



COLORADO

Colorado Water Conservation Board

Department of Natural Resources

1313 Sherman Street
Denver, CO 80203

P (303) 866-3441
F (303) 866-4474

John Hickenlooper, Governor

Robert Randall, DNR Executive Director

Rebecca Mitchell, CWCB Director

TO: Colorado Water Conservation Board Members

FROM: Linda Bassi, Chief, Stream & Lake Protection Section
Carlee Brown, Interstate, Federal & Water Information Section

DATE: January 22-23, 2018 Board Meeting

AGENDA ITEM: 36. Wild and Scenic Rivers: Issues Update

Background

Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) Staff continues to work with stakeholder groups to develop solutions in response to federal determinations by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or U.S. Forest Service (USFS) that certain river segments are "eligible" or "suitable" for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. There are two active stakeholder groups that are pursuing conservation and monitoring actions as alternatives to Wild and Scenic designations: (1) the Lower Dolores Plan Working Group (LDPWG), and (2) the Upper Colorado River Wild and Scenic Stakeholder (UCRW&S) Group. CWCB Staff has provided updates on those activities below. Because the River Protection Workgroup (RPW) has suspended its activities in the San Juan Basin, no information for that group is provided.

In addition, this memo provides updates on the BLM's Royal Gorge Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP) revision, the USFS's Rio Grande National Forest Plan Revision, and the USFS's Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests Plan Revision.

The Board asked Staff to evaluate the *Terms and Conditions Developed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board for the Allocation of Funds from the Wild and Scenic Alternatives Fund* (Terms and Conditions) at its May 2017 meeting. A status update on that process is provided below.

Staff Recommendation

No action is required. This item is informational only.

Discussion

Proposed Changes to Fund Terms and Conditions

Staff presented proposed edits to the fund Terms and Conditions at the July 2017 Board Meeting. These proposed edits were offered following a May 2017 request from Director Montgomery to review the Fund Terms and Conditions to determine whether the concept and



term "alternative" was necessary to the Terms and Conditions. At the July Board Meeting, some Board members requested Staff to spend additional time working with them on the revised language. CWCB Staff plans to resume that conversation with individual Board members in February.

Lower Dolores Plan Working Group Update

The Lower Dolores Plan Working Group's Drafting Team, appointed by the Group's Legislative Subcommittee, has completed the latest version of the draft National Conservation Area (NCA) legislation. Briefings on the draft are being set up or have occurred with Dolores County, Montrose County and San Miguel County, after which a meeting of the three county boards of commissioners will be scheduled. After the Drafting Team has received input on the draft legislation from each county's board of commissioners and attorneys, the Drafting Team may seek additional legal advice from David Robbins, who advised the Drafting Team during its development of the current draft.

After a busy spring and summer of work managing a large spring release from McPhee Reservoir and monitoring the effects of that release on the Dolores River, the Dolores River Native Fish Monitoring & Recommendation Team met on October 27, 2017 in Cortez. Speakers from the Dolores Water Conservancy District, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Land Management, Colorado Parks & Wildlife, Fort Lewis College, The Nature Conservancy, and American Whitewater presented preliminary monitoring results from the 2017 managed release. While additional monitoring work is taking place during the winter of 2017-2018, the Monitoring & Recommendation Team plans to hold another Team meeting and a larger public meeting in the spring of 2018 to discuss the results of the 2017 managed release and future opportunities on the Dolores River.

Upper Colorado River Wild and Scenic Stakeholder Group Update

The UCRW&S Group held its quarterly Governance Committee (GC) meeting on January 9, 2018 in Summit County. The GC agreed to change its fiscal year to begin on April 1. This change will better allow the stakeholders to assess their needs for monitoring and technical efforts compared to the previous fiscal year start date of January 1. This change will also help transition to a more regular budgeting and reporting cycle, which will help when applying to CWCB's Wild and Scenic Rivers Fund.

Members of the Floatboating Ad-Hoc Committee reported that they are nearly ready to recommend draft Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV) indicators to help track the utility of specific segments for recreational boating. The Committee said that their recommendations will likely include user surveys to track ORV indicators regarding the user experience. The preliminary draft report sharing these potential indicators will likely be distributed to the GC within the next two months. The next GC meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2018 in Summit County.

BLM's Royal Gorge Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP) Revision

BLM's Royal Gorge Field Office (RGFO) issued a Draft Wild and Scenic Suitability Report in March 2017 as part of its Eastern Colorado RMP update. Of the 19 stream segments assessed,

the Draft Suitability Report recommends four segments on the Arkansas River and one segment on Eightmile Creek as suitable. CWCB has Cooperating Agency status on this RMP revision through DNR. CWCB Staff is working with the Attorney General's office to review and respond through the process. The BLM has held numerous cooperating agency meetings and has worked with the CWCB and other cooperating agency water users to develop its alternatives guiding the management of the Eastern Colorado planning area. The RGFO intends to publicly release a Preliminary Alternative Report and Draft RMP this summer.

USFS's Rio Grande National Forest Plan Revision

The Rio Grande National Forest (RGNF) is revising its 1996 forest plan. CWCB Director Mitchell submitted a comment letter on the revised forest plan's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and draft revised Land Management Plan (LMP) on December 20, 2017. That letter is attached.

The DEIS and revised LMP retain the 1996 forest plan's recommendations for Wild and Scenic designations, including that 12 stream segments deemed "eligible" and six stream segments remain "suitable" for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The documents also recommended one new stream segment (Deadman Creek) as eligible.

In her comments, Director Mitchell urged RGNF to consider and incorporate the negotiated restrictions on management of suitable and eligible stream segments into the Final EIS and LMP. Additionally, Director Mitchell's letter references the 1981 Decree which prohibits the Forest Service from claiming additional reserved rights for the Gunnison and Rio Grande National Forests. The comments also ask for consideration of a potential project being considered by the Conejos Water Conservancy District and for acknowledgment of access needed to maintain Snotel sites on land proposed for wilderness designation.

USFS's Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests Plan Revision

The Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests are undergoing a revision of their joint Forest Plan. The GMUG released draft Assessment Reports in fall 2017, the first major step of the planning process. On December 8, 2017, CWCB submitted a letter in response to the draft Assessment Reports encouraging the Forest Service to use the State's Instream Flow Program as a means to protect Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) in river corridors, rather than pursuing federal reserved water rights. CWCB also recommended that Colorado's Water Plan and the Basin Implementation plans for the Gunnison, Southwest, and Colorado Basins be used by forest planning staff for policy background.

The draft Assessment Reports indicated that the GMUG plans to complete the identification and eligibility evaluation for Wild, Scenic and Recreational rivers through a separate public engagement process. CWCB indicated that the agency would like to play an active role in that process, including identifying existing and pending ISF-protected stream reaches. According to the draft Assessment Reports, 19 stream segments were identified as eligible for Wild and Scenic designation in the 2005 planning process, but the plan was never signed and implemented. Consequently, no management direction for those segments was established.

Agenda Item 36
Wild and Scenic Rivers: Issues Update
January 22-23, 2018 Board Meeting
Page 4

CWCB's December 8, 2017 comment letter is attached. CWCB staff intends to continue to engage throughout the planning process, which is scheduled to run through fall of 2020.

Attachments



COLORADO

**Colorado Water
Conservation Board**

Department of Natural Resources

1313 Sherman Street
Denver, CO 80203

P (303) 866-3441
F (303) 866-4474

John Hickenlooper, Governor

Robert Randall, DNR Executive Director

Rebecca Mitchell, CWCBC Director

December 20, 2017

Dan Dallas
Rio Grande National Forest Supervisor
Attn: Forest Plan Revision
1803 U.S. Highway 160
Monte Vista, CO 81144

Subject: Comments on the Rio Grande National Forest Plan Revision Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Rio Grande National Forest Draft Revised Land Management Plan

Dear Mr. Dallas:

The Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCBC) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Rio Grande National Forest (RGNF) Plan Revision Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and RGNF Draft Revised Land Management Plan (LMP). These documents recommend that 12 stream segments remain eligible and six stream segments remain suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). These recommendations do not appear to have changed from the 1996 Forest Plan. These documents also recommend one new stream segment (Deadman Creek) as eligible. The six suitable segments were recommended as suitable to Congress by the State of Colorado in 1979 as a result of a congressionally mandated study.

The Final EIS and LMP should consider and incorporate the negotiated restrictions on management of suitable and eligible stream segments as well as the prohibition against additional reserved water rights. As you are no doubt aware, the Forest Service, State of Colorado, and water users spent nearly 21 years negotiating the Forest Service's claims to reserved water rights for the RGNF and Gunnison National Forest within Water Division 3. See Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment and Decree, Case No. 81-CW-183 (Decree). The Decree confirmed the Forest Service's federal reserved water rights on 303 streams in those National Forests. To our knowledge, these are the only decreed reserved water rights on any National Forest in the nation. The Decree also incorporated limitations on future Forest Service reserved rights claims within this area. Most significantly, paragraph 14 of the Decree prohibits the Forest Service from claiming additional reserved rights for those National Forests:

Paragraph 14: "In settlement and compromise of the claims in this case, the signatories to this decree agree, and it is hereby found, except as provided in Paragraph 28, below, that the quantities of water decreed to the United States herein are fully sufficient to fulfill any and all federal reserved instream flow water rights under existing federal law and all appropriate instream flow water rights that the United States may be entitled to for the Gunnison and Rio Grande National Forest



within Colorado Water Division No. 3." and "Except as provided in Paragraph 24.d., the United States agrees that, in the future, it will not claim additional appropriative instream flow water rights, in Colorado Water Division No. 3 for National Forest purposes."

Thus, the Forest Service currently has decreed quantities of water sufficient to fulfill any and all federal reserved and appropriative instream flow water rights to which it may be entitled. Those decreed quantities are adequate to protect the free-flowing character of the eligible and suitable river segments and their associated outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs), as acknowledged further on in the Decree:

Paragraph 16: "...instream flows decreed to the United States herein also satisfy fully any need for instream flows in the Gunnison and Rio Grande National Forests in Water Division No. 3 for maintaining, improving, protecting, and minimizing damage to the following: 1) Riparian ecosystems, which includes stream dependent wetlands; 2) The natural physical function of stream channels; 3) Viable and diverse populations of fish and wildlife, including all habitat necessary for such populations; 4) Scenic and aesthetic conditions and values; 5) Public opportunities for outdoor recreation; 6) Soil conservation and preservation of the quality of soil resources..."

Without the risk of opening the Decree, the Forest Service may not seek to increase those flows (or flows outside those stream segments) either through additional reserved rights or management standards, guidelines, or activities:

Paragraph 19: "This decree may be reopened if the USDA Forest Service, in the exercise of its power to grant or deny land use authorizations on National Forest System lands within Water Division No 3, acts to increase or maintain stream flows, reduce depletions to stream flows, provide favorable conditions of water flow, or provide water for any of the purposes set forth in Paragraphs 14, 15, or 16 above by: (a) requiring the owner of an Existing Water Right to forego the exercise of all or a part of its decreed water right or to relinquish water diverted or stored in priority under its decreed water right, or (b) otherwise taking any action to prevent or interfere with the exercise of all or a part of an Existing Water Right."

The Decree allows the development of water projects on RGNF land, provided that there were decreed existing absolute or conditional water rights for the project as of 1998:

Paragraph 20: "Any decree authorizing a new appropriation through the diversion facilities of an Existing Water Right will not be treated as an Existing Water Right for purposes of Paragraph 19. Unless otherwise provided in the specific provisions concerning individual Existing Water Rights in Paragraph 36, below, any change in point of diversion of any water right to a point of diversion, transportation or storage on National Forest System land granted on an application filed after December 31, 1998 will not be treated as an Existing Water Right for purposes of Paragraph 19."

The CWCB acknowledges the importance of this hard-won settlement that allows the RGNF to protect ORVs through suitability and eligibility determinations while allowing water development to continue within the basin. The CWCB also understands that there is a very good working relationship between the water users in the basin and the RGNF, and we respect that the Decree satisfactorily resolved these complicated matters years ago.

The CWCB is aware of a potential project being considered by the Conejos Water Conservancy District, which would include the enlargement, exchange of water rights to, or reoperation of Trujillo Meadows Reservoir. While the CWCB understands that the project is still in the study phase, we encourage the RGNF staff to discuss the project with the Conejos Water Conservancy District with the hopes of finding a mutual understanding within the terms of the Decree.

Finally, the proposed wilderness area in the Bear Creek drainage is the site of the Beartown Snotel, which is one of the few Snotels in the Upper Rio Grande basin. The Conejos River drainage has even fewer Snotels and reliable snowpack measuring sites. The proposed wilderness area in the headwaters of the Conejos River between Platoro Reservoir and the existing wilderness boundary is where two SnoLite systems are going to be installed this year. The Conejos Water Conservancy District has obtained a special use permit from the RGNF for installing that equipment. The permit identifies various locations for equipment in the Conejos Peak District, including the two SnoLite sites above Platoro Reservoir, referenced above. It is broadly recognized that water administrators in the Rio Grande basin are hindered by a lack of reliable data. Because a wilderness designation could impact access for maintenance and data collection, and the type of equipment that can be used, the CWCB requests that the RGNF expressly acknowledge existing special use permits for such monitoring equipment, and guarantee motorized access to the permitted locations.

Thank you for considering our comments. The CWCB looks forward to working with you to ensure a successful outcome for the citizens of Colorado and for the ORVs that you have identified for protection.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rebecca Mitchell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rebecca Mitchell, Director
Colorado Water Conservation Board



COLORADO

Colorado Water Conservation Board

Department of Natural Resources
1313 Sherman Street, Room 718
Denver, CO 80203

December 6, 2017

Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and
Gunnison National Forests
Attn: Plan Revision Team
2250 South Main Street
Delta, CO 81416

Dear Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison Forest Planning Staff:

The Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft assessment reports for the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison (GMUG) National Forests in this initial stage of the U.S. Forest Service's (FS) forest planning process. Our agencies have a longstanding partnership, as recognized in the 2015 Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Colorado's Department of Natural Resources, the CWCB, and the Rocky Mountain Region of the FS. As stated in the MOU, we are committed to working together to identify steps that can be taken to better integrate federal and state laws and activities concerning protection and management of riparian resources, aquatic habitat and instream flows on National Forest System (NFS) lands. We encourage you to review this MOU and include it as appropriate among other policy documents that provide background for the revised forest plan.

In addition, CWCB believes that Colorado's Water Plan and the Basin Implementation Plans (BIPs) for the Gunnison, Southwest, and Colorado Basins could provide useful policy background for the Forest planning staff. We encourage you to consult these documents for information on how the State and the stakeholders of the GMUG region are working to foster a strong natural environment while meeting the water supply demands of our growing population.

CWCB appreciates the inclusion of multiple references to our agency's Instream Flow (ISF) Program. We strongly encourage the FS to employ the ISF Program as a mechanism to protect flow-related values in lieu of pursuing federal reserved water rights. CWCB has historically maintained that federal reserved water rights are not the best method for protecting flow-related Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) in river corridors. Likewise, we have consistently expressed concerns regarding potential federal permitting implications associated with determining certain stream segments to be eligible or suitable for Wild and Scenic designation. The draft assessment report regarding Designated Areas indicates that the



GMUG plans to complete the identification and eligibility evaluation for Wild, Scenic and Recreational rivers through a separate public engagement process. CWCB wishes to play an active role in that process, including identifying existing and pending ISF-protected stream reaches. We request additional information be made available about this planning process as soon as is feasible. In particular, we wish to learn the scope of the analysis—whether the FS will pursue only an eligibility study, or if it will also undertake a suitability study. We also encourage the FS to develop a robust process for stakeholder engagement and intergovernmental coordination to avoid unnecessary conflicts.

CWCB's ISF Program provides a means to meet other FS goals, as acknowledged during the 2000-2004 Pathfinder Project. The Pathfinder Project was the joint effort of the FS, CWCB, and multiple stakeholder groups to explore options for protecting instream flow values on the GMUG. The Steering Committee of the Pathfinder Project recommended that the FS rely, primarily, on the state's ISF Program rather than imposing conditions for bypass flows on special use permit renewals. Our staff provided you with a copy of the Pathfinder Project Report on June 23, 2017. We encourage you to continue to take advantage of our ISF Program, as discussed in this report.

The draft assessment report on Watersheds, Water, and Soil Resources acknowledges that the current Forest Plan direction to “obtain rights to instream flow volumes” is not permitted under State law and thus needs to be updated in the next report. This is correct; only the CWCB can hold ISF water rights. While our agency holds this singular role, we work with partners like the FS to identify and secure ISF water rights to protect valuable stream reaches. The GMUG recommended two ISF water rights in 2014: one on Schaefer Creek, which was appropriated by the CWCB in 2015; and one on Kelso Creek, which was postponed as additional data collection is needed. We appreciate that you have provided us this information, and we want to continue to partner with you in this vein.

CWCB asks that future planning documents and drafts acknowledge existing ISF water rights. The CWCB holds ISF water rights on approximately 1,184 miles of stream on the GMUG. We ask that this information be included in the second full paragraph of page 21 of the draft Watersheds, Water, and Soil Resources assessment report. The CWCB holds ISF water rights on approximately 13 of the 19 stream segments that were identified as eligible for Wild and Scenic designation per the 2005 Planning Rule (set forth in Table 12 of the Designated Areas assessment report). For your information, we have attached a tabulation of the ISF water rights on these streams. Because Table 12 does not identify reaches, it is not clear to what extent the ISF reaches coincide with the eligible stream reaches.

CWCB also holds ISF water rights on the Spring Creek hydrologic site discussed on page 40 of the Designated Areas assessment draft. Those water rights are for all of the unappropriated flow from the headwaters of Spring Creek to the spring outlet, and for 0.5 cfs (10/15-4/14), 2.7 cfs (4/15-8/14), and 0.8 cfs (8/15- 10/14) from the spring outlet to the headgate of the Downing Ditch. Identifying existing state protections in FS planning documents will provide a more complete description of the resource's status.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, or would like more information about any of the documents or concepts discussed in this letter, please contact CWCB Stream and Lake Protection Section Chief Linda Bassi at linda.bassi@state.co.us or 303-866-3441, ext. 3204.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lauren", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Lauren Ris
CWCB Deputy Director

Attachment



Colorado Water Conservation Board Instream Flow Tabulation - GMUG



Water Court Div.	Case Number	Stream	Watershed	County	Upper Terminus (UTM)	Lower Terminus (UTM)	Length (miles)	Amount(dates) (CFS)	Approp Date
4	84CW0428	Bear Creek	San Miguel	San Miguel	headwaters in vicinity of E: 251529.38 N: 4196446.13	confl San Miguel River at E: 253619.56 N: 4202289.70	4.2	2 (1/1 - 12/31)	07/13/1984
4	05CW0147 (increase)	Bear Creek	San Miguel	San Miguel	headwaters in vicinity of E: 251529.38 N: 4196446.13	confl San Miguel River at E: 253619.56 N: 4202289.70	4.2	4.2 (5/15 - 8/14) 2 (8/15 - 5/14)	01/25/2005
4	84CW0364	Cow Creek	East-Taylor	Gunnison	headwaters in vicinity of E: 376268.31 N: 4297472.11	confl Willow Creek at E: 369136.65 N: 4297129.74	5.6	1 (1/1 - 12/31)	05/04/1984
4	98CW0235	Cow Creek	Upper Gunnison	Gunnison	headwaters in the vicinity of E: 302377.90 N: 4278356.71	confl Soap Creek at E: 298215.85 N: 4268999.34	7.5	0.5 (8/15 - 3/31) 1.25 (4/1 - 8/14)	05/11/1998
4	84CW0420	Cow Creek	Uncompahgre	Ouray	confl Wildhorse Creek at E: 274137.68 N: 4215081.58	hdgt div near Forest Service bndry at E: 268772.88 N: 4224687.60	7	18 (4/1 - 7/31) 5 (8/1 - 3/31)	05/04/1984
4	82CW0255	East River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	headwaters at lake at E: 323262.39 N: 4319662.06	confl Copper Creek in E: 327604.32 N: 4313585.01	8	8 (10/1 - 4/30) 15 (5/1 - 9/30)	06/03/1982
4	83CW0226	East River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Copper Creek in E: 327604.32 N: 4313585.01	confl Brush Creek at E: 334462.37 N: 4305251.90	9.4	15 (10/1 - 4/30) 25 (5/1 - 9/30)	06/03/1982
4	83CW0230	East River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Brush Creek at E: 334462.37 N: 4305251.90	confl Alkali Creek at E: 338987.51 N: 4287248.25	13.9	10 (1/1 - 12/31)	06/03/1982
4	83CW0228	East River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Alkali Creek at E: 338987.51 N: 4287248.25	confl Taylor River at E: 339296.06 N: 4281068.42	12.8	27 (10/1 - 4/30) 50 (5/1 - 9/30)	06/03/1982
4	05CW0250	Escalante Creek	Lower Gunnison	Mesa	confl EF & MF Escalante Crks at E: 203296.68 N: 4275899.57	hdgt Knob Hill Ditch at E: 204287.75 N: 4280745.40	3.9	11.5 (4/1 - 6/14) 3.2 (6/15 - 7/31) 1.3 (8/1 - 2/28) 3.2 (3/1 - 3/31)	01/25/2005
4	80CW0093	Oh-be-joyful Creek	East-Taylor	Gunnison	headwaters at outlet Blue Lake at E: 316920.32 N: 4309726.05	confl unnamed tributary at E: 318298.32 N: 4310751.03	1.5	1 (1/1 - 12/31)	03/17/1980
4	80CW0093	Oh-be-joyful Creek	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl unnamed tributary at E: 318298.32 N: 4310751.03	confl Slate River in E: 324443.27 N: 4308523.98	4.8	3 (1/1 - 12/31)	03/17/1980
4	80CW0092	Slate River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	headwaters in vicinity of E: 318698.99 N: 4318743.23	confl Poverty Gulch at E: 321387.33 N: 4312815.03	4.5	5 (1/1 - 12/31)	03/17/1980
4	80CW0092	Slate River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Poverty Gulch at E: 321387.33 N: 4312815.03	confl Oh-Be-Joyful Creek in E: 324443.27 N: 4308523.98	3.7	8 (12/1 - 3/31) 15 (4/1 - 11/30)	03/17/1980

Colorado Water Conservation Board Instream Flow Tabulation - GMUG

Water Court Div.	Case Number	Stream	Watershed	County	Upper Terminus (UTM)	Lower Terminus (UTM)	Length (miles)	Amount(dates) (CFS)	Approp Date
4	14CW3096 (increase)	Slate River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Poverty Gulch at E: 321387.33 N: 4312815.03	confl Oh-Be-Joyful Creek at E: 323966.16 N: 4308782.62	3.69	30 (5/1 - 7/15)	01/28/2014
4	11CW0144	Tabeguache Creek	San Miguel	Montrose	confl NF Tabegauche Creek at E: 197554.38 N: 4253516.36	confl Forty Seven Creek at E: 192633.18 N: 4252653.69	3.66	3.5 (4/1 - 6/30) 2 (7/1 - 10/31) 1.6 (11/1 - 3/31)	01/25/2011
4	83CW0232	Taylor River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	headwaters in vicinity of E: 344881.69 N: 4314949.33	confl Eyre Creek at E: 349650.62 N: 4317129.96	3.4	3 (1/1 - 12/31)	06/03/1982
4	83CW0205	Taylor River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Eyre Creek at E: 349650.62 N: 4317129.96	confl Italian Creek at E: 358831.67 N: 4312702.92	8.9	12 (1/1 - 12/31)	07/07/1983
4	87CW0261	Taylor River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Italian Creek at E: 358831.67 N: 4312702.92	confl Illinois Creek at E: 364482.23 N: 4303541.23	7.7	18 (11/1 - 4/30) 36 (5/1 - 10/31)	10/02/1987
4	74W2377	Taylor River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Illinois Creek in E: 364482.23 N: 4303541.23	confl Taylor Park Res in E: 364031.37 N: 4302445.47	1	55 (1/1 - 12/31)	09/19/1974
4	87CW0257	Taylor River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	gage below Taylor Park Res at E: 360322.45 N: 4297811.04	confl Spring Creek in E: 345706.96 N: 4287535.69	13.1	50 (10/1 - 4/30) 100 (5/1 - 9/30)	10/02/1987
4	87CW0264	Taylor River	East-Taylor	Gunnison	confl Spring Creek in E: 345706.96 N: 4287535.69	confl East River in E: 339296.06 N: 4281068.42	6.6	80 (10/1 - 4/30) 200 (5/1 - 9/30)	10/02/1987
4	98CW0225	West Elk Creek	Upper Gunnison	Gunnison	confl Buck Wallow at E: 305223.90 N: 4280564.81	confl Blue Mesa Res at E: 301778.77 N: 4264519.28	11.5	10 (4/15 - 7/14) 4 (7/15 - 4/14)	05/11/1998
4	98CW0226	West Soap Creek	Upper Gunnison	Gunnison	headwaters in vicinity of E: 297350.11 N: 4287194.36	confl Soap Creek at E: 298129.96 N: 4279805.67	6.1	2.5 (5/1 - 7/31) 1 (8/1 - 4/30)	05/11/1998

Totals for Water Division 4

Total # Appropriations = 24
Total # Appropriation Stream Miles = 156.6
Total # Increase = 2
Total # Increase Stream Miles = 7.9
Total # Acquisitions = 0
Total # Acquisition Stream Miles = 0
Total # Acquisitions (Cases) = 0