

South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting
Tuesday, January 8, 2013
Southwest Weld County Building
Longmont, Colorado
4 pm – 8 pm.

Members and Patrons Present: Lisa McVicker (Center of CO WCD), John Stencil (Legislative Rep-RMFU), Ken Huson (Municipalities in Boulder County), Sean Cronin (St Vrain & Left Hand WCD), Gene Manuello (Ag Rep), Douglas Rademacher (Ag Rep), Kent Swedlund (Logan County), Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County), Janet Bell (Metro Roundtable), Sean Conway (Weld County), Frank Eckhardt Jr (Central Colorado WCD), Greg Kernohan (Ducks Unlimited), Bruce Gerk (Sedgwick County Municipalities), Rich Belt (Industrial Rep.), Stephen Larson (Broomfield Rep.), Diane Hoppe (CWCB), Jim Yahn (At Large)(North Sterling Reservoir), Eric Wilkinson (IBCC Rep.), Mike Applegate (Northern Water), Larry Howard (Larimer Municipalities), G. Allyn Wind (Morgan County.), Todd Doherty (CWCB/DNR), Bert Weaver (Clear Creek County), Kevin Lusk (El Paso County/CO Springs Utilities), Ralf Topper (CO Division of Water Recourses), Joe Frank (LSPWCD), Jim Hall (Local Domestic Water Provider), Bob Streeter (Environmental Rep.), Harold Evans (Greeley), Bob Winter, Matt Ready, James VanShaar (USBR ECAO), Matt Sares (CDWR), Robert T. Sakata (Sakata Farms), MaryLou Smith (Colorado Water Institute), Shane Wright (Groundwork Colorado), Chris Crouse (CSU Extension/Clear Creek County), Mark McCluskey, Hal Simpson, Mark Sponsker (CO Corn Growers), Don Ament, John Stulp (State of CO), Ray Alvarado (State of CO), Andy Moore (State of CO), Faith Sternlieb (Colorado Water Institute), Ian Shelledy, Susan Smolnik, Billy Mihelich, Ed Armbruster, Steve Malers, Dave Nettles (State of CO), Charlie Bartlett, Craig Godbout (State of CO), Jason Wright (County of Thornton), Pam Shaddock (Office of US Senator Mark Udall), Erin Messner (Aurora Water), Reagan Waskom (CO Water Institute, Brent Schantz (Division of Water Resources)

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

Harold Evans calls the meeting to order at 4:10 pm.

Standard Reports

--IBCC Report:

Eric Wilkinson and Jim Yahn; meeting 11/15/2012; joint meeting with CCWCB; highlights:

--WSRA applications: changes made to streamline the process; deadline for submitting requests is the first of the month preceding the meeting in which they will be considered; ex: must be in by Feb 1 and recommended by roundtable for consideration in March. Also rewrites will be taken of guidelines and criteria.

--spent meeting in looking at "No Regrets" application and how to use this to plan for future water needs and not regret what we have done; Ag transfers, new supply, four legs of stool, as well as non-consumptive;

--change in scenarios that we were looking at—have renamed these scenarios: business as usual, weak economy, adaptive innovation, hot growth

--Flaming Gorge task force presented under New Supply Project;

--update on alternatives on ag dryup;

--CWCB report: Dianne Hoppe: met on November 13 and 14; next meeting is on January 28 and 29 preceding CO Water Congress Winter conference; will take look at construction fund bill this coming session; appears that there will be adequate funding, better than last year.

--Follow up on WSRA grants: this roundtable gave firm instructions to not support an application from Grand County; Ms. Hoppe would like to know our position; this was for Grand County's application to put structures in the river for a white water course; Ms. Hoppe has a few concerns based on the fact that the users of the white water course have not come up with sufficient funding for a match; this is one of Ms. Hoppe's main concerns.

Harold Evans asks for reactions from roundtable.

Erick Wilkinson: Carolyn Bradford was here representing Grand County; there were also discussions on a pending 1041 permit as well; on November 20, Grand County did issue a 1041 permit.

Sean Cronin: Has the grant application gone forward?

Hoppe: Was before us in November and it is my understanding it will be back in front of us in January.

Evans: 2 issues: one of matching funds—if they have met these minimum guidelines for matching—25%—this would be most important if they have met this threshold.

Dianne: I will review the application and inform.

Harold: Part 3, pg 8 of 11, matching requirement from statewide fund: 25%--5% could come from basin fund. If it meets that criterion, I don't know that we would have a problem with it.

Flaming Gorge Task Force: Reminder from Oct: 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. Committee is made up of reps from all roundtables, also environmental and rec reps. We have met for an entire year. The committee expanded to consider any new supplies in the state. A final report was generated and will be presented during Jan 28 & 29 meetings. We are recommending that anyone with a new proposal meet certain guidelines: 4 recommendations: 1) State must convene a substantive dialogue with all roundtables so that we have buy-in from all roundtables, all the other steps must wait; 2) include a dialogue on recommendations at the state-wide summit in order to educate and inform the entire state of findings; 3) developed principles of what a good new supply project would be and 4) compiled concerns and comments on the Flaming Gorge Task specifically. Eric, Jim, Gene, Janet Bell...anything to add?

Janet Bell: The composition of this task force has been remarkable in terms of respect between all members, has been exemplary; this is the type of energy that we believe is important to have in the second phase as this goes forward because this allows us to learn so much from each other and then looking at the ultimate objective of how to get enough water.

Bob Streeter: Also saw that the West Slope realized that there will be some water coming from the west slope and that they want to be at the table.

Eric Wilkinson: I remember back to the first meetings where there was no compromise; great to see this transformation where there was much trust among everyone.

Harold Evans: Sounds like you have moved great distances to accomplish a clear recommendation to put forward.

Eric Wilkinson: In Grand Junction, there was actually a recommendation to put \$100,000 forward.

Jim Yahn: Would encourage everyone to look at this before the second phase comes forth; this is an important dialogue; some said this is redundant to the new supply committee but this is very much focused than the IBCC.

Julio Iturreria: Would like to follow up to point out that would be smart that before we move to a phase 2 level, we at this level need to review and engage in discussion.

Bob Streeter: Board needs to vote on this.

Jim Yahn: This is what we had discussed; that we should have this roundtable look at it and also bring others from other basins to come and present their viewpoints.

Julio: Would be useful if we could piggyback on your discussion.

Bob Streeter: Not that long of a report and could circulate to all of the roundtable members as soon as it is released.

Janet Bell: We did discuss the need to go into phase 2 to other communities besides the water provider community so that we have a broader base and constituency in the discussion.

--Legislative Report: Dianne Hoppe: Legislature convenes on January 10 for 120 days; understand that there will be several water bills; in terms of ag committee makeup: Senator Schwartz will be chair (5 members); House: Randy Fisher will be chair (13 members). Several bills from interim water committee.

--Education Report: Sean Conway: RE: traveling exhibit for 2012—the exhibit has been handed back to the Clear Creek Water District; thanks to them for all the assistance with the traveling exhibit.

Roundtable Brochure is complete; thanks to committee and Northern Water for printing.

Bert Weaver: Thanks to Chris Crouse for her help from the Clear Creek Watershed.

--Nonconsumptive: Bob Streeter: We have approved a map for our priorities for the nonconsumptive areas in our basin; each of these segments has been added to our map; for example: north fork of Cache La Poudre—minimal flow, thermal flow, winter flow; Parks and Wildlife have looked at these and have agreed to add these when there are resources to do so. Thus, major step completed over the holidays.

Harold Evans: North Fork of the Poudre—ironically, when we did the shared visioning process on the Hooligan-Seaman project, interesting that all of these were discussed during the shared visioning process; we are still moving forward on this; we did have much input from the DOW.

Bob Streeter: this is all in line with our discussions as we looked at non-consumptive needs; we looked at protection of aquatic and riparian resources along with how to enhance these resources through the process instead of getting in a fight in the end.

Harold: Now that you have this list, might be worthwhile looking to see if there are sponsors that might want to look to a WSRA grant to put these into place.

Bob Streeter: The CWCB is looking for possible partners to do just this.

-- Phreatophyte: Bob Streeter: CWCB has dedicated \$1million in 2013 funds for Phreatophyte work; last fall, we were able to inform interested groups that this money would be available for application (i.e. Boulder County, Weld County); the other half is being held for next year. Looking to applications in Spring of 2013 for funding in Spring of 2014; Bob will make sure that any partners looking to do Phreatophyte work.

Doug Rademacher: Yes, Weld County did put in a grant for funds for this year.

Bob: They have closed the window and will make the awards for Spring 2013.

--Alternative Ag Transfer Methods: Joe Frank: I can present later in the evening.

Todd Doherty: Email went out a month ago for a call for proposals; we have \$1million for the grant program to facilitate ATMs; hoping to build upon what has been done in the past that synthesizes the work that has been done to date; this available on the website.

We are looking at pilot projects to get on-the-ground projects where water sharing is actually occurring; please call Todd with any questions for applications.

Will have more extensive discussion later.

Update on Groundwater Pilot Project Status Update on Sterling and Gilchrest/LaSalle Ground Water Monitoring Pilots: Ralf Topper

This dovetails with Reagan Waskom's work on the legislation; will present in Sterling and in Gilchrest in January and February.

This project came from stakeholder meetings that were held in the latter half of 2011 with stakeholders. CWCB made funding available in 2011 to initiate work on this pilot project.

We instrumented wells that belonged to USGS that were part of their water quality monitoring project. Map of Lower South Platte Observation well network shows those wells that have instrumentation that is collecting data on an hourly basis; 12 of these from USGS (part of grant money went towards USGS) State's role is to collect and compile data.

Theories of cause of high water levels abound; here we are really trying to collect hydrologic data that will allow an entity to make an interpretation or analysis; intend to contract out this work to an independent contractor.

This focus of this study, again, is Gilchrest-LaSalle and Sterling area.

Topper reviews scope of work for acquiring existing water level data and existing wells; to install new wells; will characterize the geologic data; will monitor and record South Platte stream flows and diversions and diversions to recharge ponds; compile local climate data; monitor and record withdrawals by large-capacity County wells; Compile data for interpretive report.

Sterling: 2 areas that have experienced high ground water—piezometers are being monitored on hourly basis; have conducted pump test; have installed partial flume.

Geology: shale, gravel, sand, clays—various topography in bedrock; water levels shallower near clays; therefore high groundwater due to topography.

Water levels are different in each topography; the common conception of an alluvial aquifer does not apply here.

Data from May 9 to end of November; see declining water table, not surprising because of drought; then see jump of 4 ft in last few months; question is focused on what has caused this reaction.

Moving north: see ridge in the subsurface—geology of the area influences water levels in these areas; additional drilling will help define this.

Example of well in this area again shows declining tables until end of September and then an increase—return to equilibrium could be tied to turning off of irrigation.

One of the components of scope of work is climate: only one instance in July; precip was recorded.

Graphs with 40 year history of recharge diversions to ponds; of significance, looking at total recharge, there has been significant water put into the system; will look with more detail on specific ponds and ditches.

Sterling has been ongoing for ¾ of a year.

Gilchrest-LaSalle newer project.

Study goes down to Milton Reservoir, Lathan, town of LaSalle and Gilchrest.

Have existing well network with good distribution, thanks much to Central Water Conservancy District; have contracted with Central to measure these wells; other wells were put in by CO Dept of Ag for water quality; these are instrumented also; thus, all of these are collecting hourly data; also USGS has several wells that are part of the South Platte Decision Support System; thus feel that we have a good system of wells in order to fulfill scope of work requirements.

Looking at a minimum of 2 year data gathering; this will go on, therefore, beyond Reagan Waskom's work.

We have contracted with CO Geological Survey to take on many of these tasks. Have excellent long-term data—well that has been monitored by Central since 1942, can see that the water level is 6 ft below ground; therefore any minor water change can have significant impact. This not true of all wells in the area.

Map of thickness of alluvium shows a trough of thick alluvial material, representing a paleo channel of what is now the South Platte River; this is the kind of info that we will ask the CO Geological to look at for analysis—thickness, type of material, penetration of alluvium

These studies are on the Colorado Division of Water Resources to see monthly updates. Go to Division 1 (Greeley): South Platte River Basin.

John Stencil: Question about Sterling area and the incident of precept in July of 2012...please expand.

Ralph: Shows that we see a small jump in the hydrograph that corresponds with a precipitation event; a lag time will exist from the precip (2/10ths of a foot; not large, but something); what the drought cycle will give us is a lower base line.

Report on HB12-1278 Workshop: Groundwater Committee

Joe Frank: Groundwater subcommittee: we have discussed how to engage the public so that the study is transparent and to give public a chance for feedback. Today we had one of 3 meetings; we had a meeting today from 1-3:30 and well –attended. There will be a similar meeting in Sterling on Monday and on Jan 24th in Gilcrest with focus of public input.

We had a presentation on the history and then Reagan explained the scope of the study. Robert Sakata and I participated in a facilitated dialogue to air two different points of view in order to see differing views and issues. Public presented questions.

Asking from public about format and recommendations.

Emphasizes again that this is all about a public input process in step with the roundtable process.

Diane Hoppe: Is the South Platte Basin hosting the other two events?

Joe Frank: Our name will be behind it, but the work behind this comes from CSU and the staff of Reagan Waskom and MaryLou Smith.

Diane: I think this would fit in well with our education efforts of the roundtable.

Todd Doherty: I heard compliments on the animation. Is this available?

MaryLou: This will be on the website in two days: cwi.colostate.edu.southplatte/index.html

Todd Doherty will circulate this to the roundtable membership.

Robert Sakata: I will echo Joe's comments that we will appreciate any feedback.

Sean Conway: Would like to compliment everyone, especially Reagan and Jim Yahn's comments that we need to solve this together. Also, there is consensus for water search and every person stood up to emphasis that we need more buckets.

Harold Evans: Consensus on storage here, but this was not the consensus at the Boulder County Commissioners last night; Boulder County decided not to enter into an agreement with Denver on enlargement on Gross Reservoir.

Sean Cronin: Voted to postpone any decision until final EIS on Gross expansion is available; this was not part of 1041; this was an IGA in lieu of the 1041.

Harold Evans: Boulder County is part of the roundtable and part of our gap.

Harold asks for other comments.

Frank Eckhardt: There is a place for upstream and downstream to work on something; Joe mentioned looking at more places for storage; emphasizes the need for this consensus.

Sean Cronin: At last meeting, there was discussion on getting the word out; does it seem like the word is out, or do we need to do more to do this?

Joe: There are several press releases, over 150 people here today so feel confident that the word is out for the next two meetings.

MaryLou Smith: We did not just rely on the press; we sent targeted emails to 30-40 organizations and asked them to get this to their mail lists so we really worked to get a variety of people here.

Harold: Reagan, did this accomplish what you need?

Reagan: We truly appreciate the roundtable to allow us to use this as a forum.

Harold: So no conclusions yet.

Sean Conway: Will you use the same format in Sterling and Gilcrest?

Reagan: We have asked the governor to attend and John Stulp.

John Stulp: Thought it was a good tone and asked everyone to speak on their own behalf but to listen to everyone else; my initial response is very positive and I hope the other two meetings will be equally attended.

Report on the Ag Following Public-Policy Working Group:

Jim Hall: Grant from AK Roundtable: Reps from South Platte, AK, Metro and Rio Grande to look at policy issues associated with Ag Following to look at ways to make AG following easier other than buy and dry; group of about 15 of us to look at current statutes and ag following and how cities are using this. We have met 5 times: Joe, Gary Herman and Jim from South Platte. Also Brad Winn Todd Doherty and Heather Bergman running the show.

Looking at things like water supply agreements; how to get around “injury”; how some existing statutes are cumbersome; not everyone is on the same page; AK folks feel that there are bigger barriers than South Platte

AK: Jay Winner, Peter Nichols, Gary Barber

Metro: Mark Harder, Gary Napp, Mark ?

Jim believes that much of this is driven by the Super Ditch and the South Metro from Aurora; we have very different goals—short term water or long term water—because of our different goals, difficult to come to consensus on how to proceed.

For example: interruptible supply: 3 times in 10 years; can see that Aurora would want to attempt to change this with or without the group’s approval.

Our messages: 1) We believe that if you try to fast track statutory changes—you are asking for mistrust and could even see movement backwards. 2) We would not come back to the South Platte Basin roundtable with any detailed legislative proposal without input from the membership; so if anything were to happen, we would bring this to the membership.

Only 2 more meetings.

Trying to come up with a pilot project; since the AK folks are driving this, would make sense for the AK folks to be the ones with this project.

Discussions include similar issues: role of state engineer and water court, idea for having rules in specific basins that could differ, such as in the Rio Grande and their aquifer; discussion on fear of ag users with FRICO decision—if they expose their water rights they have a chance of losing those; lots of discussion on how to define injury in a different manner and how this differs from case to case.

One of the more promising ideas we discussed was the idea of conservation easements where a municipality could purchase the conservation easement; the water would remain on the land, but the user could get money both from the municipality as well as in the form of a tax credit.

Has been interesting to step back and brainstorm on possibilities and this idea of conservation easements is one example of what might be a catalyst for meeting the goals of supply needs as well as for ag uses.

We will generate a report after our final next two meetings; unsure where the group will go from here. Todd Doherty: Emphasizes that much of the conversation has been in how to streamline the process and deal with the authority of the state engineer, and how to get short-term approvals through even with some water right holders.

Kevin Lusk: El Paso CS Utilities: important to note that those from the AK are not necessarily the views of everyone in the basin; but we are in discussion; we do not think the rules are too strict.

Joe Frank: Indeed, much of this is driven by the AK Basin. But we have a unified voice from the South Platte, but again, fast-tracking legislation not one we think is a good idea. Will also voice support for the conservation easement idea; the idea for a municipality buying this easement—ties up the land but allows for a scope such as 3 in 10 for lease of water; so helps with certainty of water for farmer as well as municipality; not for everyone but t

Todd Doherty: At CWCB Sept meeting, we funded this kind of conservation easement (closed in December); now the farmer will need to work on the agreement with the municipality; so the lessons learned from this project will be a deliverable that we can learn from.

Also, North Sterling, there is a conservation easement with Excel?

Jim Yahn: North Sterling did a conservation easement for Xcel in 2005; we set aside a certain amount of water. Personally, I entered into a conservation easement with CO Open Lands; I reserved the right to lease up to 1/3rd of the water for my farm. So you don't necessarily have to do this with a municipality, can do this with a conservation group where, for example, wet lands are an important issue

What is nice about this idea—the western slope, if they come up and say we will give you water but we want to protect ag; this is one way to do that, where we can promise to the western slope that we will be setting aside some of our agriculture such that some of this land will stay in agriculture along with an interruptible supply.

Harold Evans: This started with a WSRA grant that started with the AK and we put some money into it; at the beginning of the summer, you will recall that we were presented with a white paper that included many suggestions that we did not necessarily agree to; therefore, we became involved in the discussion with this subcommittee.

Will be interesting to see what will happen now that Aurora has offered to lease up to 10,000 acft this year.

Much thanks to Joe and Jim.

Jim Yahn: They talked about the interruptible supply statute: our representative: Jerry Sonnenberg has brought out a proposal for changing this legislation where you could do this in perpetuity. North Sterling has met with him to make clear we had some issues with this. Thus, this is an instance where discussion is so very important.

Todd Doherty: I thought one of the changes was that this could be changed to 3 renewals.

Joe Frank: Would like to confirm that there are no other directions from the roundtable. Yes.

EPA has request for nutrient center proposal: CSU, CU, CUIrvine, South Carolina

Reagan Waskom: Nutrient standards are coming to Colorado; two national nutrient studies; asking for support because the crux of the proposal is looking at the North Carolina watershed and the South Platte watershed as the pilots for studying these nutrients. Thus, asking you for support for this national study.

Harold: Please explain what the centers will do and potential outcomes?

Reagan: Dischargers and ag, storm water, urban environment will be affected with these nutrient levels; Main purpose of the Centers is to model, technical tools, decision support, and discharge exchanges—to be a non-regulatory body to host this information for stakeholders. This would be a renewable center. We will put the proposal in the next two weeks; we hope the EPA will stay with it; unsure.

Mike Shimmin: Is it the presumption that this body of knowledge exists and you will bring it together, or will you do the research to develop these standards and practices? How much does this cost? And is the EPA really ready to fund this to the extent necessary?

Reagan Waskom: Both: there is a tremendous amount of knowledge out there on nutrients and discharge; thus part of the proposal is to pull info together but we will also look at ways that we can look at possibilities to reach the objectives; thus, research component.

Mike Shimmin: My concern is that if this happens but there are not enough funds to make it happen, the feds could say we have the answer when they don't have the answer.

Bruce Gerk: On the Nebraska side witnessed a process where stakeholders lose control.

Julio Iturreria: My experience has been with the Cherry Creek Authority; they have put millions of dollars into the very thing you are trying to do; it would behoove you to go to them to assist you in your objective; the EPA does not let go; thus, before you get totally involved, I think it would be helpful if you were to patch into much of the expertise throughout the state.

Chris Crouse: I would agree with that and would suggest that you tap into some of the smaller water sheds in the state and to talk to these who have over 30 years of data would help you.

Eric Wilkinson: Nutrient regulations are going to come no matter what; but studying this in an arid dry region not necessarily the right place for the EPA's test area; the EPA is going to want to test out some things and see results. CSU is a wonderful place to have it done but I have concerns of the South Platte being in the microscope.

Harold Evans: Who is your competition?

Reagan: Highly competitive. Will not be able to dissuade CSU to alter the course; but of course up to Roundtable.

Mike Shimmin: Right now...bottom line is that I cannot vote for this tonight; I have partners who are deeply involved in the water quality issues, but I need to talk to them and I am not sure what your timeline is. Could you distribute a copy of your proposal so we have some time to confer with water quality experts to weigh in on this; I agree with the concern that this could put us in the eye of the target for federal action, so I would like to have time.

Doug Rademacher: Agree with Mike; sit on Northern Water Quality; fighting nutrients.

Sean Conway: Concur with Eric and other comments. Need to know more about this before I can vote for the letter. Would like to know the genesis of this at the University.

Sean Cronin: CSU's proposal is that there would be a pair of watersheds: North Carolina and South Platte River.

Reagan: The proposal is being submitted next week; I will take these concerns back and try to explain. The proposal will go forward.

Greg Kernohan: Just a comment on the fact that in the past the roundtable has turned down proposals that were focused on water quality and thus this is outside the mission of the Roundtable.

Harold Evans: Hopefully this is constructive information for CSU.

Mark Sponsler (Colorado Corn Growers): As member of the ag committee, who has been involved with the nutrient process with the EPA, there is already a bull's eye on the South Platte and I am concerned that failure to take pro-active action leaves us vulnerable if we are not pro-active.

Janet Bell: The Metro Roundtable will not be meeting tomorrow, but given the amount of years working with Bear Creek, the issues around nutrients is of great concern to this water district, so it is important to look closer to Bear Creek Lake and talk to Evergreen metro water and this group is in the process of putting into place their standards; so seems important to touch base with these other groups such as Bear Creek.

Harold Evans: What was asked here was a letter of support; my reading from tonight is that we are not ready to move forward with this; I hope that this has been helpful. I determine as Chair that we do not have consensus to move forward with this.

Dinner

South Platte Roundtable Presentation: Todd Doherty, Sean Cronin

See PowerPoint of presentation that is attached to these minutes. Thanks to CDM and Brown & Caldwell.

Does the Roundtable want to form a committee to look at the basin in more detail than in the SWSI process? SWASI does not look at certain details; do we want a committee to look at what we do not know.

Todd: The AK basin, for example, is looking at existing and planned infrastructure to solve their gap, not only M&I but ag and all nonconsumptive needs. This could be an element of SWASI 2016. Yampa Basin is also undertaking a more in-depth look.

Mark: Notes that in SWASI 2010 only states in a few three sentences that SWASI did not consider any tributary groundwater. We need to figure out how to manage this groundwater. Need to also think about how to use this tributary aquifer as a storage bucket; this could be done with the current infrastructure. This is a critical point to include this importance of ground water as source for drought periods and storage.

Jim Yahn: We are using the underground aquifer to the tune of 600,000 acft; we are using the underground water in a more effective matter than all our reservoirs added together.

Todd acknowledges the importance of the aquifer.

Slide 9 does not include water from fracking. Next round of SWASI will include the fracking water that has come on line from the drilling in the Niobrara.

Slide 9: metro Basin M&I Water demands; compare with slide 7, look at Weld, Larimer and Boulder—310,000 look at the demand, 80% of the gap of the South Platte Basin is in these 3 counties; now look at Douglas and Arapahoe county—240,000acft in 2050; thus, note that the population in Larimer and Weld counties doubling the population; thus, important to look at the details.

Discussion ensues on the fact that this is an entire South Platte Basin issue.

Todd: Indeed, we are looking for regional support.

Eric Wilkinson: Worth emphasizing that the highest demand will be from Weld, Larimer and Boulder Counties.

Harold Evans: Our needs assessment was a very good piece of work and it is important that this not get lost.

Harold: Slide 11: Important to note that passive conservation has already been taken out of the demand number; these numbers already assume this savings.

Harold: Slide 12: Look at master plan from South Metro, it is looking to the middle South Platte and coming down river to get their water.

Todd: And South Platte not alone. Note that South Metro trying to move from nonrenewable supplies. WISE agreement, shared infrastructure; Centennial Water involved with conjunctive use project in Denver Basin; completed a few studies for conjunctive use.

Harold: My understanding is that the WISE agreement has not been executed, correct?

Julio, Todd: Yes, but progress being made.

Slide 14: Ag Water use in basin (Metro, South Platte, Republican); Slide 15: shows ag production county by county: ex: 1.5 billion: 9/10ths of ag production in 8 counties; South Platte and Republican Basin contribute 70% of ag production in the state; Roundtable, IBCC, CWCB understand the value of South Platte Ag.; the value of irrigated ag, in particular, can easily be seen in slide 16.

Slide 17: Mike Shimmin: This slide does not capture the fact that cities have been growing over irrigated land. The rate of growth has been substantially greater along the Front Range; cities were founded along rivers and they grew over alluvial areas.

Slide 19 & 20: Irrigation Supply by Water District and Water shortages; compare M&I gap with ag gap; note that this current shortage is more than M&I gap projected into the future;

Joe Frank: Comments on gap especially in dry years.

Harold Evans: This shortage was identified in our needs assessment; also, look at Water District 1, 2 & 3, with the exception of 65 (Republican) are where the biggest shortages are; these are also the districts that will be under the biggest pressure from the metro area for water supply. Look where we are already the shortest on water, and where pressure will be greatest.

Todd: This presentation highlights some of the good work that has been done.

Next presenter: Hal Simpson: Hydrology

Slide 25 shows location of peak gauging stations; selective flows for average year, dry and wet year to see the variability

Slide 26: Note how return flows have influenced water rights development. New water rights could be adjudicated once aquifer became filled over a course of about 10 years. Overtime, through development of the headwaters down, the stream becomes a drain that allows the water to be reused. Maintenance of return flows in amount, place and time crucial.

Jim Yahn: look at gauging slide again: all of this occurs below the Balzac case; we are accruing return flows that happened in District 64 itself; nothing we can capture unless we put a bucket at the end.

Slide 27: This is the total volume of return flow storage; 1880-1930—irrigation reservoirs; 1940-on more from M&I; 1960-1970 related to fact that Bonnie Reservoir was filled and adjudicated. Adjudicated storage at 2.5 million acft shows significant storage in state.

Water Availability: Look at how much water could be stored: new water support—

Bob Streeter: Is this cumulative?

Hal: Just at that location.

Mark: Free River Analysis on South Platte River; average annual basis from Denver to state line; different colored areas correspond to segments of river with varying amounts of water during free river conditions. Once into district 64, sometimes there is a call in district 1 or 2 but free river in district 64; from district 64 downstream, accumulating water during times of free river. This is from 20002-2010. Left slide is Burlington head gate; right side, state line.

Slide 31: Top line in 2010; bottom lines show accumulation of return flows.

Slide 32: Blue line is average amount; orange line: storage.

Harold: In an earlier graph, there was one that was in our needs assessment; we looked at storage to yield to see what it would take to have a firm average yield. To have firm average yield of 10,000 acft below Chatfield it would take over 300,000 acft of storage to meet that needs. Not economically feasible. So the amount of storage we need to firm our yield is our challenge. What we need is supply in a drought year, must have storage buckets. We must not forget the details behind this data. We concluded in our needs assessment that there is not enough to produce a firm yield; challenge is how to capture this and to have it available for us.

Hal: Could be misleading; this 1 to 30 is right at Chatfield; as you move downstream could become less.

Slide 33; Free river conditions frequent in District 64; blue bars are districts 1, 2 and 64 combined.

Bruce: The absence of calls on that portion of the river is due to a large amount of cooperation; thus this is a managed situation where an actual call is not made but it is managed to such a level where the water is available.

Joe Frank: Absolutely correct. Management agreement is what makes the recall projects happen.

River commissioner: Also important to remember that in January the ice reduces the amount of water that can be taken out; there were threats of a call before it became very cold this month. Thus, always right on the verge of a call, but everyone works together to prevent this.

Slide 38: Discussion on how these pipes could become a reality and how they could help all of us.

Joe Frank: presents next slides

Bruce Gerk: Reminds us that there are representatives from the top of the basin to the bottom of the basin; and we are all trying to cooperate to find solutions; but we cannot impose our knowledge of our 15 miles of the river on all others.

Janet Bell: Asks if there is a map of the existing reservoirs with their capacity and how much more they could store that they are actually storing now, to take that as one base so that if we want to talk about shared infrastructure, it would be useful to know where the existing pipelines are and what could be shared; I don't see the flip side do see what we already have.

Harold Evans: Those existing ones were looked at in the earlier SWASI studies; to pick up on Bruce's comment, there is a limit on how far you can move water; what happens in the Metro area that does not help us at all in La Poudre; there are practical limitations on what we can actually do.

Slide 44: Final slide that brings us back full circle to Sean's comments about what we want to do; if we want to form a subcommittee that takes a detailed look at what our understanding of the basin is. Perhaps, for example, if the infrastructure sharing aspect benefits several entities to the extent that they do not have to dry up; I think there are areas we can undertake in conjunction with the Metro roundtable, form some working groups, to begin to understand the system better. Are there areas where we can optimize our possibilities; not with the idea of doing that instead. I think this is a basin issue that we should be involved in. Let's start by sitting down with the Metro and brainstorming; we must do this in conjunction with the IBCC process; we will not solve our basin gap just in-basin.

Harold Evans: I suggest that this be a topic for our next meeting; I don't think we can act on this tonight.

Greg Kernohan: Is there a deadline?

Todd: There is not a deadline; Metro will be interested to hear this presentation and then might be ready to move on that.

Harold Evans: We will consider this next month then. Thank you very much for your work. Please take another look at our needs assessment as there is much work in this; please see that everyone gets a disk. Please send out a link to download this and SWASI 2010.

Janet Bell: Since Metro will be meeting next month in February; should we bring this up to the Metro to look at this in its totality; is there any behind-the-scenes direction?

Harold: I will have some conversations with the Chair of the Metro to bring him up to speed to what we have talked about.

In December there was a meeting between the Metro and the Gunnison to continue talking about conservation; asks Todd to send out a link to the minutes that came out of that meeting. Jacob has sent out a summary of that meeting. I came away from that meeting a bit discouraged; out of 60 people, 40 were from Gunnison and Colorado; some of the basic themes: conservation would be good for the east slope but did not see any reason to do it on the western slope as this is leaving water in the river; before any new supply project could be pursued, east slope has to endeavor on huge conservation projects. Much work to do to bridge gap on east and west slope on practical level of conservation; between 2000 and 2008, we have conserved at least 20%; this is a continuing conversation.

Larry Howard: When we entered the room, we were given assignments; my table had 2 east slope and 7 west slope reps; Jim Hall was alone. We did hear all of these comments about why we should conserve because we have so much water. But one positive thing is that I had a chance to visit with them about what conservation really means. To discuss return flow rights, for example. I was surprised that there was genuine surprise around the table that many did not understand this concept. So at least there was an exchange of discussion.

Ken Huron: Yes, I had a similar experience. One individual from the east slope was from Denver Water; they were flat out saying no need to conserve on west slope; Denver Water person said if we are to be successful at all, we need help. Denver Water has looked at what we can do with water conservation and much of it is societal; if the West Slope wants us to be successful, the effort must be broader. I made the point that the west slope really needs to think that it will be difficult to convince people on the east slope that there is not enough water to share since you don't need to conserve...so these kinds of meetings helps open many eyes and the discussion is good; but yes, there is a long way to go.

Harold Evans: The other issue is not how much we will conserve but how much will be supplied to gap; in their minds all should be applied to gap. Again, Todd will send out that link to get a feel for the meeting.

Part of portfolio analysis, the Denver Metro group has done some good work on their portfolio and their planning process. They have done a draft supply paper that lays out in detail how to meet the future needs of the Metro Roundtable. Metro has asked the South Platte and AK to do a position paper that would be presented to the IBCC. They did not take a position of where the water would come from; I would like input from the Roundtable to ask if we should work on a unified white paper or should we look at drafting a consensus statement that would help support their position. I think that we would agree with 99% of what they present; their density of land use frames their thinking. Sean Cronin sat in with me; good conversation and laying good groundwork for cooperation with Metro and AK. If the Metro cannot get their water from the West slope, they will come north and I think we need to be protective while still supporting the efforts of the Metro. We do not want to be the default.

Julio: I am going to put my Metro liaison hat on now; I have read the paper; to summarize, the paper (Bookends paper) says there are two options: get water from western slope or from ag; Metro has publicly stated that their first option is not to go to ag ("low hanging fruit") but culture, politics push towards the point of least resistance; takes much more effort to take water from western slope than to take it from ag; the paper does not pass judgment on this, just states this as a fact. Can look at Parker in the past; we have not done well when it comes to getting water in a reservoir that already exists (Gross Reservoir).

Jim Yahn: We are all one basin; just because the statute formed us as two different basins, we are all one basin. This is all the front range. This is our water. We gave this presentation; shared infrastructure, ag transfer, everything together...we have to talk about this together. We have to look at all of this together. It is important that we meet and go forward together.

Joe, Janet: Agree. This is the ideal time to meet. There is an expansion that demands discussion.

Harold: Focus: I was asked to come up with a combined paper; the question is whether we want to do a unified paper; we will do a supporting document that can put more emphasis on some of our issues. That paper is still metro-centric.

Eric Wilkinson: Looking at this from IBCC standpoint, it would be easier if it were a joint paper from Metro and South Platte; would be best if we could AK to blend in on this as well (Harold: AK was there).

Dynamics at IBCC: West slope roundtables have an annual get-together and they circle the wagons; being 20% of the population, they have built a wall. Risk management, climate change, CO River

Agreement—all legitimate but stall tactics. We need to move forward positively. New supply is last, but if that is the hierarchy to doing this, then ag will be the source of choice because it is easier. If there is not an option that can be seen coming down the road on new supply, the common supplier will not take on a transbasin project. Transbasin project will have participants and proponents but not a sponsor, state will have to step up. Thus I advocate that the sooner we can unite with Metro and AK, to keep this discussion moving, the better off we will be.

Diane Hoppe: I concur; I would like to see you continue working on the Metro Bookends paper and try to get the AK together.

Harold Evans: We will do this as it is the consensus of the group.

WRSA applications:

- 1) CO Division of Water Resources.** Request from basin account for \$89,205 to purchase 66 data loggers to be installed in the following districts; represents 44 ditches or ditch companies. Presentation from Water Engineer, Bruce: Clear Creek, Poudre and Boulder creek. This is the third one that has come before us. Worthwhile endeavor and meets the criteria for the application. We have found this to be a great time saver. Save 15-20 minutes for each SDR vs. chart report; this equals about 220 hours a week as a water commissioner. This is worth 3 FTEs that would spend all their time breaking down charts. With augmentation, we have grown exponentially; we require this at all new sites; this would replace all chart sites. Helps us become more flexible; if it is a blizzard or we are sick, we don't have to go, we have the data. Thus, this is to buy the equipment. We must embrace technology.

Harold: What is installation cost of these? We have discussed that there is a 25% match for these funds. Is your estimate that you would meet this 25%? Please make sure that this box is there.

Todd and Jim: There is not a match on basin accounts, but the Board has always appreciated it.

Bert Weaver: Makes motion to support.

Jim Hall: Second

Additional discussion: Are all these ditches and companies okay with these installations?

Bruce: I have talked to all the water commissioners to ask where they would want a data logger. We have several hundred that need replaced so if someone does not want one, we have other locations.

Greg: So no formal application process?

Mike: Over the years, I have had a number of clients that were told to install measuring devices at their own costs, what is the line between when the client and the state pays?

Bruce: These are existing sites that already have a chart recorder; so the benefit is to the water commissioner because these are existing chart recorders. All new structures that go in, there must be a data logger.

Mike: How much in basin account?

Harold: \$461,900 in basin account.

Bruce: This is a benefit to everyone on the river.

Greg: Is this significant enough to get statewide funds to switch out hundreds of them?

Harold: Come back for the September board meeting for Statewide meeting.

Vote.

Motion carries.

2) Ducks Unlimited:

Wetland enhancement around Prewitt Reservoir Wetland Partnership. Matt Reddy

Comment before presentation: Private individuals are eligible for basin funds not for statewide funds. Is part of this for private individuals? You may need to rework your budget because you may run into problem with statewide account.

Statewide account: \$45,414

Basin account: \$45,414

Total: \$90,828

Nonconsumptive use project.

Using wetland habitat created by storage in reservoir, water supplies can be better managed to meet habitat goals and wetland goals.

Objectives: enhancement of existing shallow-water basins; identification of areas marginal to the reservoir that may be enhanced; design and installation of drain line systems to help enhance wetlands.

Questions: Bob Streeter: Will the benefits be equal for water fowl in both spring and fall?

Matt: Right now it benefits Spring birds the most but we are trying to push this back with excavation and also if we can take flash floods this would benefit species for wintering times and make more areas available. Looking to expand benefits beyond spring.

Bob Streeter: What about management plan requirements particularly for Dept of Wildlife, especially on private parcels?

Matt: Both of these projects will be delivered under 30 year conservation agreements where the private owners agree to maintain these structures.

Bob: Penalties or enforcement?

Matt: Ultimate penalty is that they would forfeit these structures. Terms of the contract are driven by federal dollars.

Bob: Explain public use on private use; limited to youth hunts or to certain amount of public use or are these private hunting?

Matt: One is a private club; one is an active ranch; one is an active easement agreement—youth and perhaps wounded warriors to hunt there; but it is a private hunting club; but part of the agreement is that they enter into an agreement with park and wildlife for easement. Prewitt Ranch has agreed to host 2 tours a year for birders; they will allow birding tours to visit these wetlands during fall and spring; are in negotiations to also perhaps have access for youth and wounded warriors.

Jim Yahn: Operator of Prewitt Reservoir; have met with Matt; will need to work through details, but mostly it is a small amount of water; so we do have some things to work through but we are not opposed to enhancing the reservoir in some manner. I am okay with this project.

Harold: The motion must be that the statewide funds would be applied to the reservoir.

Todd: My read of the grant application is to look at the benefits...if the public benefits rank high, than it is the entity and

John Stencil: I move approval of this proposal.

Bob Streeter: Second

Discussion:

Mike Shimmin: Questioning water rights impact; if they are building these dikes that will hold water longer, and if this impacts water rights?

Jim Yahn: There are questions that will need to be resolved and we will need to work with state.

Mike Shimmin: Does this not have to be worked out before our vote for recommendation?

Mike: I would ask that these water rights issues get worked out. I will move this as an amendment. Asks Todd: How does this work?

Todd: We definitely have conditional approvals; the Board can approve this with a condition that this needs to be worked out with the reservoir operator.

Mike: I therefore move that the condition is that the water rights issues be resolved before funding is final.

Greg: Is part of the application getting these water rights worked out?

Matt: In the rules of the application that we must work within the priority system; we will work with the river commissioners and reservoir manager.

Frank Eckhardt: Seconds Mike's amendment.

Vote first on amendment; carries.

Vote on amended motion; carries.

Annual Meeting of Roundtable; election of officers:

Chair: Harold Evans is willing to continue

First Vice Chair: Bob Chair is willing to continue

Second Vice Chair: Need nomination

Recorder: Lisa McVicker willing to continue.

Must be voting members of the Roundtable.

Also must elect IBC representatives for 2 year term. Have elected Jim last year; need to re-elect Eric Wilkinson as IBC rep.

Bert Waiver moves to elect the existing slate; need nomination for second vice chair

McVicker nominates Sean Cronin for second vice chair

Larry Howard seconds

Multiple nominations—recorder cannot keep up.

Sean Cronin nominated as Chair; more nominations and seconds.

Multiple recasts of votes (written ballots) because bylaws say 60% of vote of approval needed.

Split between Harold and Sean two times; Harold withdraws.

Sean Cronin will be Chair.

Split between Bob Streeter and Joe Frank for First Chair; Bob withdraws: Joe Frank will be First Vice Chair.

Reopen nominations for 2nd Vice Chair

Joe Frank nominates Bob Streeter

Mike Shimmin moves nominations cease and elect Bob Streeter as 2nd Vice Chair.

Mike Shimmin moves to nominate recorder and IBCC rep and accept them by proclamation.

Next meeting will be April 13, 2013.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm