

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, December 10, 2013
Southwest Weld County Building
4209 Weld County Rd 24 ½, Longmont, CO
4:00 – 8:30 PM**

Present: Lisa McVicker (Center of COWCD); Sean Cronin (SVLHWCD); Jacob Bernstein (CCWCB); Bob Streeter (Environmental Rep); Harold Evans (Weld municipal); Joe Frank (LSPWCD); Greg Kernohan (DU); Connie McLain (Gilpin County); Larry Howard (Municipalities of Larimer County); Bert Weaver (Clear Creek County); Jim Ford (City of Black Hawk—Gilpin Muni); Kevin Luck (El Paso County); John Stencel (Legislative Rep—Estes Park); Allyn Wind (Morgan County); Rich Belt (Industrial Rep); Ken Huson (Boulder County Municipal Water Users); Joel Schneekloth (CSU); Jeffrey Boring (Larimer County); Frank Eckhardt (CCWCD); Gary Herman (CCWCD—At Large Rep); Jim Yahn (At Large); Mike Shimmin (At Large); Eric Wilkinson (IBCC Member); Mike Applegate (Northern Water); Jim Hall (Local Domestic Water Provider); Janet Bell (Metro Roundtable); Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County); Lynda James (Upper South Platte WCD); Mike Brazell (Park County); Craig Godbout (CWCB); Gene Manuello (Ag Rep); Douglas Rademacher (Ag Rep-At Large)

I. Routine Items

a. Welcome and Introductions - Cronin

b. Amendments or Additions to the Agenda - Cronin

Add under membership: NRCS is cutting back some of the funding for SNOTEL efforts by several basins to add additional funds to that process.

II. Action Items (4:05 – 4:10)

a. Approval of November Minutes – Cronin

McVicker: Correction: “Rick Ford” should read “Jim Ford”; will correct and forward to Viola for posting to the website; please send any corrections of the minutes to McVicker and Viola will post corrected minutes.

Motion to approve: Bert Weaver; Second: Larry Howard; carries.

III. Discussion Items (4:10 – 5:40)

a. Schedule and Process for Basin Implementation and CO Water Plans – Frank , Kernohan, Streeter

b. South Platte/Metro Consumptive and Non-Consumptive BIP – Frank, Streeter

c. Goals and Measureable Outcomes - Frank

Selected HDR for consultant for consumption implementation plan;
Selected West Sage Water for nonconsumptive implementation plan—joint Metro and SPBRT: Team of consultants

Draft implementation plan due by July 2014.

Jacob Bornstein: Clarifies: Draft water plan due December 10, 2014; anything that the Roundtables want to be included in the draft water plan needs to be in by July; after December there will be time during the beginning of 2015 to review and include. CWCB will be summarizing and resolving policy conflict to present to the CWCB in September of 2014. Thus, Draft Water Plan to board in September; board and public will comment on and then will have a plan for the Board in November for approval.

Joe Frank: Thus, as far as refinements from the Basin Roundtable—emphasis on stakeholder input—are these all due in July?

Bornstein: Not for the draft but yes will be time in 2015. Of course can work on it between July and September but the CWCB staff will not be able to work on it during this time.

Frank: This time line will help us understand how this Basin will work with the consultants and understanding the need for quick turnaround. Therefore, will narrow down Rio Chato for weekly conference calls or biweekly conference calls; need commitment from five or so people for weekly interaction.

Harold Evans: How do you reconcile the fact that this small group cannot speak for everyone? You will be making decisions that will impact many various stakeholders yet this committee does not represent these constituents.

Frank: Agree; need openness but need commitment from small group; also there must be an ongoing representation. This is more of a weekly process kind of meeting in terms of processing information and being in a position to direct the consultants in action steps. Reiterates the need for commitment for a small group because the consultants are not going to be able wait for our monthly meetings.

Harold Evans: Without knowing what kind of feedback needed, we will all need to stay tuned to see if this is a plan that we can get behind.

Mike Shimmin: Can there be a weekly email that has a list of the issues that the consultants are seeking input on and anyone who wants to be part of the discussion can call in?

Frank: Yes

Evans: Is this going to be the roundtable's plan or the consultant's plan?

Streeter: This is the roundtable plan. Roundtable will have final decision. This is not a small group plan.

Frank: My point is that we need a small group of committed folks.

Cronin: What we are wrestling with is the deadline; how to make use of the time between meetings; do we have a core group of folks from various interests. The Metro as an example are using their executive group as that group. To Mike Shimmin's point, everyone will have to have input in key issues. The Roundtable will need to be flexible going forward; will need to allow the smaller group to work through some issues and then communicate this to the roundtable for input. But deadline must be honored. As to Bob's point, it is critical that we hit the key issues before the deadline. If not, we will miss the opportunity and it might not be included in the State Water Plan.

Julio Iturreria: This group has been getting together almost monthly since 2005; question is how much of a commitment can we get from this group to meet on more than a monthly basis. Attempts to reach out in emails and get responses from all recognized, but although there is voice to the concern, question is how much is someone willing to

actually put this kind of commitment into this process. Curious to know who is willing to put up time.

Lynda James: this is the most important thing we are doing and I am personally willing to commit to this because this is the most important thing that will guide us in the future.

Jim Ford: Like Lynda, I would certainly commit to a conference call an hour or two a week (that is how long it takes me to get here!) I would expect that there will be updates during the month so then we can discuss as a group during our monthly meeting.

Frank: Good segue to introduce HDR consultants.

Consultants: HDR: Core Team: Project Management:

Blane Dwyer, PE (water supply and methods); Matt Cook, PE; Britta Strother (environmental and communication), Matt Cook, P.E. (water availability); Enrique Triana PE (analysis); Stephanie White (supporting Britta), Chip Paulson (MWH technical advisory)

Process: Standard Planning Process: public involvement from start to finish—even for just one agency—several years—but we think we can do this by July because of the amount of work that has been accomplished already. Much to build on.

RE: Schedule: Much needs to be done concurrently: note that although these are Rdtable meeting dates—the Rdtable does not have to have completed their works.

- 1) Goals and measurable outcomes (12/12)
- 2) Strengths and opportunities (2/10)
- 3) Basin Rdtable (3/6)
- 4) Projects and (May)
- 5) Plan (July)

Weekly calls intended to be a coordination call, not one in which technical actions are dictated.

Six basic tasks articulated:

- 1) Project Mgt
- 2) Communications and stakeholder outreach
- 3) Goals and measurable outcomes
- 4) Update gaps IPPs
- 5) Projects and Outcomes...this is the advancement from the work that has been done. This delves into the projects and methods.
- 6) Prepare Basin Implementation Plan

Each of these tasks will have technical memorandum for your input; these are your opportunities to make sure these are comprehensive and reflect our needs.

Final Draft: Between July 31 and Dec 1-extend the stakeholder involvement; there are many who have interest in this plan and how it is proceeding; thus, if there are areas that need refinements, or technical analysis to prove up the yield from a specific project, this is opportunity.

Jacob: Just to reiterate that this would not make it into the draft to the Governor, but there would be breathing room between when the draft is due and when the final is due. “Final draft” is representative.

State's Outline: Out of State Implementation Plan and Guide

- 1) Executive Summary
- 2) Basin Goals and Measurable Outcomes
- 3) Evaluate Consumptive and Nonconsumptive Constraints and Opportunities
- 4) Projects and Methods
- 5) Implementation Strategies for how these go forward to Projects and Methods
- 6) How the plan meets the Rdtale's Goals and Measurable Outcomes

This is then fleshed out with details of actions steps. State: one, two, three;

Section Four is where the consultants enter.

Emphasizes that the last two parts need basin roundtable input.

Lots of interaction with these.

Frank: Asks for input on this.

Bornstein: What CWCB has the raw input for Sections 1, 2, and 3. All of this data has been in existence for several years. We do not want to dictate what the basin goals are and therefore the SPBRT and the Metro roundtable will need to work on these last two parts; CWCB will help assemble the raw data in order to move forward with how to interpret this data. Needs to be roundtable and consultant support for this.

Greg Kernohan: We are experiencing some frustration; some of this is manipulating a bit of this data; we thought that this would be done.

Bornstein: For nonconsumptive, for example, CCWCB can help process the data; for example we have the raw maps. Some confusion during the writing of the RFQ, but that being said, we will provide support, but cannot do this without input from Rdtale.

Frank: Does CWCB have a consultant team that is responsible for sections 1-3; I envisioned that CDM would have worked with us and the CWCB to bring this together so there is no reinventing of the wheel; recognizes that there would be need for some manipulating of the data, updating SWSI to 2016 numbers; but seemed that it was burdensome for the consultant to do this Phase I work.

Bornstein: Yes, CWCB will work on sections 1, 2, 3 but must have Rdtale input. This is raw data; this is not just a PDF report, GIS, etc. You can adopt this as before; but especially Section 1 needs Rdtale input.

Cronin: My understanding from those meetings was for the work on Sections 1, 2, 3, CDM would be used to walk the rdtale through this and that we did not hire HDR to do this.

Bornstein: We are there in a crunch.

Cronin: My understanding was that CDM had been budgeted for and that we would not be hiring HDR to do this.

Bornstein: The Rdtale involvement was not explicit in the engagement.

Cronin: Of course. But this is not going to be the Rdtale going through CDs of data; my question is this going to be CDM or HDR who will do this.

Bornstein: We will meet with CDM and HDR and hash this out.

Where we are in the scoping process: we have met with the scoping committee; now have drafted a work scope that is consistent with what was in the RFP.

This detailed work plan is not yet ready until after meeting with CWCB. State has set up a meeting with all basin implementation teams; we will get out this next week after the meeting with the State.

Frank: Does this sound okay re: process? Meeting with all of the consultants and reps from each roundtable on the 12th.

Dwyer: Makes suggestion of how this can be approached. When we are addressing goals and measurable outcomes, we must be addressing other issues simultaneously. We will have to have multipurpose meetings. We can have Rhtable input on goals and measurable outcomes and done in a way that is not distracting or competing for resources. Need to focus on how to move forward the most effectively.

Brita Strothers: Goals and Measurable Outcomes: Will first work with CWCB and will receive a template on these goals and measurable outcomes; SPBRT has already worked through these; Integrate Phase I input; key input is to integrate pertinent input from stakeholders; not only members of Rdtables but outside stakeholders as well; outcome will be a matrix of goals and measurable outcomes.

Another aspect of the work: coordination with the nonconsumptive team...with Laurel; already working with Laurels team and nonconsumptive.

Does not want the situation where the nonconsumptive team is working in isolation; important that we work together.

Nonconsumptive uses: integrating this work into the Basin Implementation Plan: coordination, collaborate outreach efforts; integrate input in: goals and measurable outcomes, constraints and opportunities, effects of projects and methods on Nonconsumptive uses.

Opportunity for collaboration. Comments?

Greg Kernohan: Our committee has not had an opportunity to hear from Laurel (consultant for Nonconsumptive). The consultants for the Nonconsumptive Plan are West Sage Water Consultants; Laurel Stadjuhar, P.E. is the principal of the company. West Sage will be working with Steve Malers, CTO of Open Water Foundation. Laurel or Steve: comments?

Laurel: still has questions but going forward.

Mike Shimmin: If this is all about the schedule, what is missing is our meetings; we need a draft of what will be done by each of these milestones. I see four sections, then six tasks...this needs to be broken out by what will be done and ready to review by each meeting; we need these five days before so we can actually review and have some input.

Dwyer: Cannot tell you tonight, but after meeting with the State on Thursday, I can do this.

Patron: This is exactly what Harold is talking about; must involve roundtable.

Streeter: On Thursday, we have a meeting with consultants and CWCB and we will have a schedule to present. These consultants do care; I was impressed with their proposals and their interviews but we must work with them.

Shimmin: Not trying to get ahead but someone must give us a draft of these by our January meeting; we must be ready to discuss first section.

Cronin: What I am hearing from Blaine is that this is understood.

Stephanie: Stakeholder Engagement: Everything revolves around the roundtable; this is the crux of the basin implementation plan. Several groups must be wrapped into the conversation and must find buy-in: elected business, agricultural, major business, general public; in whole scheme, each of these groups will have input.

- 1) NGOs, AG community and major businesses: getting information and education;
- 2) Elected Officials: need their support and authorization eventually; need info that they can give their constituency; the more that we can prepare them for them.
- 3) Public: Last piece; this is the place where we will need the most education; this would happen right before the final draft.

Frank: In the group of three: in that first group of three, those who are not on the roundtable can still give lots of feedback and input in this step. Many of these are not sitting at this table.

Harold Evans: Do not underestimate the amount of knowledge that this group has...little; even with water officials; do not underestimate the low level of knowledge.

Indeed, with the elected officials this is important.

Bruce Gerk: Complimenting what Harold said; there are forty years of attempts at water policy and meeting the water needs of the state; the experience out of those years as to what you can practically get done and what you cannot get done is why we are here. This is very difficult for people to get up to speed if we do not use the experience in this room.

Blaine: One of the concepts that has come up is the timing of these activities; on one side if we are going to get even summarized information to these groups, we must start this process early on; tell them what is coming up; advisory or notification process. Also, the period of time between now and July 31 needs to focus mostly on good coordination with the Basin Rdtables. Then between July 31 and December, expanding. What is reaction of the Roundtable?

Ken Huson: One unique problem, we represent many constituents; we must be very careful about the timing; this goes to Harold's points. Must emphasize how difficult it is, for example, to get all of the munis in Boulder County to be part of this. Important to think about this stakeholder engagement that we cannot just put it on the street, will we have the materials, how do we do it. How this engagement is crafted will be difficult. The entire rdtable process is built on trying to get all stakeholders to have input. Caution on this stakeholder engagement design and don't underestimate the amount of time it will take.

Frank: To Ken's point: there will be lots of back and forth.

Stephanie: I will commit to bring you a communications plan for review for your January meeting. We will do everything we can do to enable you to bring this info to your constituency. Please tell me your comfort level with technology. If we begin to leverage technology to communicate with your constituency.

Ken Huson: This is a public process; whatever technology you use, difficulty is how it can be open to the public.

McVicker: Redundancy must be the key; must use both technology and paper.

Stephanie: Potential Tools: Public meeting site. Can leverage different learning styles; every frame will have lots of information and each frame will have open dialogue and people can use this. The ratio of public assistant is 1-350; for every one person that comes to a public meeting, you get 350 more when you complement it with something like this: 8am-noon and after 9 at night, so fits in with people's lives. This is a great tool to reach out to your constituency.

Blaine: You can have increasing levels of complexity; people can drill down as they find more information in which they are interested.

Each page has a comment button so each participant can comment on each page; this electronically comes back into our system, catalogued, and thus we have constant feedback from these presentations.

“Online public meeting”: www.northsystemrenewal.com

We are using this with the DOT and we can make this as specific as possible to your needs.

Frank: What do you do/we do with the comments?

Stephanie: In your communications plan there will be a comment management protocol; all those comments will come into this group (may need a communications team) and then come back to the roundtable on a monthly basis. All this goes into a data base, we can give you live reporting on what is happening.

Blaine: To summarize, we will continue the dialogue with Laurel and the nonconsumptive team, we will meet with the state on Thursday, and we will get you a detailed schedule of how our schedule will coincide with your meeting schedule. We will coordinate with Laurel and make sure our plans will dovetail. Thank you.

Jim Ford: Are you working with other roundtables?

Blaine: This is the only roundtable.

Jeffrey Boring: Suggest that with the schedule you are developing that you propose milestones for feedback form rdtale.

Blaine: Aiming for an early stakeholder outreach and then a continuation of this between July and December.

Bureau of Reclamation: As a federal employee: sensitive to the fact that this is a state wide plan; trying to be sensitive to this and trying not to interfere with something that belongs to the state; however, as a citizen of the state am aware of the significant impact of the federal government. Note that the federal government is not on your list of stakeholders. How does the federal government fit into your process in a way that we do not interfere but our presence is recognized?

Blaine: Good to point out this omission; my experience is that the federal agencies can be very engaged and yet must take care to not lead the process.

Frank: No one was purposely left out of this and we will try our best.

Mike Shimmin: What are other basins doing?

Bornstein: The Basin Implementation Plans and then Colorado’s Water Plan—specific tasks there in terms of the relations with federal partners; as for other roundtables, no other rdtale has explicitly stated that they will be communicating with certain federal agencies; but there are federal liaisons that come to the basin meetings. So two prong approach: CWCB is working with the feds to making permitting more quickly; other aspects: Aspinall Study—Gunnison and CO has been working with feds; CO River study has lots of federal input; on water quality side, have met with EPA and Forest Service.

John Stulp: It is up to the roundtables on how much they want federal agency involvement.

Rio Grande has many seats for federal partners; depends on the culture of the rdtale and how much they want to include. Objective of the State Plan is to have our plan together vis a vis the feds.

Greg Kernohan: Introduces West Sage Water Consultants (nonconsumptive consultants); Steve and Laurel introduce themselves.

Note that we have just had our first meeting and we do care that everything is cohesive and will be working with Blaine.

Greg: Emails have been going around that consumptive has hijacked this process; but we are not going through the motions. Not true.

Cronin: Reiterates that our meetings are the second Tuesday of the month here; discussion of broadening the location and also having joint meetings with Metro. But for now, look for communication plan and look for chance to bring your constituents input to the Metro.

Frank: The December 12 meeting: CWCB has circulated drafts as a template.

Harold Evans: Requests more than five days for circulating these drafts.

Frank: Yes. Rio Chato is open to everyone. If you want to be on that email list, let Joe Frank know. This will be where much of this dialogue occurs.

Cronin: Break for dinner.

IV. Dinner (6:00) – Working Dinner

V. Discussion Items (6:30 – 6:40)

a. IBCC – New Supply Discussion and Feedback – Bornstein, Wilkinson, Yahn

Jacob Bornstein: See handout: IBCC December 2013 Meeting Discussion Topics for Roundtable Feedback and New Supply Work Plan; see page 3: topics that needed to be discussed with Rdtables; this provides a path to go forward:

December: Risk Management, Sequencing of Strategies, and Relationship between Ag Transfers and New Supply.

Hope is that these statements added together, by August, ready for the state plan, will come up with preserving the new supply option and will be ready for the water plan.

Through June: Preserving the Option for New Supply: How to discuss viable options for preserving the option for new supply.

See summary on first page: John McCloud statements forwarded;

Note that each of these is viewed favorably by IBCC.

Jacob and Craig Godbout: Craig will staff this roundtable and Jacob will be support.

John Stulp: These are all components of the state plan; relying heavily on the basin implementation plan. IBCC reps representing you well. Not an easy discussion. Wide spectrum of values and thoughts on new supply. Hard to wordsmith some of these discussions, we have paired up IBCC reps with those from other roundtables. We will add some changes, but believe that this helped expedite the discussion. Other roundtables are several months ahead of the SPBRT with their contractors so the coming Thursday meeting will be useful in defining expectations and implementation plans. Will then look for commonalities.

Frank: Are they all ahead of us?

Stulp: Yes. But you have been working on this for the last eight years so now being asked to help focus. As Ecklund has pointed out, this is a dynamic document.

Eric Wilkinson: Provides background for the first two statements under Risk Management: (page 1 of IBCC December 2013 Meeting Discussion Topics for Roundtable Feedback—*Statement of Principle: Future supply of Colorado River water is highly variable and uncertain; therefore, any proponent of a “New Supply” project from Colorado River Basin must accept the risk of a shortage of supply, however the shortage occurs, including compact compliance; strictly adhere to the prior appropriation doctrine, and protect existing water uses and communities from adverse impacts resulting from the New Supply project.*

Moving forward: “By “New Supply,” we mean any new transmountain diversion beyond those already contemplated under the Colorado Cooperative Agreement, Windy Gap Firming Project IGA, and Eagle River MOU. Because “New Supply,” risk management and compact curtailment are inextricably intertwined and involve complex issues that cannot be resolve in time to be fully addressed in the 2015 Colorado Water Plan, the Plan should move the “New Supply” discussion forward by defining a process to resolve those issues and refrain from either endorsing or precluding any “New Supply” project.)

Today on the CO River because of the extended drought, there is lots of discussion within the seven basin states on how to address this. We are not close on compact compliance; our 10 year running total far exceeds the compact amount...close to 90 million. Discussions of Risk Mgt are not because of the lower levels in the reservoirs, but because of compact curtailment and how this will play into the CO Water Plan as being so important. Discussion is that we should take this off the table because this is a legal issue for attorney generals and upper basins to look at. IBCC agreed that this should be taken off the table. In its place the Statement of Principle (see above) was proposed: hydrology in the CO River Basin is variable and uncertain and if a shortage occurs, including compact compliance, must strictly adhere to the prior appropriation doctrine. As new supply develops, it should not put out of place those projects in place—450,000 to 600,000 transbasin diversions to east slope; both east and west have vested interest. Agreement on statement of principle.

Moving Forward (see above): This statement is trying to define what we are talking about in regards to new supply. Nomenclature was introduced earlier in the process that “New Supply” meant development of water supplies within the CO River. Thus this statement is a new definition: *“New transmountain diversions beyond those already contemplated by the Colorado Cooperative Agreement, Windy Gap Firming Project IGA and Eagle River MOU. Because “new Supply,” risk management and compact curtailment are inextricably intertwined and involve complex issues that cannot be resolved in time to be fully addressed in the 2015 CO Water Plan, the Plan should move “New Supply” discussion forward (see above.)”*

The position I took at the meeting was that all of those questions do not have to be answered before exploring new supply projects. The South Platte basin has advocated a concurrent study of water availability, etc.

There was a teaming up of IBCC members to look at the two subsequent issues (Sequencing of Strategies and Relationship between AG Transfers and New Supply): what do we need to do so that these are received well/endorsed by the IBCC.

(“Sequencing of Strategies: The M&I gaps should be reduced as much as possible (thereby reducing the amount of water that will be needed from ag and new supply from the CO River Basin) by implementing the IPPs that are not “new supply,” municipal conservation and reuse, and other portfolio elements defined in the no/low regrets action plan. At the same time, discussion, evaluation, and possible implementation of the new supply component should continue in coordination with the other portfolio elements.”

“Relationship between Ag Transfers and New Supply: Colorado should promote viable and productive ag across the state, and ag should have the opportunity to exist statewide. Development of new supply should be evaluated on an equitable basis with the transfer of ag water to muni uses, to the extent that the additional water supplies are available and those supplies can be developed without jeopardizing the certainty, reliability, and yield of already developed water supplies and environmental values. The IBCC should continue the dialogue about how to accomplish this.”)

Eric: It took an inordinate amount of time to reach this language.

Comments on “Sequencing of Strategies”: We need to do the best we can with conservation, reuse and other portfolio elements to minimize the amount of water we actually need from ag transfers as well as new supplies from CO River, and at the same time, discussion, evaluation, and possible implementation of the new supply component should continue in coordination with the other portfolio elements.

Metro, Arkansas and South Platte: need concurrent process; we need to work toward implementation and develop project if there is water availability and if it can be developed without risk. South Platte RT needs language for implementation and this needs to be pursued with the same fervor as the other elements of the portfolio (legs of the stool).

Comments on “Relationship between Ag transfers and New Supply”:

Teams got together and developed lots of language that was reduced to the statement (see above):

Elements: ag important; should be promoted; ag should have opportunity to exist state wide; development of new supply should be

Other points of discussion: proposal by Denver Water and others to move forward with legislature with indoor fixtures; proposal from South West CO that discourages the permanent dry-up of ag by saying if we develop new housing/growth and the basis of that growth is the dry-up of irrigated ag, there should be limitations on irrigation of outdoor landscape: no more than 15% of any lot can have grass on it. This legislation is trying to reduce the amount of water of outdoor water use from demand of new residential development; think this could reduce by 33%. This proposed legislation would leave implementation to local governments so the local govts could do as they please, although this should apply statewide and complements fixture legislation.

Does not limit grass in parks, xeriscaping or raw water irrigation. Does not affect existing change cases and any lot could have less; does not affect existing lots and does not affect irrigators vis a vis their right to sell their water.

Have been asked for Rdtbale reaction to all four statements (page 1); IBCC in basic agreement. 18 of the 27 IBCC members are Rdtbale reps, other are other govt reps. Have until Feb 7 for feedback from Rdtbale; need comments back to staff in time for the next IBCC meeting.

Cronin: This serves as a good example of what we are diving into over the next six months. Note: IBCC had a meeting; Staff put this together; we got this today; we need feedback asap by Feb. See page 3: Risk Mgt: Statement of Principle and Moving Forward: Outcome: Seek Rdtbale and Constituent feedback by Feb. Thus, this is an example of where each of us needs to be prepared to discuss and get feedback to Jim and Eric.

Eric: If there is feedback, it would be best for distribution to the entire rdtbale so when we discuss in January. If we get individual comments, this is an untenable position. We must have roundtable unified message in our representation so that we can fairly and accurately represent the rdtbale.

Harold Evans: We should send this out to the entire roundtable and have action plan.

Eric: If we could have a mailing list so that when anyone sends a comment everyone can read it and then Eric and Jim can summarize at the next meeting.

Jacob Bornstein: Several ways to do it; email with “reply all”—easiest way. Google doc would be difficult.

Cronin: This is critical to carve out time to do this.

Eric: Might be best if you are looking at this to comment on the content and not wordsmith them. We need to talk about why the concept is acceptable or not.

Cronin: As a public employee, all of this is publicly available so be mindful of your language.

Lynda James: Deadline?

Cronin: Comments by Friday, January 3 to allow Staff to compile and then can have this ready for us to review on January 14. These will then be distributed a week in advance.

Bert: Questions now? When we have talked about new supply over the years have we always meant only new transmountain diversions?

Jacob: “New Supply” is new allocations of water; SWSI 1 indicated very little of this; then new supply went to mean new allocations in the CO Water Basin because these are the only basins where there is water available. Now push to define those Colorado Water basin allocations to be subject to these limitations.

Bert: So “new supply” ... what does this mean to the public? I am one of those guys that think there could be new supply that does not require transbasin diversions.

Eric: New Supply: Development of unappropriated water.

The only charge of IBCC is interbasin communications. What can we do interbasin to best manage interbasin use of water; this is where IBCC should be focusing. That is why we are doing implementation plans. If IBCC is not talking about “new supply” no reason to be talking. Controversy is outside basin—transbasin diversions—in developing CO River entitlement; this is the subject of all of our discussions.

In Oct we went through all three legs of the stool in 8 hours; 80-100% concurrence on everything; now we are talking about the “800 lb elephant” in the room.

Michael Shimmin: When I was on the IBCC the discussion was on joint-use projects; will be east slope money building projects on west slope yielding water for entire state.

If the west slope wants to build a west slope project on their own can do that; but these transbasin projects will be big projects that cost lots of money. I get nervous looking at the new supply as only transbasin components than you are ignoring many of the uses that need water. Eric: See April discussions, multi-use components; these will include multipurpose uses. Foregone conclusion that if a new supply project is developed it will have a west slope supply component as well.

Mike Shimmin: A stand alone transbasin project that supplies only the east slope will never be built and that is the whole point...everyone will get something out of the deal.

Cronin: Seems like Mike's point of multi-use needs to be put forward.

John Stencil: We have talked about Flaming Gorge, Mississippi, Missouri...might not be feasible but is this not on the table?

Eric: Outside the CO River Basin, not one of these except Flaming Gorge because Flaming Gorge is the CO River Basin.

John Stulp: We decided to do the best we could with these statements and then go forward; so please read through the entire agenda. Please look into the future even though you will be commenting on the Feb meeting but if you have any input on the other items, please comment to Eric and Jim. This is an attempt to let you know what the IBCC has done and looking for comments.

Janet Bell: Thank you for bringing this up. We should not be limiting ourselves to just water that is here in CO and that we should be looking outside of our borders as well. If we do not look beyond our borders, looking to national discussion, than I would hope we would not lose that, but we are now talking about water we don't have and looking for it. Also, development and businesses that are being recruited to come to CO, it is not unthinkable that they might import water. State Engineer has no authority over imported water. Would hope that IBCC broadens the picture to look at new supplies from outside state borders.

Eric: The IBCC can only deal with water resources that the State of Colorado is entitled to; by definition it is a conversation between basins. If this rdtable thinks it needs to look at extrabasin, this must be in your implementation plan and this is not in the jurisdiction of the IBCC. This is outside the charge of the IBCC.

John Stulp: Caution to not look outside the state; these were looked at during the CO River Water Availability study; these were dismissed as not being financially feasible. We are looking at what we can do in the next 30-50 years. Bringing water from the Missouri is something farther out. We must focus on our relationships within basins. Per Ag Journal: Kansas looking at Missouri pipeline—8.6 billion just on the part of Kansas 10 years ago. False sense of hope to say we don't have to work out our own relationships because of looking out of state.

Mike Shimmin: Wordsmith: By new supply we mean any new project that includes transbasin diversion...add three words and this clarifies a bit...

Eric: Points to the distributed copies of the CO Basin Rdtable White Paper. This was put together by the main stem CO River Basin views. Available on the coloradowaterplan.com website.

VI. Discussion Items (6:40 – 7:45)

a. Scenario Planning and Adaptive Management – Bornstein

All of this builds on the portfolio work done previously. Builds off of five scenarios. Powerpoint also available at www.coloradowaterplan.com

Traditional planning: what is the most likely future or what is the preferred future.

Scenario Planning: current trends could be redirected by events, especially in water supply because projects take so long to get permitted.

Then adaptive managing approach.

Put this together in the “cone of uncertainty.”

Jacob presents five representative portfolio scenarios (weak economy vs hot growth, for example)

How can we go from these broad portfolios to focus on concrete steps for the State plan.

No and low regret portfolio: IPPs and Conservation for both East and West slope; West slope development for west slope water supplies; transbasin diversions; ag transfers vs status quo; impacts of status quo are worse than the no and low regret

Jacob explains process.

No/Low Regrets Portfolio vs. Status Quo Portfolios

Controversial projects pointed out in power point.

How do we lay out a process in which we understand what we need to do now and what we need to do in the future?

Adaptive Management Overview:

Water plan: 2015; then going into the future—

Projects: mid-conservation, track it; ag transfers and IPPs and urbanization—minimizing while initiating 50,000 ac ft projects; reuse; west slope development while planning for transbasin diversions.

What if, only half of the no and low regrets are successful?

Conflict starts sooner. Then need to envision more transbasin diversions or conservation imagined in any of the portfolios. Thus, consequences of not following through on the no and low regrets.

Cronin: Question: At what point do we hit a sign post?

Jacob: Adaptive capacity; for each of these, we need to be attacking conservation; tracking.

Cronin: Have you spoken with water providers to ask them if this provides any level of surety?

Jacob: No, this is where the IBCC and rdtables must continue with the discussion.

b. CO Water Plan Annotated Framework – Bornstein/John Stulp

Handout: Draft: Framework for Colorado’s Water Plan

Contractor will see that a lot of this work has been done.

This 9 page framework will be supported by the CWCB staff.

Jacob: comments are continually open to the public; very easy to get copies of all of these documents and can make comments to cowaterplan@state.co.us

See www.coloradowaterplan.com.

Not too many comments from east slope.

Jacob walks the rdtable through the calendar and the draft framework. September dates depend on basin implementation plan.

Cronin: Looking for comments on Colorado Water Plan. Look under resources.

John Stulp: This website is intended to be more user friendly than the CWCB site.

Note South Platte page.

This is more of a public interface so we can put any documents on this.

Again: www.coloradowaterplan.com

VII. Sub-Committee Updates

a. Education Sub-Committee - Schneekloth

Conference call last Friday; will have report next month.

Cronin: Reminds everyone that Joel is forging forward with public education and public outreach; how best to interface with the Rdttables; Cronin asked for a presentation next month.

Bert Weaver: Brings attention to the last issue of the Headwaters Magazine on energy.

Bert gives kudos to Headwaters Magazine; this issue on water/energy nexus is excellent.

b. Non-Consumptive Sub-Committee - Streeter

The Rdttable approved the attributes; if there is any new information on those attributes, this will be put into the database as long as it does not change.

Lynda James and Mike Brazell from Park County will be coming to the committee with new attributes and ask the roundtable to consider new focus areas in Park County; this information and study from Park County will come out the week before the next meeting.

Mike Brazell: A few things missing from the current version of the SPBRT non-consumptive attribute maps such as: 12 wildlife areas not two, Spinney Reservoir, CO Heritage Program; we have invested over 17 million in preserving Park County attributes.

Lynda: We will be presenting a map, same as the original map but the list with attributes on each stream segment and will make a presentation next month. Appreciate the opportunity to present.

c. Phreatophyte Sub-Committee - Streeter

Weld County is putting in a 45 million grant for phreatophyte control from St Vrain to confluence; will push forward with the CWCB grant.

Bob: Under 1278 project, there is money to do some mapping for phreatophyte mapping; looking to differentiate tree species. Next meeting, if there is interest, will put in a proposal for this.

d. Alternative Ag Transfer Methods Sub-Committee - Frank

Regional efforts on the South Platte; this will be key component to basin implementation plan.

e. Groundwater Sub-Committee – Frank

Another sub-committee meeting today prior to meeting; Ralf Topper gave update on water table monitoring depths in relation to the floods; Reagan Waskom taking feedback and questions from the committee on their website. cwi.costate.edu/southplatte

Report is due Dec 31. Lots of data available.

f. Rio Chato Sub-Committee - Cronin

Still working through comments on bylaws and other issues on programming.

g. Executive Sub-Committee – Cronin

No report.

New agenda matter: NRCS Snowcourse: Still have SNOTEL and Snowcourse state; some of these will temporarily not be staffed. Estimate of cost of operating these sites is about \$78,741; of this, South Platte is at about \$6,000 and CO Basin is about \$30,000. Rio Grande Rdttable have taken action today; looking to secure basin funds to put in a kitty to give to NRCS to keep those sites running for this year. Would other rdttables consider doing the same?

Deadline: Therefore added as an agenda item.

One proposal would be to look at the basin fund for \$6000 for South Platte snowcourses and then look at the CO Basin, then split with Metro third third--\$10,000 for a total of \$16,000.

Would we like to consider this as a WSRA?

We could make approval contingent and this would go in front of CWCB in January.

John Stencil: Clarify the math.

Eric: Perhaps a motion up to \$11,000 because Northern and Denver water have also already volunteered to help out.

John Stulp: There is also looking at technological that would complement this; also new technology with NASA.

Lynda James: I would not like to see any of these to disappear; I use this information all the time.

Jim Yahn: Motion to approve up to \$11,000.

Gary Herman: Seconds

Vote: All unanimous.

VIII. Items from membership/attendees (8:00 – 8:15)

Bob Streeter: Poudre River Forum meeting on Saturday, Feb 8, from 10 am-6pm. Booth opportunities and the education committee might want to consider. Please join. \$25 pre-registration required by Jan 31. See www.cwi.colostate.edu/thepoudrerunsthroughit

John Stencil: As we develop the South Platte plan, are we going to include the Republican River in the plan?

Joe Frank: Did not include in scope of work; but important to include if possible.

John Stencil: we need to put this in the plan so that they also understand their roles.

Meeting adjourns: 8:15 pm.

Next Meeting Dates

January 14, 2014

IBCC Meeting February 18, 2014 in Denver

Hold the Date: Statewide Roundtable Summit: March 6, 2014