2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit
Appendix A: Summary of Table Group Key Discussion Points

PART ONE:
EXPLORATION OF ROUNDTABLE PORTFOLIOS -- COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Discussions Session

Table groups organized by specific topic areas (demands, identified projects and processes (IPPs), conservation & reuse, new supply, and agricultural transfers) explored the roundtable portfolios, specifically addressing the commonalities and differences between the portfolios.

Discussion Questions (for all tables):

1) Discuss the range of [your table topic] and the different basis in the reasoning of other roundtables in developing their portfolio for a particular scenario.
2) For each scenario, what are the major commonalities/common interests between differing portfolio elements? How about differences?
3) Does what you've learned confirm your roundtable's portfolios, or do you think you need to make changes? If so, what changes?

Discussion Key Points

From their discussions, each table group identified the two most critical aspects of their conversation to share with the CWCB, IBCC, and other roundtable members. These key points are outlined below.

Future Water Demands
• There is a need for better data on projected water demands of energy development and associated population increases. • Regardless of high/medium/low demand, in all likelihood none of the demand scenarios are adequate to capture nonconsumptive needs and the opportunity to allow concurrent uses.
• A more comprehensive, statewide discussion of conservation and its impacts on demand should take place to see where all basins stand and why. • The potential impact of oil shale development drastically changes demand scenarios. Are the projections valid and should they be separated from other municipal and industrial (M&I) projections?
• Oil shale demands have been over-stated; new studies show a demand of 100,000 acre-feet (KAF). • Projections assuming that water will limit growth are unrealistic.
• We need to sequentially plan for low demand as the first absolute need (in the short term), followed by medium/high demand (in the long term). • We need more specificity in developing municipal demand sector values.
• There are existing demands for the environment and recreational needs that are not reflected in the tool in any way. These nonconsumptive demands must be captured in this process. • The demand gap is only measured at the tap, and the supply gap is only measured at the source. The tool assumes no system loss, but this is not true. The system loss is large in some cases and this gap is not reflected in the tool. • As cities become more sophisticated in creating reuse infrastructure, there are unanticipated consequences for all the various downstream users of the water. For example: by increasing reuse to meet the demand gap, we negatively impact agricultural uses down valley and negatively impact endangered species/environmental "demands" at the state line. • We should plan for high demands in all cases and turn "on" all toggles for demands.
• Instead of accepting/reacting to demand, we should view water demand as manageable. So, what are the realities of demand management? • Everybody must contribute to the solution. Demand management has to be a shared activity statewide.

2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit
Appendix A: Summary of Table Group Key Discussion Points

Identified Project and Processes (IPPs)
• Permitting is a common issue on all IPPs. The State can and must be helpful in addressing the permitting issues (federal and state), so that the process to move IPPs toward the 80% goal is successful. This is not to suggest elimination of local control. • As part of the discussion of IPPs, we must get the Portfolio Tool to more clearly and quantitatively identify impacts to nonconsumptive uses as it does for uses such as agriculture. IPPs must be looked at with regard to how well they are implemented relative to all issues because they will inevitably affect the success of future IPPs.
• An IPP success rate of 80% overall is too high. In the IPP analysis we need more granularity. Some types of IPPs are easier and less contentious (e.g., WISE and Prairie Waters). Others are more difficult (such as transbasin diversions). • It is important that IPPs move forward considering all interests. We need to consider both projects and processes; some IPPs require a new way of doing things (e.g., land use planning as an IPP). The State has an important role in challenging the status quo.
• It is important to promote water education to help demonstrate the need for and cost of successful IPPs. This has two components: o Educating the public in a way that they are invested and not "glazed over" o Water planners and land use planners educating each other to create a better connection between growth and water planning • It is important to recognize the interconnectedness between IPPs and other elements (i.e., IPP success means some continued agricultural transfer).
• State-level strategic vision/direction is needed: o Governor-level support of multi-beneficial projects that prioritize benefits/needs o Development of a statewide water plan • We need to facilitation of funding for IPPs.
• It is a complex problem. There is not one approach that can provide the solution. We need to consider that IPPs have an important role. We need to have the roundtables (RTs) look at IPPs again to see what is really feasible in terms of IPPs that can reduce the gap. We should favor multi-use projects. • We need to get away from the position of "it is my turf." We are all stakeholders in the state; we need to work together on IPPs that benefit all. We need to encourage partnerships to accomplish IPPs. We should streamline the process; we have to have the "hard" conversation before/outside of the permitting process.
• We need to build partnerships to prioritize and implement multipurpose IPPs. The next step will be a prioritization with an emphasis on projects that can meet both consumptive and nonconsumptive needs as well as create multiple beneficiaries. Then we will need to encourage a collaborative process and leadership to champion and prioritize projects, including funds to facilitate conversation. Example: Plaza project in Rio Grande. • We need to bring federal agencies to the table to facilitate IPP permitting where applicable. There is a need to address additional layers of regulatory and political hurdles including encouraging State agencies to talk to themselves and to federal agencies. The State is working on a pre-mitigation process with the feds to help projects move forward. However, Washington is still disconnected on western water issues and this can impact project movement. It is also important to let the feds know where the Governor's support exists.
Conservation
• If applicable, all conservation practices should be moved forward as soon as possible. • We need to incorporate land use planning (as appropriate through regulations) and water planning.
• Conservation should be pursued to its maximum extent. • We need to develop legal and economic mechanisms that enable the use of conserved agricultural water to benefit the entity or individual conserving the water.

Conservation, continued
• One size does not fit all. • Agriculture should look at more water efficiency (although water law currently makes this difficult). • We need a better understanding of the agricultural tipping point (dry-up) and nonconsumptive impacts. • Conservation should support agriculture, and agriculture should not be destroyed. • We need more statewide conservation/water education campaigns.
• Statewide, there are negative impacts to recreation and economic opportunities without more water conservation efforts. • The West Slope needs to recognize and start to conserve to the same levels as the rest of the state.
• We (State, et al) should look hard at agricultural efficiency opportunities while protecting the prior appropriation doctrine. • We should focus on M&I conservation needs to be less about indoor and a lot more about outdoor opportunities for savings.
• We need to explore water conservation causes and effects on other projects in other areas of the water industry. • Reuse needs to be separated from water conservation and be its own issue. • We need to talk about the cost of water conservation to utilities and customers.
Agricultural Transfers
• We need to explore legislation that will facilitate agricultural transfer methods to achieve: 1) water for cities to meet the gap, and 2) drought protection. • We need to educate the public on the role and value of agriculture in: 1) the economy, and 2) open space.
Minimize permanent agricultural dry-up by: • Using all "legs of the stool" • Getting creative to encourage continued farming: rotational fallowing, keeping farms as long as is desired, helping with estate/retirement planning, etc.
• There are other factors than M&I demand that impact agricultural dry-up (farm prices, aging farm population, lifestyle, new supplies). • The effects of conservation and reuse on downstream users and yields from agricultural transfers are unknown.
We should acknowledge the value of maintaining a viable agricultural sector and develop legal and financial methods to preserve agricultural production while allowing some agricultural water for municipal use without penalties.
• It is critical to preserve agriculture in all basins. This is a statewide issue due to environmental, social, and nonconsumptive benefits. • State assistance with developing alternatives to agricultural transfers (including conservation and new supplies) is crucial.
• We should develop partnerships between agriculture, M&I, and environmental interests through storage. • Agriculture is important! We should continue to build partnerships and water-sharing strategies.
• We need to explore creative alternatives to agricultural transfers. We should change the name of our portfolio to the "Developing Agriculture Portfolio." • We should develop storage of agricultural water when available and where possible.
New Supply
• Moving forward will require a full discussion of risk management and the incorporation of future flexibility and adaptive management, as well as having all voices at the table. • Moving forward, we must recognize the interconnectedness of new supply with IPP success, conservation implementation, and agricultural transfers.
• The discussion of new supply requires discussion of risk management and a more thorough economic analysis than is currently available in the Portfolio Tool. • We should explore smaller projects for incremental supply instead of really large projects that are economically infeasible at this time.

New Supply, continued
• We should maximize our entitlement on the Colorado River, but not limit new supply sources to the Colorado alone. • We should explore implementing projects to develop water on the Colorado in stages to appease multiple interests and obligations.
• Compact call potential makes all West Slope watersheds at risk if new Colorado River supplies are developed, regardless of diversion points. • There is general agreement that there is Colorado River water available and some is needed to meet the East Slope gap. The issue is not "if," but rather "how, when, and where."
• Conservation shared commonalities with new supply: we need to move from planning to action to prevent the window of opportunity from closing. • Uncertainty inside and outside of the Portfolio Tool means that risk management and adaptive management need to be discussed and addressed.
• Economic feasibility is the driver; we need to explore who bears the financial costs and what the existing opportunities are (e.g., storage). • Interconnectedness requires us to look at implementing risk management triggers.
• Basins should try to harmonize their consistency with assumptions made for portfolios scenarios. • The success of Identified Projects and Processes (IPPs) should be evaluated based on their ability to address the gap (i.e., affect the new supply discussion).

PART TWO:
TABLE DISCUSSIONS ON IMPLMENTATION

Discussion Session 1

During this session, table groups were organized by specific topic areas: 1) risk management, 2) storage, and 3) nonconsumptive needs. The groups discussed a series of topic-focused questions, specifically regarding implementation of the roundtable portfolios. The topic-specific discussion questions and key discussion points from each table group are outlined below.

Discussion Questions: Risk Management

1) What other risk management tools should be explored?
2) Would including risk management strategies change your roundtable's portfolios? If so, how?

Discussion Questions: Storage

1) Will storage be necessary to implement your portfolio? What types of storage do you think will be most successful in the future and should be evaluated? What barriers need to be overcome to implement storage projects in Colorado?
2) Does your basin have enough storage to implement the different parts of the portfolio(s)?
3) Does what you've learned confirm your roundtable's portfolios or do you think you need to make changes? If so, what changes?

Discussion Questions: Nonconsumptive

1) Using the decision tree diagram, how do you think basins can best plan to protect the nonconsumptive areas they each identified as most important in their NCNA?
2) What challenges do roundtables face to implement nonconsumptive IPPs consistent with the priority basins and reaches identified in their NCNA in the near term? What help do the roundtables need to overcome these challenges?
3) Does what you've learned confirm your roundtable's portfolios or do you think you need to make changes? If so, what changes?

2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit
Appendix A: Summary of Table Group Key Discussion Points

Discussion Key Points

From their discussions, each table group identified the two most critical aspects of their conversation to share with the CWCB, IBCC, and other roundtable members. These key points are outlined below:

Risk Management
• We need to share the risk with the lower basin and consider what the incentive is for them to share it. • We need to develop a Compact management plan within the upper basin, between East and West Slopes, to avoid a Compact call (i.e., live within our means in the upper and lower basins).
• There is risk in doing too little. There is risk in doing too much. We need to assume an acceptable level of risk and plan for the consequences. • Hedging reduces risk; storage is hedging and is needed across the state.
• We need more modeling to include triggers and additional storage. • There is a need to cooperate with upper basin states for risk management strategies to include intentional surplus in Lake Powell and/or other locations in Colorado.
• Risk management as a methodology to address Colorado River Compact compliance should be broadened to include: water quality, conservation, land use, growth, groundwater, climate change, and practices of other states. • We need to identify and quantify measurable triggers, metrics, and responses thereto that preserve the values we are trying to protect.
• Risk management is more than just management of the Colorado River. We have to look at all the basins to protect existing rights while developing new supply. • There is a need to recognize that there is a rainbow of different risks and externalities. It is not just water.
• Risk management should definitely be included in the roundtable portfolios and is a prerequisite to allowing any additional development. • It is essential to have risk management strategies in place to identify the "sweet spot" of avoiding curtailment and not leaving water on the table for lower basin use.
• We do not support a do-nothing approach and having the prior appropriation system work to manage risk. We must manage to avoid the possibility of curtailment. • We need to formalize a risk management strategy to avoid curtailment.
• We need to facilitate new storage development using support from the state level. • There is a need to define triggers to support proactive water management options in advance of administrative requirements.
• Storage is a key component to risk management for all needs, and a thoughtful look at storage to benefit different needs is important. • Costs (current and future), available funding, understanding the future costs of delaying funding, and action on risk management are important.
• The question about what else we should explore is premature because we do not fully understand existing capabilities (i.e., measuring and monitoring). • Adding risk management would change the basin roundtable outcomes, but the Portfolio Tool is not the mechanism to explore all the elements that must be considered to inform decision making (i.e., cost).
• We should explore shared shortage agreements through a shared vision planning process (assisting with permitting and joint strategizing on mitigation). • We need to identify wet-water alternatives in advance to address potential Compact calls and other risks. • Without robust and inclusive risk management strategies, there should not be any new depletive projects. Strategies could include: o Severe water conservation triggers o Ground water recharge o East Slope storage for protection against a Compact call

2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit
Appendix A: Summary of Table Group Key Discussion Points

Storage
• Storage is of vital importance to all basins. Gaining multi-sector support for expansion and rehabilitation of existing facilities is an essential first step. • Each roundtable should identify a storage project within its basin, focused on expansion or rehabilitation that encourages multi-sector cooperation, addresses multiple uses, and serves as an example for future projects within the basin.
• New storage is needed, and partnering with non-traditional groups is critical. • Finding consensus through collaboration is difficult but important.
• Storage is of vital importance to all basins. • Gaining multi-sector support for expansion and rehabilitation of existing facilities as a vital first step. • Each RT should identify a project with conjunctive uses to serve as an example for future projects.
• We need more roundtable-to-roundtable discussions on storage needs. • We need to work to streamline the regulation process.
• We need to add a rigorous study of storage to SWSI 2016 (e.g., regional needs for the basins) and use processes like those currently used. • We need to create a matrix of priorities for beneficial use of stored water and then apply evaluation criteria. • We need to identify institutional barriers, permit simplification opportunities, instances of too much duplicate or resource commitment, legal barriers, and governance barriers or issues.
We need to have the ability to manage water using storage to maximize efficiencies and beneficial use.
• Storage is needed for all portfolios to meet both consumptive and nonconsumptive needs. • We need to actively pursue rehabilitation/expansion of existing storage facilities such as the Preferred Storage Option Plan (PSOP) and Chatfield.
• We need storage! We need to find a way to get past the barriers: o It takes decades to develop. o There are massive hurdles. o We need priorities for use of stored water. o The West Slope needs others to share in the Compact risk. o We should implement strict conservation and require that all transferred water is used to extinction. • We need to take specific new and existing storage projects and start working on them.
Nonconsumptive Needs
• The federal government is a complex component in nonconsumptive use and it is hard to control. • There is a lack of legislation and flexibility with nonconsumptive uses. Entities that have water rights should be able to divert water from the stream without going through the State instream flow process.
• It is difficult to identify nonconsumptive project "applicants." There are not always project sponsors identified to put these nonconsumptive types of projects forward. Who "owns" the problem is not obvious. "Everyone's problem equals no one's problem." • We must better quantify the environmental and recreational impacts at the same level of detail as consumptive project impacts on agriculture. • We need to better quantify environmental tipping points with any given project, whether IPP, agriculture, or nonconsumptive. • Adaptive management should be a component of nonconsumptive projects.
• Nonconsumptive metrics need to be included into the Portfolio Tool in a serious and meaningful way. • Need quantification of nonconsumptive uses is critical. • The decision tree should be modified to add additional actions. • Nonconsumptive uses have downstream benefits.

Nonconsumptive Needs, continued
• Large transbasin projects should not be approved without meeting quantified satisfied nonconsumptive components. • We need to quantify nonconsumptive impacts with good science and economic data and analysis. • There is a need for a minimum set of credible nonconsumptive needs and impacts of a given change/project. • There is a need for uniformity in criteria.
• We need uniformity in nonconsumptive needs identification, quantification, and prioritization. • We need basin-specific economic value data for nonconsumptive uses and to establish linkages to quality of life and local economic bases.

• We need to quantify nonconsumptive needs to ensure adequate consideration of nonconsumptive needs in the Portfolio Tool.
• There are two challenges:
  o Finding sufficient funding sources for nonconsumptive projects
  o Limited resources available for (nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)) to compete for WSRA grants
• The State should simplify WSRA application and provide more staff support.

• CWCB needs to listen more:
  o More field time is needed.
  o We need to learn what the local priorities are.
  o We need to spend more time with local water users.
  o We should become partners rather than adversaries.
• We cannot get nonconsumptive projects without proponents.
  o We need to get information out to local users to generate interest.
  o Quality of projects is as important as quantity.
• We need greater parity between nonconsumptive and consumptive portfolios and projects.
• Nonconsumptive proponents cannot get a seat at the table (roundtable and otherwise).

• The decision tree is "customizable" and should be used as such, with diverse users in the region, areas, etc. • The Instream Flow Program is quite mature. It can act as a CWCB "champion" for nonconsumptive needs to better liaise between government entities and sustain their efforts.
• We need to recognize commonalities between agricultural and environmental needs in order to keep agriculture in business and emphasize conservation in cities. • Rather than focus on infrastructure to meet nonconsumptive needs, we need to creatively address needs with existing infrastructure. Do not be afraid of changing how we do things.
• We need to raise the status and importance of nonconsumptive needs to the level of municipal needs and agriculture. We could request that RTs use the tree to identify IPP opportunities and barriers for focus areas. • More nonconsumptive local leadership is needed, as are funding mechanisms and legal mandates on water providers to protect nonconsumptive needs.
• The roundtable process has built trust and dialogue across consumptive and nonconsumptive communities. It is time to take that message and the shared priorities to other users and stakeholders. • Roundtables can reevaluate their IPPs based on multi-purpose principles and criteria in order to increase support and success of future projects.
• The nonconsumptive needs assessments should move in a direction parallel to "the gap." Funding is more likely when a problem is quantified. • We should recognize the commonalities between agriculture and the environment; we should emphasize conservation in cities. • Rather than focus on infrastructure to meet nonconsumptive needs, we should creatively address needs with existing infrastructure. We should not be afraid of changing how we do things.

2012 Statewide Roundtable Summit
Appendix A: Summary of Table Group Key Discussion Points

Discussion Session 2

During this session, table groups organized by specific topic areas: 1) new supply, 2) conservation and reuse, and 3) alternative transfer methods (ATMs). The groups discussed a series of topic-focused questions, specifically regarding implementation of the roundtable portfolios. The topic-specific discussion questions and key discussion points from each table group are outlined below.

Discussion Questions: New Supply

1) How can Colorado River water be used to address the 2050 demands from SWSI? These demands are: West Slope demands, oil shale, Front Range demands, nonconsumptive needs, increased agriculture in the Yampa Basin, increased power generation, etc.
2) Given the competing future demands for Colorado River water, what additional activities need to take place to better analyze how we should all use Colorado River water to meet those demands? (E.g., planning, analysis, engineering, costing, identification and understanding of issues that need to be addressed, stakeholder discussions, studying compensatory storage for a transbasin project, comparative project evaluation, etc.)
3) What do we do now and what do we preserve for the future?
4) Does what you've learned confirm your roundtable's portfolios or do you think you need to make changes? If so, what changes?

Discussion Questions: Conservation and Reuse

1) Referring to the conservation table, what conservation practices should be moved forward across the range of portfolios?
2) Beyond the work of the water providers, what work can the roundtables do to support implementing conservation?
3) What types of monitoring can be put in place to determine progress toward achieving conservation levels?
4) Does what you've learned confirm your roundtable's portfolios or do you think you need to make changes? If so, what changes?

Discussion Key Points

From their discussions, each table group identified the two most critical aspects of their conversation to share with the CWCB, IBCC, and other roundtable members. These key points are outlined below:

New Supply
• It is necessary to develop all of the water to which we are entitled under the Colorado River Compact, but sources of new supply should not be limited to the Colorado River system. • We need to seek to implement a project(s) to develop Colorado River water in stages so as to appease multiple viewpoints and obligations.
Developing any new supply is likely to be very hard and fraught with obstacles, but overcoming (lessening) uncertainty regarding the risk of curtailment by developing monitoring and trigger points that would enact activities to avoid curtailment would help gather support that may be necessary to get new supply ultimately developed.
• Additional activities need to include efforts regarding Compact curtailment, nonconsumptive needs, economic impacts, and infrastructure needs, and a decision matrix needs to be developed. • What we need to do now is gain more information and have more dialogues. What we need to do in the future is look into a Missouri River transfer.
• Storage is the sum of risk management, new supply, building smaller reservoirs, and creating more, smaller reservoir rehabilitation. • There is a need to get environmental groups to the table, more public education, possible changes in current laws, and "term sheets" between East Slope and West Slope. "Term sheets" would lay out the terms for how to compare competing issues (e.g., from agriculture, environment, recreation, industry, municipal interests) and set priorities.

New Supply, continued
• There is a need to use market-based decisions tempered by risk management strategies to balance statewide needs and maintain viable economies. • There is a need to implement unique basin solutions through increased education/understanding and creative cross-basin dialogues and negotiations to support both local and statewide solutions.
• Storage solutions (with quicker turnaround and smaller scope and extent) should be examined on the South Platte to capture "extra" water flowing past state lines (e.g., maybe underground storage). Consider learning-by-doing demonstrations. Could something like this be supported at the State level (through their leadership)? This would take pressure off the Colorado River and benefit Front Range M&I providers (who owns/administers those storage systems?). There is a need for a workable exchange system. • The mindset is too often that new supply needs a big project. We need to think in terms of a two-track approach with smaller projects that can happen in do-able, short timeframes (e.g., Wolford Mountain). • Compensatory storage! (Where, however do we get capacity to move water transmountain?)
New supply must be developed in a fair, balanced, and equal way to satisfy multiple uses and needs on both the West Slope and East Slope, and must be predicated on realistic risk management strategies.
• Developing a new supply can take 20-50 years, and therefore we need to start planning now for 2050 and move forward as soon as possible. • Yes, Colorado River water should be used to meet 2050 demands. It should be done in a way that considers the needs of different interests, shares the benefits in times of abundant water, and shares shortages during drought. • Saving agricultural use and culture will require water from other sources including transbasin diversions.
• We need appropriate permitting processes to enable innovative storage projects with multiple benefits, to include surface closed aquifer, alluvial aquifer recharge, and terminal storage for new supply. • We need to develop leadership at local, regional, and state levels to drive the process.
Conservation and Reuse
• We need public education, face-to-face and hands on, and we need to begin early (i.e., pre-school). • We need to address conservation rate structures and model land use plans, and lead by example (i.e., through the roundtable process).
• As applicable, all conservation practices should be moved forward as soon as possible. • There is a need to integrate land use planning, as appropriate through regulations, and water planning.
• There is a need to create statewide conservation standards and communal expectations. This will make it easier for everyone to measure what they are doing. • There is a need to continue education and marketing of conservation best practices.
• Conservation should be pursued to the maximum extent possible. • We need to develop legal and economic mechanisms that enable the use of conserved water to benefit of the entity or individual conserving the water.
• There is a need to develop implementation strategies and share successes and results across RTs and seek WSRA grants for implementation of best management practices at the local level. • We need to address the role of statewide versus local implementation.
• We need funding assistance – use grants/WSRA to fund/advance conservation and reuse projects/etc. • There is a need to support legislation with a concerted effort in outreach and education – part of the process toward legislation – to reach more people and entities.
• We must incorporate land use controls into conservation. • We need information sharing on what does work and communicate it across basins.
Alternative Transfer Methods
• In order to incentivize ATMs, we need to develop a common technical platform useable by all parties to reduce transaction costs, including the development of additional storage with the State taking a more active role. • The transaction has to take into account the financial viability of leaser and leasee to avoid unintended and cumulative adverse consequences.

Alternative Transfer Methods, continued
• Alternatives to agricultural transfers have a lot of merit and potential. They continue to be pursued. It may not be the natural leg of the stool but nonconsumptive transfers can also happen. • There are a lot of unique versions of alternative agricultural transfers depending on the location of the agricultural and city needs; there are a lot of different things that will work in different places.
• The IBCC needs to look at deficit irrigation or low-water-consuming crops in addition to other ATMs to move consumptive use water to a city. • The IBCC needs to evaluate the "conservation easement" concept and if it can work under an ATM.
• We suggest taking the lessons learned from all these ATM studies and experiences out to other basins to discuss more effectively with each other. • We suggest an emphasis on continued evaluation of ATM barriers and solutions; many are being explored and we must continue to chip away at these issues. • ATMs are in their infancy in Colorado, and we do not have enough studies completed to make permanent decisions.
• ATMs are most viable on a sub-region or regional basis in order to understand economics and third-party impacts. • ATMs dry up agricultural land – don't pretend otherwise. • The cost of water is likely to change significantly. • There are prior appropriation doctrine and property rights constraints. Accounting for return flows is a major constraint to implementation. Current state statute does not clarify quantification or accounting for return flows. • We need to move from theory to practice, and we must address the business deal. • There is still too much risk to take a deal to Water Court until there are some statutory clarifications that provide certainty.
We have questions about the appropriate scale of fallowing: many small pieces versus larger blocks? What are the tipping points? What are the unintended consequences and externalities?
• We need to move from theory to practices with all partners at the table to address externalities and legal components. • To make ATMs viable, there is a need to consider them at the regional/sub-regional level to understand all the economic and efficiency tradeoffs.
• Roundtables need to revisit agricultural dry-up; there is a need to balance agricultural dry-up/ATMs with efforts to maintain agricultural production efficiency (agriculture-to-market opportunities). • Agricultural dry-up/ATM is easy; infrastructure is hard.
Permanency and location are critical issues; we are so far unconvinced that ATMs are a viable strategy, but it is still early and there is a need to keep exploring this. Innovation may solve this.
• ATMs have a lot of potential and continue to be pursued for both consumptive and nonconsumptive needs. • There are many different and unique versions of ATMs depending on the location – agriculture and city needs are different. Different things will work in different places.
• We have concerns about local economies directly tied to the agriculture industry as it relates to quality of life and the "tipping point" (connections with tourism, jobs, etc.). • We suggest integrating the various solutions to meeting the water supply needs, including ATMs, and moving them forward as one "stool."
• We suggest simplification of the agriculture water transfer systems (temporary transfers) to give more flexibility to the process. • We should look at presumptive consumptive use.