

**South Plate Basin Roundtable  
Meeting Agenda  
Tuesday, June 11, 2013  
Embassy Suites - Loveland, CO**

**4:00 – 8:30 PM**

**Members and patrons present:** Lisa McVicker (Center of CO WCD), Bob Streeter (Enviro Rep), Eric Wilkinson (IBCC), Tom Donnelly (Larimer Cty), Sean Cronin (SBPRT Chair), Mike Applegate (Northern Water), Bruce Gerk (Sedgwick Muni), John Stencil (Legislative Rep-Estes Park), Greg Kernohan (Recreational Rep), Jim Yahn (IBCC), Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe Cty), Frank Eckhardt Jr. (Central WCD), Diane Hoppe (CWCB Board), Allyn Wind (Morgan Cty), Mike Shimmin (At large), Todd Doherty (CWCB), Sue Morea (CDM), Rebecca Mitchell (CWCB), John Stulp (CECB/DNR), Harold Evans (Weld M&I), Steve Larson (Broomfield), Ken Huson (Boulder County Munis), Doug Rademacher (Weld Cty), Sean Conway (Weld Cty), Wayne Skold (Sedgwick Cty), Larry Ross (Elbert Cty), Dan Gallen (Aurora Water), Craig Godbout (CWCB), Blaine Dwyer (HDR), Bob Longenbaugh (Ft Collins), Larry Carrillo (Collaborative Problem Solving), Annette Aring (Amci-Wireless, Golden), Gene Bauerle (RRWCD), Chris Treese (CO River District), Don Ament (Brown & Caldwell), Jim Ford (Gilpin Muni), Janet Bell (Metro Basin Rd Table), Elizabeth Koebele (CU Boulder), Arista Hickman (Dinatlé Water Consultants)

**I. Routine Items (4:00 – 4:05)**

- a. Welcome and Introductions - *Cronin*
- b. Amendments or Additions to the Agenda – *Cronin*
  - Item 9: appreciation for Jennifer and Todd, after approval of minutes*
  - Item 3: Jacob Bornstein has conflict; will present at next meeting*
  - Motion to Sean Conway; Second by Jim Yahn; approved unanimously

**II. Action Items (4:05 – 4:10)**

- a. Approval of Minutes – *Cronin*
  - Same as above*

**III. Appreciation for Jennifer Gimbel and Todd Doherty**

Jennifer Gimbel is moving to Washington DC; Todd is moving to City of Boulder  
Sean presents a lovely plaque and framed photos of the South Platte River  
Dick Stenzil photographer; thanks for dedication to South Platte.

**IV. Discussion Items (4:10 – 6:00)**

- a. 4:10 Executive Order: Directing the CWCB To Commence Work on the Colorado Water Plan - *John Stulp*

Copies of Executive Order D 2013-005: As a context, Mr. Stulp comments on an article on water plan for Egypt; proposed hostile actions against Ethiopia to stop it

from building Nile River upstream—indication of how some draft their water plans. The Governor’s Order takes a quite different approach.

Mr. Stulp highlights main issues and insights on how it was planned.

- 1) Background: Directs CCWCB to start work on plan; this comes on the heels of his first water talk in January 2010 at the Water Congress; had asked for plan by 2015; Stulp focuses on first paragraph on Colorado Doctrine and how 18 downstream states and Mexico rely on Colorado water. These stakeholders have claim to 2/3 of our water. Order continues with a background of CCWCB and recognizes the State Engineer’s Office and points out that this is the first water plan in the State, although this plan will use studies and efforts of the past by the Basins and others—with use of state money; recites HB 1177 and the basin process; next session points out role of other state agencies in addition to DNR—health dept. (permitting process) (note comment that quantity and quality must be tied together—thus role for health department; meetings imminent); mentions water resources and power authority for infrastructure; Dept of Ag and the new CO Energy Office will all be involved in river administration; Governors office emphasis on interrelations of agency. Next part: “Why now”: purposes and needs; outlines reasoning of why this needs to be done now; draws us back to SWSI report; several times the impact on the South Platte Basin is emphasized; largest growth in population and largest ag production; drought is another reason—last 2 decades are warmest on record; driest was in ‘30s, ‘50s, ‘70’s—higher temps evident in causing draught (109 in Lamar yesterday). “Buy and Dry” not acceptable; ag has gov’s attention in terms of what water policy is doing to agriculture; the potential 20% dryup of ag if we continue with status quo; IBCC is recognized as well as work in portfolios and strategy; water quality again emphasized that this cannot be thought of separately; thus the importance of concurring with health department; of course recognizes interstate water compacts and need to protect water rights per compacts; part on Declaration and Directives again focus on the plans laid out in the basin work; note three bullet points on page 3: Productive economy, viable ag, robust rec and environment. We were asked why environment is 3<sup>rd</sup> on list—this is not any ranking of importance, complete package that we as a state must address these together. Governor has laid out an ambitious time frame, hope to wrap up by 2014 no later than 2015; plan is to align the state’s role in water project permitting and review process with water values to streamline approval of water projects in the state. Note that many state agencies have water rights –correctional agencies, CDOT, Energy, etc—therefore important to have inventory. Word “alignment” is key to how the different priorities will have relationship. Note also financial assistance is in accordance with water planning. Will need to review our process for how we spend money. Projects that come forward will need to be aligned with the state plan. Note role of IBCC.

The CWCB and IBCC and Basin Roundtables expect the CWCB to utilize the IBCC and roundtables in this plan; working relationship is crucial. IBCC meetings have been rescheduled so that they occur in off months. Reasoning is to ameliorate communication and planning between CWCB and IBCC process.

Note part III G: allows for ad-hoc panels of Coloradoans and inter-agency water working groups to develop recommendations regarding specific topics as necessary; vision is to allow contracting to complete study.

Note the reaffirmation of the water plan as being in step with the doctrine of prior appropriation.

Stulp notes that there has been vigorous debate on this but that future legislation is considered as part of the plan.

Sean Cronin: Emphasizes the part of the plan that “buy and dry” is unacceptable and notes that the plan relies on the basin roundtable process and the relationship with the CWCB; Diane Hoppe’s presence as our South Platte Basin rep really emphasizes that this is the time for us to help best position our Basin and the needs.

McVicker notes the temperature, winds and fires as a somber context for discussion.

Bob Streeter: What specifically does the CWCB and the Governor’s office anticipate from the kind of work they expect from this roundtable?

Stulp: 80-90% of the work for the state plan has been done with assessment needs, focus on portfolio, IPPs and work with other basins; notes that this work will be incorporated on one level or another; as the work is wrapping up on the “no regrets” process, next step is focused on “new supply”—these will be all important elements to be put into a state plan; if water will be moved from one basin to another, will need to focus on existing agreements such as the Colorado River agreement with 46 entities—focus on protecting economy and environment and these will show up in one way or another in the state plan; therefore as a roundtable, important for us to be thinking about how this fits into the state plan. Will depend on the basin—some agricultural like South Platte others more focused on rec, etc.

What can this roundtable do: we need to wrap up our basin plan and common criteria for that; common elements of this will be helpful for IBCC plan to go forward; important to think about money that we spend from the basin account to focus on if this need fits with the state plan. Must keep looking at how each decision we make will fit into the state plan.

Harold Evans: Any plan that will ultimately be implemented will require funding; any consideration for new funding sources in the future?

Stulp: Must go to people with a complete plan where money is strategically invested; have gone to CA and TX; TX plan has appropriated \$2 billion—helps buy down interest rate if the plan is in step with state plan—think that this \$2 billion will be leveraged into over \$50 billion; addresses growing cities, conservation, environment...all elements in order to access scarce funds. Keep in mind that severance tax is coming back (\$70 million this year); if able to leverage this, then we will be able to go forward; also have not discussed private sector as partners to be partners on projects; but the keystone is having a clear plan to go forward in order to develop resources. Stulp has question for Diane Hoppe: You are the body to which the governor has directed this to; please expound on reaction of board.

Dianne Hoppe: Shocking news to Board: Ex Director's contract not renewed and then the executive order; the board learned about it at a retreat in April. The purpose of that retreat was two-fold—how would the board go forward in finding a new director and secondly we learned about the executive order; the board did have opportunity to have input to the order; I see that the governor accepted our input: importance of doctrine of prior appropriation and role of CWCB; one matter that did not get mentioned was the issue of storage and infrastructure; this dovetails with Harold's question on funding. My understanding is that we, through the basin roundtables, must be careful of what we put in our basin implementation plan. Expresses gratitude for how Sean Cronin has taken implementation seriously. We are beginning to see more of the spirit of cooperation and looking at this as an opportunity and this is one to move forward but must take care.

Harold Evans: Has the CWCB given thought to how this will go forward?

Diane: All of this is in the infancy stage; some are distressed about the executive order, but we have it and we must move forward.

Stulp: The question about storage: note bullet point 3 on page 3: "efficient and effective water infrastructure promoting smart land use"; this would embrace ideas outside of traditional storage; 7.5 million acft of conditional and decreed storage rights on the record; the state engineer's office will bring this to the attention of the IBCC. Therefore, note that storage is umbrellaed under this. Also, this is the governor's attempt of encouraging from the ground up and building on our efforts for the last 8 years; so the basins have done the work to get this started and to push over the finish line in the next 18 months; this is a balance between leadership and "top down" response. Opines that this is what the governor noted as the need of the plan. Emphasizes the role of the roundtable.

- b. 4:30 Suggested Tasks/Schedule for Colorado Water and Basin Implementation Plans - *Becky Mitchell*

My primary focus is on basin implementation. Builds on Harold's question that focused on SWSI; we have developed some hypothetical time frames. A piece of SWSI in the implementation plans is a draft outline—this plan moves from the technical piece to the implementation plan and action; this is action oriented. Emphasizes draft. Each basin will have directed focus according to the needs of the basin:

Section 1: Facing goals and outcomes; what should and can basins accomplish; where is the basin and where does the basin want to be; reemphasizes building on the work that the basins have done. Will work to finalize basin goals and objectives.

Section 2: Evaluate consumptive and nonconsumptive needs; will be relevant to the roundtables in terms of how the goals are being met what steps can be taken to make this happen better.

Note emphasis on the roundtable being asked to provide a list of the most important considerations; often the pivotal info is missing.

Section 2.1 focuses on nonconsumptive needs of the basin roundtables. Jacob Bornstein is lead on this and will provide more info in July and outlines the responsibility of the CWCB.

Basin Roundtable responsibilities outlined and focus on certain questions—basin attributes and values and how the basin's plans will help further plan.

Becky notes that she is available for any questions.

Right now at the point of data input.

Still in process for evaluation drought plan.

Section 3: Evaluate consumptive and nonconsumptive needs and opportunities; this is where the basins will find their most interesting work. Will need to look at opportunities—where can we focus on making infrastructure more efficient.

Section 3.1: current basin operations and hydrology—this has commenced;

Section 3.2: "Optional" section—best interest of basins—water management and water administration; the executive order focuses on this in terms of looking at what the state already owns; hydrologic modeling section; further and current modeling of shortages included; this also looks at M&I and ag, need to look at these differently from SWSI; previously we looked at the average—we do not look at average, look at extremes—how to maximize or mitigate these extremes—change from SWSI on the Basin level.

Section 4: Projects and Methods: response from basin roundtable is to refine the IPPs; looking again at SWSI 2010 there is no basin without a gap—thus really focusing on the ap and hoping to look at other avenues besides just projects—cooperative projects, for example, include in basin analysis.

In Section 4: educational outreach is included with new projects. One large issue for implementation is that one basin might make plans that conflict with another

basin; at the basin level, is there a conflict within the basin—for example, hauling out same water for two separate projects; have not yet determined of how to deal with this yet. This will call on creativity from basin.

Section 5: Implementation Strategies; identify opportunities within these challenges; this has been lacking so far; basins well equipped to do this.

Final section: how does plan meet the basin's goals; important to note that these are the basin plans; emphasizes that there are many areas where the basins can go beyond the plan.

Becky notes that she will miss Todd's presence but will be ready to "staff up" and how new staff will fit with the basin's needs. She reaffirms her availability.

Believes that the executive order can generate excitement and hopes that basin is ready to move from the challenges to the action plans for implementation.

Sean Cronin reminds membership that in March we voted in a committee dedicated to basin implementation plan. The Committee has been formed "Rio Chato" committee—River of Disappointment—historical nomenclature; this committee has met several times and has carried forth member's wish to reach out to Metro Roundtable.

Cronin delivered message and Metro has accepted; executive committees have met; so wheels in motion for basin implementation plan. Will report later in meeting. Sean notes that we will be meeting more often in order to move forward with implementation plan.

Questions:

Harold Evans: One thing missing from both the draft on the plan and ex plan—no control over the federal permitting presence for projects; do not have any federal permitting on any projects in this basin; major element is to be able to implement IPPs and feds are in control and as a state we must be aware of the federal permitting process.

Stulp agrees and points out that a well articulated state plan is a crucial element in this. Therefore the governor's efforts in bringing the state agencies into the plan so that the state can work as a cooperative unity is important; if we can meet the criteria of the plan, then the feds will recognize this and hopefully ameliorate federal permitting process.

Becky: When this ex order came out, received calls from 4 different federal agencies; they felt they were called out in this exec order; and see importance of working together; she emphasized the need for feds to communicate their needs so that we can work towards this.

Stulp: Challenges each of the members of the roundtable to help fill vacancies that Becky's group has; asks for interest in these positions given the talent in the membership of the round table.

c. Discuss need for WSRA funding for basin implementation plan:

Focus on irrigated ag and finding a way to meet municipal demands and meeting ag demands, this is a good opportunity to secure some funding in order to use the roundtable process to flesh this out.

Joe Frank: Shares thoughts that the committee has discussed in terms of what to do to secure funding. Question per draft guideline: mentions optional tasks—are these funded through the existing SWSI funding?

Becky: 3.1-3.2—yes SWSI, but best to look at WSRA; Board has urgent timeline; thus can look at statewide grant funds; will get together a more efficient application form.

Joe: The Rio Chato has had to table this issue so that we have a better idea of funding; have discussed scoping process but details lacking due to funding questions;

Have also discussed importance of meeting with Metro; Chair of Metro, after one of the executive committee meetings, agrees; therefore, Joe Frank suggests that these two committees meet together in order to focus on what possible tasks could be joined together as an entire South Platte implementation plan; important that everyone's input is called upon. Emphasizes unity of the South Platte basin; then, next question, is what could we fund together through a joint application and then next question is who could be that applicant. Have not formalized scope yet because the plan is new.

Becky: The AK has done some work on this as has Yampa—doing some initial plans; emphasizes that any consulting assistance can come from WSRA; have flexibility to choose consultants that know our basin; travel, education, etc—much flexibility (references section 3.2.2)

Joe Frank: We have the flexibility to go as far with this and as detailed as we want to go; thus asks membership to consider these parameters to go forward with the funding request. Notes the importance of finding consultants and that there are some of the optional tasks that would be in our best interest.

Bruce Gerk: We may be 80% with info but with producing quantifiable water, we have nothing that approaches even 1%. Until we discuss the requirements of finishing these projects in order to find wet water—permitting, funding, campaigns—until we reach this critical mass, all the planning in the world will be worth naught.

Becky: Important to call out the barriers of implementation.

Frank: Focus on solution part of this.

Cronin: Rio Chatom committee: Sean Conway, Frank Erlich, Julio Iturreria, Joe Frank, Mike Applegate Bruce Gerk, Doug Kernohan comprise current committee; If anyone would like to be part of this committee, please express interest.

Bruce Gerk notes that perhaps all members are not getting the notifications and need to make sure this communication is going out.

d. Legislative, CWCB & IBCC Report

i. IBCC – *Wilkinson, Yahn*

Wilkinson: emphasis was on the fact that the water plan is intended to be a dynamic document that will never be finished; plan must be revised on a continual basis; emphasis is on the fact that the state and constituents must be open to it; notes the presentation from Mike King that the governor's emphasis on the state's need of addressing CO Water's future; the answer cannot be no but we must attempt to find solutions; lots of concerns expressed by "top down appearance" of the exec order, and that therefore there must be a very good communication from the roundtables to CWCB and back—this is crucial for buy-in for some of the roundtables. Will need to have frequent meetings to keep up with this process; are looking for feedback from roundtables for feedback.

Quote from James Echlin: "This is not to be done in water time"—18 months to complete draft; governor is providing political will to find water solutions; clear that the reps from the state and the governor to be driver to move the planning for future forward. Both Diane Hoppe and Alan Hammer, Chair of CWCB, expressed that this is a challenging time: "Not you, not I...it is We" if we will get this done. CWCB anxious for feedback from roundtables. Much discussion on what the water plan actually will do—this will bring perhaps the IBCC process to a conclusion; concerns about water use and land use were mentioned especially by reps from West Slope and Denver Water—mixed responses; land use has nexus but land use is a local control, but evident that land use drives water demand. Several docs were developed by CWCB that were the result of IBCC discussions at March meeting where discussion focused on "no regrets and low regrets" with focus on ag and new supply as well as nonconsumptive and conservation; docs have been developed for each of these concerns; important to look at these docs in terms of what we can do to plan for our future—so what can we do now to start moving forward that won't hamper our opportunities in the future to make optimal use of our water. Joe Frank: Where can we find these docs to make comments?

Stulp: Working on website to be more user-friendly; looking into the possibility of having a state water plan so that anyone can look at those docs and make comments. Right now can usually find these at the CWCB; will send a link to McVicker to attach to minutes.



Discussions on new supply, nonconsumptive, ATM, conservation subcommittees forming—subcommittee looking at new storage in the state and how this could be effected; also task force to revisit the IPPS and integrate storage into that. Education is crucial to this therefore PEPO will be important for this.

Meetings will be scheduled in off months from the CWCB—August, October, December for IBCC meetings—locations to be announced.

Jim Yahn: March IBCC meeting also talked about Flaming Gorge task force; one of the things that seemed effective was that we met every month and we had a deadline. Now governor has given us a deadline and we will meet more often.

When I saw executive order, I was excited. I don't quite understand the role of the IBCC but hoping that this would be better defined. During the executive meeting with the AK and the Metro, became obvious that the path forward was up to us and that this plan is pushing us on to do something. Therefore, I have always seen this as a ground up process and the time is now to come up with something and we owe it to our constituents to come up with something. Time to hammer out details to go forward. Notes one thing that Mike King said that this is a plan for Colorado's water future. I like what the governor said about focus on permitting and focus on feds. Opines that we should take this basin implementation plan seriously and tell the state what we think is the way future. Looks forward to moving this along.

Julio Iturreria: Any focus on the conclusion or consensus on any of the topics that you have mentioned; for instance, Flaming Gorge—focused on process, did the IBCC accept this as a template for a way to go forward?

Jim Yahn: Not quite settled.

John Stulp: But closer: on ATMs and new supply; but at the end, no strong feelings for conclusion at this point.

Jim Yahn: Stresses that the way that we do our basin implementation plan is up to us; one useful aspect of Flaming Gorge is there was an effective facilitator that helped draw out concerns and possibilities. Facilitation for bringing out tough questions is useful. So something worth embracing.

ii. CWCB - Hoppe

Much of what was on agenda at last CWCB meeting on May 14 and 15 in Grand Junction has been covered to date; focus on Governor's executive order; discussion on basin implementation plans and framework on how to move forward; also approved WSRA: Flex water marketing and education implementation plan. The NRCAS provided a tour of the CO river water salinity control program; valuable information; interesting to see all of the canals at the end of the state; depressing to lose executive director; Jennifer Gimbel was a class act and directed staff in quite effective manner. The State has advertised the job. Four finalists; the Board interviewed the four finalists on June 10; expect formal announcement soon; not at liberty to announce this. Have been told that this announcement would be either at the end of the week or end of year. Anticipates announcement soon. New ex director should be in the office by July 1. Expresses sadness to see Todd D. leaving and notes how much help he has been. "Driving into a dark tunnel..but we will lighten it up." Hopes that the Basin will look at how to expedite the applications but the requirements will still be there but expediting requests is a priority.

iii. Legislative Report – *Hoppe*

The Legislature has adjourned. Governor signed SB 181 the CWCB construction loan bill and signed HB1248 pilot program for use of water to see if the lease programs are actually working.

Joe Frank: The way I read the legislation is that there is public comment time, yes?

Hoppe: Yes; will follow normal procedure so comment time will be there.

Next item: water resource review committee; will meet in Gunnison on June 18 as a look toward next year's legislation will be reviewed.

S252—water coops? Agrees with Allyn Wynd.

**V. Dinner (6:00)**

**VI. Rio Chato Committee Update (6:30)**

i. General Comments – *Cronin*

Reviews purpose of committee and basin roundtable's endorsement.

Has met two times.

ii. Draft Agenda for the July 24<sup>th</sup> Joint Meeting – *Cronin*

Should South Platte convene earlier in the month or have business meeting prior to the Joint Meeting?

Agenda: Executive committee from AK, Metro and South Platte met on June 6 to discuss what they wanted to achieve: attempt to adopt a joint statement from east slope regarding new supply—could be an introduction into the implementation plan or be worked into the state plan. Sean reads into the record the Metro Roundtable New Supply Development Statement dated 5/20/2013:

**5/20/2013**

**Metro Roundtable New Supply Development Statement:**

The Metro Roundtable agrees with the intent of the West Slope caucus' New Water Supply Development statement and concurs with the desire to have substantive discussion in order to make additional progress on developing New Supply from the Colorado River.

Recent efforts have advanced the discussion of the key points needed to begin crafting a consensus-based agreement regarding responsible development of a multi-purpose water supply using the Colorado River. This water supply would help fill the long-term municipal supply gaps on the East and West Slopes beyond existing water agreements and planned projects. The Metro Roundtable further recognizes the importance of meeting conservation, alternative agricultural transfers, reuse, and non-consumptive objectives, and of implementing local IPPs, as key elements for helping to fill the long-term gaps on both the East and West Slopes.

The IBCC framework included in the 2010 letter to the Governors, the Metro Roundtable's water supply white paper, the Flaming Gorge Task Force, and the West Slope water caucus statement each include principles that can help guide the State's approach in reaching an agreement for developing New Supply that is protective of existing uses and provides long-term protection and benefits for the West Slope.

It is now time to apply those principles and produce an inter-basin agreement for development of New Supply. Such an agreement should be the IBCC's primary focus for the next year.

We look forward to working with the IBCC, the CWCB and the other basin roundtables to help move this discussion forward. Only by doing so can we truly balance the needs of the state while effectively addressing our water future.

Rio Chato considered adopting a similar statement but decided to wait for the executive order and to consider what could be a joint statement from the east slope. Metro had already developed it and wanted it available for the IBCC meeting in May. Therefore, the Rio Chato will begin work on a similar statement and will be worked on together between Metro, AK and South Platte. This will be available at joint basin roundtable meeting on

July 24; this would be a major work item for the July 24. Asking membership about what it wants for the most to come after the July 24. No comments; Sean reiterates the hope that all will participate at the July 24 meeting. Sean opines that there is high enthusiasm from the joint executive committees from AK, Metro and South Platte. This is our opportunity to help shape this.

Sean: agrees, says that the meeting was productive and positive; emphasizes the 80% of agreement between the joint executive members and expresses optimism

Joe Frank: Agrees that it was a positive meeting; emphasizes the benefit of a collective east slope basin and the importance that the AK is involved as well. Direction from executive members of all three basins useful. Look forward to more meetings. Joe references the west slope plan.

b. Draft WSRA Application Guidelines – *Kernohan*

Application has been completed; this discussion on these guidelines was to walk Josh Aims proposal through the process. Asked Josh Aims proposal to get to the point that is sitting in front of you today. Timing was an issue, but the application is in front of the membership if the decision is to go forward.

Greg Kernohan explains the purpose of these guidelines to help focus on the process; Kernohan drafted but every member commented on the guideline draft.

New change: deadlines; took some of this from the AK as AK has a flowchart that explains the process clearly. Focus on member sponsor; we could start to vet these earlier on in the process; hope that applicants can make a stronger project. Long timeline is now set with 60 days prior before the roundtable meeting.

Sponsorship needs committee emphasis.

Once membership has seen project summary, hope is that applicant can make a visual presentation and go forward with the application with more confidence aimed for success.

Project summary is a new addition; will see this in the Josh Aims outline this evening; specific elements required: what is project, how does it specifically address the needs of the state and basin—what makes it significant for state; funds. Note flow chart; note opportunity to tweak for second vote if refused first time around.

We do not get enough reports back about how projects are proceeding; this is now included in the CWCB contracts so will now ask for this in the WSRA grants as well.

Simple 4 page guideline. Lots of comment.

Cronin asks for elaboration on sponsorship. If your project is within a certain municipality or county, want the municipality or county as the sponsor; sponsor must provide basics. This is more focused on consumptive projects; for nonconsumptive use could go to rec or environmental agencies, but looking for buying at sponsor level.

Cronin: Per Josh Aims—Larry Howard, Larimer municipality rep was the local sponsor for this pilot project.

Kernohan: Because this has not been approved by membership, will go forward with former process for July to be eligible for fall funding. For fall funding, all applications must be in by July 24. These will not be in affect

John Stencil: I would like to move that we move to adopt guidelines.

Frank Erlich: Second

Discussion:

Harold Evans: some of us are new to these; this means no sponsorship—can't go forward?

Kernohan: Yes

Evans: This is just one more level of government; seems like we are making this more difficult than it needs to be; what are we gaining from adding this sponsorship? Seems like just adding layers to the process.

Kernohan: Coming from both sides—applicant and being on the roundtable—to have these shot down after putting so much time into this. Finding someone that can champion your project would be useful.

Joe Frank: Maybe we should say it is encouraged to get a sponsorship but not mandatory. Agree with Harold that there could arise issues between the applicant and the sponsor; seems like sponsor could help with guidance.

Evans: What does it mean when you say “affiliation with roundtable”? I am Weld Cty municipal rep—so Greeley can make an application, but other small towns cannot.

Larry Howard: I represent all the municipalities in Larimer County...

Evans: Needs clarification in language; First sentence of sponsorship...what does the word “affiliation” mean?

Kernohan: good point.

Julio: On third page, “Roundtable Meeting”—if I was the applicant, why would I not want to draft a final proposal with a recommendation from the needs committee and only have to do that once instead of twice.

Kernohan: Good point; do we want to make it mandatory that they make first presentation? Expounds on details of process.

Julio: Or another way of looking at it: if you come in with final application with some stipulations, membership could stipulate that only after modifications would final approval be granted.

Kernohan: Agrees, but thinks there needs to be some guidance.

Cronin: Mr. Stencil, would you like to amend your motion to include these comments?

Joe Frank: Appears that there needs to be some wordsmithing before we accept this. Perhaps these two paragraphs need changes but approve in concept.

Frank makes an amendment to the motion.

Doug Rademacher: Seconds.

Vote on amended motion first: Accept as substantially written but make changes to sponsorship

Vote: Two opposed, motion carries.

Next: Original motion as amended—motion carries.

c. Draft Metro White Paper Response – *Applegate*

At March meeting, membership voted to respond to the white paper;

Mike Applegate: Written in the context of seeing the Metro with its unique characteristics but it is in the South Platte basin.

1<sup>st</sup> paragraph declares that there must be a new water supply project or this effort is academic and will result in dry up of ag. New statement from Metro is a good step forward.

2<sup>nd</sup> part looking at ag dryup—Metro recognizes that there will be ag dryup and significantly more; we responded that this needs to be less; focus on small communities and the economic impact significant. Encouraged with governor's executive order recognizing buy and dry as a looming problem.

Next section: nonconsumptive needs—ag dryup will have significant impact.

Eastern plains are important in this area and if we do not protect these values will have negative impact.

4<sup>th</sup> paragraph: statement of action.

Metro's reuse discussion was well done; we stress that their focus on reuse is good and that their reuse ability is strong.

Metro's conservation statement is clear and they are doing an excellent job; this model will not work in all areas of the whole of the South Platte and therefore a statement that recognizes that the density in the Metro area will not drive the entire basin.

Final statement that any future supply requires this collaboration and a statewide effort. Hopeful that with John Stulp at the helm of the state water plan we can go forward.

Short statement; comments?

Rademacher, Conway: express agreement that it is a good statement.

Bob Streeter: Our work with Flaming Gorge task force, became clear that the state needed to take the lead in developing this project; in this statement, no firm

statement that state or CWCB really needs to be the lead on finding funding; cannot be left up ad hoc looking for private funding; thus I believe that there needs to be a clear strong statement that the state needs to take the lead.

Eric Wilkinson: This concept was discussed at the task force for large projects; my belief is to develop any large amount of Colorado River water, it will take significant amount of money and effort and the state can coordinate efforts between east and west best so that there is not advocates basin vs. basin.

Cronin: Looking for approval. Suggestion to modify language.

Harold Evans: Move approval.

Ken Huson and Bruce Gerk: second

Motion carries.

## **VII. Sub-Committee Updates (7:30)**

### **a. Education Sub-Committee – *Schneekloth***

Announcement: AK is hosting a workshop Valuing Colorado's Agriculture: Oct 2, CO Springs: watch for more announcements. New PEPO member—still orientating. Had meeting in Keystone prior to the IBCC meeting; executive order discusses education; committee came up with seven main items to work on over the next year. \$2000 per basin for education from governor. Looking at educational ideas.

### **b. Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee – *Streeter***

Committee will be meeting with TNC staff that has been doing state wide work; and will attempt a basin nonconsumptive plan and will ask for support from WSRA for help for staff work to complete the work. Would like to invite anyone who would like to work with the non-consumptive committee to join us.

### **c. Phreatophyte Sub-Committee – *Streeter***

Inactive at this point; Weld County applied for a grant under CWCB for \$4500; denied; trying to control 15 miles. Looking to Rademacher for motivation.

### **d. Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee – *Frank***

Committee has not met recently; under ATM grant program,--FLEX market and water cooperative that started here have moved forward. Todd. D. kept some money aside so money left to continue programs. Also, as Diane mentioned, HB1130 which extends interruptible supply agreements—can get 2-3 approvals—through this statute, and HB 1278—HB for up to 3 in each basin to develop alternative transfers.

### **e. Groundwater Sub-Committee – *Frank***

Reagan unable to make this meeting; at next meeting HB1278 update on data that state has been collecting. Maybe will have a short update at next meeting.

Mary Lou: Recent update on website: South Platte Groundwater

f. Executive Sub-Committee – *Cronin*

Have discussed prior. If anyone is interested in participating, contact Sean.

**VIII. Presentation (7:40)**

a. Nonconsumptive Toolbox – *Bornstein*

Rescheduled until July

**VII. WSRA Proposal/Approval: Caroline Bradford: Josh Aims Diversion: Unused since 1971. \$375,000 for removal of the Josh Aimes Diversion.**

Larry Howard (sponsor): Initiation of new process; given information on the project and was able to take a tour on the site. Gives overview.

Caroline Bradford: Cache La Poudre: A Healthy Working River

Reviews the process that came about through the new guidelines; 2 page-condensed version of what is actually asked on the grant application.

Working with Colorado Water Trust—this part of the project is to fund the deconstruction of the structure and reconstruction. 6 ft high, 18 inch concrete wall bank to bank; the diversion structure; the Josh Aims project is at the top of the project; major bridge replacement project is being done by Larimer County; Trailhead and Parking part of project is being done by Larimer Cty; North Shields Ponds Natural Areas Riparian Restoration—done by another partner.

John Stokes with Larimer County: “Larger Community Vision for Connecting People to a Healthy Working River....”

Reviews public planning process and highlights multiple partners. Reviews other projects along the Poudre; emphasizes that the Josh Ames Diversion Removal has not been used since 1971; looking to this part of the project as establishing precedent for doing projects like this in alliance with other regional projects. As other large projects are proposed, this will serve as a good model.

Overview of benefits from in-river and bankside recreation to habitat connectivity to bank protection to water quality.

Highlights the benefit of the narrow low flow stream channel, fill side braiding; used to create pools for habitat but narrowing of the stream will enhance habitat. Also, lowering bank to plant riparian plants will assist. Also flood benefits.



Total amount: \$8.5 million; all funded except the \$375,000 for Josh Aimes. Asking \$75,000 from South Platte Basin; \$25,000 from Metro, and \$200,000 from WSRA Statewide Fund.

Why Metro: Jeff Shoemaker—Greenway Foundation—we have approved funding for South Platte in Denver, this is similar to restoring urban corridor and now Ft Collins is trying to do the same. Shoemaker will present his letter of support at Metro meeting tomorrow.

Why statewide: CWCB touts Greenway Foundation and South Platte restoration as a success story; it traces over \$100 million in direct benefit from the South Platte restoration; thus analogy with the restoration of the Poudre.

Therefore, the cumulative impact of all of these efforts is what provides a healthy working river.

Timeline: Urgency to request; hope to have support from roundtables and incorporate feedback into Application and have vote either tonight or in July on application so that it can go to CWCB meeting in September; under contract in order to start construction on Oct 1. Advantage is that the water can be turned off so that efficiencies can be realized.

Letters of support from Northern CO; Trout Unlimited fly casters and Greenway Foundation. Mentions support from Bob Streeter.

Reviews bank account: South Platte at \$568,103 and statewide at \$4,794,514...funds refreshed this summer. Understands that this does not create wet water; but it is a nonconsumptive project that respects that this is a working healthy river.

Ask for support for \$75,000.

Diane Hoppe: John Stokes, please explain structure; who owns it, water diverted; why not needed.

John Stokes: Irrigated properties to north of Ft Collins; water rights have been conveyed to other entities including Ft. Collins—thus has not been delivering water since 1971. Title work on structure—no one owns the structure anymore; because Ft Collins has purchase water from this ditch, has decided to attempt this project.

Caroline: In application, specific question on water rights so there is details on water rights history. Up until 1972, this was a major diversion structure.

Mike Applegate: Do you have permits in place?

John Stokes: Well into this process. If we can line up this funding package, will commence in earnest for construction process.

Harold Evans: Comment on process.

Kernohan: This was directed through me to members on Rio Chato who had questions for more data; Caroline has provided this. But needs committee has not formally met.

Harold: Did not receive any of this information ahead of time.

Cronin: Todd D. is gone; has no staff in place; bogged down.

Kernohan: Recognizes issue and need for figuring out this process.

Ken Huson: Remember that in terms of the process we have turned down applications in the past for not getting to us in a timely manner; another project was turned down because the project only benefited the application; we need to be careful to apply the same criteria to all applicants. If we approve it today must note that our process has changed.

Harold: I wonder if Ft. Collins would be a more appropriate applicant—I think this is a good project and what Ft Collins is doing to enhance the river is smart and good project—but I wonder if Ft Collins would be a better applicant. Why do we need a fund raiser as a mediator when the municipality would be a better applicant—why do we need another layer? Normally applicant brings money to the table. We are talking about process.

Caroline: Role of Water Trust has been to help Ft Collins raise funds. This seems like a technicality and if it were better for both Ft Collins and Water Trust to be named as the applicants, easy to amend.

Kernohan: Serious problem; but with the Water Trust as a player, \$8.5 million is on the table because of the Water Trust. See analogies with DU projects.

Tom Donnelly: Really this is more of a Larimer County project than a Ft Collins project; we come as friend and partner but we lack staff and support in order to bring this forward.

Bob Streeter: In general, this emphasizes the importance that we have a basin plan that we can all support so that when a project comes in we can compare the project with our needs. The needs assessment is very important; thus crucial to complete needs assessment.

Sean Conway: Asks Eric Wilkinson to explain support.

Eric Wilkinson: We see this structure as an impediment to fish migration up the river.

Doug Rademacher: Asks if we can make the request for the permits to be in place before funding.

Caroline: We expect to get permits before the September CWCB board meeting. Before we go under contract with the state, could easily be a condition for the contract for the state.

Doug R: Hopefully with adoption of grant guidelines will get past process problems; our needs committee met and Caroline has reached out to all of us on the committee and asked for

feedback months ago; speaks in support of the project and the process. Exemplary project; as John Stokes pointed out this is aligned perfectly with the broad based stakeholder group: Poudre Runs Through It; many consumptive users in this group; real commonality and this project fits well into this mission. Therefore, I would encourage the basin roundtable to support it. Thus moves to fund project.

Sean Conway: Seconds.

Doug Rademacher: Even in the Greenway Project we did bring up that this does not produce wet water, are there any phreatophytes you can remove to create new water?

Caroline: Wetland habitat.

Bob Streeter asks John Stokes about program to eradicate tamarisk and Russian olive—yes, eradicated.

Sean Conway: I support the project; comments about different interests and that looks forward to reciprocation in terms of river downstream.

Cronin: Asks for vote: Motion carries unanimously.

## **IX. Next Meeting Dates**

Sean reviews issues surrounding meeting schedule.

- a. July 9 - Tentative
- b. July 24 – Joint Meeting of SPBRT, Metro and Arkansas
- c. 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of the Month. August – December 2013.

Discussion:

Doug Rademacher offers Weld County Service Bldg.

McVicker: What happens if the July 24 meeting results in a collaborative process and more joint meetings seem the way to go?

Cronin: Deal with that on July 24.

Joe Frank: Suggests we meet on July 9 and maybe can skip the August meeting.

Rademacher: Good suggestion; let's play it by ear.

Harold: We can decide that in July.

Cronin: Will lock in July 9 as next meeting; location TBD. Hope to be a short meeting. Will confirm location.

Cronin: Adjourn meeting at 8:21