

## **IBCC Colorado River Basin**

### **1. August 24, 2015 CBRT Minutes**

1. **August 24, 2015 CBRT Minutes – Grant request for ditch inventory by Eagle River Conservation District; CBRT Comments to Colorado’s Water Plan; Stream management plans**
2. **Next Meeting: September 14, 2015, Glenwood Springs Comm Ctr, 12:00 – 4:00.** Hydrologic modeling is on the agenda.
  - a. Monday October – CBRT meeting is stepped up 2 weeks so we can comment on the Colorado Water Plan.
3. **Upcoming Meetings**
  - a. August 25, CWCB meeting Keystone. The conservation stretch goal is on the agenda for 1.5 hours
  - b. September 10, 9-3:30 Colorado River District annual meeting in Grand Junction
    - i. El Nino, Lake Mead and Powell contingency planning are on the agenda.
  - c. The Great Divide, a film about water in Colorado, September 24, Crystal Theater, Carbondale, and October 17 in Grand Junction at CMU
4. **Reporter: These minutes were prepared by Ken Ransford, Esq., CPA, 970-927-1200, [kenransford@comcast.net](mailto:kenransford@comcast.net).**
5. **CBRT Members Present:** Kim Albertson, Art Bowles, Caroline Bradford, Paul Bruchez, Lurline Underbrink Curran, David Graf, Karl Hanlon, Mark Hermundstad, Bruce Hutchins, Diane Johnson, Merritt Linke, Wes Mauz, Mike McDill, Louis Meyer, Ken Neubecker, Chuck Ogilby, Ken Ransford, Rachel Richards, Steve Ryken, Karn Stiegelmeier, Mike Wageck, Lane Wyatt, Bob Zanella
6. **Guests:** Steve Aquafresca, Kathy Chandler-Henry, Don Chaplin-Director/DARCA, Steve Child, Morgan Hill-Garfield County Environmental Health, Dennis Davidson and Brett Jolley and Don Chaplin, Bookcliff Conservation District, Angie Fowler-SGM, Brent Gardner Smith, Richard Hart, Morgan Hill, Garfield County Public Health, Hannah Holm-CMU, Scott Jones, Eagle County cattle, Eric Kuhn, Brendon Langerhoizen-SGM, Greg Lanning, City of Grand Junction, Victor Lee BuRec, Heather Lewin, Holly Loff, Roaring Fork Conservancy, Dave Merritt, Colorado River District, Brent Newman, CWCB, Josh Rice, Mark Ritterbush, City of Grand Junction, Scott Schlosser, Tam Scott, Mardi Shepard, ILVC, Heather Tattersall, Chris Treese, Richard Van Guytenbeek
7. **River Flow August 24, 2015.** From August 17 through August 24, river flow at Dotsero has dropped from 1,600 to 1,300, below the long term average, and the full Shoshone Call for 1,408 is on. The Cameo gauge has dropped from 2,000 to 1,900. The

endangered fish release is low, and the Colorado River above the 15-mile reach is only flowing at 620 cfs. A surplus was declared to release 220 cfs from Green Mountain Reservoir so this could be released for endangered fish.

8. **Eagle County Conservation District application for \$54,300 WSRA grant.** Scott Schlosser and Scott Jones who are on the ECCD conservation district board, made the presentation along with Brent Langerhoizen-SGM. Langerhoizen said the grant application rose as the top regional project in the Middle Colorado region on the Colorado River from State Bridge to the Eagle River confluence at Dotsero. Schlosser said the board unanimously approved this grant application.
  - a. The Eagle County Conservation District (ECCD) Mission:
    - i. Help the agricultural community maintain irrigation infrastructure.
    - ii. Prioritize projects for ECCD Assistance.
    - iii. Develop a database of outside funding sources to fund collaborative projects with regional partners.
    - iv. Identify opportunities for improved environmental flow conditions (water quality, fish passage, riparian habitat).
  - b. **ECCD is a branch of the Colorado government created under the Colorado Soil Conservation Act**, and is managed by a board of supervisors elected by landowners in the district. The Soil Conservation Act **passed May 6, 1937, in response to the Dust Bowl**. Dust bowl conditions have been largely eliminated by Ogallala Aquifer pumping that keeps the ground moist between Colorado and the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian. The eastern side of the Texas Panhandle forms the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian, and the Ogallala aquifer, which filled with glacier runoff, sits beneath it.
  - c. In 1945, 76 soil conservation districts in Colorado formed the Colorado Association of Conservation Districts to secure conservation grants, and to discuss and influence state and federal law. There are nearly 3,000 conservation districts across the US run by volunteer boards, and affecting 778 million acres. Their duties are described at CRS Section 35-70-108. In 2002 “soil” was removed from the conservation district names to reflect that **the districts are concerned with all natural resources, not just soil**. They aim to keep soil on fields and out of rivers, preserve wetlands, protect groundwater, plant trees and other groundcover to keep soil in place, and to educate communities about soil conservation.
  - d. The ECCD mission is to preserve and restore the natural resources of the District through education, cooperation, and initiation of practices that further these goals. The district is bordered by the Eagle-Grand County line to the north, Vail Pass to the east, the crest of the peaks forming the divide between the Eagle and Frying Pain drainages to the south, and Dotsero. The ECCD has 1 FTE employee,

running weed programs and general secretarial work. SGM has also been hired to help run the ECCD.

- e. **ECCD partners include the NRCS** (Natural Resources Conservation Service) Colorado Cattlemen's Association, the Colorado Dep't of Agriculture, CSU Extension and the Walking Mountains Science Center. From 2005-2009 the NRCS has spent \$1 million on pond construction, brush management, high tunnels, range management, weed control and irrigation improvements.<sup>1</sup> The ECCD also provides seedlings at low cost, and over 1,000 trees have been planted. **Most county governments in Colorado supplement the funding** of the conservation districts in their county or there is a tax levied on real property in the county, **but this is not true in Eagle County.**
- f. **The grant will inventory and document ditch structures for the first time** from the ditch diversion structure taking water from the river to the last lateral on the ditch. There are **25 ditch systems in the ECCD, about 5 per drainage.** The deliverable is a database of multi-purpose projects and ditch maintenance needs that will be shared with each ditch owner. For example, designing a ditch diversion that prevents fish from being entrained, or captured, could provide both irrigation and wildlife benefits. **A prioritized list of multiple-beneficiary projects** will be developed and funding opportunities will be identified, with owner's consent. Scott Schlosser's family bought the Brush Creek ranch 3 years ago, and he says this database would have saved months of effort.
- g. **A summary report will be prepared for each ditch, but it will not be made public** out of privacy concerns. The report will contain:
  - i. An aerial map with denoted risk levels for identified areas.
  - ii. Ditch information page including the ditch condition. For example, a report could state that a ditch could blow out in a reach and should be piped.
  - iii. **A description of ditch structures** including the diversion dam, headgate, flume, lateral headgates, etc.
  - iv. A summary of top priority improvements.
  - v. Resources and contacts who can help with design, repair, funding, etc.
- h. **Public outreach** –public information meetings will be held and regional partners will be contacted to fund projects. The NRCS will promote the program with their agricultural community and regional contacts within the ECCD service area.
- i. **ECCD is self-funded and does not get any money through Eagle County;** thus, it is asking for a grant from the CBRT WSRA to pay for this inventory

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://eaglecountycd.org/>

project. ECC is asking for \$59,300, **\$5,000 from the ECCD, and \$54,300 from the CBRT roundtable.** ECCD will put in 150 hours volunteer time.

- j. **Partners:** Eagle River Watershed Council, Eagle County and its road & bridge department, Walking Mountain Science Center, the Nature Conservancy, American Rivers, Gates Foundation, the towns of Eagle and Gypsum, and the Eagle River Water & Sanitation District.
- k. **Specific water rights will not be identified without the owner's permission.** Schlosser said water right "information is invaluable. This information is gold to the rancher." Don Chaplin asked if the ditch company shareholders were enthusiastic and cooperative. Schlosser said that there are few ditch companies, but a lot of ditch owners. The ECCD expects that ditch owners will respond enthusiastically, as they did when once ranchers started installing sprinklers along the upper Colorado River in Eagle County with NRCS grants. Once a landowner gets a NRCS grant, the neighbors do too.
- l. David Graf asked if the ECCD would be looking at fish entrainment and passage as part of this, saying "**There's often more fish in the ditch that later dries up than in the creek.**" Or, a headwall in the river could prevent fish passage. Scott Schlosser said he has a hydro screen on his ditch that does not trap fish, and he says a high priority of the project is to work with CPW on this.
- m. **Caroline Bradford expressed concern that there was little financial contribution from wealthy landowners, and that the report summary will not be public.** The deliverable will be a database that is not ditch-specific. One of the hardest hurdles with the agricultural community is getting past their privacy concerns. Schlosser said their goal is to find top projects, and ask the landowner to participate in the project. Jim Pokrandt said **the document will not be private once it is submitted to the CWCB** since anyone can read it. Diane Johnson mentioned that the CBRT Basin Implementation Plan supports this project, but the concern with privacy is problematic.
- n. Kim Albertson said that many of the **landowners are poor** from State Bridge to Dotsero **and they cannot bear the cost to keep fish in the river.** "My family has a ranch in that reach. Privacy is very important to them. A lot of these rights are pre-1922 water rights. The privacy means a lot to those folks."
- o. Holly Loff of the Eagle County Watershed Coalition supports this project, and believes the data is essential to improving river conditions. Loff said, "**Agricultural efficiency would improve stream flows and water quality.** We would like to see the prioritized list and funding opportunities." Eagle County Commissioner Kathy Chandler Henry also supports this, saying that once it starts, more people will do it. Paul Bruchez said that the information gathered could be used in stream management plans.

- p. Ken Neubecker said that a lot of the information that will be gathered is public information. We have to find a balance and identify areas where irrigation efficiency improvements can help, if for no other reason to find funding.
- q. Ken Ransford asked **what information ranchers don't want made public.** Rancher Scott Jones and Dennis Davidson together answered that **ranchers are "afraid their water will be taken.** Water law in Colo is very complicated. They have their views of what their water rights are, and they are worried about the government coming in and taking their water. We have to make them feel comfortable. Ranchers don't know how to ask for money. Each ditch has its own issues. To be able to map these ditches and get access to them, we have to be very private with the landowner. The NRCS has made inroads into the ranching community by holding water right information close to their chest. **Ranchers don't want their neighbor to know how much water they are using.** It's like the Hatfields and the McCoys. They don't want this information made public on a website."
- r. Brent Gardner Smith said, **"If you are using water rights it should not be secret.** If you are using water correctly in accordance with beneficial use, what should remain private? The CDSS is already reporting ditch diversions and that information is public. My house is assessed every 2 years and that information is made public, but we cannot assess water rights." Schlosser responded that it's a sensitive area.
- s. Brett Jolley, a rancher in Garfield county and president of the South Side Conservation District, said **"We know agriculture has a target on their back.** It's like the government asking to look into your checking account. Ranchers look at it like you are stealing their water. My landowners would shiver to see a list of ditch owners and ditch diversion records made public."
- t. Paul Bruchez said, **"The ranchers do not want you identifying what the flaws are in their systems.** Landowners are concerned whether they can afford to pay for the improvements."
- u. Lurline Curran Underbrink said, **"Our goal is to protect agriculture.** This is a template, and we have this group devising a plan that works for us. You have to be sensitive to people's fears. ECCD has a huge hill to climb, and I support this application."
- 9. **Ditch inventory work compiled by the NRCS.** Dennis Davidson is employed by the NRCS, and he works with three conservation districts in Garfield and Pitkin counties, the Bookcliff, Southside, and Mt. Sopris Conservation Districts. These 3 districts decided to not ask for money from the CBRT WSRA account to inventory irrigation systems until they determine what is involved with performing the inventories. Davidson said there is a difference between the ECCD and these 3 districts; three districts get more money than a

single district. Garfield County has been generous to the conservation districts to help run cost share programs on small irrigation projects and weed projects. EQIP grants are available for larger projects such as installing sprinkler systems or lining a ditch. Grants from conservation districts are typically smaller.

- a. Davidson **passed out a binder that the Mt. Sopris Conservation District created for the Glenwood Ditch** that ends at City Market in Glenwood Springs. The conservation district is thinking of creating a similar binder for every ditch. The binder was created because a rancher passed away he had a lot of inside knowledge that died with him. Now, each user on the ditch gets a copy of the binder. It has emergency contact information, a list of the ditch shares owners and the ditch company officers. Davidson emphasized the binder should not become public.
- b. Davidson addressed private property rights: **“What if I went to your front door and started taking pictures inside your house? That’s how ditch owners feel. Water commissioners** (who are employed by the State Engineer and monitor how much water is diverted from rivers) **can see how much is diverted out of the first headgate from the river, but they don’t go any further down the ditch.** It’s like saying, ‘I want to see your safe, inside your closet, the clothes you wear.’ That’s how agriculture feels once you start down a ditch. Once you start down the ditch it is not public information. If you say, ‘That structure could be replaced and save water, so fix it,’ the rancher would respond, ‘How did you know that, you trespassed to get that information.’ Ranchers don’t have the dollars to fix those structures. It’s just like looking at someone’s bank account.”
- c. Davidson said that **when the court decreed the water right, the NRCS assumes the judge did an efficiency, beneficial use analysis.** “40 acres for 1 cfs is how judges issued water rights. How do you get a better handle on it? Make everyone drip irrigate? We can, but at what cost. You can’t retrieve your costs if you grow hay on rocky soils. **The best system is wild flooding on steep hillside.** The rancher’s still irrigating, he’s doing the best he can.”
- d. Water rights, decrees, and headgates are public information available from court decrees. But bylaws, photographs of ditch structures, and the rights that each ditch share is entitled to is not publicly known. Davidson said that two landowners could just do a mutual agreement, not a formalized ditch agreement, and that information is not public. He also emphasized that lot of the **ditch history is** gone when ranchers die. That information can be **critical when a rancher wants to change or sell water rights**, since the measure of a water right relies heavily on historic use, and that that is only captured at the headgate, not further down the ditch.
- e. The district is going to pay for the first 6 ditch inventories. This will require landowner cooperation and assistance. Davidson anticipates the districts will ask

for CBRT funding in the future. To identify the ditches to inventory, Davidson looked at all water rights in Water Districts 38 (the Roaring Fork drainage), 39 (Rifle, Elk, and Parachute Creeks), and 45 (Divide Creek). The CDSS database lists 10,222 water rights, but by eliminating duplicate names and limiting to just agricultural diversions, 1,302 remained that Davidson said need to be inventoried. Higher priority ditches could be identified by sorting according to year, quantity, and acres irrigated.

- f. Jim Pokrandt commented that the soil conservation districts are doing our BIP work for us, and Davidson responded, “**Soil conservation districts have the best information.**”

10. **Member comments on Colorado’s Water Plan.** Roundtable members discussed comments that Ken Ransford, Lane Wyatt, and Paul Bruchez submitted for the Colorado’s Water Plan. Ransford’s comments were organized by the CBRT’s 6 themes in its Basin Implementation Plan:

- i. Protect and restore healthy streams, rivers, lakes and riparian areas
  - ii. Sustain agriculture
  - iii. Secure safe drinking water
  - iv. Develop local water conscious land use strategies
  - v. Assure dependable basin administration
  - vi. Encourage a high level of basin wide conservation
- a. Ken Ransford emphasized 2 recommendations that the CBRT should emphasize in its comments on the plan:
    - i. **Front Range farmers will lose nearly 1 million acres of irrigated agriculture** from Ogallala dryup (550,000 acres), meeting Republican River and South Platte compact obligations (123,000 acres), urban sprawl (61,600 acres) and ag dryup from IPPs (236,000 acres). Thus, the CBRT should emphasize that a new TMD will not make a dent in the loss of agriculture on the Front Range.
    - ii. The water plan now anticipates Colorado residents will use 164 gpcd by 2050, barely surpassing the low conservation goal of 166 gpcd, leaving a gap of 680,000 af. **If the water plan adopted the high conservation goal, it would eliminate 310,000 af of the gap** (resulting in 137 gpcd). If the plan adopted the southwest roundtable’s recommendation that 70% of new residential water use occur indoors and 30% outdoors, this would save another 150,000 af, dropping the gap to 220,000 af. This could be filled by the land that cities sprawl onto.

- 1) Jim Pokrandt reminded the roundtable that Colorado River District engineer John Currier estimates that if everyone reduced use to 139 gpcd, Colorado does not need another TMD.
- b. Steve Ryken said that “2050 is such a short planning horizon. The east slope knows that. **They want to get as much water as they can now, then they’ll** start stretching the water out and **practice high conservation.** It’s just a fact.”
- c. Ken Neubecker liked the idea of submitting comments by the 6 themes. Brent Newman of the CWCB also likes this approach.
- d. Chuck Ogilby We don’t know what our rivers will look like. We have unanswered questions in the Water Plan. How can we predict our future use when we don’t know what our rivers look like today? We have made 2 key motions:
  - i. We acquiesced to the 7 Points as a gift to Front Range, but in our white paper we say that **a TMD is the last tool out of the box.**
  - ii. We endorsed the high conservation ethic. We need to set the high conservation standard statewide. If we don’t get this adopted by the state water plan, it won’t occur. But, we know it will eventually be forced on the state, so let’s do it today. **Ogilby made a motion that the CBRT will not approve the CWP unless it recommends the high conservation ethic statewide.**
- e. Jim Pokrandt said the CWP discusses the various options but doesn’t come down hard on anything. Plan is calculated to not come down hard on any point right now.
- f. Lane Wyatt suggested that rather than taking a position, the CBRT should comment on what we feel strongly about. An example could be recommend legislation to implement high conservation statewide.
- g. Rachel Richards said the CBRT should recommend the entire plan recommend high conservation for the state as a whole, but **requesting legislation at this time may not be appropriate.** She thinks we should use the IBCC’s own language – **the ultimate low and no regrets strategy is high conservation.** Land use and water conservation are coming together more than ever. This could get the state to move to a medium to high conservation goal. Every year another 100,000 homes are built on the Front Range, and the CBRT cannot lead by example.
- h. Ken Neubecker – “If it were a real plan, people would be pulling out their guns,” quoting Las Vegas water czar Pat Mulroy. It does lay everything out in one place. Eric Hecox talked about conservation, but Patti Wells is saying they need their



lawns and gardens and they need to expand them. **The state should coordinate the BIPs. If the plan does not try to assemble them we don't need a statewide plan.**

- i. Brent Newman - the 400,000 af saved by striving for **low to medium conservation** (the IBCC's no or low regrets target) **is the only conservation target in the plan.** Point 6 says that any proponent of a new (and as yet unidentified) TMD has to agree to high conservation.
  - j. Ogilby said "We've been beaten back by the Denver Water Board so many times, it's time for us to lead. The GWS Post Independent says that water is one of the big reasons why we have such a high quality of life. **If we do not make a strong statement, the Front Range will ignore our recommendations.** We'll get their attention by saying we won't endorse the plan unless it recommends high conservation for everyone.
  - k. Ken Neubecker cautioned against making an ultimatum, saying the conversations on the Front Range are just as adamant. They will say they won't endorse the plan unless it recommends a TMD. We'll get to high levels of conservation, but we can't force it at this point.
  - l. Lurline agrees with Ken Neubecker, counseling that it is important that we participate. "I agree we should endorse high conservation. The CWP is a master plan, a suggestion on how to move forward. **If it isn't backed up by regulation, it's just a good idea.** We should ask for the CWCB to see if they're willing to back this up with legislation." Diane Johnson said we should not give ultimatums to Stan Cazier and Carlyle Currier.
  - m. Lane Wyatt recommended we address this by linking land use and water planning. Colorado's Water Plan addresses **land use planning, and it is another way to get to the high conservation goal.** Zoning determines land use patterns. If communities adopt a water use goal in their **zoning master plans**, it will honor the "local control" goal, and **force the communities to decide how much water to use** and how to get there, by increasing density, or adopting conservation targets. County commissioners will put these into an ordinance. Master plans have to have a goal statement regarding water use. Once it is on paper, the county commissioners and P&Z staff will follow them.
  - n. Lurline Curran said she is not married to supporting agricultural efficiency. She supports flood irrigation. I have a hard time saying agricultural efficiency is something we should endorse. Sprinklers don't give back the return flows that replenish late summer river flows.
12. Rachel Richards made 3 recommendations for the water plan:

- a. **Grizzly Reservoir below Independence Pass dumped silt into the Roaring Fork River.** When a log got stuck in a gate, the reservoir operator drained the reservoir by sending as much to Twin Lakes as possible, but then they let the last remaining 20 acre feet of heavily silted water empty into the headwaters of the Roaring Fork River. The Twin Lakes reservoir company (owned by Colorado Springs) should have obtained Colorado Parks and Wildlife approval. **Twin Lakes Reservoir Company did not warn** about the silt dump, and Pitkin County only found out when members of the public called in. Richards said this negates Aspen's efforts to capture stormwater and clean the river. **There needs to be a section in the CWP that there's greater collaboration to maintain existing facilities.** Maybe reservoirs should be drained every 2 years. People thought it was another blowout like the Animas River (where the EPA accidentally breached a 19<sup>th</sup> century mine tailings pond on August 5, 2015, and caused three million gallons of heavily polluted mine tailings to wash downstream, eventually into Lake Powell.
  - b. **Any IPP moving additional water should be subject to the 7 Points.** How well the IPPs are implemented will be a model for what the Front Range expects from another TMD. Ken Neubecker commented that the Yampa White Green RT made this same recommendation. Michelle at the Gunnison Basin said they may be interested in this as well.
  - c. **Agricultural efficiencies and ATMs for municipal needs. Could these support minimum stream flows** where rivers are swept? It is buried in the plan and could be **emphasized more.**
13. Lurline Curran Underbrink took the General Assembly Interim Water committee on a tour of Grand County that was well received.
14. Stream Management Plans. Ken Neubecker and Paul Bruchez.
- a. Colorado River basin is unique because we don't have much water to use. Stream management plans are aimed at this issue. The plans apply to ecosystem health, sustaining agriculture, and basin administration. The CBRT Basin Implementation Plan recommends that we come up with a basin-wide stream management plan, and also for sub-basins, and also for priority streams.
  - b. The instream flow program is a good program but it has a lot of inadequacies. Most of the time it does not do what it needs to do because the ISF rights are too junior.
  - c. Stream management plan examples: Grand County stream management plan, Upper Colorado Wild and Scenic River study, the Roaring Fork Watershed Plan, Colorado River Cooperative Agreement, ESA Recovery Program, and the Colorado River Cutthroat Conservation Strategy, a 3 state agreement targeted at

eliminating the CR Cutthroat from being listed as an endangered species. The region that is missing is the Middle Colorado River.

- d. A stream management plan is a framework for maintaining healthy stream systems while also protecting local water uses and planning for future consumptive and non-consumptive water needs.
- e. **Steps in a stream management plan:**
  - i. Assemble **stakeholders**
  - ii. Identify the **objectives** based on the local stakeholders' needs.
  - iii. **Prioritize ecological, recreational and agricultural values**
  - iv. Develop **quantitative flow targets**
  - v. Assess riverbed **geomorphic and riparian conditions**
  - vi. Determine what new information is needed. A lot of this information already exists. Ken Ransford in a recent google search came across two bibliographies compiled by the USGS listing the following number of articles through the date listed:
    - 1) 1995 bibliography of 1,397 articles on the Upper Colorado River: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1995/ofr95450/pdf/OFR95-450.pdf>.
    - 2) 1993 bibliography of 1,282 articles on the South Platte River: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1993/0106/report.pdf>.
  - vii. Growth and increasing **demands for water**.
  - viii. **Climate change and decreasing supply**. BIPs and IPPs are based on the status quo, and do not take changing conditions into account.
  - ix. The need for cooperation, respect and trust to avoid conflict.
- f. A Non Consumptive Needs Assessment map of Division 5 in the upper Colorado River basin that was included in the first draft of the CBRT BIP indicates red lines for rivers at risk. Meg White, Peter Mueller, and other Nature Conservancy staff prepared a spreadsheet as part of the Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool (WFET) provides data explaining 66 priority areas and how to improve them. Ken Ransford recommended that we start with this as a guide to identify priority river reaches, and that we look for reaches that could serve as models for others so we don't have to duplicate efforts and keep reinventing the wheel. **The CDSS lists 59,000 diversion points in the 7 water divisions, so creating a stream management plan for every one of them would be an enormous task.**
- g. Roundtable members recommended that we **create a working group to identify and detail critical locations that need stream management plans**. The Yampa basin had a retreat in Meeker to do this and spent 2 days talking about meeting non-consumptive needs (particularly the PBO requirement to deliver 5,000 af downstream on the Yampa ), and how to address a compact shortage. They paid for the retreat with leftover BIP money.

- h. Paul Bruchez explained he has been working with American Rivers – healthy ranches need healthy rivers and vice versa. He said, **“The conservation conversation is heated even within my own family.”**
  - i. Laurie Rink – What does dependable basin administration mean? Initially, this referenced maintaining the Shoshone Call. Laurie likes the idea of getting a group together for a retreat, and perhaps to apply for a grant for a retreat. Laurie says **we don’t know very much about the middle Colorado River**. Stream management plan planning is important and her board supports it. Water quality issues are coming up due to lack of flows – too high temperatures and insufficient dilution of TMDLs, and these impacts municipalities.
  - j. Lurline – The stream management plan working group should plan to come up with a **RFP that asks, “We want to know the following data (\_\_\_\_\_)** for this stream reach.” The working group should address what questions the stream management plan should ask. What are the triggers that determine what happens to a river? What does each reach need – more trees, more flows, or a narrowed channel? Grand County purchased water rights in order to improve stream flows, based on the stream management plan recommendation.
  - k. Karn Stieglemeier mentioned that **Summit County** has done a lot of restoration projects, but **still does not have a stream management plan**.
  - l. The CWCB grant application deadline is October 15, 2015. **The stream management plan working group includes** Diane Johnson, Holly Loff, David Graf, Lane Wyatt, Paul Bruchez, Kim Albertson, Ken Neubecker, and Laurie Rink. Rachel Richards recommended that Mark Fuller join this committee. Steve Child recommended that Chelsea Congdon Brundige also join. Steve Ryken and Mark Hermundstad said they would try to find someone from the lower river to join this group.
  - m. **The Yampa retreat** went well because the facilitator kept people on track, and they had enough time to get into the details. About 25-30 RT members attended. **\$15,000-20,000** paid for the retreat, hotel, and an outside facilitator from Seattle. The Keystone Center is a possible retreat location.
15. Kim Albertson mentioned an article in The Fence Post about conservation easement problems; see <http://www.thefencepost.com/news/17611011-113/legislators-hear-horror-stories-about-problems-with-colorados>. According to the article, landowners refused to accept the offer that the Colorado Department of Revenue made when it audited 719 conservation easement tax credits starting in 2008. The state has settled 648 of the cases, with 71 still pending.