

South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting Agenda

**Tuesday, October 13, 2015
4209 Weld County Road 24 1/2
Longmont, Colorado 80501
4:00PM-7:45PM**

South Platte Basin Roundtable Business Meeting

1. Welcome/Introductions (5 min)

Meeting commenced at 4:05 with introductions. Christi Bode from the CWCB introduced herself, announcing she would be capturing video footage of the Roundtable meeting.

2. Approval of Meeting Summary (5 min)

Julio Iturreria moved to approve the meeting minutes and Sean Conway seconded, the motion passed without discussion or contest.

3. Agenda - additions or changes

No additions or changes to the agenda were offered.

4. Live Like You Love It - Presentation (15 min)

Amy Conklin took the floor to share work of the Colorado WaterWise program and Colorado Stormwater Council. Conklin pointed out the only statewide water awareness campaign, which was run on by the League of Women Voters between 1999 and 2001. The campaign included numerous short videos which Conklin felt could be easily repurposed for television viewing. Conklin went on to draw attention to Colorado as the only western state without a statewide water awareness campaign, but pointed out a recent study that outlined a sliding scale of potential outreach efforts. Several studies and focus groups had been conducted, Conklin reported, and in the Metro area 16% of respondents didn't know there was even a river [in Denver]. One of the larger outcomes of the studies, Conklin argued, was a mutual interest and concern over local water issues. The No/Low Regrets Action Plan, as identified in the South Platte Basin Implementation Plan ("BIP"), was a large-scale recognition of the need for additional outreach on local and statewide water issues. The Live Like You Love It [sic] program was specifically targeted at Millennials and contained within it three major themes—conserve, care, and commit—each of which was focused on a different aspect of the importance of water to communities and the impact of communities on water. Conklin drew focus to Lovecoloradowater.org—the digital presence for the program. The Live Like You Love It campaign was designed to be customizable for local communities and to be leveraged to get as wide an audience as possible concerned about water issues. Another member of the program staff called attention to the increased education and education-efforts the Stormwater Council had been employing to share information on pollutants in ditches.

Sean Cronin asked what the program budget would achieve that was put in place or missed by earlier efforts, i.e. the League of Women Voters. Amy Conklin reported the budget was unique from past efforts in that it would go toward large-scale program development and marketing to share information, although implementation alone would require a large amount of funding. Conklin, per a question from Cronin, clarified the program, as intellectual property of the Colorado Stormwater Council, was currently designed to be “purchased” with a donation from interested entities. Joe Frank asked how the program’s steering committee influenced the program itself and Conklin reported the committee’s purpose was to help craft the material going to each locale. Lisa McVicker briefly updated the Roundtable on a 2014 Roundtable-funded project where the University of Denver worked to give millennials the water information they needed to act as water diplomats and each one of them, McVicker argued, took advantage of the 14ers material developed as part of the program. McVicker argued the material was very productive given its widely available digital medium. Joe Frank and Jeffrey Boring clarified the Water Supply Reserve Account (“WSRA”) application submittal process was a potential means of funding the Live Like You Love It program. Lastly Conklin pointed out that a year in the future Presidential elections might disrupt the upcoming program schedule.

5. Committee Updates

a. Groundwater Subcommittee (Hall - 20 min)

i. Update Report of GW Tech Committee work by CWCB

Jim Hall introduced John Stulp to update the Roundtable on the Groundwater Technical Committee. Stulp announced the 19th Technical Committee meeting would be occurring relatively soon after the October South Platte Basin Roundtable meeting. He reported on HB15-1166, HB15-1178, and HB15-1013 before moving on to funding and addressing the money going to each bill and the early funding initiative from the Colorado Water Conservation Board (“CWCB”) and the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (“DOLA”) for work relative to those bills. Stulp reported certain areas along the South Platte River did not already have monitoring wells installed, but would in the future. In the Gilcrest area, in particular, there were several wells used exclusively for dewatering. Stulp showed data and graphics identifying the efficacy of the dewatering efforts in the study area. Stulp reported Brown and Caldwell had done a study on the Gilcrest, LaSalle, and Sterling area to examine impacts of sources of water on the high groundwater in the study-area. The takeaway from Stulp’s report was that numerous local factors were contributing to the groundwater level, not least of which was local irrigation (locations and methods).

John Stulp reported the ultimate goal was to incentivize local irrigators to pump more and divert surface water less as means of irrigation. Dr. Ryan Bailey was identified as an academic researcher who was refining the SPDSS model to focus on the Gilcrest area. Stulp reported one of the major concerns for project administrators was impact to local and downstream water rights. Members of the Groundwater Technical Committee, as well as support staff, were all recognized for their efforts on the Committee; additional contributors

who had lent their experience and expertise to the Committee were also recognized. Deb Daniel asked why the three monitoring wells in the Gilcrest area were so close to each other, to which Stulp reported the project goal was to get those wells as far away from the local waste treatment plant as possible without comprising the fidelity of the data. Stulp also reported there were additional wells in the town of Gilcrest near the waste treatment plant that were being monitored separately. The saturated thickness in the area, per a question from Daniel, was roughly 90-100 feet. Lastly, Stulp reported the water removed from the well-sites was being returned to the river without the ability to be put to beneficial use.

Mike Shimmin thanked the Technical Committee for all their work and research. Sean Conway concurred and called attention to the great collaborative work of the Committee.

b. Environmental-Recreational Needs (Kernohan - 10 min)

Greg Kernohan took the floor to report on a recent meeting, coming on the recent submittal and acceptance of the South Platte BIP. Kernohan argued the outcome of that meeting's discussion was a mutual agreement to support the South Platte Basin's environmental and recreational database. That support would appear as the closing of data gaps and then the design of an interface for that database that would be interactive and dynamic. Kernohan also reported CDM Smith recently won the contract for the environmental-recreational research portion of SWSI 2016. Brent Newman reported nothing had been done with the SWSI contracts that had been signed. Kernohan identified a Committee desire to develop additional funding to pay Laurel Stadjuar and West Sage for their work with the environmental-recreational study. Kernohan also drew attention to the Environmental and Recreational Needs Committee's desire to get more recreational and environmental individuals who weren't necessarily voting members of the Roundtable involved in order to diversify input and Committee knowledge. Per a question from Jeffrey Boring, Kernohan called attention to the good environmental and recreational research done for the west slope and the lack of that research on the east slope. That lack was an area that the Committee identified as needing additional attention. Jeffrey Boring drew parallels between what the Committee thought would be beneficial and what was already in place in other formats across the state, e.g. the Parks and Wildlife natural resources interactive map online.

Joe Frank additionally reported the Natural Resource Conservation Service ("NRCS") was in the process of getting a grant for phreatophyte removal along the Republican River, and they were seeking a letter of recommendation from the Roundtable. That group had already committed to Frank to present at the November Roundtable meeting.

c. Education Subcommittee (Schneekloth - 15 min)

Lisa McVicker took the floor to ask for approval to submit the Education Action Plan she was presenting to the Roundtable. The Plan was a three-year plan, as per

requirements from the CWCB. The additional money provided to the Education Subcommittee through CWCB budgetary infusion would help implement the plan. McVicker reported the South Platte Basin Education Subcommittee had joined with the Metro Education Subcommittee to maximize efforts and resources. McVicker called attention to the Digital Presence Plan, developed by Matt Betz, which highlighted a social media strategy for the two Roundtables. McVicker identified additional initiatives, such as a push to increase participation from public officials in all levels and capacities to lend their voice to the roundtables. Sean Cronin called attention to the public perception of a “veil of secrecy” surrounding Roundtable proceedings and identified a missing effort to pull aside that veil and make the Roundtable operations more apparent to all parties. McVicker went on to seek approval of the Education Action Plan, containing the Digital Presence Plan. Roundtable members agreed a presentation should be made at the November meeting.

Jeffrey Boring asked if there was a prioritization of the initiatives and goals proposed in the Education Outreach Plan and Lisa McVicker, as well as Sean Cronin, stated there was—it was acknowledged that all of the items presented were impossible to attain given current resources. Bruce Gerk expressed a sincere belief that the messaging of current and impending Colorado water issues was a critical aspect. Sean Conway made the motion to approve the South Platte Basin Roundtable Education Action Plan for 2016-2018, seconded by Stephen Larson. The motion passed without discussion or contest.

d. At-large Nominating Committee (Cronin - 20 min)

Sean Cronin took the floor to report on the recent vacancy of the water-rights At-large representative, per the resignation of Doug Rademacher several months earlier. According to the by-laws and policies of the Roundtable, the two applicants for the position had been brought to the Roundtable to make presentations—Joe Taddeucci and David Varra. Joe Taddeucci took the floor to present on his qualifications as a water rights At-large applicant. Sean Conway asked if Taddeucci himself owned water rights, to which the applicant responded he did not—he only represented an entity which owned water rights. David Varra took the floor to present on his qualifications as a water-rights At-large applicant. No questions were posed for Varra. James VanShaar asked if the City of Boulder had its own representative, to which the Roundtable addressed the division of County and Municipality representatives. It was clarified the City of Boulder applicant could also apply for the Boulder Municipal position if it became available in the future. Discussion ensued as to the origins of the current At-large representative’s responsibilities and it was clarified there were five true at-large positions and five unique At-large positions tied to specific interests.

Jim Hibbard asked the applicants to speak to their understanding of and opinion on Colorado’s Water Plan (“CWP”), both the work that had occurred on it and the efficacy of it as a top-level water planning document. Joe Taddeucci responded his representative entity, the City of Boulder, had spent the vast majority of its recent efforts on flood recovery instead of CWP guidance, as it had originally intended, while David Varra responded he was most concerned about storage, as a water-

rights holder. The Roundtable members voted via written ballot. Sean Cronin and Sean Conway were appointed by Joe Frank as the vote counters. Joe Frank took a moment to thank Doug Robotham for his service to the Roundtable. Jeffrey Boring asked if Robotham's position was a general At-large position and it was clarified that indeed it was. Greg Kernohan stressed The Nature Conservancy was viewed as a valuable member of the Roundtable.

Upon hearing the result of the vote for water-rights At-large representative, Garret Varra was voted-in as the new At-large water rights representative.

The Roundtable meeting broke at 6PM for dinner.

Dinner (6:15 to 7:00)

a. WSRA Needs Committee

i. Funding Update (20 min)

The meeting recommenced at 6:20 for a presentation by the WSRA Needs Committee. Jeffrey Boring discussed the WSRA funds and the past year's decision to only fund applications on a twice-a-year basis—he addressed recent discussion on setting aside funds for Roundtable needs and reserves. Boring posed the option of setting aside reserves without a firm understanding of future needs from the Roundtable. Boring, as per WSRA Needs Committee discussion, addressed the Committee's decision not to impose a funding cap, but instead allow applicants to seek the entire fund, currently at \$306,213 (Basin account). Boring reported the upcoming January account recharge would raise the balance by some amount, even if that amount was unknown. The takeaway was a recommendation from the Needs Committee to set aside \$35K for an Education Reserve and \$100K for a BIP Reserve.

BIP costs would always be cost-shared, so the Roundtable would be planning to submit 1/3 of each cost (shared with the Metro Roundtable and the State). Joe Frank clarified the Metro Roundtable would be evaluating \$35K from their own account for an Education Reserve to match the South Platte Basin Roundtable account. Jeffrey Boring identified a recommendation for a separate \$50K reserve to be set aside for general-use. Those three reserves come to a total of \$185K, reducing the overall WSRA balance to \$241K (unencumbered funds). That \$241K included an expectation for receiving a budget injection of \$121,213 in January. Mike Shimmin moved the Roundtable tentatively earmark the reserved amount requests with the understanding the Roundtable could revisit the action upon review of the November applications, Lisa McVicker seconded; the motion passed without contest.

ii. Project Update (25 min)

Matt Lindbergh with Brown and Caldwell took the floor to present on their WSRA funded project. The report is available through the CWCB website. Sean Cronin asked if the report showed 80,000AF of water was being put back into the river with augmentation releases and Lindbergh responded the amount in

question was a result of uncontrolled recharge rather than planned releases. A member of the public asked where that recharge was occurring and Lindbergh pointed out the relatively small impact areas the recharge was affecting, although those impacts were frequent across the lower South Platte. Sean Cronin asked if the presentation was triggered per earlier Roundtable discussion seeking follow-up reports on WSRA funded projects. Cronin felt there was significant opportunity to use the WSRA reports to show how the BIP was being manifested in active or completed WSRA projects, Joe Frank concurred. Jeffrey Boring and Joel Schneekloth discussed how the need to report on WSRA funded projects was originally written with a requirement that funded projects present to the Roundtable, in addition to the final report submitted to the CWCB with each project. Discussion ensued as to the process by which funded projects report back to the Roundtable.

Jeffrey Boring offered to interface with the CWCB regarding the specific trigger at which WSRA funded projects could be scheduled to present their final report to the Roundtable. Doug Robotham asked how share prices were arrived at by project managers, to which Matt Lindbergh responded the costs were chosen to be low enough to pose an easy buy-in, but high enough that entities would feel a responsibility to participate after buy-in. Doug Robotham asked Lindbergh and Joe Frank to clarify the number of shares each entity could purchase, which was only one. Discussion ensued as to the recharge/depletion release lag and Frank responded the accounting tool was as close to real-time as possible, operating on a daily basis. Mike Shimmin spoke to the badge of efficiency for augmentation plans, which was a generation of credits. Jim Yahn added the excess water was being put to use in some way or another and provided a benefit to lower rights-holders along the river. Shimmin pointed out how ditch companies with short-term sites could pair with ditch companies with long-term sites to match up and make the augmentation plans run more efficiently.

Jim Yahn added the project and the ability to match upstream needs with downstream opportunities, and vice versa, held significant implications for firm yield in the lower river and the area's resiliency to buy-and-dry.

6. Legislative Update (5 min)

Joe Frank identified an email sent out by Matt Betz outlining upcoming legislative bills. Frank also reported on the public hearing in Greeley held in September and announced the message of a need for storage in the Basin was loud and clear. Julio Iturreria reported the Aurora meeting, supplemental to the Greeley meeting, went well—the messages presented were well accepted.

7. Colorado Water Plan (Newman - 15 min)

Brent Newman took the floor to update the Roundtable on the current status of the CWP. Since Sept 17, the CWCB had been working hard to incorporate edits and comments into the Plan, totaling just shy of 30K (comments). The CWCB had been reviewing the comments submitted in writing as well as all the comments that were submitted orally at public hearings, etc. Responses to every comment would be

provided at the upcoming CWCB board meeting, Newman reported. In Ch10 there were ample comments addressing the aggressive nature of 84 priority goals established in the Plan. Newman clarified all goals would remain in the Plan, but roughly half would be identified as part of a critical action component. Newman reported storage would take a prominent role in Section 6.5.—the benefits of storage, the IBCC actions related to storage, and each basin’s unique comments and suggestions on storage. Additionally, discussion of conservation reflected the nature of the aspirational conservational goal and the importance of local needs and impacts of conservation. Buy-and-dry also was discussed more using realistic predictions. The Conceptual Framework was addressed directly, in its current format. There had also been increased discussion of the State’s role in project development and funding. Additionally, the integration of SWSI 2010/2016 into the CWP and each BIP, and future revisions of each, was addressed. Per a question from Cronin, Newman clarified SWSI 2016 was expected to begin in 2016 and would take 12-18 months. Doug Robotham asked when the final report would be delivered to Gov. Hickenlooper and Newman reported it would be no later than Dec 10, 2015.

8. Basin Implementation Plan (15 min)

Matt Cook took the floor to update the Roundtable on the BIP over the past month (September to October). Cook reported HDR had spent much of September finalizing the response letter to the CWP and was able to submit the letter on September 16. Cook also reported a one-page synopsis of the document was developed for the South Platte Basin and the Republican Basin with the help of Joe Frank and Deb Daniel. Cook also reported there was a plan to develop next steps and future action items for the consultant team. Joe Frank added there was a concerted effort between the Metro and South Platte Basin Roundtables to identify hard numbers for future planning, comparative to what appeared in the BIP.

Joe Frank announced the Groundwater Technical Committee was also planning to develop future action items and next steps relative to the Roundtables’ plans. Diane Hoppe asked if the next day’s Rio Chato meeting would have a call-in option and Matt Cook responded there was no plan for such an option.

9. Public Comment (10 min)

John Stencel reported the Colorado Ag Water Alliance had a summit planned for Tuesday, December 15 at Adams County Fairgrounds from 8AM-5PM with a reception to follow. Registration would be at the Ag Water Alliance website: cawa.org

The meeting adjourned at 7:35

10.Meeting Schedule

- a. Next Roundtable Meeting - November 10, 2015 - Weld County Service Center
- b. Rio Chato and Metro Executive BIP Meeting Oct. 14, 1 - 4PM - Denver Water, Denver