

**South Platte Basin Roundtable
Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, February 11, 2014
Ramada Inn
2500 East Chestnut St, Sterling, CO
4:00 – 8:30PM**

Present: Sean Cronin (SVLHWCD); Mike Applegate (Northern Colorado WCD); Eugene Bauerle (Republican River WCD); Rich Belt (Industrial Representative); Jeffrey Boring (Larimer County Rep); Harold Evans (Weld County Muni); James Ford (Gilpin Muni); Joe Frank (Lower South Platte WCD); Bruce Gerk (Sedgwick Muni); Jim Hall (Local Domestic Water Provider); Dianne Hoppe (CWCB); Larry Howard (Larimer Muni); Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County); Greg Kernohan (Recreational Representative); Stephen Larson (Broomfield); Gene Manuello (Agricultural Representative); Karen Martinez (Boulder County); Connie McLain (Gilpin County); Brent Nation (Morgan Muni); Doug Rademacher (At-Large Representative); Wayne Skold (Segwick County); John Stencel (Legislative Appointment); John Stulp (Director Compact Negotiations/IBCC); Kent Swedlund (Logan County); Allyn Wind (Morgan County); Jim Yahn (At-Large Representative)

1. Welcome and Introductions – Cronin (4:15)

Director Cronin introduced Matt Betz as the Deputy Recorder and outlined the bylaws which state the recorder has to be a voting member, and therefore stated that Matt is a deputy recorder. Matt's role at the Roundtable is to take care of communications and manage the membership efforts in addition to Rich Belt's efforts.

2. Amendments or Additions to the Agenda - Cronin

No Discussion

3. Basin Implementation Plan

Director Cronin called Blaine Dwyer (HDR) to the podium to present goals and measurable outcomes.

Blaine Dwyer began his presentation by giving the update on where The South Platte Basin stands on the basin implementation process. He first stated that the purpose of the Basin's current work is to get a draft document to the state by their goal on March 6th, the same date as the Basin Roundtable Summit. Due to a glitch in communicating with the State to get the scope of work out as early as intended, Blaine Dwyer said that he expected memorandums on a variety of topics (conservation, reuse, agricultural water use and transfers) to make an appearance within the next 7-10 days and was seeking a review period of about 2-4 weeks.

Blaine Dwyer then presented on Task 500 - projects & methods and brought Britta Strother to the podium to present with him.

Britta outlined how HDR moved toward touching as much of the South Platte Basin as possible and was in the final stages of working over online meeting tool talking points. The point of creating the online meeting tool, Britta explained, was to create a high-learning tool to be presented on the HDR and South Platte Basin Roundtable websites of the South Platte Basin Plan. HDR also stated that they were working on a PowerPoint presentation to be used by all Roundtable members in relaying messages. The presentation was designed to be a tool that could be posted online with different levels of information contained within. In summation, the PowerPoint presentation was designed to be more in-depth, while the web tool was designed to be more higher-level.

Commissioner Rademacher mentioned that he was concerned with the County Building availability, Britta confirmed that the Weld County Building has been reserved.

Britta Strother (HDR) issued a CORRECTION - the Longmont date would be March 5, not March 4.

Director Cronin questioned if the effort had been made to contact local RT reps, at which point Britta confirmed that HDR's efforts at the present meeting *were* that effort.

Blaine Dwyer explicated that he wanted to make Roundtable members visible and engaged, that he had a spot on the agenda for members of the Roundtable to identify themselves as a South Platte Basin Roundtable member and to give the history of the Roundtable and planning process.

Blaine Dwyer also made a call-to-action, stating that HDR's effort needed more volunteers.

Director Cronin pointed out the present shortcomings in the Roundtable's public outreach, stating that other Roundtables do great outreach, by comparison. The South Platte Basin Roundtable has been pointed out as having poor outreach.

Director Cronin called out, "this is *our* Basin Implementation Plan. It is important we attend these dates."

Director Cronin pointed out that materials for conducting outreach were readily available via Britta/HDR: "everyone is encouraged to look at the dates and have at least some kind of committal to the dates presented"

Blaine Dwyer, at this point, stated that he would handle it by email, and would get a volunteer at the Metro Roundtable.

Joe Frank volunteered for the Fort Morgan meeting, stating that he "wants to see as many as possible reps there and at other regional meetings."

Blaine Dwyer pointed out the 4PM time slot for SWSI and for the Basin Roundtable rep: Joe Frank volunteered and was therefore slotted at that time.

Harold Evans asked: “is there a standard presentation?”

Blaine Dwyer responded: “yes, we will put that together. Are there any volunteers for Longmont?”

Commissioner Rademacher volunteered Director Cronin for Longmont.

Director Cronin asked: “is the Denver one a Metro rep? Do you want Fairplay and Yuma?”

Blaine Dwyer responded in the affirmative to both.

Director Cronin said that he would talk to Lisa about doing Fairplay, or would be willing to do it himself if Lisa could not.

Blaine Dwyer said that, “we are tying in Yuma with the water conservancy district meeting”

John Boring had questions about tools following Blaine Dwyer and Director Cronin’s conversation: “do you [HDR] anticipate us [Basin Roundtable reps] sharing those presentations in the same time frame from Feb to Mid March?”

Blaine Dwyer responded: “yes, February and March for the PowerPoint presentation; the tool can be used for the Roundtable members who are asked to talk at a civic talk or community organization, that PowerPoint presentation can give the basics of the Basin Implementation Plan. The online meeting tool is a URL that can be used to respond and page through the presentation: the contents will be similar. The online meeting tool can be used in public settings, depending on the style of group.”

John Boring: “These are an extension of public meetings. The last meeting is April 10, are you hoping to get feedback then too?”

Blaine Dwyer: “Yes, plus 3 more public meetings, depending on these public meetings, to use after July 31, to roll out with the draft.”

Blaine Dwyer then returned to his presentation of the Basin Implementation Plan educational material. He stated that HDR excerpted quite a bit of information from the technical memo and instead of looking at each individual wordslide, he instead chose to present an overview and decide how much narrative needed to be dug down into. At the end of discussion, Blaine Dwyer explained that “the State has asked each basin to put together measurable outcomes by March 6.

Jacob Bornstein stated that he was hoping to present measurable outcomes at the March 6th summit, that CWCB would have the necessary document by then.

Blaine Dwyer presented two “background slides” with 19 total low/no regret items, then stated to the Roundtable that Jacob had helped him compile information into a 13 page table, “low/no regrets are actions that are necessary actions regardless of changing proprieties and uncertainties in the future.” Discussion about the number of items and their appearance on the slides ensued between Diane Hoppe and Blaine Dwyer. It was determined that no points were omitted or forgotten from the slides.

As the draft info was provided, Blaine Dwyer stated that HDR was coming up with simplified ways for feedback to be gathered and that the solution would be an attached survey (presented via SurveyMonkey).

Blaine Dwyer stated several points regarding the survey

- a) the survey had been tested for functionality and usability
- b) feedback via the survey was preferred to other forms of feedback
- c) feedback could be sent in to HDR at southeplattebip@hdrinc.com, but survey feedback should take priority

HDR then went over survey questions and stated:

- a) answers to Q1 would illuminate how much discussion could take place with CWCB (how deep the discussion can be)
- b) answers to Q2 would rank importance - if the document was not yet ready to go to the State as a draft document, respondents were to rank the most important remaining items
- c) answers to Q3 would address measurable outcomes

At this point Blaine Dwyer pointed out that CWCB had compiled information useful for the portfolio planning process and that technical analyses backing up numbers may not be there. To that end, the State may want to consider measurable outcomes worded a certain way, but would need to have numbers behind it.

Blaine Dwyer also stated:

- a) the plan in discussion “is only version 1.0” (reiterated by Jacob)
- b) long term performance “is not necessarily a priority of the short term input on the Basin Implementation Plan”
- d) answers to Q4 would address input: what percentage of people on the Basin Roundtable said the same things?

Joe Frank asked when the surveys needed to be turned in.

Blaine Dwyer responded that HDR would need the surveys on 2/21.

Director Cronin pointed out that the link to the survey had been sent out several times already.

Blaine Dwyer and Director Cronin agreed that a reminder with the link would need to be sent out again.

Blaine Dwyer made it clear to the Roundtable that the most important reaction HDR was seeking was the reaction to overarching themes -- overarching things that the South Platte Basin Roundtable would want to communicate to other basins in the State as well as the CWCB. At that point, Blaine Dwyer began addressing the themes...

Theme 1) - good South Platte Basin solution = a good Colorado solution
“basins are closely intertwined, so the Plan needs to match Governor Hickenlooper’s order. A viable plan for the South Platte Basin needs to address consumptive/non-consumptive gaps. The default loss of agricultural product is not to Colorado’s benefit.”

Theme 2) - solutions must match Colorado law and property rights

Julio Iturreria stated that the phrase “regulatory approvals” would need to be honed in with examples in order to overcome the negative perception of the term.

Joe Frank stated that more examples would be helpful.

Blaine Dwyer continued addressing the themes...

Theme 3) - the South Platte Basin will continue leadership in water (use/management). The State’s future as whole depends on efficient, sustainable and collaborative solutions.

Julio Iturreria pointed out that the bullet point following “leadership role” was disconnected. “The theme from 1 and 2 should carry on to 3. The leadership role of the South Platte Basin Roundtable should assist in and contribute to the State goal. There is no clear connection to ‘State’s future’; it appears as a separate concept.”

Blaine Dwyer reiterated that “what is good for the State is good for the South Platte Basin” can be municipal or agricultural: should the rest of the state follow?

Julio Iturreria reiterated Blaine Dwyer’s point and theme, but added that he felt theme was important, and that he didn’t want that to get lost.

Blaine Dwyer continued addressing the themes...

Theme 4) - a balanced program is needed to balance and preserve Colorado’s river options, and to benefit East and West Slope consumptive and non-consumptive needs. The State’s plan would need an equal focus on four parts. At this point Blaine Dwyer stated that he was seeking Roundtable input on the overarching themes.

Director Cronin pointed out the Roundtable’s shyness should be shied away from and that input on the matter at hand was important, especially given the Roundtable’s membership as representatives of the Basin, “this is a good opportunity to participate.”

Blaine Dwyer stated that “these are our guiding principles, these need everyone to buy in and communicate consistently.”

Public input: “This document does not contain any mention of water disappearance and the inability to supply water needs in the next 20 years. Politicians will not be interested unless there is an impending crisis.”

Blaine Dwyer responded by stating that, “why are we developing particular things: we are taking an approach to the problem that is fundamental? ‘What is the problem?’ We need to state the problem and then the overarching things. ‘State up front what the problem is.’”

Director Cronin added that the public’s expressed concern was more important for the Basin Implementation Plan and would appear there, “this is the plan for *addressing* the Basin Implementation Plan.”

A roundtable member opined that the intro was problematic: “the South Platte Basin Roundtable needs to continue to be a leader in presenting these objective to the State, not just focusing on a single Colorado river. Could the South Platte Basin Roundtable be placed or maintained in the forefront of the ones who set the way?”

Blaine Dwyer agreed to consider the idea.

John Stencil pointed out an issue with the preamble: “agricultural transfers are concerning. The focus should be on curbing agricultural transfers

Joe Frank reiterated John Stencil’s point and along with Harold Evans, went on to address the 4th leg of the stool.

Harold Evans said that, “an agricultural transfer was a combination of multiple types of agricultural transfers with a focus on minimizing [them]. It was never stated ‘no buy and dry’.”

Joe Frank added that “it includes all agricultural transfers.”

Janet Bell spoke up, stating, “don’t say ‘minimize adverse effects.’ Instead use a beneficial option such as ‘improving’ or ‘supporting’ to activate positive thoughts.”

Eric Wilkinson suggested that legs three and four be switched on the Theme 4 slide

John Ford commented: “I see different types of agricultural transfers and we also have ag transfer or urbanized lands that still have ditch rights - how are those handled? That is a benefit that land has already been brought into the municipality (talking from Gilpin Muni). When the muni goes out to buy ditch water, goes to change to municipal use, but the land has already been changed to urban use, I’m not sure how to handle that, not sure how to talk about that.”

Director Cronin asked, “Was that addressed by passive vs. active buy-and-dry?”

Jacob Bornstein pointed out that “we have urbanized vs. ag (see IPPs).”

Director Cronin: “That points out how we, as spokespersons, for us the language is critical. As for a canned presentation, all Roundtable members need to look at the presentation and get comfortable with the language.”

Blaine Dwyer and Director Cronin determined that a sub-committee was not necessary.

Eric Wilkinson asked if on Theme 3, if there was a way to incorporate “maximize water to take advantage of maximum water supply”?

Blaine Dwyer responded in the affirmative. The goals (8 categories) had been kept with no/low regrets intact in order to still participate in the State’s process going forward and to continue with scenario-planning kinds of approaches.

Blaine Dwyer broke down the 8 categories...

- 8 categories: “conservation, reuse, efficiency should be grouped together”
- IPP = Identified Projects and Processes
- Category 5 - “should the Basin Implementation Plan focus on safe drinking water and improving water quality?”

Blaine Dwyer continued on, stating that municipalities are responsible for drinking water, but from the watershed, water quality is their chief concern

John Stencel asked if there would be sub-categories beyond the eight primary ones.

Blaine Dwyer responded, “yes:

- South Platte Basin Roundtable has options to leave numbers in the presentation or replace numbers with blanks,
- Blanks could be introduced and measurable outcomes would still apply in terms of wording, but numbers may take more time.”

Jim Hall asked “What specific portfolio did these numbers come from?”

Jacob Bornstein responded, stating that, “this one [referring to ag] is urbanization and IPPs. it should be 20%”

Jim Hall added that, “The portfolio developed by the Basin Roundtable should be used, we spend time talking about portfolios, we could use ones we decided.”

Joe Frank and Jacob Bornstein then discussed the origin of the numbers and correct percentages.

Jacob Bornstein argued that the percentage should be IPP’s and urbanization. “The CWCB worked with roundtables to determine appropriate portfolios and compared those with what the Governor preferenced: low/no regrets are the least common

denominators, those within the South Platte spec portfolios may be a little different and still can be used, but IBCC and the CWCB tried to reconcile portfolios to 5 that best represented what the roundtables have determined.”

John Hall stated that, “when you look at conservation numbers, both Metro and South Platte Basin Roundtable did not feel median conservation level was important to have.”

Joe Frank stated that initially, the Roundtable came up with 20% since it should equal 166,000 acres.

Harold Evans contributed, stating that one thing that would be helpful before inputting numbers would be an understanding of the numbers. “We need a document that says ‘this is how these numbers were developed’ so we can understand them, otherwise we need to provide input. Can we have something sent out to us that outlines logic behind the numbers to get everyone board with the numbers?”

Director Cronin asked, “what is the source of this 148,000 - low/no regrets?”

Rich Belt stated that he had been concerned about putting in hard number because the legislature is going to get involved and it may make its way into a law. “Will the legislature set limits if we use hard numbers? Does the number become a limit or a restraint?”

Blaine Dwyer responded to the growing number of concerns, stating “I had anticipated this, we need to discuss these numbers. I don’t have the history in that utilization of the portfolio and the history or creation of the numbers.”

Harold Evans said, “we need to go back to Jacob to determine what the IBCC and CWCB put into the numbers.”

Blaine Dwyer again responded to concerns, “if we dig into the numbers, we are going to use time that could be spent on other things”

Commissioner Rademacher - stated that he did not like the term “limit” and that he agreed with Harold Evans, that he did not want to see a number; “how can you dictate land use and further growth?”

John Boring continued the theme, “the idea of having a measurable outcome - we need this? Has the State asked for one?”

Jacob Bornstein responded to John Boring, “the State is requesting measurable outcomes in order to track process. I respect Rich’s concern, but be careful with whatever is come up with. Still measures are necessary.”

Jacob Bornstein explained that the measure would be done ever six years to track progress.

Harold Evans stated that the “turf bill” was a prime example of dangerous numbers getting turned into policy, that the numbers can be arbitrary and improperly generalized. Blaine Dwyer explained that numbers could be used to encourage movement in a direction. He asked, “are our other numbers defensible?”

John Boring suggested using “protect traditional agricultural land...so many acres” instead of making a negative. Boring addressed the other side of the numbers debate, the concern about watering down the document to the point where objectives would have no value: “numbers are critical to measuring success. Maintaining numbers is necessary.”

Jacob Bornstein explained that the legislative grounding that all this [the numbers] is within is HB177 - “each Basin Roundtable should come up with consumptive and non-consumptive needs, and projects and methods to meet those needs. There is no specific statement that this needs to be measurable outcomes, but there is a strong suggestion that it is needed. The Roundtable should develop at least one incentive program to expand beyond IPP.”

Joe Frank continued the explanation, “when we did the portfolio, we looked at several and generalized in order to form a Basin perspective. We needed to determine how much new supply we needed, how much new supply we would need, how much was livable. We can’t get held up with numbers.”

Director Cronin pointed out that “several years ago the Roundtable set out on a Basin Implementation Plan effort, lots of folks were eager. The implementation part is not easy without a specific charge by an agency. Discussion on measurable outcomes is key.” At this point Director Cronin made a new discussion rule - “feedback is great, but suggestion is required. ‘I don’t like X, but I can live with Y’ and so on.”

Greg Kernohan follow up by saying, “following on Sean’s comments, we say we would like to avoid dry up, but we say we want to limit dry up. We want to promote ATM’s as an acceptable approach rather than permanent dry-up. MO#2 is closer to 50,000 af per annum, that is all more palatable to people and the State.”

Janet Bell added, “what if we didn’t have to limit or could avoid looking to dry land productivity? Other ways to do fallowing? Those discussions included alternatives to dry-up? Why not identify alternatives as a means of encouraging the State economic engine?”

Jim Yahn - “one that is not included - don’t know the number: ‘encourage max usage of the aquifer through increased storage and recharge efficiency through prior-appropriation doctrine.’ That should be put up front and should be used as much as possible in prior-app doctrine.”

Joe Frank and Jim Yahn then addressed where aquifer use could be placed, finally determining it would be appropriate within the “low/no” regret section.

Harold Evans expressed concern with the amount of work that was going on that had not come before the Roundtable. The low/no-regrets doc was one example. “We should be wary of unintended consequences; we cannot make this a club to be used against us. We have a number of users who are supply-limited with surface rights and curtailed well owners, adding on top of that would be bad. Consider all this in aggregate - we have the potential to get a lot more here than we thought we could.”

Per Director Cronin’s request, Jacob Bornstein stated that “we made a presentation on how we got those numbers, the IBCC developed the actions that they felt would be needed to implement those basic things. We can send out the data if that would be helpful.”

Eric Wilkinson contributed: “remembering the IBCC meeting where they went through low/no-regret discussions and note takers would take down ideas, the conservation thresholds were widely recommended as a requisite to new supply. Those were reduced into some of the statements considered by the IBCC meeting in CO Springs, and incorporated into statements that were agreed upon, the threshold was tied to the development of new supplies.”

Jacob Bornstein - “The numbers are the basis of scenario planning and the CWCB hopes the Basin Implementation Plan will provide detail on how to actually get at some of the numbers, ideally.”

Janet Bell asked, “do we have the numbers for the IPP’s so we know what that means for the South Platte Basin, and so we know what we can do to move forward (the IPP’s that have not been identified yet - name, location, and pro/con benefit)?”

Jacob Bornstein responded, stating that he didn’t believe the Roundtable would be concerned with identifying which IPP’s specifically should be addressed.

Laurel Stadjuhar - “Most of goals were determined by the non-consumptive sub-committee. Non-consumptive goals and measurable outcomes are important to the non-consumptive sub-committee:

- Non-com Goals and Measurable outcomes fit into low/no-regrets
- The purpose is to increase the habitat and riparian areas that are important as part of the SWSI 2010
- Group is working with non-consumptive sub-committee to drill down and identify more goals and measurable outcomes
- Want to make sure overarching themes and measurable goals and outcomes are congruent
- Any Q’s or concerns should be sent to Laurel Stadjuhar [email address available via Britta/HDR]”

Greg Kernohan - "lots of work needed to be done with the database from CDM - we will finally be able to drill down. I am excited about being able to identify focus areas that will have some overlap with IPPs and the agricultural landscape. We will have things to review next month with the Roundtable."

Diane Hoppe: "somewhere in there should we put in 'recognizing private property rights, to recognize and enhance value and rights'?"

Laurel Stadjuhar: "that is called out in text document with goals and measurable outcomes, property rights, water rights, included in there - those were left out for the PowerPoint presentation."

Bruce Gerk stated that he had never seen preservation of wetlands where development was going to be for agriculture, and noticed that it did not appear anywhere and would like to see that addressed.

Greg Kernohan suggested that, "we might want to change language to 'wetlands associated with agriculture' since that is what we are seeing in the landscape. 80% of the wetlands are supported by irrigation. If we lose 148K acres of agriculture, what does that mean for wetlands? Detrimental! The West Slope brings up the importance of water to environmental development, South Platte Basin Roundtable should bring that up too."

Laurel Stadjuhar responded that "we want to take into account property and agricultural lands."

Greg Kernohan reiterated, "Bruce would like to see a policy to protect wetlands in urban areas."

John Stencil expressed concerns over the workload of some sub-committees, "we have the most significant gap in the state; not sure the Rio Chado can do the task."

Harold Evans: "the South Platte Basin gap and the Metro gap is significant, the mid level gap is where the IPP assessment came up - that additional complication involves joining the Metro and South Platte Basins."

Julio Iturreria: "the South Platte Basin and Metro exec-committee need to go over the plan simultaneously - we need to do whatever it needs to get the numbers accurate."

Mike Applegate: "a number can be used as a club, but if we think of it more as a range, that may be more effective - as a goal we can try to achieve since this is a long-term document. That may eliminate the problem of having a specific number pinned to us."

Blaine Dwyer: "a half-day workshop may be needed to improve the plan. Jacob's team needs to be available. not sure how the results of that can be reported back to the Basin Roundtables. We need to draft, input to the State before March 6. Communicating

overarching themes and general goals are important to get out there now. (discussing survey).”

Jacob Bornstein: “I didn’t hear pushback on themes and goals, not sure those are necessary before March 6. We can probably get in another meeting before the CWCB meeting - full Roundtable meeting to get in work to plan the next steps moving forward.”

Blaine Dwyer: “Director Cronin, if you engage those two committees in order to get some kind of quorum, if some kind of overarching goals and themes can be decided upon, the next Basin Roundtable meeting can finalize deliverables for the next CWCB meeting.”

Joe Frank: “Rio Chado was going to meet on the 20th to discuss the South Platte document. We could roll this all together into an already scheduled date. Metro already has that on the schedule.”

Blaine Dwyer: “move comments to due date on 18th.”

Diane Hoppe: “I like the idea of Rio Chado. The 18th is State IBCC meeting.”

Blaine Dwyer - concluded his presentation.

Director Cronin - broke for 30 minutes for dinner

Director Cronin reconvened the meeting at 6:50

4. Basin Implementation Plan

Blaine Dwyer: “Task 400 - one of the main topics is updating the IPP’s. Steve is helping the State populate the IPP and fill out the forms to send out in the next week.”

Steve Mahlers: “The Excel workbook needs blanks filled in by the sponsors of each IPP. I thought HDR was in control.”

Blaine Dwyer: “please turn around the IPP’s as quickly as possible. When the IPP goes to an organization, it’s not just one person to approve the IPP, there are usually multiple people, important to getting info and approval on the IPP. The South Platte and Metro list for cumulative yields is a handful of the largest ones that include the lion’s share.”

Steve Mahlers: “Blaine Dwyer, work with Rio Chado, they know and can look at the list and can add to it.”

Jacob Bornstein: “The SWSI 2010 IPP list has been updated, has generated forms, and has been pre-populated so when Blaine Dwyer goes to water provider x with project y, here is the name and the assumed yield, they can react to it. Also, anyone interested in getting contact lists and info not on the form, we will get that info, who delivers above 1000 af, by the end of the week.”

Director Cronin then introduced Karen Martinez with Boulder County Parks and Open Space, designated as a rep on the RT.

5. Legislative Updates

Director Cronin then called for legislative updates - [still no official designee]. Following the call for updates, Director Cronin opened up for the open forum to share any thoughts.

Harold Evans submitted an update: “the ‘turf bill’ is still in the works, it still has the same problems as a month ago. The turf bill totally goes against the processes of the Roundtables: one group dictates to another what they should be doing. There was no pre-council: danger is with grass dictation, the corn could be dictated as well, and so on. The well augmentation bill which may have done away with pre-flood depletions died. There may be another bill dealing with ag efficiencies, to reduce consumption you can turn over to CWCB (west slope only).”

Doug Robotham: “Senate Bill 23 grew out of representatives from several NGO’s and representatives of irrigated agriculture. Could there be principles to inform policy development, recall SB19? The scope was greatly constrained, the intent was to figure out a way whereby to authorize an irrigator to make investments in their means of diversion or distribution of water or conveyance and leave some or all results of efficacy savings to the CWCB for instream flow measurements for instream return. The scope was narrowed due to a discussion that ensued. The Senate Bill from the fall did develop guiding principles in SB23. The Colorado Water Congress special affairs committee further refined and after three or four lengthy sessions, the Colorado Water Congress sub-committee developed a position of recommending support to the state affairs committee. The state affairs committee has not yet taken action, expected next Tues 2/18, then the focus of the debate would shift to the general assembly. It is important to remember that this would require water court approval and be subject to water court processes. Also, this would protect other irrigators from injury, specifics as to timing/location/amount. I feel it is a good product and represents change and differing points of view; this works in the context of Colorado water law and in the context of where the state is going and accommodating the needs of irrigators and accommodating some measure of some environmental protection.

John Stencel: “SB115 bill sponsored by Roberts, Schwartz, Fischer, Korum. This is a bill to approve the state water plan. I would like to suggest that everyone look at the bill, although I am not sure if the Roundtable can support or oppose.”

Hoppe agreed with John Stencel’s opinion, that legislative approval of the State Wide Water Plan is not preferred.

Mike Applegate stated that Northern had already filed opposition.

An unidentified member of the roundtable stated that the leg has always been involved and the bill was just one more step. She also expressed concern that what something like legislative approval of the Water Plan would do, especially since the geographical distribution of the Roundtables does not appear in the representation in the legislature. She felt that the legislature would have an opportunity at the appropriate time.

Director Cronin reiterated that the Roundtable maintains the position of not wanting to get in the habit of taking positions, it would have to be up to the RT as to where they want to take that.

Diane Hoppe suggested that individuals communicate with their legislators and let them know they sit on a Roundtable

Jim Yahn: "HB118, sponsored by Fischer (no senate sponsor yet), has to do with well pumping the aquifer - it gives the State Engineer the power to write policies as using wells as an alternate pint of diversion for your ditch."

Rich Belt: "the Roundtable took position on HB73 last time, although it still has to go through and get enough signatures (title setting)."

Director Cronin: "the Roundtable has and should take a position on HB73 in the future? Yes."

Joe Frank: "that is part of our goals and measurable outcomes."

Eric Wilkinson: "Initiative 72 - local right to self government. Sounds like 1041 on steroids, it would give local government unlimited power, they could veto whatever projects or plans they wanted. This originated as an anti-fraking bill, but does not stop there (introduced 2/10). (original public trust)"

John Stulp: "flex market bill - already gone through the house, been sailing through intact, that would cause senior water right owners to go to court to get multiple flexible uses of consumptive water. That is moving along smoothly. CWCB has supported it in the past and helped with public outreach (1026)."

6. Committee Updates

a. Non-consumptive updates:

Greg Kernohan explained that they could only work on the non-consumptive plan, but that they also picked up B.Biggs and Shoemaker from Metro. Greg stated that he felt he had a good cross section of representation and a good committee, including Larry and Jim Hall, as well as Barb.

b. Education Sub-Committee

Joel Schneckloth stated that there would be a meeting on Thursday

c. Groundwater Sub-Committee

Joe Frank stated that they had a meeting before the Roundtable meeting on 2/11 in Sterling regarding effects of private projects and the 2013 flood on the aquifer and produced 6 page document as a result. Joe Frank also addressed Reagan's report from the Colorado Water Institute and what role groundwater would play in the Basin Implementation Plan. In regards to South Platte Basin groundwater and surface water - Joe Frank wanted to know, "how do we move recommendations forward in a manner that brings all sides together?"

John Stencil talked about a series of meetings with neutral parties ("Reagan, someone from the DWR, and someone from John Stolk's office") to find common ground and find ways to begin with implementations, but warned that disagreement points may take longer. John Stencil also mentioned that some additional bills would be dropped as late-bill status, dropped by Thursday (immediately after 2/11), two or three bills would come out that would be targeted to the recommendations toward 1278. John Stencil hoped to get a small group together, like the groundwater committee, and figure out ways to apply those specific recommendations.

Harold Evans - summarized Dick Stencil's book on the history of the State Engineer's Office, recalling how the first Colorado groundwater well ended up in litigation.

7. Colorado's Water Plan

Eric Wilkinson/Jim Yahn provided an update that the IBCC would be meeting on 2/18 to talk about new supply, with Carlyle Courier, Bill Trampe out of Gunnison - water availability, and the ability to meet West Slope water needs.

Eric Wilkinson - briefly addressed principles that came out of the Dec meeting of the Metro Roundtable (Dec 13).

Public Forum - "What was the reaction from the Colorado River Roundtable?"

Eric Wilkinson: "no new supply, ad nauseum. The Colorado River drought has been going on 13 or 14 years, comparable to a drought in 1100 AD., unable to make compact deliveries and now a political issue. If the drought continues, Powell could drop below minimum power pull and Mead could drop below minimum Las Vegas pull. The US Secretary of the Interior said at the Colorado Water Users meeting that if Colorado water users cannot come up with a solution, then the federal government will step in and 'help'. There is now a basin wide discussion about how to address the issue, water professional colleagues are using that as proof that we shouldn't be talking about new supply at the moment, so it will be difficult to keep in that on the table with three other legs of stool."

Director Cronin: "recall the previous talk about Roundtable chairs getting together surrounding new supply and new options. Their first meeting was Monday 2/3 and involved the Colorado River, Rio Grande, Metro, South Platte, and Arkansas River basins. A difficult conversation ensued that what happens at the IBCC level, there

seems to be the sense amongst the chairs that other voices want to participate that are not part of the IBCC. Pointing to Windy Gap firming as way to do a multi-use, multi-benefit model. There seems to be a desire by some on the West Slope to narrow the gap by time and location. The gap coming up in area x could be addressed by C-BT rather than new TBD. IBCC has said to discuss preserving options and new supply, so we may end up making a suggestion to IBCC.”

Kevin Lusk: “due to the West Slope approach, there are no ideas of what rules they may place on new projects, anyone at the Roundtable with IPP’s that haven’t been identified or developed, make sure those are in the plan in case West Slope restricts IPP’s after the plan.”

Director Cronin: “for the Colorado Water Plan, return comments on the draft of overview (Chapter 2 of BIP) to Sean Cronin and Mark Colobur, or to Kate McIntyre by 2/18. [CORRECTION - 2/13].”

Jacob Bornstein: “the water plan as a whole is moving away from the framework of having to having draft chapters, the CWCB board has seen three draft chapters. Most of the water plan has to wait for the Basin Implementation Plans. Send in feedback to statewaterplan@state.co.us; all those chapters are on the water plan website.

Jim Yahn: “comments need to be back before 2/13”

Joe Frank: “South Platte and the Republican River should be said ‘together but broken out’ to address geography and major differences in their Basins.”

8. CWCB Update

Dianne Hoppe: “the CWCB met at a board meeting the last week in January, before the Colorado Water Congress. Director King felt the Water Plan should be first item on agenda next month. four legs of the stool are important as a unified approach, one leg that wants to get kicked out by the West Slope is the new supply leg. If that leg goes, the whole thing collapses. We need to keep insisting that this is an important part of the stool. Update on flood recovery is that there is still a lot of work left to be done. The CWCB has continued making loans and grants in addition to other loans. We went through the WSRA grants and approved all those that came to attention. In contentious issues, the intent to propagate new instream flows where the Bureau of Land Management has made a recommendation seemed like a trick, since the required instream flows would be 900cfs - quite high, and it seemed dangerous for an outside entity to tell Colorado how to manage its water. Instream flows have kept feds out of Colorado water management. We are meeting again March 18/19 at the new History of Colorado museum, which is open to the public, or you can listen online, come in and make comments if desired.

9. Member and Public Feedback

Public feedback: “We would like to publicly thank Northern WCD help big and small irrigators recover from the flood.”

Eric Wilkinson: “we have some great staff, thank you”

Robert Sakata: “on behalf of the Colorado Ag-Water Alliance, we want to ask you to support an effort: the CAWA is going to reach out to representatives and forward that on to the community to get comments on bills. We recommend each rep to talk to constituents to provide input into the legislative process.”

Rep Jerry Sonnenburg: “I was curious how much public interest there was in Sterling.”

10. Meeting Schedule

Cronin: “thank you to our local host. The Roundtable meeting in March will be in Longmont, following the Summit days earlier (11,6, respectively). IBCC is coming up on March 18, joint SPB/Metro May 13 (see agenda).

Jim Yahn: “Colorado Basin Roundtable meeting twice monthly.”

Meeting Adjourned at 8:30