

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
1	3/4/14	Steve Harris on behalf of Southwestern Water Conservancy District	Email to Jacob Bornstein and Rebecca Mitchell; forwarded to cewaterplan@state.co.us	Framework, 1.2, 5.2, 8	Comments from the Southwestern Water Conservancy District on Colorado's Water Plan Framework, Sections 1.2, 5.2, and Chapter 8.	Comments on draft attached	Staff recommendation and response: CWCBC staff will discuss with the CWCBC Board in May, 2014 the reorganization of Chapter 5 suggested by Steve Harris on behalf of the Southwestern Water Conservancy District. Mr. Harris suggests that Chapter 5 be split into 2 subsections, with one of the subsections addressing the "four legs of the stool", and the other subsection addressing Sections 5.1 - 5.4 and 5.10. With regard to Mr. Harris' caution regarding land use, this issue received Board discussion during the March, 2014 CWCBC Board workshop. The Board decided to create a separate subsection on land use which describes the relationship between water and land use and suggests some incentives that local jurisdictions may consider. This section will be available for review at the May Board meeting.
2	3/5/14	Diane Johnson, Eagle River Water & Sanitation District, sent on behalf of 8 entities within Eagle County	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	1, 5.10	<p>Text from email: "Attached are Principles for the Colorado Water Plan from the Eagle River Basin (tributary to the Colorado River) that have been adopted by entities within Eagle County. Also attached are Resolutions “Endorsing the West Slope Principles and Adopting the Eagle River Basin Principles for the Colorado Water Plan” by the following municipalities, special districts, and water providers within the Eagle River Basin:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Arrowhead Metropolitan DistrictBerry Creek Metropolitan DistrictEagle Vail Board of GovernorsEagle River Water & Sanitation DistrictEdwards Metropolitan DistrictTown of AvonTown of VailUpper Eagle Regional Water Authority <p>Each of the Resolutions states, among other items, that the Board of Directors of the above entities “supports these principles and believes that the Governor and the Colorado Water Conservation Board should adhere to these principles in preparing the Colorado Water Plan.” We submit this message and the attached documents as public input on the Colorado Water Plan to be considered by CWCBC Directors at the March 18, 2014, Board meeting. Thank you for the opportunity to include this information in the board packet. The West Slope Principles were previously provided to the CWCBC by the Colorado Basin Roundtable, and were previously endorsed by many other jurisdictions."</p>	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: The CWCBC is committed to sending letters to each of the participating entities within the Eagle River Water and Sanitation District with a more detailed response and inviting these entities to engage in the conversation about how to best incorporate the West Slope Principles and any related thoughts or concerns. In general, many of the West Slope Principles are consistent with the values that will be expressed in Colorado's Water Plan, which are: 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. In addition, the Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC) is working through several issues related to the West Slope Principles and their direction is largely consistent with these values. Colorado's Water Plan also further encourages conservation, reuse, incentives for land use, as well as multi-purpose and cooperative projects. The plan is founded upon scenario planning, which will allow for Colorado to adapt to changing water supplies over time. In addition, the state is working vigorously with other upper basin states and the Colorado River Basin as a whole to mitigate any risks Colorado may face with regard to compact compliance and other interstate issues.
3	3/5/14	Thaddeus Tecza, United North Metro Denver	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.4	Webform comment as follows: " On Monday, March 3, I attended the Denver outreach meeting of the South Platte River Basin Implementation Plan. At that meeting I noted that the Colorado Department of Transportation currently is engaged in the I-70 East Project which will reconstruct and widen I-70 below grade from Dahlia Street to Brighton Boulevard. This will significantly impact the South Platte River in numerous ways including, (A) constructing a barrier that will divert the dominant groundwater drainage for 1.75 miles, (B) releasing large amounts of contaminated groundwater that will need to be treated prior to release into the river, and (3) creating an east-west impervious surface equivalent of a new river that will channel large amounts of contaminated water toward the river with each significant rainfall, rather than allowing normal absorption into the ground. I asked why CDOT is not being required to integrate their activities into the overall South Platte River Basin Implementation Plan. I believe that they should be required to do so rather than being allowed to independently develop their plan. "	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCBC staff will pass this comment on to the South Platte BRT and CDPHE. The Water Quality Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) regulates water quality issues of this nature in the state. However, please note that the CWCBC is working in close coordination with the Water Quality Control Division on Section 5.4 Water Quality, which will be released for public review at the May 2014 CWCBC Board meeting. Finally, many decisions regarding roadway projects are managed at the local level, as opposed to the state having jurisdiction in these matters.
4	3/7/14	Jack Arney, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1	Webform comment as follows: "your comments show your thinking is on the right track..I hope you realize that the objectives you have outlined depend on the amount of snowfall and rain the basins receive. city folks have to realize these basics and how they effect their daily lives. i.e. showers , lawn and car care, gardens and whatever else needs they have." we live on the west slope and have a few acres for hay, etc., and have been involved with a small domestic water company for many years. irrigation is not new to us but sometimes a mystery...I am 82 plus years, a forester and wildlife biologist and still have a lot to learn about water. thanks for the opportunity to visit with you. I will keep in touch."	N/A	Staff response: The CWCBC is working together with the Basin Roundtables (BRTs) to expand education and outreach activities related to raising awareness regarding the issues presented in the webform comments submitted and Chapter 7. Outreach, Education, and Public Engagement will include recommendations on continuing education on these topics long-term. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs.
5	3/8/2014 - 3/15/14	24 emails generated from individuals who submitted a form letter online	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.9	Form letter text base: "As an river enthusiast and active recreational-user, I'm concerned that the Colorado Water Plan is not taking sufficient steps to protect and restore flowing rivers and the tourism and recreation opportunities they provide. I'm writing in support of a Water Plan that is consistent with Governor Hickenlooper's focus on "a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams, and wildlife." Please advance a Water Plan that keeps Colorado's rivers healthy and flowing, increases water recycling and conservation programs, protects our farms and ranches by making agricultural water use more efficient, and find ways to improve flows for river health and our recreational economies."	A separate attachment was created for the Board packet including 24 emails	Staff response: This comment is consistent with Colorado's water values as expressed in Governor Hickenlooper's Executive Order D2013-005 and will be incorporated into Colorado's Water Plan. The values driving Colorado's Water Plan address all of the important strategies mentioned in this group of form letters. Those values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
6	3/7/14	Nik White, American Whitewater Association Member	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.2, 5.9	Webform comment as follows: "1. On May 15, 2013, Governor Hickenlooper signed legislation, HB13-1044, regarding authorization of the use of graywater in Colorado. As a result of the legislation, the Water Quality Control Division of the Department of Public Health and Environment is beginning to develop a graywater control regulation for consideration by the Water Quality Control Commission. Please approve their proposed regulations to allow graywater reuse in residential areas. 2. As an river enthusiast and active recreational-user, I'm concerned that the Colorado Water Plan is not taking sufficient steps to protect and restore flowing rivers and the tourism and recreation opportunities they provide. I'm writing in support of a Water Plan that is consistent with Governor Hickenlooper's focus on "a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams, and wildlife." Please advance a Water Plan that keeps Colorado's rivers healthy and flowing, increases water recycling and conservation programs, protects our farms and ranches by making agricultural water use more efficient, and find ways to improve flows for river health and our recreational economies. "	N/A	Staff response: The issue of graywater in Colorado will be addressed within Subsection 5.6.2 Reuse. The values driving Colorado's Water Plan address all of the important strategies mentioned in this group of form letters. Those values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs.
7	3/8/14	Allison White, American Whitewater	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6, 5.9	Webform comment as follows: " I support the sensible use of water resources, including conservation and reuse efforts. Like many Coloradans, the enjoyment of the outdoors is one of the main reasons I make my home here. I would like to see rivers continue to run for generations to come."	N/A	Staff response: The values driving Colorado's Water Plan address all of the important strategies mentioned in this group of form letters. Those four values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs.
8	3/11/14	Combined comments from Melinda Kassen, WaterJamin Legal & Policy Consulting; Theresa Conley, Conservation Colorado; Bart Miller, Western Resource Advocates	Email to Mike King, James Eklund, and Rebecca Mitchell; forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us	Framework, 1, 5.9, 5.10	Combined comments regarding Chapters 1, 5.9, 5.10, and the Annotated Framework.	Comments on draft attached	Staff response: With regard to modifications to the Annotated Framework, the suggestion is that for 5.9 single purpose environmental or recreational projects should be incorporated. The updated May version of the Annotated Framework includes this change. An additional comment suggested that the description for Section 1.1 of the Annotated Framework should indicate that as we meet the gap, we should be "minimizing the permanent buy and dry of irrigated agriculture and impacts to Colorado's Rivers". The updated May version of the Annotated Framework includes this change. The comments also suggest that some of the wording describing Section 5.10 is confusing and staff has worked to clarify this in the Annotated Framework. The CWCB will review and incorporate the comments as appropriate into the related chapters and sections of Colorado's Water Plan. Since all of the comments are on chapters and sections previously released to the CWCB Board, the final draft versions with all public comments incorporated will be released in October, 2014.
9	3/11/14	David Lorenz, Executive Director of South Suburban Park and Recreation District	Email to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.9, South Platte/Metro BIP	Text from email: "I recently attended the meeting on March 3 that you put on at the Tivoli Turnhall facility in Denver. I was surprised at how little the consultants knew about all the work we are doing on the South Platte River thru Arapahoe County. We have a group that includes representatives from Arapahoe County Open Space, Littleton, Englewood, Sheridan, Urban Drainage and Flood Control, Corp of Engineer, and South Suburban Parks and Recreation District. We have been working for several years to improve the river channel, acquire adjacent lands, build trails and recreation amenities, improve water flows and water quality, and economic development opportunities, etc. I think it would be valuable to coordinate a meeting to bring you up to date regarding what we have accomplished and what we are still working on. I would like to suggest a meeting as soon as possible to share information. In the interest of time, I suggest a meeting with three representatives of our group, Michael Penny, Littleton City Manager; Laura Kroeger, Urban Drainage and Flood Control; and myself. I am the Executive Director of South Suburban Park and Recreation District. Due to scheduling conflicts, is it possible to meet sometime next week or after March 30??"	N/A	Staff response: The CWCB forwarded Mr. Lorenz' email on to the South Platte and Metro basin representatives including the consultant teams, and Roundtable chairs. The Roundtable chairs were in touch with Mr. Lorenz regarding his input.
10	3/12/14	Anthony D'Aquila	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	Yampa/White BIP	Comments regarding the Yampa/White/Green Basin Implementation Plan.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCB Staff will forward the attached letter to the Yampa/White Green Basin Roundtable for review.
11	3/12/14	Polly Hays, US Forest Service	Email to Rebecca Mitchell; forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us	1, 5.2	Comments from the US Forest Service on the draft sections of Colorado's Water Plan that were presented to the Board in January, 2014 (Chapter 1, Section 5.2).	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: The CWCB will review and incorporate the comments from the USFS as appropriate into the related chapters and sections of Colorado's Water Plan. Since all of the comments are on chapters and sections previously released to the CWCB Board, the final draft versions with all public comments incorporated will be released in October, 2014.
12	3/14/14	Ben Beall, Yampa River System Legacy Partnership/America's Great Outdoors	Email to cowaterplan@state.co.us	1, 5.9	Text from email: "I have attached a letter that the Yampa River System Legacy Partnership/ America's Great Outdoors as requested by Jay Gallagher which the Legacy Partnership sent to Jacob Bornstein, Program Manager, CWCB. Last Wednesday, March 12, 2014 the Legacy Partnership submitted a similar letter concerning the CWP to the Yampa/White/Green Roundtable. Thanks for your consideration of the Legacy Partnership Principles in regards to the Yampa River for the CWP."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCB Staff will forward the attached letter to the Yampa/White Green Basin Roundtable for review.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
13	3/16/14	Frances Frainaguirre, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.5	Webform comment as follows: "How can fracking even be considered when all the public hears is that we have a water shortage. Our water sheds and rivers need to be protected for future generations. The lowering of I 70 to accommodate the widening east of I 25 is not the best way to deal with flooding situations. Digging up are a residential street (Race St.) is not an equitable way of dealing with the water table in the widening area."	N/A	Staff response: Fracking currently uses approximately 18,000 acre feet per year, which is a very small proportion of Colorado's overall water use. However, there may be some areas where there are greater regional effects. In addition, power plants that burn natural gas to make energy use less water than traditional power plants. Therefore, from an overall resource management perspective, fracking and the resulting energy production do not consume a significant amount of water compared to current levels. Under Colorado's constitution there is a right to use water for beneficial purposes if it is available. Colorado's Water Plan is not geared toward restricting specific beneficial uses such as fracking. With regard to the concern of flooding associated with the lowering of I-70, this is a local issue. CWCB staff will pass the comment on to the South Platte BRT, will discuss internally with CWCB's Watershed and Flood Protection Section to see if the discussion warrants any state action.
14	3/17/14	Carl Stude, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.4, 5.7	Webform comment as follows: Here's a broad oversight from a person who lives in Western Colorado (Garfield County), but has a national perspective on the importance of allocating water efficiently for a multitude of legitimate uses. To start with, any plan addressing only the water demands of Colorado is flawed in ignoring the potentially greater demands of downstream states, and also flawed in not recognizing the potential for economics (especially, trading of water rights) to allocate the water most fairly and efficiently on a national basis. All of the platitudes about sustaining agriculture in Colorado, or on the Western slope, tend to divert attention from two facts about agriculture in Colorado that relies upon irrigation rights dating back to the 19th Century: 1. Irrigated agriculture is far and away the greatest consumptive use of water, and where municipal water requirements are concerned, irrigation of lawns is by far the greatest consumptive use. Aside from irrigation, normal domestic and industrial uses consume relatively little water, because the vast majority is treated and returned to streams for subsequent re-use. The implication is that areas of high population such as the front range can meet their basic water NEEDs by reducing irrigation and recycling water (particularly for irrigation and industrial cooling). I would consider the basic NEED to be about the 60 gallons per person per day that typical communities use for domestic and commercial purposes, without irrigation or recycling. 2. Much of the agricultural irrigation is of pastures used to grow hay to feed to livestock. That is an extremely inefficient way to grow food, and this would become apparent if there were a market mechanism that allowed farmers and ranchers to sell their water rights to downstream users -- including those in other states. This does NOT mean that all water being used to irrigate pastures in Colorado would necessarily be sold for growing, say, lettuce or almonds in Southern California. While I do not know the exact relationship between the inches of water applied to forage crops and the production per acre, it is apparent that the amount of water being applied to pastures in my area is well into the area of diminishing returns. That means that, with appropriate market incentives, ranchers or other farmers would optimize their incomes by selling a part of their water rights and continuing to operate with less water. I am also aware that maintaining certain minimum flows of water in streams provides considerable benefit in the form of recreation and preservation of wildlife. Some of this benefit can be measured in dollar terms and some cannot. But in most cases, selling water rights to there parties would simply involve shifting water diversions farther downstream, such that more miles of stream would experience more natural levels of flow. It is an excellent example of the way that enhanced economic efficiency can be compatible with environmental protection. "	N/A	Staff response: Regarding comment 1) Lawn irrigation - the commenter is correct in stating that urban lawn irrigation consumes more water than other municipal water uses. Subsection 5.6.1 explores opportunities for municipal conservation including outdoor use. It is important to understand that urban environments that include vegetation are critical aspects of vibrant cities, which is a value driving Colorado's Water Plan. While Colorado's Water Plan won't get into the technical details concerning consumptive use, this issue will be addressed in the 2016 update of the Statewide Water Supply Initiative. Regarding comment 2) Colorado's Water Plan will discuss agricultural sharing in many ways including the potential to use agricultural water for Interruptible Supply Agreements (ISA) and agricultural/nonconsumptive partnerships. Additional information is available in Subsections 5.6.4 and Section 5.7.
15	3/18/14	Ellis McFadden, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	General	Webform comment as follows: "General concern about water in Colorado"	N/A	Staff response: N/A
16	3/19/14	Lee-Ann Hill, Dolores River Boating Advocates	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.9, Southwest BIP	Comments from Dolores River Boating Advocates for the Colorado's Water Plan, most of which were also discussed in person with CWCB staff.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: The CWCB appreciates the encouragement to continue to engage on solving the difficult issues on the Dolores River. CWCB and the Southwest Basin Roundtable have helped fund efforts, such as "A Way Forward," and will continue to support the Dolores River Dialogue process as appropriate. Staff will pass these comments onto the Southwest Basin Roundtable. CWCB has helped fund the operation of the Slick Rock Gage on an annual basis, and if there is considerable local support for funding the Slick Rock gage on a more permanent basis, will discuss with the CWCB Board how CWCB may be able to help fund it on a more permanent basis. Staff encourages Dolores River Boating Advocates to partner with other groups and ask the Basin Roundtable or the Watershed Protection Fund for assistance to develop a Watershed Plan for the Upper Dolores River. This could incorporate the optimization study, youth involvement, and watershed assessments. Because staff has supported many watershed efforts across the state, please contact Chris Sturm for some example grants and watershed plans that have been fruitful.
17	3/24/14	Melinda Kassen, WaterJamin Legal & Policy Consulting	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.4	Comments on the draft 3/14 outline and 3/10 text of section 5.4 of Colorado's Water Plan from Conservation Colorado.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: Staff passed the comment onto the CDPHE Water Quality Control Division, and will work to incorporate this and other comments to Section 5.4 into the revisions due to the Board in October.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014							
Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
18	3/24/14	Mary Gardner, Colorado Wastewater Utility Council	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.4, 5.6.2, 6.1	Webform comment as follows: "The Colorado Wastewater Utility Council is submitting comments relating to water quality issues. The Colorado Wastewater Utility Council (CWWUC) is a nonprofit organization. Its mission is to professionally and responsibly promote environmental protection by supporting legislation and regulations which achieve well-defined environmental benefits while maintaining local flexibility. The CWWUC represents large, medium and small wastewater treatment facilities, state wide. "	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: The Colorado Wastewater Utility Council provided several comments. Several of the comments related to reuse were incorporated into Subsection 5.6.2 and those comments will be considered for incorporation into the October draft of that subsection. With regard to 208 Plan funding, CWCB staff will discuss this further with the CWCB Board in May, 2014. Funding will be incorporated into Section 6.1. CWCB staff would welcome the opportunity to better understand watershed permitting from the CWUC perspective. CWCB staff will further research the EPA's "agency interpretation of applicability of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act to Water Transfers". With regard to additional recommendations for permitting concerning the lengthy and uncertain permitting of reuse projects, CWCB staff will consider these for incorporation into the October draft of Section 5.10. Subsection 5.6.2 Reuse does support technical development for reclaiming wastewater.
19	3/25/14	Tricia Bernhard, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	4	Webform comment as follows: "I recently learned about the development of the statewide Colorado Water Plan and applaud the efforts that are being made. Water planning is of paramount importance in Colorado and is a complex issue. My personal concern is the issue of groundwater being used to meet the needs of growing urban populations. As we know, groundwater is generally considered to be a non-renewable resource and must be managed carefully to continue serving the needs of rural Colorado into the future. I am a land owner and resident in southern Douglas County near the headwaters of the South Platte River Basin. There is a potential disastrous groundwater extraction project looming in our area, often referred to as the Greenland Ranch water project. The owners of the groundwater (apparently the Anschutz and Malone families) obtained a water court decree in 1995 giving them the rights to extract 38,000 acre feet (AF) of groundwater per year from the Greenland Ranch area, PLUS, they can legally take that amount for every year since that time, presumably at one time! (Quick math comes to 722,000 AF of groundwater) That amount of groundwater mining, in my opinion, will forever change the aquifer system in this area. Residents and landowners in this part of southern Douglas County have no other potential sources of water. The Greenland Ranch water project is short sited and not a long term solution to water planning. I have repeatedly asked for help from Douglas County (water planner, commissioners) and the State Engineer to consider this matter carefully, to model this amount of groundwater extraction, to inform the public, to disclose information from the test wells and pump tests etc. My requests have met brick walls, primarily due to attorneys hired by the groundwater owners who are doing a good job of keeping most of the information confidential. That said, I would like to be involved in Colorado's water planning and am particularly interested in groundwater planning as a piece of the overall water supply scenario. Please let me know how my voice can be heard and how I can be involved. Are there round table discussions planned in the southern portion of the South Platte River Basin (Douglas County)? I did not see any on the schedule shown on the website. Thank you for your help and consideration."	N/A	Staff response: Nontributary groundwater is declining as indicated by the commenter. CWCB has funded studies including groundwater well monitoring in rural areas of Douglas County. CWCB agrees with the commenter that depleting bedrock aquifers is not a long-term solution, and Colorado's Water Plan and the South Platte / Metro Basin Implementation Plan will encourage renewable alternatives. As part of this, the Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC) is exploring the use of the Denver Basin Aquifer as a drought reserve, and the South Metro Water Supply Authority has worked with Denver Water and Aurora Water on the WISE Partnership, which provides renewable water to urban areas within Douglas County. Any work on developing renewable water supply alternatives, or limiting the use of bedrock aquifers must be done under direction of the respective local land use authority.
20	3/27/14	Kent Holsinger, Holsinger Law on behalf of the Colorado Oil and Gas Association	Email to James Eklund; forward to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.5	Colorado Oil and Gas Association's Position Paper on Colorado's Water Plan. The document was circulated to the Basin Roundtables as well.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCB staff appreciates the thoughtful comments from COGA and will work to incorporate the concepts into 5.6.5 Self-supplied industrial. CWCB will explore with the Colorado Energy Office the permitting suggestions made by COGA for the October draft version of Section 5.10.
21	3/27/14	Jan Cornwell, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.5	Webform comment as follows: " I see no mention of fracking. This uses lots of water. Where does the water come from? Obviously, the Colorado river. What impact does this have of the quality of the remaining water in the river? And many more questions. I was told last night at the meeting in Frisco, CO, that this is a political question. Yes, of course it is. But, Isn't this the time to look at all sides of the issue? Please include some information in your web site and PLEASE include something about it in the basin plan. "	N/A	Staff response: Fracking will be discussed in Subsection 5.6.5 Self-supplied industrial and will be further discussed in SWSI. Fracking currently uses approximately 18,000 acre feet per year, which is a very small proportion of Colorado's overall water use. However, there may be some areas where there are greater regional effects. In addition, power plants that burn natural gas to make energy use less water than traditional power plants. Therefore, from an overall resource management perspective, fracking and the resulting energy production do not consume a significant amount of water compared to current levels. Under Colorado's constitution there is a right to use water for beneficial purposes if it is available. Colorado's Water Plan is not geared toward restricting specific beneficial uses such as fracking.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
22	3/28/14	Eddie Kochman, Colorado Citizen	Email to Craig Godbout & Linda Bassi; forwarded to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.3, 5.6.5, 5.9, 6.1	Text from email: "I have attached my comments and recommendations for input into the Colorado State Water process. I did attend the recent Fairplay meeting. Since my major input concerns stream, rivers and aquatic habitats I am also providing a copy to Linda Bassi. Thank you again for the presentation and opportunity for input. I hope members of the Board are taking the time to read the various public comments."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: The CWCB will pass the comments related to encouraging a strategic look at environmental needs to the South Platte and Metro BRTs and CWCB's Stream and Lake Protection Section. With regard to funding, this will be further explored in Section 6.1 including the Instream Flow Acquisition Program and opportunities to support monitoring. The commenter asked if riparian areas could be protected with instream flows. Although not fully tested, instream flows can be designed to directly benefit riparian areas, and the CWCB Stream and Lake Protection Section will discuss the issue with the CWCB Board in May, 2014. CWCB has been working with the BLM to design an approach to in-stream flows by providing a flood flow component in the spring. Comments related to watersheds will be incorporated into Section 5.3. The CWCB will use the Source Water Assessment and Protection Plan (SWAP) in the Upper South Platte as an example and will consider funding for SWAPs as part of the recommendations. CWCB staff will discuss with the CWCB Board in May, 2014 the issues related to both SWAP and 208 plans. Regarding the comments related to fracking: Fracking will be discussed in Subsection 5.6.5 Self-supplied industrial and will be further discussed in SWSI. Fracking currently uses approximately 18,000 acre feet per year, which is a very small proportion of Colorado's overall water use. However, there may be some areas where there are greater regional effects. In addition, power plants that burn natural gas to make energy use less water than traditional power plants. Therefore, from an overall resource management perspective, fracking and the resulting energy production do not consume a significant amount of water compared to current levels. Under Colorado's constitution there is a right to use water for beneficial purposes if it is available. Colorado's Water Plan is not geared toward restricting specific beneficial uses such as fracking.
23	3/31/14	Harlene Michaels, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1, 5.6.4	Webform comment as follows: "Promote aquaponics, as it is an extremely waterwise method of growing food. Require all new construction to collect roof water, as a huge percentage of our water is lost to evaporation. Collecting roof water and storing it until used and returned to the aquifer could increase our water supply tenfold, according to statistics I heard at a water basin roundtable. Consider other methods of limiting evaporation in agriculture, such as heavy mulching."	N/A	Staff response: The commenter's suggestion to further explore aquaponics is an interesting one, however it will not be able to fully meet our agricultural needs in 2050. However CWCB will discuss with the Colorado Dept. of Agriculture's regarding any programs to support aquaponics. Rainwater harvesting does have some limitations within current Colorado water law. However, CWCB maintains a pilot program to explore how rainwater harvesting can be used. This is further discussed in Subsection 5.6.1. The commenter is also concerned with agricultural water conservation such as mulching, and this is further explored in Subsection 5.6.4.
24	4/1/14	David Smeltzer, Retired Division of Wildlife Fish Hatchery Manager	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.9	Webform comment as follows: "I attended the March 5, 2014 South Platte Basin Roundtable meeting and heard much informative information and Q&A sessions. After the meeting I spoke to one of the roundtable speakers about my concerns that if we are to have healthy rivers and aquatic environments that always rate high on our quality of life issues in Colorado we must require that minimum water flows remain in most all of our rivers and streams. The speaker told me that information would be highly desireable in the decision making process, but they didn't have the time, money or biologist resources to establish those parameters. I told her that I was sure that the Department of Parks and Wildlife biologists already had a very good idea of those minimum stream flow parameters and would inquire about that issue. I recently spoke with Ken Kehmeier, Senior Fisheries Biologist for the South Platte Basin and he informed me that the DPW in fact does, and has for years, researched and established firm minimum stream flow parameters for almost every stream reach in Colorado, especially head water streams. This information I feel is critical to knowing what minimum water flows must be maintained in our rivers and streams for healthy fish, insect, and riparian habitats. Our streams and rivers are vital to Colorado's quality of life and should not be dewatered below those levels and therefore would establish a baseline for what water would be available above those baselines for use in all other municipal, agricultural or industrial needs. Planning for useable water supplies without following the healthy aquatic baselines would be irresponsible in the least and a waste of time and money in the planning process you have deemed so important to sensible growth and a quality of life issues for all of Colorado. I urge everyone involved in this water planning endeavor to make this statewide minimum stream flow data foremost in importance and vision in this critical process. "	N/A	Staff response: CWCB has worked closely with Colorado Parks and Wildlife and runs the Instream Flow Program. Staff will communicate with Ken Kehmeier to determine if there is additional content that should be included Colorado's Water Plan related to this issue.
25	4/1/14	Mark Snyder, Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.4, 5.9	Text from email: "Water usage is an important issue that effects us all, especially those of us who use the water for recreation. I'm concerned that the Colorado Water Plan is not taking sufficient steps to protect and restore rivers and the tourism and recreation opportunities they provide. I am in support of a Water Plan that is consistent with Governor Hickenlooper's focus on "a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams, and wildlife." Please advance a Water Plan that keeps Colorado's rivers healthy and flowing, increases water recycling and conservation programs, protects our farms and ranches by making agricultural water use more efficient, nd find ways to improve flows for river health and our recreational economies."	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan supports values concerning recreation and agriculture. Recreational projects will be explored within Section 5.9 and agricultural conservation will be explored in Subsection 5.6.4.
26	4/2/14	Dave Miller, Natural Energy Resources Company	Email sent to James Eklund, forwarded to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.11	Letter regarding "Colorado's ignored sustainable water and energy solutions"	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: Many of the concepts and motivations behind the commenter's proposal are similar to the latest IBCC work. However, to move the commenter's specific concept forward with modeling will require either the project proponent to model it on his own, or stakeholder support for it.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
27	4/2/14	Bart Miller, Western Resource Advocates	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	3, 5.6.1, 5.6.2	Webform comment as follows: "Please see the attached document -- labeled "March 18 CWCB board meeting" -- which are talking points for the short comments I provided at the recent board meeting. -- Thanks "	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: Staff appreciates Western Resource Advocates' comments. Concerning further detailing the "gap", the Basin Implementation Plans should allow for greater detail. The Best Management Practices provided by WRA and other conservation groups were passed on to the BRTs and the initial draft Chapter 5.6 explores conservation and reuse. Colorado's Water Plan suggests that at a minimum and in the near term, Colorado should seek to implement "medium" conservation practices while acknowledging that in the future "high" levels of conservation may be needed depending on which scenario presents itself in Colorado.
28	4/3/14	James Lochhead, Front Range Water Council	Letter to John Stulp, Rebecca Mitchell, and Jacob Bornstein; forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.11	Letter regarding the "New Supply Discussion"	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: Comments from the FRWC regarding the work of the BRT Chairs has been helpful. The letter was provided to the chairs and they plan on responding that the work was conceptual in nature. The CWCB appreciates the participation of FRWC members in furthering these discussions at the IBCC meetings.
29	4/4/14	Melinda Kassen, on behalf of several conservation organizations listed in the summary	Email to Kate McIntire, forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.6	The attached document details some best practices that several conservation organizations put together and asked us to send to the Basin Roundtables. The participating organizations include Western Resource Advocates, Environmental Defense Fund, Conservation Colorado, and several other NGO's. They relied upon the IBCC letter to the Governors and No/Low Regrets strategies to extract this list of best practices.	Comments in attached document	Staff response: The CWCB appreciates the efforts of Conservation Colorado and other non-governmental organizations in putting together these Best Management Practices. These were sent to the BRTs for consideration.
30	4/4/14	Gene Watkins, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	4	Webform comment as follows: "Reducing evaporation from non-recreation reservoirs: You may want to examine use of a thin plastic membrane (similar to bubble wrap) to cover the non-recreation reservoirs surface during non-frozen months. A huge amount of water could be saved by avoiding the evaporation from those reservoirs and this is a simple, effective and (relatively) cheap way to save that water. Total evaporation loss is about 2.5 million acre feet. If you use this (or some) method to avoid a material portion of that loss, and increase the places that are barred from recreational use (and thusly available for anti-evaporation efforts) you will have saved a lot of water. UV damage will likely require annual new membranes, but you can recycle the plastic for some cost recovery. "	N/A	Staff response: CWCB agrees with the commenter that evaporation loss is significant. A number of potential solutions have been explored over the years. Unfortunately, there is not currently a technically or financially viable option.
31	4/4/14	Carey Barta, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1, 5.9	Webform comment as follows: "I am willing to Xeriscape where I can but would still like to see trees and green grass. I would love to preserve the water rec for when my son is able to play on water (ski, raft), and maybe his children. Maybe advertise what happens in 20+ years with our current water consumption. Wake some people up. The automatic faucets in bathrooms really do help, I think! "	N/A	Staff response: The comments expressed are consistent with many of Colorado's Water Plan values. Colorado needs both vibrant cities with urban landscapes and robust recreation and tourism.
32	4/4/14	Jeffrey Winters, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	3	Webform comment as follows: "Here's a simple solution that will absolutely work to improve the situation with water supply Put A Complete Halt To Anymore New Housing Developments being built around the metropolitan area! (front Range) Colorado has reached capacity and simply can't accommodate any more people with the limited amount of water available. State officials knew the situation, and that Colorado needed some kind of building moratorium 20 years ago. Members of city and state governments will just have to stand up to the powerful home builders associations. If the construction industry wants to stay active in the area, they can revitalize older neighborhoods with remodels or build upgraded new homes on older established lots. The governor knows this example; When a bar or restaurant is filled to capacity with customers, that business will stop seating people, and puts patrons on a waiting list, the business doesn't try to cram in more tables and chairs, it just won't work, (kitchen and wait-staff can only accommodate a certain amount of people, without a complete breakdown in service.) Thank you for your consideration.	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes three 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. The CWCB is working with each basin on their Basin Implementation Plan and will continue to encourage all interested parties to do the same.
33	4/4/14	Sue Provenza, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1	Webform comment as follows: "Dear CWP, I would like to see the front range cities in this state make a concerted effort at xeroscaping and turning their water thirsty green lawns into food gardens (food security) by incentives (possibly tax credits?) and punishment (higher water rates), to show that they are serious about water conservation. You know, doing their part. Thank you for your consideration."	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan encourages conservation and this is explored in Section 5.6.
34	4/4/14	Peter Morelli, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1, 5.6.5, 5.7	Webform comment as follows: "I believe large-scale opportunities exist in Colorado to reduce water usage and maintain Colorado's values and lifestyle. 1. Reduce Residential Water Usage a. Change pricing structure of water to change consumer behavior i. Implement increasing marginal pricing of water 1. Unit price increases as usage increases b. Discourage water-intensive lawns & gardens in Denver's arid climate i. Promote aesthetics of desert-scape to improve acceptance c. Mandate / subsidize sales of water efficient faucets, shower heads, toilets, etc. in Colorado d. Distribute information on individual household usage relative to neighbors 2. Provide Industry Incentives to Conserve Water a. Agriculture i. Allow land owners to sell water rights to Colorado on a defined periods of time 1. When water is scarce, prices increase, land owners incentivized to sell water rights 2. When water supply increases, prices drop, land owners incentivized to cultivate land b. Oil & Gas i. If increasing marginal pricing implemented residentially, the same should hold for industry uses of water (even if unit prices differ between commercial and residential markets)"	N/A	Staff response: With regard to indoor water conservation and tiered rate structures, the vast majority of water providers currently operate with tiered water rates. As the commenter suggests, this is an effective means for conserving water. If recent legislation, such as the "Fixtures Bill" and "Turf Bill", become law, they will allow for further efforts for both indoor and outdoor conservation. Comments concerning agricultural sharing are incorporated in Section 5.7. With regard to oil and gas, many of the energy companies develop their own water sources and therefore municipal water providers have little control over oil and gas water usage.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
35	4/5/14	Emery Cowan, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1	Webform comment as follows: "I believe it is vital that this plan consider the implementation of programs and regulations that serve to reduce water consumption among residents with both a carrot and a stick approach. I support tiered billing systems to encourage people to use less and programs like that used by Denver Water install water efficient fixtures in low-income homes for free. I think that residents across the state need to better recognize the value of water and part of that recognition, I believe, would come from higher water rates and a bigger emphasis on the need to conserve in the home. I also support actions like the initial language of a bill carried by Ellen Roberts this legislative session to limit the law size of new suburban developments across the state. There is no reason that we shouldn't start planning and implementing regulations that recognize the reality that we are facing a gaping water deficit and we need to change our consumption habits to adapt. I think state and local governments need to take a more strong willed approach to implementing regulations that will accomplish conservation goals. "	N/A	Staff response: With regard to indoor water conservation and tiered rate structures, the vast majority of water providers currently operate with tiered water rates. As the commenter suggests, this is an effective means for conserving water. If recent legislation, such as the "Fixtures Bill" and "Turf Bill", become law, they will allow for further efforts for both indoor and outdoor conservation.
36	4/6/14	Kyle Helton, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6	Webform comment as follows: "Government recognition of xeriscaping, no more green lawns that only show off affluence without regards to the water needs of others. Orientation on CO climate for people from less arid areas. Cleaner waterways around the Denver area, with more protection for wetlands. Renegotiate water agreements with other Western states. Better fracking protection, conversations about water use in fracking. Water conservation earning tax credit. Tightening restrictions on land and water use so that water isn't being used improperly. Restrictions on plastics that require water to make. Public landscaping should be xeriscaped, but there should still be grassy areas for people to romp on (we would also be willing to romp on dirt/mud). More water conservation in kitchens and bathrooms; grey water in toilets; strategies to conserve while bathing, cleaning, etc. Give water priority to local farmers. "	N/A	Staff response: The commenter provides many interesting concepts, many of which are explored in Section 5.6.
37	4/7/14	Ken Neubecker, American Rivers	Email to Jacob Bornstein; forwarded to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.9, 5.11	Text from Email: "I wanted to give you a heads up about the American Rivers listing of the upper Colorado river system in Colorado this Wednesday as the second most endangered “river” in the country. The impetus for the listing comes from the persistent calls for a “New Supply” diversion by Front Range entities. The focus is on the Colorado Water Plan, with the idea of getting as many more common citizens engaged as possible with protecting West Slope rivers and water supplies. I am attaching the press release that was sent out, as well as the report page that will be printed. The White River is being listed separately because of potential threats from energy development."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCB staff appreciates American River's informing us of their decision to list the Upper Colorado River as the second most endangered river in the country. Colorado's Water Plan will not have a specific transmountain diversion project as part of the plan. One of the driving forces behind development of Colorado's Water Plan is to create solutions that support these values: 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife.
38	4/9/14	Robert Rutkowski, Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	1, 5.6.1, 5.7, 5.9	Text from Email:"I am writing to ask that you insist Colorado’s rivers be protected through specific stream improvement projects identified in each river basin. These rivers include the Yampa, Green, Colorado, Fraser, Blue, Eagle, Fryingpan, Roaring Fork, and Gunnison Rivers. All of these rivers are now being targeted for potential new projects that could drain even more water to the Front Range. There simply is not enough water left to satisfy all the demands being made without irreparably damaging the health of our world-class rivers. The Colorado River and its major tributaries are the economic foundation of the West Slope of Colorado. Current diversions that move water across the continental divide already take more than half a million acre feet (over 160 billion gallons) each year. Other projects already in the works will drain even more. Colorado River headwaters see as much as 40 to 60 percent of their flow siphoned off by Front Range diversions. Additional diversions would take as much as 80 percent from some rivers when they are completed. These massive reductions in flow have left a wake of damaged rivers in the heart of Colorado’s most famous scenic and recreational areas. Yet the Front Range still demands more water. The Upper Colorado River itself is nearly sucked dry, so some interests are shifting their focus to the Yampa, Green, and Gunnison Basins. Any new diversion from the Colorado River basin in Colorado must be only a distant and last resort. There are many alternatives that must be employed first, including much greater conservation and efficient use of both municipal and agricultural water. Colorado’s Water Plan needs to incorporate these conservation essentials: * High levels of water conservation by urban water providers in their local plans * A more refined and accurate forecast of the Front Range’s municipal water “gap” * An emphasis on water re-use/recycling projects as the infrastructure of the future * Recognize that large new trans-mountain diversions from the Colorado River Basin are not the solution for filling the Front Range “gap” Colorado’s Water Plan must also recognize the need to quantify and provide for the real water needs of healthy rivers, streams, and a “strong environment.” The water needs and “gap” for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses are well documented, but not for the non-consumptive needs of the environment and recreation. Providing for non-consumptive needs must be more than just “enhancements” added on to both existing and planned diversions. They must be plans in their own right, adding flow to damaged rivers. Flows need to meet the needs of healthy rivers and the species they support, not just “minimum flows.” We need to add specific measures in each basin that support nature and recreation when managing Colorado’s rivers. Colorado faces a difficult task in formulating the State Water Plan. It is imperative that we craft a plan that will provide the water needed for our communities, our farms, and our rivers. We need to think boldly, with a new vision and ideas that are truly innovative and pioneering. The status quo approach from the 19th and 20th centuries does not work. We must prepare for the future of Colorado. I urge you and the Colorado Water Conservation Board to take the needs of rivers and recreation seriously in this plan. We need to make sure that your declared Colorado value of “a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams, and wildlife” extends to all the great rivers that make up the Colorado River.	N/A	Staff response: CWCB staff will clarify that Section 5.9 and the Basin Implementation Plans can include single purpose environmental and recreational projects. Many of the points made by the commenter are consistent with the values of Colorado’s Water Plan values, and the plan will encourage conservation, agricultural sharing, and the development of planned projects. Still, this may not be enough. The IBCC is exploring new ways to develop balanced projects that meet Colorado's future needs.
39	4/9/14	Camille Gilbert, California Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.9	Text from email: "As a supporter of American Rivers, Conservation Colorado, Western Resource Advocates, Friends of the Yampa, and High Country Conservation Advocates, I am writing to ask that you insist Colorado’s rivers be protected through specific stream improvement projects identified in each river basin. These rivers include the Yampa, Green, Colorado, Fraser, Blue, Eagle, Fryingpan, Roaring Fork, and Gunnison Rivers. All of these rivers are now being targeted for potential new projects that could drain even more water to the Front Range. There simply is not enough water left to satisfy all the demands being made without irreparably damaging the health of our world-class rivers."	N/A	Staff response: The CWCB and the Basin Roundtables will be working to support conservation, environment, and recreation in the Basin Implementation Plans and draft of Colorado’s Water Plan. Meeting Colorado’s nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado’s Water Plan. In addition, the CWCB’s Water Supply Reserve Account (WSRA) grant program has been used by several basins to analyze water flow requirements related to ecological values.
40	4/9/14	Eric Johanson, Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	General	Text from email: "Can you suggest a resource that shows all the water sources and needs for Colorado and the sharing states?"	N/A	Staff response: CWCB staff suggests that the commenter read the "Citizen's Guide to Interstate Compacts" published by the Colorado Foundation for Water Education.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014							
Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
41	4/10/14	Melinda Kassen, WaterJamin Legal & Policy Consulting	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.4	Conservation Colorado's Comments on Chapter 5.4 Water Quality of Colorado's Water Plan.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: These comments were incorporated into the current draft of Section 5.4 by the CDPHE Water Quality Control Division.
42	4/10/14	Mary Keyes, Northwest Colorado Council of Governments (NWCCOG)	Email to Jacob Bornstein and Rebecca Mitchell; forwarded to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.4	NWCCOG's comments on the April 2, 2014 draft Section 5.4 Water Quality.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: These comments were incorporated into the current draft of Section 5.4 by the CDPHE Water Quality Control Division.
43	4/13/14	Maria Strausbaugh, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.2, 5.4	Webform comments as follows: " I believe it is completely irresponsible for the Front Range to continue to want to take more and more water from the western slope. Whatever happened to being stewards to the environment? The wildlife, a large source of revenue for this state, can not speak for itself. It's time we take a good hard look at what is going on here. As a resident of the Vail Valley, I see how the drought years affect us and the environment. Why should we suffer more while Denver just takes and takes. It's time to restrict their water supply. We have watering restrictions, fines, etc. every season even when no water supply emergency is in place. Why not Denver? It's time to learn to make due with what is available and stop the waste and the insanity. "	N/A	Staff response: Denver Water has restrictions and associated fees every year, even when there is not technically a drought. Colorado's Water Plan will encourage conservation, reuse, agricultural sharing, and implementing planned projects. However, this may not be enough, so Colorado must plan for additional options in the future.
44	4/14/14	Kent Brakken, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	4, 5.6.1, 5.6.2	Webform comment as follows: "I have not YET read the Plan; however, I have comments that may be useful to the planners. I trained in the natural resources: BS, Soil Science, U of Wisconsin, Madison; MS, Forest Ecology, U of Washington, Seattle; and PhD, Range Science, Colorado State University. I mapped soils in Colorado, San Juan NF and worked on timber harvest, mining and prescribed burning projects, White River NF. I have worked on mining, mine permitting clean up of mixed waste industrial sites in Colorado and in some 20 other US states. What are my thoughts on long-term water use planning for the State of Colorado? 1. Niobrara Aquifer: Increasing rates of water withdrawal have raised concerns about sustainability of yields from Denver Basin aquifers. I suggest that ground water from the Niobrara Aquifer is being pumped, withdrawn and used at rates that will limit the land uses currently using that water. I suggest that the State of Colorado (hereafter referred to as State) work with the other states using that aquifer and an/implement the best long-term use of that and other Colorado aquifers used by western states. 2. I have seen cases in which a Colorado municipality waters, that is, sprinkle irrigates municipal street grass median to the point where excess irrigation water drains into the street and down the waste water drains. I suggest that irrigation policies be implemented to save this precious water resource. 3. Subject: Gray Water. I built a home in Delta County, CO. I wanted to use the Gray Water from my home (as compared to Black Water) to irrigate trees I planted around my house. The Colorado sanitary regulations apparently did not allow me to do that. I suggest that those regulations be changed to the end that a home owner can use sanitary Gray Water to irrigate trees and landscaping plants. 4. I suggest that the State draft and implement regulations not just allowing, but rather encouraging land developers to separate Gray Water from Black Water and build facilities to treat and then beneficially used Gray Water in Colorado housing and home building projects. 5. In Las Cruces, NM, I saw expensive homes using xeriscape plants and xeriscape landscaping designs. Apparently, Las Cruces, NM encourages that water conservation alternative. I suggest that the State and Colorado municipalities aggressively support the conversion of Kentucky bluegrass irrigated lawns to xeriscape conditions. I suggest that the State and affected municipalities reimburse home owners the cost of converting said bluegrass lawns to xeriscape vegetation for the purpose of conserving water. I suggest that home owners desiring to pour valuable water on bluegrass lawns be charged a much greater cost for that land use in order to encourage home owners to change that behavior, to conserve water and reduce water charges for themselves. 6. I suggest that Colorado industries and individual businesses be encouraged to reduce water use through State environmental permitting and compliance regulations. Industries/businesses that conserve water should be encouraged, while industries/businesses that contaminate and/or waste water should be discouraged. 7. I suggest that the State should look to sources of water in the Midwest and be involved in the purchase and transport (large water pipelines) from Midwestern sources. Given that this will result in interstate agreements, the Federal Government will almost certainly be involved in the planning and implementation of said long-term water agreements.	N/A	Staff response: 1) Colorado's groundwater resources are important and will be discussed in Section 3 Water Supply. Colorado's Water Plan will encourage development of renewable resources. 2) Outdoor conservation is an important aspect of Colorado's Water Plan and is explored in Subsection 5.6.1. Local land use control must be respected at the same time. Land use related issues are described in Subsection 5.6.3. 3) Graywater is discussed in Section 5.6 as well. 4) CWCB staff will discuss with the CWCB Board in May, 2014 opportunities to "encourage land developers to separate graywater from blackwater and develop facilities to treat and beneficially use graywater." 5) Outdoor conservation is explored in Subsection 5.6.1 and the "Turf Bill" provides an opportunity to further explore options for outdoor water conservation. CWCB staff will discuss with the CWCB Board in May, 2014 opportunities to further incentivize xeriscaping. 6) Many municipalities are working with individual businesses to reduce municipal water use. 7) Water sources from the Midwest have been explored and are not currently viable at this time.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
45	4/15/14	Neil McLane, Natural Design Solutions, Inc.	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1	Webform comments as follows: As a landscape architect who has promoted water conservation practices for over two decades, I would like to discuss some landscape water conservation measures for your consideration. Landscape water conservation: My company, Natural Design Solutions, has been able to reduce landscape irrigation needs for many of our clients from 25%-100%, depending on the type of groundcover selected. Bluegrass and other high water turf varieties typically require the greatest amount of supplemental water of any groundcover. Low-water turf varieties typically use about 25% less irrigation than bluegrass, whereas Xeric shrub beds use from 40-90% less water than bluegrass. Native grass mixes typically need some supplemental water for establishment, but can be taken off of irrigation once established. The cost of converting bluegrass turf to low water native grasses can pay for itself in less than 2 years. Tiered water rates can penalize heavy water users and provide the cost saving incentive necessary to switch from high water turf to low-water plant varieties. We have clients that have saved over \$30,000 in water fees in the first year after conversion of large bluegrass areas to native turf. Watering restrictions can also have a long-term affect on plant selection and water consumption. A 3-day/week watering restriction makes it very difficult to maintain a green turf in Summer months. A 2 day/week watering restriction can result in bluegrass browning out in the Summer heat. No one wants to have brown turf in the growing season, so the more these restrictions become the norm, the less we will see people opting for high-water turf. Daily restrictions can prevent larger properties from applying sufficient water to all sprinkler zones within the allotted time frame. Some of the most efficient sprinklers spread the water slowly, often with several cycles, reducing runoff and giving the water more time to infiltrate. Daily water restrictions can actually encourage waste, providing a disincentive for using these low-water sprinklers and encouraging the use of sprinklers that apply the maximum amount of water in the shortest time. An annual water budget could be more flexible than daily restrictions, and would allow users to be more creative in reducing water consumption, while effectively providing for the needs of landscape plants. The main problem with water budgets is in being able to track consumption, as well as separating irrigation from potable water consumption. The expense of adding a separate meter for irrigation can be prohibitive. Rainwater harvesting: Colorado interprets prior appropriation law as prohibiting rainwater harvesting, whereas in neighboring New Mexico, which also ascribes to the "prior appropriation" model, this practice is strongly encouraged. Rain water detention is permitted in Colorado to reduce peak storm water discharge rates. Detention is permitted, but retention is not, unless you own the water rights. Since any water harvested for irrigation will be applied to the land within a short time frame, rainwater harvesting does not affect the total volume of water entering a watershed, it only reduces peak flow rates that have been exacerbated by development. Could we not simply reclassify rainwater harvesting for landscape irrigation as detention? No harm no foul to downstream water rights holders. In a world with limited water resources, landscape irrigation is one of the least essential water uses, yet landscape irrigation accounts for about half of urban water use. With limited resources, landscape irrigation should not compete for potable water resources. A truly sustainable landscape is one that can survive after the tap is shut off. Through creative incentives and regulation we can reasonably anticipate a 50-75% reduction in landscape water consumption.	N/A	Staff response: The vast majority of municipalities already utilize tiered water rates and Colorado's Water Plan will further encourage the use of water budgets. The "Turf Bill" provides an opportunity to explore additional options for outdoor water conservation. Colorado's Water Plan will not fundamentally change Colorado's water rights system. The Prior Appropriation Doctrine, which is in Colorado's Constitution, typically dictates that rainwater is used by a downstream user. However, the CWCB maintains a rainwater harvesting pilot program to address some of the issues presented in this comment. Conservation and reuse, including gray water, will be strategies considered in Colorado's Water Plan. It sounds like the commenter may have some photos representing low water use landscapes and CWCB would appreciate receiving any of those photos for inclusion in its documents.
46	4/16/14	Scott Canby, Colorado Citizen	Email to James Eklund; forward to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.1	Text from email: "Mr. Eklund - I recently heard your interview and discussion on CPR regarding the states plans for managing our future water needs - a subject I have a great deal of interest in I am a Manufacturers Rep in Colorado and I thought you might find the following low water grass seed product of interest - add it as another arrow in your quiver I was introduced to Pearls at the US Greenbuild Expo several years ago: FYI http://www.pearlspremium.com "	N/A	Staff response: The CWCB appreciates the link to low maintenance and low water use grass products provided by Pearls Premium.
47	4/17/14	Doug Nelson, Colorado Citizen	Email to cowaterplan@state.co.us	1, 5.6.1, 5.6.4, 5.9	Text from email: "I am writing to support your efforts to create the first ever statewide water plan. Thank you for reiterating the importance of the plan, and water conservation, in your recent State of the State address. As our state's communities grow, our rivers are becoming increasingly strained. That means we need to change the status quo. We need our rivers to be clean and flowing - to support our fish and wildlife, tourism, recreation, and future generations. Colorado's Water Plan has the potential to chart an innovative path forward for our state. I urge you to stand up for measures to protect and restore our rivers, push for conservation, and for cities to live within their means. We need to help agriculture modernize and increase efficiency, and stop looking to the West Slope to solve our water issues. We need to maintain working landscapes, support growing communities, and protect river health. Please ensure that Colorado's Water Plan uses our state's ingenuity to "be prepared" for our water future." "	N/A	Staff response: The comments are consistent with the values guiding Colorado's Water Plan, which are: 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife.
48	4/17/14	Kevin McBride, Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.11	Letter to the Yampa/White/Green Basin Roundtable (YWGBRT) regarding their support for the YWGBRT's White Paper.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: The CWCB will send the Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District's letter to the YWGBRT. These comments also helped inform the IBCC discussion during the April 29, 2014 IBCC meeting.
49	4/18/14	Genia Gallagher, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1, 5.6.5	Webform comments as follows: "While obtaining my Masters in History from Regis University I developed a course on History of Water in the West which opened my eyes to the issues that face many of the states in the region. Upon further research into how Colorado is addressing this "gap", I realized that the way water is viewed by most Coloradans does not match reality and to adequately provide a sustainable water future for 2050 and beyond this "water ethic" must be changed. Thus, I developed the attached position paper. My husband have lived in Colorado since 1996. The first 9 years in Boulder, where I children graduated from High School. Since 2004, we have lived in Summit County and our children remain in the Denver area. In the next several years my husband and I intend to return to Denver to live. Given this, I am able to see the rationale behind each of the basins demands; however, as a realist understand that it is impossible to meet them all while attaining sustainability. This makes the need for a new water ethic critical when devising the Colorado Water Plan. "	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: Fracking will be discussed in Subsection 5.6.5 Self-supplied industrial and will be further discussed in SWSI. Fracking currently uses approximately 18,000 acre feet per year, which is a very small proportion of Colorado's overall water use. However, there may be some areas where there are greater regional effects. In addition, power plants that burn natural gas to make energy use less water than traditional power plants. Therefore, from an overall resource management perspective, fracking and the resulting energy production do not consume a significant amount of water compared to current levels. Under Colorado's constitution there is a right to use water for beneficial purposes if it is available. Colorado's Water Plan is not geared toward restricting specific beneficial uses such as fracking. With regard to conservation, the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs. If helpful, CWCB staff would be happy to present as part of a Regis University course.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
50	4/19/14	Kristin Martinez, Metro State University	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1, 5.6.5	Webform comments as follows: "In seeking a solution toward viable and productive agriculture, have different methods of irrigating Front Range farmland been discussed? No doubt many farmers currently rely on flood or pivot systems to irrigate crops. Could these systems be converted to subsurface drip (SDI) systems? SDI systems surpass the previously mentioned irrigation systems' efficiency by at least 90%. Subsurface systems are well suited to arid climates; at the same time increasing crop yield. They use far less water due to being below ground at root level, don't create runoff, and do away with water loss through evapotranspiration. Admittedly, the systems take a lot of effort to install, and much dedication to maintain. However, when cared for properly, they can last nearly as long as standard pivot systems, according to CSU's extension program. If agriculture is in fact essential to Colorado's way of life, and if the city is considering paying farmers for their water rights, could Denver not invest in setting up better, more efficient irrigation systems for farmers? In this way, water is saved and agriculture is likewise preserved. The fact that the majority of our states' water is consumed by agriculture might be a reflection of outdated and wasteful growing methods, not requiring such drastic measures as buy and dry. Yet speaking of buy and dry . . . Would the city also consider paying metropolitan businesses and residences to "dry" up their ground and install zero scape lawns (similar to what the city of Las Vegas has done with its citizens)? Agreed, agriculture stands as the biggest water user, but farmers should not be the only ones to feel the pain of supply and demand. Most Denverites don't give heed to the serious task of stewarding their water - not as a farmer must. Why aren't local industries/municipal users being asked to sacrifice their lifestyle or adjust their operations? How Colorado deals with agriculture will make the water difference; that is clear. But can Colorado's water plan please ask urban users to take ownership of their consumption, in addition to solving it by diverting farm water? That is the kind of plan I would choose to support.	N/A	Staff response: With regard to agricultural conservation, several methods including drip irrigation are explored in Subsection 5.6.4. In some cases drip irrigation can and is being used to reduce soil moisture loss. However, because many agricultural lands are under watered, when efficiency practices are used, water use also increases. Also, in many instances, modifying agricultural practices can have a negative impact to stream flows, riparian areas, and downstream agricultural users. Nonetheless there are some recommendations explored in the aforementioned subsection. With regard to your concerns related to outdoor municipal water conservation, staff will discuss xeriscape incentives with the CWCB Board in May, 2014 as mentioned above in comment #44.
51	4/21/14	George Sibley, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	1, 5.11	Webform comment as follows: "You have sites for those wanting to speak up about ag water, enviro/rec water and muni/ind water, but where is the site for those wanting to talk about a balancing of all three? And what ag might feel justified in asking from muni/ind water providers before accepting the inevitability of ag transfers, and what enviro/rec might do to pay for the free ride it gets on ag's ecosystem services, etc etc...? Where in other words do we go if we to try to transcend the 'silos' and start getting integrative about this situation? "	N/A	Staff response: The CWCB has received many comments regarding the important connections mentioned in the email through the Submit General Input Form at https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cowaterplan/form/general-input-colorados-water-plan . Colorado's Water Plan will also provide solutions across the different sections of the plan, and recognize that many issues are interrelated. The CWCB welcomes all comments no matter the content. However, in order to keep the website organized the CWCB chose not to create separate webpage input forms for every possible type of content that could be submitted and have received great, diverse response through the general input webform. All commenters can review all of the input received to date at https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cowaterplan/record-input-received-date . Several key stakeholder groups specifically requested that the CWCB create guides for input outlining what input might be most effective coming from those groups. For all of those groups, the way to submit input is still through the general input webform. The CWCB will continue to review and update the guides based on the perspective provided in the email and on other comments received. At this time the CWCB advises the commenter to direct people to use the "Submit General Input Webform" or send an email to cowaterplan@state.co.us for comments that might span stakeholder groups and issues.
52	4/22/14	Eric Hecox on behalf of the South Metro Water Supply Authority	Email to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.7, 5.8, 5.10, 5.11	Text from email: "Please find attached South Metro Water Supply Authority's input to Colorado's Water Plan. This document was unanimously approved by the South Metro board at yesterday's regular monthly board meeting. Please let me know if you have any questions or if additional information would be helpful. A special thanks to CWCB, the IBCC, and the roundtables for their leadership in this important effort."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: 1) With regard to agricultural transfers, Colorado's Water Plan will stress the importance of adding additional options to buy and dry. 2) SMWSA's comments were incorporated into the draft Section 5.10 released in May, 2014. 3) CWCB appreciates the hard work SMWSA has done in updating the IPPs. 4) The comments concerning "new supply" are largely consistent with the IBCC's recent discussions. The CWCB will consider the suggested funding mechanisms in Section 6.1. The letter will be passed on to the South Platte and Metro BRTs.
53	4/22/14	Kevin McCarty on behalf of the Little Thompson Watershed Restoration Coalition	Email to Chris Sturm, Rebecca Mitchell and Sean Cronin; forwarded to cowaterplan@state.co.us	5.3, 5.8, 5.9	Text from email: "I have authored the attached document on behalf of LTWRC. While this document comes off as critical of planning efforts as it relates to our watershed, it is not directed at any particular party. In fact, I think the lack of involvement in the state water planning efforts by water users within our watershed makes us as culpable as anyone, including me. I deal with water rights in my job and it has taken this flood and the subsequent planning efforts to understand a lot of the details about the water supply issues confronting this watershed. But, at this point we are just scratching the surface on water use and water supply issues and further study is warranted. Tetra Tech will be providing some basic hydrologic information as part of their master plan, but it doesn't appear it will go into the level of detail necessary to fully understand issues such as the impact exempt wells may be having on surface water flows (among other areas of study). Their scope of work certainly does not cover exploring water supply alternatives such as in stream flow potentials, possible reservoir sites and how NCWCD could fit into the water supply picture. I would ask CWCB's opinion on what strategy we might want have if we apply for an additional grant to include water supply planning as part of our master planning effort. I know a lot of these master planning efforts, including ours at this point, are focused on the river and riparian area and not on water use and supply. However, it is hard to think about restoration of the Little Thompson without considering the serious water supply issues which exist here."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: We appreciate calling attention to the issues in the Little Thompson Watershed and suggest that the commenter seek a Water Supply Reserve Account grant through the South Platte Basin Roundtable. Partnerships such as with the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District often help applications be successful. CWCB staff will pass this on to the South Platte BRT.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
54	4/22/14	Eddie Kochman, Colorado Citizen	Email to Craig Godbout; forwarded to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.9	Text from email: "Please include the attached comments into the record regarding the Colorado Water Plan process. They were submitted to the Parks and Wildlife Commission at their April meeting in Salida."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: With regard to 5.9, the CWCB maintains and operates In Stream Flow and Natural Lake Level programs, both of which are highly regarded as some of the most successful programs of their kind in the Western US. Nonconsumptive needs are critically important aspects of the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan. Although not fully tested, instream flows can be designed to directly benefit riparian areas, and the CWCB Stream and Lake Protection Section has been working with the BLM to design an approach to in-stream flows by providing a flood flow component in the spring. - instream flows conserve riparian areas. With regard to conservation, the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs.
55	4/22/14	Elizabeth Maslow, Colorado Citizen	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.9	Text from email: "I recently visited Drakeland Farms wetland project and was impressed at the mitigation efforts to help birds and water quality with South Platte filtered water. This wetland restoration project is a model program. U.S. Fish and Wildlife are involved with the program and both the South Platte and wildlife will benefit. In assessing future water needs, this type of mitigation to help both conservation of wildlife and water quality should be attached to consumptive water needs assessment. Why not have a required mitigation measurement attached to consumptive water? For example, Chatfield storage does not seem to have a concrete mitigation plan attached to the acre feet of water storage. I propose attaching a mandatory percentage of water measurement that is used for nonconsumptive uses. We need units of measurement for the environment to prevent future damage. Chatfield reservoir will be a glaring example of poor management if mitigation is not included or better storage choices are not considered. Thanks for your attention."	N/A	Staff response: All projects, including over \$150 million for Chatfield, have mitigation aspects and need to consider alternatives under the National Environmental Policy Act. The example provided by the commenter is a good one, and CWCB staff will pass it on to the South Platte and Metro BRTs and the CDPHE Water Quality Control Division for consideration in their work.
56	4/23/14	Melinda Kassen, WaterJamin Legal & Policy Consulting, on behalf of a number of non-governmental organizations	Email to John Stulp, Rebecca Mitchell, and Jacob Bornstein; forwarded to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.11	Text from email: "Please find attached a letter from a number of non-governmental organizations in response to the Front Range Water Council's letter to the CWCB on April 3rd."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan will not have a specific transmountain diversion project included in it. The write-up in the water plan concerning transmountain diversions will be dependent on the IBCC discussions which are still ongoing.
57	4/24/14	Robert Garnett, Baca Grande Property Owners Association	Email to James Eklund; forward to cewaterplan@state.co.us	Rio Grande BIP, 5.9	Letter from the Baca Grande Property Owners Association regarding non-consumptive in-stream rights.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCB staff will pass the letter on to the Rio Grande BRT and CWCB's Stream and Lake Protection Section.
58	4/24/14	Deborah Reed, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.1	Webform comments as follows: "Municipalities and other governmental and public entities should be required to install moisture meters and/or take any other measure(s) necessary to ensure that watering on its properties, parks or other public lands do not take place when it is raining, or any day after a substantial rainfall. Very frequently sprinklers servicing medians, parks and other landscaped public areas are running during rainstorms or the day after a rainstorm. The monitoring guidelines should apply even if non-potable water is used."	N/A	Staff response: CWCB staff will pass this comment on to the Roundtables for consideration.
59	4/25/14	Melinda Kassen, WaterJamin Legal & Policy Consulting, on behalf of Conservation Colorado	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.4	Conservation Colorado's comments on Section 5.4 Water Quality of Colorado's Water Plan.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: These comments were incorporated into the current draft of Section 5.4 by the CDPHE Water Quality Control Division.
60	4/26/14	Mary Keyes, NWCCOG	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.4	Text from email: "Northwest Colorado Council of Governments appreciates all the work that you have put into preparing the water quality section of the Colorado Water Plan. We know that the timeframe is incredibly short and appreciate the attention you have given to our other comments. We offer a few more comments in track changes in the attached document that we think will provide more clarity to the document. Thank you again for the work that you are putting into this very important section of the plan."	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: These comments were incorporated into the current draft of Section 5.4 by the CDPHE Water Quality Control Division.
61	4/27/14	Chuck Downey, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	3, 5.6.1	Webform comment as follows: "Please do not allow any more water diversions from the western slope. Western Colorado has already given up too much water to the front range. Rather than diverting more water from the west, the front range needs to adopt strong water conservation measures. Also, how about limiting growth on the front range? I fail to understand how continued growth will improve the quality of life and make Colorado a better place to live. Thanks for listening."	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes three 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. The CWCB is working with each basin on their Basin Implementation Plan and will continue to encourage all interested parties to do the same. With regard to conservation, the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
62	4/28/14	Ed and Terry Talbot	Email to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.1, 5.7, 5.9, 5.11	Text from email: "We have a home in Grand Junction and the impacts from the gas drilling industry are extensive and negative. Our water is precious and needed for more than cheap gas! Gov. Hickenlooper has said that "every conversation about water should begin with conservation," and I could not agree more. Water is our most precious natural resource and we must take steps now to protect and preserve it in a way that will benefit Colorado's rivers, wildlife, recreation, agriculture, businesses and residents. As you oversee the creation of a plan to meet our future water needs, I urge you to prioritize the following goals: 1. Keep Colorado's rivers healthy and flowing. Colorado's rivers are an integral part of our unique heritage and way of life. Rivers support our wildlife, agriculture, and a multi-billion dollar tourism industry. Protecting and restoring our rivers must be a top priority. 2. Increase and prioritize efficiency and conservation. Finding ways to reduce our water usage is crucial to our ability to meet our growing water needs. State studies have shown that water providers will need to reduce current water use by 35% by 2050 in order to meet our future demands. Expand conservation incentives, increase indoor and outdoor efficiency and support recycling programs. 3. Modernize agricultural and water sharing practices. The state should support voluntary, compensated, and flexible water-sharing agreements between agricultural producers and growing communities while respecting their water rights, as well as incentives to improve agricultural infrastructure that benefits operations and rivers. 4. Avoid new, large, trans-mountain water diversion projects. Trans-mountain diversion projects that drain water from West Slope rivers to supply growing Front Range demands are controversial, costly and damaging. Prioritize conservation and reuse so we can make every drop count and avoid the need for these projects. Thank you for helping to keep these four goals at the forefront of Colorado's water plan drafting process."	N/A	Staff response: 1) The CWCB and the Basin Roundtables will be working to support conservation, environment, and recreation in the Basin Implementation Plans and draft of Colorado's Water Plan. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan. In addition, the CWCB's Water Supply Reserve Account (WSRA) grant program has been used by several basins to analyze water flow requirements related to ecological values. 2) With regard to conservation, the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. This is not enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs. 3) Agricultural water sharing and modernizing agricultural efficiencies are aspects of Colorado's Water Plan and included in Section 5.7 and Subsection 5.6.4. 4) Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation and reuse, however those strategies alone might not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be explored.
63	4/28/14	Dea Jacobson, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.6.4, 5.9	Webform comments as follows: "Concerns include availability of water for wildlife, wilderness and fisheries - both quality and quantity. Agriculture needs education/ help with water conservation measures. No question that conservation of existing resources is a big part of the solution. Building more water storage is too expensive. Some expansion may be feasible if it doesn't harm endangered and threatened or protected ecosystems. "	N/A	Staff response: The CWCB and the Basin Roundtables will be working to support conservation, environment, and recreation in the Basin Implementation Plans and draft of Colorado's Water Plan. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan. In addition, the CWCB's Water Supply Reserve Account (WSRA) grant program has been used by several basins to analyze water flow requirements related to ecological values. With regard to agricultural conservation, those issues will be addressed in Section 5.6.4.
64	4/28/14	Conor Felletter, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.4, 5.6.4	Webform comments as follows: "The state needs to encourage farmers and ranchers using irrigation water to practice conservation methods. Only through conservation and better irrigation practices can Colorado meet the needs of its growing population and safe guard its rivers and wetlands. Colorado should work to retire lands that have poor drainage and contribute huge amounts of salt to the rivers. Colorado should encourage ranchers to use better irrigation practices and switch to dry land grazing animals like bison. Farmer should pay more realistic cost for their water rather than having it subsidized by tax payers. Subsidies should go to farmers and rancher who have shown a commitment to improving irrigation practices and being stewards in Colorado's future. "	N/A	Staff response: With regard to agricultural conservation, those issues will be addressed in Section 5.6.4. Agriculture often supports wetlands and rivers. Additional concerns about water quality are addressed in Section 5.4. The CWCB and many other states have invested millions of dollars in salinity control programs.
65	4/29/14	Theresa Conley, Conservation Colorado	Email to Kate McIntire, Brent Newman and Jacob Bornstein, forward to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.4, 7	Text from email: "Hello. As you know, Conservation Colorado has been engaging on the development of Colorado's Water Plan, including submitting comments to the Water Quality Control Division (WQCD) on Chapter 5.4, Water Quality.The issue of quality is often overlooked in our water planning processes. I was excited to see the Governor's statement in the Ex. Order that "Colorado's water quantity and quality questions can no longer be thought of separately. Each impacts the other and our state water policy should address then conjunctively."That said, it would be great to have someone from the Division, perhaps Nicole Rowan, speak about the water quality chapter and aspects of the plan at a state or public meeting. I recently attended the DU Water Law Symposium which had a panel on the CWP which included James Eklund, Becky Mitchell, Linda Bassi and Ted Kowalski. No one presented on the quality chapter or on quality (certainly more pressing than compact questions). I noted the absence to both James as well as Andrew Todd, both of whom seemed to think that Nicole would have been a good addition. Seems like they just didn't think of adding someone on quality and not an intended omission. So, I respectfully request looping in more discussions on quality and perhaps someone from the Division on panels that address the water plan. It would compliment the robust discussions that are already happening."	N/A	Staff response: Thank you for the suggestion regarding water quality. Section 5.4 Water Quality will be released for public review at the May CWCB Board meeting. There will also be a staff presentation on the section during the May meeting. We will continue to incorporate this comment into future speaking opportunities.
66	4/29/14	Roberta Richardson, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	South Platte/Metro BIP, 5.8	Webform comments as follows: " Please stop the plans to expand the Gross Dam, we don't want our wild areas damaged, nor trucks running constantly creating noise and air pollution! Thank you! "	N/A	Staff response: CWCB staff will pass the comment on to the Metro and South Platte BRTs.
67	4/29/14	Stephanie Rayer, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	4, 5.6.1	Webform comments as follows: "When I looked over how much water we could lose I became worried about the growing population in Colorado and how it will effect us. It is very important to myself and others that we conserve as much as we can through our rivers and our wildlife. We need to make it a requirement that we make changes in our life styles to conserve water. Although this wont solve the problem completely, it's a good start. In addition to conserving in Colorado's households, I think it is important that we spend time studying the water supply in our basins so that we can look at this in a long term manner. I look forward to seeing what our future Colorado water plan will look like. "	N/A	Staff response: With regard to conservation, the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation as a critical component to helping meet future water needs. Initial work indicates that conservation will likely be able to meet the needs of an additional one million people. As the commenter suggests, even with agricultural sharing projects and completing already planned projects, this may not be enough to meet all of Colorado's future water demand, so Colorado's Water Plan will also encourage balanced multi-purpose projects to meet our future water needs. Additionally, the CWCB has invested tens of millions of dollars to study water supply under various future conditions and developed models so that water supply issues can be understood over the long term.
68	4/29/14	Mindi Must, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	4, 5.6.2	Webform comments as follows: "1.Develop area groundwater in the basins and improve their management 2.recharge area groundwater basins 3. With recycled water we should increase the use. 4.delivery to drinkable supplies "	N/A	Staff response: The issue of reuse will be explored in Section 5.6.2 and CWCB staff will incorporate the commenter's thoughts on water supply into Chapter 4.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received
between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
69	4/29/14	Sierra Emanuel, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	4, 5.6.1, 5.8	Webform comments as follows: "Colorado is such a great place to live, but unfortunately we don't have the resources for unlimited growth. We need to seriously think about enhancing what we have instead of expanding. Conservation, reuse/recycling, and expansion of current reservoirs to catch excess water when we're lucky enough to have it, need to be the options explored. Water cannot be taken away from other communities any more than it already is. "	N/A	Staff response: Most of the commenter's thoughts on conservation and reuse are incorporated into Section 5.6. The BIPs will explore additional storage options.
70	4/30/14	Aaron Sturm, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	7	Webform comments as follows: "Most people don't know where there water comes from, that statement has twofold meaning. In Colorado most people don't know that snowpack is the primary reservoir for the entire state, and they don't know anything about the municipality that supplies clean water to their tap. I'm fortunate enough to work seasonally at a water treatment plan, I'm also minoring in water at my college and learning about water in ways that don't pertain to simply treating it. So this is cool, I know a lot about water, and a lot of people don't... why does that matter? What matters is that people don't. The only context many Coloradains can put water in, is that it comes out out of their faucets and sometime in August they get a letter telling them to water less, and their water bill goes up. I think that educating people about water scarcity in Colorado is key to making progress, after all any water plan has to involve the people using the water. Therefore I think that education needs to be a focus in any water plan, just as much (if not more so) tha policy. "	N/A	Staff response: The development of Colorado's Water Plan has helped to raise the level of importance placed on education and outreach statewide related to water supply planning. Additionally, there has been a significant level of outreach and education activity throughout each basin and statewide during the planning phase. Chapter 7 of Colorado's Water Plan will further demonstrate the need and provide recommendations for enhancing the coordination of outreach and education efforts throughout Colorado. CWCB staff will incorporate these comments while developing Chapter 7, due for draft public release in September, 2014.
71	4/30/14	Melissa Houser, Colorado Citizen	Online General Input Webform at www.coloradowaterplan.com	5.8, 5.9	Webform comments as follows: "Water should be reserved for sustainable organic food production, basic needs of people & animals, and for Mother Earth. Industries that are heavy water users should not be allowed to operate in arid regions. Any industry that is needed by the surrounding communities in an arid region should utilize technologies that use little or no water. "	N/A	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan will not restrict beneficial use.
72	4/28/14 - 5/2/14	137 emails generated from individuals who submitted a form letter online through saveourevironment.org	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.4, 5.7, 5.9	Form letter text base: "Gov. Hickenlooper has said that "every conversation about water should begin with conservation," and I could not agree more. Water is our most precious natural resource and we must take steps now to protect and preserve it in a way that will benefit Colorado's rivers, wildlife, recreation, agriculture, businesses and residents. As you oversee the creation of a plan to meet our future water needs, I urge you to prioritize the following goals: 1. Keep Colorado's rivers healthy and flowing. Colorado's rivers are an integral part of our unique heritage and way of life. Rivers support our wildlife, agriculture, and a multi-billion dollar tourism industry. Protecting and restoring our rivers must be a top priority. 2. Increase and prioritize efficiency and conservation. Finding ways to reduce our water usage is crucial to our ability to meet our growing water needs. State studies have shown that water providers will need to reduce current water use by 35% by 2050 in order to meet our future demands. Expand conservation incentives, increase indoor and outdoor efficiency and support recycling programs. 3. Modernize agricultural and water sharing practices. The state should support voluntary, compensated, and flexible water-sharing agreements between agricultural producers and growing communities while respecting their water rights, as well as incentives to improve agricultural infrastructure that benefits operations and rivers. 4. Avoid new, large, trans-mountain water diversion projects. Trans-mountain diversion projects that drain water from West Slope rivers to supply growing Front Range demands are controversial, costly and \damaging. Prioritize conservation and reuse so we can make every drop count and avoid the need for these projects. Thank you for helping to keep these four goals at the forefront of Colorado's water plan drafting process."	A separate attachment was created for the Board packet including 137 emails	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan will support Colorado's rivers as will be described in Section 5.9, address the need for increased conservation as described in Subsection 5.6.1, and the need for agricultural efficiencies and water sharing practices as described in 5.6.4 and 5.7. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC is exploring innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountan diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific transmountain water project, but it will discuss how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.
73	3/18/14 - 4/28/14	8 emails generated from individuals who submitted a form letter online through Conservation Colorado	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.4, 5.7, 5.9	Form letter text base: "I am writing to support your efforts to create the first ever statewide water plan. Thank you for reiterating the importance of the plan, and water conservation, in your recent State of the State address. As our state's communities grow, our rivers are becoming increasingly strained. That means we need to change the status quo. We need our rivers to be clean and flowing - to support our fish and wildlife, tourism, recreation, and future generations. Colorado's Water Plan has the potential to chart an innovative path forward for our state. I urge you to stand up for measures to protect and restore our rivers, push for conservation, and for cities to live within their means. We need to help agriculture modernize and increase efficiency, and stop looking to the West Slope to solve our water issues. We need to maintain working landscapes, support growing communities, and protect river health. Please ensure that Colorado's Water Plan uses our state's ingenuity to "be prepared" for our water future."	A separate attachment was created for the Board packet including 8 emails	Staff response: Colorado's Water Plan will support Colorado's rivers as will be described in Section 5.9, address the need for increased conservation as described in Subsection 5.6.1, and the need for agricultural efficiencies and water sharing practices as described in 5.6.4 and 5.7. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC is exploring innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountan diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific transmountain water project, but it will discuss how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.
74	5/2/2014	Stephanie Scott, Colorado Trout Unlimited	Email to Kate McIntire, forwarded to cwaterplan@state.co.us	5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.11	<p>Text from email: "Thank you for the opportunity to submit materials to the CWCB Board and also for the time to speak to them at the board meeting. Attached are the final packets that Trout Unlimited has prepared that are specific to each basin. These packets are our suggested content for the basin implementation plans. While we intended on developing comments for all 9 basin we realized that it was best to focus on just the ones attached. We have combined the South Platte and Metro comments into one packet. For the basins that do not have comments we are still pushing our TU Water Plan Principles to be incorporated into the BIP and our members will be involved at the meetings. Those principles are attached to this email in a separate document. After speaking with roundtable representatives it was suggested that we included both broad level and specific detailed comments. Per this request we have gathered and organized the packets into 3 sections to make it easier for the roundtables to incorporate the comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· The first section includes broad principles that Trout Unlimited would like to see incorporated into all of the BIPs throughout CO.· The second includes bullet point comments that are specific to each of the basins.· The third section lays out each of those bullet points in more detail. <p>I will be the one speaking at the CWCB Board meeting. I will be presenting these packets to the board and explain the outreach that Trout Unlimited has done on the water plan, emphasize the opportunity for the CWCB Board and Trout Unlimited to work together and give a brief overview of our high level principles. Please let me know if there is anything else that you need. "</p>	Comments in attached letters	Staff response: Staff appreciates the considerable work Trout Unlimited (TU) put into the comments provided and will pass each of the basin-specific documents to the respective BRTs. With regard to TU's Water Plan Principles, "meaningful efforts to protect and restore healthy rivers and streams" will be incorporated into Section 5.9 and the BIPs. The CWCB expects that the BIPs will help refine the municipal supply gap and Colorado's Water Plan will emphasize efficient use of Colorado's Water supplies in Section 5.6. The initial draft of Chapter 5.6, released in May for public review, explores conservation and reuse. Colorado's Water Plan suggests that at a minimum and in the near term, Colorado should seek to implement "medium" conservation practices while acknowledging that in the future "high" levels of conservation may be needed depending on which scenario presents itself in Colorado. Section 5.7 is also now available for public review on Alternative Transfer Methods and the BIPs will explore the integration of water supply systems. Overall, TU's Water Plan Principles are consistent with the values expressed in Colorado's Water Plan and the plan will encourage multi-purpose projects. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC is exploring innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Lastly, CWCB will consider the laws and policies suggested by TU to facilitate creative water management when drafting Section 5.11.

Colorado's Water Plan - Input Received between 3/4/14 and 5/2/2014							
Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters of CWP Framework	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
75	5/2/2014	Craig Mackey on behalf of over 100 Colorado businesses and Protect the Flows	Email to Kate McIntire, forwarded to cewaterplan@state.co.us	5.6.1, 5.6.4	A letter from Protect the Flows, signed by over 100 Colorado businesses regarding input on Colorado's Water Plan.	Comments in attached letter	Staff response: CWCB appreciates the engagement level of the commenters, whose comments are in line with the efforts of Colorado's Water Plan. Related subsections of Colorado's Water Plan are now available online at www.coloradowaterplan.com for public review.