

Interbasin Compact Committee Meeting Summary
Tuesday, August 25, 2015 - Keystone Resort Conference Center
0633 Tennis Club Road, Dillon CO 80435

IBCC Members

Joe Stibrich
Marc Waage
Kevin McBride
Peter Nichols
Taylor Hawes
Jay Winner
Steve Vandiver
Senator Sonnenberg
Rick Brinkman
Jeff Devere
Melinda Kassen
Carlyle Currier

John Rich
T. Wright Dickinson
Jim Pokrandt (alt for Stan
Cazier)
Travis Smith
Bruce Whitehead
Wayne Vanderschuere
Jim Yahn
Jeris Danielson
Steve Harris
Eric Wilkinson
Mike Allnut

Bill Trampe
Eric Kuhn

Staff

John Stulp
Becky Mitchell
Jacob Bornstein
Brent Newman
Kevin Reidy
Viola Bralish
Kate McIntire
Stephanie DiBetitto

Meeting purpose:

Discussion of subcommittee progress and ongoing statewide discussion on elements of Colorado's Water Plan.

Welcome and purpose of the day:

The intention and goals of the day were set. Goals included wrapping up IBCC work for the year. IBCC members were thanked for their hard work and for being liaisons to their basin roundtables.

Conservation Stretch Goal:

A PowerPoint presentation was given by CWCB staff discussing accountability within the municipal conservation stretch goal language of the Conceptual Framework.

The group discussed potential state endorsement and what is required. They also discussed including greater incentives into water provider conservation plans. Members of the conservation subcommittee expressed that the stretch goal has built-in flexibility, and is a stretch but that it must be acknowledged that greater technologies will become available in future years. There was also a call for greater discussions on future land use especially in terms of viable agriculture.

The IBCC reached consensus by a unanimous vote in support of the Conservation Stretch Goal with the adapted language.

Conceptual Framework:

CWCB Staff updated the IBCC on basin roundtable motions concerning or discussions of the conceptual framework. All roundtables expressed the various levels of support for the conceptual framework. CWCB Staff discussed the issues of concern and comments received from the basin roundtables and presented suggested staff language drafted to address these concerns. The

integrated resource planning language has been altered to insure it is the primary focus of the Framework.

CWCB staff explained the modified language, which expresses that the stretch goal will be reached through integrated resource planning. Some felt that the new language does not solve the problems expressed and that the Framework should be directed towards developing a new TMD, and therefore that the original meaning of the Framework has shifted. It was further clarified that all proponents of new M&I water projects will need to incorporate integrated resource planning not just new TMDs. The CWCB will work with stakeholders to better define planning processes. Concern was expressed that the stretch goal conservation levels will be required for very small water providers, and it was decided to clarify that the covered entities would be the focus. The new red-lined language reads as follows:

All M&I water providers that are covered entities should do integrated water resource planning that strives to meet proponents of new M&I water projects should meet high conservation standards, consistent with the “conservation stretch goal” which is discussed in detail in section 6.3.1 of Colorado’s Water Plan. The stretch goal recognizes the need for flexibility by the local water provider to do what is technically, economically, and legally practical for their system as not every conservation practice is appropriate for every community.

In addition, an introductory paragraph was added, to clarify that there are other aspects of the water plan and that the conceptual framework will evolve in the future. The language reads as follows:

The intent of the Conceptual Framework is to represent the evolving concepts that need to be addressed in the context of a new TMD, as well as the progress made to date in addressing those concepts. The Conceptual Framework refers to several topics that are not exclusively linked to a new TMD, but are related to Colorado's water future. These include conservation, storage, agricultural transfers, alternative transfer methods, environmental resiliency, a collaborative program to address Colorado River system shortages, already identified projects and processes (IPPs), additional Western Slope uses, and other topics. The Conceptual Framework, like the rest of Colorado’s Water Plan, is a living document and is an integrated component of the plan. Many of these topics are further discussed in more detail in other sections of Colorado’s Water Plan.

The IBCC reached consensus by a unanimous vote in support of the conceptual framework with the adapted language, which confirmed the IBCC’s recommendation to include the conceptual framework in Colorado’s Water Plan

Funding Discussion:

Agriculture viability was added as a critical piece of the funding discussion.

The IBCC thinks the next step in funding will be to first to prioritize projects to be funded. In an effort to discuss all alternative funding solutions, staff will work to incorporate Sales Tax into the funding sources. From Denver Water’s perspective it would be beneficial to discuss more statewide

multi-benefit projects, more so than water supply projects since many of those are already being paid for by water customers. Senator Sonnenberg suggests that the State legislature restore money borrowed from Severance tax to fund projects.

Legislative Concepts:

CWCB staff reviewed the proposed point of sale (POS) for outdoor irrigation equipment legislative concepts, which work much like a regulation. Staff estimates that based on an existent study the minimum additional savings from POS legislations can be up to 73,000 AF (though there may be some error within this figure). This concept should be discussed in greater detail.

The IBCC indicated that there needs to be education on the installation, design and other features of POS outdoor irrigation equipment because it is less straight forward as other POS equipment (i.e. toilets). In addition to education it was felt there is an emerging market in the efficiency industry as a whole.

Other Goals:

Goal setting at this time is not a top priority for the group, as goals will not make their way into the final draft of Colorado's Water Plan. However, defining state goals is worth pursuing at a later date. The IBCC believes the BIPs have set goals and will act as a catalyst for basins to begin implementation.

IBCC Next Steps and Roundtable Roadmap:

Moving forward, the Roadmap presented will act as a guiding document for work to be done by basin roundtables. There will be grants offered by the CWCB to encourage project implementation in the basins. The match requirement will be the same as it was in the BIP guidance. The IBCC will be "value added" to the CWCB; they will bring a statewide perspective to help the CWCB work through certain concepts and act as a think tank moving forward.

Adjourn:

John Stulp thanked the group for their collaborative efforts today and throughout their time on the IBCC. He expressed how important these discussions have been and how important discussions like these will be moving forward 10, 20 30, 50 years from now.