

**South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting**  
**Tuesday, April 10, 2012**  
**Southwest Weld County Building**  
**Longmont, Colorado**  
**4 pm – 8 pm.**

**Please contact Lisa McVicker at [mcvicker1@q.com](mailto:mcvicker1@q.com) with any changes or corrections.**

**Members, patrons and staff present:**

Lisa McVicker, CCWCD; Douglas Rademacher, Ag; Sean Conway, Weld County; Julio Iturreria, Arapahoe County; Sean Cronin, SULHWCD; Mike Shimmin, V&R; Gene Bauerle, RRWCD; Bruce Gerke, Sedgwick County, Muni; Bob Streeter, environmental at large; Larry Howard, Larimer Co. Muni; Ken Huson, Boulder County Munis; Diane Hoppe, CWCB liaison; Eric Wilkinson, IBCC member; Mike Applegate, Northern Water CD; Bert Weaver, Clear Creek County Water; Todd Doherty, CWCB; Harold Evans, Weld County Muni; Jim Yahn, At large; Steve Larson; Doug Robotham, at large; Janet Bell, JeffCo and Metro Roundtable; Elena Ackeer, City of Thornton.

Please let me know if I have neglected to include your name in this list. See email contact above.

Jim Yahn calls the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

**Standard Reports**

**--IBCC Report: Mike Shimmin and Eric Wilkinson:** IBCC meeting was spent preparing for the Summit; hence, there will be an in-depth report later in the meeting.

Eric Wilkinson: Discussion of portfolio development; five scenarios put forward; environment rep pointed out that 2 of the five put out there did not include conservation or ag conversion; Mike S. pointed out that the conservation was represented in IPPs and that there was large passive conservation. Complements to Mike S.

**--CWCB report: Eric Wilkinson:**

Diane Hoppe: Strange to not have Eric W present. Workshop on severance tax—severance tax down because price of natural gas down; met in Denver; new members: Don McCloud, Gunnison reappointed; new members: Diane and Ty Watenberg from North Platte Basin; and new officers: John McCloud, from, and Alan Hammel from Pueblo as new vice chair.

Received study and final report on CO River Water Availability Study; is available online. Discussion for \$2 million—contention around what exactly this risk management study would do; staff is charged to better define the issues and terms. Loan projects: 4 loan projects approved, 3 of which were combined with WRSA—good tool for future projects. Had public deliberation on Grand County application for recreation, in-channel diversions; plan was put together well and board approved staff's recommendation. Adopted a resolution of support for WISE project—not typical, but resolutions of support from CWCB seems “wise.” Looked at SWASI work plan—will be continued. Big news: Eric Hecox leaving CWCB and will be director of South Metro District; sounds like Eric faces a big challenge--they are not as easy to get along with as we are!

**--Legislative Report:** Dianne Hoppe: Senator Schwartz, Senate Sponsor; House sponsor changed from Sonnenberg to Randy Baumgartner; status update: passed Senate Ag Committee, headed to appropriations. Money for forest health and stream restoration—need to attend to both. Projects build will be long.

Jim Yahn: Any money marked for South Platte groundwater?

Dianne: Yes. In addition, in the South Platte, \$500,000 to South Platte Decision Support System to focus on ground water issues; other change: Water Supply Reserve Account—change in name: Water Supply Reserve Fund—request from Comptroller. More money allocated to State Engineer to work on abandoned water rights; Eric W. instigated many fixes that we moved on. One change was to change the way State Engineer receives and spends funds—minor change, but significant for state engineers' office; \$6 million for water shed protection and flood control; \$55 million for reservoir projects.

Also, HB 1278—Rep. Fisher: study on South Platte, has passed out of house ag to appropriations—he was proposing to do a strike below amendment—can't do that in appropriations—has extension; he may send this bill back to house and appropriations; this bill may run out of time.

Jim and Mike S: Have seen different versions, another yet to come.

Dianne: Not sure of chances for this bill surviving; but could be future options.

Don Amendt: Platte River Recovery Program: Governor has appointed Don to represent Colorado on this \$300 million recovery program that allows everyone to recover water on the South Platte. As our obligation to provide water is met, we are able to focus on the retimed water. We have asked for a determination of law asking if Colorado is allowed to do this under the Export statute; quite a question to ask this at this point in time; this will call the water court judge to decide if we have violated this export statute; focus is on how we are retiming the recharge. SPWRAP, major water users, etc. are filling out affidavits to understand this impact. Some of our augmentation programs have excess water at times, and we are buying these excess water rights; we have almost acquired the habitat at Grand Island that we were obligated to; the rereg reservoir that has been built for purpose of storing this water; everything is working well, but this case will be very important.

Dianne Hoppe: Tax payers were on both sides of the fight; this seems similar; legal option to pursue this but one wonders if this is worth the tax dollars of the people of Colorado.

#### **--Education Report:**

Sean Cronin: Education committee had a conference call on Feb 24 and tweaked some deadlines; the document has been modified and will be posted on the website; the traveling exhibit is traveling; latest was at Metro Roundtable and will travel next to Northern; we can schedule and get it to your event.

April 30: Conference call with PEPO; purpose is to focus on all roundtables' education action plan. Also, CFWE and CWBC May 30 meeting for detailed look at the education efforts; if inclined to be part of this conference, will be discussed on April 30.

Bert Weaver: Thanks to Chris Cross for coordinating and traveling;

Sean: Yes, thanks to everyone who

Doug Rademacher: Will it be on the water-users meeting next week?

Sean: Yes. Someone in Sean's office handles the scheduling.

**--Nonconsumptive:** Bob Streeter: In February new paper published; has been sent out to membership from CWCB; implementation plan looking for input. Suggestions for how to fill the gaps, to identify costs and partners, and who agrees to take the lead. Anyone interested in developing nonconsumptive projects—we are not looking for a workshop, as we have not had any technical look at the reaches we have already identified; thus asked CO Dept of Wildlife to look at map and go reach by reach to point out what they think is needed from an aquatic perspective, then from riparian habitat issues; then we will go back in order to focus on areas that we have identified as needing benefits; thus, first step is working with the Dept of Wildlife with these steps of identification. When this is done, then we can come to the Roundtable to see if the Table wants to initiate some projects; five projects want to be identified; CWCB has a tool box that has resources to use in order to identify these projects. Note that there is no part of the portfolio process in which nonconsumptive plays a role. Next meeting: July 10; but July we will have the product from the CO Dept of Wildlife.

-- **Phreatophyte:** Bob Streeter: Have had discussions with CWCB staff; \$1 million for Phreatophyte control; no work on calls for proposal yet. As soon as this RFP process has started, we will notify.

**--Alternative Ag Transfer Methods:**

Joe Frank not present.

Todd Dougherty: Have request for \$1million to continue the discussion; this is going forward;

Mike Shimmin: The Ag Transfer subcommittee is working with other groups to establish discussion with front ranges cities and farmers; subcommittee effort is active and ongoing to try to figure out how to make alternatives to ag transfer might work.

Todd D: One idea is to couple conservation easements with interruptible supply water agreements. Still in development.

Harold Evans: This might be one way to address permanency; this could be a vehicle for this.

Todd: Agree.

**Gene Bauerle: Update on Republican River:** Completing pipelines; feeder line complete, other lines complete, storage tank almost complete; will have a dedication in July or August—all will be invited.

Jim Yahn: Has Kansas bought into it?

Gene: Need an attorney to answer that.

Mike Shimmin: State engineer's office is in discussions with Kansas to narrow the issues; still out.

Gene: Have an allocation of 500 acft for pipeline.

Dave (water commissioner): South Platte Update: flows are way down; precip and snow pack way down; could be reminiscent of 2002 although the reservoir storage is much better than 2002.

Eric Wilkinson: Water user meeting: Thursday, April 12, 8 am, The Ranch; full program; in afternoon, water conservation workshop for anyone who is interested; all invited; if you have not registered yet—tell them you are coming. Lunch presentation by researcher from USGS.

**Feedback on March 1<sup>st</sup> Summit:**

**Todd Doherty:** 300 attendees; 40% were other than roundtable or CCWCB meetings; excellent workshops; great breakouts. For example, I attended Risk Management, as we discussed if there were to be a transbasin diversion, the need is clear to needing to focus clearly; this is testament to talking over 7 years. There is a summary of the Summit that has been distributed. Main focus is to look at portfolios and the commonalities that exist and then identify the areas that need further planning.

Many roundtables have had an open discussion with sharing what they heard at these meetings, especially for those who were unable to attend. There were different themes for different breakouts; would like to hear feedback from Roundtable.

One example is that the Gunnison had a discussion about the need for conservation; they have invited Front Range Roundtables on having a meeting to focus on this. Thus, this level of dialogue is a great sample of success.

Doug Rademacher: Yes, this was excellent; better than the first; and it seems that the attitude on the Western Slope has really changed.

Jim Yahn: Who was able to make it? 2/3rds of the room. Any other comments.

Harold Evans: One thing that seems still very obvious, depending on what your geographical location is, you have a very different view on conservation and what conservation will be able to solve; the rep. from Yampa, for example, noted that the numbers put forward by Metro and South Platte were “unacceptable.” However, looking at the big municipal users and their need to really get the message out about the seriousness of the issue on conservation, because if we don't get it right, consequences

loom. Adaptive management depends on the attempt to change people's behavior; thus, it seemed as though there were still a big gap with the Western slope on conservation.

Don Amendt: Would like to support Harold and reiterate what he is saying; for example, Western Resource Management tells Metro that conservation is the panacea. Say this so that everyone is aware that this debate is going on.

Sean Conway: It would be good to invite this individual to present; it would be a good opportunity for education and dialogue.

Harold Evans: Total consumption: indoor/outdoor/industrial, etc.—comes to 121 gallons per day; Metro does not take this lightly; this is a West slope rec representative and his priority is for conservation;

Sean Conway: Would like to ask where we start drying up.

Harold: His position is that the cities are not doing enough; our environment would look like Tucson.

Sean: Return flow is the issue—this is used 6-7 times before it hits the state line. Seems like the only way to get over this hurdle, is to open the dialogue; an invitation and discussion will be welcome. Maybe if he were to come here, he would learn from that. Do they recognize return flow?

Eric W.: One thing that seems useful in the summit is the diverse groups sitting at tables; for the last two years, this is the assertion: if you increase your efficiency of water use by 10%, there will be lots of water and meet the growth for 2050. Many do not understand this; difficult to try to explain how AK and South Platte basins work and the dependence on return flows. Opines that this one-on-one exchange in the summit is one of the best parts; those who live where there is water in abundance to see how we use our water; for me, it is useful to understand how others reach conclusions on the other side.

Julio Iturreria: Referring to the White paper, issues that he sees, are that issues that the Western Slope sees is that they react negatively partly because they do not have the facts to come up with their own white paper; no one on Western Slope had any comments during winter meeting because they have not been studying the issue; agrees that an individual such as this, needs to come and understand our use of water. When Metro was presented to: we are talking to the water providers here, and we know the answers...stops dialogue.

Also, another white paper is being released on reuse; this paper is revealing; thus the aspects of the four legged stool are coming into focus. Agree with Harold that the folks that did the white paper, did this consciously, so the reality is that is a good study of this. Also, has copies of the reuse paper.

Harold Evans: On the reuse issue: about the First of May, Denver is going to start a trial on irrigation return flow.

David the commissioner: Yes, correct.

Harold: If we reduce the lawn irrigation, is going to have to make up that return flow somewhere else.

Janet Bell: One of the things I noticed in the Summit, when you are talking about conservation, someone brought up low-flow toilets, etc, there is not an awareness that you have to have a certain amount of water because of the construction of the sewer system; on the western slope, fewer people relying on sewer systems that need this amount of water. One man from Gunnison area, for example, when I was talking about measuring, metering water use, this kind of monitoring not clear in flood irrigation. At last Flaming Gorge meeting, he brought pictures of installation of pipes to show gauges to monitor—I was struck by the lack of understanding of return flow metering and evaluation. Seems clear that awareness is growing.

Mike Shimmin: The Conservation committee of the IBCC is working on this debate; some interesting cross currents; part of it can be seen that West slope folks seem to think that we should conserve huge amounts but they are not willing to do any of this themselves; this is why state-wide legislation is crucial. For example, on the low flow toilet legislation, the people pressing this—Denver Water and Sen.

Schwartz—realized the politics would not work, therefore they decided to not introduce that bill this session. But because the recommendations in the letter to the Governors from the IBCC said that we needed to get to work on state-wide legislation, first with indoor plumbing, and then get to work on

outdoor work on landscape work that would implement some of these conservation—then others who are advocating for conservation say they don't want this legislation—thus, conflict; every water provider is saying you can get some level of conservation without mandates, but cannot realize any level of conservation at a mid or higher level without state-wide legislation and mandates. So, discussion at IBCC is focused on how we can do this; therefore, a balancing act, but necessary. The other piece is to realize that we have built in 154,000acft of water through passive conservation, when we talk about legislation, the reaction is this is a mandate and it will happen in the marketplace. My viewpoint is if this is going to happen in the marketplace, do it now through mandates and see it happen sooner.

Harold Evans: No fisticuffs.

Jim Yahn: Any suggestions or other comments?

Janet Bell: I felt comfortable with the emphasis that emerged on storage and the recognition of the need to do that. I heard recognition of the fact that we send a good deal of water down the river and how storage would not be a bad thing.

Jim Yahn: Anyone have an idea for improvements? Any opinion on how often these should happen? I know it is a lot of work; it was well done. Worthwhile doing it every year?

Harold Evans: I think annually is best, too much work going on in between. Maybe some interbasin work would be useful; facilitating some of these in between would be a good idea.

Jim Yahn: The Gunnison chair sent an email and invited us to a May 7 meeting in Montrose; if any of us want to attend, please advise.

Harold Evans: The one in January in Silverthorne was facilitated by CWCB and this was very well planned.

Todd Doherty: This meeting is targeted on municipal conservation and would like representation from water providers; they are open to having the conversation about the extent of conservation expected on the West Slope.

Sean Cronnin: The education action plan does include a plan to meet with Metro and Gunnison, we have funding to put one together; after the Metro roundtable last week, there were discussions that the South Platte and Metro should do a similar event.

Julio Iturreria: Whenever we are having a meeting with other roundtables, we need a facilitator; need this consistency and to make sure that there is a balance of power, an agenda, a spokesperson from CWCB to keep everyone on track. This is what lends itself to a good session.

Todd Doherty: Who facilitated?

Harold: Eric Hecox and Jacob Bornstein. It was very much the preplanning that went into it that made it so efficient and useful and productive.

Todd Doherty: Vis a vis the Gunnison, Michelle Pierce, Chair, runs a tight meeting; confident she can run the meeting.

Julio: But the definition of a facilitator is they need to be neutral.

Mike Shimmin: Do we have an agenda? What are the issues?

Todd Doherty: They will have Rick Burkman, utilities director from Grand Junction, and will talk about conservation from their point of view; these are the two main items: amount of conservation and amount that can be applied to gap. West Slope has question about how they would use the conserved water.

Mike Shimmin: Do they have a plan about east slope water providers and their plans about use of conserved water?

Julio: It would be good to have this discussion before

Harold: Get the three guys who did the work; this is technical enough that you need the experts: Mark Wagner from Denver Water; Greg Fisher who wrote it; Rick Marsted.

Todd Doherty: All roundtable members invited, but Gunnison has specifically asked for these three to present; we have reached out to them; and they will come.

Mike Shimmin: Do we need to respond to the invitation to the Gunnison?

Todd Doherty: Who is interested in attending?

Jim Yahn: Yes, we should; this is an important part of the outreach between roundtables; we need people there and we will like a final agenda. Who is interested?

Sean: Bring our exhibit if you go 😊

Mike Shimmin: I am very interested in this kind of dialogue occurring; I am on the IBCC conservation committee; and I think if we get invitations like this and don't go, that is not good; we need to respond.

Jim Yahn: I would like to go. Again, Monday, May 7, 4-7.

Janet Bell: Would it be helpful to have questions that we want a certain response to from them so they could consider our questions in advance; what would we want to know what they are doing before you go.

Mike Shimmin: The value of a meeting like this lies greatly in preparation. Not sure we can be prepared.

Jim Yahn: But we met to the Yampa and our willingness to show up demonstrates our intent to encourage discussion and dialogue.

Julio Iturreria: Key is whether or not the key individuals are going.

Todd Doherty: Commitments from Denver Water, Aurora, CO Springs, Pueblo; so we have some major water providers, would be good to have others.

Mike Shimmin: I would like to suggest that our muni reps attend if the M&I conservation is key; this is the expertise we need at the table. I am not a water supplier; I don't have to implement this; I think people who have to do this are those who should be at the table and understand the planning process.

Harold Evans: Not sure will work with my schedule. We are riding on the coat tails of Denver and Aurora and it is important that some muni rep from here be there.

Jim Hall: Will look at his schedule and consider.

Mike: If the education fund could help with expenses, 6 hours each way, overnight, we should go.

Patron: Question: What is the message in terms of Metro and South Platte in terms of this dynamic; seems like if everyone in room at the same time, could be strange alliance.

Julio: This paper is a way has created more of a common ground that we have been working toward for the last 7 years.

Jim Yahn: I will try to go; what do we need to do for education funding?

Sean will get with Jim.

**Todd Doherty: Presentation on short and long-term schedule regarding the portfolio tool, project implementation, SWSI 2016 and state water plan.**

First question: Any changes to the portfolios that have come out of this roundtable; four portfolios: 2 at mid-demand level, one of these had 0 new supply from West Slope; one had 175,000 acft coming over; then high demand portfolio—again 0 new supply from West Slope, and one had 175,000 acft coming. IPPS similar with about 80% success rate; one was lower, but average was 80%.

All portfolios, for conservation, low conservation strategy with 10% of savings going to M&I gap; As new supply came in from West Slope, various degrees of ag dry up; more west slope water, less ag dry up.

So—anything from the Summit that you might change, does this cover everything you wanted to demonstrate? Want only 1 portfolio? Want to wait until I have completed my overview of the IBCC presentation before deciding if we are comfortable with our portfolio?

Jim Yahn: Yes, let's listen to your presentation about our portfolio.

Todd sets up

**Basin Roundtable Vacancies:**

Eric Wilkinson: IBCC rep.

Dianne Hoppe: South Platte rep for CWCB.

Adam Bergeron with Nature Conservancy; Doug Robotham is replacing Adam.

At-large position; previously with environmental focus; this has traditionally been held with Nature Conservancy.

Doug: Have long history Assistant Director of Water at DNR representing State of CO in negotiations in the recovery program along with Jim Lockheed; thus would like to fill this position.

Eric Wilkinson: Will testify that Doug spent many long hours negotiating with Dept of Interior, Wyoming, etc and was instrumental in implementing the program. Opines that Doug would be a very good representative.

Doug Rademacher makes motion to approve Doug to replace Adam.

Sean Conway seconds.

Discussion? Vote: Unanimous.

New representative from Broomfield; I am encouraging them to fill that seat and to fill the seat with (me) Steve Larson, water lawyer in Boulder.

Harold Evans endorses Steve.

Dianne Hoppe: Question for Todd; Broomfield also has a seat on Metro Roundtable? Both voting members?

Todd Doherty: Statute states that for a city and county if the boundaries of two roundtables divide the city and county, both roundtables get a voting member.

Dianne: I will vouch for him.

Jim Yahn: Metro is looking for non-voting member to attend Metro roundtables; thought maybe Sean Cronin would be able to attend.

Sean Cronin: If no one else is interested, I can try to make it work; but if someone else would attend, would be great.

Julio Iturreria: Second Wednesday of every month.

Sean Cronin: Not available.

Doug R.: Would be happy to step in.

Jim Yahn: Consensus that

Mike Shimmin: Would like under standard report that there be a metro report at each of our meetings.

Jim Yahn: Good idea; we can hear from our other Metro reps (Janet and Julio) as well.

## **Dinner break.**

### **Todd Doherty presentation continues:**

Overview of next steps for the Basin Roundtables, CWCB and IBCC: portfolios, management, focus on getting projects up and running with the Basin Roundtables; funds available with contractor, CDM, to help scope-out projects, find grant money, etc.

Major tasks leading up to 2016:

--Implement SWASI 2010 16 recommendations;

--Identification and implementation of Consumptive and nonconsumptive, multi-purpose projects (one aspect of moving process into implementation phase);

--Scenario planning and adaptive management process (no-regrets planning);

--Evaluate SWSI 2016 Methodology (involvement of CWCB, IBCC and roundtables);

--SWSI 2016 Development;

--Finalize SWSI 2016 and Water Plan;

Scenario development is underway, especially vis a vis portfolio process.

Intro to scenario planning: through portfolio effort, four to five scenarios have been grouped together; Looking for adaptive management framework that will highlight some areas where there is agreement and we can move forward as a state on those areas for implementation—so, we might be planning for a scenario that is high-demand, low supply CO River Water, or high-demand and climate change, or low demand...so each scenario brings forth a different response.

Again: “no-regret” or adaptive management focuses on what will work because of existing agreement.

--Projects groupings can be used to identify decision points and work to be done—from conservation, to new supply—work on that which can find agreement at first.

Todd: Questions in terms of specifics of this framework for future work?

Eric Wilkinson: Concern about putting new supply at the very end; takes 25 years for a new supply; Ag to Municipal transfers—easiest way, but there will 20-30% dry up; does this take precedent over new supply. I would like to see new supply moved up.

Todd: This is just illustrative purposes; might group differently.

Eric W.: I think this sends a message and reserves our certainty in regards to the compact; this needs to be moved up in priority.

Mike Shimmin: A piece of new supply needs to be in each of these; and group differently:

- 1) New supply discussion; 2) New supply planning 3) New supply design 4) New supply comes on line

Need to put parts of this in each step because it takes more than 30 years to bring new supply on board; I am concerned that if we don't do new supply, it will be too late to have new supply by 2040 or 2050.

Todd Doherty: Duly noted and agree.

Bert Weaver: Would like to reiterate these facts that new supplies take 25-30 years; makes no sense to put these at tail end.

Janet Bell: New supply requires storage; we need storage at the beginning.

Julio Iturreria: Locations important.

Doug Rademacher: I agree with Mike Shimmin that new supplies need to be in each element.

Todd: Any subject area—say conservation—what we are doing is to first work on areas of agreement and commonality.

Julio Iturreria: Is there commonality between the three roundtables on Front Range in their portfolios?

Todd D.: Yes, the Metro took more of an attitude that they do not care where the new supply comes from—transbasin or ag transfers—where this basin is more focused on transbasin.

Janet Bell: On the Flaming Gorge project and the steps being taken, what do we need to know about this...costs, etc? My understanding was that if you were doing this with Flaming Gorge you could also do this with other IPPs; where does this fit in with the scenarios? My understanding was that in order to make a judgment on projects in the future, you were bringing different groups together to see if Flaming Gorge was valid, you could take this and apply to other projects.

Todd D.: Yes we are working on metrics to evaluate other strategies.

Timeline: Summer into Fall of 2012, much progress shall be made in laying out framework for adaptive management and focus on strategies for evaluation; meanwhile, roundtables will be engaged to move projects forward.

Will focus on IPP list that basins have identified; CWCBC will compile this; will engage finance and loan staff; will compile list of consumptive and nonconsumptive projects and will look to roundtable of best way to work through these: subcommittee, workshop, etc. Some of these projects will be well on the way, others may need help for scoping, costing, etc. to get to point where it can be funded—state or federal funds.

Harold Evans: Comment: In the South Platte Basin, the bulk of the water needed to meet our M&I gap is in four new reservoir projects; everything you talked about does not help that at all. Thus, your proposal



deals with a very small amount of our gap. For us, we need to build Windy Gap, Halligan-Seaman, NISP. This is where we will meet the bulk of our gap.

Julio Iturreria: This is why I brought up about the dissimilarities about the roundtable portfolios; disappointing to hear that this will go on for two more years; to wait around until others get the idea, is disappointing. The feedback I heard from the summit was that the various tables were talking about how to move away from the portfolios; seems like for us to play around more with portfolios, disappointing.

Todd D.: In the May meeting, the plan is to identify those areas where there is no agreement; understand the M&I gap serious and that the four projects would meet 40% of that, but this looks at other gaps.

Julio Iturreria: Note Chatfield, can't get that moving either.

Todd D.: Defends state's work on Chatfield.

Doug R: Wow, must have missed those letters of support for NISP:)

Eric W.: Met with governor and asked for support on these to get these moving forward; agree with Todd in regards of the state's administration to try to move projects forward; greater State involvement with dialoguing with Federal permitting agencies since 1980s. Must complement the State in that regard but will take constant pressure. Where are the project champions? With the IPPs and there are a number of IPPs that are being moved because of project opponents; need project proponent, champion, advocate. This state needs to change its view in terms of state water projects. Our emphasis needs to be on the IPPs instead of searching out other projects; like Flaming Gorge—you at least have the dialogue going if the project goes forward. A good state role would be how do we put forward a transbasin project that takes advantage of the compact; needs to be a state role involved; if the state could develop it and sell allotment contracts in that, state becomes the facilitator for state water resources. I would advocate concentrating on initiating IPPs instead of finding others.

Janet Bell: I am a proponent on the state being the one to spearhead these projects—one of the water consultants came up to me and noted that the three areas for good storage had been identified; we need to identify storage and get water there.

Todd defends state well.

Bob Streeter: One of the things that struck me at the Summit, we did not take same approach as the AK, but I would like to know what a high demand, with mid conservation, and IPPs at 80% would look like, would we gain anything from that since we only looked at low conservation option.

Harold Evans: We can do that but the way I understand the process, unless we significantly change, it is up to the IBCC and the IBCC will start to look at five different scenarios and one of those looks at high conservation—this is state wide, but this runs out for all basins.

Todd: Yes, the IBCC will take these scenarios and look at different strategies to meet each scenario.

Bob Streeter: This will be done basin by basin? Yes

### **Dick Brown: Ag Following Public Policy Working Group**

Not representing AK roundtable, rather, my client is Pikes Peak Water Authority; Gary Barber is Chair, also on AK Roundtable. Former city manager, recovering economist, taught at DU; looked at public policy; real issue when became involved in AK basin: what do we do with defining issue with M&I gap that will have some filling with Ag transfer to municipalities. AK interest ongoing (super ditch, for instance)—what goes on when transferring from AG to municipalities, but we do not want to see valuable ag land to be dried up—how to achieve both needs. There has been legislation introduced—unsuccessful—to introduce ideas of interruptible supplies – 40 years—then roll over. This caused concern. Looked at this, then, from a perspective not from water law point of view, but rather from the stand point as to whether or not our system makes sense economically—do we have a rational system to allocate water resources that can be scarce. As a result, I have put together a foundational paper—

this paper is available to all. This foundational paper has been vetted through the AK roundtable and the AK roundtable wants to join with South Platte Roundtable to see if we can come to some agreement of introducing some guidance for the inevitable transfers from ag uses to municipal uses. Tomorrow, at AK meeting, the board will appoint a group of their members to form part of this working effort and we would like to ask that the South Platte Basin Roundtable also does the same. Heather Bergman will be providing professional facilitation services to help winnow this to come with some recommendations. The foundation paper 1) comes to no conclusions and 2) makes no recommendations. Therefore looking to the Roundtables (AK and South Platte). In addition, we are asking the CWCB and IBCC staff to accomplish many tasks with limited resources; encouraged by the work that CWCB/DNR staff have dedicated to this process.

Jim Yahn: Questions?

Jim: When do you need to know the people who will be involved?

Doug: Best would be for you and Gary to talk and decide.

Todd D.: IBC have combined the longer document with the executive summary; so this is a starting point. Thought maybe the subcommittee on ag transfers would be a good starting point.

Harold Evans: Fundamental problem that we need to address; this goes against what we have seen with the Roundtable approach. We are being asked to go to work on a foundational document that we have had no input. I think that this Roundtable needs to have some vigorous discussion here; one of the challenges is that there are significant differences geographically and what may be issues and solutions for the AK are not necessarily the same for South Platte. I am reluctant to go into a process with a handful of people without the Roundtable having a serious discussion. This work is predicated on the work that the AK has done to solve the AK problems; we are being asked to work on a foundational document we have had no input on this.

Doug: I think there is fairness to your observation and done because of AK request, but the purpose was to provide a foundational base to start a dialogue with the recognition that there will be lots of differences. Time is not our friend and that is why we have come forward thinking it is a starting point for discussion.

Jim Yahn: This is what I remember that we were reluctant but we wanted to be part of the solution as well.

Harold Evans: Statement of work that comes from WSRA dated March 2009, application date? 116 pages? The simple fact is that the AK will use this as their bible and they will come from them. "The preferred strategy..." their issues are different, but to drop this on us and we will put together 3 or 4 people without the roundtable having even read it, does not seem like how we have done business.

Todd: Concern that this might be further along.

Mike Shimmin: I do not have a vivid recollection of how this came about; this was funded with a \$20,000—10 from us, 10 from AK—that is was supposed to be a joint effort; so far, nothing "joint" about it; I would like to have some information about some of these details before we use this as a starting point from which to proceed. Would be interested to know if this is 90% finished, and we have 10% to go and only now we are being brought in one thing...but if it is just beginning of process, different. I too was surprised to receive a 144 page paper and no one was ever involved; I wonder how we are involved.

Todd: At least 2/3rds of the budget is in place for a facilitated dialogue. When Gary Barber came and asked for this, it was in the shadow of 1068.

Mike Shimmin: Suggestion, would like to ask Jim Yahn to talk to Gary Barber and ask him where the "joint" process is; we need some fleshing out in terms of the joint process we are being asked to engage in, and then we would be better situated to vote on what to do or who will do it.

Doug: Might be helpful if Heather could be part of the discussion between Gary and Jim.

Harold: part of the fundamental problem is that there has been no request for input; this is procedural. Not a good way to work with your partners, especially those who are funding ½ effort.

Jim Yahn: I will call Gary.

**Presentations on Projects: three updates**

1) Greenway Foundation: Jeff Shoemaker

9 months ago: Preliminary study on South Platte: \$25,000 engagement to take section of South

Platte Roundtable: how to deal with non-consumptive uses, delivery water from upstream to downstream, dealing with invasive species, ---matched it with \$25,000 from Metro, and \$200,000 from State. Dollars being put to good work.

2007-2012: How do we take South Platte River to make a better river; now three months into 6 month project where this will be accomplished? Explains funding that will take a section of the South Platte River and improve it.

Shoemaker will come back in June to explain status; has asked \$8 million from GOCO and will be asking for more money because project will have proceeded to point of construction.

Ecologically dead river will have come back to being a live river. 135 storm sewers come into South Platte River in Denver alone; we will create an ability for people to enjoy and recreate in a beautiful river. Three years from now, project will be realized: concept will become reality.

This roundtable is investing in something beyond the borders; will ask for \$50,000 from us in July, \$100,000 from Metro, and \$200,000 from state.

**Ovid Reservoir: Mike Applegate.**

Joe Frank not able to attend. 12 miles from State Line. Original GASP project; took original study on reservoir from GASP, modeled and looked at potential uses; built off of SWASI; broke it into a monthly model. Recognition to Ken Frissler, on Lower South Platte, developed useful daily model and recharge, etc., very useful tool.

Clay Good: with Applegate; family farms near Ft. Morgan and was ditch monitor; worked on model and figured out the potential of the reservoir. See beneficial uses, consumptive and nonconsumptive—for each scenario, came up with modeling for daily demand, shortage, reservoir shortage.

The District 64 Reservoir Company has established demands and uses for beneficial use of the water by their shareholders; previous engineering design was reviewed for feasibility and potential changes; basin scenario shows that the Ovid Reservoir could reliably fill in most years; Reservoir fill firm yields from 5,560 acre-feet to 8,300 acre-feet for total annualized 30-year cost per acre-foot values from \$134 to \$225.

Reservoir is benefit to the Julesburg Irrigation District for multiple purposes: augmentation water, supplemental water for recharge; alternate supply for maintenance operations at the head-gate.

Additional study will be required such as: groundwater modeling, easement and river access analysis; conveyance options for delivery to the reservoir.

Total Budget: \$176,000

Total Costs: \$139,700 (Applegate: 147,700; legal costs: 15,000)

Returned to CWCB: \$36,300

Harold: What would the next step be? What can roundtable do?

Mike Applegate: Sit down with partners and have discussions. Best to sit down with the Coop and Julesburg to see what will come forth.

Harold: Did this get you what you needed down on the river, Bruce?

Bruce Gerke: This was a good study, we are worried about some mechanical issues and some of us feel these need to be addressed; this is my first exposure to the report. Important that we not do anything that might create injury, so we will keep moving forward.

**Jim Yahn: Lower South Platte Water Cooperative**

Began 3 years ago, group looked at fact that there were excesses in recharge; wondering if some could share in these aug plans with excesses. Began to discuss and saw an opportunity for alternative transfer methods; other water conditions such as free river conditions. We met with every ditch company and aug plan from Kersey to State Line—once or twice—50 meetings; Joe Frank, Mike Groves. Map shows different aug plans and if we could become more efficient we could use the water to everyone's benefit better.

We formed the Committee and worked with Colorado Corn Growers; joined in for a grant to CWCB; DU and Brown and Caldwell—we became third study: how much water is there, how successfully can it be exchanged, how often, what potential, how much free river water is available, what kind of infrastructure might enhance that.

Exchange potential appears on map: parts where it is good, parts where not useful.

North Sterling Canal, Pruett Reservoir—dries river, not potential.

Used 2008 numbers to look at this (dry year);

Volume of excess recharge: Kersey to Morgan County Line: 16,900 acft of potential excess recharge in 2008. Further down; another 5000 acft.

Then looked to see how often could it be exchanged to Kersey: 70% of the time.

Summary: looks like potential and quite of bit of water could be exchanged.

Looked at free river potential: 50,000-100,000 acft of free river potential in some areas that could be tapped into.

Need for infrastructure: look at Pruett reservoir, Sterling reservoir...if there were some wells to tap into free river and pump up into the canal—a little bit of infrastructure, could increase potential for free river upstream.

Met with participants to survey interest; received positive feedback.

Focused on fairness, transparency, and work within the current water rights system. Want to provide water both in our area and upstream.

Received grant funds from alternative ag transfer grants, received WRSA grant money; thus now looking at organizational alternatives now; operational perspectives under study; wanted to include entire stretch of river.

WSRA grant work: evaluate organizational framework: we are about ½ done with this evaluation framework; leaning towards coop.

Analyze water law, begin organizational planning.

Alternative Transfer Methods work: how, when, who; want this to be a ground-up effort; have met with more than 50 people, farmers in the area, so that this organization will come from the farmers; will have several stakeholder meetings through the process and will have enough information for stakeholders to buy in or not.

Design board of directors that is representative.

Looking at issues for stakeholder feedback; questions of board structure; what water uses are part of the plan; how much water available and what is the time line.

Operational planning: connect water supplies with demand: municipalities, NISP, other reservoirs to hold our excess credits; looking for partnerships and will meet with municipalities.

Identifying location, amounts, and liabilities as we go forward.

More stakeholders on board, more operational flexibility.

Trying to use excesses to make more efficient.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Next meeting: Southwest Weld County Building, Longmont, CO: Tuesday, July 10, 2012