

**South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting**  
**Tuesday, July 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, presenters and patrons present:** Gene Manuello, Julio Iturreria, Diane Hoppe, Kent Swedlund, Douglas Rademacher, Frank Ekhard, Gary Herman, Sean Conway, Bruce Gerk, Gene Bauerle, Doug Rotshotham, Bob Streeter, John Stencel, Larry Howard, Rich Belt, Eric Wilkinson, Ken Huson, Sean Cronin, Keith Lusk, John Stulp, Sue Morea, Todd Doherty, Bert Weaver, Mike Shimmin, Jim Ford, Harold Evans, Jim Yahn, Lisa McVicker

**Standard Reports**

**--IBCC Report:** John Stulp: Transition from portfolio tools; 34 different portfolio outcomes from the nine basins; focused on path forward and scenario planning; looking at commonalities in all portfolios and finding a “no-regret” scenario; will be refining those in order to come to the Sept 11 meeting; looking at different futures for Colorado Water Supply. Looking at what we can do today or in near future where there would be no-regrets for future state supply.

Jim Yahn: Attended for Eric Wilkinson; Mike Shimmin unable to attend; reports how the IBCC focused on “portfolios,” “scenarios” and metrics of how each portfolio differs from scenarios. Identifying the portfolios and focusing on how the scenarios differ.

John: Looking at different examples such as in San Diego; we know we can’t predict the future based on past. Looking at 3 different models: high or low population increase, climate variability, triggers such as the economy, regulation over water issues—focus on need to make decisions and implementations, especially for major projects. Commends the IBCC that everyone still standing at the table; very important to continue effective leadership; South Platte Basin is an important player (aka keen target):) Scenario planning: “alternative futures that portfolios will be tested against”

Jim Yahn: Commends our IBCC representatives: Eric Wilkinson and Mike Shimmin; brings attention to the great leadership that Mike has brought to the IBCC leadership and that Mike has announced he will be stepping down. Roundtable will need to replace Mike and asks for thought in possible nominations for Mike’s replacement as representation on the IBCC. Asks the Roundtable to put names forward to either Todd Doherty or Jim.

Mike Shimmin: Comments that this is a work management issue; he has viewed this as an honor and an important obligation but he cannot continue to meet his commitments. Timing for his resignation seems right because the IBCC process is moving into a new wave of activity and thus would be a good time for a replacement. Thank you for your trust and confidence over the last seven years.

McVicker: As one of the best litigators in the state, Mike has shown another side in his effective leadership in facilitating agreement among divergent stakeholders. Many thanks. Roundtable echoes with applause for Mike Shimmin.

**--CWCB report:** Diane Hoppe: Starts with offering thanks to Mike as well and remarks on the great representation of our basin and his incredible focus on wordsmithing and ushering the IBCC forward. CWCB met in Glenwood Springs in May; first day of the Special Session of the legislature; CWCB was a bit agitated because the special projects bill died and were pleased that the governor put it back on the special session bill and the bill passed. Next meeting in Gunnison on July 14 & 15, coincides with the Gunnison Water Workshop; will be meeting at the College. Met with the Colorado River District Board

and will meet with the Upper Gunnison WCD Board as well and allows the CWCB to become acquainted with the CWCB. South Platte Basin is extraordinarily active with drought, floods, and fires; expresses appreciation of cooperation between the many users. We will continue to work together.

**--Legislative Report:** Diane Hoppe: Water Resource Review Committee: first meeting and tour scheduled around South Metro tour; Water Resource Committee meeting in Stream Boat on August 17 and will be working on legislation to present in 2013. Interim water committee meets on Tuesday, July 14 before CWCB meeting.

Pam Shaddock: Representative for Senator Udall: Regional Director for Mark Udall; re: Water 2012: Senator has made a video on the Water 2012 website; Resolution read on the floor of the Senate: Water is a vital part of our lives in Colorado...."

Statement of thanks for courage and commitment to water resource and our various economic drivers; reminds us that 2012 is the Year of Water in Colorado. Resolution passed in Senate in focusing on maximizing the efficiency of this resource. Presents resolution "suitable for framing" to Jim Yahn.

**--Education Report:** Sean Conway: Reports on funding available from education.

August 25 in Golden at the US Pro Cycling Challenge; this is the South Platte's version of the Water 2012 exhibit. If you are interested in having the exhibit, contact Sean.

Doug Rademacher and Sean Conway: Tuesday, July 24, 11:30-1:30 at the Fort in Ft. Lupton; Hank Brown featured speaker; Farmers for NISP: Perspective on water development in West: this is the exact replica of the Fort constructed in Ft. Lupton; free barbeque.

Joe Frank: Who has the exhibit now?

Clear Creek Watershed Foundation now has the exhibit.

**Central Water Conservancy District:** Ian Shelledy: CSU statement; doing thesis on collaboration and the roundtable process; thank you for being willing to talk to me in the future.

**--Nonconsumptive:** Bob Streeter: Status: started with CO Parks and Wildlife where aquatic biologists are looking at the identified places we focused on in our maps; looking at any restoration needs on these stretches; looking where we could provide water as well as environment for nonconsumptive; July deadline has been pushed forward until August because of fires, etc. Non-competing nonconsumptive needs will take more focus then.

**-- Phreatophyte:** Bob Streeter; CWCB: Chris Stern: there is money in the budget for phreatophyte control and will be presenting the budget (\$500,000) and a call for proposals called to go out on August 1 and proposals due by October 26—weed districts, etc, -- will be notified in hopes to generate proposals for the South Platte.

**--Alternative Ag Transfer Methods:** Joe Frank: Our subcommittee has not met recently.

Todd Doherty: Several projects underway; coop making good progress; within next few months and by next quarter will pull a compilation of the work that has been done. In Projects Bill, \$1 million for round of grants—will look for guidance for updating criteria guidelines so that proposals will come in competitively, probably around January, up for discussion.

Joe Frank: Asks Jim for meeting with Arkansas: last meeting, had a report on Ag Fallowing—we were supposed to be part of the collaboration on this; met with the AK roundtable; expressed our concerns in terms of the volume of the report and that we had not had any input and the budget had already been

spent, and there were recommendations made in the report although we had no input; expressing concerns: Gary Barber with AK Basin is to refine.

Mike Shimmin: Attended this meeting also; after expressing our concerns, asked them to back up and think about how is the best way for this to unfold and to get back with us; not definite response. We expressed that AK had some ideas that we did not necessarily agree with; therefore, understanding is that AK will come back to us with a modified suggestion about how to move forward.

Jay Winters with AK in attendance; Todd D.: On the heels of HB 1068; this was supposed to look at the legal tools available and was to lay these out; therefore this will be the focus going forward; to pull back and start over with the AK.

Jay Winters reiterates that South Platte really needed to be at the table; so the report had to be pulled back in to start over.

Jim Yahn: We appreciate you reeling this back in.

Dianne H.: asks about time line for spending this money?

Mike Shimmin: Two years after contract is signed; assumed that we have another year.

Harold Evans: Suggest that AK have some discussions with the South Platte before starting again, sounds like they will be looking at legal issues and we should be at the table; the earlier report reaches many conclusions that South Platte would not buy into.

Jay understands; AK meeting tomorrow.

#### **Additional Issues:**

**Jim Yahn:** John Hendrick asked us to consider that we vote on a letter or resolution of support for the Chatfield project.

McVicker reads letter. Voices support from upper South Platte Basin.

Sean Conway: Moves to support;

Dianne Hoppe: Seconds

Sean mentions that the entire representation supported it;

Sean suggests that this be cc'd to Congressional Delegation.

Discussion:

Bob Streeter: Has not seen the mitigation report; Bob Streeter will abstain from vote.

Vote: Unanimous with one abstention.

**Jim Yahn:** Rich Belt: Industrial Rep with Xcel – Water Congress and Public Trust Initiative ballot issues; need 86,100 by August 6. Issue committee forming to oppose measures should the signatures be gathered. Colorado's Water Future: headed by Farm Bureau at this point.

One of the objectives of the issues committee is to collect resolutions from entities that are opposed to these and to post on websites; would Basin Roundtable; draft language on Colorado Water Congress website.

Doug R.: Weld County has passed a resolution

Jim Yahn: Will draft resolution modeled on CO Water Congress

John Stencil: Moves to use CO Water Congress Resolution as template and ask that the Roundtable pass the resolution to oppose the initiatives.

Harold Evans: Second

Harold: Greeley and Weld County have also passed Resolutions that can be used as a good template;

Rich Belt: Have heard from different groups;

McVicker: Emphasizes info at Co Water Congress website.

Todd D.: Rio Grande Basin also just passed a resolution.

Mike Shimmin: From a legal standpoint, have never seen anything that will create such chaos; the way this is worded prohibits the consumptive use of water; takings litigation will last lifetimes.

Sean Conway: I understand that the collection of signatures is struggling; tell these petitioners that this is not a good thing; we are trying to cut this off ahead of time.

If asked to sign, please politely refuse.

Janet Bell: Has CML and CCI passed resolutions?

Sean: Not yet because of timing.

Jim Yahn: Vote: Motion carries unanimously.

#### **Report from Groundwater Subcommittee:**

Joe Frank: Groundwater subcommittee set up at the beginning of the roundtable process seven years ago; Ralf Topper and others, smaller group, began to look at issues. With current issues in the South Platte, legislation, reconvened. At January roundtable, Joe suggested that the subcommittee reconvene. Met in April, then again today. Current issues demanded attention. HB 1278 has become law: started July 1 with projects and decided to look at role that South Platte might play.

Andy Moore: CWCB discussed the CWCB projects bill and that there is \$500,000 and half of this will be used to support South Platte supply decision; and other half to support a few projects, installing and monitoring wells and to get some better data on areas with high ground level.

\$100,000 already used to focus on a few areas in the Sterling area. Hope is that some of this data will be used to understand cross connection for HB 1278.

Ralf Topper presented an update on the pilot project in the Sterling area.

Scott Custerson with Waters Resources: Alluvial Aquifer Accretion/Depletion Analysis tool; we approved a project to look at the math for calculating the accretions and depletions within the system—per structure, or per aug plan or different reaches of the river; should be able to apply real time data to understand where the water is in the river—will help with aug plans; this will be up and running summer of 2013.

HB 1278: 7 areas of objectives: see handout on South Platte River alluvial Aquifer Study

Reagan's summary will be emailed to Roundtable.

- 1) To evaluate whether current laws and rules that guide water administration in the South Platte river basin achieve the dual goals of protecting senior water rights and maximizing the beneficial use of both surface water and groundwater within the basin;
- 2) To identify and delineate areas within the basin adversely impacted by high groundwater levels and to conduct a feasibility-level evaluation of the causes of high groundwater levels in the affected areas;
- 3) To provide information to use as a basis for implementation of measures to mitigate adverse impacts in areas experiencing high groundwater levels and

Study that will be done by Water Institute with Reagan Waskom at the lead; Reagan gave an overview of what the study will entail; this study will cost up to \$911,000; scheduled to be done in 18 months.

Reagan currently working on scope of work to outline details of the objectives.

Discussion pursued on what the role of the Roundtable should be; independent/transparent study that needs input; thus, our view that we should use the Subcommittee and roundtable as a whole as a conduit for discussion and analysis, looking for any possible gaps in the data and questions on interpretation.

Joe reports that the group was in agreement that the Roundtable would play a proper and useful role; the specifics of this will be worked out and Reagan will help in defining our role.

Bert Weaver: Fractured bedrock in Mountainous areas...will this be included at all?

Joe: No, this is really looking at alluvial, tributary groundwater.

Doug R.: Some of the info gathered from the oil and gas industry that has done seismic testing could be a good addition to these studies.

Reagan Waskom: I need an advisory committee and a public process; the groundwater committee can serve this role or we can involve the entire roundtable; looking for a group of folks that is willing to provide guidance and a transparent platform so that the entire process is open.

Jim Yahn: Because of Reagan's timeframe, he will return to present his articulated definition of what our role would be soon. Our next meeting not until October, therefore, would like to have a special meeting in August.

Sean Conway: Seems that Reagan is asking if we are willing to be the public forum; is the Roundtable comfortable saying tonight that we are comfortable being the forum? If so, then Reagan can come back to us with definitions.

Joe: I would make the recommendation that we are the public conduit/the public advisory group and then final approval coming after the

Mike Shimmin: yes, I think we could act tonight on the concept of if we want to do this job but we need to decide what the specifics are. Bylaws: Article 4 Section 8: Subcommittees: Roundtable shall have ability to establish sub roundtables or subcommittees to facilitate discussion on issues cogent to the Roundtable. We need to give some thought to this and exactly what are we delegating to the Subcommittee; in reviewing the Bylaws, I was reminded that all meetings of the Roundtables are open meetings governed by open meetings law and require public notice 30 days before meeting...we have not been following this. Sean Cronin has raised some questions about our bylaws and this might be the time to amend them and we need to be sensitive to our bylaws. I am willing to react to the general question of if we want to do this job and Reagan has offered to write up the summary of the job description.

Kent Swellund: Moves to go forward with the Groundwater Study as a sounding board per the HB 1278 and will refine at next meeting.

Bruce: Seconds

Sean Cronin: Can we nail down a date for special meeting? Can we do this electronically? Are bylaws silent on this?

Todd Doherty: Proposes that we do a separate workshop; August might be a possible date or we could wait.

Jim: My first impression is to go with Sean's suggestion; in concept approve tonight; then have electronic input and have 10 days for comment.

Sean C: What if disagreements?

Jim: We can resolve although perhaps cumbersome.

Mike: Date that you have to have details worked out or do you have more time to work out the details?

Reagan: I am working with detailed scope for CWCB; I think you have given me what I need.

Joe Frank: We have talked about the Groundwater subcommittee meeting before then.

Reagan: I would like to have a meeting with the subcommittee in august or September; does August 21 work for subcommittee, open to full roundtable.

Doug Rademacher: We will look to see if this space is available.

Sean: Are we delegating to the subcommittee?

Joe: The scoping is different from the input from South Platte roundtable in general.

Harold Evans: Two issues: 1) How we will work as the Roundtable with Reagan; this will be electronically distributed; 2) the detail of the scope of the work, this will come from subcommittee—and then presented to Roundtable in general.

Ragan: Adds transparency to the process.

Mike Shimmin: Point of Order: only one motion to approve this in concept; note that there is no provision for electronic reading. My suggestion is that we should not do this; personal suggestion is that if we need to take action – schedule a meeting on August 21 and do it then. Meeting to commence at 1:30 at South Weld Service location.

Jim Yahn: Motion made to approve this in concept.  
Motion carries.

**South Platte Groundwater Update: John Stulp from Governor's Office:**

Jim Yahn: Notes that his involvement is considerable; and wants to make clear that the media has represented him as President of South Platte Basin Roundtable and he wants to make clear that he serves in his capacity as North Sterling.

John Stulp: Request to Governor from Weld County BCC; Governor declined to issue an executive session. Meeting with governor after 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting in Greeley; had meeting with impacted irrigators and Roundtable. See Stulp's summary (CWCB website).

Another suggestion was to contact municipalities; after fires, many municipalities have expressed concerns about their own water sources at this point. Complex and nearly impossible for these municipalities to respond. Central's quota sharing was discussed; Gary Herman with Central Water Conservancy District; Frank Eckhart suggested phreatophyte control; this is ongoing. Agriculture Emergency Response Guidelines: March 2010 document; this money has not been used; thus those water providers for ag. Should look at this. Kurt Russell is the staffer who is working with Don Ament and Dianne Hoppe had involvement with this; this is money for aug water and then apply for these funds. Thus this money is available but moot if there is no water to buy. This has been used a few times and is available.

Have also discussed with insurance providers; insurance providers state that they are working with farmers—assure that they are working with producers to salvage whatever they can based on low water supply.

Looked at long-range plans; HB 1278 and presentation that USGS gave on new technology on sonar/radar ground penetrating that was developed by oil and gas industry and could be used with aquifer structures; exciting technology that the state will be looking at. Glimmer of hope of why augmentation or recharge works better in some areas than others.

Drought comparable to 2002 although perhaps not as bad; but munis are holding on to their water. Questions: none.

**Jeff Shoemaker with The Greenway Foundation:**

Late submission of WSRA

**Greenway Foundation:**

**South Platte River Recreation and Habitat Improvement Preliminary**

**Design WSRA Grant Request Summary**

**Jeff Shoemaker: Executive Director of Greenway Foundation**

**Request: \$250,000: total amount of funds requested**

**Statewide Account: \$200,000**

**Amount from Basin Account: \$50,000 from Metro Basin Roundtable**

**Requests letter of support from South Platte Basin.**

Asking for \$25,000 from South Platte and will ask Metro for \$175,000; to state for \$300,000; this \$500,000 will take preliminary design work so that in 15-16months can start work.

This is recreational and nonconsumptive needs; believes that a cleaner river upstream is a cleaner river downstream.

Expresses gratitude for past support .

See breakdown of funding in report.

Asking for help because construction dollars are more difficult that design dollars.

Questions:

Bob Streeter: GOCO board thinks excellent project; how dependent is success of the project on water?

Jeff: Wet river better than dry river; counting on Chatfield process. Also expresses gratitude to munis that are assisting; design will be such that will rely on low flows.

Bob: Any discussion with water providers about whether or not they will work with the Greenway Foundation?

Jeff: We are supporting Chatfield because opines that it is a good project.

Bert Waver: Moves to support \$25,000 from inbasin and recommendation of support from State Basin for \$300,000.

Frank Eckhart: Seconds.

Discussion:

Dianne Hoppe: How much in our basin account?

\$429,000 in basin account

McVicker: Status of the Overland golf course?

Jeff: Project will not reduce 18 hole historic Overland golf course.

Frank Eckhart: Questions about tree removal and planting...

Jeff: Yes, will be thinning the tree.

Vote: Unanimous.

Dinner.

Mark Waage: Metro Roundtable Update: Metro Roundtable Supply Paper

Julio Iturreria, Janet Bell and Doug Robotham recognized as members and attendees from the Metro Roundtable.

Comments on portfolio and how this is an opportunity to see what utilities in the Metro area might have in common and how on a planning level they can meet water supply needs.

Presentation is with hopes to commence discussion between the two Tables; will make a similar presentation to the AK roundtable.

Overview of supply challenges; Metro's approach to the Portfolio and discussion.

Julio: The more discussions at the Metro roundtable, more desire to focus on some of the issues of conservation and reuse; Metro was a bit skeptical of portfolio, but focused on some of these concept papers to be the catalyst to finding some answers. Metro looks at some of these papers as a substantial standard for point further. Joint effort between Denver and Aurora to come up with these papers; effort usurped political standoff.

Mark: Overview of Colorado population, irrigated acres and flows: 80/20 rule. 70% of the population is in the South Platte Basin.

Water Demands by basins: muni demand highest.

Approach to portfolio tool: focus on efficiency and conservation in the Metro basin; practical maximum effort that could be attained: first two papers focused here; IPPs assumed to be successful; water development filled in. Did not want to engage in debate on West slope/East slope; need to focus on efficiency in Metro basin. State said you have to designate where the water will come from. Also added climate change to their study. To fit climate change in, upped demand by 30%.

Water use efficiency: Metro area leads the state in terms of lowest gpd—regardless of industrial use.

Metro area: amount of irrigation for lawns, our system uses minimum amount for viable lawn.

Highest municipal reuse; innovative projects: WISE project—making use of remaining reusable water. See limitations of that supply.

WISE concept: utilizing Aurora's unused capacity from Prairie Water project; three way arrangement: Denver, Water Infrastructure and Supply Efficiency Partnership; when Aurora has excess capacity can be delivered to South Metro area or when Denver needs to use the water for its own use, will use it.

Interruptible but utilizes excess capacity in the most efficient manner.

Julio: Note that this is renewable water; this is key.

Harold: Comment on reuse: each basin is different; one of the aspects that sets Metro apart, high percentage of original supply is wholly consumable. But in Larimer and Weld County, we don't have such a high percentage that is wholly consumable, so we don't have the same opportunity for reuse. CBT water is only available for one time use. Important difference to note the difference of reuse as our water is not wholly consumable. We are reusing every bit of our Windy Gap water and what we can—but differences.

Paper: Role of water utilities as per efficiency and strategies. But there is a limit of what we can do as a utility—changing landscaping, etc, is a discussion that needs to happen across the board and there needs to be political support for these changes.

Redevelopment opportunities—more densely built cities, example. Need help on land use planning side, economic development side to encourage smart growth.

Most roundtables came to conclusion that conservation is not the answer.

Environmental and Social Impacts:

IPPs: Metro—seems a good test—if important IPPs don't pass, then the system needs to change.

We are looking at small and incremental projects but having a difficult time with permitting; thus success is far from being clear here.

Storage: All options involve some management of water and storage.

Colorado River Risk Management discussion: probability of not meeting the compact obligation unknown; lower basins overusing; we need to develop more water without increasing the possibility of curtailment.

Big wild card: climate change; we are looking at adaptive management ideas – we look at what we can use in the wetter periods and be more adaptive—support water bank and demand management idea instead of water caps.

“We oppose caps on water use”—

Ag transfers: interest in all alternatives. Can Denver Water combine its water with new storage on the east slope (deep aquifer storage) and back it up with dry year leasing on east slope; instead of pitting east vs. west, how to have dual source supply systems that will minimize impact. Ag to urban transfers, need permanence and reliability. Political will for legislative process for water court changes.

Preserving options: We should preserve a full range of options for future generations. Option to develop new supplies on Colorado River. Recreational in Channel Diversions—Wild and Scenic limit ability to develop more water; as we continue with IBCC discussions, systematically the options are being closed down for developing for water.

--if we fail to preserve options what are we left with. If it is in our best interest to push efficiencies as far as we can, we will look to ag transfers.

Metro vision: Near term: envision a political support building process to push smart growth and efficiencies and to add to that small multi-benefit supply projects on east and west slope.

Preserve ability to do something big on west slope in the future. Need to push the debate; can we push the IBCC process for scenario planning, portfolio planning, and then have it funnel down to what development projects might be possible and how to preserve these—means filing water rights and making decisions on things like wild and scenic designations.

Pursue big projects; dual sources—east west important focus.

Summary: Political will for support needed; can't do it alone; alternative ag to urban—need legislative help; get successful with IPPs and smaller projects and develop water on CO River.

Metro rejects the false choices that are set up in the portfolio. Can minimize the impacts. Can't stop growth but should be able to have vibrant ag economy and rec economy on West Slope.

IBCC suggestions: Worried that we have only to go to east slope ag if IBCC can't find political will to make changes.



Dianne Hoppe: In development of IPPS, are you including concept of larger storage project? Should be included separately. Important that everyone knows that storage is a big part of the future.

Mark: Metro supports all the IPPs.

Julio: Disturbing is the reality of how long it takes to create these reservoir sites. Comments on surprise that there is not more activity for finding these storage sites.

Mark: Notes a comment of Eric Wilkinson that large utilities could afford it but what about the other cities and towns? As a state, do we want to make more funding available to make these projects happen?

Eric W: This is my biggest concern with IBCC and the scenario planning; what is lacking is who is going to do it; we can put numbers out there, but who will do it and what is the vehicle. The statement on political will is key; now, I see only ag as a default because ag has more certainty to it. The will to go through the uncertainty of water project development is not there; the state is training people to go to ag and not move forward with other projects; who will do the other projects? The big guys can, but the smaller entities don't have the mechanisms or means to find the water and build storage.

John Stencil: Did the Metro talk about the water pipelines: Flaming Gorge? Missouri?

Julio: Metro meetings we have talked about all this, but with the issues that arose from South Metro and Flaming Gorge; Janet Bell is on subcommittee that is dealing with the Flaming Gorge—is in limbo as we move forward because of political issues.

Eric W.: Comes back to question of who will back these projects for the entire state.

Mark: Important to note next step in IBCC process and if we return to risk management of CO Compact, this is not productive and how will we have discussions on new options and preserving options. Important to preserve options.

Janet Bell: Colorado releases more water than required per the compact because of no ability to store it; who then has the money and in the State of Colorado to issue bonds to build storage. Colorado Water .... Authority (37-4----they have the ability to issue bonds for these kinds of bonds. Have requested information on this authority, perhaps this is the possibility. Also notes that we have been negative in these discussions, and instead we need to be positive in how we can put these kinds of projects forward. Perhaps private/public relationships are an option. One consultant said that three locations have been identified on the upper Colorado for storage; need to have the courage to go forward with this.

Sue M with CDM: Reclamations Basin Study; using historical hydrology: 0 likelihood for call on river or compact curtailment; climate change is the driver; hence the notion that we can't develop more, reclamation study shows that this is a small risk and the system is supply driven.

Mike Shimmin: Would like to have a presentation on Sue's point about risk management for the West slope. Concept of risk management is based on undefined fear that compact curtailment is a real risk and we can't move forward because of this; would like this as a future topic.

John Stulp: Have you had a presentation on the Colorado Compact? Jennifer Gimbel and Ted Z. presented this to the flaming gorge taskforce. This was worthwhile because one of the Western Slope advocates actually noted surprise for facts. Suggests a presentation on the Colorado Compact by Jennifer and Ted with a focus on eastern slope impact.

Joe Frank: Would be interesting to know how the Bureau decides releases.

John Stulp: Study is to be out in September.

### **Projects Implementation: Todd Doherty**

When Board adopted SWASI 2010, move away from planning and move into Implementation Phase. See handout.

Funding: ag needs, non-consumptive as well as muni/industrial.

I.E. Ducks Unlimited projects for recharge.

CWCB would like to schedule some workshops (even for others outside the roundtables) to vet projects and multi-purpose projects;

Page 2: Compiled list of project (loan section for CWCB) and nonconsumptive projects; want to categorize these projects into different areas to look for long or short-term projects.

Short term projects needing CWCB assistance to help fully scope out a project.

Promoting loan/grant combo. And looking at other funding.

Will help coordinate a workshop. Perhaps have two different workshops: consumptive and nonconsumptive.

Tech support, funding.

CDM (consultant) staffed and ready to help.

Sue M.: Team is large team: Brown and Caldwell for modeling, Nature Conservancy, GBSM for public education outreach. Hence, we are ready to do short term implementation or to help scoping. August might be a good time to walk everyone through the projects identified in the South Platte and see if we are ready to get the projects moving forward.

McVicker: Comments that there were two patrons tonight from Wiggins looking for exactly this kind of information and support: implementation of a small project crucial to their town.

Harold Evans: Implementation is usually done by project proponents. When SWASI I and II, lots of work done in talking with providers; we don't have a list of all those projects. How do we identify the opportunities? Challenge is how do we look at the list? "Refine project list"—challenge is to identify those.

Todd: RE: list: SWASI list of major IPPs; portfolio tool has a list of IPPs, but list was pulled together internally. Trick will be then how to sort through them.

Next few years—basin specific planning.

Sue and Todd: We will share our list; everyone needs to solicit people outside of the roundtable.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.

Next meeting: August 21, 2012: 1:30

Southwest Weld County in Longmont