

South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting Agenda

**Tuesday, February 9, 2016
4209 Weld County Road 24 1/2
Longmont, Colorado 80501
4:00PM-7:30PM**

South Platte Basin Roundtable Business Meeting

1. Welcome/Introductions (5 min)

The meeting started at 4:10 with introductions of all those in attendance.

2. Approval of Meeting Summary (5 min)

Jim Hibbard submitted written comments on the meeting minutes. Sean Conway asked that those positions whose tenure was re-established in the January meeting be specifically spelled out in the January minutes, as a modification, Jim Yahn seconded. The motion passed without contest. Those changes would be made in satisfaction of the vote to approve the minutes.

3. Agenda – additions or changes

Lynda James asked why the dinner period had been extended from 30 minutes to one hour. Joe Frank and Lynda James discussed the merits of switching the dinner period back to 45 minutes.

As per pre-meeting discussion, the vote for the modified Colorado WaterReuse WSRA application, conducted after the January Roundtable meeting, was added to the February meeting minutes. The vote on the modified application for WSRA funding was ultimately decided by an electronic vote showing 23 in support and 2 in opposition. It was decided that email would be added to the current meeting minutes.

4. Committee Updates

a. WSRA Needs Committee

i. SPBRT WSRA Criteria – Scoring (Boring - 30 min)

Jeffrey Boring took the floor to discuss the updated WSRA funding criteria. Boring asked the Roundtable members to have a high-level discussion on the updated criteria and the strategy for using the WSRA funds moving forward. According to Boring, the Metro Roundtable broke their funds down into 5 categories and then added an additional category, agriculture. The WSRA Needs Committee recommended the 6 categories as a new funding schema for adoption by the South Platte Basin Roundtable. Boring recommended prioritizing projects within each category to maximize the use of WSRA funds. Additionally, Boring reported the merits of breaking funds down into specific categories allowed each focus area to receive enhanced focus and competitive funding amongst similar projects. Boring stated the Needs Committee was focused on refining their messaging and funding processes for the Roundtable, all with the intent of realizing the goals identified in the Basin Implementation Plan. Jim Yahn and Lynda James asked Boring if multi-purpose projects would not only score higher, but also have an opportunity to use funds from each funding category, to which Boring answered they would.

Greg Kernohan suggested a rephrasing of “multi-purpose” to “multi-objective”. Boring suggested parameters could be further defined during the discussion process. Rich Belt, however, pointed to the risk of setting certain goals within categories that may not have willing applicants, such as certain municipal groups. Sean Cronin echoed Belt’s concerns, stating that creating distinct funding categories made it difficult to balance funds and projects and opened the Roundtable up to the possibility of creating a precedent that didn’t necessarily align with the group’s philosophy. James Ford felt there was significant merit in creating distinctions between the funding sources. Similarly, Jim Hibbard felt dividing the funding into segments would help the Roundtable identify which categories weren’t receiving interest. Hibbard also called attention to the funding of projects that ran perpendicular to certain Roundtable priorities through impacts or externalities.

Mike Shimmin called attention to the BIP and its 11 plan elements, drawing comparisons to the 6 funding categories being proposed by the WSRA Needs Committee. Shimmin’s solution for the reduction of categories was to identify which categories were merged and how. Lynda James voiced her support for the 11 categories over the 6 categories being proposed. Jeffrey Boring addressed the risk of splitting categories out too much and Shimmin responded to the significant value of documenting which funding categories were combined and in what ways. Bruce Gerk recommended concentrating on projects that overlapped core components of the Basin Implementation Plan was crucial. Sean Cronin called attention to the core argument being addressed in discussion and that was the use of limited funds. Cronin recommended defining a scoring floor for projects to ensure projects of a high enough caliber received funding. Julie Iturreria argued addressing the gap should be the driving force behind all funding decisions. Discussion ensued as to what gap was being discussed. Kevin Lusk expressed concern over the lack of interest on the Roundtable to support municipal IPPs, stating that all projects working toward closing the gap, even municipal ones, were excellent uses of Roundtable funds. Lisa McVicker pointed out the funding could also be used to hire someone to go after more funding for projects, especially since the Roundtable was only able to offer limited funding opportunities. McVicker argued the time and money spent developing the 11 elements identified in the Basin Implementation Plan was worthy of more attention in the WSRA funding categories.

Jeffrey Boring argued analysis of the WSRA funding criteria, such that it incorporated the 11 Basin Implementation Plan focus elements, was central to the WSRA Needs Committee’s efforts to redefine funding categories. Mike Shimmin weighed in on the discussion, addressing the core of the argument—a shift in how the Roundtable funds projects and utilizes its limited WSRA funding. Mike Shimmin moved to have the WSRA Needs Committee proceed in drafting the WSRA funding criteria and present a draft of that policy to the Roundtable at the March meeting. Bruce Gerk seconded. Lynda James announced the WSRA Needs Committee’s goal with the current discussion was to solicit feedback from the Roundtable as to how projects were categorized and funded. Mike Shimmin recommended the discussion be added to the following month’s agenda as a one-hour item. Greg Kernohan recommended the memo at the center of the night’s discussion be reordered and then used to drive the discussion of WSRA funding criteria. Jeffrey Boring pointed out the modification of the guidelines would take time, but the current guidelines would still be applied to the May application deadline. Boring stated the new guidelines would be in place by the following November 1 application deadline. Boring added applicants would need to look to the BIP in order to design effective applications. Lastly, Boring asked the Roundtable if they were comfortable acting on a potential proposal from the Needs Committee to have an

informal developmental session to craft new funding criteria. The motion passed without contest or further discussion.

ii. Funding Update (Boring - 10 min)

The balance at the time of the meeting was \$298,663, which included the subtraction of the WSRA funds encumbered the January meeting as well as the recent funding recharge.

Joe Frank added a special agenda item to discuss the West Slope's recent announcement of an analysis of the Colorado River water budget. Joe Frank was bringing the topic to the Roundtable to discuss how the South Platte and Metro roundtables could participate in that analysis. Jim Pokrandt took the floor to discuss the developing project of re-evaluating the Colorado River Compact in order to address the looming minimum-pull issue of Lake Powell. The result of a minimum-pull would be an inability to release any water from the dam. Evaluating the water levels, the budget, and abilities to meet Compact amounts would require a re-evaluation and likely a change of the hydrology. Pokrandt stated the information from the study would be shared. Joe Frank stated the East Slope had interested parties concerned with the study. Jim Hall reported that as a representative of Northern Water he and his affiliates were very interested in the results of the study. It was his opinion that the Roundtable should financially contribute to the project as one of the biggest water issues facing Colorado. Sean Cronin inquired as to whether or not procurement of the project would follow a formal process.

Kevin Lusk voiced his support of the project as one of the most critical studies in the state. Lusk recommended the Roundtable participate in the process however possible. Mike Shimmin asked how the Roundtable could support the project and what the procedure would be for contributing funding from the WSRA accounts. Joe Frank went a step further to ask if the East Slope roundtables could be a part of the application. Jim Pokrandt stated each of the four West Slope Basins had been approached and had committed funding. Sean Cronin asked if the East Slope could still participate in the project, even without financial contribution. Pokrandt responded they could, but he wasn't sure how. Jim Hall felt more explicit commitment was necessary and a financial contribution was important. Boring called attention to the October "general operating funds", with a reserve of \$50,000.00. Jim Hibbard and Sean Cronin expressed the significance of the South Platte Basin to the Colorado River study and the importance of being a participant in the project. Ken Huson felt there was the most value in participating in the study, regardless of buy-in, due largely to issues of timing and only having the ability to fund future projects. Discussion ensued and support was voiced for Joe Frank and the chair of the Colorado River Roundtable, as well as chairs from other East Slope Roundtables to have a discussion about timing and potential contributions.

Jim Hall voiced support for authorizing Joe Frank to discuss the project with Jim Pokrandt and make decisions with the full support of the Roundtable. Joe Frank addressed the Roundtable's preference to participate in the project, regardless of funding. Pokrandt stated there was still a lot of formative work that needed to occur before the project could get off the ground. Mike Shimmin recommended writing a letter to the CWCB allowing the South Platte Basin Roundtable to financially contribute to the project. Jim Yahn made a motion that Joe Frank meet with other roundtable chairs to discuss being part of a technical committee and request the ability to contribute financially, Lisa McVicker seconded. Mike Shimmin felt a WSRA funding application would need to be submitted to the East Slope roundtables by the project leads, seeking

funding. Stephen Larson suggested the Roundtable could fund its own consultant to sit on a technical committee. The motion passed without contest or further discussion

b. Education and Outreach (Schneekloth – 15 min)

Lisa McVicker stated the Metro and South Platte Roundtables had joined forces to utilize combined funds. McVicker addressed ongoing discussion of how the combined roundtables would spend their funding. That combined effort would ride the coattails of what the roundtables' consultants and Deputy Recorded Matt Betz had defined in digital strategies. McVicker stated one of the major elements of the combined approach was to reach out to elected officials and gain their support. McVicker stressed the importance of collaborating with other roundtables to maximize funding and implement CWP plans. McVicker also addressed an upcoming conference in Steamboat that would be a good way to garner support in pursuit of the Education and Outreach committee's goals.

Casey Davenport took the floor to discuss communication about the Basin Implementation Plan. Davenport discussed Roundtable efforts to identify core elements of messaging about the Roundtable in order to best utilize funds spent on Education and Outreach efforts. Davenport pointed out that previous discussions all focused on a common theme—protecting native supplies through the establishment of greater storage opportunities. Lisa McVicker stated conservation was often a great way to open the door to larger discussions on water. McVicker conveyed a sense of urgency in spending-down Education and Outreach funds to manifest the goals of the South Platte and Basin Roundtables.

c. Groundwater Subcommittee (Hall – 10 min)

Jim Hall reported there was a January 25 CWCB meeting where the board had approved an application to evaluate a permanent solution for the Gilcrest area. Most of the solutions involved pipelines to permanently dewater the area. A subsequent public meeting in Gilcrest to discuss with local land owners the incentivized dewatering of the area led to lots of discussion on the legal issues surrounding pumping. Hall reported that several parties, at least, had signed on to learn more and potentially participate in the dewatering effort in that area. The technical committee would meet Friday, January 12 to discuss the issue further. Matt Cook added there were several pumping models ready to go to begin analyzing the impacts of the pilot project in the Gilcrest dewatering effort.

d. Environmental-Recreational Needs (Kernohan – 5 min)

Greg Kernohan reported there was not a recent meeting and no update was available.

5. Mine Leaching @ South Platte Headwaters/Park County (Brazell – 15 min)

Mike Brazell was absent from the meeting and therefore no update was provided.

6. Legislative Update (5 min)

Representative J. Paul Brown took the floor to report on a bill (HB1256) to capture water on the South Platte. His plan was to study the hydrology of the South Platte and see how much water was sent out of the South Platte Basin in Colorado and into Nebraska over the past twenty years and to evaluate what options were available to take advantage of that water. Brown reported his bill was already receiving quite a bit of

support and he was working hard to continue gaining additional support. Sean Conway asked what the Roundtable could do and Representative Brown reported the most beneficial actions would be to reach out to local legislatures and encourage them to support the bill. Representative Brown reported the bill would be before the Ag Committee on February 24th, but it would be delayed a week until March 2nd. Representative Brown argued the goal of his bill was to collect South Platte water for South Platte uses rather than relying on the West Slope.

7. Public Comment (10 min)

Joe Frank reported Diane Hoppe was undergoing treatment for a tumor, but it was reported she was doing well. Lynda James asked if the Roundtable could send Hoppe a card and the Roundtable voiced their overwhelming support for the idea. Joe Frank stated he would see to the matter.

Dinner was shortened to 30 minutes, and broke from 6:10 to 6:50.

Dinner (5:50 pm – 6:50 pm)

8. Statewide Water Supply Initiative 2016 Update (10 min)

John Stulp took the floor to provide an update on the Statewide Water Supply Initiative. The recent loss of several key CWCB staff members had delayed the contracting of the Initiative. Stulp reported the CWCB was receiving less money from the Statewide severance tax. The reduced severance tax for 2016 could be significantly lower than originally thought, thus allowing CWCB less money to work with. Lastly, Stulp reported the IBCC meeting was set for February 23rd, but the location had not yet been decided. The agenda was going to include significant discussion on funding. Stulp reported there was recent discussion on tax credit for storage. Joe Frank asked if part of that discussion was the backfilling of a CWCB funding source, to which Stulp replied it was, but insofar as it not being an actionable activity this year. Stulp updated the Roundtable on ways the CWCB was planning to fund projects and gain revenue to supply that funding. The SWSI technical platform being developed, according to Stulp, would contribute to the implementation of South Platte Basin goals and initiatives.

9. Basin Implementation Plan 2016 Discussion (20 min)

Joe Frank took the floor to address some of the recent discussions by Roundtable members of upcoming projects. Frank stated the Roundtable was seeking feedback on Roundtable funding initiatives and priorities. Mike Shimmin responded the current discussion tied directly to the earlier WSRA Needs Committee discussion, specifically, how the Roundtable prioritized funding needs and how those monies were carved out of the Roundtable's available budget. Frank felt it was up to the Roundtable to jointly decide how to address those questions. Bruce Gerk argued it was important for the Roundtable to be proactive about the goals it set for itself. Discussion ensued as to the possibility of posting the Education and Outreach Committee's poster from the summer 2015 workshop. Jeffrey Boring pointed out he liked the suggestion to prioritize projects identified as some of the most important to the Roundtable. Mike Shimmin proposed further modifying the categorization process for prioritizing WSRA applicants. The core message of Shimmin's suggestion was breaking down the funds into categories directly in service of Roundtable priorities and funds directly in service of applicants' needs, although still in-line with the Roundtable's priorities.

Jeffrey Boring spoke to the opportunities available to Roundtable members to participate in committees, namely the WSRA Needs Committee.

10. Other Business (10 min)

Joe Frank announced the Water Fluency Program, organized by the Colorado Foundation for Water Education was forthcoming and actively seeking new registrants. Although the cost was around \$1200, scholarships were available to offset part of the funding.

11. Meeting Schedule

- a. Next Roundtable Meeting – Mar 8, 2016 – Island Grove, Greeley, CO
- b. IBCC Meeting?
- c. CWCB Meeting – March 16th-17th – La Junta
- d. Governor's Ag Forum – February 18th

The meeting adjourned at 7:24

ATTACHMENT A

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Roundtable,

Per discussion at the January 12 South Platte Basin Roundtable meeting, Mike Shimmin and the committee set up at the January 12th meeting have worked with WaterReuse Colorado on revisions to the associated WSRA funding application, which Mike is now recommending for approval. Voting Roundtable members need to vote electronically on the attached application. Please take a moment to review the revised application, available [here](#) and vote by this Friday at noon. The link to the online voting tool is available [here](#).

Mike Shimmin's email regarding the revised WaterReuse Colorado application is provided below for reference.

Thanks!

-Matt

Matt Betz
Flood Recovery Planner
Boulder County Transportation

Deputy Recorder
South Platte Basin Roundtable
Cell: [847-702-0976](tel:847-702-0976)
matthew.sbtz@gmail.com

Web Wrangler
Colorado Riparian Association
www.coloradoriparian.org

----- **Forwarded message** -----

From: Mike Shimmin [mailto:mdshimmin@gmail.com]

Joe: I am writing this email with the understanding that you/Matt will send it along to the SPBRT members with the redlined documents from Reuse Colorado concerning their revised grant application. I wanted to summarize our work on this application since the RT meeting last week, and explain that I think our issues and concerns have been addressed and resolved. With these changes, I am ready to vote for approval of this grant, and recommend it to the other SPBRT members.

Following the SPBRT meeting on Tuesday, I read the entire grant application and related documents, and talked to John Rehring, the consultant that will be working on the project. I realized that there were some things stated differently in different places in the documents that caused some confusion, and some differences between the documents and the oral presentation at the RT meeting. I concluded that we actually did not have a conceptual disagreement, but rather some confusion/misunderstandings caused by some mixed signals that could be resolved with some modest wordsmithing. As a result, I proposed that the applicant make some changes to the documents that focus mostly on making sure that the scope of work is described the same way each time a topic is covered, along with a few clarifying words and phrases to address the concerns identified by RT members. I wanted to be sure that Task 1 is described more clearly and consistently. At the suggestion of Kevin Lusk, we also added language to make it clear that approving the grant does not mean that the RT or CWCB has endorsed the outcome, unless we later expressly say that we do. The applicant has graciously agreed to all of the changes that our work group requested.

The redlined documents being sent are the summary ones. But, the applicant has agreed to revise the text in the grant application itself so that it reads identically to the redlined summary documents.

I also noticed that in the grant application that the applicant plans to submit monthly summaries of the work done to the CWCB staff. I suggest that you include in our letter of approval a requirement that they also provide those summaries to the RT directly so that interested members can monitor the grant work as it proceeds. The applicant has agreed to this proposal.

With these changes, I think that we have resolved the issues raised by the RT members, and I am ready to vote for approval of this application, and to recommend the same to other SPBRT members. By the way, I have also been informed that the Metro RT gave its approval to this application at its meeting last week. Let me know if you have questions or need anything else from me. Thanks. Mike Shimmin

FINAL VOTE

Totals:

23 - in support

2 - in opposition

Here is a breakdown of the results:

Joe Frank	yay
Kevin Lusk	yay
Larry Howard	yay
James Ford	yay
mike shimmin	yay
stephen larson	yay
jim yahn	yay
garrett varra	yay
john stokes	yay
jeffrey boring	yay
lynda james	yay
julio iturreria	yay
jim hall	yay
karen martinez	yay
deb daniel	yay
sean cronin	yay
ken huson	yay
frank eckhardt	nay
burt knight	yay
john stencel	yay
allyn wind	nay
lisa mcvicker	yay
bruce gerk	yay
larry ross	yay
jim hibbard	yay
kent swedlund	yay