

South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting
Tuesday, October 9, 2012
Southwest Weld County Building
Longmont, Colorado
4 pm – 8 pm.

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

Harold Evans chairs the meeting; welcomes John Stulp.

Standard Reports

--IBCC Report: Eric Wilkinson; meeting 9/11/2012: Scenario planning and adaptive management approach. Scenario planning group: 5 different scenarios—scenarios capture possibilities that include population, climate, energy, conservation, magnitude of M&I demands, etc. Business as usual, weak economy, adaption and innovation and hot growth; idea is to get scenarios in an acceptable format where everyone can understand and then have a portfolio that can address these different scenarios.

Metrics' concerns were addressed in terms of how to measure these scenarios; analytically determined? Or, for example, municipal water sustainability—do you try to protect against drought every 50 years or is it rather either yes we can address it or no we cannot; discussion around metrics; subcommittee formed on metrics and discussions are on-going throughout the state. Discussion on portfolios and how to move forward; continuing discussion on new supply discussion: IPPs, water conservation, etc---should new supplies only come into the discussion later; putting off discussion on new supplies, then appears that ag dry up will continue. Certainty exists with ag transfers, no certainty in terms of developing new water, for example, from CO River. Once start down road of no certainty on any given project, hence, if we want to conserve ag, must put forth something that will work; must move something forward that works; must be something that shows that these portfolios work. Otherwise, no credibility and water providers will not rely on this process to solve future water needs.

Metrics subcommittee will continue meeting.

John Stulp: IBCC will be meeting with CWCB jointly in November on November 15.

--CWCB report: Dianne Hoppe; met at end of September for four days; thanks to Northern Water for hosting the meeting. Finance committee meeting: budget projections for construction fund bill and for nonreimbursable side of construction fund; Northern gave overview for Windy Gap bypass and will be considered during next legislative session. Discussed wild fire mitigation funding; noted small amount of money for stream restoration; but perhaps \$10 million available for loan program at 0 percent interest for revegetation, etc.; maintenance of decision support software that needs upgrading and maintenance. Discussed use of Open Source for updating software. Northern Board gave update on all of their projects to the CWCB; amount of money that Northern has spent on NIPA process for NISP and Wind Gap Firming: significant amount, \$12 million each; Governor has sent a letter to WA that hopefully will push the process along. Thanks to John Stulp. Considered WASP grants; Grand County Gore County White Water Park; this was withdrawn from applicant; four applications were withdrawn. Presentation from Grand County, the Water Supply Fund Accounts are low and will not be replenished this year, thus if this basin is looking for these funds in the future, need to put those applications together and go forward. Legislature has supplied adequate funding for the Roundtable process and Water Supply Reserve Accounts. Was an application from the AK Basin concerning AG/Muni conservation easements; asks for funding for demonstration project; this could be mimicked by South Platte Basin. Approved three new construction fund loans: well augmentation for Central WCD (purchase of water rights);

construction loan for Eckhardt farms and another for Ft. Morgan irrigation district. IBCC will be meeting with CWCB in Denver on November 11th.

Harold Evans: As participant in Windy Gap, we have approved the 6th Amendment on Windy Gap, all have money attached to these. Halligan Seaman plans have collectively spent \$12 million: thus NISP, Halligan Seaman, and Windy Gap, collective amount is very large. All of these projects are on our IPPs.

Dianne hopes that we will get more aggressive in pushing these forward.

--Legislative Report: Water resource review committee met several weeks ago and passed six bills out of the committee and draft bills; these will be read across the desk at the beginning of the 2013 session.

Harold Evans: There has been a request to introduce a bill (re: expansion of use): if no one has protested in last 25 years, the request for expansion of use, the right would go away

Mike Shimmin: Any expansion of use after 50 years after the original decree was entered, would be validated per this statute. Hence, the concept was adopted and the parties have been asked to acknowledge. Premise is that these decrees should be validated after all these years; response to ditch cases (FRICO) where there were severe restrictions under ditch decrees.

Harold: South Platte Recovery Program?

Don Ament: Putting a deal together to construct a new reservoir in Nebraska, down river from North Platte, in order to get water near the critical habitat. Dept of Interior was out for a visit; 10,000 acft of habitat secured, working on water now.

--Education Report: Sean Conway; PEPO workshop on Oct 29 to focus on water messaging; how to convey information state wide on water issues. Sean had requested for professional help; state has added multiple members to assist. Please RSVP.

South Platte Forum on October 24 & 25th in Longmont. On October 24: Reception for the South Platte Forum after the first day, Left Hand Brewing; will focus on 1882 Coffin v Left Hand case.

Thanks to Reagan for his keen organizational skills.

There will be a discussion on the portfolio tool at the forum.

Sean Conway: Discussion within subcommittee about how to assume role for groundwater committee and question is how to engage the public; the education subcommittee could be pivotal.

--Nonconsumptive: Bob Streeter; had a meeting today about the non-consumptive needs in terms of the reaches of streams where we think are the most important and how to provide
Kenny Kenmire, senior biologist, have asked him to opine if there is any additional water that might be needed in any of these reaches; need information on any areas of the streams that would be needed for additional water for boating if there is additional water; time to look at the different "legs of the stool" and to identify any areas of streams that might benefit from additional water.
Looking to identify any possible partners that could help with instream flow program or through agreements outside of that; purpose: to inform environmental and conservation organizations of opportunities to work with any of these reaches and to bring resources to these reaches. Would like the Roundtable to approve a potential workshop on this area.

Todd Doherty: There have been several workshops (one on Colorado, for example) where these purposes have been addressed. Environmental Rep from Nature Conservancy is willing to assist.

McVicker: This seems like a great idea.

Harold: Is this something that we could maybe do with the GOCO grant near Greeley and Ft. Collins to work on lower reach of Poudre to work on trail; a moose even showed up!

Bob: Exactly; we would like to build on what other groups are already doing and to focus on restoration of stream reaches and bring them in on it.

Harold: Perhaps this is something to discuss later this evening when we talk about our future role. Our efforts in the nonconsumptive piece have not been strong, but all three focus points of the IPPs include some nonconsumptive part. Please think about Bob's request.

-- **Phreatophyte:** Bob Streeter: talked to Chris Strum; rules will be on website for rules on phreatophyte control. Weld County, Logan County, Ducks Unlimited ...these groups that were involved earlier with phreatophyte control. These rules will be out there so that everyone will know what it takes to apply for these.

Harold: Russian Olive, Tamarisk have taken over certain canyons, like Canyon de Che, how these invasive species have taken over. This is a national monument with a similar problem as we have here.

--**Alternative Ag Transfer Methods:** Joe Frank; AK Basin has a WSRA grant to look at ag fallow policy; this group is convening: Gary Herman, Jim Yahn and Joe will be attending the first meeting in Denver this Friday.

Harold: Background: We received a draft copy of a white paper that someone representing AK Basin Roundtable put out; now they have decided to have a facilitated dialogue on this and Jim, Joe and Gary will represent the South Platte Basin Roundtable (Gary: middle part, Jim as district rep and Joe from lower parts.); this first meeting is an organizational meeting. Heather Bergman will facilitate.

Asks Todd Doherty to talk about ultimate objective: heels of 1068, what policy tools and statutes are on the books and what changes need to be made to the statutes and policies.

Joe Frank: \$1 million in past project bill provides funding for ongoing projects; will provide a summary report of these projects; once synthesized, will bring this to IBCC / CWCB joint meeting and ask for guidance from the Board of how to sponsor these studies for the next round; recommendations in March thus Feb deadline for application. We have some interesting studies on issues such as deficit irrigation, but looking for projects and pilots to start moving some water and getting some traction for these issues.

Groundwater subcommittee: Joe Frank

Met previous to this meeting today; apologizes for not having broader notice of the subcommittee meeting.

Reagan Waskom gave an update on his progress; the Water Institute is under contract with CWCB since Aug 23; project management team has been set up; four tasks: 1) data collection and display; 2) GIS mapping; 3) groundwater data analysis (with USGS); 4) communication, deliberation and education.

Reagan presented on some of the data that has already been collected; lots of data gaps out there which is key; website will be open to the public starting around Oct 20; data will be on website as well as summary updates. Next meeting will be scheduled before Roundtable in January; if there are additional meetings needed, ground water committee will convene. Public outreach that was brought up by Sean Conway and Sean Cronin important; how to engage the public in the most efficient manner. Community meetings? Mary Lou Smith, as part of PM team, is front and center to assist. Asks Roundtable for feedback.

Harold Evans: What are goals for outreach?

Joe Frank: The groundwater committee is to give feedback on data, but want general public feedback as well.

Reagan Waskom: it would be counterproductive to get to the end of the study as a “fait accompli”; there is lots of misinformation out there, and a public process would allow transparency and would allow Reagan to have a better view of the public’s needs and interests. If there will be changing Objective: Return to legislature with what needs to be done to maximize the groundwater in the basin; this forum seems like the right forum. The education piece seems important for this. Reaching out to the communities such as Sterling, Greeley, Hillcrest is important.

Sean Conway: When Reagan asked us to join him in this study, the idea was that the Roundtable could be pivotal for this education outreach. My concern is that we don’t meet until January and yet there are lots of issues that Reagan needs input on; there will be points of decision that must be made before our January meeting. We assumed responsibility as a roundtable and the concern is that we have not had public input. This is an important task and right now this ongoing study demands of the roundtable an active part—either as a partner to get word out so that those who want to participate in this process can have the opportunity to do so.

Sean Cronin: Mary Lou Smith and I talked about this last week; this is an adhoc committee, thus suggestion was that the education committee could work on some discrete items to work on. However, sounds like that it is the role of the Roundtable to spread the word and to make sure that our constituents to be aware of this. Does not opine that the education committee is the go-to committee to have press releases, etc.

Joe Frank: My question also; we will have scheduled meetings but will also have meetings when Reagan asks.

Janet Bell: Since South Platte Forum coming up, seems like this would be a good forum to announce this process and to get information out; this might be a first step in identifying people who might be key “ears” to help with the public process.

Harold Evans: Might be late to get on that agenda.

A few thoughts: Reagan and his staff are being paid to do this; the role of the groundwater subcommittee would be to co-host, to look at time frame that Reagan is under; consider a possible date in November or December to have a public meeting; put out some press releases (Greeley Tribune is very good in this arena in terms of promoting ag uses); start the public engagement in November or December; those who will show up will be those who have an interest. In January, although maybe too late, the Colorado Farm Show would be a great place to get engagement because most of the ag interests in this area will be at that show. So: have interim meeting and then Farm Show.

Joe Frank: Part of the problem can be that there can be informational overload so would it be useful to have a written comment process.

Reagan: Great idea; I am so tangled in the data but on the website this is a great idea.

Final Report is due December 2013, thus have a full year cycle and thus fall of 2013 will be the time that our focus will be rolled out.

Harold: Thus, what do you need in terms of public engagement in the short term.

Reagan: I believe that I am responsible to provide as much transparency as possible: what we are doing, how we are doing that and this is what we are finding.

McVicker: Could you please articulate your objective in this study for the record.

Reagan Waskom: HB1278 Status Report to the South Platte Roundtable

CO HB 12-1278 authorized an independent study of the South Platte River alluvial aquifer by the Colorado Water Institute to delineate areas within the basin adversely impacted by high groundwater levels and conduct feasibility-level evaluation of the causes of high groundwater levels in affected areas. H1278 also requires study to evaluate whether the dual goals of preventing injury to vested water rights and maximizing beneficial use of both surface and groundwater are being achieved. Final report of study findings must be submitted to the General Assembly by December 31, 2013.

Analyzing the data record for surface and ground water in the South Platte to understand if ground water records are being used efficiently. Basically this is taking a look at the 1967 and 1968 studies that led to the 1969 Act.

Shimmin: I see two phases: data collection and analysis and then what will do about it; opines that data collection is not the prevue of public input; this is not about transparency—explaining what and why; thus still struggling with what you need and when.

Reagan: I am looking for transparency.

Shimmin: What you need is a meeting with the engineers to explain to them what you are doing and to get their reactions as to what you are looking at; committee of the ASCA; tap into this group of engineers that practice in this field. Don't think that the data collection is about public opinion; this is about data—what do we know and what do we do with this data. Best to be targeted and do that job. Fuzzy about time line; personally, will help you do whatever you need to do, but seems like we need to focus.

Harold: Leaving up to Joe and Reagan; I think Mike brings up an excellent point about data.

Sean Conway: I think Reagan is asking for public information not public opinion.

Harold: Suggests that we need to add to the list of notices of the subcommittee, like CO Corn Grower Association; so Roundtable can help expand the list and get the list out there.

Discussion of upcoming water-energy nexus workshops (Tracy Bouvette)

Grant coming out of CWCB to look at water-energy nexus. Welcome to Tracy Bouvette.

Representing Recharge Colorado (Increase energy and water efficiency investment and implementation in Colorado) and Great Western Institute (Promote water use efficiency through education, policy and research).

In these first workshops is to determine if there is a need for more workshops.

Grant from Water Efficiency group program, looking at workshops in 3 major river basins (South Platte, AK, Colorado). Save the date, agenda development, pre and post workshops interactions.

Why these actions: National call to action; must improve our water-energy planning; increase collaboration between water and energy communities in planning and implementing use efficiencies; pursue coordinated educations and awareness programs. Federal money exists for this therefore if there is dialogue that is useful, we can look for other funding.

Call to action: hold facilitated education workshops, water and energy utilities, land planners, other influencers and stakeholders; identify coordinated water-energy system management opportunities for utilities, planning, permitting, and operations.

McVicker: Asks about involvement of CO Oil and Gas Commission and outreach to small towns that are forming their own regs re energy development. Seems like we need

Tracy: So far, mostly in the Colorado Basin.

Janet Bell: How about the regional development planning folks like with Denver.

Tracy: We are also looking to involve DRCOG. Really looking for feedback from you; emails with save the date gives us opportunity to give feedback.

Anticipated outcomes: key WEX issues in each river basin; next steps to address/characterize key WEX issues; identify key WEX stakeholders/partners; identify funding alternatives.

Speakers: NREL (energy choice impacts on land and water resources); Deloitte (global trends in energy and water demands); practitioners (utilities and customers); policy makers; content: storytelling: successes and challenges; roadblocks and opportunities.

What they need from South Platte:

What topics and special concerns; who are key reps from the river basin; who should speak at the workshop; how to advertise to our basin roundtable.

Harold: It would be useful to send this slide to the roundtable so that our members can see this request.

Janet Bell: Charge for attending?

Tracy: No.

Dianne Hoppe: As one of your topics, anything on hydroelectric generation?

Tracy: Small hydro projects have been coming out of AK basin and will have a panel on that and could do the same thing here; seems valuable.

Dianne: Northern has a new hydroelectric generator at Carter Lake.

Janet Bell: Applications of solar energy to irrigation and other ag app

Bob Streeter: Seems like the environmental aspects and issues only come in at the end of the discussion so that hopes that this discussion comes in at the front end to diffuse this kind of conflict at the end.

Jim Ford echoes Bob's statements.

Dinner

Flaming Gorge Task Force: Bob Streeter: \$2000 allocated for each roundtable for appointed members to attend task force; ag and environmental reps have run out of money; Gene Manuelo is ag rep, Bob Streeter is environmental rep. Travel

Moton: to ask roundtable to shift money set up for South Platte Basin Roundtable to fund

Ken Huson: Seconds.

Harold Evans: How much for reallocation?

Bob Streeter: \$2000 for each roundtable; Eric Wilkinson and Jim Yahn's organization is funding them.

Vote unanimous.

Presentation on IBCC scenario planning/adaptive management (Todd Doherty)

Overview of portfolio process; 34 different portfolios created.

Portfolio: 4 legs of stool; different combinations of these are reflected in scenarios.

“Scenario”=different futures

Five possible scenarios and look at different range of portfolios and how they conform to these different scenarios; looking at how these different portfolios play out in the different scenarios.

“No regrets” For example, no more than 20% South Platte ag can be transferred.

Scenarios look at different sets of populations, drought, etc. Thus goal is to try to plan for the future.

Power point from Todd:

IBCCs approach to scenario planning and adaptive management.

5 different scenarios and the different metrics

Anticipate “no regret” plans that will rise to the surface from the process

Presentation of “scenario planning and adaptive management definitions”

Planning horizons is 2050

Scenarios, Portfolios, Strategies, projects and Methods, Metrics, No Regrets Actions

Adaptive Management: triggers and outcomes

Examples of no regrets: from basin summit in March 2012.

IPP, Conservation, Ag Transfer, New Supply, Agriculture, Nonconsumptive

(IPP: 80% success) (less than 20% South Platte acreage—how to actually attain this is another issue; roundtable needs to focus on how to actually do this)

(low / medium conservation strategies)

Mike Shimmin: We ran a portfolio that did this; what is your question?

We have given you input about how to hit this target.

Wilkinson: Question is how do you implement a portfolio: through higher IPPs or conservation or push to develop a new supply. Mindset for many is that you do what you can in conservation, IPPs and new supplies and default is always irrigated ag; irrigated ag is the South Platte, basin of highest growth and easiest conversion; west slope values their ag and will protect their ag to the same extent as protecting nonconsumptive and rec.

Joe Frank: Back to Mike’s point, in the portfolio we developed, there were elements that kept us to that level.

Sue Morea: Policy recommendations.

Mike Shimmin: Policy is not what will drive this; projects will. I am surprised because we already looked at this in our portfolio; our portfolio clearly outlined what to do with mid/mid scenario. As per “no regrets” —no new projects and no new supplies, there will be regrets. New supply must be about getting projects on the board and get them built.

Todd: Because there is not consensus state-wide, scenario planning helps you start thinking long term. Some scenarios may look at developing west slope water for east slope purposes.

By preserving options, it is a way to move forward with discussions. Even with Flaming Gorge option, lots of opposition even just discussing the process; hence, this is a way to continue to move the dialogue; there seems to be interest from some players on the West Slope; may not be the quickest and easiest way to get something done, but this is not our political environment.

Examples of triggers/sign posts:

--are M&I demands tracking low, med, or high?

--is supply reliability low or high on east slope? On west slope?

Etc.

Nine various scenarios with variation of low to high demand and supply.

Scenarios: 1) hot and crowded; 2) hot and green; 3) environmental ethic; 4) business as usual; 5) slow growth.

Slide from California water planning helps illustrate the influencers/drivers:

Descriptive exercise: Population, climate, precipitation and temperature, energy water needs, ag water needs, ag demands, water efficient technology, social and environmental values, urban land use, regulatory constraints, M&I water demands

Sean Cronin: Comments on how the illustrations are over generalizations and can be dangerous as a communication tool.

Todd, Sue and Eric W. respond in terms of the IBCC symbols and scenarios and Todd emphasizes that these are not final.

Julio Iturreria: Expresses disappointment over this presentation. We should all have the opportunity to have studied this before you came to this meeting; feeling negative about the presentation. 15 minutes on one slide as indicator that this is not working

Todd: Right now the IBCC is in a working mode and in a spirit of keeping the roundtables involved with what the process is going forward.

Sue: This intended to give you a heads-up of what is going on with the IBCC.

Eric: This has just come out just day before yesterday to the subcommittee.

Janet: My concern is wondering if this is just for the IBCC and not to go out to the public? Our discussion has been around trying to understand what is trying to be communicated.

John Stulp: This is a work product and is part of the iterative process of sharing the work that the IBCC is doing with the roundtables.

Todd reviews slides:

Attributes for good metrics; looking for mix of four legs of stool, looking at more detailed analysis of new supply development and ag transfer (concept attributes); can look at different projects and the various tradeoffs.

Portfolio tool looking again at the ag transfer, cost, south platte depletions

Range of portfolio components based on basin roundtable efforts (reuse, ag transfer, new supply development, etc)

Will take the work from the roundtables and portfolios and see how these perform.

Work in progress: next steps: develop qualitative metrics and analytical tools to evaluate portfolios, incorporate portfolios specifics and pilot metrics for a scenario.

At the point where partnerships and relationships are forming and this was meant as a demonstration of the portfolio.

Harold Evans: Would like to pick up on Mike Shimmin's comments that if we are going to have only 20% ag transfer, we have to have new supply. CBT transfers are at \$10,000 a unit. Developer: would buy 250 units of CBT --\$2.5 million of CBT; thus, while we are looking at policy, the market place will buy up our water.

Discussion and request for approval of South Platte basin brochure (Sean Cronin)

Reminder that this group voted to develop an education action plan that included the creation of the basin brochure; email sent out last week: 2 emails with suggested changes; Sean presents a visual for brochure; thanks to Northern Water for prototype. Sean asks for feedback.

Sean: Moves to accept the “Message from the South Platte Basin Roundtable” and approve the brochure.

Jim Ford: Seconds

Editorial comments for changes must be sent to Sean by 5 pm on Thursday.

Motion passes unanimously.

Harold Evans: White paper on conservation from Metro Roundtable; we will be meeting with the Metro roundtable to discuss this. Must preserve options. Metro roundtable saying that the new supply will come from west slope or from agriculture; not taking a position. We will enter into this discussion to make recommendations to the roundtable on this white paper. Asks Todd to please send this white paper out to the round table. Any suggestions, please let us know before Friday.

Discussion of Basin Roundtable’s role/future work

Harold Evans: We are commencing our 7th year. The basic act said we would do a needs assessment, provide a portfolio; question is to ask ourselves what do we want to accomplish in the next year; we meet quarterly but the question is what are our thoughts in terms of what the Roundtable should be doing. Asks John Stulp if he has suggestions.

Joe Frank: Jim Yahn and I met with Todd last week and as we were discussing the South Platte in general, I thought about the presentation on the South Platte so we can understand the river. We all understand our parts of the river but don’t understand other parts of the river, the demands, the infrastructure, the existing and planned infrastructure. Would help to put together an overview of the entire basin, metro and South Platte combined, so that we can understand the river in its totality. Would like to understand the big picture of the entire basin so as to begin to understand what could be put in place in our own basin.

Harold: What would be different from the two SWASI studies and our needs analysis?

Joe: What are some potential solutions that are not on the drawing board.

Harold: NISP, Halligan Seaman are on the drawing board, not sure what to do after these.

Patron: Information sharing.

Todd: Harold had mentioned that for the January meeting, put together a comprehensive overview.

Harold: I agree this would be useful for all of us.

Eric: What we need is a basin plan; where do we want to be by 2050. You need the infrastructure and additional infrastructure to be able to better manage potential in the future. More infrastructure you have, the better certainty for people to step outside their comfort zone. If there were some kinds of mechanisms such as an “insurance reservoir” that could assist in a change of parameters. Maybe a change in ground water use; something that can come to the forefront in very dry years that there is some mechanism in-place; a South Platte coop; a change with higher quality water with more effluent; what do we need to put in place to “think out of box”; how to preserve ag water supplies; regional issues meeting idea: market place purchasing of water supplies so that they are held in this area and they don’t move—but this would be a tax incentive; so perhaps we need to brain storming so we can start thinking outside the box; maybe we could use some of our WSRA meetings.

John Stencil: To add to Joe and Eric’s comments, if we are going to approach our scenario such that less than 20% of what we must do something. We need an IPP list; challenges are to identify those.

I would like to “push the pencil” so that during the coming year we do not overlook anything so that we can attempt to reach a scenario that we can all embrace for this basin.

Harold: Is this something that you, Todd, might have resources to help facilitate these action steps?

Todd: Yes, I do think we have the resources available. Some of our funding where we were attempting to identify specific projects and move them forward has been hit hard because of reduced severance taxes. But by January, we could assist with such a facilitated brainstorming session.

Sue Morea: To do a regionalize analysis, there are grant resources that could augment a process like that, but first would be that we would need to get all the ideas on the table and we could do that in January.

Todd: I can see asking Hal Simpson to help with this.

Janet Bell: At the Metro meeting tomorrow, I would be glad to bring this up at the Metro which goes to your point about looking at the entire basin. Also, some of these discussions that came up from the Flaming Gorge task force, was to look at a group where people come together to look at opportunities, where could underground storage occur, also looking at expanding existing storage, both-was pipelines, and to look to shared management of water.

Harold: Perhaps pre-mature; first important that we focus on what we know first then move to Metro.

Janet: Perhaps could be a parallel movement.

Dianne: I like the directions that Joe and Todd have brought up this evening. At some point in time, would like to see this roundtable have more communication with the Metro roundtable.

Sean Cronin: Would like to add to the Larimer/Weld county issues discussion; if we are really exploring uncharted territory, can look at other entities, could look at Boulder Open Space organization; perhaps we could look at this model and I would be glad to make an invitation.

Also, would like to voice full support of the IPPs. How can we ask other roundtables to support IPPs when we have not done so.

Eric: From Northern’s standpoint, we wanted to get Windy Gap project through before the Roundtables had opportunity to approve. Part of the problem is that if we have to have roundtable approval, could be problematic.

John Stulp: This is the work of the roundtable and each basin has a personality of its own. As Joe mentioned earlier, very important that you know your own basin very well. Important to go forward with projects that meet your needs. Emphasis on both consumptive and nonconsumptive needs and possible projects. Expresses eternal optimism. We are making progress state-wide. Encourages the members to think of the progress that has been made in the last 7 years. Need to have an eye for state-wide issues and solutions as well as basin specific focus. Opines that the IBCC is heading in the right direction; that the portfolio tool for many basins have worked well; we are overcoming our differences between east and west; I am encouraged and believe we are making courage.

If Mike Shimmin won’t say anything, would like to say something on his behalf. Thanks to Mike for the wisdom he has brought to the IBCC and notes that Jim Yahn is an excellent replacement.

Harold thanks the roundtable for talking about the issues and reminds the roundtable that officers will be elected.

John Stulp: Seems as though we have much work to do and that perhaps we should meet every two months instead of every 4 months.

Joe Frank: Will depend on the work that needs to be accomplished.

Harold: What are the objectives for the IBCCs?

John Stulp: Will continue with the scenario exercise and focusing on no-regret solutions. From this basin can see that, for example, we will need storage and an IPP. The challenge will be to how we come to

agreement in pushing these actions forward. The IBCC will continue to meet every 2-3 months and continue work. Important to look at

Todd: Reviews upcoming agenda items.

McVicker: What is the chance that the state will step into Chatfield where Aurora pulled out?

John Stulp: Discussions are on-going.

Harold: Meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm

Next Meeting: January 8, 2013