

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, August 13, 2013
Southwest Weld County Building
4209 Weld County Rd 24 ½, Longmont, CO
4:00 – 8:00 PM**

Please contact Lisa McVicker at mcvickerl@q.com with any changes.

Members and patrons present: Mike Applegate (Northern), Rich Belt (Industrial), Sean Conway (Weld County), Sean Cronin (St. Vrain and Left Hand WCD), Frank Eckhardt (Central WCD), James Ford (Gilpin Munis), Joe Frank (Lower South Platte WCD), Jim Hall (Local Domestic Water Provider), Diane Hoppe (CWCB), Larry Howard (Larimer Muni), Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County), Greg Kernohan (Recreational), Stephen Larson (Broomfield), Kevin Lusk (El Paso County), Connie McLain (Gilpin County), Lisa McVicker (Center of CO WCD), Brent Nation (Morgan Muni), Wayne Skold (Sedgwick County), Doug Robotham (At large), Joel Schneekloth (CSU Extension liaison), Bob Streeter (Environmental Rep), Eric Wilkinson (At-large, IBCC), Jim Yahn (At large, IBCC), Janet Bell (Metro BRT), Matt Cook (HDR), Elizabeth Koebele (CU Boulder), Don Ament (Platte River Recovery Program).

Thanks to Eric Skeie from the IBC with his assistance in taking minutes for the first part of the meeting.

Sean Cronin: Meeting called to order. Heavy agenda for the meeting: Reviewing JESRT statement, meeting and polling results, reviewing SOW & WSRA Guidelines. Must be aware of the deadline under which we need to work: WSRA Goals & outcomes due in 10 months, draft in 16 months, final in 21 months. If we miss a deadline, that delays us 4 months. Critical to keep that in mind. Requested RSVP due to lack of quorum, we feel confident that we have a quorum tonight. We have a sign-up sheet for attendance. Linda James, Connie McLain, Mike Prezel, Larry Ross welcome new members. Introduces Kate McIntire and Wayne Sklod.

Kate McIntire: New position created in CWCB, Public outreach coordinator position created. I will be attending meetings to offer support and craft BIP. Provide consistent messaging across all of the BIPs, look forward to knowing all of you.

Cronin: Welcome Kate. Also welcome to Wayne Sklod from Sedgwick County.

Approval of the Agenda: amendments or additions? Clarification, item 7B, BIP WSRA grant, received additional WSRA Grant on nonconsumptive, note that there are two parts to that. Motion to approve June/July meeting minutes, second. **Approval**

Next Item, JESRT statement, July 24th, joint statement, we had interactive polling. Did on the fly math to capture the essence of polling results: 87% of SPBRT supported recommendations, 0% said no, 13% neutral. As a RT, supportive of recommendations. Take it to the CWCB as early as Sept, maybe Nov. Enter into CWP discussions to understand ESRT. BIP SOW items came from ESRT white paper. Metro also

going to discuss tomorrow night, impressions, thoughts, etc. Tonight is an opportunity to provide comments.

I. Routine Items (Continued, new recorder)

Amendments or Additions to the Agenda – Cronin—approved as presented (Cronin notes that 15 voting members present; need 18 for quorum. More members hopefully will join.)

II. Action Items

- a. Approval of Minutes for June and July: Approved

III. Discussion Items

- a. Joint East Slope Roundtable Statement: Summary (see summary available on IBC website).

Hope is to use this information for the State Water Plan; also elements of this meeting are being introduced into the Basin Implementation Plan. Tonight will be another opportunity to provide comments. Cronin summarizes some of the polling results. Categories: conservation, reuse, planned supply projects, water sharing with agriculture, new Colorado River supply, new East Slope storage (aquifer storage). In summary, over 87% of those in attendance were generally supportive of the recommendations.

Next steps: some have been folded into the Basin Implementation plan. Feedback on meeting or polling results:

Any major concerns that arose during the Joint East Slope Basin Roundtable meeting: (Cronin notes time crunch.)

Bob Streeter: Note that the focus of this white paper is very much one focused on muni and ag and, thus, the environment does not figure prominently, and thus it is all the more important that we put together a strong basin implementation plan.

Jim Hall: Opines that this was an excellent meeting, especially the first part of the meeting, and that during the second hand when ideas were thrown out, the meeting was not totally consistent. But to listen to all of the different perspectives during the first part of the meeting was very worthwhile. Can we consider the joint statement now as well?

Further Comments: First page: Purpose of the Statement: Delete the word “small.” These are not small cities.

Next: Item 3 under Conservation: needs modifying: need to “encourage” not “mandate” high efficiency statements; unless state will ante up cash, which is unlikely to happen.

Cronin: looking at the results, only 54% of the SPBRT agreed with this.

Kevin Lusk: Thought that the framing of the questions did not allow for an accurate reading of the thinking of the group.

Sean Conway: Disagree; my understanding was that the Chairs of the 3 east slope basin roundtables, in concert, came up with the development of these questions (Cronin: yes). I, therefore, have a different take. I was astonished at how much

agreement there was over these questions. Seems as though, whether through many years of dialogue and participation, we seem to know where we want to go. Yes, these were difficult questions, however, it seemed as though these questions were aimed at trying to get to underlying issues. If there was total disagreement, we knew that that would be a good area for focus. I came away feeling that it was a very good meeting; surprised at the level of disagreement in the Arkansas. Overall, felt that it was a very positive first step. Pleased with seeing where we are as a roundtable.

Greg Kernohan: Thought it went well; after 8 years on this roundtable, I am surprised at how many of the issues that the munis are facing have nothing in common with the issues that I am facing; I was struck at the difficulty and the complexity of some of the questions posed.

Larry Howard: I was surprised at the 84% of agreement for our basin given the great disparity of our representation. Seems that the time that we have spent together over these years has really had an effect.

Joe Frank: Thought that the table break-outs were very interesting; and although there was not agreement in terms of recommendations, the dialogue between basins was very worthwhile. From a new supply point of view, even Erick Kuhn was in agreement during some of our discussions of possible recommendations. Next question: what is the goal of the paper that came out of that meeting? Are we looking to roll this into the basin plan?

Cronin: This is meant to be a living document; by design that we are not looking to approve this tonight. This will be rolled into other documents; one goal of the Chairs of the East Slope roundtable is to get in front of the IBCC soon; basin implementation plans will have the opportunity to be modified and likewise, this one also.

Bob Streeter: Bottom of page 5: “large amount of east slope ag water or additional Colorado River water could be needed...” Need to take out the word “could.”

Julio Iturreria: Opines that it was very positive that all these various groups in the basins could meet with up to 87% agreement; facilitation was well handled; “clickers” were used well. Impressive that the fact that the basins could get together for these difficult discussions. Did not observe any negativity in the process; chairs of all roundtables did a remarkable job in pulling this together. A few questions: when we think about getting together...is it three basins or two? Seemed as though the Metro and South Platte were more unified—but this all was a great step forward in presenting a unified east slope roundtable face.

Cronin: The “municipal supply gap” paper will be pushed forward to conclusion and will be a reflection of the voice of the three east slope roundtables.

Sean Conway: The most significant comment came from John Stulp: if you have issues or challenges, we need you to come forward. He said that “folding your arms and not coming forward” is not acceptable at this point. Opines that this comment portends that this is a new day and that we must move forward. And also really impressive that there was 87% agreement from all present. Stulp really set a tone which should serve us well.

Bert Weaver: Expresses agreement with these comments.

Jim Yahn and Eric Wilkinson--from IBCC perspective: Would like to especially express gratitude to Sean Cronin and the other chairs for all the time and energy they put in to making this happen.

Eric: We got the attention of the West Slope. Evident at the IBCC meeting in regards to the discussion of new supply—late on the agenda and not addressed. The unified nature of the three roundtables and the basic principles expressed were very significant.

Doug Robotham: True to form: common enemy was identified: at my table, the state engineer. Heather did a great job facilitating. Would echo what Julio said that there is a real sense of possibility; a very diverse representation of perspectives; will take hard work; a large amount of effort for the next several months, but lots of optimism came from.

Doug Rademacher: Echoes the fact that 87% agreement was impressive.

Sean Cronin: No action on this tonight; this will come back and be folded into further discussions. Turnout was impressive. Message was clear. Expresses appreciation to board members.

c. Legislative, CWCB & IBCC Report

i. IBCC – Wilkinson: Meeting in July; focus of the meeting was to look at the “no-regrets/low regrets” paper. Some of the highlights of the presentations were 1) CO River Plan is the first one in the state; emphasis on grassroots approach and the role of the basin roundtables. Concern about addressing the ag dryup; do not want to live with the status quo; movement at the governor’s office to move forward to make critical decisions after 8 years; values of CO River watershed must be recognized and sustained; focus on nonconsumptive; regulatory incentives were discussed; the water plan—intent to integrate all of the state efforts is focus. Went through all of the steps of the no-regrets/low-regrets—voted on with polling—goal was to review every step until all disagreement could be assuaged. 26 votes present. Highest percentage on one question was 16%--meaning that 4 votes in group could not live with the option presented. Thus, at the end of the long day, with the exception of the nonconsumptive—group voted to come up with alternate language on non-consumptive, all aspects of the no-regrets and low-regrets, unison was reached. Touched briefly on new-supply, ran out of time. This one will be a tough one. Concern about risk management and moving forward with a plan; discussion that development of new supply should be the last issue on the table—exhaust all other options. Many think it could take 20-30 years to focus on new supply; need to start now. Otherwise, ATMs or buy-and-dry will be the option, and ag will be the sacrificial lamb. Interesting discussion at the next meeting.

Jim Yahn: Agrees with Eric and notes that this is very interesting and exciting. Notes that a facilitator is crucial and that Heather and the clickers really helped keep the meeting on target. If you voted no, you had to have a better idea in mind. Can’t just vote no unless you have an idea as an alternative. This was handled well to make people think. Lots of “underlying language” that people could come back to, but for the most part, the meeting went very well and this will all help toward discussion on new supply.

Eric: Some of this underlying language was why some members voted no to begin with. So this rallied attention to the language and helped solve some of the problems.

Sean Cronin: One of the items that Eric W. has brought up was the need to keep a focus on new supply; is there anything you and Jim need from this Roundtable to emphasize the new supply discussion?

Eric W.: We need to continue to keep new supply front and center. Not a perception that the east slope is sending a message that we will get west slope water no matter what but rather than if there is water available, would like to be able to use it for east slope uses. Interesting during closing that the new supply issue was not going to be taken to the CWCB in September; emphasis is that the CWCB really needs to talk about new supply in September and a plan is needed on how to focus on it. Risk management, compact administration, discussion with upper basin states—some of this, the IBCC and roundtables should not a part of but rather there should be a state discussion and how the state will administrate the CO water is needed; this is not for discussion at IBCC but rather strategy on the compact and the state should be the guide on this one to work through. The challenge will be to keep new supply front and center; we know about conservation, ag transfers, IPPs—we know about these—storage and infrastructure conversion to get it to where it needs to be—but new supply is the big challenge

Julio I.: Was there any results or percentages of the polling at the IBCC meeting similar to our basin roundtable meeting? Did you see any greater cracking of the IBCC members on the issues or were the members more forthright?

Eric W.: Yes; results are compiled. Believe that there has been a more collegial atmosphere than before because of the facilitation. When it is shown that 16% has voted no—these must articulate their options.

Julio I.: Agree that new supply does need to have the focus; this will not go away; thus at your next IBCC meeting, seems that we need to take a stand that this must be a priority.

Jim Yahn: Next meeting October 1.

Eric W.: When you see the results (attached? Website?) Would like everyone to focus and decide what might be best returns might be.

Janet Bell: Want to come back to the fact that Jim, Eric and I and Gary Barber really had success in the Flaming Gorge subcommittee process. Benefit of a very good facilitator who kept us on point month after month. Would like to emphasize the successes of the Flaming Gorge committee and that some of the same members are on the new supply committee; making everyone articulate just exactly what is “new supply” to each of the members. Would think that this kind of facilitation could help move this discussion forward.

ii. CWCB – Diane Hoppe. CWCB meets again on September 24-25 in Telluride; met in July in Alamosa. Attended by phone and was able to vote. Would like to bring up the new supply discussion in her basin report at the September meeting.

iii. Legislative Report – Diane Hoppe: Looking for another rep to make legislative reports.

Water Resource Review committee will meet in Steamboat on August 21st during Water Congress. Legislators on that committee are very interested in what the basins are doing and the basin implementation plan. Not a proponent for drafting legislation right

away but rather better to keep our legislative members informed of our progress and actions here as the committee meets in the fall.

Joe Frank: There is a bill on ag conservation that is being discussed; Senator Schwartz (last year SB 19—stripped down) –talk of this coming back and important that we need to be involved in this discussion. State affairs is talking about this.

Doug Robotham: Attended the meeting: Shwartz open to listen; last 15 minutes was devoted to a report on SB 19 dialogue—Cattlemen’s Association has brought together representatives from conservation and ag; group of 15 people. Among the many issues discussed is the fact that SB 19 will be back; makes sense that we have a civil conversation over the subject matter and articulate a statement of principle; a discussion paper has been prepared. Discussion has been broadened to include a Colorado water/conservation/ag alliance. SB 19 was focused on nonconsumptive portion of a water right—need to look at the consumptive portion of the water right. Multiple issues that need to defined and narrowed.

Joe Frank: HB 1248: Drought following guidelines are out; looking for comments; stakeholder meeting on Sept 9 at 1315 Sherman from 1-4. Can find these guidelines on the CWCB website. Please comment.

IV. Rio Chato Committee Update

a. Approve WSRA Guidelines: Kernohan

This was brought in front of membership in June; edited version has been circulated to membership. Please note red-lined version.

Jim Yan: Move to adopt

McVicker: Second

Adopted unanimously.

b. Create WSRA Needs Committee: Kernohan

Guidelines call for committee. Cronin circulates a sign-up form.

Kernohan: Articulates his vision of the committee: In the guidelines, 7 individuals called for—hoping to have representation from many sectors. Example, Larry Howard was the representation for the Josh Aimes project and the Colorado Water Trust project approved in June. We are looking for reps from all sectors—environmental, ag, muni, industrial, etc.

Sean Conway: Motion to form committee.

Doug Rademacher: Seconds.

Motion carries.

Committee: Greg Kernohan, Steve Larson, Doug Robotham, Douglas Rademacher, Frank Eckhardt, Jr., Sean Cronin, Jim Hall

c. Proposal to Amend SPBRT Bylaws: Rich Belt

Reminder that the Rio Chato committee was tasked to address the bylaws; one of the issues in the bylaws was attendance of membership and amending bylaws to facilitate votes when attendance is scarce. Rich Belt headed committee; memo has been circulated to membership.

Rich Belt: Focus is on the fact that we must participate in the basin implementation plan and the state water plan and we cannot do this if we do not have a quorum;

committee members--Larry Howard, John Stencil, and Rich—with input from Mike Shimmin—discussed revisions.

Only one other roundtable has bylaws that address activity level of the membership--item #1 is a restatement of this; Note #1—if member not present for 2 consecutive meetings, considered inactive; list of active and inactive members will be kept; roll to be taken at each meeting. #2: Bylaw amendment proposed: now 1/3 of voting members need to be here; new: 1/3rd of active members will be sufficient for quorum. #3: Several seats were defined by statute; if a member representing one of these entities were to become inactive, the roundtable will contact that entity to encourage a new representative; if at-large member becomes inactive, then roundtable will attempt to find a replacement (item #4).

#5: We must fill these expiring positions; Roundtable will vote to reaffirm that position.

At annual meeting, 50% of the active members will make a quorum.

Until we hear from the statutorily defined groups, we will assume the representation of that group is acceptable.

Bert Weaver: Asks for clarification on municipality rep. Item 3 in new bylaws: change entity to “entities” because of multiple municipalities being represented.

Opines that the entities should be contacted directly.

Larry Howard: In Larimer County the various munis were approached and it came down to the city councils making the appointment.

Rich Belt: Emphasizes that if a member is inactive, the Roundtable will contact the entity.

Rich: Mike Shimmin advises that we need to adopt specific bylaw language before we can act on these. Thus, tonight we need feedback to give to Mike Shimmin and he can draft specific bylaw language and at next meeting we will

Bylaw amendments need 60% of membership (pre amendments) to amend.

Bert Weaver: I think these are excellent suggestions per our previous meeting.

Stephen Larson: Retroactive?

Rich Belt: No, once they are voted...forward moving. Very important that we try for 60% of our membership. Assume that for these are adopted we will need to recruit more active memberships.

Cronin: Will send out a final draft before next meeting.

d. Basin Implementation Plan – Frank and Cronin

The various scopes of the basin implementation plan were emailed on August 9 to membership. Two parts for this; we will also vote on a two-part basin implementation plan WSRA later in meeting.

August 5: Meeting to focus on this work product for basin implementation plan.

Joe Frank: Four documents have been circulated to membership. Joe explains process to work on deliverable. South Platte, Metro, Rio Chato met.

South Platte Roundtable and Metro Roundtable Basin Implementation Plan:

Integrated Scope of Work: Phase I—CWCB and Technical Team Component

Joe Frank discusses importance to focus on existing scope of work for CDM currently and additional work that needs to be addressed in the future.

See draft that circulated on August 9.

Basin Roundtable Responsibilities are highlighted in red: these are aimed at meeting the minimum guidance outlined in the Basin Implementation Plan Guidance document.

Section 2 of Phase I: Updating and evaluating the consumptive and nonconsumptive needs.

Diane Hoppe: Brings attention to the importance to include language on compact obligations.

Joe Frank: Agrees.

Bob Streeter: Important that this should also include basin compacts.

Cronin: Emphasizes that all of these items are being completed by CDM and that our basin is not being asked to take action steps on these.

Frank: Correct. Once we agree on this, CDM can move forward on this.

Streeter: Measurable outcomes should be formatted correctly.

Sean Conway makes motion to approve Phase I of SPBRT Basin Implementation Plan.

Larry Howard: Seconds.

Motion carries.

Sean Conway amends his motion to include the language “substantially as shown”

Larry Howard accepts amendment and seconds.

Motion carries.

Phase II: BRT Consultant Component: WSRA Grant Application:

Frank notes that some of the scope of work is highlighted in blue which are tasks that would be performed by selected BRT consultant(s). Red, again, notes where the BRT will lend guidance.

Section 4: Projects and Methods: Education, Watershed Health, New Multi-Purpose, Cooperative, and Regional Projects, M&I Projects and Methods, Ag Projects & Methods, Nonconsumptive Projects and Methods, Interbasin Projects and Methods, Hydrologic Modeling

Frank: Emphasizes that this is a plan for all stakeholders and the importance of all voices being engaged. Frank emphasizes that Task A on Education, Participation and Outreach is a key component to the entire plan.

Janet Bell: Asks for making sure that reps from economic development will be included in these initial meetings.

Discussion on Phase II continues after dinner.

V. Dinner

Basin Implementation Plan discussion continued. Joe Frank reviews highlights of Phase II document. Asks for comments; Bert Weaver comments on language and addition of fire suppression.

Doug Robotham: Asks for clarification on needs based on specific location; need to take information to a more detailed level that could be more useful.

Sean Cronin: Question came up in terms of whether or not all providers did contribute to SWASI—staff, yes—intend to do this again in 2016. Agrees that this level of detail should be fleshed out in scope of work description for consultant.

Kevin Lusk: Also important to focus on how conservation will be applied to gap.

Cronin: Language should be “substantially as shown” but allows Rio Chato committee to flesh out and this needs to be communicated to consultant.

Frank: Hydrologic modeling. Could be seen as a point-flow. Not to be seen as a “model” to find projects.

Jim Hall: Clarifies that this is not in step with the expensive modeling but rather would be used for specific areas and language could be narrowed so as to make it clear that this is not an attempt to model the entire South Platte.

Julio Iturreria: Suggests adding next steps after the action steps articulated in Task D. Suggests that we should be specific in our focus with this plan. Opines that our integration plan for South Platte should really prove to be a leader for the entire state. Opines that we need to really articulate and lay out our plan, regardless of costs. Important to lay out details and important that we need to not stop at the very general. Should not stop at “more detail needed.” Agrees that this is a moving target.

McVicker: Emphasizes Cronin’s point that these implementation plans should be read and agreed to “substantially as shown” and how these will expand.

Iturreria: Notes that whereas he may be coming at this from a land planning point of view, Frank comes to it as an engineer, and this is a good example of the need to emphasize concern for detail.

Cronin: Emphasizes John Stulp’s point that these will expand.

Iturreria: Stresses that time is of the essence and that it is important that we must be part of the solution.

Steve Malers: HB1278 study on ground water; we are looking at point-flow analysis on that; also, South Platte Decision support system contracts are being completed; hopefully all of this data and work will become part of this. A lot is already going on in terms of “modeling” and will be leveraged; question is how will this be part of this bigger scope of work. Important that this data should be used appropriately.

Jim Hall: Steve makes a good point and it will be a task for the consultant to know about this other work that is under way.

Joe Frank: Discusses Tasks E & F: Implementation Strategies and measurable evaluation as well as final consultant responsibilities.

Rich Belt: This is a joint effort with Metro and they are looking at same scope; process?

Sean Cronin: Metro will look for same feedback and allow chairs to tweak the language.

Rich: Assuming we get the funding, we will jointly select a consultant?

Agree.

VI. Sub-Committee Updates

a. Education Sub-Committee – Schneekloth

October 7: Valuing Colorado’s Agriculture: A Workshop for Water Policy Makers

In conjunction with Arkansas basin; PEPO will have a \$2000 per basin and are looking for each basin to contribute and then fund a video for later viewing.

See www.coagwater.org

Looking for participation from elected officials.

Sean Conway: Notes that Congress is in session and wonders about the benefit of the aide of the federal legislature being in attendance.

Sean Cronin: The Arkansas and COAG really steering this. Joint meeting helped bring focus to the east slope.

Joel: More in September

Next PEPO meeting in September

b. Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee – Streeter

Met several times in the last month. Focusing on goals and objectives for nonconsumptive needs. Will seek help from CDM. Need to look at opportunities of where are priority areas are that could be benefitted from ag and muni projects; came up with a process for the nonconsumptive portion of the implementation plan: look again at the maps that the RT has approved where areas have been identified based on attributes; need to look at those attributes to study whether or not there are action steps that need to be taken and these could be worked into existing IPPS or new projects; thus, came up with a statement of work (circulated on Aug 13) and this statement would mesh together with the implementation plan that Joe Frank has presented. Agree strongly with Joe and Eric and Jim—we worry about ag dryup from environmental and recreational point of view because the South Platte rec and environmental benefits are severely impacted from ag dryup; discussed economic impacts as well from ag dryup. Therefore as all projects go forward, must look at rec and enviro impacts. Also, need to note the impact to common species that come from ag dryup. Unsure of what these are so would like some projections from a consultant. Greg, Doug, Larry: Comments? Another meeting upcoming in September.

Larry Howard: Need to look at ways to leverage benefits for nonconsumptive uses; important to work together.

Doug Robotham: We envision coordination and interaction between contractor that is tasked with the basin implementation plan as well as the nonconsumptive plan. Rio Chato committee will need to be aware of this.

Sean Conway: Appreciates Streeter's comments and overview.

c. Phreatophyte Sub-Committee – Streeter

No report. Any ideas from anyone to rejuvenate the committee please contact Bob.

d. Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee – Frank

No report.

e. Groundwater Sub-Committee – Frank

Reminder that all are welcome to these meetings. Reagan Waskam unable to attend this meeting today, but plans on attending the September meeting to give update for feedback on this HB 1278 study.

Sean Conway: My understanding is that this will be presented to the legislature first, yes? Does Reagan plan to have recommendations as part of the report?

Joe Frank: Interim report in October is my understanding. Recommendations will be included if the Act calls for it.

f. Executive Sub-Committee – Cronin

Some of the executive committee met with staffer from Senator Udall's office--Sean, Eric W., Harold Evans, Jim Yahn, Becky with CWCB. Met with Pam Shadduck—rep with Udall's office—and another rep from Udall's office. Asked for an overview of our water issues. Explained the issues at hand.

Sean Conway expresses thanks to Pam Shadduck and Udall's office. They seemed interested in learning about projects; Eric W. took care of that. Was a positive conversation; appreciated time and interest. Good step in moving the process forward. Sean Cronin: Opines that the “east coast bias” seemed to be problematic; need for more education about what really ag is about here in Colorado.

Sean Cronin: Some members have asked for time each month for an update on IPPs. We did talk about Chatfield, NISP, and Halligan-Seaman.

McVicker: EIS on Chatfield!

VII. WSRA Proposal/Approval

a. Water Development Feasibility of Colorado State Land Board Property Along the Lower South Platte River – Greg Kernohan

This project will look for top 10 recharge facilities on state lands; do coring and other investigative work. This is a revenue generating project for state-land agency. Will study 18,000 acres of state land board and find at least one that is feasible. Looking from Denver out to state line.

DU and state land board will contribute. This will be similar to other projects in past. State land board does not know what it owns as far as water rights. We can use some of their water or hope to entice municipal water providers as a contributor.

Doug Robotham: State land board owns 2,000+ water rights most in South Platte Basin; significant rights along the South Platte River. This is very exciting that they are thinking actively about how to create a revenue source to help school kids and also to support environmental aspects as well.

Total request: \$33,663 from South Platte Basin Roundtable.

Janet Bell: Question on use of water: could be used by anyone they agree to lease or sell to?

Greg K: Will use Lower South Platte WCD as example; whoever the water provider is will have the use of that water.

Janet: Am sensitive to the use of water and being able to sell that water to an oil and gas company for fracking.

Greg K: Have not worked in the past with any oil and gas companies.

McVicker: Moves to approve DU's application as presented.

Bert Weaver: Seconds.

Motion carries.

b. Basin Implementation Plan—Joe Frank

Two basin implementation plan WSRA applications; these were separated. The chairs of the RTs asked for a stream-lined process so that these are 2 page applications. WSRA applications have a 30 day deadline before it goes in front of CWCB. We are past this but staff has told us that we can push forward these WSRA's that are connected to the Basin Implementation plan.

We have not yet hired a contractor for implementation plan and are not yet sure how the dollars will meet up. Therefore decided that it would be better to keep the non-consumptive portion to the basin implementation plan separate from the general basin implementation plan. Therefore two separate grant requests. These will be presented as two separate applications to CWCB but they all fall under Basin Implementation plan. Have reviewed the basin implementation plan from Joe Frank (see above). Bob Streeter will now give overview of non-consumptive WSRA.

- 1) Request for \$58,000 from SPBRT, Metro RT and Statewide Account for a total of \$174,000.

Need to emphasize again that we would move for approval as “substantially presented.”

This is a group product in order to map nonconsumptive reaches and the attributes with them; then look at attributes important to any of those mapped reaches and to look at what would be important and needed to maintain or benefit those attributes. Then will look at consumptive IPPs and nonconsumptive reaches and impact; what is nexus and what are opportunities within that IPP to sustain and benefit those attributes. Emphasis that this is not to impeded IPPs but to benefit nonconsumptive attributes. Concern on ag dryup again focused upon in terms of impact on nonconsumptive attributes; look at land that may be slated for dryup and what nonconsumptive attributes could be impacted—i.e. risk analysis.

Greg K.: Much of this ag dryup is based on willing buyer and willing seller; this is unsustainable for rec and environmental attributes. Therefore need risk analysis to study and understand better what interactions between economic, rec and environmental impact.

Joe Frank: Would you be looking at land owned by providers or how are you looking at land that may be dried up?

Bob Streeter: For example, looking at the land that Thornton has bought; we will be looking at land where transactions have already occurred.

Sean Conway: Help me understand under your risk analysis—how do you prevent an entity—privately owned entity—say Thornton—how do you impact their decisions?

Agree that this is very much needed; these assets are going away and will create a dust bowl. But then what is the next step?

Bob Streeter: Education on mitigation steps or steps that might be presented to the county commissioners.

Joe Frank: Recommendations; not preventive actions.

Sean Conway: Could make a change from the legislature, but bottom line is the farmers have the water and the municipalities need it. Important to approach this carefully.

Bob Streeter: Thinking that this would be of importance to the water utility in hopes of being a good neighbor.

Jim Yahn: I think that this helps us in our new supply conversation; if we have this information to show how ag dryup hits the economy as well as individual farmers.

Gary Herman: Important to take into account that Central WCD leases a lot of this water at this point.

Janet Bell: One of my concerns is asking if the risk analysis will include the loss of the return flows and the impact over time. Other concern: the value of this study is that you are opening the door as another incentive that might offer the basis for possible legislation of another kind of funding for a farmer who would have an alternative to selling the water off the farm, but that this could be a kind of water reserve account for such a farmer. The time is different and this is a good time for these kinds of studies. Also the fact that you are looking at the agriculture economy is an important element in this study.

Greg K.: I would not know how to tackle the return flows. Return flows can come back to the river in many different ways. Other concerns that you bring up, these are being included in the studies of the alternative ag transfers.

Bob Streeter: Brings attention to how this application will include and provide information for public review and to mesh this with the consumptive project; may be the same contractor but opined that it was important to have a separate nonconsumptive plan

Sean Cronin summarizes request for funds.

Sean asks for members to focus on the application for the Basin Implementation Plan as presented by Joe Frank above and that the members consider both applications for approval concurrently.

South Metro Water Supply Authority and Northern Water as co-applicants.

Total: \$329,600.

\$41,200 from SPBRT and Metro RT; \$329,600 from state account.

Questions:

Jim Hall: Concern on second application because many of the IPPs involve reuse, and have not had a chance to really think about the impacts of the nonconsumptive application.

I understand your comment focusing on working with the providers is important.

Greg Kernohan: A good portion of this application is to emphasize that our best way forward is to work with all players in the IPPs.

Bob Streeter: Our entire focus with nonconsumptive uses is the importance of working with consumptive players. Any word smithing that could help?

Jim Hall: I do see your emphasis on multi-use. Yes.

Joe Frank: I remember that when we mapped our attributes we put them out there for benefits but not in any way to stop any projects; I read this as an attempt to provide communication and to join the efforts of consumptive and nonconsumptive uses.

Doug Robotham: Speaking on behalf of the nonconsumptive committee, if we are able to manage these time frames and be responsive to the CWCB schedule, this

reflects a strong desire to make sure that this statement of work absolutely addresses all the concerns around the table. We have a genuine desire to make sure that everyone is comfortable with the articulation in the application.

Larry Howard: As a municipal rep on the nonconsumptive needs group, would like to reinforce that there was much concern about how this would mesh with the consumptive portion of the Basin Implementation WSRA. There was much discussion about how to focus on how a project could fulfill the needs of both consumptive and nonconsumptive; thus, a real active thought process that led to the articulation of the steps that are included in this WSRA. The final step and focus is to really try to make this work with the other Basin Implementation WSRA.

Diane Hoppe: Please review the dollar figures for the nonconsumptive budget: \$58,000 from SPBRT, Metro, and State for a total of \$174,000.

McVicker: Moves to approve the WSRA for the Basin Implementation Plan from Ducks Unlimited as Applicant as substantially presented.

Doug Robotham: Second
Motion Carries.

Jim Yahn: Moves to approve the WSRA for the Basin Implementation Plan from the South Metro Water Authority and Northern Water as Co-Applicant as substantially presented.

Jim Ford: Seconds.

Patron: How will the decision be made about choosing the consultant?

Sean Cronin: Explains the process, involving Rio Chato and the Chairs, and then will bring forth to the Roundtables.

Motion Carries.

VIII. Items from membership/attendees

Note that Congressman Polis will be in town tomorrow; good opportunity to meet with our congressman. Patron will attend and will emphasize to the congressman the need to move our projects along. 11:45 at Guarantee National Bank in Berthoud

Sean Cronin adjourns meeting at 8:15 pm

Next Meeting Dates

September 10, 2013: SPBRT meeting: 4 pm Weld County