



# Arkansas Basin Roundtable

PLANNING OUR  
WATER FUTURE

## Executive Committee Meeting Notes January 13, 2021 – GoToMeeting [www.arkansasbasin.com](http://www.arkansasbasin.com)

**Executive Committee Present:** Mark Shea – Chair; Mike Fink – Secretary; Paul Fanning, Al Tucker, Tim Canterbury, Jeris Danielson - IBCC, Sandy White- Past Chair; Russ Sands, Sam Stein-CWCB; Abigail Ortega- Needs Assessment Committee; Terry Scanga - IBCC, Bob Hamel – Vice Chair (Recreational and Environmental Committee); Brett Gracely and Wil Koger - Consultant; Greg Felt - CWCB Representative; Chris Wiseman, Amber Shanklin, Annie Berlemann, Matt Heimerich-Vice Chair, Carol Ekarius-ARWC

### **Call to order:**

Chairman Mark Shea called the meeting to order at 10:35 AM. Greetings and introductions were performed.

### **Minutes:**

Consensus approval for December 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

### **ARWC Board Meeting:**

- Executive Director Update- Carol would like to schedule a separate meeting with the Executive Committee in February to have a longer discussion about where ARWC is at, where ARWC is going, and hiring another Executive Director.

### **Reoccurring Matters:**

- Chair Comments- Mark Shea gave the Executive Committee a quick update on the follow-up questions he helped convene in December regarding Volume 1 strategies and objectives of the Roundtable:  
Mark reported on one meeting with augmentation stakeholders. The attendance was limited, but enough person participated to get appropriate input. Each individual provided some direction to Brown and Caldwell for reviewing and updating the objectives that we had between 2015 BIP document for inclusion and the current BIP update. Based on the technical update work that was done by Wilson Water and the general contractor team, there was a pretty large water supply gap that was identified for irrigated augmentation under current conditions (upwards of 600,000 AF annually). It was appropriate to have a discussion on how we want to approach and address that issue in our BIP update. Mark reported on a conversation with Environmental Recreation Committee regarding the objectives that were included in the 2015 BIP on Non-Consumptive uses and provide input to the general contractor team on how those should be updated and revamped for this round of updating. The same conversation needs to be had with municipal water providers and the objectives that were identified in the 2015 BIP document. Mark facilitated a conversation with representatives from the Southeast District and Pueblo Board of Water Works, regarding Transmountain Diversion Projects and how those important supplies were modeled in the technical update and the different planning scenarios.



# Arkansas Basin Roundtable

PLANNING OUR  
WATER FUTURE

- Terry suggest before we do any updates to the BIP we should go back and get any old studies before doing any new studies.
- Greg states the CWCB has a study in place, which is a subcommittee just to focus on how CWCB recovers the lost storage in Pueblo Reservoir. He states it's not just for the Fry-Ark project it's the top priority storage and everyone else who relies on storage.
- Other Outstanding Reports- Executive Committee Members- Greg Felt was open to meeting different entities within the Basin and getting a better feel for what their needs are, and what challenges they face. Greg wanted to let the Roundtable know he heard from Mike with Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority, and he had an opportunity to set up a meeting in February. Greg is working on meeting with Denala Water and Sanitation, he's spoke with Park County, and has plans to speak with Lee Miller from Southeastern to get his angle on demand management from the perspective of transmountain diversion.

## **ABRT BIP Update/ Local Expert:**

- Project Tiering Process- Wil Koger states they are going to go through the overview of the tiering process, and the thought would be that the Local Expert will develop some guidelines on how to apply the tiering criteria and then those guidelines will be provided to the Roundtable for feedback and input. Once the guidelines are agreed to, the Local Experts will go through and assign tier level to each of the projects and make those tier alignments on the spreadsheet available to the Roundtable to review.
  - Q:** Sandy White questions who makes the final decision on the assignment of tiers for a particular project?
  - A:** Brett stated there is a combination of subjective and objective criteria that drives assigning the project to the correct tier. There are some formulas that the master spreadsheet will have objective analysis and discussion between himself and Wil Koger, the Coordination Committee and the Executive Committee, and if project A is more important than project B, then the and tiering scoring gets pulled into it.
- Sandy stated that, in his opinion, the Roundtable should make the final decisions.
- Russ agrees with Sandy; he thinks the Roundtable should decide, but the point which you decide is the point at which you move a project forward for funding. This tiering matrix was originally envisioned to be applied for a WSRF grant, and CWCB has provided more broadly through the BIP process just to get a feel for really just the funding needs, and that's it. It's not tier 1 (one) is better than tier 4 (four) it's really about how ready it is to go, and a tier 4 (four) project could easily move forward for grant funding if the project could get the data as needed just as a tier 1 (one) project could.
  - Q:** Sandy would like to know if Brett can generate a list of those accounts of which there are no local projects.
  - A:** Brett states he will work on generating a list for local projects.



# Arkansas Basin Roundtable

PLANNING OUR  
WATER FUTURE

## Roundtable Business:

- Draft policy addressing Letters of Support for Stream Restoration Projects-Terry Stanga presented the Policy and Procedure to the Executive Committee. This policy is for Water Plan Grants Applications involving stream or land and water restoration components. Terry states we already have a policy that exists for all grants that we have to follow this policy and procedure would be an extension to the existing policy. The purpose of this document is the protection of water rights and Watershed Health Projects when submitting for a letter of support from the Roundtable; all other projects and grants requested are covered under the existing policy. (see document for reference)
  - Q:** Amber noted in the proposed protection of water rights statement it says “the applicant will determine whether the project will injure water rights conferring with the Colorado Department of Water Resources, Division 2 Engineer.” What if those two entities disagreed on whether water rights were injured? Should we have an independent person who makes the determination?
  - A:** Terry states the Colorado Department of Water Resources, Division 2 Engineer, is the same person.
  - Q:** Ambers asked if we think this needs to be its own separate policy or should it be incorporated into the other existing policies?
  - A:** Terry thinks its best we leave the policy by itself because there is so much language on the document; that’s why he tied it together down below in the “procedure” column.
  - Q:** Greg asked with the paragraph that Sandy White added the “notwithstanding” paragraph are all those different documents? Are those documents able to be accessed?
  - A:** Terry states those documents can be accessed through the Division 2 Engineer, and 95% are available for public access.
  - Q:** Sandy White stated he’s not sure where the Roundtable wants to impose a burden dealing with subparagraph 2 (two); Sandy asked if we want to impose it on the Roundtable or the applicant; or do we want to impose it at all? Sandy stated that if there is concern from the Roundtable assuming the letter of support gets to the Roundtable and doesn’t get approved through the Executive Committee, how do we deal with this if we don’t even mention it?
  - A:** Mark’s perspective is if the potential for some projects to run up against one of these rights addressed in sub paragraph two (2) isn’t apparent to the project component, and isn’t apparent to the Division 2 Engineer it isn’t apparent to the Executive Committee nor the Roundtable as we are considering this the responsibility for protecting those rights lays with the entities and individuals who have that right and enjoy that right, and if the project moves forward, it will be the applicant’s responsibility to protect those rights; Mark stated that he doesn’t think it should sit with the Roundtable.
- Jeris feels there is potential for really loading up the Division 2 Engineering and staff; he feels there is a lot of avenues for review without mandating something on the Division Engineer.
- The Executive Committee will continue this policy topic on February 10th.



# Arkansas Basin Roundtable

PLANNING OUR  
WATER FUTURE

## Upcoming Meetings:

- Arkansas Basin Roundtable – February 10, 2021
- Subcommittees
  - Enviro/Rec Comm.- January 25, 2021
- Statewide PEPO- February 22
- IBCC- February 23, 2021

## Adjourn:

Mark Shea adjourned the Executive Committee Meeting at 12:15 PM.