

Appendix A — Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan¹

Feedback from the Water Resources Review Committee	
Committee Action	Recommendation for the Final Colorado Water Plan
<p>This recommendation was approved unanimously at the September 15, 2015 regular meeting.</p>	<p>Add additional information about funding available for water conservation system improvements to the chapter concerning alignment of state resources (currently Chapter 9 of the Second Draft) and the chapter concerning critical action to develop a multi-purpose funding plan (currently Chapter 10). Specifically, add the following statement to the discussion on the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Water conservation system improvements, such as smart metering technology, more efficient customer billing and communication systems, and other related technologies used to influence behavior to achieve water conservation goals, are eligible for financial assistance from state revolving funds as part of a water system capital improvement project."

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Charlie Preston-Townsend, Vice President, Friends of the Yampa</p> <p>Submitted in a July 15, 2015, e-mail to the Water Resources Review Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state of Colorado shall view the Yampa River as a significant and reliable source of water to meet Colorado River Compact obligations. • Colorado shall hold nonconsumptive needs as a priority and consider the significant conservation work that has been accomplished in the Yampa River Valley as an example for future water planning. • The Yampa Valley and Western Slope water users must be assured that, in the event of a compact call, negotiated equitable apportionment will be utilized to protect our many important junior water rights. • The Eastern Slope must maximize water use efficiency through a variety of methods including, but not limited to, conservation, reuse, fallowing, new and expanded Eastern Slope storage, and wise land-use planning principles.
<p>Allen D. (Dave) Miller</p> <p>Submitted to Water Resources Review Committee staff in a document on August 27, 2015.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado water planners are ignoring a proposed, U.S. patented, high altitude, multiple river basin, pumped water and energy storage solution in the Gunnison National Forest, called the Central Colorado Project. • Innovative high altitude, multiple river basin, pumped water and energy storage projects could help Colorado and all western states reach their renewable energy goals from sporadic wind and solar operations much sooner than projected. High altitude, multiple river basin, pumped water and energy storage projects are also near and long-term solutions for highly variable western droughts, growth, recreation, environments, and climate change, throughout the 21st century and beyond. All Colorado, western, and national leaders should immediately call for objective economic and environmental comparisons of innovative high altitude, multiple river basin, pumped water and energy storage projects with traditional alternatives, as required by National Environmental Policy Act rules and good science. • A state audit of Colorado's failed water planning practices is also needed.

¹Comments in this table are a summary of comments provided during public hearings of the Water Resources Review Committee, as well as comments submitted in e-mails, letters, and completed questionnaires. This summary does not include background information or other public comments not directly related to the draft Colorado Water Plan or water policy recommendations. A more complete record of the public comments is provided in meeting summaries and audio recordings of the committee hearings that are available at <http://www.colorado.gov/lcs/WRRRC>.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Jessie Shaffer, Chairman, Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority</p> <p>Submitted in a September 14, 2015, letter to the CWCB, the IBCC, and the WRRC. A copy is available on the WRRC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6 of the draft Colorado Water Plan should clarify the relationship between the state and local public water supply entities and deemphasize a philosophy of state level "command, compel, and control." • Section 6.3.1 of the plan should include a discussion of the use of structured or tiered tap fees as a method of incentivizing water conservation with a particular focus on reducing the presence of irrigated lawn areas. • Conservation includes the replacement of nonrenewable water supply with renewable water supply. • Per capita water use should be framed in a proper context to avoid inappropriate conclusions. • The Plan should not require that all water suppliers use all of the tools that it identifies, as some are more or less useful in certain contexts. • Future action 2 b should be stricken from Table 6.3.1-1 of the draft Colorado Water Plan. Future action 5 c should be revised or stricken. Future action 5 d should be stricken. • The Plan should consider and clarify whether the stretch conservation goal is aspirational or a mandate. • Water supply providers that have undertaken a project consistent with their basin's BIP should be presumed to have met the Plan's requirements for integrated water supply planning. • With respect to Section 6.3.3, the plan should insulate local water providers from being punished for abstaining from doing something they are not legally allowed to do. • The Plan should clarify the list of funding strategies in Section 9.2 as representative rather than exhaustive. Funding strategies should be evaluated for their potential long-term financial contributions and aligned with component parts of the plan. • Sections of the Plan concerning permitting procedures should be revised to reflect the Governor's call for streamlining. • The Plan should clarify that the Plan's conceptual framework shall be applied only to evaluations of future transmountain diversions.
Public Comments from July 20, 2015, Southwest Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Art Goodtimes, San Miguel County Board of County Commissioners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan should quantify evaporative water losses from water storage. (This comment was provided at the July 20 regular committee hearing).
<p>Judy Garrigues, Dolores Conservation District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New storage has limited use because we can only save as much water as precipitates. • Soil conservation is important to stave off dust bowl conditions.
<p>Travis Custer, Dolores Conservation District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 10 of the draft Colorado Water Plan seeks to develop a strategic education program to promote agricultural water conservation and soil health initiatives. It should also identify conservation districts as partners, in addition to the state and federal agencies identified in Chapters 6 and 9.
<p>Kate Greenberg, National Young Farmers Coalition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.5 of the draft Colorado Water Plan mentions reducing barriers to entry for young farmers. This should be emphasized further in the plan. The state needs a workforce that can sustain agriculture and food production. Access to land, capital, education, and training for young farmers ought to be priorities. • In a survey of over 375 western young farmers, over 94 percent are implementing some type of conservation, most commonly soil conservation.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from July 20, 2015, Southwest Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
John Ott, James Ranch and Animas Water Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil health should be recognized as an effective method of water storage.
Dick Ray, Archuleta County Farm Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado is approaching its human carrying capacity. Population growth should be slowed.
Bruce Whitehead, Executive Director, Southwest Water Conservation District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed in the state including additional water storage on the East Slope, such as the Northern Integrated Supply Project.
Steve Harris, Harris Water Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state sales tax should be increased to fund water infrastructure projects. • Outdoor water use should be limited to 30 percent of residential water use.
Jake Gardanier, Southwest Farm Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional storage in the South Platte Basin should be considered.
John Porter, Southwestern Water Conservation District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2003 Colorado Water Projects Bond Referendum, also known as Referendum A, failed because voters perceived it as a top-down approach without clearly identified projects. A water project bond referendum that is developed through a more grassroots process would have a better chance for approval by the voters.
Public Comments from July 21, 2015, Gunnison Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Stephen Schrock, NoChicoBrush	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 10 Critical Action Plan (4) (b) (2) concerning support for agricultural conservation and efficiency should include state grants to farmers and ranchers for on-farm irrigation efficiency and small hydropwer. • The public trust doctrine is in conflict with the doctrine of prior appropriation. The voters should be provided meaningful water projects as an alternative to the public trust doctrine.
Jay Jutten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed on both the East and West Slope. • Burdensome regulations of water projects should be reduced. • Agricultural return flows are important to other water users.
Jaris Jutten (submitted completed questionnaire)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More storage is needed throughout the state. • No transmountain diversions. • Keep prior appropriation.
Dave Whittlesey, Overland Ditch and Reservoir Co.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed for agriculture and to help the state comply with interstate compacts. • Onerous federal environmental regulations should be eliminated.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from July 21, 2015, Gunnison Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
David Crane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed on the East Slope. • Protect the agricultural economy to protect the state's quality of living and to attract new workers. • Protect water rights.
Don Suppes, Mayor of Orchard City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate unnecessary requirements to obtain funding from the Colorado Water Conservation Board that increase the cost of the project, such as historic reviews for construction projects. • The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment's graywater regulations are too burdensome.
Glenn Davis, Montrose County Commissioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change is not an issue that should be addressed. • The water needs of humans should take precedence over water needs for the environment. • Without agriculture, Western Colorado will dry up.
Sandy Head, Executive Director, Montrose Economic Development Corp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water is needed for a healthy economy and for the quality of life that attracts new employers and employees.
Bob Brown, Montrose Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Buy and dry" negatively affects the business community.
Public Comments from July 22, 2015, Yampa-White Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
T. Wright Dickinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow the HB 05-1177 process to continue and identify legislation needed to address future water supply challenges. Water legislation should reflect the consensus of the water community and not the preference of special water interests. • East Slope communities should maximize water conservation prior to seeking additional West Slope water supplies. • Any new transmountain diversions should be developed in accordance with the Interbasin Compact Committee's conceptual framework for new transmountain diversions. • Agricultural water use efficiency may negatively impact return flows and late season streamflows that are important to the environment and recreation. • Additional storage is needed to meet municipal water demands. • Chapter 10 of the Colorado Water Plan should be amended to create the goal of a "vibrant" and productive agriculture instead of a "viable" and productive agriculture. • Restrictions should not be placed on the ability of farmers and ranchers to sell their land and water as the proceeds from such sales are needed for retirement.
Pat O'Toole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed. Water supply solutions should occur sooner than later due to the rising cost of construction. • States should be given greater authority to issue permits for water projects. • Due to improvements in water purification technologies, municipalities should be encouraged to use nonpotable water supplies such as water produced from oil and gas development.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from July 22, 2015, Yampa-White Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Kevin McBride</p> <p>Feedback was provided during the July 22 regular meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate water plans should be developed for each basin because their water needs and resources are unique. • A portion of Colorado's undeveloped compact entitlement should be reserved for the Yampa-White Basin. • Any water legislation should encourage flexibility in water use and recognize the diversity of river basins. • Unappropriated water from the Yampa-White Basin enables Colorado water users in other Colorado River basins to comply with its interstate compacts.
<p>Jackie Brown</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado River Compact allows each state to develop its allocation as it sees fit. The legislature should follow a similar course and allow the Yampa-White Basin to develop unappropriated water in the basin at its own pace.
<p>Ken Brenner, Director Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District Board of Directors, Friends of the Yampa</p> <p>This feedback was provided during the July 22 regular meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Interbasin Compact Committee's conceptual framework for new transmountain diversions needs additional clarification and should include enforcement measures to protect exporting basins. The framework should only be viewed as a starting point for future negotiations over new transmountain diversions. • There should be no new transmountain diversions because they will hinder Colorado's ability to comply with interstate compacts and limit the Yampa-White Basin's ability to address future water needs. • The water plan should recognize Governor Ritter's water supply solutions including water conservation, water reuse, East Slope water storage, and allowing to promote water sharing between irrigators and municipalities.
<p>Ben Beall</p> <p>This feedback was provided during the July 22 regular meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan should discuss protocols for addressing water users' ability to divert water for health, safety, and welfare purposes if there is a Colorado compact call. • Protocols should be developed through legislation or other means that determine how to apportion the impact of a compact call equitably across river basins.
<p>Marsha Daugenbaugh</p> <p>This feedback was provided during the July 22 regular meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan needs to focus on new agricultural efficiencies and non-traditional ideas that new farmers are exploring. • There should be no more transmountain diversions, especially those intended for non-food consumption uses. Agricultural, environmental, and recreational uses are dependent on each other in the Western Slope and each would suffer if there were more transmountain diversions.
Public Comments from August 10, 2015, Rio Grande Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Don Shawcroft, Colorado Farm Bureau</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed in the state to capture surplus water crossing the state's boundaries. • The state should declare a water emergency and urge the federal government to allow the state to store additional water. • Section IV of Chapter 10 of the draft Colorado Water Plan concerning support for agricultural conservation and efficiency should further define "saved" water and explain that conservation of agricultural water rights is different from conservation of municipal and industrial water rights. It should also explain who may benefit from the marketing of saved agricultural water rights.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from August 10, 2015, Rio Grande Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Mike Mitchell, Colorado Farm Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New residents should learn about Colorado's water laws and water use traditions. They should also better understand the impacts of rainwater harvesting on other water users and understand how agricultural return flows benefit other water users. • The Prior Appropriation Doctrine should be protected.
Public Comments from August 11, 2015, Arkansas Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Tom Goodwin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal income spent on food has decreased over the past several decades, but the loss of agriculture could lead to rising food prices and loss of disposable income that consumers spend on other products. • Additional storage on the East Slope is needed.
<p>Kip Petersen, Vice President, Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority</p> <p>A copy of Mr. Petersen's written testimony is included in the August 11 meeting summary and available on the WRRC website.</p> <p>Additional comments from the Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority were submitted outside the meeting both to the WRRC and directly to the CWCB. These are available on the WRRC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State and federal permitting requirements should be streamlined to avoid unnecessary reviews and costs being imposed on water providers and their customers. • The Colorado Water Plan should recommend that all state agencies coordinate their review of water projects and use the same analysis and expert input. • Environmental analysis for federal agencies should be used by state agencies without requiring duplicate analysis. • Projects endorsed by the state should be supported in federal permitting and for funding. • The Interbasin Compact Committee's "stretch goal" of 400,000 additional acre-feet of municipal demand reduction should be vetted by more stakeholders before being endorsed by the state. • Under Section 10.3 III of the second draft of the Colorado Water Plan, prior conservation achievements are not incorporated or recognized as value-added accomplishments. This creates a disincentive to do anything not prescribed or mandated by the state government since they might be discounted or ignored by the state. • The Colorado Water Plan should recognize that Colorado does not currently allow direct potable reuse (DPR). The plan should recommend funding and research to develop standards and processes for DPR, and recognize the role of the Water Quality Control Commission in authorizing DPR. • The State Water Plan is too directed at municipal and industrial use, the smallest percentage of water consumption in the state. Further study should be conducted concerning how agriculture can be more efficient in the use of water, along with a mechanism to provide for funding for agricultural irrigation enhancement.
Dick Brown, Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide financial support to farmers participating in water conservation, including tax credits and other tax incentives. • We need local participation and control of water projects.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from August 11, 2015, Arkansas Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Drew Peterzell, Trout Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state ought to consider ideal stream flow rates through stream management plans. • Additional funding should be provided for stream management plans. • The Colorado Water Plan should further emphasize agricultural efficiency. • Additional funds should be provided for agriculture efficiency.
Brett Gracely, Colorado Springs Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state water plan needs to recognize that water projects occur simultaneously and they often lack coordination with one another. • The level of conservation advocated in the state water plan will be difficult to achieve quickly because no court order or executive action can drive conservation at such a pace. • Additional water storage will enable more flexible water use, such as exchanges. • Regulations promulgated by different agencies are a hindrance to water projects, especially for smaller water providers. • Different basin implementation plans have different goals and are, at times, in conflict with one another, which could lead to future inconsistencies in planning.
Julie Nania, High Country Conservation Advocates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crested Butte's water supply, Coal Creek, is listed as contaminated with heavy metals from mining. Coal Creek is treated by a water treatment facility that is required to operate in perpetuity, despite the financial difficulties faced by the plant's owner and operator. Under current law, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment may require bonds to ensure that water treatment project can continue when an operator goes bankrupt, but these are rarely used in practice. The state should revisit bonding requirements for water treatment projects.
Public Comments from August 12, 2015, Colorado Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Stan Cazier, Middle Park Water Conservancy District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water is not available in the Colorado River Basin for new transmountain diversions. • Outdoor water use should be limited to 30 percent of residential water use. Otherwise, additional agricultural water rights will be transferred to satisfy the growing municipal water demand. • Colorado should follow the example of California in order to curtail water usage and declare a state of emergency to address the drought conditions. • Concerned about how future water projects will be funded.
Abby Burk, Audubon of the Rockies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overuse of many of Colorado's rivers has impacted river health and the environment. The Colorado Water Plan should identify funding for healthy flowing rivers to protect the environment and the recreation economy.
Bill Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should help ensure an adequate water supply for water users in Grand County.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from August 12, 2015, Colorado Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Torie Jarvis, Northwest Colorado Council of Governments, Water Quality and Quantity Committee</p> <p>A copy of Ms. Jarvis' written testimony is included in the August 12 meeting summary and available on the WRRC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should act as a neutral facilitator in order to create a more efficient permitting process. • Local interests should be more involved in developing and reviewing water projects. • The Joint Review Process (Article 10 of Title 34, repealed in 2003) should be reestablished so that all permits from all state offices may be coordinated. Under this process, local affected interests would also be at the table from the beginning, before NEPA begins, and can express local concerns as well as mitigation concepts at the earliest possible time. The NEPA process would also be less onerous because reports and studies can focus on the real concerns instead of hypothetical concerns. Also, agencies with regulatory authority will be discussing their concerns and can avoid duplicative requirements on the applicant. • The Colorado Water Plan recommends potential endorsement of projects to make permitting more efficient. State endorsement of a project without first requiring local approval of a project could create the situation where the state advocates for a project before local permitting processes occur or even after a local government denies a permit. • Tying state endorsement and preliminary § 401 certification to the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) would make it harder for the state to change or deny certification later based on the more complete and accurate final EIS, and based on its own processes such as the anti-degradation review. • Some sections of the Colorado Water Plan call for the state to consider funding or filing for water rights for future water projects, including transmountain diversions. This is not the proper role for the state and should not be part of the Colorado Water Plan. The state should not assume the role as a proponent of a water project until the state regulatory process has been completed and the project has been agreed to by the impacted local governments in the area from which the water would be diverted. • Financing for water projects should not occur unless affected local governments approve the project. • Funding is an important issue for land use planning and conservation.
<p>Lurline Underbrink-Curran County Manager, Grand County</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return flows from agricultural water diversions benefit stream flows in the Colorado Basin. The Colorado Water Plan should not promote water use efficiency policies that may impact agricultural return flows. • The Colorado Water Plan should focus more on agricultural users and agricultural efficiencies.
<p>Merrit Linke, Grand County Commissioner</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return flows from agricultural water diversions benefit stream flows in the Colorado Basin and help keep streams cooler. • The Windy Gap Project increases the temperature of water stored in the reservoir and hampers the passage of fish. The Windy Gap Bypass Project will benefit fish and the environment by keeping stream temperatures cooler and enabling the passage of fish.
<p>Paul Bruchez, Agriculture Representative on the Colorado Basin Roundtable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public education helps residential water users better understand the impact urban landscapes have on rivers and streams. • Voluntary programs, including education and outreach, should also be used to encourage irrigators to use water in a manner that protects the environment while maintaining agricultural productivity.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 14, 2015, North Platte Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Ty Wattenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Water Supply Reserve Account funding component of the plan should be kept as whole as possible, and more funds should be added to the account. All basins will need additional funding in order to implement components of the plan. • Alternative transfer methods should retain the current sideboards in place, such as regulating the time in which water can be leased. • The state should be more involved in the funding of projects, and there needs to be more creative ways to fund projects. • The education of voters about water issues is an important component of the water plan.
Carl Trick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Supply Reserve Account funding should be put towards lowering the gap in municipal and industrial supply. • The plan is not strong enough in its current form. It needs more requirements rather than suggestions. • There should be an emphasis on increasing storage on the South Platte and along the Front Range. Agricultural users in the Front Range and along the South Platte are connected to the agricultural users in the North Platte Basin. • Everyone involved in developing the plan should compromise, but that is currently not happening. Current projects have been halted due to specific concerns, i.e. environmental, and the state should become more involved with those projects to ensure that groups involved are compromising with each other to get water projects completed. • The General Assembly should help to streamline the permitting process in order to complete water projects.
Public Comments from September 14, 2015, South Platte Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Joe Frank, Chair South Platte Basin Roundtable</p> <p>The Metro and South Platte Basin Roundtables combined, will send a 12-page letter to the Colorado Water Conservation Board that includes comments and information that was agreed to by both roundtables. Highlights of the agreement are identified in the following column.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The doctrine of prior appropriation must be defended. • The Colorado Water Plan advocates for the rehabilitation of existing storage or underground storage. It also says that new storage is controversial. The plan should explain why new storage is controversial and identify alternatives to overcome it. Overcoming this controversy should be a high priority and emphasized in Sections 4, 6 and 10 of the plan. Both above-ground and underground storage is needed to facilitate alternative transfers, augmentation, and to benefit the environment and recreation. • Conservation and reuse is an important piece of the Colorado Water Plan but the plan needs to keep building on conservation and reuse. • The plan's conservation stretch goal is aspirational. It should not receive greater emphasis in the plan than other methods for meeting the demand gap. • The plan should also recognize that agricultural efficiency does not create new water and that it may impact streamflows and other water users. • The plan should advocate for a more efficient water project permitting process including a more active role for the state that begins earlier in the permitting process. • The plan should be balanced and provide equal emphasis to all methods for meeting the demand gap including conservation and reuse, alternative transfer mechanisms, completion of identified projects and process, and the development of Colorado's compact entitlement.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 14, 2015, South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Burt Knight, City of Greeley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan should preserve and protect Colorado's prior appropriation doctrine as specified in state constitution. • A water right is a property right. The state should not impact those rights through rules and statutes, and further complicate the system. • As the state asserts a greater role in water supply planning, it should not preempt local control or impose one-size-fits all solutions. • As the state develops new formulas to measure progress on conservation, it should also recognize prior conservation accomplishments. • Conservation shouldn't be the dominant focus in the plan. • The Colorado Water Plan should include a chapter on storage that explains how storage mitigates drought impacts and benefits stream health. It should also explain how storage helps secure water supplies and provides flood control, water to fight wildfires, and redundancies when water systems are compromised by wildfires. • Unallocated water exists that should be captured. • Chapter 10 of the plan should not advocate for a change in the law to allow funding for certain projects until the final Colorado Water Plan is released and consensus exists for such a change.
Sean Conway, Weld County Commissioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water storage should be increased. • The Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) will provide flood control benefits and help preserve irrigated agricultural lands. If this project is not built (the no alternative option in the environmental impact assessment), large amounts of agricultural water rights will be transferred to meet the demand for municipal water. • Buy and dry is devastating to Weld County agriculture as well as West Slope farmers and ranchers. The West Slope should help support NISP and other projects that address East Slope water supply needs without the use of new transmountain diversions. • Conservation should be a vital component of the plan as well as additional water storage. • Collaboration is needed to meet Colorado's water supply challenges.
Randy Ray, Central Colorado Water Conservancy District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a lot of opportunities for additional water storage in lined gravel pits. • The environmental pool in the Chatfield Reallocation Project should be viewed as a model for other water storage projects. • Irrigated agriculture landscapes are important to urban residents. • While efficient water use stretches water supplies, it also removes return flows from the system. The South Platte River is a gaining system that depends on return flows. Eliminating return flows will impact downstream water users. Conservation and efficient use of water can be utilized, but properly located storage can likely solve the problems created with efficiency.
Alan Gentz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional water storage is needed on the East Slope and the West Slope. • Irrigated agriculture is already efficient. Increased efficiency, such as the replacement of flood irrigation with sprinklers, reduces groundwater recharge. • The Colorado Water Plan should protect water rights and Colorado's water law.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 14, 2015, South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Peter Bridgeman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Northern Integrated Supply Project is critical as well as the Chimney Hollow Reservoir and Windy Gap Firming Project. • Water must be used more wisely to stretch this limited supply. • Water conservation will not satisfy all of Colorado's water needs. Additional storage is needed to satisfy these needs.
Delores Martindale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The prior appropriation doctrine must be preserved for those who have water rights.
John Martindale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers, homeowners' associations, and golf courses should increase their water conservation efforts.
Roni Sylvester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over augmentation is contributing to high groundwater levels in the South Platte Basin. • The Colorado Water Plan should include a discussion on Platte River Endangered Species Recovery Program and its effect on Colorado's ability to develop its compact entitlement.
Bruce Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado's water must be managed to meet future water demands.
Public Comments from September 15, 2015, Metro Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Celia Greenman</p> <p>A copy of Ms Greenman's written testimony is included in the September 15 meeting summary and available on the WRRRC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote healthy rivers, the Colorado Water Plan should consider the volume, frequency, and timing of flows necessary to maintain river health and the plan should identify funding for such assessments. Once these nonconsumptive water needs are identified, they should be met through increased conservation, reuse, and efficiency. • The Colorado Water Plan, which currently considers average yield for water storage projects, should instead consider safe or firm yield. Safe or firm yield is the amount of water that a project can deliver year after year, despite droughts. • Transmountain diversions do not benefit the Western Slope or the state's robust tourism industry. • Energy producers, including those obtaining oil and gas through hydraulic fracturing, should primarily use recycled water. • The plan should not consider water needs for oil shale development as this resource is not economically viable and would require substantial amounts of water and energy to develop. • Oil and gas development should also be excluded from areas near bodies of water.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 15, 2015, Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Ken Ransford</p> <p>A copy of Mr. Ransford's written testimony is included in the September 15 meeting summary and available on the WRRC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy rivers were the public's primary concern when polled in the Colorado Basin Implementation Plan outreach in 2014. In nearly every case, the best way to improve rivers is to add more water to them. The use it or lose it practice in Colorado results in far more water being diverted from streams than crops need or can consume. Water law reform is necessary to remedy this, particularly by eliminating the abandonment risk. Policymakers should adjudicate each farmer's consumptive use right based on acres irrigated as shown on GIS maps. Without basin of origin protection, the Western Slope fears that the Eastern Slope will obtain rights to water left in rivers. For many Western Slope residents, this justifies excessive river diversions despite the harm to rivers. Funding is needed for irrigation system efficiency improvements, such as the Orchard Mesa irrigation improvements in Grand Junction. • Up to 1 million irrigated acres in the South Platte and Arkansas basins will be lost to urban and suburban sprawl. Colorado's Water Plan does not address this. The Colorado Basin cannot prevent this loss of irrigated agriculture by diverting still more water to the Front Range. Irrigation reform is thwarted by water court expenses and by excessive concern with return flows. Water laws promote flood irrigation to protect return flows and avoid the no injury rule. Farmers in Australia's Murray-Darling Basin eliminated return flows by converting to sprinklers between 1991 and 2008. In Colorado, 97 percent of irrigated acres in the Republican Basin use sprinklers. We can sustain and aid agriculture with zoning protection, conservation easements, denser development, easing barriers to alternative transfer methods, and making water freely transferable. Colorado's Water Plan should estimate how much land is needed to grow enough food to sustain Colorado's current and projected population, and discuss how to protect that land. • Increasing river flows will improve water quality. Increasing river flows on Western Slope rivers and preventing any additional transmountain diversions is essential to ensure safe drinking water. • Land use decisions should be made with water budgets. Local jurisdictions can determine their own water budgets and water use practices, but all future development in Colorado should target high conservation. • The Colorado Water Plan overstates Colorado's projected population growth by saying 50 percent of the increase is from births by Colorado residents, amounting to 0.9 percent per year in the Hot Growth Scenario. The US Census Bureau projects that the average indigenous population growth in the United States will drop from 0.5 percent in 2015 to 0.2 percent in 2060. At that rate, only 14 percent of the Hot Growth projected population growth will come from indigenous births, with 86 percent of the population growth (3.9 million) resulting from in-migration. The average indigenous growth rate from 2015 to 2050 is only 0.3%, one-third of the rate projected by Colorado's state demographer. • The Shoshone and Cameo calls are essential to protect the health of the Colorado River. • Colorado is now using 100 percent or more of its share of the Colorado River, and there is no more firm yield available for diversion to the Eastern Slope. • Eliminating the water supply gap requires high conservation statewide, following the Southwest Roundtable's recommendation that 70 percent of municipal water use occur indoors and 30 percent outdoors. Colorado's Water Plan should acknowledge and promote this.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 15, 2015, Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Kristin Green, Conservation Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan should include a more robust stretch conservation goal based on the high conservation goal identified in the Colorado River Basin Implementation Plan and the 2010 State Water Supply Initiative. • Water conservation should be maximized prior to pursuing other water supply options that impose more impacts. • Additional incentives should be developed to encourage water reuse, including an improved regulatory environment (as identified in Chapter 10 III b of the draft plan). • State endorsement of water projects should not occur prior to the release of a final environmental impact statement. This could marginalize the statement's findings.
Sonia Skakich-Scrima	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan ought to acknowledge and address the projected impacts of climate change. Protection of water supply may not be possible if climate change becomes irreversible. Combating climate change will require leaving two-thirds of existing fossil fuels in the ground. • Hydraulic fracturing uses an unacceptable amount of water to extinction. It also increases the migration of methane gas toward surface water supply and the atmosphere. • Climate change ought to be the basis for the approach of regulatory bodies, including the committee, in water policy planning.
Larry Scrima	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water should not be considered cheap or free. • Industrial users of water and other natural resources should adequately compensate for their use or lease of public resources. Industrial users should also be held responsible for cleanup of the sites they abandon.

Feedback on the Draft Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 15, 2015, Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Anne Castle, Getches-Wilkinson Center at the University of Colorado</p> <p>A copy of Ms. Castle's written testimony is included in the September 15 meeting summary and available on the WRRRC website.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Colorado Water Plan describes a large number of proposed action items, both inside and outside of Chapter 10. The action items in the draft Colorado Water Plan should be prioritized in order to promote a practical implementation strategy. • Significant funding will be needed in order to address water gaps, promote agricultural and environmental viability, and prepare for climate change. The Colorado Water Conservation Board ought to develop criteria to determine which projects receive funding and from which sources. • The Colorado Water Plan appropriately recognizes the key role of conservation in meeting Colorado's project water supply gaps, and the important corollary that no one sector can or should be relied upon to bear the entire burden of the projected conservation goals (Chapter 6.3). The plan should include the stretch goal of reducing projected 2050 municipal demand by 400,000 acre feet through active conservation (Chapter 10, Action III.a.4). • Without thoughtful scoping parameters, development of significant new Colorado River supplies increases the risk of future curtailment to all existing, post-1922 Colorado River water users, reduces the production of renewable hydropower at Colorado River Storage Project reservoirs, and could ratchet up unwelcome and counter-productive political dynamics among the Colorado River Basin States. The IBCC-developed Conceptual Framework mitigates these adverse effects of new water development on the Western Slope. The Conceptual Framework is a critically important part of the plan and should be formally adopted in the plan and by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, not just monitored (Chapter 10, Action VI.d.4). • The state must take a leadership role in developing meaningful alternatives that can help make some irrigation water available for other uses, but in a manner that benefits the agricultural economy in order to demonstrate its commitment to reducing the use of permanent water transfers to meet new consumptive use demands. • Legislation should be considered to recognize the right of a water rights owner to continued ownership, and the right to dispose of saved consumptive use. Such legislative recognition currently exists in Montana, California, Oregon, and Washington, and provides a secure foundation for farmers in particular to alter their usage of water without fear of loss. • While the Colorado River Water Bank Working Group and the CWCB's support for this group are mentioned in the plan (pages 196, 211-12), the plan should include a specific action item continuing this support and eventual implementation of a Colorado River water bank to reduce the risk of a compact deficit. The plan should also consider additional regional water banks created under CWCB guidelines to help facilitate more flexible response to drought situations and to manage the use of alternative transfer methods for the sharing of irrigation water.
<p>Casey Davenhill, Colorado Watershed Assembly</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basin roundtables are important for engaging the public in conversation about water management in the state. • The Colorado Water Plan should also promote public education and outreach for basin roundtable members to learn about the priorities of their local communities and to educate elected officials and special districts representatives about water matters. • The Colorado Water Plan should recognize that water supply planning for water quality and supply projects is a regional issue that requires collaboration among people with diverse perspectives and interests. • More funding should be available to offset travel and other expenses incurred by persons participating in basin roundtables, water districts, and other water meetings.