

Metro Roundtable Meeting Summary

Thursday, July 13th, 2017

Meeting Location: DOW Denver Office

6060 Broadway Denver, 80216

(303) 291-7227

4:00 PM - 6:00 PM

Members in Attendance:

Casey Davenport, Dan DeLaughter, Dave Nickum, David Allen, Emily Hunt, Jamie Hartig, Janet Bell, Jim Hall, Julio Iturreria, Lesley Sebol, Lisa Darling, Marc Waage, Rick McLoud, Rick Marsicek, Rob Sakata, Scott Brink, Susan Nedell

Guests:

Sean Chambers, Royal Koepsell, Phyllis Thomas, Steve Malers

CWCB:

Megan Holcomb, Diane Kielty

Metro Roundtable Business Meeting

1. Welcome/Introductions

2. Approval of May 2017 Meeting Summary

All in Favor - Approved

3. Approval of June 2017 Joint RT Summit Summary

All in Favor - Approved

4. Agenda: additions or changes

Addition during item 6. WSRF presentation requested by South Platte RT regarding grant request for Data Platform by the Open Water Foundation.

Update requested on the SPBRT meeting.

5. Public Comment

6. WSRF (Hunt)

1. Water Information / Real Estate Disclosure Tool (H2info) – Chambers

Request for grant to develop geospatial tool that consolidates and communicates water information to inform home buyers in water understanding on both the CWP and district specific conservation plans. This would be a data nexus with MLS transactions. Engaging home owners early in the house buying process. It would be a free service to the public. Looking for state support funds and small funding from basins. Propose to employ a pilot over a two-year period. The request is for \$10,000 from the MRT. They are leaving it up to the State to decide which funding category it would fall under.

Q. Where would the link reside and what is the long-term plan? The link could be in multiple locations, for instance the two RT web sites, CWCB conservation page and the MLS service site for realtors. The goal is to get pilot up in a few months, run it for a year to test results, and determine next actions based on pilot outcome. In long-term they would go after sponsorships to run it.

With MRT funding splits there is money in the Conservation Reuse and Education funding categories which are both potential category funds where this project could be housed. A draft application has been completed. It would be nice if the applicant didn't need to draft more than 1 application. The rules for submittal and how the splits work is confusing. To

meet RT and state requirements MRT could use some guidance. The submittal schedule could also come in conflict with State guidelines and the MRT grant approval process.

They have received additional interest from utilities who may support this project and may support the match requirements. If they don't make the September submittal deadline they will be ready for the next deadline.

Q. How will you ensure the data is consistent across different jurisdictions? They will be gathering data from Colorado data bases. This will be their challenge to collect this data to the best of their ability. Some information may need to be scrubbed. Many of the private entities have good data to tell stories at the level of real estate transactions. There may be data gaps but they are not going to generate data. They will rely on the State 1051 Data Base. It will involve a 6 County pilot area. They will be engaging with the water providers early in the process to gather consistent data.

Q. What efforts will you make to disseminate this tool through the real estate community? Will you build in a metric to determine how successful you are in educating the buyer and if the data being accessed is having an impact on behavior change? They've started the process of contacting the real estate community. The first approach is with the Association of Realtors and MLS.

Q. You plan to link with provider web pages. It sounds like there will be a portal for interpretation. How do you guard against interpretation error? There will be a general link to home page of utility provider. They are aggregating the existing data sets, not interpreting.

If can't get future contributions they would take the link down to prevent old information from being distributed. If nobody stands behind it as an on-going tool then it becomes stand-alone data set the CWCB housing it as an archive.

How has this concept been received in Pikes Peak area? From a realtor and association perspective they like that it would clear up misunderstandings regarding utilities. It would involve strategizing about the tool and how to use it. The target audience is small water providers. There is confusion at the level of which providers serve what areas.

Assuming you get sponsorships and it goes well, what is the expansion plan? The front range would be next where there are complex municipal boundaries. There are counties that are both urban and suburban that meet the target for this tool. The implementation is scaleable to the entire state but the real problem is the front range.

Do other states have this tool? It's not based on any other tool. They have heard that Arizona has a similar tool developed through a cooperative effort devised by the utility companies.

MRT approved advancing an application.

2. Data Platform by the Open Water Foundation

SPBRT has asked MRT to split the grant request amount. Ask is for \$40,000 - \$20,000 from SPBRT and \$20,000 from MRT. Its focus is data and visualizations going from data, to information, to knowledge, to decisions. This is not a software development project. They can build these visualizations and publish. It is a type of repackaging to improve the educational message. The duration of the project would be a year to a year and a half. The outputs may fit well into the SWSI process.

Q. Who will decide what data is to be presented? What would the interaction be with the Roundtables? They are trying to use data sets that cross jurisdictions and work with education liaisons to support framework data. There is enough data but nobody can get to it to make it useful. The tool could also help inform grant funding decision. This would be a helpful tool to bring the Education Coordinator up to speed.

This is the type of material the PEPO committee has been trying to locate for the website. The Colorado Basin is also trying to do this type of visual data story telling.

The proposal has been approved to move forward with a grant application sharing the cost with SPBRT.

3. Colorado's Water Plan Implementation Grant Fund – Holcomb
Becky Mitchel is the new CWCB Director. Megan provided a Colorado Water Plan grant process overview. CWCB is planning on conducting a webinar on this process that will be posted.

On the CWCB website under Colorado Water Plan you can access loan & grant information. There is \$9 million from legislation in this fund. August 1st is the first submittal deadline. The next deadline is October 1st. The process will involve 2 steps: 1) Review from staff to CWCB board; 2) CWCB Board meeting decision. There may be requests from applicants coming to RT over the next month asking for Letter of Support. They want to receive as many applications as possible. There is a check box on 1st page of application asking intent to apply. Board wants to see what projects are pending so they may rate / rank the projects. They want to see the demand in each project fund category for future planning. It is allowable to tap into multiple project categories per project. This permits flexible use of funds. There are links under projects that provide description of the types of projects desirable under each category. There may be discretion to move grant money access from different grant fund categories based on availability and need.

Q. Is there a funding goal for next year? There is no solid number now.

Q. Will there be guidance from CWCB on which funding mechanism is most appropriate for the various projects that come forward? If it has very local impact and called out by the BIP it is likely a WSRF grant. Any that directly address measurable directives of the CWP would fall under this grant. CWCB will provide direction to applicants. Chapter 10 of the Water Plan gives very specific direction. There are recommended match amounts. Refer to the table online. You cannot match with other CWCB funds.

Q. If you don't make the August 1st deadline should you still submit with intent to apply in next round? Yes.

Q. What is the role of the RT in the Water Plan Grant? The first immediate role is to tell people about this opportunity. The Board has not discussed this as being integrated into the RT process. The RT will not need to review applications.

Q. How will RTs know if applications would be of interest to the RT? In time, the hope is that the RTs will be informed on project candidate information and projects pertinent to the individual basins.

This is a step toward the funding hole in the water plan. This first year will reveal the need. They are unsure if it will be managed by basin or by category.

4. WSRF Balance Summary (In meeting packet)
Metro Basin now has \$494,337. Next installment will be in January.

7. Committee Updates

1. PEPO (Davenhill)

1. Outreach Coordinator Position Status

The application for coordinator will be seen by CWCB next Wednesday. The guiding document is the Education Action Plan. It may be outdated. They may need to revisit the plan. They will have a plan revision with budget ready to present to MRT by September 1st. One of the goals in the plan is to promote good projects coming forward but they have no list of IPPs. Asking MRT members to help identify priorities for funding. What message does the RT want to get out?

Would be nice to have guidance on support letters for grant proposals from RT. As it is done currently the letter is to be written by the RT Chair, an already busy

person. Applicants need to be prepared to support drafting of the letter that the Chair will submit in support of their project.

2. Website Status

It is being updated with goal to create a member portal.

2. Environmental/Recreation Committee (Nickum)

Reached out to the Roaring Fork Valley on Stream Management Planning. Contact David Nickum if you are interested.

8. **SWSI Update (Holcomb)**

Next week is distribution of the 1st draft of methodologies. It will go to TAG representatives who will have 6 weeks to respond.

9. **South Platte Storage Study Update (Holcomb)**

Several MRT members attended. Based on results of 1st workshop they have narrowed the focus based on reach. Had conglomeration of representative sites within reaches. From that they selected representative site within a specific reach. They are focusing on the selected representative sites. The group is further beyond the scope of the legislation which was asking specifically for identification. There is no optimization that will be done to this study. That is beyond the scope. The information is available for those who may be interested in going after storage. They are finalizing their results and will have a final meeting in October before the due date for the report in November.

10. **Joint Front Range RT Discussion**

1. Debrief
2. Next Steps

MRT may address this during a future meeting.

11. **Colorado Water Congress' Summer Conference Steamboat Springs, CO, Aug. 22nd – 24th**

1. Stream Management Planning Workshop requesting one member from each basin
2. Metro Basin Roundtable representative at workshop August 22nd from 10:00-11:00am

12. **Meeting Schedule**

1. South Platte Basin Roundtable Meeting - Tuesday, July 11th, 2017, 4:00 pm - TBD, Southwest Weld County Service Center, 4209 County Rd 24 ½, Longmont, CO 80504
2. South Platte Storage Study - Wednesday, July 12, 2017, 9:00 am - 1:00 pm, Southwest Weld County Service Center, 4209 County Rd 24 ½, Longmont, CO 80504
3. Metro Roundtable Meeting – Thursday, August 10th, 2017, 4:00 pm – 6:00 pm, DOW 6060 Broadway Denver, 80216
4. Colorado Water Congress' Summer Conference, Steamboat Springs, CO, Aug. 22nd – 24th, 2017

Meeting Adjourn – 6:05 pm