

TABLE 1 - PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES ON THE COLORADO WATER PLAN

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Colorado River Basin								
Steven Acquafresca (also testified at the August 21 Colorado Basin Hearing) Colorado Agricultural Producer Local Government - Mesa County Board of Commissioners	Yes	How much weight will the Colorado River Basin Implementation Plan (BIP) carry in the statewide water plan?	Support: The opposition to future out of basin water diversions. Modify: The concept of "water banking" needs a great deal of study, refinement and additional work.	The legislature should stay entirely <u>out</u> of the statewide water plan.	Future out of basin diversions are a great threat. Future transmountain diversions (TMD's) would devastate our basins' water resources and our future.	I support the "grassroots" approach to a state plan. Individual basins should have the authority to prohibit out of basin diversions.	State funding and permits should be consistent with BIPs including the Colorado River Basin.	
Annie Henderson (also testified at the August 21 Colorado Basin Hearing) Colorado Recreation - Upper Colorado Private Boaters Association	No	1. How will the state implement real policy to enforce the values identified in the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) plan? 2. How will we identify quantifiable measurements to gain better use of data and track use and effectiveness of efforts? 3. FUNDING!?!? Who's paying for this?	Support: I support the attempt to lead the basins in a model of conservation. I believe that holding other basins accountable for their use is vital. Modify: Public policy implementation plan is lacking. How do we overcome funding to actually create policy around stipulated plan? Where will funding come from?	Land use connection to water. The Colorado legislature must push to enact regulation that favors conservation efforts. Address rampant growth and encourage sustainable, responsible development, especially in basins that divert H2O out of existing communities.	The water study will not be adequate to meet the demands due to frivolous use and wasteful practices.	-	Yes	Thank you!

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Colorado River Basin								
Mike McDill Colorado Municipal with recreation and environment interests	Yes	Who proposed reservoirs on Roaring Fork tributaries for stream health. (I like this idea, just don't know where it came from)? How will minority interests be adequately represented?	Support: Getting the issues up on the table. Educating the Colorado public about the complexities of the Colorado River Basin. Modify: –	1. Use the plan to develop changes in Colorado Law. 2. Establish guidelines for statewide land use planning. 3. Maybe declare irrigation of turf grass as <u>NOT</u> a beneficial use. 4. Look to the long term best solution for the whole state. 5. Avoid power politics for short term problems.	1. The state needs to learn to live within its water means, similar to Nevada, Arizona, and California. 2. There should be different rules for water within a basin, versus water from outside a basin. 3. Past experience with Front Range water providers makes the Western Slope very suspicious of the next "deal." We always have ended up on the short end of previous agreements.	–	I think that is why we put every conceivable project in the BIP. If it is not in "the plan" there will be chance of innovative new solutions in the future.	
Ken Neubecker Colorado Environment or Recreation	Yes	Not any, really. I am the environmental representative on the Colorado Basin Roundtable.	Support: All of it. Modify: Tiering of potential projects.	–	See additional comments.	–	–	See below.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Colorado River Basin								
<p>Other Comments: There is nothing more important for Colorado's future than water. Given that, few things are more important than the current effort to create a statewide Colorado Water Plan. It is high time that all Coloradans start taking water, water use and the rivers that supply most of our water seriously. Its also high time that we take a hard look at how we use water and start making some long overdue changes to water laws and traditions. We can not meet the stated goals and values of the Colorado Water Plan without new thinking.</p>								
<p>It has been said that the Colorado Basin Roundtable's BIP has a "defensive" tone, as if that were somehow inappropriate and less than collaborative. Of course the Colorado Basin is defensive. The Colorado River Basin is the major donor basin providing water for the cities and farms of the Eastern Slope and has been for more than a century. It is the only basin that not only has its own water supply "gap" to fill but is also expected to be a significant source for filling at least three other basins "gaps". Yes, the Colorado Basin is defensive. Meeting the West Slope "gaps" is no less important and no less vital to the future of Colorado than meeting the perceived shortfalls of the Eastern Slope basins.</p>								
<p>There are continued calls for a new, large diversion of water from the already heavily drained Colorado River system. The claim is that such a new diversion will be necessary if the Front Range basins are to fill the "gap" between anticipated water demand and supply for that demand.</p>								
<p>While we cannot legally say "not one more drop", that is the overwhelming sentiment of the people within the Colorado basin. Any "New Supply" will mean taking water from an existing and valuable West Slope use and thus must be the very last option for filling the Front Range "gaps". Reducing the demand for water through high levels of conservation and efficiency, re-use and significant adaptations through land use planning must occur first.</p>								
<p>Any new diversion from the Colorado River system, whether it's from the Green River in Wyoming, the Yampa River or the Colorado River can no longer be a reliable source of water for the growing Front Range. There just isn't enough water left without further crippling the West Slope, our rivers and our economy. It also could have grave consequences with Colorado's ability to meet our downstream obligations.</p>								
<p>Here are the facts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There really isn't any water left to take that could be considered "reliable". We have already crossed the line of taking more water, basin wide, from the Colorado River than is supplied by its native flow. • The West Slope has its own "gap" of water needs with no as yet identified source of supply. • West Slope agriculture is already short by 100,000 acre feet. Any new diversions could worsen that situation and contribute to the loss of even more West Slope farms. • Lakes Powell and Mead, our Compact bank account, are less than half full and have been for more than a decade. If Powell reaches a low where hydroelectric power can no longer be generated, electric rates throughout Colorado could quadruple. If Mead drops much lower, it will threaten the water supply for the two million people of Las Vegas, something the Bureau of Reclamation simply cannot allow. • The fragile agreement for water supplied to the endangered species of the Colorado near Grand Junction will be compromised. • There are already plans and projects in the works to divert an additional 150,000 acre-feet from the Colorado River headwaters. • New diversions will further degrade the already heavily impacted river environment of the Colorado headwaters. • New diversions could have a major negative economic impact to the West Slope's large recreation industry. This will have serious consequences for all of Colorado. 								
<p>In many ways the "crisis" is already here, even if we can't see it. We need to remember that population growth is exponential, not linear. Forty years ago, Colorado's population was two million. Today it is five million and we are planning for a population of ten million in another 40 years. What do we do for the 20 million that will be here 40 years after that? 2100 really isn't that far off. Growth may be what our economy is based on, but whether we like it or not there are limits before we irrevocably destroy the "way of life" we are trying to preserve.</p>								
<p>It has been said that the bulk of Colorado's population along with the "real" economy of the state exists along the urban corridor of the Front Range, and therefore the Front Range has the higher and better need for water over the rest of the state. This is myopic thinking that ignores the tremendous value of the West Slope's recreation and agricultural economies to the state. People and corporations are drawn to Colorado because of what we have in our Western Slope mountains and rivers, our Western Slope communities and farms, as much or more than they are by the amenities found in the urban corridor. All of this is supported by the health and strength of the environment.</p>								

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
--	--	--	---	---	--	---	---	----------------

Colorado River Basin

Other Comments Ken Neubecker (Cont.)

The Colorado Water Plan aims to protect the values we now hold. Among those values are “a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams, and wildlife”. Healthy rivers were not valued as highly, nor as well understood in 1876 as they are today. We know far more about the health and water needs of rivers and streams today than we did even twenty years ago. The State’s Instream Flow program attempts to meet the water needs of the environment but often falls short. While the system of Prior Appropriation has worked well for most of our needs, we must remember that it is a system founded on the idea that any water not diverted is wasted. Prior Appropriation at its very heart is a system founded on a dry streambed. Dry streams are not healthy streams, nor are they able to maintain a “strong environment”. While we do not advocate abandoning the doctrine of Prior Appropriation, we do believe that significant changes are needed to accommodate new technologies, new needs and a new understanding that rivers and streams are more than a natural ditch for the simple conveyance of water.

New water supply projects and processes must incorporate the real needs of the stream ecosystems they impact. Mitigations often fail to consider the full needs of affected ecosystems. The biology and functioning of stream ecosystems is complex and often not well suited to rigid or simplistic engineering solutions. There is no Manning’s Equation for a stream ecosystem. We need to begin incorporating the concept of “learning by doing”, keeping our options open and flexible, not only for new projects but also for existing water supply infrastructure and operations.

This will also mean that we have far more information about affected environments than we have now. Incorporating the modeling of the Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool (WFET) developed for the Colorado and Yampa/White Basins should be done through out the state. Areas of concern identified by the WFET’s broad analysis should then be examined more closely to identify potential “projects and processes” that could improve or prevent further degradation.

We need to move from the historic tensions and animosities of the past to what CWCB Director James Ecklund called a “creative tension”, a more cooperative “tension” that helps us find new ways to provide water for farms, communities and rivers. Placing straight jacket restrictions on the Colorado Water Plan that require we view the future through a rear view mirror is not a plan that solves anything. It’s a plan that will enshrine future division and conflict.

We need to start thinking in new directions and the Legislature needs to take a significant role in finding new paths. We face a situation with demands, values and knowledge unimagined by Colorado’s founders in 1876. The sooner we, and the Colorado Water Plan, move in that direction, the better

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Colorado River Basin								
Ken Ransford (also testified at the August 21 Colorado Basin Hearing) Colorado I am the recreation representative to the Colorado Basin Roundtable	Yes	–	<p>Support: High municipal conservation. Smart land use planning - high density, minimize sprawl, protect irrigated agriculture land, and reduce outdoor watering.</p> <p>Modify: The IPPs total over 410,000 acre feet in the Colorado River Basin, and this is not sustainable. The Colorado Basin Roundtable should reduce demand rather than increasing supply. There are disincentives to practicing efficient irrigation practices - no one leaves water court with more rights than they entered with. The opposite is true, and thus water right holders try to increase their use to the MAX amount possible. That leads to inefficient water use, and dried up rivers.</p>	<p>1. Adopt a pilot program to adjudicate water rights in a basin and remove barriers so users can freely transfer water for riparian or agriculture needs.</p> <p>2. Come up with a funding mechanism to lease instream flows when river flows are low. This should be funded by utility customer block rates that increase as gallons per capita per day (GPCD) use more.</p> <p>3. We need common metrics; * Basin should report numbers for GPCD use indoor and outdoor, residential and commercial. * Gaps should be identified for Municipal, Agricultural and Energy Development and breakeven Municipal (GPCD) should be determined to eliminate the gap. * We should be able to compare BIPs between basins regarding the above.</p>	<p>1. Climate change suggests there could be a 30% decrease in Colorado River flows.</p> <p>2. United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) suggests Colorado River compact states have over-allocated to the river and will need to use by 3.2 million acre feet (MAF) by 2050, yet the CWCB acts like Colorado can still divert more from the river.</p> <p>3. What is the human carrying capacity of Colorado? We determined this with livestock in the Taylor Grazing Act 85 years ago. Is it sustainable for the Colorado River to support 38 million people today? 65 million tomorrow?</p>	–	<p>I think we need to put more water back into rivers, yet the Colorado Water Plan is weak on this issue. The basin plans all say conservation is important, but they allocate few resources to it. For example, the Gunnison Basin Roundtable has \$516 million budgeted for projects, but \$0 for nonconsumptive needs. This illustrates the divide I feel that exists between the zeal to take more water out of rivers and the painful reality that we have a weak instream flow program very few miles that are designated as outstanding rivers, and some of our biggest rivers dry up in low flow years (Fraser, Crystal, Roaring Fork, Dolores)</p>	

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Colorado River Basin								
<p>Rachel Richards (also testified at the August 21 Colorado Basin Hearing)</p> <p>Colorado</p> <p>Policy; Environmental and recreation</p>	Yes	<p>1. Is the outcome of the state water plan supporting the Front Range water providers desire to avoid mitigations, conservation, and smart land use planning a forgone conclusion?</p> <p>2. Is a new TMD a forgone conclusion of the State Water Plan?</p> <p>3. Will the Colorado River Basin Plan hold any weight with the state decision makers?</p>	<p>Support: The support for the environmental and recreational economy.</p> <p>Modify: The basin plan should insist on more Front Range storage projects; especially to capture flood waters. There should be NO new TMDs until all Front Range flood waters are captured and put to beneficial use! More investigation and investment must be made into agriculture efficiently and agriculture conservation.</p>	-	<p>The state plan is for water needs through 2050 - our basin fears there will be new demands for more TMD after this plan. That the west slope economy and way of life will be sacrificed for Front Range economic gain. That conservation and land use will be ignored while the state pursues new TMDs. That compact compliance costs will fall upon the West Slope rather than the Front Range.</p>	<p>The state plan does not adequately acknowledge economic value of the environment. Conservation goals should be increased. Land use planning must be addressed. Full mitigations, social, economic, and environmental for any increased TMDs must be secured for basins of origin. The state plan may "forestall" the demise of agriculture; but it will NOT, by itself, stop the demise of agriculture.</p>	<p>The state should fund more non-consumptive. There should be NO state funding for new TMDs. Permitting must stand on its own, after appropriate National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) processes. State funding should only be allocated to small growth, high conservation communities.</p>	<p>With 450,000 to 600,000 acre feet (AF) a year going to the Front Range currently, better conservation of land use planning is a tool that the Front Range must employ to <u>SAVE Agriculture</u>. It is not "the mean West Slope" that doesn't want to give up more water (which we don't have); it is the Front Range that won't admit that they must manage what they already have better.</p> <p>We must find ways to change the "use it or lose it" mindset regarding agriculture rights. We must find ways to allow agriculture to maximize their water conservation savings; selling those rights to municipal and industrial (M and I) or river health needs.</p>

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Rio Grande Basin								
Ron Brink (also testified at the August 28 Rio Grande Basin hearing) Rio Grande Agriculture	Yes	–	Support: Protect agriculture water and the "first in time; first in right!" Modify: –	Keep the process going and funding available.	Keep all the water in Colorado that is available and not obligated to compacts! <u>Storage statewide.</u>	–	Hard to predict the future so I don't think it should be limited.	–
Nicole Langley Rio Grande Municipal and Industrial	No	I am a member of the Steering Committee and the M and I Subcommittee for our BIP. I am also co-author of the M and I Guidelines for the BIP, and for 8 years I have written most of the water project grants which have been funded by the Water Supply Reserve Account (WSRA) and other sources. In our basin here in the Rio Grande, as I presume is true in other basins of the Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC), we do not have a systematic funding plan or strategy. The roundtable has stated its goals and objectives but does not have a funding strategy or a systematic way to prioritize or implement those requests that should move forward. WSRA requests for funds come before the roundtable from (1) internal folks who are leaders on the roundtable or (2) projects which are, in a rather haphazard way, brought to the roundtable as problems or opportunities which we feel are credible or likely to meet the criteria/guidelines. Basins need to have their own internal funding priorities and strategies in addition to the very well developed statewide criteria!!	Support: Recreational and wildlife issues are thoroughly addressed; we are dealing with complex issues -- fire and beetle kill -- and climate uncertainties are likely to exacerbate these problems. Well done. Modify: I believe the entire M and I subcommittee's "Guidelines" (we didn't call it a plan) need to be included in the Rio Grande BIP. The recommendations with respect to prioritizing, funding, and providing technical assistance to remote small communities (places where humans live) and a few of the informative tables we created should be included. Yes, M and I only represents a small fraction of water use for us, but if even one town which has 100-year-old infrastructure (as all of ours do) gets its blackwater and greywater mixed up, we will have a disaster on our hands. Remote rural communities frequently cannot qualify for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) or any other forms of funding due to small populations, nonexistent or small staff, inadequate communication tools/skills, or the technical resources to put together the engineering or the scientific aspects of a proposal. Each basin needs to have a Water Resources Outreach program to address/remedy this lacuna.	Please consider ways to expand the IBCC/CWCB funding criteria and guidelines to enable small, poor, remote, rural and otherwise disadvantaged communities to gain access to (CDPHE) and/or other sources of funding. Perhaps you could establish a specific fund for this? Perhaps you could insist that the implementation portion of our basin plans include a requirement for basins to establish ways to support and provide needed technical help? For us, National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) cutbacks have virtually stopped our ability to bring WSRA requests to the roundtable. I have right now four projects which cannot get the engineering or technical help we have always appreciated from NRCS. They're very backed up. As a result, you will SEE CLEARLY that this year's funding requests from the Rio Grande Basin are at almost zip compared to other years. I would like to be a part of putting such a statewide plan together, working from the perspective of the applicant, because I am well acquainted with the issues in these kinds of communities. It isn't rocket science. Please help us by providing funding for such programs throughout Colorado. Otherwise, what does "implementation" mean?	Increased requirements or tighter standards for water quality imposed by the state will have devastating effects on places which were "first in use" a century ago. If such requirements are imposed, let there please be an accessible funding source for those of us who simply cannot meet such requirements. Towns will simply shut down. So I hope you will set up funding priorities and provide -- urgently -- a funding source specifically as suggested above. I might consider working with you to help make this happen, first in our own basin of course, but I believe this is a need which exists throughout Colorado wherever rural/remote/poor communities are in dire need of upgrading their M and I infrastructure.	I have not studied this carefully enough to comment. Our M and I subcommittee has put in over 300 people hours on the Rio Grande BIP, so that's where my attention has been.	So long as small, remote, and resource-poor communities of Colorado are included in the M and I section, I would favor that. If large cities or primarily Front Range needs are addressed, then I would not favor that. The needs of rural Colorado communities need a good strong voice, and I am asking you to build that into your funding considerations.	It was delightful, a real privilege, to welcome you all here in Alamosa. I am especially proud of Senator Gail Schwartz, of Representative Ed Vigil, and of all the hard-working people who have pulled together to create our BIP. Let us please create the MEANS to implement, not just put out there our intention to do so. The seriousness of your work and your energy and dedication are a great comfort and a tremendous hope for us. Thank you all so much!

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Rio Grande Basin								
Melissa J Leintz Rio Grande General Public	No	What is the water basin and what is it all about and what is it for?	Support: Water conservation - finding out who can conserve and how much and how to regulate. Healthy Rivers! Modify: Agriculture is 85% of usage. Maybe we shouldn't focus on it just because they are the biggest. Maybe the smallest user can actually conserve the most.	Force the land development full usage to secure water rights prior to any start up.	The amount will continue to decrease. How can we develop new ways to reuse what there is?	Have not read	Yes	-
Chuck Reel (also testified at the August 28 Rio Grande Basin hearing) Rio Grande General Public and Poor People	No	Why is there no allowance for poor people that live on their own land outside of a city limit to grow a small garden? Without the right to grow their own food organically, these people are forced to spend money they may not have on cheap foods that are full of pesticides and herbicides affecting their health in a negative manner.	-	Allow people with in-house wells only to grow a garden to supply their own food at a minimum. It would also be nice to grow some trees to help conserve energy.	Individual water rights for basic survival will be more important as more people move in to Colorado than the right of people who make money from water.	-	-	Force farmers to grow crops that are water conservative. Don't let natural gas fracking use huge amounts of water do to fracking that also poisons water wells near fracking sites. Encourage water conservative farming techniques like drip irrigation and the shape of the soil surface to catch water and run it down into the soil instead of running it off the soil.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Southwest River Basin								
Michael Church Southwest Municipal - PAWBD	No	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Margaret Cozine (also testified at August 27 Southwest Basin hearing) Southwest General Public	No	--	--	--	More efficient use of this water resource through education, positive reinforcement	--	--	I'm a citizen who wants water harvesting to become a valued method of water conservation.
James Lambert Southwest Agriculture	No	I need to learn more before I have questions	Support: Still learning	--	--	--	--	--
Raymond Lattin Southwest Agriculture	No	New storage? Conserve or share without losing water rights?	--	Ensure Colorado water law is observed at all times and protected	Loss of water rights because of a call from other states, will it be for how long?	--	No	--
John Taylor Southwest Agriculture - Mt. Ranch	Yes	Role of this plan in Colorado River Compact and Colorado's part in lower basin water deliveries. State issues on water.	Support: We need a statewide plan to protect Colorado river compact. Modify: Transbasin diversions subject to Colorado river compact	Strongly protect water rights. Protect state rights Grass roots solutions Strongly support agriculture enterprises. Hydro power generation	TMDs -- subject to Colorado River Compact.	--	Yes	--

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Arkansas River Basin								
Gary Barber Arkansas Municipal and Environment	Yes	None	Support: Sub-regional approach to meeting needs. Modify: Requires more solutions to ground water depletions and dependency	Legislative action to relieve ground water augmentation requirements. The quality of any engineering model cannot meet the stringent requirements of a judicial "non-injury" standard. Ground watering subject to the plenary authority of the General Assembly. Most western states manage ground water <u>conjunctively</u> without real injury to surface water rights.	Uncertainty is inherent in the Colorado River Compact. Using "risk mitigation" is a reality that will never be, nor has it ever been, a zero level of risk.	Permitting is too expensive.	Yes	Public/private partnerships maybe a solution, particularly with respect to a future transbasin diversion. The State of Colorado has a role to play but today that role is not clear.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Arkansas River Basin								
<p>Margaret Vorndam (also testified at August 29 Arkansas Basin hearing)</p> <p>Arkansas</p> <p>Environment or Recreation</p>	Yes	<p>The plan is obviously addressed to the needs of human populations in Colorado. Population will nearly double in Colorado between 2015 and 2050. Will the plan meet the goals to supply water for those here in 2050? What about beyond? If we continue to siphon water from agriculture and recreation/wildlife/environment past 2050, what good does a plan do now for the future? We need to set what the total human population number goal is to address in this plan.</p>	<p>Support: Need to preserve agricultural values. We cannot count on imported foodstuffs to fulfill all of our consumptive needs. Local agriculture has to be included in the equation. Removing the ability to produce food locally removes our environmental values, wildlife values and recreational values. Most of what I've heard at the meetings that I've attended gives lip service to these subjects, but is mainly concentrated on how to obtain water for M and I. If it's going to be part of the overall plan, then those related topics NEED to be taken seriously.</p> <p>Modify: Emphasis on protecting tributary flows. So much of wildlife and recreation also depend on the streams and rivers that flow into the Arkansas. The plan does not address the need to preserve instream flows and wetlands associated with all tributaries of the Arkansas River. Also, per Trout Unlimited, transfer of interbasin flows is counterproductive to the planning in the communities from which this occurs. We need to learn to live with what we have, and not cause damage re: water loss, from other communities.</p>	<p>Conservation -- need to be FAR more proactive in implementing measures that will promote conservation of existing water supplies. DO AWAY WITH the ability of Front Range communities to divert traditional flows from West Slope communities.</p>	<p>No address of tributary protections. Tributaries are "up for grabs" for water right claims but drying up tributaries hurts wildlife and environmental values. Need to address what realistic human population growth numbers can be served with EXISTING appropriations, without implementing more interbasin flow plans.</p>	<p>More emphasis on the importance of preserving wildlife and environmental values for every community. This has to be a local effort, not defined by regional interests.</p>	<p>Yes, as long as the plan supports wildlife, recreation and environmental values equally as the needs of municipality and industries and Agriculture interests.</p>	-

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Arkansas River Basin								
Sandy White Arkansas Agriculture	Yes	<p>It appears that the draft BIP is a consultant generated document under guidance from the CWCB staff. There have been very few meaningful opportunities for public input, i.e., input that is actually considered by the consultants, on the general portions of the plan. The consultants generated the draft and it is presumed that their draft is the correct approach. Consequently, the much touted public input is illusory. Input has been given but was not considered. There needs to be a mechanism through which those who took the time to give input get a substantive response.</p>	<p>Support: Those which are yet to be drafted involving specific projects in each sub-basin.</p> <p>Modify: The BIP (and the CWP) need to affirm that existing decreed water rights will be honored. Both plans need to address the question of local control, e.g. the current authority of local governments to regulate projects under HB 74-1041, 1034.</p>	Keep a very close eye on the CWP process; don't let it degenerate into another ignored (or worse, a harmful) attempt at centralized planning. Be sure to fund your staff adequately so that it can exercise independent and informed judgment, free from undue influence by the CWCB or project partisans.	Without a Decision Support System (DSS) in the Arkansas, planning is being done by the seat of our pants. That is not always bad and the basin has benefited from individuals' visions that have come to fruition. Nevertheless, now we're at the point where we have a fully appropriated system but we're trying to work around existing rights while looking for more water and flexible water use. For example, one of the inputs received by the roundtable was from the Division Engineer (and others) suggesting a futile call model from some of the tributaries. That is a significant need which could be met by a DSS and would promote both maximization and flexibility in water use.	The CWP needs to expressly affirm that existing decreed water rights will be honored. The CWP needs to address the question of local control, e.g. the current authority of local governments to regulate projects under HB 74-1041, 1034.	No. Funding should be influenced by that consistency, but not limited by the vision of the CWP's drafters. Leaving funding decisions to the discretion of the CWCB (rather than some scoring system based on the CWP) is the only reasonable way to ensure that all important projects be given adequate consideration. I'm not sure what "permits" are meant by the questions. Hopefully, it does not refer to the adjudication of water rights. For example, it would be distressing if, in diligence proceedings for conditional water rights, the water court was required to dismiss an application involving a project that didn't meet the consistency test.	When considering the results of the survey, be careful about placing too much reliance on the self-described "constituent group," above. At least in the rural portions of the state, most of us are members of and represent several different groups. I would arguably fit in all of them. I hope that the WRRC will continue to solicit input as the CWP process progresses. While an enormous amount of money has been spent on consultant work, the real payoff will be when the result of that work is evaluated and becomes the basis of policy decisions.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Yampa-White River Basin								
Ken Brenner (also testified at the September 16 Yampa-White River Basin hearing) Yampa-White Agriculture, Municipal Environment, Recreation	Yes	–	Support: No state funding for any TMD. State Water Plan is East Slope problem, needs Eastern Slope solution. Eastern Slope must focus on conservation, re-use, fallowing (agriculture-municipal water sharing), storage on East Slope, sustainable land use (water policy) Modify: * Strong statement that we will NOT SUPPORT ANY transmountain diversion! * MORE EMPHASIS THAT THE YAMPA RIVER IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT SOURCE OF WATER FOR THE COMPACT OBLIGATION. * Climate change/extended drought is real problem.	* Ensure due process of CWP. * Help every Colorado resident understand that Colorado has a limited water supply and water suppliers can not keep coming to the West Slope for more water. * Allow a more easier, friendly, water sharing (agricultural > municipal and industrial>recreation, etc.) process in water court, less rigidity)	Lack of widespread acknowledgement that Colorado has a limited water supply.	Modified to ensure "No State Staff Support of State Funds for a transmountain diversion."	Yes, Eastern Slope storage assistance only.	The Yampa River is the cornerstone of our regional economy. Supports agriculture, driver recreation valley's environmental integrity, energy production. The Yampa River is the last remaining free flowing (relatively) Colorado River tributary and must be preserved as such. The Yampa River's role in state water plan should be a consistent and reliable source of water to meet the Colorado River compact obligation.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Yampa-White River Basin								
Anthony J. D'Aquila (also testified at the September 16 Yampa-White River Basin hearing) Yampa-White General Public	Yes	A lot of data is presented in summary graphs and tables. I understand the need to do this. But I think access to the assumptions and factors used to derive the numbers expressed in the tables would be helpful. It would let interested individuals like myself see how conclusions being presented were derived.	<p>Support: In principle, all of what I have read. I think there are aspects of it that would need revision and issues not included that need to be considered.</p> <p>Modify: First, the plan is "supply-centric" - it seems to only address water supply, and does very little to address "demand". The other side of water policy planning. It needs to include discussion on conservation, demand management and efficiency of water use. These considerations need to be applied to all users, M and I, self-supplied industrial (SSI), and Agriculture. I also take exception to the focus on "preserving historic use." What if historic use is not efficient, is wasteful, or could be improved upon?</p>	Focus on fairness for all. Be aggressive in negotiations with other states and feds concerning Colorado's involvement in the Colorado River Compact. Work to establish water conservation and reuse-reclaim.	Water quality and maintenance of appropriate environmental flows. Oppose trans mountain diversions. Not a good idea.	I generally support the plan, and agree protecting diversity and agriculture are important. But as agriculture represents the largest consumer of water, I think the state should be more aggressive in pursuing best management practices and efficiencies (re-use, reclaim, drip irrigation vs. flood, etc.)	Yes, as this would help make the plan something enforceable and implemented.	-

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Yampa-White River Basin								
Lou Dequine Yampa-White Agriculture	Yes	–	–	–	–	–	–	My family owns property that would be partially covered by the proposed Morrison Creek reservoir. We are not opposed as long as the reservoir could be operated so that it would be significantly lowered only in a severe drought year. We do believe that additional storage is very important in keeping our water in Colorado, and specifically in our basin.
James Hicks Yampa-White Environment - Wildlife-Fisheries	Yes	Considering the obligations of the Colorado River Compact and the requirement for endangered fish, it has been demonstrated that there is not any excess water for diversion of water out of the basin.	Support: Efficiency of agriculture. Water use - weirs and lining ditches. Modify: The plan needs to address in a more understandable language IF there is really any excess water that could be diverted to the Front Range.	Require through laws that water users develop strict conservation plans to reduce water use. Conservation of water use is the key to having enough water in the future. These laws need to be developed now before we have water emergencies like they are having in Colorado.	There is a finite amount of water in the state and we need to find ways to use it more efficiently. There should not be any water diversions out of the basin.	Not yet	The Front Range needs more water storage for water produced there. They have flood control problems and water supply shortages.	Plant more trees to replace pines that the pine beetle destroyed. The Yampa River should be designated as a major supplier of water to meet compact requirements. Much of the lower Yampa River should be designated as wild and scenic river by the Federal government.
Bruce Lindahl Yampa White Agriculture	Yes - I was a member of the roundtable for 5 years.	–	Support: We need to keep the water on the Western Slope. We have needs for the water.	No more TMDs from West Slope to East Slope.	Not enough water to meet our needs.	–	–	–

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Yampa-White River Basin								
Jason Peasley Yampa-White Recreation	No	In an environment, where Colorado's population continues to grow, can we preserve our water resources for recreation and wildlife habitat?	–	–	Diversions to the Front Range; loss of free flowing nature of the Yampa.	–	–	I support utilizing the Yampa to meet the downstream obligations and letting it flow unregulated down to Lake Powell.
Cody M. Perry Yampa-White Agriculture, municipal Environment, Recreation	No	Energy development. I would like to see a plan that recognizes energy development, specifically oil and gas, as having a major impact on water quality and supply.	Support: All aspects of the Yampa-White-Green BIP. Modify: Additional studies on climate change and effects.	Recognize the main points of Yampa-White-Green BIP.	That the state will develop water supplies to simply sustain short term growth. That the State of Colorado will reduce the quality of life by destroying habitat by creating artificial ones on the Front Range.	I have not.	No, unless the State Water Plan is entirely comprehensive. That would include aspects of the Colorado River compact.	–

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Yampa-White River Basin								
Paul Stettner Yampa-White General Public	Yes	Amount of development (agriculture, municipal, industry....) possible in the future - limit to growth. Prioritize uses How do the various basin plans coordinate - do they support each other; e.g., TMDs.	Support: – Modify: require: East Slope to use TMDs to extinction; provide water use plans to basin from which diversion is proposed. Tie land use ultimate growth assumptions - is there a limit to a variable/ finite water resource?	–	Meeting the Colorado River Compact - 1922 * the Yampa doctrine *water quality as there is more development (degradation) * overdevelopment - demand on a limited resource both East and West slope. * proposed developments must prove reliable/ adequate source of water. * potential need for energy development.	* what is the plan to get us through the worst dry cycles - restrictions on water use, river calls, Colorado River compact call, etc. Address the long-term/future generations.	?	The Basin Plan needs to be more specific in; * goals * define limits of water supply and resulting limits on development; * interaction with other basins * I have a concern that water rights can be sold - beneficial use - use it or lose it.
Peter Van De Camp Yampa-White All- I run a small farm, I own a building in downtown Steamboat Springs, I'm a recreational river runner. I own a river outfitting business. I'm interested in policy affecting water (river) quality and quantity.	Yes - State Water Supply Initiative (SWSI)	How can we maintain our Yampa River quality and quantity.	Support: Support of Colorado River Compact obligations. Modify: Municipalities must have a water supply intact before development, not look for a water supply after development.	Hold municipalities accountable for water use.	–	–	–	–

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
North Platte River Basin								
Susan Peterson North Platte General Public	No	-	Support: Capturing water in Colorado. Modify: Not providing for unlimited growth. Adding conservation incentives. Eliminate Glade Reservoir.	Law to require developers to bring water shares to water district (e.g., East Larimer County Water District) rather than \$ for taps.	Unlimited growth.	-	-	-
South Platte River Basin								
Alice Bergeron South Platte Environment - Recreation	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	I think that damming the Poudre River <u>is not an option</u> especially for the proposed Glade Reservoir. Save the Poudre.
Tom Hale South Platte Municipal	No							See below.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
--	--	--	---	---	--	---	---	----------------

South Platte River Basin

Other Comments: As the Town of Georgetown does not have the resources to participate directly in the South Platte Water Roundtable meetings that are developing the "Colorado Water Plan" for Clear Creek, the Town of Georgetown included our goals and requests in the Basin Implementation Plan for the Colorado Water Plan.

Currently contemplated projects include, but are not limited to, any combination of the projects listed below along with a summary of the Town of Georgetown project descriptions.

Town of Georgetown Storage Projects
PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS
Overview

Georgetown currently supplies water to a customer base of approximately 997.384 equivalent residential units (EQRs) and 591 individual taps for both residential and commercial customers with a permanent population of 1,110 residents. It diverts water for its municipal uses from Clear Creek under the Georgetown Ditch and Reservoir right, decreed in the District Court, City and County of Denver, in Case No. CA 41340 on October 9, 1914, with a priority date of January 10, 1866, for 1.14 Cubic feet per second (CFS) during the period from October 1st to May 1st, and 3.0 cfs from May 1st to October 1st in each year. Although fairly senior, this water right is subject to call. Georgetown therefore also has decreed storage rights and plans for augmentation that allow it to continue to provide a legal, reliable water supply to its existing customers when the 1866 right is out of priority. Georgetown's existing water rights and supplies include junior storage rights and transmountain water that is available by contract. Georgetown anticipates the need to bolster and add to its existing portfolio in order to provide reliable service into the future, as development and infill occur. Additional storage is currently considered to be crucial to meeting future demand with sufficient legal, reliable water supplies.

- Currently contemplated projects include, but are not limited to, any combination of:
- Enlargement of the existing storage capacity at Georgetown Lake;
 - Agreements, which may require construction of infrastructure, with Clear Creek Skiing Company regarding diversion and use of water for snowmaking during the ski season, with the water used for such snowmaking becoming available for storage by Georgetown as it melts during the runoff season and flows into Clear Creek or its tributaries;
 - Development of underground storage, which may require infrastructure construction;
 - Repair and/or reconstruction of the small storage component of Georgetown's 1866 water right to facilitate deliveries of the 1866 right at the Georgetown intake.

Successful completion of these projects will provide Georgetown with a permanent interest in facilities, water rights and agreements necessary to enable Georgetown to reliably store and use water rights and water supplies to meet the needs of its existing and future customers.

Project Sponsor
The Town of Georgetown, and possibly other partners, such as the Clear Creek Skiing Company, the City of Black Hawk, or Clear Creek County.

Project Beneficiaries
Georgetown is investigating the feasibility of alternative storage options to meet its own needs, but anticipates that other potential beneficiaries could include the Clear Creek Skiing Company, the City of Black Hawk, Clear Creek County, and other water providers and environmental interests in Clear Creek County.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
--	--	--	---	---	--	---	---	----------------

South Platte River Basin

Other Comments - Tom Hale (Cont.)

Uses
 The primary purpose of obtaining additional storage is to increase the reliability of Georgetown’s municipal water rights and supplies in order to meet existing and future demand. In addition, water stored in any of the contemplated projects may be able to support fishing and related recreational uses (in an enlarged Georgetown Lake), recreational uses (through agreements with Clear Creek Skiing Company), environmental uses (through releases of stored water to protect stream flows or other habitat values), and to provide additional storage sites that could be shared with other water providers, such as the City of Black Hawk or Clear Creek County in particular.

Project Region
 The storage alternatives considered by Georgetown are anticipated to be at Georgetown Lake, on Clear Creek and/or tributaries upstream of Georgetown Lake, and underground storage alternatives may be located downstream of Georgetown Lake as well.

Project Cost
 Costs for these various projects are being more thoroughly evaluated.

Permitting
 Different projects would require different permits. Georgetown anticipates that it could need County 1041 Permits, Corps of Engineers 401 and 404 permits, and a State wildlife mitigation plan, depending upon which projects are chosen.

Sensitive Species and Environmental Concerns
 No sensitive species or environmental concerns have been identified at this stage.

Progress
 Georgetown has obtained decrees for its storage rights and plans for augmentation. Georgetown, together with the City of Black Hawk, is preparing to construct additional outlet capacity in Georgetown Lake in order to implement the requirements of existing water court decrees. Such additional capacity will also facilitate release of water from an enlarged Georgetown Lake, should that project be chosen. Construction of the new outlet capacity is planned to commence in August 2014, and to be completed by April 2015. In addition, Georgetown is in the process of exploring opportunities to recover water used for snowmaking. Georgetown is evaluating options for a Master Plan to assist it in determining what storage options are best suited to meeting its future needs, in terms of location, cost and timing.

Time Frame
 Following completion of construction the additional outlet capacity for Georgetown Lake in 2015, Georgetown anticipates that it could take as long as 10-15 years to identify and implement a new storage alternative. However, repairing and/or reconstructing the small existing storage structure at the intake is expected to take less time.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
South Platte River Basin								
Chris Kraft (also testified at the September 17 South Platte River Basin hearing) South Platte Dairy Farmer (Agriculture)	Yes	–	Support: The discussion is the beginning of finding solutions. Modify: Properly account for agriculture water use. Gross diversions may not be the best way. We use and reuse (from return flows) and are quite efficient. The ultimate users of agriculture water are all of the citizens not just those in agriculture.	Be careful not to create negative unintended consequences.	That its use is misunderstood. Return flows from irrigation create a flowing river and allows for water use downstream.	Alternatives to buy and dry. Mostly wanted <u>INCREASED STORAGE!</u> For all users.	No. Any and all options should be explored. New technology or ideas may out run the plan and may augment or help the state's plan eventually.	–
Steve Malers South Platte Municipal chair of the Fort Collins Water Board NGO - founded Open Water Foundation	Yes	*Need a clear description and visual of relationship of SPDSS, SWSI, BIP, CWP and path forward. (Strategy, tactical, operational) * Need clear description of "who does <u>planning</u> in CO and <u>how</u> is planning done - e.g., local master plans - how recognized/integrated regionally. *Need more connective content (state, regional, local) How do these connect?	Support: Plan = good Local perspective = good Modify: Disclosure - I am on the consulting team for the South Platte/Metro Basin BIP. The BIP is rushed. "Grass Roots" is volunteers - tough to create/review plan.	* Don't create a one time plan. * Recognize levels of planning and also gaps in planning. * Leverage tools like South Platte DSS * Be more nimble and adaptive -- should be possible to update plan relatively, frequently like any "Board" works on policy/strategy, etc.	"Death by a thousand cuts" rather than an integrated systems approach. Lack of understanding and transparency about complex issues.	The BIP, SWSI and CWP are very many pages. Who is CWP intended for? Balancing? Summary and detail is important. Is it a document or truly a plan that is actionable?	Are there projects that state should fund/own? What about regional projects? - Ground water storage - Bring all reservoir storage to original decree - Network of "small" reservoirs.	The Open Water Foundation strives to improve data access and transparency on complex issues - part of the plan should be how to have analysis process and systems in place to support on-going planning, data driven, transparent, <u>ongoing</u> . The gap analysis could be fundamentally improved (I've done some work)

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
South Platte River Basin								
Diane Marschke South Platte General Public	No	-	<p>Support: Conservation and reuse, and agricultural transfers as part of the "Four Legs of the Stool" of Colorado water planning.</p> <p>Modify: 1) Top priority seems to be "streamlining" projects approval, like Glade Reservoir. A faulty environmental impact study (EIS) resulted from this attitude the first time around. Please don't cast out environmental and economic concerns, or public input in this rush to get done.</p> <p>2) Multi-purpose reservoirs beg to be filled! Encouraging recreational use puts pressure to justify the expense and expectations of a reliable and stable shoreline. In Los Angeles, California they actually cover many of their reservoirs. Check it out.</p>	<p>1) Taxpayers will be more amenable to the likes of Glade if they see efforts by the government to FIRST conserve water. This is a great opportunity to enact statewide municipal conservation standards like more efficient plumbing, tiered water rates, greywater use, rainwater capture, xeriscaping, recycling, etc.</p> <p>2) Research the above as well as alternative transfer methods (ATM's) and aquifer storage and recovery (ASR.) Make the extracting industries pay for treatment of lower quality water resulting from fracking, not the public.</p>	<p>Which comes first, water or the developers? I worry about all of the communities signing up for Glade that rely on projected population growth to pay off the huge bonds. "If you build it they will come" Do we want them to? Barry Goldwater often regretted his work to bring so much Colorado River water to Phoenix. He feared it would become another Los Angeles.</p>	-	-	<p>I applaud the forward looking attitude and commitment to planning of the Colorado Water Plan. I agree with most all of the proposals except Glade Reservoir, which I am against. Minimum stream flows don't cut it. As the vitality of the Poudre goes, so goes our town. (Fort Collins)</p>
Robert F. Marschke South Platte Environment, Recreation, Interested in the well being of our Poudre River tourist industry.	Yes, today 9/17/14	It needs a better focus of conservation and tiered levels of increasing expense for increased water usage.	<p>Support: Additional, thorough, environmental impact study is needed to focus upon the protection of the Poudre River flow.</p> <p>Modify: As above.</p>	Any bond issue aimed at water storage to the benefit of developers needs to go to a vote as a statewide referendum.	As above.	I am familiar with the executive summary of the proposal - see above comments	Yes, provided that the plan adequately addresses our concern about water conservation and the environment.	Do <u>NOT</u> build Glade Reservoir. Instead, find other means/plans for water storage to protect water flows in the Poudre River.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
South Platte River Basin								
<p>Carolyn Mita</p> <p>South Platte</p> <p>Save the Poudre/save the Cranes / leave something for the people to come after us.</p>	<p>No. How do I find out about them?</p>	<p>1. We live in a desert and thus have high evaporation rates. Therefore -</p> <p>2. Water should be stored in covered tanks or cisterns to conserve this precious resource.</p> <p>3. They say agriculture needs the H2O, but cities buy up all the H2O rights so we can waste it watering the Kentucky bluegrass laws required by all the HOAs.</p> <p>4. This is a waste of the little H2O not evaporated in reservoirs.</p> <p>5. We act like we are the only species on the planet. The Whooping Cranes are practically extinct and are we going to send the SandHill Cranes to the same fate by eliminating the water they need in the Platte River in Nebraska during their migrations.</p> <p>6. Can we please provide a minimum flow in streams and then fight over the rest?</p>	<p>Support: None.</p> <p>Modify: Any H2O storage should be covered to mitigate our high evaporation rates in our desert environment in which we live. Please provide minimum flows in streams before we fight over the rest of this precious natural resource.</p>	<p>Re-think our uses (extremely wasteful) of H2O.</p>	<p>1. Open storage in reservoirs in high evaporation environments wastes too much H2O.</p> <p>2. Watering bluegrass lawns as required by HOAs is wasteful.</p> <p>3. Minimum streamflows are needed to keep species such as cranes, from going extinct.</p>	<p>Thank you for telling me how to find the plan!</p>	<p>No. They should all be stopped until evaporation rates are addressed by closed storage and transport methods.</p>	<p>Please give us and the other species that share our planet minimum stream flows before we waste the H2O.</p>

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
South Platte River Basin								
Kevin McCarty (also testified at the September 17 South Platte Basin hearing) South Platte Little Thompson Watershed Restoration Coalition (our goal is to have broad representation at all water users within the watershed) Big Thompson Conservation District Board Member. McCarty Land and Water Valuation, Inc. (owner/president).	Yes	-	Support: - Modify: The Little Thompson River/Watershed is never mentioned in SWSI and is noticeably overlooked in the State Water Plan. The gap analysis which has been conducted is on a very broad scale and is certainly not focused on the scale necessary to solve the "gap" that already exists in our watershed. Our water problems include some of the most stringent water restrictions in the state at Pinewood Springs, the river going dry in places and decreasing diversion quantities for ditches diverting our water.	Possibly fund small scale projects which can stabilize water supplies in the Little Thompson Watershed.	-	-	I think the goals and objectives are fine. There just needs to be the will to identify and act on appropriate projects in a timely manner.	-
Laura Pritchett South Platte Environment/ ranching/general public	No	Why was the roundtable membership not more inclusive? Few conservationists represented.	Support: I support the fact that an overall plan is in place. Modify: The plan should focus on restoring rivers and conservation - NOT NISP or other dams/reservoirs.	Spend more time on this: Don't fast track permitting reviews.	Conservation. Conservation. Conservation. No kidding. It's not just a vague statement: policy should be focused on river health. Long-term water use.	-	Depends on the plan, of course.	I'd love to see more focus on water conservation, efficiency, recycling and growth/population management.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
South Platte River Basin								
Laurie Thomas South Platte General Public		Can the Governor be as aggressive about conservation as he is about growth?	<p>Support: I support the aspects that stress conservation of our water resources and maintaining riparian ecosystems.</p> <p>Modify: The South Platte BIP needs to include more time from local environmental groups and the general public to evaluate the impacts in their own communities. The BIP should not fast track projects - especially not the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) or Glade reservoir - let the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and water quality agencies do their due diligences to ensure if the project is environmentally feasible.</p>	Do not fund water storage projects - let municipalities foot the bill if growth is necessitating more water. DO NOT increase availability of cheap water to the oil and gas industry. The industry should be regulated more - subsidized less.	I'm concerned that a new water supply project NISP or Glade Reservoir would be a short sighted, short term solution to the insatiable growth projected for the South Platte Basin. In the end, it will short change the residents of the Fort Collins area which is a wonderful place to live because of the vibrant ecosystem around the Poudre River.	I support expanding existing reservoirs and water conservation measures. I do not think that a new reservoir project in Fort Collins would make enough difference in water storage to justify this unpopular project that would further stress our river.	State funding should not be subsidizing municipal or industrial water. Permits for new growth (albeit on a local zoning level) should always have a component of water conservation.	We cannot survive without water for more than three days. We can live without oil and gas - (it's eventually going to be exported overseas anyway). We cannot continue to strip away our natural resources for short-term profits. Please do what you can to keep Colorado intact.

Name River Basin Constituent Group	Have you attended any of your basin's roundtable meetings?	What questions do you have about the draft plan?	What aspects do you support? What aspects need to be modified?	What should the legislature do to address these concerns?	What concerns you about the future of water?	What aspects of the Colorado Water Plan relative to the whole State do you support?	Should State Funding or permits for water projects be limited to Colorado Water Plan?	Other Comments
Denver Metro River Basin								
Jennifer Barrow Denver Metro General Public - I am here as a concerned resident but I am also a volunteer for WRAN (Western Rivers Action Network)	No? I attended the meeting in Rangely, Colorado which outlined the BIPs of each basin.	What exactly is the conservation strategy of the South Platte BIP? It seems that the BIP is more concerned with return flows than conservation. Does the South Platte BIP consider active conservation measures fully?	Support: I highly support the conservation and reuse portions of the BIP. Modify: I feel the South Platte BIP needs to adopt a "High Conservation Strategy." I don't think the BIP goes far enough in addressing water conservation. I feel the BIP is structured to favor supply projects.	New development along the Front Range and in Colorado needs to incorporate smart growth strategies and water-wise landscaping in all new developments. I understand that new supply projects are necessary, but I think a high conservation strategy needs to be incorporated as well. Colorado legislature should consider active conservation measures. HOAs often require lawns for their residents, this should not be a barrier for residents wishing to xeriscape their yards.	I'm concerned that supply projects in the South Platte Basin will permanently affect our river ecosystems. I'm concerned that a double in population by 2050 without implementation of a high conservation strategy will not solve Colorado's water problems.	I support the Colorado River Basin's adoption of a high conservation standard as well as no new transmountain diversions.	Yes.	I think the South Platte BIP was very well written, well researched, and comprehensive. However, it seems like road blocks are inserted into BIP, phrased as "return flows" everytime conservation is mentioned.
Harriet Huddle Denver Metro General Public	Yes. Attended the October 1 meeting at Metro State University.	1. Will we all end up in court because of water rights? 2. Golden is involved by "water attorney's watching!" the Colorado Water Plan. 3. New Colorado River Supply? - Is this siphoning off at headwaters - Arizona?	Support: Active conservation - Chatfield expansion. Moffat Tunnel expansion. Require fracking to recycle water they use. Modify: Clarification of what obligations are to Colorado River Compact of 1922. New water storage - established conservation goals. Established new TMD's and cost and when construction starts. Mandatory distribution system leak identification and regain data availability for usage - where is water being used.	More public education - hearings. STATEWIDE Town Hall meetings. Mail information to every registered voter.	Distribution system leak identification and repair. Low water use landscapes. Lawn watering restrictions.	Support infrastructure repair. Fix the leaks. Implement low water use landscapes in any new projects.	Yes.	Water diversion projects are not part of the Colorado Water Plan, but are in "Colorado Water Portfolio." What does that mean?