

**South Platte Basin Roundtable**  
**~~February 11, 2014~~**  
**Southwest Weld County Building**  
**4209 Weld County Rd 24½**  
**Longmont, CO**

Present: Gene Manuello (Agricultural Representative); Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County); Douglas Rademacher (At-Large Representative); Doug Robotham (At-Large Representative); Mike Shimmin (At-Large Representative); Jim Yahn (At-Large Representative); Karen Martinez (Boulder County); Ken Huson (Boulder Muni); Stephen Larson (Broomfield); Frank Eckhardt (Central Colorado WCD); John Stulp (Director Compact Negotiations/IBCC); Bob Streeter (Environmental Representative); Connie McLain (Gilpin County); Rich Belt (Industrial Representative); Jeffrey Boring (Larimer County Rep); Larry Howard (Larimer Muni); Kent Swedlund (Logan County); Joe Frank (Lower South Platte WCD); Allyn Wind (Morgan County); Brent Nation (Morgan Muni); Mike Applegate (Northern WCD); Mike Brazell (Park County); Greg Kernohan (Recreational Representative); Sean Cronin (St. Vrain and Left Hand WCD); Sean Conway (Weld County); Harold Evans (Weld County Muni); Janet Bell (Metro BRT); Craig Godbout (CWCB Staff);

Sean started the meeting at 4:15.

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Director Sean Cronin clarified email procedures, stating that Deputy Recorder Matt Betz would be the nexus of all South Platte Basin Roundtable (SPBRT) emails that were to be distributed.

**II. Agenda Additions or Changes**

No additions or changes were made to the agenda

**III. BIP Update**

Blaine Dwyer with HDR opened (introduced team) and provided an overview of his presentation

Blaine Dwyer had circulated a memo over Goals and Measurable Outcomes of the Basin Implementation Plan (BIP) and shared with the Roundtable that feedback stated there needed to be an explanation of the study and the purpose, and of the background; and that these explanations had made their way into Chapter 1. Clarification was also made that the state was calling Chapter 1, Goals and Measurable Outcomes. Finally, Blaine explained that the last

component of his group's update to the Roundtable would be the work of Matthew Cook and the Gap Analysis including the series of memos that had been going out to the Roundtable for review and comment. At this point Blaine emphasized that he was still seeking feedback on memos and documents.

*a. Study Process and Communication Plan Update:*

Blaine Dwyer handed off to Britta Strother who started her presentation with a discussion of the South Platte Basin Implementation Plan (SP-BIP) study process and communication plan. Britta stated to the Roundtable that 3 of the 5 stakeholder meetings had already been held: attendance at 2 of the meetings was good and overall Roundtable members' participation was the meetings' biggest asset. Britta went on to clarify that speakers from the Roundtable demonstrated to the public that this BIP is a grassroots effort and is a stakeholder effort that is not top down. Furthermore, Britta explained how concerns and comments from the stakeholder meetings changed depending on where the meetings were held

Britta Strother stated to the Roundtable that there were 2 meetings still to come: one on March 19, in Fairplay, CO, where the schedule and agenda would be the same as the previous previous meetings: doors at 3:30, presentations at 4:00, and ample time for Q&A; and one at the Republican Water Conservancy District, on April 10 in Yuma, CO. Additionally, Britta observed that a large contingency of the population has become tired of coming to face-to-face meetings, and she/HDR was not seeing a passion to get new information. Therefore, the online meeting tool has become useful in reaching these groups.

Britta Strother went on to explain the online meeting tool, stating that the production of the tool and of the content it included was now available. "The goal of the meeting tool," Britta explained, "is to engage different and a variety of learning styles. The overarching goals are the explanation of the BIP, including efforts to explain to and include the public, and the direct engagement of the public in the BIP creation/evaluation process."

At this point Britta asked the SPBRT to help HDR distribute the link for the online meeting tool, "stakeholder meetings have reinforced the strength of Roundtable networking, they have brought the most people to the stakeholder meetings." Britta also explained that the goal for the outreach effort has been to include as many groups in the South Platte as possible.

Jeff Boring asked if the general input form would be the same as the comment form HDR had been using for the BIP.

Britta Strother, via Kate McIntire, responded that she/HDR had been and would continue to be pushing folks to go through the SPBRT to respond and has provided three ways to comment on the State water plan and SP-BIP:

1. Colorado Foundation for Water Education
2. Colorado Water Conservation Board
3. HDR

Blaine Dwyer jumped in to explain that the HDR form is designed to be freeform, general, and looking for general input.

Joe Frank asked if technical-memo comments would go up on the Online Meeting Tool Site

Britta Strother responded that the memos were not planned to go up on the site, “once the BIP is drafted there will be a second Online Meeting Tool. Roundtable members will have a chance to comment on the BIP once it has been drafted.”

Director Cronin: “a PowerPoint went out, share that to your networks with the web address, and make comments and encourage comments. Roundtable members are central to the information distribution and comment process.”

Britta Strother added that the PowerPoint presentation file size issue had been accommodated via Dropbox, and all technical memos and PowerPoint presentations would be stored on Dropbox.

Britta Strother took a few moments to troubleshoot some general problems with Dropbox.

Laurel Stadjuhar then presented some quick updates, specifically, that she had received some feedback on non-consumptive issues

*b. Goals and Measurable Outcomes*

Director Cronin: “members not in attendance will be at the Fairplay (HDR) meeting”

Blaine Dwyer: “Chapter 1, Goals and Measurable Outcomes (GMOs), is Chapter 1 of the BIP; this section is now called “Preface and Chapter 1. This title responds to the outline mentioned by the Denver Metro Roundtable. The Chapter 1 title is State dictated.” Dwyer then went on to explain the BIP’s table of contents. “Since so much of “the gap” is in the South Platte Basin (SPB) and the Basin is the most agriculturally productive in the state, section 4 provides key context for the BIP.

Blaine Dwyer also explained that water needs and values should dictate the GMOs. “The GMOs are broken down into 8 subcategories, responsive to the feedback that HDR has received from the RT. “we ought to have needs and potential solutions to precede overarching themes. Wait! We don’t want overarching themes to be buried in the back of the document. The solution is the preface.”

Blaine Dwyer went on to explain that the BIP, specifically the section on GMOs, is being directly tied to the Executive Order. South Platte water needs are taken from the memos, whitepapers, and feedback. “‘Long-term Goals’ are now called ‘Statewide Goals’. Long-term Goals confused people and generated a lot of comment. Long-term Goals could complement the low/no regret items and therefore caused confusion. Statewide Goals is consistent across plans and

local/state terminology. HDR wants to maintain consistency with other Basins and what they are doing.”

Blaine Dwyer then broke down the individual GMOs. He first stated that specific numbers had disappeared since they had proven too controversial. Additionally, “limit” versus “encourage” were removed or switched. “Limit” implies that the RT has an enforcement mechanism as opposed to encouraging a certain kind of action or providing incentives for that/those actions.”

Julio Iturreria – commented that he was concerned with the use of “encouraged,” “who is responsible for the implementation of those encouraged actions?” Iturreria went on to comment that he was concerned that there were no stated actions or specifics.

Blaine Dwyer responded by saying, “do the BIPs have the resources or ability to enforce anything? GMOs are designed to work within available means.”

Mike Shimmin spoke up to call attention to the preliminary draft status of this document (referencing the presented version of the BIP). He spoke to the setting of a roadmap to guide future action and decision-making processes. “All the hard work is going to come after this document is written.”

Director Cronin added “there are some RTs that are using the BIP as a catalyst since they have the local agencies to act with authority; not really an option for such a highly-populated Basin [as the South Platte]. A BIP in the SP would help guide WSRA fund allocation. Still, future action and decisions are difficult to predict, but will ride the coattails of the BIP.”

Julio Iturreria interjected that he wanted to make sure the final version of this document is well rounded, but includes a definite strategy, a definite “roadmap”.

Harold Evans: “implementation will be over multiple years. From a practical standpoint, the BIP is going to be a combination of various entities, efforts, and groups. The roadmap is the most important component: ‘it is a roadmap, not a railroad track.’ The State has a role; the Legislature has a role; as a state, we need to come together with a roadmap for future action and decisions, this will provide a good foundation. Lots of BIP concerns are large policy concerns with multi-year-long fixes.” Evans then pointed out that the RTs are without authority to act, only influence.

Blaine Dwyer explained to the group, “a ‘measurable outcome’ is a statement against which future actions can be compared, from which progress can be made.” He explained the starting point, the baseline, from which measurable outcomes have been established; “there is lots of interaction on the use of imported and reused water, and downstream effects. [in reference to measurable outcome #3].”

A discussion ensued about when Roundtable feedback should be given. The final decision was that comments on the overall topic are welcome, high-level comments are invited on an ongoing and open basis.

Doug Robotham: “there is tension between the SPBRT and the Metro RT: their views of the world differ and it is apparent in the GMOs [1-3], non-consumptive water and the reuse and import of water on municipal water systems and availabilities. We should address advantages and disadvantages of reuse as it pertains to the SPB and the perception of what occurs in the SPB as held by other basins, as far as there is negotiation.”

Joe Frank: “non-consumptive flows are legal and practical, but they impact base flows. Reuse is being called new supply, but it is taking away from a base supply somewhere else. That needs to be addressed in the gap analysis.

Director Cronin stated that the Sterling meeting stopped at present slide [Conservation, Reuse and Efficiency]. He argued that in terms of the acceptance of the SP-BIP by other roundtables, the biggest issue is going to be conservation. “The SPBRT needs to scrutinize if it wants to stay *this* broad or if it wants to dig down into detail. We will hear about it and in the context of new supply, we will get stuck. “

Richard Belt: “the entire [Statewide Roundtable] Summit discussion surrounded that topic, new supply vs. conservation.”

Blaine Dwyer addressed the merits of general language vs. specific language. He explained that general measurable outcome language could lead to specific and potentially more and less-aggressive options later in the document. General measurable outcome language allows for a variety of alternative packages of strategies later in the plan. The disadvantage of general language would be later in the plan there will be more complications as a more diverse range of items are compared and contrasted. Dwyer added that it seemed that the Roundtable did not feel the technical analyses were far enough along to take advantage of specific language, although they would still be an option for doing so later in the plan.

Harold Evans discussed West Slope dynamics and pointed out the small number of Roundtable members (4) who could implement conservation measures. “It is important that we decide what we are going to do and then do it.”

Ken Huson argued that care should be taken in the discussion of reusing water. “Lots of water is being sent to the Metro, if it doesn’t arrive, it creates a massive problem and hurts the gap. There is a myth about how much water is out there to reuse.”

Harold Evans: “other parts of the SPBRT use different amounts of CBT (which cannot be reused) creating different opportunities depending on location. Specifically, there are major differences between opportunities on the SP and the Metro Basins.”

Larry Howard: “reusing water can create problems with return flows, downstream water rights, and other contractual or legal obligations, and can create an additional tax on the river.”

Mike Shimmin then spoke to his experience on the IBCC and the benefits of conservation as well as the difficulties of discussing each measurable outcome topic, “each topic is an opportunity and a roadblock depending” on a slew of factors. Quantitative solutions are nearly impossible because of the human

factor. Lots of people see reuse and return-flows as a 'magic bullet' to solve the gap." Shimmin then addressed the trouble with specifying language and the speed with which such a discussion can become "lots in the weeds," "a balanced Statewide Water Plan needs to get away from those specifics."

Eric Wilkinson contributed, stating that reuse and return flows are unique to Colorado and a precious component of CO water management. "Conservation is the expansion of a water right in an M&I [municipal and industrial] setting and does not carry over to other ag areas. Reuse is the utilization of return flows. Characteristic of providers, and individual systems dictate reuse. If you conserve and your gallons-per-day drop, you have less for reuse. The system needs a balance: all sites need to be addressed together. Each system has its own balance. Specific numbers are dangerous and can cause issues in implementation since methods need to be tailored to each individual issue."

Bob Streeter: "conservation is not the answer to the gap. Other basins are very concerned and focused on the SPB conservation and reuse and have threatened to not divert trans-mountain without a better showing of conservation. A plan as a totality needs to address conservation in that sense, especially since it is important to environmental and recreational interests."

Eric Wilkinson: "conservation has an environmental, non-consumptive effect. High conservation in a water short basin has very significant environmental consequences."

Julio Iturreria: "that should be explained in the BIP. If we are unique, that needs to be up front. They don't know what we are doing or why we are doing it." Blaine Dwyer – took a few minutes to move through slides on IPP, Storage and Infrastructure.

Mike Shimmin then pointed out that SP Storage and Infrastructure is a necessary component of the BIP.

Blaine Dwyer paused to point out that over-appropriation of the SPB is a primary issue in regards to storage. "General consensus is that 'where possible' should replace 'if possible' due to area-specific differences."

Harold Evans: "there is not much left after IPPs. We need to be realistic and address the huge costs required to address additional storage after IPPs."

Steve Malers: "are there additional opportunities for shared storage?"

Harold Evans: "how does this collaboration and sharing generate additional water yield?"

Doug Robotham identified the existence of numerous options to create new supply, but pointed out that there would need to be lots of work, negotiation, and creativity necessary to secure those options.

Mike Brazell pointed out that the SPBRT is missing the economic opportunity in storage and the adjustments to cost and resources that storage may influence

Blaine Dwyer stated that "safe drinking water" was removed from the "Water Quality" slide. "Measurable outcomes needed to focus on raw water supplies."

Bob Streeter pointed out the dangers in increased reuse, specifically, the amounts of salts in the water.

Discussion ensued about the validity of using “new supply.” Eric Wilkinson recounted the discussion of the term at the most recent IBCC meeting and whether or not that term can be applied beyond transbasin diversions; he mentioned the definition may need to be explicated in the BIP.

Mike Shimmin pointed out that the slide introduction and measurable outcome statements are incongruous. He identified the importance of including “new supply” in the Statewide Water Plan, “it needs to accommodate both sides of the mountain.”

Doug Robotham: “a statement should be included speaking to what the SPBRT will do in regards to the goal statement [measurable outcome #2].

Mike Shimmin stated that he wanted to include a statement or modification to the present statement that Front Range and West Slope basins are willing to work together to complete projects in a fair and balanced way.

Director Cronin then stated he had been struggling with the phrase, “preserving options,” especially since it did not explicitly shy away from buy-and-dry and argued that he wants to address it directly, he wants to modify the measurable outcomes and put a good message forward for the State Plan.

Harold Evans: “‘preserving options’ takes away one leg of the stool. The Front Range needs to identify what the West Slope needs to address their gap and accommodate those projects first.” Evans went on to point out that several West Slope basins have stated they have no available water, either to use or divert.”

Eric Wilkinson stated that the IBCC approach had gone beyond preserving options, adding, “providers need other options. Buy-and-dry is a one-way-trip that cannot be stopped, it is a sure way to secure supply, but it is far from preferred. Trans-basin diversions will eventually require NEPA and local permitting. The West Slope dictates how much water is diverted to the Front Range. All options must be considered equally: ‘either we do it or we don’t’ [in reference to securing new supply.] This leg of the Colorado water plan is the most controversial, unknown, and insightful of emotion, politics, and religion: the biggest challenge to moving forward. This is the only option to limit buy-and-dry.”

Jim Yahn: “preserving options is not going to work. Municipal needs are going to go after ag needs to secure a solid source of water. You are going to go after water you know you are going to get.”

Blaine Dwyer then gave the floor to Laurel for the non-consumptive report

Laurel Stadjuhar: “no big changes to goals and measurable outcomes, the ones that have come past the Roundtable members will be the ones that go into Chapter 1.”

Discussion ensued regarding the language surrounding non-consumptive needs and environmental/recreational perspectives. The final decision was the phrase “non-consumptive” would be shied away from in lieu of using “environmental/recreational.”

Blaine Dwyer stated that numbers have been removed from the Statewide Goals language.

Harold Evans: “stay away from acronyms and initials due to different levels of knowledge in the audience/readership”

Matthew Cook took the floor to explain task 400 and “updating the gap.” He asked the Roundtable for help identifying contact info for specific providers.

Cronin and the CWCB representative discussed the duplicity of efforts to identify IPP contacts and Joe Frank pointed out the Republican Basin contacts.

Harold Evans suggested looking at M&I needs and groundwater supplies in meeting those needs.

Matthew Cook continued on in his presentation to address the IPP Questionnaire results. “Acre-feet yields are increasing, application dates are getting pushed out, and new IPPs are appearing. HDR is sending out a streamlined questionnaire in order to gather data as quickly as possible.”

*The meeting broke for dinner, 6:15-6:50.*

Matthew Cook discussed the SurveyMonkey link and addressed the technical memos. He pointed out differences within SPB areas and identified various opportunities to adopt conservation goals and measurable outcomes. Cook also addressed HDR’s plan to meet with SPB municipal representatives to address and evaluate appropriate conservation goals and measurable outcomes, “The shortage in ag water is planned to decrease as irrigated acreage decreases.”

Harold Evans clarified that the numbers from the alternative transfer methods (ATMs) slide came out of a compilation of ag users who are water short and unable to do full crop; done by CDM Smith (in SWSI 2010). “This is a bigger number than the M&I gap, excluding the Metro – shortage is larger in ag than M&I.”

Matthew Cook: “Water Districts 1 and 64 are most feasible for ATMs. HDR is looking for feedback on their tech memos.”

Discussion ensued regarding the most effective way to provide feedback on memos to HDR. The final decision was that given the PDF format, HDR wanted to use the surveys to capture high-level feedback and specific changes that needed to be made.

Harold Evans strongly suggested capturing what has been going on in the BT and the Poudre, on the Watershed Program’s memo.

Laurel Stadjuhar reported that the non-consumptive team would be updating the SPBRT as soon as they identified non-consumptive programs that were already occurring.



Discussion ensued addressing the coordinated communications to the SPBRT via Matt Betz, the Deputy Recorder.

#### **IV. Legislative Updates**

John Stulp: "Amendment 115, flex bill, is moving through water congress. Several other bills have been introduced, 147 (no hearing yet) regarding increased pumping, Representative Fischer is getting ready to drop the bill in response to 1278 by Colorado Water Institute, Bill 1218 on using surface rights to augment wells on the same properties, is not being well received."

Jim Yahn/John Stulp/Doug Robotham discussed how senate bill 23 has support from the West Slope, Colorado Water Congress, Colorado Cattlemen's Association, numerous NGO's, but Stulp believes there is diminishing support on the Front Range.

John Stulp: "the project in the Arkansas valley based off last year's 1248 met its demise due to lack of agreement from the ditch company that was going to be part of it."

#### **V. Committee Updates**

##### *a. WSRA-Needs Committee*

Greg Kernohan: "an application came in from the Republican River last month, was not well repaired, and did not address SWSI needs. They were told to go back and readdress their goals in relation to SWSI." Kernohan commented that he had heard that WSRA funds are frozen at state level

Craig Godbout: "funds are inadequate to match statewide account requests (1M in funds, 2M in requests). The evaluation process for projects has been criticized for being inadequate. CWCB is going to review the guidelines, but is going to allow options. Basins will get \$120,000.00 and the statewide acct 1.9 million, which should cover all the applications. The CWCB wants to develop additional criteria for evaluation of statewide account requests. We are just shy of \$441,000.00 in the Basin account. People are still encouraged to come forward with requests. Another application from Elbert County is upcoming." Godbout has done analysis on the running balances: the aggregate basin account balance has been growing while the statewide account balance has been bottoming out, especially with BIPs coming up; he expressed a desire to keep the account balances even.

John Stulp: "the drawdown in state funds is largely due to flood impacts and temporary fund redirection."

Discussion ensued and clarification was made that Northern has spent money in the administration of CWCB funds, no funds were given to Northern for their administration of those funds.

Director Cronin: "questions have come up regarding the funding of the BIP and the allocation of funds to HDR/West Sage; any concerns about the allocation of money for the BIP formulation should be directed to Greg Kernohan." Joe Frank conferred.

Greg Kernohan: “the contractors should put together a scope of work and identify what they are doing and how much more money they need to do it.”

Karen Martinez asked what Rio Chado is—Director Cronin explained that they are basically the executive committee—and what the WSRA applications are.

Greg Kernohan responded, explaining that they are programs relative to the SWSI 2010.

Mike Shimmin clarified that the hold does not apply to Basin funds. Craig Godbout conferred.

Discussion ensued regarding the WSRA funds and their pending allocations

*b. Non-Consumptive Committee*

Bob Streeter had no update, commenting that Laurel already did most of the update earlier. Streeter added comments regarding previous floods and the acquisition of baseline data.

*c. Education Sub-Committee*

Bob Schneekloth thanked those who had participated in a recent educational event.

*d. Groundwater Sub-Committee*

Joe Frank stated that the Groundwater Sub-Committee did not meet before the SPBRT meeting. He addressed a desire to meet next month (April) and would send out a notice to discuss 1278 – groundwater in the BIP. He also stated a desire to discuss more 1278 recommendations.

Discussion ensued regarding the time of the March groundwater sub-committee meeting. “Fritzler from the Groundwater Coalition should forward on the email list to invite more people to the groundwater sub-committee meeting [to go out via Viola, not Matt Betz]. Reagan needs to come back and present, but largely to contribute to discussion”.

*e. IBCC Update*

Eric Wilkinson: “East Slope and West Slope members are being paired to come up with suitable language in regards to “new supply”. [Handout is passed out] The handout shows original and revised language to compare the two.” Wilkinson specified how the “new supply” is coming up to the same level of progress as the other legs of the stool, “lots of progress has been made in terms of determining language.” There is an upcoming IBCC meeting on Mar 25 in Denver.

Jim Yahn – clarified the structure of the handout and pointed out the original and juxtaposed revised statements.

Discussion ensued as to the categorization of projects under the “Risk Management and New Supply” section. The final decision was to categorize them under the IPP and SWSI category.

Discussion ensued over the language in the same area [repeat] and the application/consideration of risk management to new supply development projects. The final decision was that new supply identifies additional compact development that is developed for transbasin projects. Risk management then applies to additional compact development, but it only applies to new supply.”

## **VI. Colorado’s Water Plan**

### *a. Statewide Basin Summit Update*

Craig Godbout updated the Roundtable on the Summit, first presenting the organization of the Summit, which was broken into 5 components: update on water plan progress, a table discussion, then IBCC progress, table discussion, then a lunch panel regarding BIPs’ themes and questions, a table discussion, then governor Hickenlooper and the former governor, and then the afternoon was a series of breakout sessions.

Discussion ensued as to whether statistics and feedback from the summit would be sent out to the Roundtable membership.

John Stulp: “the CWCB plans to put together a summary to send out.”

Harold Evans applauded the representation of each Basin and the mixture of East and West Slope basins.

Discussion ensued regarding the aggressive timeline for the Water Plans as set forth by the Governor’s Executive Order. The takeaway was that the Governor was sympathetic to the aggressive timeline, but felt deadlines were necessary to make progress.

John Stulp clarified that after the drafting process has been completed there will still be another year before the plans are concretized.

Director Cronin then addressed the Roundtable Chair meetings, “the meeting after the Summit was productive, all in attendance addressed including some language in the BIPs that was common, agreed upon, and Colorado themed and wrapped around new supply.”

## **VII. CWCB Update**

Director Cronin provided the date and time of the next CWCB meeting

Craig Godbout clarified that the agenda includes a BIP update, an update on the Colorado Water Plan, an update on public input on Colorado Water Plan, an update on SWSI (Statewide Water Supply Initiative), Basin descriptions, and a summary of what has taken place thus far. The SWSI update will include a glossary of Statewide Account Grant application guidelines.

John Stulp added that the agenda is available online.

## **VIII. Member/Public Feedback**

Kent Swedlund asked if there should be a glossary of terms, discussion ensued in support of this idea.

John Stulp stated that this week is the six-month anniversary of the flood and thanked all who have been working on recovery efforts. Stulp then made a call-of-assistance in identifying and addressing any unmet needs.

Director Cronin commented that the next Roundtable meeting would be on April 8<sup>th</sup>, CWCB on March 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, BIP on the 30<sup>th</sup>, IBCC on Mar 25<sup>th</sup>, and the joint meeting would be May 13 in Denver. The IBCC meeting would be on April 29<sup>th</sup>. And upcoming stakeholder meetings were on March 19<sup>th</sup> in Fairplay and April 10<sup>th</sup> in Yuma.

*The meeting was adjourned at 8:10.*