

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 11/07/13 and 1/15/2014

Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
11/15/13	Linda Tillson - General Public, Agriculture Consituent Group	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.2 Agricultural conservation	Webform Comment as follows: "I would like to see agricultural areas find a way to more efficiently and equitably distribute irrigation water. Some states have replaced irrigation ditches with pressurized irrigation and have set up a system of buying and selling water shares. This seems much more progressive than the current practice in some areas where water rights have been handed down for generations which leaves some land owners with more than they can use and other's drying up."	N/A	Staff response: CWCB has active grant and loan programs to support irrigators to become more efficient. These programs will be reflected in Colorado's Water Plan, currently in the Annotated Framework, Section 5.6.2. Agricultural conservation.
11/29/13	Virginia Till - General Public	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	N/A	Webform Comment as follows: "Why has no one really addressed the phrase "limit growth" in this conversation? I know politically this is a sinful word, but in order for our systems, including water, to be resilient and sustainable, I think we really need to take a hard look at our plans for population/development/growth. Why not limit growth and population in the metro area and use all resources more efficiently? Concerning other areas of the state, this should also be the case, though I know that smaller metropolitan areas/towns will disagree that slow or now growth affects them in a more substantial manner How can we continue to use more and more with less and less? We cannot expect unlimted growth forever, as adaptable cycles do not function that way. Our systems are bound to fail if we continue to work toward continual growth rather than adaptability and more efficient use of resources. Just my two cents. Thanks."	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes 3 growth scenarios: low-growth, mid-growth, high-growth. As water planners, Colorado must prepare for any of these future possibilities as we do not have control over the state's economy and how many people are born or choose to move here. While some communities choose to limit growth, doing so on a broad statewide scale is untenable and unconstitutional.
12/11/13	Stephanie DiBetitto, General Public - Environment and Recreation Consituent Group	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	Chapter 5	Webform Comment as follows: "Mandate strict water conservation enforcement on the Front Range to prevent the need to take more water from the Western Slope. We must look at the holistic health of watersheds throughout the state and keep all habitats and instream flows at a healthy level. The need for water on the eastern slope increases with increased population, though it is important to remember that taking from other watersheds directly impacts the health of their watersheds and we should all be using only what we need."	N/A	Staff response: Conservation is a critical component of Colorado's Water Plan and the plan will prioritize solutions that balance healthy watersheds and the environment while meeting Colorado's future municipal water needs.
12/18/13	Douglas Rademacher, South Platte Basin Roundtable Member	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	Chapter 4	Webform Comment as follows: "I am a member on the South Platte Roundtable since 2007. My family has been in Agriculture since the early 1900's. We do not operate any wells, all senior water rights are for suface water only. My concern is we are leaving out a critical compoment of the Water Availabilty Study, which the Governor has requested. No where in this plan is Ground water mentioned. I'm confused when we have a estimated 10 million acre feet of water right underneath - why is that not inclued? In fact there are efforts to have it not included. All options should be indentified and explored."	N/A	Staff response: Groundwater will be included in the Chapter 4. Water Supply, Including Description of Historical and Projected Supply.
1/3/14	Charles Howe	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com		Webform Comment as follows: "Federal farm policy, including the ethanol and sugar programs, will be crucial to what happens in Colorado and must be carefully analyzed-if we ever find out what it is!! Cheers!"	N/A	Staff response: CWCB will work with Colorado's agricultural interests for specific recommendations and will consider federal policy.
1/6/14	Community Alliance of the Yampa Valley	Email to CWCB Director, forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us .	N/A	Letter addressed to the Yampa/White Basin Roundtable, dated December 26, 2013	Letter addressed to the Yampa/White Basin Roundtable	Staff recommendation: CWCB Staff send the letter submitted by the Community Alliance of the Yampa Valley on January 6, 2014 to the Yampa/White Basin Roundtable for consideration in the Yampa/White Basin Implementation Plan.
1/7/14	David Smeltzer - General Public, Retired	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	N/A	Webform Comment as follows: "Before any serious discussion about population increase and water supplies to those populations begins the first question to ask is: if Colorado's population were to increase without restrictions into the future, would there ever come a time when our water supplies would run out? If the answer to that question is yes then why would we ever want to reach that point with it's quality of life, overcrowding, crime, pollution, infrastructure needs, and traffic congestion problems? We must have a serious, honest, and open discussion about what Colorado means to the people that live here and the quality of life they expect and depend on. Our river's in this state are already overutilized and suffering from raparian habitat losses and fish and aquatic life declines. Most people live here or come here for our natural beauty, resources, and outdoor recreation of which our streams and rivers are it's backbone and largest drawing card. We must objectively determine what our maximum population can be in order to preserve those resource qualities. To do anything else is pure folly and will lead us to an environment that will no longer be fit for our children and grandchildren to exist in. Have the guts to tackle this issue up front. Constant growth without checks and balances is a pyramid scheme with no winners and only losers. The water in this state is limited and thus should our demands for it be! To sacrifice our rivers and streams in the name of economic benefit and growth is unconscionable and immoral."	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes 3 growth scenarios: low-growth, mid-growth, high-growth. As water planners, Colorado must prepare for any of these future possibilities as we do not have control over the state's economy and how many people are born or choose to move here. While some communities choose to limit growth, doing so on a broad statewide scale is untenable and unconstitutional.
1/7/14	John Hendrick, Centennial Water and Sanitation District	Email to CWCB Staff, forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us	Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 (Annotated Framework - 9/12/13 version)	John Hendrick submitted a document containing comments on specific chapters and sections of the Annotated Framework.	Comments on CWP Framework (9/12/13 version)	Staff response: Most of the suggested edits were accepted and are reflected in the January, 2014 Annotated Framework. Regarding Mr. Hendrick's comment on Section 1.1, the CWCB is working with the BRTs to engage stakeholders beyond BRT membership. Regarding Section 1.2, the suggested description is included in the draft of this section presented at the January, 2014 Board meeting. Regarding Section 1.3, hydrologic variability will be covered in Chapters 4 and 5.
1/15/14	Northwest Colorado Council of Governments/ Water Quality Quantity Committee	Email to cowaterplan@state.co.us	Chapters 1, 4, 5	NWCCOG/QQ Committee submitted two documents - one document is the redline changes the group suggested, and the other pulls out the group's suggested changes and includes rationale for each suggested change.	1. NWCCOG/QQ Committee Redlined version of the CWP Annotated Framework and 2. Letter to CWCB Staff Including Comments and Rational	Staff response: Most of the revisions suggested by the NWCCOG/QQ Group are reflected in the updated January, 2014 version of the Annotated Framework. With regard to suggested changes within Chapter 4, the language was not incorporated since in addition to relying on existing data, CWCB will use the latest climate change models. At this point, CWCB does not want to prejudge the outcome. Comments suggested for Section 5.1 were not included in the January, 2014 version of the Annotated Framework, however "land use" was added to the title of Section 5.6.1. Municipal & industrial conservation, reuse, and land use. Staff recommendation: For the suggestion on Chapter 4, discuss the comments regarding water availability with the CWCB Board. For the suggestion on Section 5.8, discuss with the CWCB Board whether to be proactive or reactive when considering new projects and incentive based criteria.