

South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, October 8, 2013
Southwest Weld County Building

Members and patrons present: Jim Hall (local domestic water provider), Sean Conway (Weld County), Lynda James (Upper South Platte Water Conservancy District), Kent Swedlund (Logan County), Brent Nation (Morgan munis), Greg Kernohan (Ducks Unlimited), Mike Applegate (Northern Water), Eric Wilkinson (IBCC), Doug Robotham (Nature Conservancy), Mike Brazell (Park County), Diane Hoppe (CWCB Board—South Platte Basin), Rich Belt (Industrial), Connie McLain (Gilpin County), John Stencil (Larmier County Legislative Rept), Frank Eckhardt (Central Water Conservancy District), Gene Bauerle (RRWCD), Larry Howard (Larimer Munis), Jeffrey Boring (Larimer County), Kevin Lusk (El Paso County), Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County), Janet Bell (Metro Roundtable), Bob Streeter (Environmental At Large), Jim Ford (Gilpin County Muni), Steve Larson (Broomfield), Ken Huson (Boulder County Munis), Joe Frank (LSPWCD), Sean Cronin (St Vrain's Left Hand WCD), Larry Ross (Elbert County), Lisa McVicker (Center of CO WCD).

(Recording secretary arrives 30 minutes into the presentations.)

Welcome and Introductions - *Cronin*

Amendments or Additions to the Agenda - *Cronin*

Discussion Items (See details below)

2013 Flood Update – *Cronin*

i. FEMA/CO OEM (no one present from FEMA)

ii. CWCB (Kirk Russell, Kevin Houck)

DWR (Scott Cuthbertson)

iii. CPW (Greg Gerlich)

iv. NRCS

v. Army Corps of Engineers (Dick Taylor)

b. 2013 Flood, Member Report

FEMA presentation/CWCB presentation:

Overview of state and national assistance and procedures.

Questions from presentation:

Can't be a group of private borrowers.

Ditch questions. Scott C. Culbertson, Deputy State: Flood Response and Recovery Plans: DWR

This concept must be formally voted on; request must be in by noon on Oct 16 for Oct 21 board meeting; information on website; next opportunity is in November—deadline: November 1.

Will take about a month to get under contract. The appropriate forum will be on the website by Oct 9.

Joe Frank: \$15 million ready right now...more money expected? Yes.

What is the source of this money: Revolving loan program; seeded by General Assembly; new fund from severance tax revenues; these accounts can be interchanged.

Kirk Russell (Kevin Houck) with CWCB will be here for questions.

Kevin....from DWR: questions from FEMA assistance program as it relates to private companies; someone from FEMA needs to answer these; but there is a process "Form for Request for Public Assistance"—deadline is Oct 31; thus, suggestion to anyone with damaged infrastructure, turn this request in by Oct 31.

Sean Cronin: FEMA is saying apply no matter what and do not miss the deadline.

Sean Cronin: Scott Culbertson: Deputy State Engineer:

Responsibility for dam safety program—emergency dam inspections and hydrology program; Scott notes presence of many water commissioners and water district; please get to know them.

--NOAA precipitation: this exceeded the 1 in 1000 occurrence; this exceeded the 1000 year storm; meaning that every year a storm like this could happen...1 in 1000 chance; this could happen again yet not equal to a One thousand Year Storm.

Underestimates are because could not fill and spill fast enough.

--Dams in affected areas: 205 dams needed inspections; 12 safety engineers; 50 volunteer PEs; Dynamic: three category of dams: low hazard dam—based on consequences of the failure; significant hazard dam: significant damage but no loss of life; high hazard dam—loss of life.

9 low hazard dams failed in the first 4-5 days; these are designed for 100 year event; once they overtop, start failing; typically low volumes, therefore not adding a significant amount of water to the flooding rivers; do not represent a threat to human safety;

--significant high hazard dams—these are designed to higher dams—to 1000 year event—they performed magnificently; but if the river is still coming at them, they will fill and spill; all the reservoirs in the hills have never spilled water in the past; neighbors did not understand the event of spilling—safely but scary; citizens called on these because of the spills;

--report on the 205 dams needing inspections—none are in a case of urgent concern; those of concern have been breached or drained; trying still to get water to Lyons and those dams are safe above them.

--rain turns into river flow; Friday Sept 14 through following week—only gauge operating peaked at 50,600 CFS at Fort Morgan gage on Saturday night.

--river is still draining; this storm even has yet to exceed, normal level is at 200 CFS currently at 2500 CFS

--comparison: Fort Morgan, June 1965, 10,000 at Ft Morgan

--impact of hydraulic program see slide with destroyed structures and surviving structures; looking at 350,000 damages—funded by CWCB and volunteer donations;

--diversion structures: FEMA needs a preliminary damage assessment—assistance to help counties hit quota; some diversions that have been damaged are still operating thanks to local work efforts

--Recovery effort: 1) install temporary gages for administration so division engineer can continue to manage calls; 2) assist with stream debris removal / logistics of stream alignment (big concern); 3) Repair/replace permanent gages; 4) assist with SWSPs for head gate

relocations; and 5) Reconstitute remote data collection network. In August, every diversion was on a remote data recorder; must figure out how to get these up and running.

Questions of Scott:

Has there been an estimate of damages? Not yet, know of one that is between 2-3 million; but not sure.

Question on how Scott's group is assisting—working with Corps of Engineers and other federal agencies to help stream line help.

Question about tribs past Kersey? No, don't know; lost Kersey. Issue was the bull's eye because of the timing of the rain storm and the duration was such that all those tribs converged on Kersey.

Question on moving head gate—what advice for ditch companies that have to move this 37-86—water court question—how to go over others property, etc.—37-8—how one can access their diversion points; if your attorney determines that you need to go to Water Court, we can provide a temporary working permit so that you can access these.

Question: RE: change to standards?

Not the standards (yet speaking prematurely because of collection of data) we will have to change how we assess the low hazard domains; example: Estes Park. We had just opened HWY 7 when we found a troubled dam above HWY 7—we had to take control of the dam; only equipment available was a volunteer fire truck, had this dam gone, it would have taken out Hwy 7...thus, there will be analysis and may change some protocols.

CO Parks and Wildlife: Greg Gerlich: State wide fishery manager; overview of agency response; first responders—boats and equipment and people with white water experience; prompt responses to assist state patrol—from emergency calls to woman who asked what kind of fish were in her basement. Many parks sustained serious damage; 2 parks closed; 31 state wildlife areas that were impacted; initial estimates 14 million for this state agency alone; few fishery units impacted—Ft Collins was the most severely impacted, fish were unsupervised for a few days;) Handout on diversion structures that were damaged showing how impact happened without impacting water rights. Contact point is Greg.

Another example: East River on Gunnison—diversion structures that were impeding fish passage when they were under diversion—have worked with owners so that the salmon can more easily pass without injury to senior water users. Please contact Greg with any questions.

Most of fishery biologists have experience with in-stream flow and hydro structure;

Sean Cronin: Those who are owners of diversion structures there is an effort to come up with funds to help you work with Parks and Wildlife to leverage funds to benefit you.

Steve More: US Army Corps of Engineers: 404 permitting realities;

Dick Taylor out of Omaha District Office: 2 ongoing efforts here: 1) regulatory office where Steve resides—issuing permits for any needed repairs; extra staff here in the Denver regulatory office to help expedite this; see handout; and 2) support of FEMA; FEMA's technical team here; we help provide technical assistance that FEMA may need.

Question: Pilot Springs Water District—we have been waiting for our permit for 2 weeks;

Steve: We are turning around our nation-wide permit in 2-3 days; need to turn this around quickly. Steve asks to meet with the Pilot Springs Water rep.

In the 1976 flood, had federal assistance in rebuilding river.

Dick: Currently the Corps does not have that authority; FEMA can hire us to do work with them; we do have various planning projects that can help with that; but unfamiliar with the 1976 work.

Question: Could you expand on stream restoration?

Dick: Yes, CO River Conservation Board is leading the multi-agency board that is focusing on stream restoration efforts; this is a local effort in determining where the stream should be moved in order put the stream back.

So if a head gate was washed out and the river was moved 100 yards, who should we contact?

Dick: You need to contact your state; these are all state and local decisions; if it rises to the level where FEMA is involved, we can be involved.

Sean Cronin: To clarify: two different situations: infrastructure not intact, but river is or if the river is now away from the infrastructure, can they apply under an ag exemption?

Greg: If there is whole restoration of the channel—then this is the regulatory process, but the decision on what that channel will look at –local decision.

RE: ag exemption: if you have an infrastructure that is at the same place, this will fall under the ag exemption and is not regulated under the Clean Water Act; but where the river has shifted, this will be case by case and some may require a permit.

Question: Thus if we don't build the river back—no permit needed, ag exemption? Yes, correct.

Question: Regulatory office in Denver—see one page sheet—if existing road crossing that is washed out—if you build it in the same place and the same bridge—can rebuild it, but do need to be in compliance with ESP and Historic places issues—than you are covered under nation-wide permit, and these are being turned around in 2 days.

Question: Potential for historic preservation review—most of our structures are old; any sense in getting permits for getting repair for structures for over 150 years?

Steve: Right now have not seen any hold ups.

Sean asks anyone present who would like to share experience with their tributary: St Vrain, Poudre, etc.

Jim Hall: Poudre: Poudre fared better than any other tribs (St Vrain, Boulder Creek, Big Thompson)—Greeley—one of our main lines broke, but redundancy allowed to cover; Watson Lake—impacted; 2-3 diversions on Poudre impacted; but Greeley, have several north-south streets in Greeley and we block these off; no impact on our waste water treatment plant. However, Evans was a bulls eye—this is the South Platte right before Kersey—no flush order for their treatment plan and many residences in low lying areas severely impacted;

Susan: Ft Collins: Poudre compared to other tribs did not get hit as hard; Ft Collins, this is more like a 1 in 50 year event; did not impact water treatment or waste water treatment; some of the natural areas around the river were good to have from a planning perspective.

Jim: Several gravel pits are now full and lower farm land near the river – but we did have a 10,000 ft peak, by the time it reached Greeley, lowered to 5,000. Also have a system on Big Thompson that did not sustain bad damage.

Larry Howard: Larimer Muni: Big Thompson: serious damage; many of the infrastructure damaged; heavy damage to many of these structures; working to look for assistance for ditch companies; several gravel pits completely filled in; Idlewild completely filled in with cobble and

rock; power house was filled with water and silt and 2000 ft of in stock washed out; city council in Loveland is discussing which direction to go with this project—whether to restore or abandon. City of Loveland—effect on pipelines bringing water into town, all run parallel to one water treatment plant; along side of the river west of Loveland, the river moved 100 yds and exposed all three of these water lines; could therefore see the history back to 1887; 3 inch line was broken apart; 36 inch line exposed—floating in water; 3rd line was exposed but did not move—thus able to stay in service and did not lose our service to the majority of the population, only about 75 people west of town; the project to save this water supply for a population of 75,000 challenging; gratitude to the agencies who helped and were able to save the pipelines. The only way to get from one side of Loveland to the other was to travel through Greeley.

Eric Wilkinson: Some damage on the CBT on one of the canal—blowout of the canal that runs parallel to the St Vrain and also damage on the Boulder Canal—but should be fixed by Monday, Oct 14. Still no determination on what happened in the Big Thomson canyon; we fared very well through all this; lucky.

John Stencil: Little Thompson on Hwy 36—we did lose some houses and bridges; have been traveling to Black Hawk to get here. Estes Park is doing well; Hwy 7 busy and the Army Corps of Engineers working diligently. David Jesup is here who lives in the narrows on the Big Thompson: David: Rough on our ranch bldgs; the river bed is 4-6 ft higher than it was because of the rubble that blasted out of the canyon; thus standing on the roads that we used to look down at the river, now looking up...river bed is higher than it was.

PE from State: Really encourage everyone to resist urge to look; talking about implementing emergency controls that would obstruct anyone who want to look.

Ken Huson: Boulder County eye of storm; City of Boulder did fairly well although some problems with treatment; Left Hand Creek—significant damage; Jamestown suffered greatly; Left Hand Water District entire supply taken away—stream and point of diversion totally separated; water supply interrupted; Longmont and the St Vrain Creek lost every single ag ditch in the basin; this one is left because the river moved; no ag ditches anywhere; many the river is not near anywhere; the main stem of the St Vrain filled with rock, trees and houses, reached out of the creek, and started unzipping the gravel pits; Longmont lost every one of our native water supplies; some of these we cannot get to yet; the flood was so big in North St Vrain canyon—scoured it—no floor, nothing from canyon wall to canyon wall; for ag ditches it will be a huge challenge to work on this; we have begun getting permits out of the Corps—have 11 permits so far; get in and get in quick—sooner that you get in sooner you will get the permits; luckily for us in Longmont, five different sources of supply and we lost 4 of the 5, one pipeline left from Carter Lake. We will be okay but it has been a wild ride.

Sean Cronin: The Left Hand Conservancy District has 103 reports in District 5 and has now approximately \$9 million in damages and this represents 50% of the ditches, this is just ag ditches and irrigation ditches; this will rise.

Frank Eckhardt: Central Water Conservancy District has seen \$1 million in damage to slurry walls and other infrastructure. Ag ditches were broken out.

Todd Doherty: Boulder Creek: Similar extent of damages in Longmont; many ditches breeched, sedimentation, river has moved, head gates gone; lots of river damage for Boulder Creek; South Boulder Creek fared well, but some of the small tribs were blown out—Coal Creek serious

damage; working to assess damage; notes that Chris Sturm, under Kevin How, trying to coordinate a Boulder Stream Team—any interest, shooting for next week to get out there to look at short term solutions for getting these ditches on line.

Sea Conway: Weld County: Trillion gals of water from the Poudre, St Vrain and Big Thompson. Focus: middle of harvest, thus trying to get farm to market roads open; 16th Sept 109 roads closed; now down to 20. Weld Cty 13—just led contract—14 day performance, hope to have it open on Oct 24; Weld Cty 61—near Kersey, should be open by Oct 24; lots of roads are open. Much help from many counties—thanks to Douglas County, Otero County; Alamosa—sending 4 dump trucks—thus going from 109 roads to 20 in less than 1 month, amazing. All of infrastructure should be open by the end of the month; damage to irrigation ditches and how to move forward still a challenge. We went through \$15 million in five minutes, thus question is what will we be doing to free up additional resources...governor's office? FEMA will not reimburse anything that does not have a municipal component—thus if you do not supply water to a muni—if just ag purposes—no FEMA money. Thus we need

Patron: How about fracking fluid sloshing around?

Sean: Denver Post story – all contamination is Ecoli coming from waste water plants. This is the biggest concern; the Post reports that they are not finding contamination from oil and gas; 43,000 gals of oil spill out of one trillion gals of water.

Weld County health department on the scene; many of these wells were shut in; Conway says minimum containment and that the real problem is Ecoli.

Patron: Oil and gas spills: 42, 000 gals; fracking fluid 17,000 gals; thus big issue is ecoli.

Joe Frank: Had time and attenuation on our time; Morgan Cty all the way to state line—20,000 cfs left the state line; 3 million acft=trillion gals of water. In our area, significant damage, but most of the damage for ditch companies is being fixed; top end of the district in Morgan Cty cannot get to their system yet and are estimating longer times for fixing; Morgan Cty 46 structures that were damaged and 30 that were destroyed; town of Sterling—no flush order because the lift stations were compromised; City of Sterling lost great economic problems because of the waste water plant being so compromised; all business had to shut down.

Patron: Ft Collins, Greeley and Windsor—ditch companies had reservoirs that could be filled; Windsor had a reservoir that could have been used; but these three ditches running full steam meant lesser harm.

Patron: Spilled crude oil: have tromped miles looking for livestock; has seen lots of tipped crude oil tanks, have seen no spilled oil. Dilution with so much water means that little oil contamination.

Action Item: Emergency flood Recover: (WSRA Proposal/Approval) (moved up on agenda):

Sean Cronin: Northern Water has stepped up to be the fiscal agent for this grant.

Becky Mitchell CWCB and Eric Wilkinson:

Becky: This is unusual procedure; however, moved on call from Sean Cronin and response from Northern; therefore CWCB scrambled in order to present a grant to the Board the next day; looking at funding sources—have committed 100% of the funds to this project; WISE had a recommended grant of 1.2 million to give a little, therefore, we were able to put together everything we had...\$1.6 million--\$1.5 out of state wide fund and the proposal will be matching funds from basin fund--\$150,000 from basin fund. This is the fastest way we could do this at

CWCB and get this money out on the grant for an assessment to see what needs to be done. Will be working on a streamlined process. Northern is the hero in the room to enable the alacrity of response. South \$460,000 (does not include the \$150,000 or basin implementation plan which has been approved by the Board); Metro has \$450,000 in its account; perhaps collaboration could be pursued with Metro.

Eric Wilkinson: Catalyst for this is focused on how to get money out as quickly as possible; CWCB will have to contract with each grantee to go through this therefore Northern will contract with the State and then Northern will contract individually with each water user to do what is necessary to hit minimum regulations; form of contract with water users will be similar to emergency water user contract—fairly simple—will resemble the contracts that came out of the High Park Fire. This will meet the state's needs for process. This will be based on criteria that is being worked upon with the CWCB; expenditures will be documented, Northern will compile data and will forward to the state, the state will reimburse Northern; hope is to turn around reimbursement within 45-60 days; reimbursement cycle will not occur more than once a month.

Criteria is really focused on spreading the money out, not just focusing on one or two projects; focus is 1) to provide funds for technical assistance needed for projects; decision is that there would be \$25,000 for each project that needs technical assistance; projects: diversion gate on head gate or breach on ditch or sluice way washed out—thus can bifurcate the project into separate units—idea is that each entity (entity=each diversion point and anyone that diverts at that diversion point = entity) so ditch and reservoir company that diverts from the same ditch will have to come together as one entity; each entity can have up to five projects=\$100,000; dividing into projects because everyone working with CWCB—will review every 2 weeks then go to CWCB for their approval. Multiple projects—can get one in the first in the first review period and second in the second phase, etc., this way everyone gets a proverbial bite out of the apple. (Write Becky to ask for Memo on these guidelines.)

Eric gives details of program; money available on execution on the contract; anything that you spent after contract; anything that you spent after Sept 9 would be considered as in-kind Water conveyance and water divergence and stream rechanneling; water applicants must have a water right with the structure. Thus land owners along the river that want help, this does not apply.

These are grants not loans; with approval of CWCB, we will ask that one of the entities need to be the point person but all entities must sign the contract.

John Stencil: Roundtable needs to approve the request for \$150,000

Sean Conway: Seconds and says thank you to Sean, Becky and Eric and Northern for stepping up. Also would like to echo the suggestion to contact the Metro Roundtable.

Vote: Unanimous vote.

Question from Patron: Who is contact person that will be designated at Northern Water; Amy Johnson or Gerry Gibbons?

Sean: Question to Becky: Can Craig or Becky provide information about telling people that this is available via the CWCB website; subscribe for getting announcements; go to water management section of CWCB website and see water supply planning section—this will show ways of signing up this. Also, you can contact Becky: Rebecca Mitchell 3008663441 ext 3217; if you have trouble, call Becky and she will direct you to how to sign up; see also Northern's

websites; we will also pull together any other grant funding but at this point in time we will do what we can with what we have.

Sean: If this comes together by Thursday, October 10, will it be announced?

Eric: We are still working on the application form; it should not take more than one-two hours to fill out the application; minimal amount of information to meet the state's requirements for state funds. It is our intent to have the document and application ready today, but...working as fast as we can.

Question: Need preliminary damage assessment prior to application?

No, only estimated project costs, where it is, water rights associated with it, entities involved, and why you think it qualifies.

Eric: If you are going to have the same contractor, this would be one application.

Question: Can you clarify what is covered: if ditch is completely silted in, covered?

Yes, this is flood restoration.

First come first serve. I imagine that we will get many the first time through but this is why if you have multiple projects looking for multiple grants, you will be in the next stage; this is so we can spread the money as far as possible.

Becky: The goal is to reach as many as we can with our limited funds.

Eric: We realize that \$25,000 is not much considering what you are facing but this is seed money.

Patron: Any engineering companies here?

Todd: Will Northern make decisions?

Eric: No CWCB will make these decisions; we will tabulate and send on to CWCB staff, not the board. Northern will approve the contract with Northern.

Sean Cronin: The roundtable has approved the grant. Summarizes the previous 2 hours of presentations and information. Explains the purpose of the roundtable. Thanks everyone for attending.

Dinner

Action item: Approval of the minutes:

Motion and second: motion carries

Notes change in name tags: Green tags are voting members; white tags non-voting members or staff; please look for your name tag when you arrive.

Rich: Rio Chato committee to look at membership roster; the roundtable has asked Rio Chato to shake out the membership; in order to change Bylaws so we can have a quorum we need significant presence of

Jeffrey Boring: Larimer County rep; natural resources expert; is taking Tom Donnelly's place; has lived in Larimer County for 6 years; has worked on restoration projects; coordinates other land management projects in the county; before coming to Larimer County, Big Thompson.

Lynda James: Member of Upper South Platte Water Conservancy District; very excited to be here. Background in water and former county commissioner.

Craig Godbout: CWCB staff; intern for several years; finishing Masters in Ag at CSU; internship through Regan Waskom at the Water Institute; many thanks to many professors and CWCB staff; privilege to be here.

Regular Agenda Items:

- 1) IBCC report: Eric Wilkinson; most of the meeting was concentrated on the new supply issue; began with review of memo to Board on no regrets/low regrets as it applies to new supply; new supply subcommittee met before the IBCC meeting; much discussion about the gap and where the gap is, what timing of the gap that would be served by a new supply project; opines that the gap garnished too much focus—it is evident that we have a gap between now and 2050. One issue that arose was that some basins wanted to define an ag gap and to make an attempt to bring in new supply for new ag, particularly in Yampa and White basins. Need discussion at the basin roundtable about the ag gap; we recognize an ag gap (since 1859) but our concern is more on metro gap because of the impact on gap; thus, something to discuss here.

Another discussion of cooperative agreements—WISE, CO River agreement, MOU; any kind of collaboration; decision was that these are very different in nature.

Polling exercise associated with new supply—purpose was to help focus the discussion on new supply; gave good direction to the IBCC; electronic polling seems to really produce more candid discussions; a good percentage agreed on individual topics and then a representative number not in agreement; therefore, the poll really showed that discussion needs to develop.

Discussion on WSRA modifications; this will be addressed between CWCB and the IBCC on Oct 18.

Appears that there exists a faction that does not want to address new supply; that instead IBCC should look at other three “legs of the stool” as well as reuse; response from our IBCC members are that, no, we must keep a focus on new supply; need to go forward with discussions and studies; no need to have all answers before continuing effort on studying new supply.

Julio Iturreria: Wants to reiterate what you said; as member of Metro Roundtable, agree; the whole purpose of the white papers is exactly this—we must have a focus on all the elements; we cannot go after ag dryup; must also look at new water supplies for this entire area; thus, as a rep on Metro, we agree with this stance; we want to protect ag at virtually all costs; this might be one of the reasons that there has been such a ripple in the entire state; focus on new supply is the only way to go.

Kevin Lusk: Wants to make clear that the IPPs are not new development; as a roundtable, Front Range and east slope that there is not bait and switch...no sacrifice of new development in the name of IPPS.

Eric: New supply is really about development of CO River water.

Joe: Important for us to embrace joint projects and multi-purpose projects, any opportunities need to address these; also important to verbalize that our IPPS are not on the table; must emphasize that the looming municipal gap is here.

Larry Ross (Elbert County): Represent a different dynamic; low population; no river; the 800 lb guerilla is the high economic value of water development in adjacent counties and the temptation to exploit our confined aquifers to the detriment of our constituents and farmers; piecing together the impact from your areas all the way to Elbert County, I am here to support you; new development is the only way to go.

Bob Streeter: Ag is so important from an environmental point along the South Platte, another reason to fully support new supply.

- 2) CWCB: Diane Hoppe: Much of what I would report has been discussed; meeting in Telluride on Sept 25 and 26 as well as the CWCB finance committee. Appreciates listening to other CWCB members discussing the decisions that were made. The South Platte flood was the center of many discussions; gratifying to see many board members coming forward to support the South Platte basin to get through this historic event. Thanks to everyone who was able to describe the impact of this flood as this will help her convey her advocacy for us. Did approve several of the grants that came forward: 1) Josh Aims diversion project; 2) State land board South Platte recharge project (DU); and 2) South Platte and Metro basin implementation program—all approved.

Other water loan projects approved: Windsor—reservoir; Greeley/Loveland reservoir improvement; and water rights program.

Also had a good report on construction funds needed to put construction fund together for this year.

Special Board meeting on Oct 21—South Platte flooding issues will be focus; must comment on the work that Sean Cronin, Becky Mitchell and Eric Wilkinson put into getting no interest loans but work is not done; please come forward with any ideas.

Also Diane is a new member of the Water Supply Guideline committee and we will be discussing this. Any suggestions for this, please forward suggestions to Diane.

Bob Streeter: Comments on Josh Aims project; great group of people to celebrate this; and thanks to the Roundtable for approving this project. Bob notes that the Fort Collins Coloradoan had a good article on the Josh Ames diversion project on October 4. The article summarizes the dam-removal project that aims to revitalize the river.

- 3) Legislative Report: Water Resource Review Committee (Interim Committee)—two or three more meetings coming up. This week and the end of October.

V. Basin Implementation Plan

a) Non-consumptive needs vision and goals: Bob Streeter: Last meeting, SPBRT and METRO approved this; DU was sponsor; Greg Kernohan is putting together an RFP; looking for bidders; one piece missing—need to put together goals that contractors would use; thanks to Larry Howard, Lynda James, Greg Kernohan, Jim Hall and Metro members—true collaborative effort between SPBRT and Metro; this has been sent last week.

Vision Statement: “A holistic watershed approach will be used to identify and pursue opportunities to maintain and enhance healthy rivers and streams capable of sustaining ecosystem services that provide environmental, societal, and economic benefits.”

Three goals: 1) environmental: identify strategies that maintain and enhance environmental attributes of the South Platte Basin including: self-sustaining fisheries, riparian and wetland habitats, special values waters, threatened and endangered species

2) recreational: identify strategies that maintain and enhance recreational attributes of the South Platte Basin including: community river values (aesthetics, greenways), fishing, wildlife-related recreation, boating

and 3) Multipurpose projects and partnerships: identify strategies to meet nonconsumptive needs by promoting multipurpose projects and partnerships in the South Platte Basin including: IPPs and new development, working ag landscapes, cooperative operation with existing projects, and infrastructure optimization and enhancement (in-channel and floodplain).

McVicker: moves to approve the South Platte Basin Non-Consumptive goals, objectives, and vision statement as presented.

Ken Huson: Seconds

Motion carries.

b) Consumptive Basin Implementation Plan: Joe Frank: Only difference from our proposal is funding: 1/3 of \$137,000 from SPBRT, 1/3 from Metro, 1/3 from State; this means an additional \$95,800 from

Joe Moves for approval

John Stencil: Seconds

Motion carries

Joe: Next step is moving forward; tight time frame; Rio Chato Committee and Metro Roundtable—proposed process is to have Rio Chato and Metro Ex send out RFPs, go through the selection process and have these committees make the selections; anyone who wants to be involved in this can join the Rio Chato committee

Eric Hecox—sponsor for Metro—will put out the RFP at the end of this week; responses from consultants by first of November, review applications and interviews and have selection by the week of November 18; looking to send out the scope as submitted, look for qualifications and proposed approach from each consultant based on dollar amounts, then the committee will make the selection of the consultant/contractor/or group.

Next step would be to come back to the Roundtable on the work product. No need for action but need general consensus.

Group agrees and thanks Joe for his work.

Question: Julio: The Rio Chato and Metro executive group is a substantial group; will you do this electronically so that the momentum will keep going?

Joe: Yes, I think electronic submittals are the way to go.

Julio: When it comes to the interview process, need face to face.

Joe: Agrees.

Rick Ford asks for clarification on process; Joe elaborates.

Greg Kernohan: Lots of information will be generated from this process; need to think about where we will store this information—once the contractor is selected—need to set up a portal so that everyone can view this; this would be something to ask the contractor—a shared portal.

Joe: Asking for a list of consultants if you can add.

Julio: Any chance that any of these consultants could team up?

Joe: Yes, hoping for creative approaches to the best way to put together a basin plan.

VI. Sub-Committee Updates

- a) Non-consumptive and phreatophyte: Movement on phreatophyte; hope to move forward once flood issues subside. Non-consumptive: see above.

Frank Eckhardt: any look at getting trees out of the middle of the river?

Bob Streeter: This would have to be under authority of the county. Three years ago we put together a plan to remove phreatophytes from entire river basin.

Joe Frank: Clarifies that cotton woods are not considered phreatophytes.

- b) Groundwater subcommittee: Update on HB 1278 earlier this afternoon; much data. Plan is to have a meeting in November prior to the roundtable meeting.

Regan: thanks to feedback from the committee.

Greg Kernohan: We will be holding a “Water for Breakfast” on November 20 at Brown and Caldwell—looking for consultants to put implementation together.

- c) Rio Chato Committee: Met on bylaws revision, plan on this for November 12 meeting; this could be the meeting to vote on the bylaws themselves; please attend.

- d) Executive Sub-Committee: Conference call to bring in flooding discussions; wanted to ask the membership if this was of value to have all agencies here? Okay?

Yes...great idea and good exposure for the roundtable.

Sean Cronin: Invited to speak at the CWCB Board Meeting at Telluride; sat on panel with Eric Kuhn, Peter Nichols and Jim Pokrandt to talk on new supply; fair and balanced; all agreed that we must have this discussion just coming to the point of having this discussion; tried to convey the message that this is an issue that must be met with urgency and that without this the focus on ag dryup; we must go forward to our constituency about the urgency; beginning of the discussions; message from CWCB says we cannot keep talking about it, time to move forward.

Julio: How are we going to implement things?—bottom line.

Sean: Opines that things will start moving with the basin implementation plan.

That joint east slope meeting was a catalyst to start focusing on the basin implementation plan and how we must collaborative.

Sean: One of the directors of the CWCB asked the question—what if the South Platte, new supply from Colorado and a western basin says no—what do you do about the reconciliation...this is the next big chapter.

Janet: Questions the process in looking at the IPPs; should we not look at which of these are looking at the same amount of water. Question is how much of the gap will be reduced if these

are developed. Maybe this water is not here in Colorado and this analysis could help start to look outside the state of Colorado. Is this discussion happening?

Sean: this is part of the new supply discussions; the western basins are asking where does the gap exist; all the way down to a municipal level—and when does the gap hit; then start having strategic discussions on this. So, to answer Janet, this is a good question and that these discussions are actually starting to wrestle with these.

Joe: Points to basin implementation plan and that this could really be movement.

Janet: When we identified the IPPs during SWSI did we not identify what we expected from these. Why can we not go back to much of this information?

Joe: Lots of this is here; much of what we need to do is pull this together. Also, Phase One is under contract; no need to select a contractor for this. This will be the base of Phase Two.

Craig Godbout: CWCB meeting with CDM this week.

Larry Ross: Could someone identify the difference between where does the water come from and where does the money come from for the projects.

Eric Wilkinson: That is the million dollar question; the complexities include who builds the project, who pays for it, who are the stakeholders, where does the water come from, where are the sources, what about critical habitat. One factor is that it will cost much money to move water from the sources of the Colorado River—most of the closest sources have been developed (Fraser, Blue, Roaring Fork) therefore for the economies of scale, going to have to move the water from a long distance; your question goes to the heart of the new supply question.

Janet: Last year the legislature said that we could store water for conservation purposes and not lose the water right—not just store for fires and floods; can store for storage and not run afoul to use it or lose it. If this is the case, some of the people from the West slope were trying to explain the value of flood irrigation or why not exercising more irrigation efficiency.

Joe: Being more efficient in agriculture irrigation does not produce more water; efficiency in ag does not create more water.

Frank Eckhardt: Looked at place on South Platte that if dam were erected would hold 25,000 ac ft, north of Platteville; part of South Platte and St Vrain drainage. Have talked to the Corps of Engineers who has interest. Could be worthwhile to look at for new supply and could be a hydroelectric generation plant.

Central Colorado Water Conservancy District engineer: Multi-faceted, multi-purposed project—would help to meet the gap in aug and ag and would provide recreation; main stem of South Platte.

Motion to adjourn; second.

Meeting adjourns at 7:50.

Next Meeting Dates

November 12, 2013

Hold the Date: Statewide Roundtable Summit: Feb. 26 or 27, March 5 or 6, 2014