COLORADO
Colorado Water Conservation Board
Department of Natural Resources

Contract CORE No. POGG1 2018-818
CMS #

March 30, 2018

Eagle River Watershed Council, Inc.
Attn: Holly Loff, Executive Director
P.O. Box 5740
Eagle, CO 81631

Dear Holly:

We are pleased to inform you that the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) has approved your application for funding pursuant to the WSRF Grant Program ("Program") in the amount of $75,000. This letter authorizes you to proceed with the Eagle River Integrated Water Management Plan (ER-IWMP) Project ("Project") in accordance with the terms of this Grant Award Letter.

The Purchase Order has a link to the terms and conditions of your Grant. Please review these terms and conditions, as they are requirements of this Grant to which you, Eagle River Watershed Council, Inc. agree by accepting the Grant Funds.

The WSRF Criteria & Guidelines can be located on our website for additional information.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the project, please contact Megan Holcomb, Project Manager at 303-866-3441 ext. 3222 or at Megan.Holcomb@state.co.us. Please send the 6-month progress reports and invoices directly to the Project Manager and cc me at Dori.vigil@state.co.us.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

//s//

Doriann Vigil
Program Assistant II
O 303-866-3441 ext. 3250
1313 Sherman Street, Rm. 719, Denver, CO 80203
Dori.vigil@state.co.us / cwcb.state.co.com

Attachments

STATE OF COLORADO
Department of Natural Resources

ORDER
Number: POGG1 PDAA 201800000818
Date: 03/29/18
Description:
PDAA 2500 WSRF ONLY-Integrated Water Mgmt Plan (ER-IWMP) CRB
Effective Date: 05/01/18 Expiration Date: 04/30/21

BUYER
Buyer:
Email:

VENDOR
EAGLE RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL INC
PO BOX 5740
EAGLE, CO 81631

Contact: .
Phone: .

**** IMPORTANT ****
The order number and line number must appear on all invoices, packing slips, cartons and correspondence

BILL TO
COLORADO WATER BOARD CONSERVATION
1313 SHERMAN STREET, ROOM 718
DENVER, CO 80203

SHIP TO
COLORADO WATER BOARD CONSERVATION
1313 SHERMAN STREET, ROOM 718
DENVER, CO 80203

SHIPPING INSTRUCTIONS
Delivery/Install Date:
F.O.B: FOB Dest, Freight Allowed
VENDOR INSTRUCTIONS:

Line Item	Commodity/Item Code	UOM	QTY	Unit Cost	Total Cost	MSDS Req.
1	G1000		0	0.00	$75,000.00	☐

Description: PDAA 2500 WSRF ONLY-Integrated Water Mgmt Plan (ER-IWMP) CRB

Service From: 05/01/18 Service To: 04/30/21

TERMS AND CONDITIONS
https://www.colorado.gov/osc/purchase-order-terms-conditions

DOCUMENT TOTAL = $75,000.00

Last Update: May 19, 2017

Colorado Water Conservation Board	
Water Supply Reserve Fund	
Exhibit A - Statement of Work	
Date:	**November 6, 2017**
Water Activity Name:	**Eagle River Integrated Water Management Plan (ER-IWMP)**
Grant Recipient:	**Eagle River Watershed Council (ERWC)**
Funding Source:	**Colorado Basin Roundtable WSRF**

Water Activity Overview: (Please provide brief description of the proposed water activity (no more than 200 words). Include a description of the overall water activity and specifically what the WSRF funding will be used for.

The Eagle River Integrated Water Management Plan (ER-IWMP) intends to develop proactive water management recommendations that anticipate changes to local hydrology due to 1) population growth and increasing municipal demand for water in Eagle County, 2) climate change, and 3) projects related to the Eagle River MOU (ERMOU), an intergovernmental agreement for developing municipal water supplies in the upper Eagle River watershed.

The ER-IWMP will be developed through a stakeholder process with local conservation organizations, state and federal agencies, recreational users, ERMOU partners, commercial fishing/rafting guides, local municipalities, agricultural, and other local stakeholders to develop strategies that can respond to these changes in a way that helps meet municipal demands, while maintaining and improving ecological attributes in the Eagle River watershed.

The ER-IWMP will integrate both consumptive and non-consumptive water uses to ensure that all existing and future uses are considered. The ER-IWMP will safeguard the interests of the community and extended stakeholders, which include the environmental and recreational use needs. ERWC will provide the opportunity for all interested parties to participate and will educate the community so that the results of this plan are accepted as a fair and reasonable approach to managing our precious water resource.

Objectives: (List the objectives of the project)

Planning activities will focus on the mainstem Eagle River from its source on the East Fork Eagle River below Eagle Park Reservoir to the confluence with the Colorado River. Homestake Creek and Gore Creek will also be included in the assessment effort.

ERWC, in partnership with River Network, began to engage the ER-IWMP stakeholders in the fall of 2017 to better understand their concerns, constraints and individual objectives. The intent was to build stakeholder engagement and buy-in for the planning effort and to create ER-IWMP goals/objectives that truly reflect the interests and concerns of the stakeholders and that of the broader community. When the full ER-IWMP effort launches in the spring of 2018, it will further refine the purpose and scope detailed in this document and will conclude with the evaluation and prioritization of alternative actions. Peak Facilitation and ERWC will be responsible for convening and managing the stakeholder group that will help inform and guide the process. The anticipated tasks associated with this project are summarized through extension of the Rational Planning Model (Taylor, 1998).

At a minimum, the remaining tasks and objectives will include: 1) assessing ecosystem condition, developing environmental flow needs, and evaluating recreational use preferences, 2) characterizing the type and location of environmental and recreational attributes at risk and working with stakeholders to identify specific planning goals around them, 3) working with stakeholders to identify collaborative

opportunities for projects and processes that may help meet the diversity of use needs present in the basin, 4) evaluating the relative effectiveness and feasibility of each identified opportunity to prioritize them according to their anticipated implementation success, and 5) develop and implement a community engagement plan to raise community understanding surrounding river health. The specific tasks associated with each planning phase listed above may require supplementation, modification or removal prior to completion of the proposed work. Implementation, monitoring, and adaptive management of planning recommendations are expected to occur after this effort is completed.

Tasks

Provide a detailed description of each task using the following format:

TASK 1: Engaging Stakeholders

Subtask 1.1 Advisory Committee

ERWC will work with Lotic and Peak Facilitation to engage key stakeholders in an Advisory Committee to develop the ER-IWMP. Key stakeholders include major water rights owners, environmental interest groups, recreational user groups local government, and state/federal agencies. The Advisory Committee's role will be to provide input on the goals, technical methodologies, and identification of high-priority planning issues and project/management options. At the first Kickoff Meeting, the Advisory Committee will have an opportunity to refine the scope and help shape the timeline and guiding principles for the project.

Deliverables:

- Coordinate and provide minutes for 10 meetings throughout the 36 month ER-IWMP planning process
- Memorandum defining the collective, purpose statement and guiding principles for the planning effort, including roles and responsibilities of each member.

Subtask 1.2 Community Engagement Plan

Peak Facilitation and ERWC will develop a community engagement plan for keeping members of the general public informed on ER-IWMP processes and outcomes and on opportunities and concerns for protecting/improving river health. Additionally the community engagement plan will outline activities for increasing community understanding of how the current (and potential) water system of the Eagle River watershed is operated. This plan will include a timeline for community engagement, the topics to be covered at key points in the process, needed supporting documentation or educational material, and strategies for soliciting public comment/feedback and using it to inform the ER-IWMP effort. The ER-IWMP Advisory Committee will be engaged in developing the community engagement plan, and ERWC will implement its recommendations during the project timeline. ERWC's education and outreach coordinator will assist in the development of the community engagement plan as well as the engagement tools, which is an in-kind match by ERWC.

Deliverables:

- A community engagement plan with timeline for implementation by ERWC
- Community engagement tools (to be determined in subtask 1.2, but may include (but not be limited to) videos, a website or webpage, flyers, posters, articles or advertisements, public meetings)

TASK 2: Assess Conditions & Identify Risks

Subtask 2.1 Review Existing Data and Information

Local organizations, federal and state agencies, the CBRT and others have produced information and data relevant to characterizing ecological integrity and the delivery of ecosystem goods and services on

Tasks

streams and rivers throughout the Eagle River watershed. Some need exists to aggregate this information for the planning reaches to ensure that planning activities are informed by and grounded in the rich historical context of assessment activities.

Deliverables:

- Technical report summarizing the availability of data relevant to environmental and recreational needs assessments. Report will also summarize findings of existing reports or studies that relate land and water use activities to conditions of ecological or recreational attributes on stream reaches in the planning area

Subtask 2.2 Characterize Hydrological Regimes

River systems subject to hydrological change under human management are vulnerable to shifts in the composition and resiliency of both structural and biological components of the ecosystem. The Natural Flow Paradigm (Poff et al., 1997) postulates that streamflows represent the key driver of riverine structure and function. Changes in the timing and magnitude of various elements of the hydrological regime can produce cascading effects (or positive feedback loops) between: 1) the availability and quality of aquatic habitat, 2) the condition and extent of riparian zones, and 3) the dynamics and evolutionary trajectory of channel structure. Therefore, a detailed understanding of the hydrological regime at various locations throughout a watershed provides important context for understanding changes to other ecosystem components. Critically, in order to provide this understanding in Colorado, it is necessary to characterize the administrative and operational conditions that govern the way that water is stored, diverted, consumed, and returned to river systems in time and place. Lotic will utilize results from a StateMod simulation model developed by the Eagle River Water and Sanitation District for the Eagle River watershed to characterize daily streamflow behavior at all major tributary confluences and surface water diversion points in the project area.

Deliverables:

- Data tables containing statistical characterizations of hydrological regime behavior at major tributary junctions and surface water diversions throughout the study area. Simulated conditions may include:
    1) natural conditions,
    2) existing conditions,
    3) maximum in-basin demand projections (no change in climate),
    4) moderate-dry climate change future conditions (no change in demand),
    5) maximum in-basin demand and moderate-dry climate change future conditions,
    6) ERMOU project development (no change in climate or demand),
    7) ERMOU development with maximum in-basin demand (no change in climate),
    8) ERMOU development with maximum in-basin demand and moderate-dry climate change future conditions
- Graphics characterizing typical hydrographs under wet, average, and dry conditions at major tributary junctions, reservoirs, and surface water diversions throughout the study area for the selected scenarios.
- Technical memorandum describing the hydrological simulation results and characterizing the scenarios producing the greatest changes in hydrological regime behavior.

Subtask 2.3 Classify Fluvial Geomorphological Forms and Processes

Classifying river channel types provides a useful framework to understand the dominant physical processes at a position in the stream network. This process based understanding of channel form is useful for contextualizing historical impacts to riverine ecosystem function or for anticipating future shifts in ecosystem function following some altered condition. In this way, river classification not only simplifies communication about the ways that dynamic physical processes manifest themselves across the landscape, but also aids in natural resource use decision-making. The River Styles framework is an

Tasks

example of an appropriate approach for channel classification in the project area, as it encourages process level understanding of channel forms. River Styles or a similar framework could be used for Task 2.3 of the ER-IWMP. Rapid field assessment methodologies will be applied to assess the geomorphic condition of each channel segment and the natural recovery potential of impaired segments will be characterized.

Deliverables:

- Map of channels classified down to the level of the floodplain and instream geomorphic features for reaches in the study area.
- Map of geomorphic condition assessment results for reaches in the study area.
- Technical report discussing the geomorphic condition and natural recovery potential of segments for reaches in the study area.

Subtask 2.4 Characterize Water Quality

Lotic will evaluate historical stream temperature and water chemistry data against State of Colorado water quality standards for streams and rivers in the project area to develop an index of water quality concern. This index will be based on nonparametric statistical characterizations that identify multiple impairment thresholds (e.g., satisfactory, concern, poor, impaired) for each water quality parameter relevant to aquatic life or recreational use. Particular attention will be paid to water quality parameters that are somewhat controlled by use and management of water (e.g. water temperature, suspended sediment, selenium). Results from this assessment will provide important context for understanding the dominant climatic, land cover, and land use controls on a suite of water quality parameters that constrain ecological function or recreational use opportunities.

Deliverables:

- Table of water quality impairment thresholds for all historical water quality data collection locations throughout the project area.

Subtask 2.5 Characterize Ecological Integrity

Lotic will apply desktop assessment methods (e.g. GIS and aerial photography analysis, hydrological time series evaluation, etc.) and rapid assessment field techniques to corroborate and supplement existing information regarding the hydrological conditions necessary for supporting resilient ecological systems. Lotic anticipates data reviews and field assessments in the summer of 2018 will allow for adequate characterization of aquatic habitat quality, stream network connectivity for aquatic organism passage, floodplain inundation and riparian recruitment, channel maintenance and flushing flows, and other ecosystem attributes. A significant focus of this planning effort will be on water management and use. Therefore, Lotic will use the hydrological assessment performed in Task 2.2 to understand relationships between changes in the flow regime and other components of the ecosystem. Assessment results will inform the selection of specific management goals and objectives. The specific type and number of methods applied will be based on data availability, refinement of project geographic scope and scale (see Task 1), and preferences expressed by stakeholders. In addition to characterizing ecological integrity on each stream reach in the project area, Lotic will map the type and location of ecological attributes with particularly high ecological value and Lotic will evaluate the natural recovery potential of ecologically impaired reaches. Mapped attributes may include, but will not be limited to, Colorado Natural Heritage Program (CNHP) Potential Conservation Areas, native trout and non-native sport fish ranges, presence of threatened and endangered species, location of rare or significant plant communities, etc.

Deliverables:

- Technical report summarizing ecological integrity assessment methodologies and results.
- Map of known high-value aquatic biota attributes throughout the project area.
- Map of known high-value riparian attributes throughout the project area.

Subtask 2.6 Characterize Ecosystem Services Delivery

Tasks

Lotic will work with local stakeholders to characterize and prioritize the ecosystem goods and services that local communities derive from the riverine landscape. Relevant categories of ecosystem services include regulating services (e.g. flood abatement, groundwater recharge, water purification), provisioning services (e.g. agricultural production, drinking water supply, capture fisheries), and cultural services (e.g. boating recreation, angling recreation, aesthetic values). Lotic will evaluate qualitative information (e.g. local perceptions and anecdotal evidence) in addition to quantitative data (e.g. StateMOD hydrological simulation results, proximity of infrastructure to floodplains) to characterize the relative demand for ecosystem goods and services on stream reaches throughout the project area. American Whitewater (AW) will be contracted to conduct recreational use and flow preference surveys for stream segments in the planning area. Lotic will work with USFS, BLM and CPW to aggregate similar information describing preferred conditions for anglers. Lotic will subsequently work with stakeholders to characterize perceptions about the primary constraints on recreational use opportunity on each reach. Identified constraints may include: streamflow variability, access, structural impediments, etc.

Deliverables:

- Tables indicating the type and relative demand for ecosystem goods and services on stream segments throughout the project area.
- Map of known high-value recreational attributes on the priority stream reaches.
- Map of existing and contemplated river access points and other recreational features.
- Memorandum detailing the results from whitewater boating surveys and the "boatable days" assessment.
- Memorandum detailing the results from angler surveys and the "fishable days" assessment and discussing the primary constraint(s) on recreational use on various reaches.

Subtask 2.7 Develop Conceptual Models

Lotic will use the assessment results produced above to develop conceptual models that describe the bio-physical setting and the primary direction and strength of bi-directional interactions between different ecosystem components (e.g. hydrology and riparian recruitment, sediment transport and aquatic habitat quality, etc.) that contribute to overall ecosystem integrity, the ecosystem services that local communities receive from riverine landscapes, and the capacity for stream reaches in the project area to deliver these services. Lotic will, additionally, identify the primary anthropogenic and/or natural sources for degraded ecological integrity or constraints on delivery of ecosystem services on a given stream reach. Finally, Lotic will consider the potential vulnerability of ecological integrity or delivery of ecosystem services to changes in hydrology contemplated in Subtask 2.2. These conceptual models will help inform subsequent discussions regarding specific planning goals and objectives and identification of collaborative projects and processes to help meet those goals. Output from this assessment effort will be compiled in color-coded ranking tables that promote discussion about critical relationships between ecological integrity and the high-value ecosystem services that local communities derive from rivers and riparian areas. This output may be organized around the FACStream framework or a similar framework under development by Colorado Mesa University and the CBRT.

Deliverables:

- Color-coded ranking tables illustrating the relationships between concepts like ecosystem integrity, the capacity for delivering ecosystem services, and the demand for those services on stream segments in the project area.
- Map of at-risk riparian and aquatic biota attributes.
- Map of at-risk recreational attributes.
- Technical report detailing conceptual models developed for stream reaches with at-risk environmental and/or recreational attributes.

TASK 3: Articulate Planning Objectives and Measureable Results

Tasks

Subtask 3.1 Identify High-Priority Management Issues and Locations

Lotic will work with stakeholders to prioritize river segments and management issues for subsequent planning steps. Lotic will rely heavily on the deliverables produced in Subtask 2.7 to support these conversations. Lotic will consider management issues that anticipate some altered future hydrological condition brought about by climate change, in-basin demand growth, development of water storage projects under the ERMOU, or some combination of the three. Throughout the issue identification process, Lotic and Peak Facilitation will work with stakeholders to refine and/or expand the planning considerations listed above to ensure they sufficiently reflect local concerns and perspectives.

Deliverables:

- Memorandum detailing high-priority planning issues identified by stakeholders.
- Map of high-priority stream reaches.

Subtask 3.2 Select Objectives and Measureable Results

Lotic will work with stakeholders to select specific management objectives and describe measureable results that respond to the high-priority issues identified previously. This effort will include discussions of morphologically-based, biologically-based, or flow-based management targets used as a direct or indirect measure of riparian area health, health of aquatic biota recreational use opportunity, or receipt of ecosystem services. Management targets may focus on a specific component of the aquatic or riparian ecosystem (e.g. trout biomass), a measure/indicator of whole ecosystem integrity (e.g. Multi-Metric scores for aquatic macroinvertebrates), or on the quality and quantity of ecosystem goods and services received by local communities (e.g. number of "boatable days" available to recreational users). The characterization of planning objectives is necessary to identify and evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of alternative management actions or projects.

Deliverables:

- Memorandum detailing planning objectives and measureable results identified by stakeholders.

TASK 4: Identify Potential Alternatives

Lotic will identify several candidate structural projects, collaborative processes or management actions that respond to the planning objectives. Candidate actions will be drawn from several sources. Lotic will initially identify alternatives through internal assessment of hydrological conditions, water use and administration, and ecological needs. Discussions with local stakeholders may also point to some unique local opportunities not apparent to us. While there may be significantly more than ten candidate projects suggested or identified, Lotic will use a high-level, expert assessment of feasibility and effectiveness to limit the list to only those actions that have the greatest chance of occurring and/or succeeding.

Deliverables:

- Table identifying candidate structural projects, collaborative processes or management actions that respond to the planning goals and objectives. Table will reference candidate actions against high-priority planning reaches and the management issues present on those reaches.

TASK 5: Evaluate & Prioritize Actions

Subtask 5.1 Identify and assemble relevant stakeholders

It is important to identify stakeholders with the greatest ability to exert control on outcomes or who are likely to be impacted by the direct or indirect effects of the proposed alternatives. Peak Facilitation will work with Lotic and ERWC to ensure that the assembled stakeholder group includes all parties that should be engaged in discussions about the relative merits of the identified alternatives. In cases where all stakeholders are not appropriately engaged, Peak Facilitation will conduct outreach and engagement activities.

Deliverables:

- Memorandum listing the stakeholders critical to successful evaluation of effectiveness and feasibility of each alternative action.

Tasks

Subtask 5.2 Characterize Effectiveness

Lotic will utilize process-based conceptual models (see Subtask 2.7) to predict ecological and recreational use outcomes of each candidate alternative action. Where identified alternatives are expected to impact hydrology (e.g. reservoir release schedules), Lotic will use the hydrological simulation tools developed in Subtask 2.2 to assess the likely hydrological effects. For structural projects (e.g. diversion structure improvements), Lotic will use conceptual level engineering assessments and/or 1D hydraulic models to evaluate effects. Predicted outcomes will be assessed against stakeholder-identified management objectives. Actions will then be ranked against each other based on their predicted ability to meet those objectives.

Deliverables:

- Expansion of the table developed in TASK 4 to include the relative effectiveness rank assigned to each alternative.
- Technical report discussing the employed methodologies and assessment results characterizing the effectiveness of each proposed alternative.

Subtask 5.3 Characterize Feasibility

The characterization of feasibility for each alternative is a social exercise that requires careful evaluation of administrative, legal, financial, and institutional constraints. Lotic will initially utilize streamflow records, hydrological simulation products, records from the Colorado Department of Water Resources, existing engineering reports, and/or discussions with local water users to characterize the demands, efficiencies, and use shortages associated with various uses of water from the high-priority reaches. Lotic will utilize available engineering assessments or secure new conceptual level assessments to provide important information about the costs of structural projects. Lotic will work with the local Water Commissioner to identify critical administrative constraints on water management alternatives. Lotic will also work with stakeholders to further characterize land ownership and institutional constraints and understand local perceptions of equitable cost allocation for E&R use projects. Through this process, we hope to identify likely proponents/champions for specific issues and areas of broad stakeholder interest and support. Lotic will subsequently work with the stakeholders to rank alternatives according to their relative feasibility.

Deliverables:

- Expansion of the table developed in Subtask 5.2 to include the relative feasibility rank assigned to each alternative.
- Technical report discussing the employed methodologies and stakeholder discussions characterizing the feasibility of each proposed alternative.

Subtask 5.4 Prioritize Actions

Lotic will integrate the results from the effectiveness and feasibility assessments above to identify high-priority actions for protecting or improving environmental and/or recreational flows. Lotic will identify a conceptual level implementation plan for each action. The implementation plan will identify project champions, affected stakeholders, recommendations for overcoming technical, financial, or legal constraints, anticipated outcomes, and a monitoring plan for assessing long-term effectiveness.

Deliverables:

- Technical report integrating all previous maps, graphics, memoranda, and technical reports. Report will additionally include identification of high-priority management recommendations and corresponding discussions for implementation and monitoring of each.

REFERENCES

Mahoney and Rood, 1998. A device for studying the influence of declining water table on poplar growth and survival. Tree Physiology 8:305–314.

Tasks

Poff, N.L., J.D. Allan, M. B. Bain, J.R. Karr, K.L. Prestegaard, B. Richter, R. Sparks, and J. Stromberg. 1997. The natural flow regime: a new paradigm for riverine conservation and restoration. BioScience 47:769-784.

Schmidt, L.J. and J.P. Potyondy, 2004, Quantifying channel maintenance instream flows: An approach for gravel-bed streams in the western United States, General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-128, Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, pp. 33

Taylor, N., 1998. *Urban Planning Theory since 1945*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 67–68.

Budget and Schedule

Budget: This Statement of Work and Schedule shall be accompanied by a Budget that reflects the Tasks identified in the Statement of Work and Schedule and shall be submitted to CWCB in an excel format.

Schedule: This Statement of Work and Budget shall be accompanied by a Schedule that reflects Tasks identified in the Statement of Work and Budget and shall be submitted to CWCB in an excel format.

Reporting Requirements

Reporting: The grantee shall provide their respective Roundtable(s) and the CWCB a Progress Report every 6 months, beginning from the date of executed contract. The Progress Report shall describe the status of the water activity, the completion or partial completion of the tasks identified in the Statement of Work including a description of any major issues that have occurred and any corrective action to address these issues. The CWCB may withhold reimbursement until satisfactory Progress Reports have been submitted.

Final Deliverable: At the completion of the water activity, the grantee shall provide their respective Roundtable(s) and the CWCB a final report on the grantee's letterhead that:

- Summarizes the water activity and how the water activity was completed
- Describes any obstacles encountered, and how these obstacles were overcome
- Explains the Proposed Budget versus the Actual Budget
- Confirms that all matching commitments have been fulfilled
- Includes photographs, summaries of meeting and engineering reports/design, if appropriate

The CWCB will withhold the last 10% of the entire water activity budget until the Final Report is completed to the satisfaction of CWCB staff. Once the Final Report has been accepted, and final payment has been issued, the water activity and purchase order or contract will be closed without any further payment. Any entity that fails to complete a satisfactory Final Report and submit to CWCB within 90 days of the expiration of a purchase order or contract may be denied consideration for future funding of any type from CWCB.

Payments

Payment will be made based on actual expenditures, must include invoices for all work completed and must be on grantee's letterhead. The request for payment must include a description of the work accomplished by task, an estimate of the percent completion for individual tasks and the entire Project in relation to the percentage of budget spent, identification of any major issues, and proposed or implemented corrective actions.

The CWCB will pay the last 10% of the entire water activity budget when the Final Report is completed to the satisfaction of CWCB staff. Once the Final Report has been accepted, and final payment has been issued, the water activity and purchase order or contract will be closed without any further payment. Any entity that fails to complete a satisfactory Final Report and submit to CWCB within 90 days of the expiration of a purchase order or contract may be denied consideration for future funding of any type from CWCB.

Performance Requirements

Performance measures for this contract shall include the following:
(a) Performance standards and evaluation: Grantee will produce detailed deliverables for each task as specified. Grantee shall maintain receipts for all project expenses and documentation of the minimum in-kind contributions (if applicable) per the budget in Exhibit B. Per Grant Guidelines, the CWCB will pay out the last 10% of the budget when the final deliverable is completed to the satisfaction of CWCB staff. Once the final deliverable has been accepted, and final payment has been issued, the purchase order or grant will be closed without any further payment.
(b) Accountability: Per the Grant Guidelines full documentation of project progress must be submitted with each invoice for reimbursement. Grantee must confirm that all grant conditions have been complied with on each invoice. In addition, per the Grant Guidelines, Progress Reports must be submitted at least once every 6 months. A Final Report must be submitted and approved before final project payment.
(c) Monitoring Requirements: Grantee is responsible for ongoing monitoring of project progress per Exhibit A. Progress shall be detailed in each invoice and in each Progress Report, as detailed above. Additional inspections or field consultations will be arranged as may be necessary.
(d) Noncompliance Resolution: Payment will be withheld if grantee is not current on all grant conditions. Flagrant disregard for grant conditions will result in a stop work order and cancellation of the Grant Agreement.

Last Update: May 19, 2017

COLORADO
Colorado Water Conservation Board
Department of Natural Resources

Colorado Water Conservation Board

Water Supply Reserve Fund

Exhibit B - BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

Date: 11/6/2017

Water Activity Name: Eagle River Integrated Water Management Plan (ER-IWMP)

Grantee Name: Eagle River Watershed Council (ERWC)

Task No.	Description	Start Date[1]	End Date	Matching Funds (cash & in-kind)[2]	WSRF Funds (Basin & Statewide combined)[2]	Total
1	Engage Stakeholders	5/1/18	4/30/2021	$48,858	$9,000	**$57,858**
2	Assess Conditions & Identify Risks	06/1/18	8/30/2019	$161,763	$39,750	**$201,513**
3	Articulate Planning Objectives & Measureable Results	09/01/19	01/31/2020	$28,593	$6,750	**$35,343**
4	Identify Potential Alternatives	01/01/2020	03/30/2020	$25,818	$6,750	**$32,568**
5	Evaluate & Prioritize Actions	04/01/2020	04/30/2021	$49,913	$12,750	**$62,663**
			Total	**$314,945**	**$75,000**	**$389,945**

ERWC anticipates a start date between May and June 2018.

(1) The single task that include costs for Grant Administration must provide a labor breakdown (see Indirect Costs tab below) where the total WSRF Grant contribution

(2) Start Date for funding under $100K - 45 Days from Board Approval; Start Date for funding over $100K - 90 Days from Board Approval.

(3) Round values up to the nearest hundred dollars.

• Reimbursement eligibility commences upon the grantee's receipt of a Notice to Proceed (NTP)

• NTP will not be accepted as a start date. Project activities may commence as soon as the grantee enters contract and receives formal signed State Agreement.

The CWCB will pay the last 10% of the entire water activity budget when the Final Report is completed to the satisfaction of the CWCB staff project manager. Once the Final Report has been accepted, the final payment has been issued, the water activity and purchase order (PO) or contract will be closed without any futher payment. Any entity that fails to complete a satisfactory Final Report and submit to the CWCB with 90 days of the expiration of the PO or contract may be denied consideration for future funding of any type from the CWCB.

• Additonally, the applicant shall provide a progress report every 6 months, beginning from the date of contract execution

• Standard contracting proceedures dictate that the Expiration Date of the contract shall be 5 years from the Effective Date.

Eagle River Integrated Water Management Plan (ER-IWMP)

Budget by Unit costs

Task	Sub-Task	Description	Lotic Hydrological							Peak Facilitation		ERWC			TOTAL EXPENSE
			Seth Mason	Jessica Mason	Bill Hoblitzell	Mark Beardsley, EcoMetrics (sub)	Greg Policky, Policky Aquatics (sub)	Nathan Fey, American Whitewater (sub)	In-Kind from Eagle Park Reservoir Co. (sub)	Heather Bergman	Katie Waller	Holly Loff	In-Kind from ERWC Staff	Engagement Plan Tools or Contractors	
			$ 150	$ 150	$ 105	$ 125	$ 125	Flat Fee	Flat Rate	$ 150	$ 85	$ 50	$ 50	Flat Fee	
			anticipated hours	*anticipated hours*	*anticipated hours*	*anticipated hours*	*anticipated hours*	*$*	*$*	*anticipated hours*	*anticipated hours*	*anticipated hours*	*anticipated hours*	*$*	
Engaging Stakeholders	1.1	Advisory Committee	20.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	68	348	240	$ 10,000.00	**$ 57,855.00**
	1.2	Community Engagement Plan													
Assess Conditions & Identify Risks	2.1	Review Existing Data & Information	415	128	423	170	60	$ 5,000.00	$ 15,000.00	36	42	345	0	0	**$200,857.00**
	2.2	Characterize Hydrological Regimes													
	2.3	Classify Fluvial Geomorphological Forms & Processes													
	2.4	Characterize Water Quality													
	2.5	Characterize Ecological Integrity													
	2.6	Characterize Ecosystem Services Delivery													
	2.7	Develop Conceptual Models													
Articulate Planning Objectives & Measurable Results	3.1	Identify High-Priority Management Issues & Locations	57	0	50	5	0	0	0	12	14	347	0	0	**$ 34,775.00**
	3.2	Select Objectives and Measureable Results													
Identify Potential Alternatives	4.1	Identify Potential Alternatives	27	20	20	10	10	0	0	12	14	350	0	0	**$ 32,148.00**
Evaluate & Prioritize Actions	5.1	Identify and assemble relevant stakeholders	108	18	78	48	25	0	0	36	42	350	0	0	**$ 62,663.00**
	5.2	Characterize Effectiveness													
	5.3	Characterize Feasibility													
	5.4	Prioritize Actions													
Total Anticipated Hours			**627.5**	**166.0**	**571.0**	**233.0**	**95.0**	**flat fee**	**flat rate**	**160.0**	**180.0**	**1740.4**	**240.0**	**flat fee**	
Mileage at $.575/hour			$ 432.00	$ -	$ -	$ 486.00	$ 729.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ 1,647.00**
Total Cost			**$ 94,557.00**	**$ 24,900.00**	**$ 59,955.00**	**$ 29,611.00**	**$ 12,604.00**	**$ 5,000.00**	**$ 15,000.00**	**$ 24,000.00**	**$ 15,300.00**	**$ 87,018.00**	**$ 12,000.00**	**$ 10,000.00**	**$389,945.00**

* WSRF GRANT BUDGET IS FOR $75,000 - SEE PAGE 1 OF EXHIBIT B.

Eagle River Integrated Water Management Plan (ER-IWMP)

Exhibit C: Project Area Map