

South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, February 10, 2015

Ramada Hotel

2500 East Chestnut

Sterling, CO 80751

Attendance: Sean Cronin, Joe Frank, Greg Kernohan, Larry Ross, Joel Schneekloth, Gene Manuelo, Diane Hoppe, Mike Shimmin, Jim Yahn, Larry Howard, Rich Belt, Ken Huson, Harold Evans, Kevin Lusk, Brent Nation, Doug Rademacher, Mike Applegate, Frank Eckhardt, Randy Ray, Karen Martinez, Allyn Wind, Bruce Gerk, Mike Brazell, John Stencel, John Stulp, Erik Wilkinson, Bert Weaver, Doug Robotham, James VanShaar, Kent Swedlund, Pete Konovitz, Gary Herman, Matt Betz

Meeting was called to order at 6PM.

Introductions

Per the enhanced public component of the Roundtable meeting, Roundtable members made introductions.

Opening public comment included Gross Farms thanking the Roundtable for funding a project in conjunction with Ducks Unlimited several years ago.

Agenda Chances

Joe Frank added "Discussion of Roundtable Committees and Membership" beneath agenda item 5, thereby creating items "f" and "g".

BIP Overview

HDR and West Sage took the floor, beginning with Matt Cook giving an outline of an update on HDR's efforts. Cook announced the South Platte Roundtable meeting for March would be in either Evergreen or Pine. A joint meeting would likely be scheduled the same week that the final draft of the Plan is to be submitted. Cook spoke about the roving BRT meetings that occurred in January and the current February as well as future meetings (March), and then addressed webinars that have been between the January and February meetings. Cook stated there were no webinars scheduled between the February and March meetings. Sean Cronin asked HDR to discuss previous discussions on maximizing Roundtable resources and to generate a breakdown of costs-per-member at each regular Roundtable meeting and the costs per member at each Roving meeting and webinar, etc.

Matt Cook addressed the Water Availability Technical Analysis for Surface Water Availability, speaking to a workshop several months ago that generated several key takeaways, focusing on models developed for surface water analysis in different areas of the South Platte Basin. The Brown, Caldwell

, and Fritzler tool showing the stretch from Henderson to the mainstem was a pointflow model that had been updated to reflect present conditions (September 2013 was excluded due to uncertainty of data quality). At the time of presentation, seven mainstem analysis points and five tributaries had base estimates of potential water availability developed for them. The Division 1 engineer, Staff, Water Commissioners provided information on water administration, water operations, and water rights for those points and tributaries. Water providers also provided information on IPP's, water operations, and reuse (SMWSA, Aurora, Denver Water, Northern Water, Xcel). This work was done to ensure that there is not **more** water than the base estimates predicted. This data was being used to generate a Draft Technical Memorandum. Cook spoke to the consultant teams' desire to avoid adding strict numbers in their estimates. Cook stated the plan was to have that Memorandum submitted to the Roundtable by the end of the week of the March 9th and then have the document back with feedback within one week.

Matt Cook then went on to address projects and methods. He reported there were 25 participants from the Rio Chato and Metro Exec Committees at the January 22 meeting at Thornton's Wes Brown Water Treatment Plant. They reviewed projected water demands and new GIS-based graphics to be incorporated into the final BIP. They also reviewed water availability – groundwater and surface water including preliminary results of water availability analysis. Additionally, they reviewed the 10 key elements of the draft BIP and the estimated water supply gap as well as key assumptions that impact the gap with current portfolios. Cook reported the Basin had a 60% success rate for IPPs and the State aggregate was 80%. They obtained direction on the development of Conceptual Projects and Methods for inclusion in the final BIP and established a Projects and Methods Workgroup to further develop concepts identified during the Workshop.

HDR reported Concept #1 was to Maximize In-basin Supplies including unappropriated water, reuse, and ATMs (alternative transfer methods) using The Nature Conservancy's concept of integrating various forms of water into the consideration. Doug Robotham took the floor to discuss The Nature Conservancy's concept of examining a regional reuse plan. Peter Benny with Merick and Company wanted to see if the idea could serve as a catalyst for further discussion and problem solving. Joe Frank stated his pleasure with the conversion of the original regional reuse plan to the name HDR was presenting then (Maximize In-basin Supplies). Harold Evans argued that a significant amount of storage would need to be added to make Concept #1 feasible. Sean Cronin added that he felt The Nature Conservancy was aiming directly at the increase of storage capacity to make maximize in-basin water supplies.

HDR reported Concept #2 was the Conjunctive Use of Denver Basin with Trans-mountain Diversions. Matt Cook stated this concept was an SMWSA concept originally presented within Appendix F of the draft BIP. Cook stated Eric Hecox had asked HDR to map the seven concepts from Appendix F against the IBCC Conceptual Framework. The core concept was bringing water from Flaming Gorge through a pipeline to the Front Range to be used in a conjunctive-use format. The philosophy was to use the Denver Basin Aquifer constitutently. Mike Shimmin argued that the concepts, as they were being

presented, should really be merged in order to maximize in-basin supplies. That maximization would necessarily be paired with trans-mountain diversions to show how a firm-yield was being considered in conjunction with in-basin supplies.

HDR reported Concept #3 was Multi-purpose Groundwater Recharge/Augmentation. This concept was generated from a South Wiggins Project highlighting the potential benefits to well users. Water would be delivered through the Empire. This project would help well users in the 2nd, 1st, and 64th Districts. Matt Cook argued this concept included conjunctive use, addressed the agricultural-municipal gap, and was designed to address the agricultural gap specifically.

HDR reported Concept #4 was the Headwaters Area Investigation. This concept was designed to investigate the potential for infrastructure in the headwaters areas of the Gunnison, Colorado, Arkansas, and South Platte Basins. Matt Cook felt there would be lots of difficulties with this Concept, but it still warranted attention in order to keep discussion going on the concepts. Cook felt Concept #4 tied in with Concept #2.

Sean Cronin asked what “investigate the potential for infrastructure” meant. Matt Cook argued the infrastructure could be pipelines, holes in the mountain, etc., but Cook wanted to move forward until they received guidance to do otherwise. However, this idea (Concept #4) received some resistance from the Roundtable. Joe Frank argued Concept #4 was not clearly defined in past discussions. Cronin asked how Concept #4 differed from the language directly calling for trans-mountain diversions and Cook responded that concept was focused on the geographically proximal headwaters areas. Jim Yahn argued that the idea of pumping water **out** of the South Platte Basin did not seem attractive or logical. Eric Wilkinson added that the trans-mountain diversion discussion was encapsulated by IBCC discussions. One of the fundamental concepts was that high-mountain storage potential was not yet fully investigated and would likely provide numerous benefits while also having caveats for the Basin. Ken Fritzler suggested such inter-basin water sharing might hinder water right development further downstream in each basin. Any excess changes or predictions would change significantly from the work that had already been done, respectively. Cook argued such feedback was precisely what HDR was looking for. Cronin argued Concept #4 was perhaps not the best concept to move forward and Shimmin argued the concept would draw unnecessary resistance from internal **and** external groups. The attention would distract from other discussions that would likely prove more fruitful.

Laurel Stadjuhar took the flood to address the environmental-recreational needs and BIP work in that area. Stadjuhar addressed development of the Stream Mile Representation of the River, specifically the improvement of focus areas, projects (where information was available), stream gauges, diversions, and other information. West Sage announced they had also developed an Updated Projects List and improved work in the Example Project Areas. Stadjuhar showed a representation of the interface wherein someone could review and compare projects in the different focus areas. The representation was in a spreadsheet that would link directly to another data source to show the data. Within each example area within each stream reach, there would be hydrograph comparisons to

show streamflow, environmental minimum, environmental flushing, recreational minimums, and recreational maximums. Stadjuhar stated her team was currently parsing through each study to include pertinent data in each graph. Stadjuhar reported her team was working on developing a Raster hydrograph given the breadth of data her team was working with—the goal was to present the data in a meaningful way. There would be an Environmental-Recreational Committee workshop on February 18th at 1:30PM at Northern Water, focusing on the Stream Mile Representation of the River, Projects, and the Example Areas.

Jim Yahn asked if the loss of lands and env-rec abilities would be included in the plan and Laurel Stadjuhar argued those losses would be reflected. Most notably, those losses and impacts would be addressed with narratives rather than with specific numbers because such numbers were extremely difficult to gather or generate. Greg Kernohan stated a grad student was doing similar work (generating env-rec loss numbers) on the Poudre. Bruce Gerk asked where the env-rec study data was coming from and Stadjuhar responded they were using several studies and those studies would be cited in their work. Kevin Lusk asked that multiple solutions to each problem be presented. Kernohan asked that attendees from municipal and industrial interests take special note of the upcoming environmental-recreational meeting as those interests were of particular importance to the committee's work.

Matt Cook took the floor to report HDR was still wrapping up the surface water technical analysis and preparing the pre-final BIP in preparation of a BRT comment period. The joint RC&E (Rio Chato and Metro Executive) Meeting to resolve comments would be early April and a joint BRT meeting in mid-April would be necessary to match the Plan submission timeline.

Legislative Updates

Joe Frank reported he had contacted Doug Kemper to get a Colorado Water Congress (“CWC”) State of Affairs and upon a non-response, took care of the update himself. Frank distributed the CWC information to the Roundtable in preparation of the meeting. Sean Cronin added he felt HB1167 seemed like a big-ticket item and asked if anyone in the room could speak to that Bill. Frank spoke to the possibility of adding a reservoir on the South Platte mainstem and using the Missouri Pumpback as a way for the South Platte to solve its own water problems. There was a mention of water availability analysis, but some Roundtable members had told the Bill advocate that engaging in extra work wasn't always helpful to Basin-wide water projects. Cronin was concerned that the Bill would overload the Colorado Water Conservation Board and Diane Hoppe suggested there were enough studies on the books that data could likely be pulled from elsewhere.

Bob Laungenbaugh called attention to a precipitation bill that would directly impact the Sterling Ranch—they proposed the harvesting of rainwater for use in their development. If approved, they would be the only private project funded in this manner. Laungenbaugh expressed his concern over the project's stated precipitation levels and its impact on runoff and recharge water. Joe Frank added their timestamp of a month versus a day was problematic. The project would be 12,000 homes and

30,000 people in development. Laungenbaugh was also concerned about the project as a redevelopment project with that captured water and the lack of requirement for augmentation (70% capture and 30% return). Eric Wilkinson reported the bill in discussion had seen several significant amendments in the few days leading up to the Roundtable meeting.

Jim Yahn added that for HB1166 the well-monitoring network was a Bill that came out of the Technical Groundwater Committee. Even though the Committee may have seemed to be moving slowly, they were making process. He wanted to be clear that the Roundtable was working through these issues.

Committee Updates

WSRA Updates

Greg Kernohan stated the Funding Guidelines were a necessary point of discussion. The goal of revising the funding guidelines was to promote more competition between WSRA applications and to match the WSRA process with the CWCB funding process. Kernohan stated there was more flexibility and guidance in how WSRA applications were ultimately funded per the updated WSRA Funding Guidelines. Kernohan asked that a new draft of the Guidelines should be adopted at the March meeting. Kernohan stated there was no resolution on a funding cap for projects in the Basin. Doug Robotham argued the balance in the fund was diminishing, while there would likely be increased interest in and competition for the remaining funds. The two-cycle funding the WSRA wanted to use was a contentious point with the CWCB since it would place increased work on them to review WSRA funding applications at a quicker speed.

Joe Frank stated that since the State only reviews funds twice a year then they should only see applicants twice, but in-Basin requests could conceivably be reviewed more often. Kernohan argued there was not a lot of interest for in-Basin funds since the WSRA Needs Committee had been strongly encouraging applicants to seek State funds first. Kernohan also argued that some projects might require attention quicker than only twice a year and the twice-a-year review system would likely not adequately address those applicants. Doug Rademacher stated there was one applicant who asked for the entire WSRA fund and the decision to use two review periods would be a better way to ensure competition was increased between applicants and the funds used in a more need-based manner. Sean Cronin argued that maximizing financial resources and volunteer resources was critical to the State and the Basin Roundtable, so encouraging both goals was important. Cronin also argued that the WSRA fund was being drawn-down because of the BIP development—he asked if funds could be specifically devoted to the Roundtable. Cronin went on to address the potential for future funds to go specifically to education and outreach.

Doug Kernohan reported that the WSRA Needs Committee was not in place to set direction for the Roundtable, but they were tasked with providing recommendations. Kernohan warned against overcommitting funds for a Phase III initiative. Joe Frank also pondered on what would occur after

April 17 and how monies would be prioritized after that date. Mike Shimmin wondered if the new WSRA Funding Guidelines could be adopted for funding of non-Roundtable projects and if that adoption could occur quickly. Frank also stated that contractors have also held contracts in a manner that used WSRA funds separate from what was available for non-Roundtable projects. Sean Cronin and Doug Kernohan discussed the possibility of draining the WSRA fund in May and then waiting many months before another application could be reviewed. Brent Newman addressed the significant drain on staff resources that a twice-a-year application review would place on the CWCB.

Groundwater Committee

Joe Frank reported on the Groundwater Committee meeting held prior to the Roundtable and on the upcoming Technical Committee meeting to be held several days after the February Roundtable meeting. The meetings would be focusing on the high-groundwater situations in Gilcrest and Sterling and how to address water supply in Sterling. Frank wanted to reserve Jim Hall as the Roundtable representative with the Technical Committee, pending his acceptance of such an offer. Frank asked if others were interested in chairing the Groundwater Committee since their role in developing Roundtable discussion and guidance was such a crucial component of what the Roundtable has been doing. Discussion ensued as to whether or not the chair of the Groundwater Committee needed to be on the Roundtable. Frank stated he would resign in March as Groundwater chair and a new chair would need to be appointed.

Environmental-recreational Subcommittee

It was reported there would be an environmental-recreational meeting on February 17th at the Southwest Weld County Administration Building at 2PM.

IBCC Update

Jim Yahn gave the IBCC update, stating the IBCC met recently to discuss the draft Conceptual Agreement and those were seven points that would need to be looked at for a trans-mountain diversion. Yahn felt those points were vague, but had some positive results in discussion. For example, the West Slope showed they were comfortable with the understanding that trans-mountain diversions would not be tied to a firm yield. The Agreement also received a new name as the Conceptual Framework as a means of addressing a trans-mountain diversion; each Roundtable had a chance to weigh-in on the discussion. The IBCC set up a sub-committee to look at the Framework, before discussing what would need to be addressed and prioritized in the future. One of those discussion items would be agricultural conservation, and another would be legislative changes, another the preservation of agriculture, and another focused on IPPs.

Jim Yahn reported they would be working quicker to make things fit into the water Plan. Yahn asked Roundtable members to register for the upcoming Roundtable Summit (March 12 in Westminster). Wilkinson also added that the Conservation Sub-Committee reported on what levels and locations

should be used to attend to the gap with conservation. John Stulp stated he was pleased with the meeting and felt the timing of the recent meeting was appropriate given the impending submission date of the BIPs and State Water Plan. Stulp asked that Roundtable members attend the Summit since it was such a valuable resources for Roundtable members to interface with and gain increased understanding of other Roundtables.

Education Sub-Committee:

Joel Schneekloth spoke to the Education Action Plan and made a change—budget item “A” needed to be removed since the CWCB was already funding the Roundtable and did want to use their own money to fund their own indirect purchases. The Education Committee reported they had \$2000 remaining to use before July 1 (early June). Schneekloth expressed satisfaction that his ideas for Education funds were often handled by West Sage and HDR before he could even suggest those ideas. Schneekloth wanted to take advantage of West Sage and HDR to develop education-based projects. Joe Frank asked if the money could be spent as soon as the Action Plan was approved and Joel Schneekloth and Sean Cronin confirmed. Schneekloth discussed some of the items that would be in the long-view for 2015 and beyond (the CWCB works on a fiscal calendar of July 1 to June 30).

Sean Cronin asked for clarification if the EAP would need to be completed or approved before applying for funds and Schneekloth confirmed it should have read “approved”. Cronin also asked for clarification on what kinds of activities and costs would be included in Budget item B. It was stated that there was consideration of adding a membership to the Colorado Waterwise group to gain access to their educational and information materials. Cronin stated that in the past the Committee Chair has brought funding issues before the Roundtable for concurrence of approval, but that was not always feasible given time constraints. Joe Frank and Joel Schneekloth confirmed the updated Action Plan was a working document and Frank asked for a change to page 2 (“approved”).

Joel Schneekloth stated that WSRA projects were supposed to come back to the Roundtable with a report on their project. Greg Kernohan agreed that reports on WSRA funded projects would be a great way to show the public where State dollars are going. Kernohan confirmed CWCB has a list of the current and completed projects WSRA has funded and Schneekloth could use that list to gather reports. Kernohan also tasked Rio Chato with the prioritization of where outreach moneys go. Mike Shimmin moved to adopt the EAP and Rich Belt seconded, the motion passed without contest. Joe Frank addressed the strategy for Roundtable messages after April 17th and what that strategy would look like. At the time of the meeting the BIP was in the draft status and couldn’t be heavily pushed to the public as a completed initiative until completion.

Joe Frank spoke to the Roundtable membership and stated that Roundtable members needed to confirm their place on the Roundtable and improve their attendance. Roundtable members would also need to determine a process by which the current At-large vacancy could be messaged-out and

by which resumes could be collected. Frank called attention to the differences in absences (excused and unexcused) and the impact of attendance on quorum size.

Brent Newman called attention to a handout the CWCB brought highlighting updates to Colorado's Water Plan. The update was going to include updates on the Water Plan including what comments had come in. That update would usher in a new 60 day comment period beginning May 1. The deadline for public comment on Colorado's Water Plan would be September 17.

Bob Laungenbaugh raised concern over the inability of the public to review the BIP before its submission on April 17th. Joe Frank and Matt Cook reported the remaining timeline was not open enough to include additional public review and comment. Frank suggested that Laungenbaugh work through his Roundtable representatives to provide comments. Discussion ensued as to how an individual could gain access to the draft BIP. Stadjuhar provided background as to how the first draft of the BIP was originally released and their early release was access-protected in order to provide the Roundtable an opportunity to review the document before the Public or members of other Roundtables. It was decided by Roundtable members to push discussion of access to the March meeting.

Meeting Updates were concluded and the meeting adjourned at 8:25.