Demand Management Workgroups – Inter Basin Compact Committee (IBCC) Meeting
Thursday, March 5, 2020
Sheraton Hotel
360 Union Blvd, Lakewood, CO 80228
Meeting Summary-DRAFT

OPENING REMARKS

Becky Mitchell, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) Director, gave opening remarks to the meeting. Her comments are summarized below.

- Becky Mitchell welcomed everyone to today's meeting and thanked everyone for volunteering their time to be at the meeting.
- The ongoing discussion among the demand management workgroups is to determine the feasibility of a demand management program and what a demand management program could entail. These questions are difficult to answer, but it is important for the demand management workgroups to come together to figure out how to protect Colorado moving forward.

INTERBASIN COMPACT COMMITTEE (IBCC) OVERVIEW

Russ George, Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC) Director of Compact Negotiations, gave an overview of the IBCC. His comments are summarized below.

- Colorado has recognized that the Colorado River faces significant challenges and that Coloradoans need to be smart on how they plan for a water shortage on the River. The CWCB took on the task to start building solutions and invited people across the state to participate in the demand management workgroups. People have risen to the occasion and began to work together to identify potential solutions.
- The IBCC wanted to support the demand management workgroups as there are many people who are both a part of the IBCC and the workgroups. There was a meeting of the IBCC yesterday on March 4 during which they discussed elements of a demand management program. The IBCC decided early that they wanted to answer what an equitable or fair demand management program could look like. Because the IBCC serves as the main statewide connector for the basin roundtables and there is a diverse set of interests represented on the IBCC, they were in a good position to discuss fairness in a demand management program.
- It is not possible to talk about fairness until there is recognition that there is a lack of trust in developing a demand management program. Some of the mistrust is historic, but there is a willingness to trust as the IBCC comes together to listen to each other in open and candid conversation to determine what each person needs to make a demand management program fair.
- Kevin Rein, State Engineer of the Division of Water Resources, presented on Compact Administration on the March 4 IBCC meeting. The State Engineer's Office has accepted the complexity of the Colorado River Compact Call and is taking a thoughtful approach to address it. The State Engineer's Office has the best data and team to analyze the data. There are large problems facing the Colorado River, but the State Engineer's Office believes they have the time to develop a serious understanding of the problem to make smart and informed decisions if and when a Compact Call is issued.
- Through today's meeting, participants should ask themselves if they are making the situation more complex than it needs to be. The Colorado River situation is very complex, but there will come a point where they need to understand what hard choices need to be made and who can make those choices.

OTHER PROJECT UPDATES
Greg Johnson, CWCB Interstate, Federal, and Water Information Section Chief, gave updates on the Upper Colorado River alternative transfer method (ATM) pilot program, CWCB's weather modification program, and the demand management feasibility study. His comments are summarized below.

- The ATM pilot project on the Upper Colorado River is supported by the Colorado Basin Roundtable and the Agricultural Impact demand management workgroup. The project is going to look at the ecological and economic impacts of conserved consumptive use on high altitude agriculture. Dr. Perry Cabot of Colorado State University is helping to lead the studies. The CWCB Board will decide on whether to award the project funding on March 11.
- The CWCB has a weather modification program, which they have been implementing for the past decade. They continue to increase the number of projects under the program.
- The request for proposal for the demand management feasibility study has been awarded.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT POLLING
Meeting participants were asked several polling questions. The questions and results from the polls are detailed below.

1. How clear do you feel the definition of Demand Management is (temporary, voluntary, compensated)?

Response	*Percentage of Responses*
Not confusing at all – no need to keep repeating them	18%
Not confusing but there are some gray areas	44%
Somewhat confusing – please refine	33%
Really confusing – find new words	5%

2. I think:

Response	*Percentage of Responses*
A demand management program could be helpful if done correctly	66%
A demand management program might be a good idea, but I need to know more	29%
We should NOT have a demand management program at all	4%

3. Which one of these statements have you heard before?

Response	*Percentage of Responses*
"There's a target on west slope Ag"	32%
"The state already has a demand management program figured out"	5%
"A voluntary program is a set-up to make a permanent program"	5%
All of the above	54%
None of the above, but I've heard worse	5%

DEMAND MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP PROGRESS UPDATE

Amy Ostdiek, Federal, Interstate, and Water Information Section Deputy Chief, and Russ Sands, CWCB Water Supply Planning Section Chief, provided an update on the demand management workgroups. Their comments are summarized below.

- CWCB staff received feedback from the workgroups that they wanted to meet and talk to each other, so one purpose of today's meeting is to give workgroups that opportunity
- Workgroups have requested that there be more structure to their discussions. One of the challenges with structuring the discussion is that there is a lot of uncertainty with whether there will be a demand management program and what it potentially could look like. The workgroups have framed uncertainties in many ways.
- Another challenge in the workgroups is developing and using a common language that everyone understands, particularly in defining the word "equity."
- Workgroups are also saying that they do not want to move through the process too quickly. The workgroups will not be making decisions at today's meeting, but they will be exploring various uncertainties and values.
- Workgroups have shared the feedback that they would like to have a strawman or scenarios to vet and facilitate their thinking and discussion.
- The Funding workgroup has outlined several factors that influence the need of a demand management program; the demand management need is a function of the volume of water requested, the costs that will be necessary, and the time needed to collect funding. It is difficult to analyze these different factors when there are so many uncertainties.
- Workgroups also have provided feedback that they want parameters, to know what other workgroups are doing, to be clear that demand management is not a foregone conclusion, and to discuss a range of alternate options.
- There are seven identified uncertainties that are out of the control of the workgroups:
    - Whether the Upper Basin states agree to a demand management program
    - The storage pool targets in kilo acre feet (kAF) (i.e., what are the target water goals and what options are available to reach those goals while incorporating loss from evaporation and transpiration?)
    - Cost of effort (i.e., varying costs of an acre-foot of water, programmatic costs, etc.)
    - Number of participants (i.e., how many people would be involved)
    - Acute or chronic (i.e., is the need for water going to be over a long period time or immediate)
    - Storage options
    - Years (i.e., how much time is there to build up funding for a program)
- CWCB staff continue to refine this list of uncertainties, but they want to explore uncertainties with the demand management workgroups. Other potential uncertainties include population growth, climate change, and the amount of tax revenue available.
- In evaluating what is feasible for a demand management program, it is important to understand and summarize workgroup ideas to allow the demand management workgroups to explore a range of potential futures that consider various uncertainties, potential actions, and what works best for Colorado. Additionally, better understanding key workgroup issues may help uncover self-identified workgroup priorities, how different workgroup ideas impact the ideas of another workgroup, and what data and research are needed to help workgroups prioritize action.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

David Groves, Rand Corporation, presented on a framework to help analyze a potential demand management program. His comments are summarized below.

- Good water resources planning accounts for a wide range of viewpoints. Demand management could be a tool to help Colorado remain in compliance with the Colorado River Compact, but there are remaining questions about impacts, distribution of impacts, and fairness that must be answered.
- To organize thinking around demand management, it is helpful to categorize different viewpoints. The first category is related to uncertainties (i.e., what are the conditions that are outside of control, such as population growth, regulatory conditions, etc.). Some uncertainties include the amount of water needed under a Compact Call, the cost of conservation incentives, and participation rates and patterns.
- The second category is related to values (i.e., what is important to individuals and their communities). Some values include impact to communities, ecosystem effects, and fairness and equity.
- The third category can be thought of as potential actions (i.e., the desired outcomes and goals of a program). The third category considers what can be done and what is feasible. Possible actions could include keeping things as they are or the different design elements of a demand management program (e.g., participation, timing of implementation, etc.).
- This framework of uncertainty, values, and possible actions can be used to help define what assumptions must hold for a demand management strategy to be successful. Identifying key uncertainties and discussing how important they are can help the demand management workgroups define which uncertainties are really salient and which are less so.
- There are different needs and requirements of different communities in Colorado with respect to water. It is important to incorporate all those perspectives and values to evaluate the details of a demand management program.
- The demand management workgroups will discuss uncertainties and values at today's meeting. The information from the exercise will help to develop a range of scenarios to account for a variety of future conditions and to incorporate individual and community values into the design process.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP INDIVIDUAL BREAKOUT SESSIONS

The demand management workgroups broke into individual sessions during which each workgroup discussed and listed their uncertainties and values. They then prioritized which values and uncertainties were most important to them using dots. The list of uncertainties and values and the prioritization results from the individual breakout session dot exercise can be found at the end of this summary. Each workgroup reported out to the full group on their individual workgroup breakout discussions. Their comments are summarized below.

Note: The Agricultural Impact, Monitoring and Verification, and Education and Outreach workgroups provided additional notes on chart paper for their individual breakout discussions, which are recorded below.

Agricultural Impact Workgroup

- The individual session represented the third meeting of the Agricultural Impact workgroup. The workgroup is getting better focused while discussing a wide range of issues.
- The workgroup discussed the concept of equity and how the idea of equity changes depending on the person.
- Another discussion point was that a voluntary, compensated, and temporary program needs to be truly voluntary, not a coerced type of voluntary. They also discussed the financial

obligation that would be required to compensate people who voluntarily commit and participate in a demand management program.

- The term "demand management" seems to be appropriate for the most part, but other terms, like "shared responsibility," may be useful as well. It is important to continue to define and think through terms, like "fairness."
- There needs to be a conversation about the value of the water committed to a demand management program. There were concerns in the Agricultural Impact workgroup that a demand management program would incentivize agricultural producers to participate, which would impact the financial wellbeing of local and regional communities depending on how much water was contributed to the program.

Agricultural Impact Workgroup Additional Notes

- A Demand Management program should:
    - Build off the ideas of voluntary, compensated, and temporary
    - Message to non-agriculture users with information on who, how much, when, and why
    - Ensure continuity and avoid disruption
    - Be compared to an insurance policy
    - Prevent adverse impacts to agriculture and the community
    - Define renter/owner
    - Clarify how much water is needed and the size of impact
    - Consider the opportunity to change the name (e.g., statewide obligation conversation)
    - Leverage the opportunity to upgrade infrastructure
    - Involve intrabasin sharing on a fair/equitable basis
    - Support long-term agricultural viability and avoid separating water from land
    - Provide positive opportunities to work together
    - Involve the free market to facilitate voluntary and compensated choices
    - Emphasize shared responsibility
    - Ensure impact and opportunity are equitable
    - Recognize that equal is not the same thing as fair
    - Consider equity to payors to support values (i.e., how much money is added and to whom and where is subsidization being directed)
    - Involve compensation to owners (e.g., municipal, industry, farmer, etc.)
    - Consider differential pricing
    - Incorporate proportionality
    - Incorporate environmental values
    - Answer the question "what are we willing to pay for?"

Funding Workgroup

- The task of the Funding workgroup is to find the money to pay for a demand management program that the other groups help define.
- One question on which the workgroup is focused is how much money do they need to raise? This question is answerable, and the answer will affect what demand management options are available.
- Another question they are trying to answer is for what does any raised funds need to pay? There are potential administrative and staffing costs, monitoring costs, and infrastructure costs. However, the funding for a demand management program may also just pay for the water that goes to Lake Powell.

- The timeline for how water is delivered under a demand management program would influence funding needs. For example, funding needs would be different if a demand management program seeks to store 250,00 acre feet by 2022 or if it would seek to provide flow on an annual basis.
- The Funding workgroup is trying to balance the risk of having multiple funding sources versus one funding source. This could mean having downstream states contribute funding to make sure a demand management program is successful.

Law and Policy Workgroup

- Every workgroup will require a legal discussion. The task of the Law and Policy workgroup is to set up the framework to help other workgroups think about the legal issues. The workgroup is seeking to identify the legal and policy questions rather than define the exact policy.
- The Law and Policy workgroup is developing questions to help identify the legal and policy threshold issues that the CWCB Board needs to understand and evaluate to make decisions.
- The Law and Policy workgroup is also seeking to provide a definition of key terms of any demand management policy agreement to ensure there is a defined common language. There does not have to be a consensus agreement on the exact definition of the terms, but there should be clarity regarding what terms are being used.

Monitoring and Verification Workgroup

- The Monitoring and Verification workgroup discussed developing a streamlined process for monitoring and identifying who participates in any demand management programs. Streamlining the monitoring and verification process should occur outside of water court to increase flexibility.
- The degree of monitoring and verification that is needed depends on the water rights that are being used, the amount of funding available, and how accurate the monitoring needs to be.
- Transparency and honesty in a monitoring program is important. Any monitoring program needs to credible to downstream users and standardized across communities.

Monitoring and Verification Workgroup Additional Notes

- A demand management program should:
    - Develop sideboards for the types of projects
    - Identify funding for monitoring and verification
    - Determine protections for other water users
    - Define "temporary" by potentially limiting the number of years
    - Consider the legality and mechanisms for demand management use of conserved consumptive use
    - Determine the acceptable level of accuracy for monitoring and verification

Environmental Considerations Workgroup

- The premise of having a demand management program is important because when the hydrology is bad, the environment will suffer. Doing nothing is not an acceptable option.
- The environment is an indirect beneficiary or harmed entity of a demand management program.
- In a programmatic structure, there should be to criteria to evaluate two factors of demand management projects: 1) environmental compliance and 2) net environmental benefits. The criteria should incentivize projects that have a net environmental benefit. It is easier to

evaluate projects in a stable chronic Compact Call situation, and much more difficult to evaluate them in an acute Compact Call situation.
- The goal is to have all projects in a demand management program have a net environmental benefit that is community and site-specific.
- Having criteria to evaluate projects assumes that there would be many participants who would be applying to the program across different areas. Any demand management program would need to have robust participation.

Water Rights Administration and Accounting Workgroup

- The Water Rights Administration and Accounting workgroup focused their conversation on uncertainties.
- The overarching theme of their discussion was that there are outstanding policy questions that they do not have the authority to answer; the State Legislature or CWCB have more authority to answer the questions. There is uncertainty about how to answer or request answers to their questions.
- The process for managing water rights under a demand management program has to be nimble and probably not driven by water court.
- It is critically important that there are no water right injuries as a result of changes to the return flow regime due to any water right exchanges.

Economic Considerations and Local Government Workgroup

- The Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup discussed shifting the paradigm of how to evaluate a demand management program by looking at the benefits of a program instead of the impacts. Their goal is to ensure that a program maintains or benefits state and local economies, including the recreation and tourism economy.
- There should be a collaborative analysis of cumulative economic benefits between the CWCB and local governments.
- The CWCB already has experience in managing instream flow programs and grant and loan programs. A demand management program should build on the programmatic structure that CWCB already has in place.
- The language that is being used may be overcomplicating the situation. Instead of "demand management," the discussion should be about "water leasing," which is a common term with which people are familiar. Instead of "shepherding," they should use "administration of water rights."

Education and Outreach Workgroup

- The Education and Outreach workgroup discussed how to frame a demand management program that still needs to be defined. The tone and framing of any demand management program message may change depending on the stage of development of the program. The messaging of the program can be built as the program itself is being built.
- There will need to be differing messages with different details for different audiences.
- The workgroup discussed that they are uncertain about what their role is in the process and what they can do to best support their colleagues and other workgroups.
- Some of the values that the workgroup discussed included empowerment and inclusivity and developing a clear message that is also positive and supportive.

Education and Outreach Workgroup Additional Notes

- The communications frame should consider climate change, terms for the general public, and how to define/develop messages.

- It is important to communicate the differences between the ongoing investigation and the plan for the demand management.
- Other factors (e.g., drought, snowpack, etc.) impact demand management messaging in the short term.
- One message is that demand management is a tool in the toolbox to prepare for an emergency and that there is a cost of doing nothing.
- Terms about demand management are important ("emergency" and "crisis" versus water management tool).
- There is an opportunity for the state to show solid foresight for future needs, which falls under a "proactive" frame.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP JOINT BREAKOUT SESSIONS [START HERE]
Following their individual sessions, demand management workgroups participated in two sessions in which they met with one other workgroup. A representative from each workgroup reported on their joint discussions to the full workgroup. Their comments are summarized below.

Education and Outreach Workgroup

- The Education and Outreach workgroup met with the Agricultural Impact and Environmental Considerations workgroups.
- From the discussions, there are concerns that the Education and Outreach workgroup could be doing more to support the other workgroups. The Education and Outreach workgroup did not know what their role was, but the joint discussions have motivated them to better define their role and deliver a concrete plan for their workgroup.

Agricultural Impact Workgroup

- The Agricultural Impact workgroup met with the Education and Outreach and Monitoring and Verification workgroups.
- The Agricultural Impact workgroup appreciated the cautiousness of the Education and Outreach workgroup who were making sure they were taking the right actions at the right time.
- There is an educational process that needs to happen in the agricultural community to understand demand management and the idea of "voluntariness." Having a "one message fit all" approach might not be successful at spreading information to the general public.
- One way to change the conversation is to use the term "food production" instead of "agriculture" to emphasize the message that farmers are in the food production business and changes in agriculture affect what people eat and drink and where they recreate.
- The Agricultural Impact workgroup and Monitoring and Verification workgroup had a lot in common. Monitoring is important to the agricultural community.
- The Monitoring and Verification workgroup wants to streamline the process for monitoring. There are projects across the state than can be used as examples to help inform monitoring and verification practices.
- Differences in elevation and water quantities that come from high mountain meadows versus lower elevations is an important variable to understand for both the Monitoring and Verification and Agricultural Impact workgroups.

Funding Workgroup

- The Funding workgroup met with the Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup and the Law and Policy workgroup.

- The Funding workgroup and the Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup discussed the importance of accounting for the full cost of the program. These costs include the value of the water itself and administrative costs (e.g., staff capacity, monitoring, analysis, etc.). The workgroups discussed whether there is a role for local groups (conservancy districts, community organizations, etc.) to play in administration.
- The task of the Law and Policy workgroup is not to define the law but to ask the questions that will guide the development of law and policy. The Funding workgroup gave them questions to consider.

Monitoring and Verification Workgroup

- The Monitoring and Verification workgroup met with the Agricultural Impact workgroup and with the Water Rights Administration and Accounting workgroup.
- The Monitoring and Verification workgroup interests aligned with the Agricultural Impact workgroup interests. They both want to consider who participates and how they evaluate participation. They also want flexibility to monitor and verify projects to make sure they are delivering accurate results at the right costs.
- With the Water Rights Administration and Accounting workgroup, the Monitoring and Verification workgroup discussed how to look at the larger basin for monitoring. So far, the Monitoring and Verification workgroup has been discussing projects at the "farm and head gate" level and have not expanded their scope basin-wide. There are questions on how to evaluate changes in return flows, especially if demand management projects are temporary.

Environmental Considerations Workgroup

- The Environmental Considerations workgroup met with the Economic Considerations and Local Government and Education and Outreach workgroups.
- With the Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup, they discussed how to develop program criteria to protect communities and the environment. They also discussed the importance of messaging and how the term "demand management" has become more polarizing.
- With the Education and Outreach workgroup, they also discussed messaging. They discussed how to communicate to the public versus water right users and how to generate support to receive funding for any potential program.
- It is difficult to message a program that does not exist and when there is fear and misinformation circulating. One way to begin to message demand management is by relating it back to the Drought Contingency Plan and Colorado Water Plan.

Water Rights Administration and Accounting Workgroup

- The Water Rights Administration and Accounting workgroup met with the Law and Policy workgroup and Monitoring and Verification workgroup.
- The Water Rights Administration and Accounting workgroup and Law and Policy workgroup talked about one question: whether compact compliance is a beneficial use under the law? Having the Law and Policy workgroup define key terms will help provide a foundation for the Water Rights Administration and Accounting workgroup to discuss these types of questions.
- The Water Rights Administration and Accounting Workgroup and the Monitoring and Verification workgroup discussed how to measure return flows to avoid injury and whether there may be options for reservoirs to provide replacement flows.

Economic Considerations and Local Government Workgroup

- The Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup met with the Funding and the Environmental Considerations workgroups.
- With the Environmental Considerations workgroup, they discussed the challenges of developing a message, but agreed that it is not too late to lay the groundwork for basic messaging, such as relating demand management to an insurance policy or saying that a Compact Call would be bad.
- With the Funding workgroup, they discussed how to fund a voluntary, temporary, and compensated program. Although an individual's participation in a demand management program may be temporary, the demand management program itself is not temporary. If a program can start off well, then the program can go into a maintenance phase.
- Funding needs will be related to the timing of a Compact Call.
- Having a functioning demand management program will put Colorado in a good position during the round of negotiations.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP BREAKOUT SESSIONS - FULL GROUP DISCUSSION

Following the reports from the individual and joint workgroup breakout sessions, all meeting participants discussed key takeaways from the breakout sessions. Their comments are summarized below.

- Utah is considering passing a bill in their state legislature which would signal their intent to use their full entitlement. This legislation does not necessarily exclude Utah from participating in a demand management program.
- With the retirement of coal power plants in Colorado, there are questions about to where that water will go. The water rights can be transferred and exchanged if they are not claimed, including potentially to other states.
- The industry sector is missing from the discussion. The Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup have discussed incentivizing power plants downstream that use hydrological power to participate in a demand management program. The Economic Considerations and Local Government workgroup also has discussed the water rights of some of these retiring power plants and whether they could be used to address water deficits under the Colorado River Compact. It is important to involve industry in the discussion because in some counties, they may represent a significant portion of water use.
- Some workgroup members said that it may be time to start evaluating straw-man proposals (i.e., potential demand management program options) to begin to focus on some of the programmatic details. The Funding workgroup has already been engaged in a scenario planning exercise to evaluate funding in a suite of potential futures. Having straw-man proposals could allow workgroups to narrow their focus, provide clear direction, and test uncertainties.
- The full group was asked if there was anyone who did not feel ready to evaluate straw-man proposals. There were no objections.

FULL GROUP VALUE DOT EXERCISE

After individual workgroups listed and prioritized their values using dots during their individual breakout session, CWCB staff took the top three values prioritized by each workgroup and compiled them into one list. The full meeting group was given dots to prioritize the full list of top values. The top five values were statewide resilience, environmental impacts/benefits, agricultural viable, simplicity of monitoring and verification, and shared responsibility. The complete results from the full group value dot exercise can be found at the end of this summary.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT POLLING

Meeting participants were asked several polling questions. The questions and results from the polls are detailed below.

1. I feel this feasibility investigation is moving:

Response	*Percentage of Responses*
Too slow	57%
Too fast	4%
Just right	39%

2. How did you feel about the conversation today?

Response	*Percentage of Responses*
High value	55%
Somewhat valuable	33%
Marginally valuable	10%
Not valuable	2%

3. I would like to work with the feedback received relating to values and uncertainties of the workgroups to develop a framework for future discussion.

Response	*Percentage of Responses*
Yes definitely – we need it and I'd like to help refine the next steps	87%
I think so but want to hear more	12%
Not sure	1%
No. The concepts discussed today didn't resonate with me	0%

NEXT STEPS

- The list of the values and uncertainties that each workgroup identified will go to each workgroup's facilitators to continue their discussions.
- CWCB staff will take the uncertainties that the workgroups discussed at today's meeting to generate straw-man proposals and a framework to give workgroups more structure for their discussions.
- Meeting participants were thanked for their hard work during the day's meeting.

Colorado Water Conservation Board - Demand Management Workgroups
Dot Exercise Results
March 5, 2020

INDIVIDUAL WORKGROUP VALUE EXERCISE RESULTS

Funding Workgroup - Values	
Statewide resilience	*8*
Secure funding source / dedicated funding	*6*
Multiple funding sources	*5*
Equity – geographically	4
Equity – sector	3
Ability to pay	3
Agricultural Impact Workgroup -Values	
Ag viability/local	*26*
Shared responsibility	*14*
Voluntary (true sense)	*10*
Community sustainability / viability	9
Economic stability / regional / linkages	6
Free market	6
Wildlife habitat	5
Open space value / landscape / viewshed	1
Monitoring and Verification Workgroup – Important Issues	
Simplicity (14 total dots, divided among the following bulleted concepts): • *Useful role for research (CSU and others) (1 dot)* • *Physical measurement (wet water), but large expanse (aug stations and/or remote sensing) (8 dots)* • *Return flow replacement; simplified i.e. reservoir pool* • *Streamlined assumptions, balance of complexity/simplicity/conservativeness (No dots)*	*14*
Doable, scalable, simple (not full change case complexity; protect intra-state water users)	*7*
Multiple sectors	*6*
No need to reinvent the wheel (may consider new tech)	5
Standardization of process – pre- and post-project monitoring	5
Flexibility	4
Maximize pilots, but consider geography, ground water, etc.	1
Don't forget non-ag sectors	0
Monitoring and validation tools already exist	0
Education and Outreach Workgroup - Values	
Inclusive	*4*
Connectivity	*3*
Respect	*2*
Empowering	*2*
Consistency	1
Creativity	1
Clarity	0
Concise	0

Environmental Considerations Workgroup – Values	
Impacts	*17*
Location (east vs. west, specific locations)	*12*
Timing of impacts	*7*
Environmental compliance	6
Basin health	5
Equity	5
Flexibility	3
Biodiversity	2
Habitat (ESA and other)	1
Flows	1
Economic Considerations and Local Government Workgroup - Values	
Support/benefit local economy (includes environment and recreation)	*15*
Clear grant criteria (LEED example, ISF example)	*12*
Transparency	*8*
Anyone can participate (any water user)	7
Local/state collaboration	6
Managing owner/tenant issues (recognizing tenant concerns/impacts)	2
Administration and Accounting Workgroup – Values	
Not injurious	*13*
Mechanisms are not overly burdensome	*9*
Opportunity to store in non-CRSPA reservoirs	*7*
Minimize legal questions	*7*
Prevents federalization	5
Measurement rules	5
Details of administration (temporary compensated, evaporation, bypass, etc.)	3

INDIVIDUAL WORKGROUP UNCERTAINTY EXERCISE RESULTS

Funding Workgroup – Uncertainties	
Source of funding	*8*
Interim guidelines	*7*
Source of water	*5*
Proportionality	4
Available funding	3
Amount of water	2
Acute/chronic needs for funding	1
Storage options	0
Timeline to create water	0
Demand management/no demand management	0
Agricultural Impact Workgroup – Uncertainties	
Available funding	*19*
Caps on sector/acreage/basin	*10*
Unknown opportunities	*10*
Amount of demand management participants	8
Market maker – who is it?	8
Target water goal	7
Program criteria	7

Risk reduction	5
Acute or chronic	4
Year to reach total kilo acre feet	4
Reservoir storage options	2
Upper Basin agrees to demand management	0
Monitoring and Verification Workgroup – Uncertainties	
Allowable types of projects versus flexibility (side boards)	*12*
Acceptable uncertainty in monitoring and verification for other water users	*11*
Prediction versus verified conserved consumptive use	*8*
Accounting for municipal systems	6
Level of accuracy of monitoring and verification versus cost	5
Project practices, phase into more complicated?	4
Change in technology	4
Legal (RFO's, water rights)	3
Available money	1
Upper Basin agrees to demand management	0
Target water goal	0
Amount of demand management participants	0
Acute or chronic	0
Reservoir storage options	0
Year to reach total acre feet	0
Education and Outreach Workgroup – Uncertainties	
What is the frame?	*6*
Define terms for messaging "demand management" to make sense to the public	*4*
Demand management/no demand management	*3*
What is our process – ongoing versus after investigation?	*3*
Will public funding support?	1
Are there participants and a program structure?	0
Sell concept/open dialogue versus explanatory/awareness	0
Environmental Considerations Workgroup – Uncertainties	
Demand management program participation (i.e. who, how much, when)	*14*
Positive and negative impacts of demand management, locational	*9*
How would impacts be measured (e.g. loss of ag lands)	*9*
Incentives and effects	6
Acute/chronic	5
NT hydrology	3
Criteria for design	3
Who decides?	2
Unintended/unanticipated consequences	2
Timing of review	2
Money availability	1
Economic Considerations and Local Government Workgroup – Uncertainties	
Scale of administration – state or local (e.g. conservancy districts) or some level of local/district input that works with CWCB	*11*
Upper Basin agrees to demand management	*7*
Program speed (e.g. acute versus chronic program goals) to fill versus offset evaporation (fill fast then offset evaporation or fill more slowly)	*6*
Reservoir storage options	6

Available money	5
Acute or chronic (hydrologic needs)	3
Years to reach total kilo acre feet	3
Other state's contributions	3
Target water goal (kilo acre feet)	0
Amount of demand management participants	0
Administration and Accounting Workgroup – Uncertainties	
Is "compact compliance" a beneficial use? (i.e. store in priority, changed senior right, export? (37-81-101))	*22*
How can that "compact compliance" use be administered? (e.g., shepherding)	*14*
Where can demand management water be placed? Just CRSPA units? Others?	*11*
Can one entity acquire a compact compliance water right?	*6*
How s demand management water release allocated?	5
Number of structures; amount of water (<x acre feet)	2
Need to define compact compliance	0

FULL GROUP VALUE EXERCISE RESULTS

Full Group - Values	
Statewide resilience	*43*
Environmental impacts/benefits	*42*
Ag viability	*41*
Simplicity of Monitoring and Verification	*36*
Shared responsibility	*33*
Support/benefit to local economy	29
Non-injury	26
Legal clarity	24
Secure/dedicated funding source	17
Transparency	16
Do-ability and scalability	13
Connectivity (with the audience messaging)	9
Clear grant criteria	8
Voluntariness	7
Respect and empowerment	6
Inclusivity	5
Multiple funding sources	5
Non-burdensome	5
Location of impacts	3
Timing of impacts	1