

Next Steps Committee meeting notes
June 25, 2018

David Graf	Nathan Bell, P.E., Mt. Sopris Cons. Dist.
Ken Ransford	Angie Fowler
Ken Neubecker	Laurie Rink
Russ George	Paul Bruchez
Karn Stiegelmeier, chair	Mark Harris
Brent Gardner-Smith	Elizabeth Chandler, Mt. Sopris Cons. Dist.
Bruce Hutchins	Stan Cazier

Hannah Holm, Megan Holcomb, Lane Wyatt, April Long

1. Upcoming meetings:

- a. July 23, 2018 CBRT roundtable meeting, Glenwood Springs Community Center from 12-4:00.
2. **WSRA Balance.** The CBRT WSRA Basin Account balance is \$205,220. It is unclear whether any additional money will be available for roundtable funding; it's up to the legislature to fund it, likely through an allocation from the General Fund.
3. **Recommended limit on grant requests – no consensus reached.** Stan Cazier suggests limiting grant requests to \$25,000. Elizabeth Chandler recommends not limiting it, but instead looking at this on a project-by-project basis. Laurie Rink suggests considering the number of beneficiaries who will be affected by the grant. Heather Tattersall suggests that we see all the requests at one time and vote on them together. Lane Wyatt suggests that the Next Steps Committee be more stringent in evaluating grants. Scott Schreiber said the Metro Basin roundtable allocated funds by project category, such as \$150k to environmental, and \$150k to new projects; education and outreach got the least funding. Heather Tattersall suggested that we consider percentage allocations. Scott Schreiber said they reviewed grants 4 times a year and emphasized multi-purpose projects. Angie Fowler said they know of projects on the BIP list, and we could reach out to them to move their projects forward. **Angie will report on this at the July Roundtable meeting.**
4. **Kendall Reservoir improvement grant request for \$37,800.** Harry Teff was not present, but the grant request is for engineering fees of \$37,500. The US forest service is a partner in this project, and it owns 1/3 of the reservoir; it's offering \$8,200 in in-kind services. The reservoir company is only contributing \$2,300 in in-kind contribution. The project has alleged recreation and environmental benefits, but they are not quantified. There was significant discussion about whether cutthroat trout would benefit and if enhanced streamflow would result. Lane Wyatt recommends funding 50% of the request, or at \$18,900, contingent on their raising the other funds. Ken Neubecker complained that the CBRT is the only entity being asked to provide cash. Ken Ransford is concerned that there be streamflow benefits and requested that Mr. Teff report in July to the roundtable on this. Heather Tattersall said that it is hard to

find engineering funding, and Lane said it's easier to find funding once you have some funding.

- a. Stan said this is a wet water project, and will keep water in the basin, and has recreation and fishing benefits; he agrees with Lane's recommendation to offer \$18,900. Laurie Rink asked if there a downstream benefit of increased stream flows in the river. An instream flow benefit in that reach would be important.
 - b. Elizabeth Chandler. Who are their other funding partners. Can they complete this project
5. **NWCOG Water QQ committee is asking for \$5,000**; if received, it would benefit several QQ communities. Stan Cazier said it's something we've identified all along, and he supports it. Ken Ransford echoed Stan's comments.
6. **Phase III Colorado River Risk funding request**– Ken Neubecker suggested that we beware of the word "scheme." The CRD has recommended investigating how long it will take to refill CRSP, the impact of a call on the ag economy, impact on ski snowmaking since they have junior rights; and how much water is lost to evaporation.
7. Colorado Basin Roundtable website: The username is *flywheel*, and the password is *goofy-cbrt*, and th website is www.coloradobasinroundtable.flywheelsites.com.
8. **Integrated water plan Grant update.** Hannah Holm. The goal to increase resources for IWMPs, and to also create a repository for data and studies that have been previously done. A guidance document is forthcoming, with a matrix to help guide how IWMPs should be conducted and identify what should be reviewed. They have identified stream reference points that are consistent across the basin; there's a studies library with links to articles, and interactive maps addressing hydrology, diversions that alter stream flows, and water quantity and quality. A new website has these online tools. **Hannah sent an email with screen shots** that show how the interactive mapping service will work.
 - a. www.uppercoloradoriver.org is the website, and it is available for beta testing right now. This website was developed for a broader purpose than just this IWMP project, such as a searchable library. Be sure to click on Colorado River Headwaters, and also click on the data dashboard.
 - b. **Hannah is presenting on this at the July Roundtable meeting.**
 - c. Lotic Engineering of Carbondale has worked on this for 2 ½ years.
9. **Angie would like the CDPHE Water Quality Control Commission visit the roundtable to discuss water quality.** She hasn't obtained a commitment yet. They would make us aware of what they do, and their process for evaluating water quality standards, why they vary within the basin, what it means to have water on the "impaired" list, and what is the result of th process. In Grand Junction there are several streams with high levels of selenium.
 - a. Ken recommended specifically reaching out to cities and counties so they can see CDPHE's presentation.