CWCB work includes portfolio analysis and dialogues to develop scenarios to help facilitate statewide implementation planning. During this phase there will also be an increased focus on two concurrent paths:
  1. **Initiate Consumptive and Nonconsumptive Projects:** Facilitate the implementation of selected consumptive and nonconsumptive projects or methods that meet identified needs by the end of 2012.
  2. **Develop Projects and Methods Implementation Plan:** Suggest and provide advice to basin roundtables on projects and methods that can meet their identified consumptive and nonconsumptive needs in a strategic manner. This will include:
    - Initial cost estimates
    - Promotion of multi-beneficial projects
    - Potential partners and project proponents

This effort will include CWCB staff working with the BRTs to identify next steps and implementation methods for priority projects, complete technical requirements, and increased use of the CWCB grant and loan program. The goal of this effort is to look strategically at each basin's IPPs (consumptive and nonconsumptive) in order to streamline appropriate and effective implementation and identify multi-purpose projects.

### **Discussion**

*There is a need to discuss what the implementation phase of the IBCC process will look like—how the IBCC and BRTs will prioritize implementation steps, projects, etc. All of the BRTs are going to need to take a different approach to implementation; some BRTs will need more help than others and there will be a different quantity of projects to address in each basin. How will all of that work?*

- The intent of the BRT implementation phase is to have each BRT evaluate its current list of IPPs and identify which projects they need help from CWCB staff to evaluate. Implementation of the IPPs will be on a case-by-case basis and will involve a combined effort between the BRTs,

CWCB, the project sponsor, and other necessary stakeholders. It is not solely the task of the BRTs to determine which IPPs to implement, or for the BRTs to initiate the necessary implementation steps. The intent of this effort is not to have the BRTs implement a project but to have the BRTs identify what projects will help meet the gap and address the portfolio of basin and state needs.

- CWCB is hoping that a direct focus on implementation at the BRT level will help move this process beyond the studies and data collection to begin to outline what elements need to be put in place and how in order to move projects forward. There is also the desire to use the BRTs as a central ‘organization’ to engage stakeholders and project sponsors in one venue in order to evaluate ideas, address concerns, avoid overlapping efforts, streamline implementation processes, and develop project support in an efficient manner.

#### Comments

- Based on the current set of portfolios, it seems most of the BRTs agree that a high IPP success rate is important. Therefore, it seems the opportunity is ripe to move forward with the implementation of IPPs as a starting point for transitioning this process toward advancing overarching implementation-focused efforts.
- There is a need for the BRTs to ensure that their implementation plan is developed as a bottom-up process and that all project sponsors/proponents and other stakeholders are actively engaged.
- There seems to be a need to clarify/emphasize the need to fill the M&I gap; IPPs should focus on addressing the gap in addition to meeting agriculture, consumptive, and nonconsumptive needs.