

## IBCC Colorado River Basin

1. **February 23, 2015 –Legislative Update, Agriculture Rep election, Should the CBRT develop a computer water model, Shoshone Call presentation, Colo Water Plan update.**
1. **Next Meeting: March 23, 2015, Glenwood Springs Community Center, 12:00 – 4:00.**
2. **Reporter:** These minutes were prepared by Ken Ransford, Esq., CPA, 970-927-1200, [kenransford@comcast.net](mailto:kenransford@comcast.net).
3. **Upcoming Meetings:**
  - a. March 3, 2015, Meeting with Gunnison RT representatives to draft a joint West Slope response to the 7 Point Conceptual Agreement.
  - b. March 12, 2105, All Basin Roundtable meeting in Denver
  - c. March 23 CBRT Meeting.
4. **CBRT Members Present:** Kim Albertson, Clay Altenbern-Bluestone Conservancy District, Art Bowles, Caroline Bradford, Lurline Underbrink Curran, Mark Fuller, David Graf, Mark Hermundstad, Hannah Holm, Bruce Hutchins, Diane Johnson, Greg Lanning (City of Grand Junction), Mike McDill, Ken Neubecker, Chuck Ogilby, Ken Ransford, Steve Ryken, Mike Wageck, Lane Wyatt, Bob Zanella,
5. **Guests:** Steve Acquafresca, Linn Brooks, Paul Bruchez, Don Chaplin DARCA, Steve Child-Pitkin BOCC, Linn Brooks-ERWSD, Angie Fowler-SGM, Mark Harris GVVUA, Dick Hart- retired judge, Brent Gardner-Smith, Todd Hanlin-SGM, Jamie Harrison, Brendon Langerhoizen-SGM, Victor Lee-US BuRec, Heather Lewin-Roaring Fork Conservancy, Dave Merritt, Peter Mueller-TNC, Laurie Rink-Middle Colorado Watershed Council, Collis Robinson-Colorado Parks & Wildlife, Angela Ryden, Charles Ryden, Heather Tattersall-Roaring Fork Conservancy
6. Colorado River Flow at Dotsero – 1,600 cfs, a little above average.
7. **\$25,000 grant request to continue the Missouri Heights groundwater monitoring study.** The grant request is for Phase IIA. Ryan McBride and Eric Mangeot, engineers with Resource Engineering in Glenwood Springs, gave an update on this project, which the CBRT first authorized in 2008. The Basalt Water Conservancy District (BWCD) has 500 contracts for municipal and ag use that serve the Roaring Fork watershed. Real estate developments are relying more and more on groundwater in Missouri Heights, which is a mesa on the north side of the Roaring Fork Valley about 700 feet above the Roaring Fork River. It was formerly a hay-growing region, but more and more has ranchettes on parcels ranging from 1-2 acres to 35 acres. Farmers with senior water

rights are concerned that increasing numbers of residential domestic wells could deplete the aquifer.

- a. Phase I – 3 wells and 4 springs were monitored once a month.
  - b. Phase II – 6 sites were monitored, as well as a weather station to get local weather data.
  - c. **Phase IIA** – This is the subject of the grant request. **From 2015 to 2019, up to 8 wells will be monitored as well as a weather station.** New wells will be placed on the Fender property which showed a previous decline in aquifer levels, and a new well may be placed in the Spring Park watershed.
  - d. Phase IIA goals:
    - i. Verify trends and conclusions from Phase II.
    - ii. Investigate the amount of recharge the aquifer receives. This will be difficult in part because they don't know how much water flows into the watershed.
    - iii. Help the BWCD to assess its ability to augment water allotment contracts.
  - e. Imported water from Cattle Creek has helped maintain the aquifer, but precipitation plays a bigger role than Cattle Creek diversions. The water table ranges from 50' deep to 500' in Missouri Heights.
  - f. In the first part of the study, imported water from Cattle Creek had a more important role than withdrawals from wells drilled for new subdivisions or homes had on the water table – real estate development was not having as big an effect as they suspected. A series of wells were failing where the Fender well is sited, which they believe resulted from the Fender ranch converting from flood irrigation to sprinkler.
  - g. The BWCD will contribute \$31,500 toward the \$56,500 cost of Phase IIA; the BWCD is requesting \$25,000 from the CBRT. For more information, contact Eric Mangeot or Ryan McBride at [www.BWCD.org](http://www.BWCD.org).
8. Grand Valley Water User's Association grant request for **\$45,000 to update their watershed study** and stream management plan. Mark Harris, General Manager, discussed the grant request.
- a. Ken Ransford asked what the project's environmental and recreation benefits would be. Harris said that they would look for delivery efficiency improvements that could leave more water in the Colorado River through Grand Junction. They

will identify which parts of the system could free up water that could be made available for other parts of the system or remain upstream in Green Mt. Reservoir. By previously lining ditches the **GVWUA has been able to save up to 50% of water formerly diverted from the river, resulting in 46,000 af of reduced diversions each year.** This means about 1 maf have remained in the river that was previously diverted from it. They are not expecting this much will be available in the future, but perhaps savings of 20% are achievable.

- b. **Concern for repairs to the Roller Dam in Debeque Canyon** is emerging as one of the Grand Valley's top projects.
  - c. This project scored at .75, one of the highest scores yet in the CBRT grant rating system. Caroline Bradford made a motion to approve the request, Chuck Ogilby seconded it, and it **passed unanimously.**
9. Chris Treese, legislative update. "Jim Pokrandt asked for the latest dope from Denver, and here I am."
- a. **HB 1038 – Flex water bill.** This would permit an irrigation water right holder to transfer water on a temporary basis to cities, or leave it in the river to improve river health, without having to go to water court. It passed the House, but **the Colorado River District opposes it. It has since failed** (in the Senate Agriculture, Livestock & Natural Resources Committee) **for the second year in a row.** It would have allowed farmers and ranchers to realize more value from their water right without having to sell it. The flexible water right is a new water right from Water Court; it allows them to use the water anywhere else by another party for any purpose at any time, and at any place. Under current law, a water court change case determines this. Treese commented that there will be a lot more objectors if information as to time, place, and amount of use is lacking. The Colorado River District believes **it will burden water right holders who don't want to change their water use or have to go to water court** to object to another water user's Flex transfer.
    - i. Caroline Bradford asked how to fix this. One solution would be to let water right holders to come in later to raise opposition. This was rejected.
    - ii. Don Chaplin – this bill creates unknowns, so it will hamper implementing the Colorado Water Plan.
    - iii. Ken Ransford commented that **the flex right being transferred is only historic consumptive use; thus, return flows** that other farmers rely on **still have to be preserved** with respect to their time, location, and amount. He asked why the Colorado River District opposed the transfer of historic consumptive use. Treese responded the Colorado River District

opposes it because it will cause people to have to come into Water Court and object, and that is expensive. That is the same reason that the Colorado River District objected to Senate Bill 14-23, which would permit farmers to improve irrigation efficiency and leave water in the river to improve stream health. The Colorado River District opposed SB 14-23, and helped convince Governor Hickenlooper to veto it after it passed both houses in 2014.

- b. HB 15-1222. The “**son of SB 14-23**,” this would permit up to 12 pilot projects to test irrigation efficiency for 10 years from 2015-2025. It is only available to the West Slope in Divisions 4-7. Applicants must apply to the CWCB between 2015-2020, and no more than 5 pilot projects can be done in any one water division. Efficiency measures can permit less water to be taken out of the headgate, and left in the stream as a non-consumptive instream flow. Each of the 12 pilot projects can be extended for 15 years. So, a pilot could run for up to 27 years.
  - i. The **Colorado River District is supporting this bill**, but Treese said nobody is very excited about it. Representative KC Becker (Dem, Boulder and Grand Counties) is carrying this bill, but there’s not a lot of support for it. It still does not have a Senate sponsor. **People are exhausted. The bill is 17 pages long.**
  - ii. This may suffer the same fate as previous pilots – when the legislature is finished, it often puts so many weights and limits on the process that no one is willing to take advantage of it. This has been the fate of most water pilot projects such as the bill to permit rainwater harvesting by new subdivisions such as Sterling Ranch, or alternative agricultural transfers from one basin to another. The Colorado River District’s goal is to develop a pilot project that can work, and its board suggested that it would be a mistake to put too many limitations on it.
  - iii. Caroline Bradford asked why were only 12 projects permitted. Treese responded that this might be too many.
  - iv. Chuck Ogilby asked whether the Colorado River District will recommend any pilots.
  - v. Is there any incentive to encourage people to take on these pilot projects? No. The incentive is to improve stream flows. It will cost a lot to get into the pilot program, which will be managed by the CWCB. The State Engineer has to confirm that the project can be administered, and the CWCB must verify that other water right holders that rely on return flows will not be injured. **Water right holders can object every year during the pilot project**, not just the year it is proposed, and if they feel their

objections are not met, they can appeal to Water Court at any time throughout the pilot period. The pilot projects are designed to be very CWCB-centric. The idea is to make the process friendly and approachable, compared to Water Court.

vi. Ken Ransford and Chris Treese spoke in support of the bill at a legislative hearing before the House Agricultural, Livestock and Natural Resources Committee in Denver on March 6. It **passed 7-6 on a strict party line vote** and it passed the House on March 17. Republican legislators opposing the bill raised the following **objections**:

- 1) This would create a **new water right** in Colorado.
- 2) This would **harm upstream junior** water right holders. (No one mentions the fact that Front Range providers are upstream junior water right holders. The Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, which receives water from the Fry-Ark project, has indicated to Ken Ransford that it opposes this bill.)
- 3) This would leave water in the stream that is no longer available to Colorado. It will go down to Lake Powell to benefit other states.
- 4) This will **drag other water right holders into water court**, and that's expensive and unfair.

vii. Governor Hickenlooper says this is one of his 6 top bills.

c. SB 15-8 – Coordinate land use planning with water supply planning. The CWCB and the Department of Local Affairs provide technical assistance to utilities that deliver at least 2,000 acre feet to at least 10,000 people (“covered entities”). This bill addresses land use and how a local water entity coordinates land and water supply planning. The Colorado River District supports this bill. This bill allocates \$50,000 (**10 cents per Colorado resident**) **for the CWCB to develop program to support covered entities** as follows:

i. Develop training programs, including introductory programs, refresher programs, and advanced programs, for local government water use, water demand, water consumption, and land use planners regarding best management practices for water demand management, water efficiency, and water conservation.

d. SB 12-183: This bill says a water court judge does not have to consider every year that a water right has been used in determining historic consumptive use and, if historic consumptive use has previously been determined, it cannot re-open that

issue. The **Colorado River District opposes** this bill because it tells the Water Court judge that it should not consider any undecreed use of a water right in a change case. Currently, undecreed uses typically receive 0 for historic consumptive use.

- i. This statute addresses the issue in the **Busk-Ivanhoe case** that is now before the Colorado Supreme Court. Aurora converted a water right that was decreed for agricultural use to municipal use in the 1980s without getting a decree authorizing the change in use. The water right passes from the Fryingpan to the Arkansas drainage through the Busk-Ivanhoe tunnel. Under Colorado water law, had Aurora changed its decreed use in a change case in the 1980s, that would have permitted other water right holders to challenge that **Aurora's alleged agricultural right was not as robust as Aurora claimed.**
- ii. Pitkin County argued that since Aurora's municipal use was an **undecreed use**, Aurora **should be given 0 historic consumptive use credit** for each year the water was used for municipal use. This would effectively drop Aurora's water right, as this example shows: if historic consumptive use was 1,000 acre feet from 1960-1980, and 0 from 1980-2000 because the right was for an undecreed use, average historic consumptive use would be 500 acre feet over the entire 40-year period, not 1,000 acre feet as Aurora claimed. The water court judge agreed with Aurora's claim and awarded the higher historic consumptive use that Aurora desired.
- iii. Many Front Range entities have submitted briefs to the Colorado Supreme Court in favor of permitting Aurora to get credit for its historic use of the diversion through the Busk-Ivanhoe tunnel despite the change in use from agricultural to municipal purposes.
- iv. **Most Front Range entities are supporting this bill.** The Colorado River District, which earlier opposed Aurora's recent application to change its use from agriculture to municipal use, opposes this because the bill addresses a fact-specific issue that may have statewide ramifications we cannot predict; it's best to let the court handle this.
- e. Rain barrel use – Each residence can install two 50-gallon barrels to keep rainwater.
- f. Cities have a difficult time complying with **stormwater regulations**. Storm water that runs down city streets carries trash, dog poop, petroleum residue and other contaminants into rivers. Aspen recently built some settling ponds to filter out contaminants before the stormwater enters the river. The State Engineer

claims that if water is **held for more than 72 hours, the city needs a reservoir permit**. This bill will address this situation.

- g. Oil and gas task force – The task force has forwarded its recommendations to the Governor.
  - h. **South Platte study of new supplies**, sponsored by J. Paul Brown, House Republican from Durango: This bill would allocate state funds to study how storage can benefit the South Platte basin, including the potential transfer of **water from the Missouri River**. This study will be similar to the Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado Basin study.
10. Election of a new agricultural representative.
- a. **Steve Aquafresca** – Mesa County peach grower. Steve is a former County Commissioner from Mesa County, and a 3-term House of Representative member representing Mesa County. Now that he is not on the BOCC, he'd like to attend CBRT meetings.
  - b. **Paul Bruchez**, 5<sup>th</sup> generation rancher. Paul's family operates a 6,000 acre ranch with a 27 cfs water right on the Upper Colorado River above Kremmling. They also have a leaseback agreement with Denver Water for 111 acre feet on Williams Fork River. Paul has run the ranch since 2001. The lease expired in 2013, but with Lurline Underbrink-Curran's help, the family convinced Denver Water to permit it to keep irrigating with water from the Big Lake Ditch (that gets water from Williams Fork Reservoir). It's a good example of potential cooperation for the future.
  - c. **Don Chaplin** farms an apple and peach orchard in Divide Creek, and also grows hay. Don is on the DARCA board of directors. The Ditch and Reservoir Company Alliance is only 10 years old, but it is an effective voice for ditch companies. Don serves on board of Roseland Ditch, and a past director of the Ware & Hinds ditch.
  - d. **Charles Ryden** has a ranch on the main Elk Creek, and also on the West and East Elk forks north of New Castle. He sold his ranch last year and now has more time. He has been president of Garfield County Farm Bureau for 25 years, and was president of the soil conservation service. His wife is on the state board of the Colorado Farm Bureau.
  - e. A vote was held, and no person received a majority. Paul Bruchez and Steve Aquafresca received the most votes, and the CBRT members will vote by email to determine the winner of these two.

- f. Ken Ransford encouraged all members up for election to continue attending CBRT roundtable meetings, noting that their **contributions to the discussion were more important than their votes**, which often are unanimous or near-unanimous.
- 11. Angie Fowler – Update on the Basin Implementation Plan. The CBRT BIP describes future actions in the section titled *Next Steps*. According to Angie, these are the issues we need to focus on:
  - i. Quantify environmental and recreation flows
  - ii. Define regional agricultural needs
  - iii. Ensure the production and maintenance of agriculture.
  - iv. Plan and account for future municipal and industrial demands.
- 12. Angie Fowler led a discussion on **whether the CBRT should develop a hydrologic model of the Colorado River Basin**.
  - a. A model is a scientific based tool to quantify water for planning purposes. It can also be used to play what-if scenarios – what happens if there are new TMDs, or a Water Bank, or climate change? How do these affect the Shoshone and Cameo calls?
  - b. SGM wants to hear from CBRT members to see what should be in the model.
    - i. Environmental and recreation flow needs, ag shortages (location, volume, timing)
    - ii. Consumptive use gap
    - iii. IPPs or projects.
    - iv. Who gets to use the model?
  - c. Establish a modeling technical committee.
  - d. Review existing Basin studies and models.
  - e. Develop a modeling framework.
  - f. Lurline – Grand County has been through all kinds of modeling. A normal person doesn't understand modeling – modelers have to talk to modelers, and it takes a very long time to get anything accomplished. **The CBRT needs a technical**



**committee of modelers to advise us. Grand County has spent a lot of money modeling, and it can't run the model; consultants have to at hourly rates of \$100-150 or more.** Grand County uses TetraTech to run its model. These are big challenges and over our head. Modelers speak a language well beyond the capacity of CBRT members to understand.

- i. Tweaks cost \$50,000 and take 8 months.
- ii. We need to know upfront what we want the model to do.

13. **Linn Brooks, Eagle River Water and Sanitation District President**, described their experience in **creating a model**. Their model has several partners, whose water systems are inter-connected in the Eagle Valley. It ties the exercise of water rights to real time stream flows, which allow them to optimize their system and enhance stream flows. They can use this to run future hydrologic scenarios, and connect water supply planning and land use planning. They've spent \$200,000 so far, and expect to spend \$150,000 more. You can simplify the model depending on your needs.
- a. She provided an example of a map for Gore Creek planning. It is a tool with a lot of data depicted – bridges or land ownership where development is possible; stressors on streams – impervious areas that don't soak up water; riparian buffers. It can produce a cumulative stream health index, as defined by macro-invertebrate studies. The graph is spatial and shows the impact on river flows as one moves west to east through the Eagle River Valley.
  - b. ERWSD is finding the model very useful; they've been working on it for about 18 months; this is normal and should be expected. A lot of the data in the model has come from the State of Colorado.
  - c. **ERWSD is using the State Mod model developed by the State of Colorado**; one reason they did this was so their model could communicate well with the state. State Mod is very good at water rights administration. Some models are open source platforms, but you need a consultant who can run it. The ongoing management expense is significant. The model output is reams of paper with numbers, so you need a reporting tool to pull out useful information.
  - d. Mark Fuller asked Linn to provide a real world example of how the model would be used. **The Eagle River MOU project plans to develop about 30,000 acre feet of new supplies near Homestake Creek**, 20,000 acre feet for Aurora and Colorado Springs, and 10,000 acre feet for water providers in the Eagle River valley. The model permits ERWSD to consider alternatives for how this water would be developed. Another example is to provide data for the water demand management program, which will cause users to cut back water use in dry periods, or in response to a Colorado River Compact Call. It will manage

demands based on various conditions. It can model future water use based on emerging trends in indoor and outdoor use, or by single family equivalents. It can look at a specific augmentation plan and determine whether water is being under- or over-used.

- e. To develop the model, ERWSD chose consultants they have been working with for 25-30 years.
14. What should **the CBRT** do: Linn said we **could evaluate non-consumptive uses** in a region. This is the weakest data for our BIP and the State Water Plan. How do you quantify those needs. This tool could be helpful there. Or if a TMD is proposed, this tool could help us evaluate it and generate comments for a permitting process. Once the model is put together, there are a lot of ways to use it. Have a committee determine the needs, prioritize it, and determine the cost.
- a. Caroline Bradford had experience with the 10825 modeling project which used **proprietary models developed by Denver Water and Northern**. Caroline is leery that the Water Supply Reserve Account is becoming the consultant employment act, and fears that the CBRT cannot afford a model. This sounds good on paper, but this is a huge project that we may not be able to pull off.
  - b. Dave Merritt – we have models statewide that are respected and used by people around the state. There’s a **perpetual care aspect to models**. Each time computers are updated, models have to be updated too.
  - c. Don Chaplin – we’re biting off a big project; where is the \$100,000 or \$200,000 going to come from. **\$38,000 has been allocated to SGM to investigate this** and get back to us.
  - d. Phase II BIP Work - \$100,000 was given to us from the CBRT. Task 1 – water provider surveys. Task 3 is modeling, for which \$38,000 has been approved already, Task 4 is maintaining the web site.
  - e. Steve Ryken – This should be under the CWCB CDSS Support system. Ute Water Conservancy did a model of distribution lines. CDSS was weak in Plateau Creek, so they did not use the CWCB CDSS Support system.
  - f. Chuck Ogilby – we should have Phase II of CRWAS done today – plug in a project, and see the impact all the way down the river. The state has been reluctant to do Phase II. Could they do it now?
  - g. Brenden – we could look at what exists now, and see what is needed to update them.

- h. Ken Ransford asked **why are models proprietary** since they are developed by water providers like Denver Water or Northern that are public entities funded with tax dollars. He suggested that we ask Denver Water and Northern to make their models available to us, and that we reimburse them for consultant time to answer our queries.
  - i. **A technical committee was created to investigate this, with members including Dave Merritt, Steve Ryken, Lane Wyatt, and John Currier of the Colorado River District.**
15. Brendan Langenhuizen – Update on water provider interview.
- a. Now, we have tourism data – **422,000 tourists vs. a stable population of 275,000** in the Colorado River Basin.
  - b. Consumptive use will grow from 9,000 af to 18,000 af by 2050, based on questionnaires that have been received.
  - c. What are the **top needs**?
    - i. Additional **storage**
    - ii. Raw water quality preservation and improvement.
    - iii. **New treatment plants**
    - iv. **Water court flexibility**
    - v. Conservation implementation.
    - vi. Surface water flow preservation and improvements.
    - vii. Have constituents verbalized a **need for more recreation and environmental flows**? 44% haven't answered, **35% say yes, 21% say no.**
    - viii. Lane Wyatt – how do you track water use by tourists? Use both a peak and a base. We can't just use gpcd, because the number is fluctuating all the time. How is the CBRT going to implement high conservation? What is the game plan to do that. (The Southern Nevada Water Authority's Water Conservation Plan says that **Las Vegas' 40 million annual tourists equate to 465,000 full time residents**; see 2014-18 plan, page 4.)

16. Mark Hermundstad – Protecting the Shoshone Call, which permits . Article VI of the Colorado River Cooperative Agreement (CRCA) concerns the Shoshone call; the CBRT’s goal is to keep this call permanently protected.
- a. Here is what Denver Water’s website says about the Shoshone call:
    - i. The Shoshone Hydro Plant is owned by Xcel Energy and is located in Glenwood Canyon. It has senior 1902 water right of 1,250 cubic feet a second (cfs) and a 1929 right for 158 cfs (1,408 total). When called, it is administered by the Colorado Division of Water Resources against junior water storage rights upstream that include Denver Water’s Dillon and Williams Fork Reservoirs, the Colorado River District’s Wolford Mountain Reservoir and the Bureau of Reclamation’s Green Mountain Reservoir.
    - ii. **The agreement “relaxes” the call to 704 cfs when river flows are low,** or takes a Shoshone call totally off the river when flows are rising. **The relaxation period is between March 14 and May 20,** in deference to boating season on the river and irrigation needs in the basin.
    - iii. Two tripping points activate the agreement: when Denver Water forecasts its **July 1 reservoir storage in its ten largest reservoirs to be 80 percent full** or less, and when the Colorado River Basin Forecast Center predicts **spring runoff flows at Kremmling** in Grand County will be less than or equal to **85 percent of average**. On April 2, 2013, the reservoir forecast was 74 percent full on July 1 and the Kremmling forecast is 60 percent of average.
  - b. **Shoshone outage protocol** – the call is treated as if it is in place on the river even if the plant is down. **Northern has not signed** off on this protocol, nor has the US Bureau of Reclamation. Most parties have been operating as though the Shoshone Outage Protocol was on.
  - c. Denver water can make a call when the West Slope is in severe drought. The **West Slope takes the hit when the river is most stressed**, but the CRCA doesn’t address this. This makes more water available to DW and Northern, but 10% of the call is also stored in Green Mt. Reservoir so not all the water goes to the Front Range.
  - d. The CRCA says we are still subject to the one-turbine call even if we own the Shoshone plant. Both **the Shoshone call** and the Shoshone outage protocol **agreements expire in 2032**, twenty-five years after the Denver Water-Xcel agreement’s January 1, 2007, effective date. The current Shoshone agreement

between Denver Water and Xcel supersedes an earlier agreement that had been in effect since 1986.

- e. If Xcel sells the Shoshone water right, the new owner can cancel the agreement with Denver Water 2 years later. Here's what the agreement says about a later sale of the water right:

13. Sale of Shoshone Water Rights. In the event the Company (Xcel) should determine that it is in its best interest to sell the Shoshone water rights, it agrees to do so only on an open bidding basis in which the (Denver Water) Board shall have an equal opportunity to purchase the water rights as all others. **If the Company sells the Shoshone water rights to an entity other than the Board, the new owner shall have the right to terminate this Agreement two years after closing of the sale.**

- f. The Xcel Vice President told the CBRT roundtable in 2014 that the Shoshone wasn't for sale. But, Mark Hermundstad said, "**Everything is for sale** for the right price and terms."

17. Brent Newman – January 2015 update of the Colorado Water Plan

- a. March 12 CBRT Basin Summit
- b. April 17 – Final BIP goes to the CWCB Board.
- c. May 1 – Public Comment deadline
- d. July 15 – another water plan draft. It will include every one of the 15,000 comments received. Who submitted it and what section it applies to.
- e. September 17 – Final draft begins.
- f. December 10 – Final Water Plan will be delivered.

18. **Open issues** the CWCB would like more detail on:

- a. **Draft Conceptual Framework to be finalized** collaboratively by the CWCB, IBCC, and the Roundtables.
- b. Tributary and non-tributary **groundwater sustainability**.
- c. **Conservation** will be further developed.
- d. **Legislative** concepts focusing on **conservation and alternative transfer methods** for agricultural water sharing.

- e. **Funding** options and permitting efficiencies will be further developed by working with sister agencies and stakeholders.
19. Brent Newman said, “Colorado won’t do what California did – a big project. We respect property rights and local control too much to do this.” He said **the Colorado Water Plan would not promote any specific water projects**, leaving that up to the individual BIPs.
- a. Chap 2 - Prior Appropriation, interstate compacts, tribal and federal water rights.
  - b. Chap 3 – 4-5 paragraph of each BIP. Brent could use our help reviewing this.
  - c. Chap 4 – Water supply – snake diagram, groundwater basins, climate change.
  - d. Climate change did not receive its own chapter, because it affects every chapter.
  - e. Agriculture does not get a separate chapter.
  - f. Map of potential statewide reservoir storage facilities.
  - g. SWSI scenario planning.
  - h. No and low regret actions that every RT agrees upon.
  - i. Section 6.2 – Jacob Bornstein – how every basin will meet its gap. What the gaps are, and what projects and methods are to meet the Gap. The Colorado Basin Roundtable has the most projects and methods, so we have the most options to meet our gap.
  - j. Every section has a series of actions.
  - k. ATMs – not many have succeeded. Perhaps we should relax Colorado water law to make them more successful.
  - l. The CWCB has a mandate to not call out any project. These are in the BIPs.
  - m. The CWCB is **calling out and emphasizing our recommendation for stream management plans**. These are discussed in section 7.1.
  - n. The Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) recommends that we combine water quantity and quality.
  - o. Chapter 8 – This is controversial since it calls out the importance of interbasin projects and agreements.

- p. Section 9.1 – protecting Colorado’s compacts and prior appropriation.
  - q. Legislative recommendations for the 2016 legislative session to initiate the Colorado Water Plan.
  - r. Chapter 8, no and low regrets is important to review.
- 20. Six \$250 scholarships are available for the March 12 statewide Roundtable summit–email Jim Pokrandt.
  - 21. Next meeting of 4 west slope roundtables meets next on March 3 at 9:00 AM at the Colorado River District office. Nothing to report yet.