

IBCC No & Low Regrets Subcommittee Meeting #3

Date:

April 28, 2025

Time:

11:30 AM - 12:30 PM

Attendees:

Sean Cronin, Ken Curtis, Lisa Darling, Ken Brenner, Joanne Fagan, Kari Van Valkenburg, Audrey Seery, Pat Wells, Kat Weismiller, Elizabeth Schoder

Meeting Minutes:

General Takeaways from Completing Crosswalk Exercise

Pat Wells: Got a lot out of the crosswalk exercise. DRAP had a lot of aspirational buzzwords — much of it tied back to IBCC work from 10–15 years ago.

Lisa Darling: Hearing Kat describe the 2015 document, was it the timing that made it important? Should there always be work, or is timing critical?

Pat Wells: Good question. At that time, I worked closely with IBCC members. It was a transition period coming off SWSI 2010, with grassroots planning at its strongest. Things changed when Governor Hickenlooper signed the executive order. IBCC should and could still work at that level — figuring out strategies like low to medium conservation.

Lisa Darling: You're getting to the heart of it — we're searching for that topic we can build consensus around.

Sean Cronin: Exactly. That's the crux — what should IBCC be focusing on? So much has changed that the 2013 doc didn't foresee: a second Water Plan, new gambling revenue, significant funding shifts. Now, agencies and proponents have clearer roles — what's left for the Roundtables and IBCC? The more I dig into 2013, the more I think there are still things IBCC and Roundtables could roll up their sleeves on. But we have to acknowledge that circumstances have changed and refocus our efforts accordingly.

Lisa Darling: Are we agents or tools for staff? Could we stand ready as an ad hoc group for the next Tech Update and scenarios work?

Sean Cronin: That's one way to look at it. There may be others. We should sit with the CWCB guide — figure out which "lanes" IBCC should stay in to support the Water Plan best. Don't want to prematurely box ourselves into roles before we understand them.

Lisa Darling: We could take the roles document and make it more linear — show a logical progression.

Pat Wells: Maybe IBCC's role could be more advisory — like many utilities and planning groups have — filtering ideas tied to Roundtables. Provide recommendations on tough statewide policy issues. That would give IBCC a real and lasting role.

Lisa Darling: Full circle — finding a more permanent, defined space for IBCC.

Kat Weismiller: For the next Tech Update, we're starting to review scenarios. IBCC helped develop and narrow them down last time — we could use IBCC similarly now.

More importantly: does everyone agree that developing no/low regrets strategies is something we want to take on?

Ken Brenner: I think so. For example, engagement and collaboration — p. 28 of the 2013 plan — emphasizes consulting a wide variety of stakeholders. That's exactly in our lane, especially around land use and water supply.

Kat Weismiller: Each Roundtable IBCC rep already has a defined stakeholder group. The Governor's appointees could help coordinate and facilitate broader engagement.

Ken Brenner: We're here to help — to offer that broader perspective and assist with tasks.

Pat Wells: Got a lot out of the crosswalk exercise. DRAP had a lot of aspirational buzzwords — much of it tied back to IBCC work from 10–15 years ago.

Lisa Darling: Hearing Kat describe the 2015 document, was it the timing that made it important? Should there always be work, or is timing critical?

Pat Wells: Good question. At that time, I worked closely with IBCC members. It was a transition period coming off SWSI 2010, with grassroots planning at its strongest. Things changed when Governor Hickenlooper signed the executive order. IBCC should and could still work at that level — figuring out strategies like low to medium conservation.

Lisa Darling: You're getting to the heart of it — we're searching for that topic we can build consensus around.

Sean Cronin: Exactly. That's the crux — what should IBCC be focusing on? So much has changed that the 2013 doc didn't foresee: a second Water Plan, new gambling revenue, significant funding shifts. Now, agencies and proponents have clearer roles — what's left for the Roundtables and IBCC? The more I dig into 2013, the more I think there are still things IBCC and Roundtables could roll up their sleeves on. But we have to acknowledge that circumstances have changed and refocus our efforts accordingly.

Lisa Darling: Are we agents or tools for staff? Could we stand ready as an ad hoc group for the next Tech Update and scenarios work?

Sean Cronin: That's one way to look at it. There may be others. We should sit with the CWCB guide — figure out which "lanes" IBCC should stay in to support the Water Plan best. Don't want to prematurely box ourselves into roles before we understand them.

Lisa Darling: We could take the roles document and make it more linear — show a logical progression.

Pat Wells: Would it be an appropriate role for IBCC to act as an advisory group, just like many utilities or planning groups have, filtering ideas and tied to the roundtables, here's an assignment where you are supporting staff, provide recommendations on these tough policy issues with a statewide focus, that's an exciting space for IBCC to live to provide real value

Lisa Darling: Full circle — finding a more permanent, defined space for IBCC.

Kat Weismiller: For the next Tech Update, we're starting to review scenarios. IBCC helped develop and narrow them down last time — we could use IBCC similarly now.

More importantly: does everyone agree that developing no/low regrets strategies is something we want to take on?

Ken Brenner: I think so. For example, engagement and collaboration — p. 28 of the 2013 plan — emphasizes consulting a wide variety of stakeholders. That's exactly in our lane, especially around land use and water supply.

Kat Weismiller: Each Roundtable IBCC rep already has a defined stakeholder group. The Governor's appointees could help coordinate and facilitate broader engagement.

Ken Brenner: We're here to help — to offer that broader perspective and assist with tasks.

Review of Crosswalk Exercise Summary

Kat Weismiller: The draft crosswalk summary lists the 2013 No & Low Regrets strategies and links them to the C9 topics. Walked through each. Pat provided helpful conclusions on progress to date.

Lisa Darling: If you put it in a Google Doc, we could all help edit and make it more homogenous.

Kat Weismiller: Should we have another subcommittee meeting before the June IBCC meeting? What do we want to share with IBCC?

Sean Cronin: I've been on a bit of a spectrum of what we can do next, lots of good work that was done in the Water Plan, highlight a few things in 2013 where there could be more progress, that's where we focus IBCC on, sometimes I wonder what we are doing and how to actually build consensus; the last IBCC meeting where I said let's cross walk the two, we've all discovered the crosswalk have some old paint and holes that don't make it easier; starting with 2013 and evolving it to C9, the doc that Kat put together is a great start, then we are going to the IBCC we should start preparing a 2026 "..." title TBD, maybe its not as robust as 2013, maybe it is very aspirational, if we put a doc together that has buy in

from this generation of IBCC - that would be the infamous work plan that we've been searching for for decades

Lisa Darling: Our thinking is evolving — using IBCC to help develop scenarios could naturally create that document. Staff seems to need that guidance.

Sean Cronin: We might need to let ourselves dream a little. It might be maddening for CWCB or the legislature — but the 2013 doc was aspirational too.

Pat Wells: What got done? What didn't? Why? What needs reinvigoration? Like ATMs. Acknowledge what we've been through and current conditions.

Kat Weismiller: I've invited Rep. McCormick and Sen. Roberts to June's meeting. It would be great to share the IBCC evolution story with them. I'd like the subcommittee to have a formal agenda item for storytelling and outlining next steps.

Lisa Darling: Great idea — helps cross-pollinate relationships between IBCC, CWCB, and legislators.

Ken Curtis: Are we missing anything? Are there ideas we haven't thought of yet?

Kat Weismiller: Not exactly — but reaching consensus in June will set us up to work through C9 more effectively.

Ken Brenner: Dedicating a full day at C9 for breakout groups and data collection will be key.

Ken Curtis: C9 was a brainstorm — shows how the landscape has changed. We don't need new goals and directives annually. It takes time to develop something like the No & Low Regrets document so it could be helpful to keep the IBCC and maybe the C9 Summit focused on a goal or outcome for multiple years.

Ken Brenner: Prioritizing what we work on after C9 could be a goal itself.

Sean Cronin: C9 is a great opportunity to get everyone together, it may be saving space at C9 for this evolutionary conversation, there's a convo to be had about how we interact with legislators without taking a position, why did the WP stop short of making rules, we hand it to people without expertise to shape it - don't get that; If we can't engage as RT or IBCC, how do we engage?

Ken Brenner: Legislators aren't necessarily the water experts — Receiving testimony that has consensus is important.

Sean Cronin: Sen. Roberts mentioned the CWC's State Affairs Committee is the only water voice out there — many took offense. Maybe RTs and IBCC aren't inclusive enough. We have to do better to influence policy.

Kat Weismiller: This is a valid question, we can maybe cover it at the June IBCC meeting. To bring it back, what do you think the ask is? Do we want to start here with 2013 work, talk about progress to date, is there consensus that that's what we want to present to the larger IBCC?

Next Steps Ahead of June IBCC Meeting & C9 Summit

Ken Curtis: I agree but how do we not incorporate - we have a whole new slate coming out of the draft that we can't ignore - add on the C9 DRAP to what you said Kat

Kat Weismiller: Starting with 2013, what hasn't made progress, incorporating what came out of C9 DRAP, also choosing a name will be a top priority

Joanne Fagan: Sounds good to me.

Ken Brenner: Maybe have a naming competition at C9?

Kat Weismiller: Good idea! So the next steps would be developing a presentation for the June meeting (20-25 minutes with 40 minutes to discuss), refining the crosswalk summary document - go in and make any edits, think about how we present this in June. Everyone should review and make edits.

Ken Brenner: We should meet again before June, once we see the draft IBCC and C9 agendas.

Sean Cronin: Agreed. Let's meet again, and prepare clear asks of IBCC and expectations for homework between June and C9.

Kat Weismiller: Would people be interested in having a formal IBCC subcommittee chair?

Sean Cronin: Probably unavoidable. More structure could be helpful.

Kat Weismiller: Any volunteers to chair?

Sean Cronin: I'd volunteer, but heavy workload ahead and a sabbatical in 2026. Someone with more capacity might be better.

Ken Brenner: What about co-chairs?

Ken Curtis: Let's resolve that after June. First, decide who will present — the material is dense.

Sean Cronin: I'll be there, but I'd want staff to present most of the updates.

Kat Weismiller: 1–2 subcommittee members presenting, with staff handling the updates on NLR progress to date could work, since we compiled that summary.

Presenters: Ken Brenner, Sean Cronin, Pat Wells, possibly Lisa Darling; Kat and Jeff will present the staff portion.

Ken Curtis: Unable to present.

Subcommittee Homework:

- Review the Crosswalk Summary document.
- Kat will send a Doodle Poll for the next meeting.
- Presenters (Sean Cronin, Ken Brenner, Pat Wells, potentially Lisa Darling) will coordinate with Kat on shaping the 20-min presentation, allowing 40 min for discussion.
- Staff will send out these meeting minutes.
- Kelsea will likely facilitate the June meeting — (Sean) suggested making it interactive with clear asks of IBCC to guide work from June through October.