

**Water Resources Review Committee
Senate Bill 14-115 Report to the Colorado Water Conservation
Board**

Members of the Committee

Representative Randy Fischer, Chair
Senator Gail Schwartz, Vice-Chair

Senator Greg Brophy	Representative Don Coram
Senator Mary Hodge	Representative Diane Mitsch Bush
Senator Matt Jones	Representative Jerry Sonnenberg
Senator Ellen Roberts	Representative Ed Vigil

Legislative Council Staff

David Beaujon, Senior Analyst
Brooke Maddaford, Research Analyst
Clare Pramuk, Principal Fiscal Analyst
Greg Sobetski, Economist

Office of Legislative Legal Services

Jennifer Berman, Staff Attorney
Thomas Morris, Managing Senior Attorney
Meghan E. O'Connor, Legislative Editor

October 2014

State Representative
RANDY FISCHER
3007 Moore Lane
Ft. Collins, Colorado 80526-2103
Capitol: 303-866-2917
Home: 970-226-5383
E-mail: randyfischer@frii.com



Chairman:
Agriculture, Livestock &
Natural Resources Committee
Member:
Capital Development Committee
Transportation & Energy
Committee

COLORADO
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
State Capitol
Denver
80203

October 28, 2014

Mr. James Eklund, Director
Colorado Water Conservation Board
Department of Natural Resources
1313 Sherman Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Director Eklund:

On behalf of the members of the 2014 Interim Water Resources Review Committee (Committee) and its staff, I am pleased to submit to you and the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) the attached final report summarizing the Committee's activities around the State pursuant to Senate Bill 14-115. The Committee, staff, and I are submitting this final report to comply with SB 14-115's November 1, 2014, reporting requirement.

I am extremely grateful for and proud of the diligent efforts of the Committee and its dedicated staff in conducting the nine SB 14-115 public meetings throughout the summer and fall of 2014 which are described in our report. The Committee and I especially wish to acknowledge staff's heroic efforts to arrange the travel, organize the meetings, and prepare this final report for 2014.

The attached report supplements the preliminary report we submitted on October 9, 2014, which summarized the public comments received during our SB 14-115 outreach efforts. Staff prepared and submitted our preliminary comment summary report in order to meet the CWCB's October 10 deadline for accepting public comments for consideration in the writing of the draft Colorado Water Plan (CWP). This current report summarizes our activities and finalizes our 2014 compliance efforts under SB-115.

As you know, SB 14-115 directed the Committee in 2014 to convene at least nine public meetings, one in each geographic region of the State served by a basin roundtable, to gather and submit public comments, and to provide its own input on the scope, fundamental approach, and key elements of the draft CWP. The Committee declined at its September 30, 2014, meeting to submit a formal comment letter of its own pending the CWCB's release of the Draft CWP in December of this year. However, the Committee directed me, as chair, to submit a summary of the common themes we heard from members of public at meetings around the state during 2014. These common themes we heard statewide are summarized as follows:

- Colorado citizens support a strong and robust statewide commitment toward achieving increased levels of municipal, commercial, and industrial water conservation as one of top priorities for meeting future water demands. People throughout Colorado expect the CWP to include strong recommendations to increase the conservation and efficiency of residential and commercial water usage and reduce urban outdoor lawn irrigation, especially along the urbanized front range.
- Not surprisingly, citizens across the state voiced great concern that their communities will be dewatered for the benefit of fueling front range urban population growth. This sentiment is especially prevalent among west slope residents but is true of residents in every basin. People are concerned about the impacts that possible trans-basin diversions would have on their economies and quality of life and believe that the CWP should address this concern in meaningful ways.
- The link between urban development and land-use practices and front-range water conservation was a common theme heard at nearly all the SB 14-115 public meetings. A State role in reducing the water footprint of new development and redevelopment as a conservation measure appears to be strongly supported by citizens in urban and rural communities alike. Citizens in west slope communities in particular believe that the front-range basin implementation plan's commitments to conservation are not sufficiently rigorous to prevent future diversions of west slope water to the front range.
- Based on public testimony received throughout the State in 2014, the people of Colorado clearly value healthy rivers and resilient, naturally functioning watersheds. People view the maintenance of healthy aquatic ecosystems and riparian corridors as a beneficial use for water and are willing to make the tradeoffs necessary to allocate water toward meeting environmental and recreational needs. Citizens recognize and support the need for assessing and meeting the segment-specific environmental and recreational needs of State water bodies.
- The need for additional water storage is a universal theme expressed across Colorado. Additional storage as well as infrastructure improvements to increase the efficiency and resilience of our water supply and delivery system is deemed essential. However, citizens everywhere believe that funding for environmental and recreational projects should be on par with water supply and delivery identified projects and processes (IPPs). Similarly, State support and funding for multi-benefit IPPs should be prioritized according to a set of guidelines and criteria which protect the health of aquatic systems and enhance environmental and recreational benefits.
- Another theme raised statewide was the importance of maintaining agricultural productivity and strengthening our agricultural economy. People everywhere recognize that Colorado must find alternatives to drying-up irrigated farmland to meet future municipal and industrial water needs and that farming and ranching remain viable pursuits only with sufficient water needed for food production. Citizens statewide place a high value on our farming and ranching heritage and believe the CWP should emphasize multiple benefits of keeping agricultural water rights in the hands of the producers.

- Support for Colorado's prior appropriation doctrine and our existing market-based system of allocating our scarce water resources is universal. Yet, the Committee heard expressed the hope that the CWP will establish strong policy directives aimed at increasing flexibility, innovation, and creativity in the administration of Colorado water law. Specifically, citizens support innovative approaches toward conservation and toward sharing water among agricultural, municipal, and industrial users as well as for maintaining environmental and recreational values. There is strong preference that the CWP develop the framework for State policies that legally and financially support pilot and full-scale projects for implementing innovative practices, such as leasing/fallowing, flexible water rights, water banking, urban and agricultural efficiency, conjunctive use of surface and ground waters, rainwater harvesting, and others. The expectation statewide is that the CWP will provide the policy and legislative direction necessary to achieve the flexibility needed to meet the water needs of the 21st century and beyond.
- Citizens throughout the State are concerned about water and want their concerns to be heard and addressed in the CWP. A public dialogue on water is viewed as critically important to future decision making. People everywhere hope the CWCB will remain committed to seeking public input through a deliberative process.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this report. The Committee is honored to have participated in the process of developing the Colorado Water Plan by engaging the citizens across the State as envisioned by SB 14-115.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Randy Fischer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Randy Fischer, Chairman
Interim Water Resources Review Committee
State Representative
House District 53

Table of Contents

Committee Charge Pursuant to Senate Bill 14-115	1
Committee Activities	1
Overview	1
SB 14-115 Hearing Format.....	2
Public Outreach and Process for Obtaining Public Feedback	3
Public Feedback Provided to the Colorado Water Conservation Board	3
Public Feedback from Questionnaires	3
Public Feedback from Meetings and Other Sources	3
Public Feedback from Meeting Sign-In Sheets	4
Next Steps in the SB 14-115 Process	4

Water Resources Review Committee Senate Bill 14-115 Report to the Colorado Water Conservation Board

Committee Charge Pursuant to Senate Bill 14-115

Governor's executive order concerning the Colorado Water Plan. In 2013, Governor Hickenlooper issued an executive order directing the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) to commence work on the Colorado Water Plan. According to the executive order, the plan must promote a productive economy that supports vibrant and sustainable cities, viable and productive agriculture, and a robust skiing, recreation, and tourism industry. It must also incorporate an efficient and effective water infrastructure promoting smart land use and a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams, and wildlife. The CWCB is instructed to provide a draft plan for review by the Governor's Office by December 10, 2014, and to complete the final plan by December 10, 2015.

Senate Bill 14-115 legislative declaration. Senate Bill 14-115 declares that the General Assembly is primarily responsible for guiding the development of state water policy. It also declares that this law is necessary to protect the interests of the public in the state's water resources and that the General Assembly intends to engage the people of the state in a public dialogue regarding optimal state water policy. The law also affirms the legislature's delegation of policy-making authority to the CWCB, and declares that the law seeks to promote the policies, processes, basin roundtable plans, and Interbasin Compact negotiations conducted pursuant to the "Colorado Water for the 21st Century Act," and the Interbasin Compact Charter.

The Water Resources Review Committee (WRRRC) was created to contribute to and monitor the conservation, use, development, and financing of Colorado's water resources for the general welfare of the state (Section 37-98-102, C.R.S.). Pursuant to SB 14-115, the committee is required to review statewide planning for water resources. The law requires the committee to hold at least one public hearing in each geographic region associated with basin roundtables to collect feedback from the public on the scope, fundamental approach, and basic elements of the draft Colorado Water Plan. The committee must provide a summary of the public's feedback, as well as its own feedback, to the CWCB by November 1, 2014. The committee may recommend the introduction of legislation based on the results of the review.

Committee Activities

Overview. In addition to six regular meetings, the committee held nine meetings during the 2014 interim, one in each geographic region associated with the basin roundtables, to collect feedback from the public on the draft Colorado Water Plan. Over 500 people are estimated to have attended the 9 SB 14-115 hearings. The committee also received public comments in letters and e-mails, handwritten questionnaires, and questionnaires that were completed on the committee's website. On October 9, 2014, the committee delivered a preliminary report to the CWCB that summarized the public feedback provided to the committee by October 1, 2014. The committee decided to defer providing its own feedback to the CWCB until after the board has released the draft plan.

SB 14-115 hearing format. At each SB 14-115 hearing, the committee received a briefing on the basin implementation plan (BIP), typically from the chair of the local basin roundtable or his or her designee. The basin's representative on the CWCB was also invited to provide an update on the Colorado Water Plan. Attendees were encouraged to meet in small groups to discuss the BIPs, the draft Colorado Water Plan, and other water matters. Following these discussions, a member of each group reported on that table's discussion. The purpose of the small group discussions was to provide an opportunity for people who may not have been comfortable directly speaking to the committee to provide feedback on the Colorado Water Plan. Each small group typically included at least one member of the WRRRC or local legislator to help facilitate the discussion and listen to the public's comments.

At each meeting, the committee also received public testimony from any person who wanted to speak directly to the committee about the draft water plan or any other issue of concern. Table 1 provides information about the SB 14-115 hearings conducted during the 2014 interim, including the date and location of the hearings, estimated attendance, number of people who testified, and the number of small group discussion reports.

**Table 1
Summary of SB 14-115 Hearings**

Basin	Location and Meeting Date	Estimated Attendance At Basin Hearing	Number of People Who Testified	Number of Small Group Discussion Reports
Gunnison	Gunnison June 18, 2014	65	8	8
Colorado	Glenwood Springs August 21, 2014	50	16	9
Southwest	Durango August 27, 2014	80	8	9
Rio Grande	Alamosa August 28, 2014	50	7	7
Arkansas	Pueblo August 29, 2014	45	6	5
Yampa-White	Steamboat Springs September 16, 2014	50	10	5
North Platte	Walden September 16, 2014	5	N/A ¹	N/A
South Platte	Fort Collins September 17, 2014	150	24	12
Denver Metro	Denver October 1, 2014	50	9	4
TOTAL		515	86	59

¹ Due to the small audience that attended the North Platte Basin hearing, the committee opened a dialogue with the attendees instead of receiving testimony and small group discussion reports.

Public Outreach and Process for Obtaining Public Feedback

According to SB 14-115, the General Assembly passed this law to engage the people of the state in a public dialogue regarding optimum state water policy. Towards this end, the WRRRC conducted a public outreach process that encouraged any interested person to provide testimony on state water policy at a public meeting or submit comments directly through the committee's website or by other means. Specifically, the chair of the WRRRC drafted a letter to members of the General Assembly inviting them to attend the SB 14-115 hearings and notify their constituents about these hearings. The chair also drafted letters to local water entities, local governments, agricultural organizations, environmental organizations, and other entities asking them to encourage their members to participate in the SB 14-115 process. The committee also worked with the Colorado Foundation for Water Education and the public education and public outreach coordinators for each basin roundtable to provide the public with notice of the committee hearings and identify alternatives means of submitting feedback to the committee. Notice of the hearings was also provided to local media.

The committee's website enabled the public to provide feedback on the Colorado Water Plan by filling out a questionnaire or by sending an e-mail to the committee. Questionnaires were also distributed at each SB 14-115 hearing. This questionnaire offered interested persons the opportunity to provide information about themselves, including their name, their basin of residence and their water constituent group, their experience with the roundtable process, and to indicate whether they wanted to be added to the committee's SB 14-115 interested persons e-mail list. It also offered an opportunity for respondents to raise questions about the plan, provide comments on the plan, and comment on any other water issue of interest. The public was also provided the opportunity to send a letter to the committee concerning the Colorado Water Plan.

Public Feedback Provided to the Colorado Water Conservation Board

The committee's deadline to submit feedback on the Colorado Water Plan was October 1, 2014. CWCB staff requested that the WRRRC deliver its summary of the public's feedback prior to the board's October 10, 2014, deadline to submit public comments on the draft Colorado Water Plan. On October 9, the committee delivered two tables to the CWCB Director that summarized public feedback provided to the committee. These tables are also included in Appendix A and Appendix B of this report and are available on the committee's website: www.colorado.gov/lcs/WRRRC. A summary of the contents of the tables follows.

Public feedback from questionnaires. Appendix A includes comments from questionnaires that were submitted by 39 individuals at meetings, through the committee's website, or mailed to the committee. The comments in this table were essentially verbatim with corrections for typographical errors and complete names instead of acronyms. Several completed questionnaires were submitted anonymously. The committee decided to not convey anonymous comments to the CWCB.

Public feedback from meetings and other sources. Appendix B includes summaries of the comments provided by 86 individuals during public testimony, as well as summaries of e-mails and letters submitted to the committee. The table also included a summary of the 38 small group discussion reports from eight SB 14-115 hearings. This table did not include public comments from the North Platte Basin hearing. Due to the small audience that attended that meeting, the committee opened a dialogue with the attendees. This dialogue could not be summarized without risk of mischaracterizing the speakers' comments. The audio recording of

the North Platte Basin meeting, as well as the recordings for all other meetings, are available on the General Assembly's website. To obtain the most accurate understanding of the public comments, interested persons are encouraged to listen to the audio recordings of the SB 14-115 hearings.

Thirteen people submitted both completed questionnaires and testified at an SB 14-115 meeting. The October 9 report indicated whether a person provided testimony at more than one SB 14-115 hearing or provided copies of written testimony.

Public feedback from meeting sign-in sheets. People attending each meeting were requested to sign in and complete a brief survey. The sign-in sheets requested that attendees identify their name, address and who they were representing, and indicate if they had attended a basin roundtable meeting. Approximately 34 percent of the people who attended a committee meeting had never attended a basin roundtable meeting. Table 2 summarizes feedback obtained from sign-in sheets.

**Table 2
Summary of Feedback from Sign-In Sheets**

Basin Meeting	Number of Attendees Who Signed In	Attendees Who Also Attended a Roundtable Meeting	Attendees Who Requested to Be Added to Committee Mailing List
Gunnison	41	25	34
Colorado	30	22	24
Southwest	73	26	66
Rio Grande	48	33	30
Arkansas	38	29	36
Yampa-White	42	28	36
North Platte	3	3	2
South Platte	115	43	80
Denver Metro	19	15	17
TOTAL	368	227	291

Next Steps in the SB 14-115 Process

According to Governor Hickenlooper's Executive Order commissioning the Colorado Water Plan, the CWCB must provide a draft Colorado Water Plan to the Governor's Office by December 10, 2014, and complete the final plan by December 10, 2015. Pursuant to SB14-115, in developing the draft plan, the CWCB is required to consider the feedback from the WRRRC submitted to the board by November 1, 2014. The CWCB is also required to submit a draft state water plan to the WRRRC by July 1, 2015, after which the committee must hold at least one public hearing in each basin to collect feedback from the public. The committee must provide a summary of the public's feedback as well as its own feedback to the CWCB by November 1, 2015. The committee may repeat this process whenever the CWCB submits a significant amendment to the state water plan. By November 1 of each year following the submission to the committee of a state water plan or plan amendment, any member of the General Assembly may request that the committee hold one or more hearings to review the plan or plan amendment.

APPENDIX A - 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Here are the facts:

- 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.

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.

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.

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								
<p>Ken Ransford (also testified at the August 21 Colorado Basin Hearing)</p> <p>Colorado</p> <p>I am the recreation representative to the Colorado Basin Roundtable</p>	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 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. 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/remotepoor 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!
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	–

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
<p>Chuck Reel (also testified at the August 28 Rio Grande Basin hearing)</p> <p>Rio Grande</p> <p>General Public and Poor People</p>	No	<p>Why is there no allowance for poor people that live on their own land outside of a city limit to grow a small garden?</p> <p>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.</p>	-	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	-	-	<p>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.</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
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	<p>Support: Sub-regional approach to meeting needs.</p> <p>Modify: Requires more solutions to ground water depletions and dependency</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Permitting is too expensive.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>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.</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								
Margaret Vorndam (also testified at August 29 Arkansas Basin hearing) Arkansas Environment or Recreation	Yes	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.	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. 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.	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.	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.	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.	Yes, as long as the plan supports wildlife, recreation and environmental values equally as the needs of municipality and industries and Agriculture interests.	-

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	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.	Support: Those which are yet to be drafted involving specific projects in each sub-basin. 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.	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.	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. 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?	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 is not an option 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. 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>	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. 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.	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.	–	–	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)
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?

Appendix B: Table 2. Public Testimony on the Draft Colorado Water Plan

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings and Not Using Questionnaire	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Senator Larry Crowder</p> <p>E-mail to committee staff (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Water Plan (CWP) should include reports from all municipal water providers concerning water losses related to leaking pipes and aging infrastructure. • It should also include a goal of limiting such losses to one percent of the water delivered by a water provider.
<p>Kay L. Linder</p> <p>E-mail to committee (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concerned about the possible future issues with the Poudre River and felt very strongly that (the committee) could make irreparable damage to it if (the committee) was not careful in (its) decisions. • Objected to a reservoir that would impede the flow of water through the city of Fort Collins or harm the Poudre River.
Public Comments from June 18, 2014 Gunnison Basin Hearing	
<p>Steve Glazer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Joint Review Process (Article 10 of Title 34, repealed in 2003) should be reinstated so that all permits from all state offices may be dealt with at one time. The state should initiate a Colorado Environmental Quality Act to help avoid future litigation.
<p>Marlene Zanetell</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public education materials for the basin roundtables should not identify the purchase of water rights that are senior to the Colorado River Compact as a possible solution to enable continued Front Range diversions during droughts. • The state should encourage greater water conservation and reuse to reduce the pressure on West Slope water resources. • The CWP should also explain that Blue Mesa Reservoir and other elements of the Colorado River Storage Project do not directly benefit Gunnison and Montrose Counties but provide benefits to the state as a whole.
<p>Marc Catlin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not more water in the Gunnison basin than what is needed by the basin. • All tributaries should be treated equally in the CWP. • Water efficiency does not necessarily mean lower consumption. • Water use and reuse is important. • Tamarisk and Russian-Olive trees are using huge amounts of water. Grant programs to remove phreatophytes quickly are crucial to prevent land following. • Water banking is not the whole solution and needs to be examined closely. • The law should be amended to prohibit the use of water obtained from new transmountain diversions (TMDs) for outdoor water consumption, such as lawn watering.
<p>Jennifer Bock, environmental representative on the Gunnison Basin Roundtable, and Water Program Director for High Country Conservation Advocates</p> <p>Also submitted a letter to the committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should promote funding for environmental needs assessments and increased instream flows, such as funding to increase efficiency and purchasing or leasing of water rights for instream flows. • The plan should also include criteria for new diversions including a requirement that conservation and reuse be maximized prior to allowing new diversions.

Public Comments from June 18, 2014 Gunnison Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Cassidy Tawse-Garcia, High Country Conservation Advocates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the Gunnison watershed.
Garin Vorthman, Colorado Farm Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The word "viable" should not be attached to "agriculture" in the CWP. Instead it should be "robust" and "strong." "Viable" implies there is a value judgement. • The CWP should respect the doctrine of prior appropriation.
Donna Brosemer, Greeley Water Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should not prioritize water projects proposed by municipalities and other water users. The state should treat water users equally and not withhold state funding or permits for projects based on their priority in the CWP. • The CWP should respect property rights and local control. • Local land use planners and water providers should also work more closely together.
J. Paul Brown, Colorado Wool Growers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should respect property rights and encourage additional storage on the Front Range to ensure that Colorado is able to use its full entitlements under the South Platte River and Arkansas River compacts. • The state should also coordinate federal permits for water projects.
Chris Treese, Colorado River Water Conservation District Submitted written comments using the original questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP statewide goals and objectives should also include "minimize impacts; adequate compensation and mitigation for inherent/inevitable conflicts/tradeoffs; affirmation of prior appropriation; do not overdevelop the Colorado River Basin." • Priorities for addressing possible Gunnison-basin-specific issues should include "basin directed actions; first, do no harm, protect existing uses; broaden education/participation in water matters." • Basin-specific priorities that should also be included: "coordinated management and development of Gunnison basin with other 3 basins of the Colorado River."
Roger Espinoza Submitted written comments using the original questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this plan help to mediate some of the tensions between recreationalists and private land owners? • Seeing the differences in absoluteness between water and land rights would make this task difficult. • Lastly, would this be a money issue or a value issue?"
Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP's goals should explicitly acknowledge the need to protect and preserve existing water rights and the environment, and to encourage conservation. • Measures to address the gap between supply and demand should not hurt agriculture. • Water storage should be listed as a goal or as a strategy of the CWP. • The plan should acknowledge the effect of the Endangered Species Act on Colorado's ability to complete projects as they were originally intended. • A goal of CWP should be to protect watershed health. • Additional storage in the upper Gunnison basin should be emphasized. • The plan should also explain how conservation is beneficial to the environment.

Public Comments from June 18, 2014 Gunnison Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goals identified in chapter 1 of the draft CWP are inherently in conflict. • The doctrine of prior appropriation is important. • Current uses of water both statewide and in the Gunnison basin should be retained. • Do not over-develop statewide nor in the Gunnison Basin. • The values identified in chapter 1 of the draft CWP concerning a productive economy that supports "viable and productive agriculture" should instead be "robust and productive agriculture." • Front Range water usage must be conserved to limit the need for additional transbasin diversions. • Compact compliance is also a concern
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP is brilliant idea that needs to be done and organized well. • Concerned about outcomes and how to meet supply and demand issues, including transbasin diversions, watershed protection, the importance of water quality. • Public education about water is critical. The public is uninformed about water. They have little to no understanding of our relationship to other states including CO's fixed amount of water. • Agriculture must not be harmed. • Enlarging existing storage facilities should be considered, rather than building new storage facilities. • Recreational and economic impacts of water and evaporation from storage projects are real impacts. • Water is key to the quality of life on the Western Slope. • Forests are our largest reservoir. Forest health is key to healthy water.
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may not be enough water for both agriculture needs and municipal needs. • Agriculture is key because it sustains the environment, recreation, and groundwater recharge. Incentives should be provided to encourage agricultural water efficiency. • The Front Range should conserve their water better. The ration of indoor to outdoor water use by Front Range residences should not be 50/50 as it is currently, and instead be closer to 70/30. • The goals of the CWP must be more specific, especially related to conservation measures. • The pre-1922 Western Slope diversions should be prioritized.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The values identified in chapter 1 of the draft CWP are too broad and do not all apply to the Gunnison Basin. • The value of "sustainable cities" should be further defined. • Water quality should be preserved even during "boom" and "bust" cycles. • The plan should protect existing uses. • The meaning of "forest health" is different to people living in different areas of the state. • There are concerns about funding for water projects to promote conservation. It is unclear where the money for such projects will come from. • There are concerns about the effect of compacts on the basin. • The plan should support an equitable distribution of water, rather than distributed according to population or the demographics of the legislature. • The CWP drafting process should be nonpartisan and encompassing of people from all areas of the state--not urban vs. rural.

Public Comments from June 18, 2014 Gunnison Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 6 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Western Slope is concerned about being "bullied" into trans mountain diversions. • Conflicts exist and will continue to exist and there must be continuous cooperation to work through these conflicts. • It is unclear how much water is actually available. Efforts should be made to clarify water availability through improved data collection. • There must be an acceptance of a certain amount of uncertainty. • Conservation is important. The connection between land use and water connection should be examined.
Table 7 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about the state government playing too large of a role in statewide water planning that local communities are better suited to planning for their needs. • Different basins in Colorado have very different needs and a "one size fits all" CWP may not fit all basins. • There are concerns that the doctrine of prior appropriation is not mentioned in the CWP goals. • One property right should not be prioritized over another. • The CWP should not prioritize water supply projects and should not be used prevent individual water projects from moving forward. • Education about water in Colorado schools should be a priority of the CWP.
Table 8 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation in the CWP and in the water process must be made a priority. • Transmountain diversions from the Western slope are a large concern. New diversions should also address the economic loss in the basin of origin. • Lake Powell should not be used as a water bank to enable the East Slope to make diversions from the Colorado River Basin. Once the water reaches Lake Powell it is no longer Colorado's water because there is no way to return it to the state.
Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Colorado Basin Hearing	
Robert Ittner, Jr. Chair, Pitkin County Board of County Commissioners Letter to Committee (excerpts provided in the following column).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transbasin diversions (TBDs) and other projects of statewide interest which are implicated or propounded by the CWP must be subject to robust 1041 review by local governments. • CWP should recognize and account for the disproportionate impact that TBDs have on the state's ability to meet its compact delivery obligations compared to in-basin diversions. • Recreational in-channel diversion (RICDs) and Wild and Scenic designations support western slope recreation and economies, and are tools for compact compliance.
Rachel Richards, Pitkin County Commissioner Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBDs and other projects of statewide interest which are implicated or propounded by the CWP must be subject to robust 1041 review by local governments. • RICDs and Wild and Scenic designations support western slope recreation and economies. CWP should recognize the benefits of healthy rivers and recreation to the economy. • It should also consider how to protect agriculture without new TBDs. • Municipal outdoor water consumption should be limited to reduce the pressure on agriculture and the waters of the Colorado Basin. • New residential growth should pay for new water projects, transportation, and related infrastructure needs.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Colorado Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Steve Child, Pitkin County Commissioner, representing himself</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWP should take a longer range view beyond 2050 to avoid upcoming problems. • A reservoir on the lower South Platte should be considered to provide water for upstream municipal and industrial users, help meet interstate water delivery obligations in the South Platte and Republican River Basins, and to recharge the Ogalala aquifer. • Triggers should be developed based on levels in Lake Mead and Lake Powell that determine when TMDs are allowed. • Alternatives should be developed to replace bluegrass lawns with landscapes that use less water. • A pump back project on the Gunnison River would help provide water for endangered fish on the Colorado River. • Land use policies should be adopted that encourage conservation.
<p>Laura Makar, Pitkin County, Pitkin County Healthy Rivers and Streams Advisory Board</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County 1041 review powers should be maintained for new transbasin diversions and for statewide projects. • The CWP should recognize and account for the disproportionate impact that transbasin diversions have on the state's ability to meet its compact delivery obligations compared to in-basin diversions. Unlike in-basin diversions, transbasin diversions (TBDs) provide no return flows to the basin of origin. • The CWP should support stream health and recognize the benefits of RICDs and instream flows in helping Colorado meet its compact obligations.
<p>Andre Willie, Chairman, Pitkin County Healthy Rivers and Streams Board Letter to committee (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County 1041 review powers should be maintained for new TBDs and for statewide projects. • The CWP should recognize and account for the disproportionate impact that TBDs have on the state's ability to meet its compact delivery obligations compared to in-basin diversions. • CWP should also support stream health and recognize the benefits of RICDs and Wild and Scenic designations, and instream flows in helping Colorado meet its compact obligations.
<p>Torie Jarvis, Northwest Council of Governments Water Quality and Quantity Committee Public testimony and written comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New TMDs should only be allowed if they are able to address local concerns and if approved by affected local governments and water providers. • TMDs must provide multiple benefits and make streams and rivers healthier to the maximum extent possible. • Legislation should be approved to reestablish the Colorado Joint Review Process that was repealed in 2003. • The state should not sponsor a water project until the state regulatory process has been completed and the project has been agreed to by the impacted counties, conservancy districts, and conservation districts in the area from which the water would be diverted.
<p>Ken Nuebecker, American Rivers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should recognize the challenge and importance of quantifying water needs for the environment and recreation. • The Colorado Basin Roundtable developed the Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool to identify the basin's nonconsumptive water needs. This tool may also help other basins identify environmental and recreational water needs as well as provide a standard and widely agreed upon method for assessing these needs.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Colorado Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Mark Fuller, Executive Director, Ruedi Water and Power Authority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should identify realistic and broadly applicable metrics to measure adequate streamflows and include implementation measures to guarantee those flows. • It should identify short-term leases of agricultural water rights for instream flows as a reasonable means for meeting instream flow needs while complying with Colorado water law. • Unappropriated water in the Colorado River Basin should not be used to satisfy water needs in other parts of the state. Instead, this water should be used to ensure that Colorado meets its compact delivery obligations. • The value of the CWP lies in the boldness and innovations that it brings in helping to solve water issues. A plan that is a catalog of unresolved issues, undeveloped projects, and unchallenged policies will not make progress.
<p>Steve Acquafresca, Mesa County Board of County Commissioners</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The value of the CWP depends on it being developed by the grassroots and it should be flexible enough to be adjusted over the years. • The legislature should not recommend changes to the CWP that overturn grassroots recommendations.
<p>Ken Ransford, Recreational Representative of Colorado Basin Roundtable</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All basins should adopt the high conservation target in the BIPs. • Colorado water law should be amended to remove disincentives to efficient irrigation practices, such as use it or lose it. • The law should allow certain changes of water rights outside of water court to reduce the cost of water transfers and to encourage more flexible water use.
<p>Kristin Green, Conservation Colorado</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should prioritize conservation and reuse and such measures should be maximized prior to authorizing new water diversions. • The CWP should also include a high-level water conservation goal and should promote funding for environmental needs assessments.
<p>Annie Henderson, Upper Colorado River Private Boaters Association</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water based recreation economy benefits the environment. • Conservation is the only way to avoid the impending water crisis. • New water diversions should be opposed. • Water conservation should be maximized prior to considering new TMDs. • Water for the environment and other nonconsumptive uses should be recognized as beneficial uses. • The law should be re-evaluated to ensure that it can address climate change and population growth.
<p>Marc Catlin, Montrose County</p> <p>Also testified at June 18 Gunnison Basin meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should encourage permanent phreatophyte removal to make additional water available at the state line and to reduce the need for agricultural water transfers. • Water banks that store agricultural water for other purposes will impact agricultural communities. • Communities that receive water from fallowed agricultural lands should be required to offset the economic impacts to the affected agricultural communities.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Colorado Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Roger Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWP should identify water needs for endangered species and to ensure that sufficient water is provided to allow the removal of these species from the Endangered Species List. • The legislature should adopt legislation or a resolution that identifies guiding principles for the IBCC that are derived from regional sensitivities and statewide economic interests (tourism, recreation, agriculture, and municipal needs) with a focus on preserving the current balance of water use. • The price of population growth must be borne by those seeking that growth and not by current water users.
Richard Van Gytenbeek, Trout Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that agricultural water efficiency can benefit stream flows. • Greater cooperation between the agricultural community and the recreation, tourism, and sportsmen's communities should be encouraged. • New TMDs should be opposed because other water supply options are available.
Bill Hoblitzell, Eagle Watershed Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about provisions of the State Water Supply Initiative (SWSI) that identify the Colorado Basin as a possible solution to the water supply needs of other basins. • SWSI should be updated to include information about the impacts of climate change, provide a greater emphasis on conservation, and to identify new water conservation technologies. • Colorado instream flow law should also be updated to reflect new scientific information, such as the benefits of flushing flows, and the CWP should consider the benefits of stream management planning such as developed by Grand County. • The legislature should consider new policies to allow water-sharing agreements and flexible water use, and to provide sufficient time for local communities to identify solutions to their water supply needs.
Rick Lofaro, Executive Director, Roaring Fork Conservancy Letter to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconsumptive use of water on the western slope is essential to the ecological health and economic vitality of the state. • New TMDs could cause significant declines in river health. • The legislature should promote agricultural efficiencies. • Water conservation should be increased statewide.
Kendall Bakich, Wildlife Biologist, Colorado Parks and Wildlife Letter to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should identify priority stream reaches and characteristics to protect in the Colorado River. • It should specify support and funding to address data gaps for nonconsumptive needs within critical reaches of the Upper Colorado watershed to support aquatic ecosystem health and recovery of endangered fish species. • It should provide project funding to address non-consumptive needs identified in the Upper Colorado River Basin. • It should encourage innovative partnerships and legal mechanisms that help augment stream flows in cooperation with in-basin water users. • It should emphasize water conservation, reuse, and efficiency before seeking to increase water diversion, particularly out-of-basin diversions, and promote mitigation and monitoring against such impacts.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Colorado Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about how basin implementation plans (BIPs) will be incorporated into the Colorado Water Plan (CWP) and whether the basins will have an equal voice in the development of the CWP. • Concerned that the draft CWP is too project focused instead of policy focused. • The legislature should also listen to a broad range of opinions when it reviews the CWP, instead of just special interests and to help ensure that land use is more closely connected to water and that there will be sufficient water available for recreation. • The CWP should also encourage the state to live within its water means such as some of neighboring states.
Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoshone Hydropower plant water right should be owned by the Colorado Basin because it is critical to the basin. • No new transmountain diversions should be allowed for municipal outdoor purposes. Approving authorities, such as zoning boards, should not approve open space planted with non-native vegetation in new subdivisions. • The term "new supply" is a fictitious term because its only a new supply for the persons that receive the water and that such water is being taken from someone. • The state should control how water is used instead of the federal government.
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado needs to quantify the amount of water that the state is entitled to that is currently going downstream, to quantify how much water is adjudicated, and to identify how any shortfall will be covered. • Delta and Mesa counties need more storage on the Grand Mesa and the State of Colorado should advocate for this storage in the federal permit review process. • Colorado should also sustain agriculture and ensure local control, and the priority system must stay in place. • Water use should not predicate land use.
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear whether new TMDs are needed when existing TMDs have unused capacity. • Users of any TMDs must bear the risk during droughts and compact calls. • The burden of proof should be on those seeking new diversions to demonstrate the need for the water and prove that existing users and streams will not be impacted. • The CWP should be the basis for unified state action and not a collection of competing interests. • The plan should also address the needs of Lake Powell and Lake Mead, and the downstream states. • A reservoir in the lower South Platte Reservoir should be considered because it would enable flexible water transfers and help meet compact delivery obligations. • There should be a permanent and reliable source of funding to implement the plan. • There should be a stronger connection between land use and water use in the plan. • CWP should encourage additional research on low-water consuming crops.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water for agriculture and water-based recreation are important but may be in conflict at times. • Residents should reduce outdoor water consumption by limiting the size of lawns to help ensure that other important needs are met and to delay the need for new projects. • Local communities should resolve conflicts between competing recreational water needs, such as water for golf courses, ski areas, and fishing, through voluntary agreements. • CWP should also address legal barriers to conservation, such as "use it or lose it" and should enable the tracking, protecting, and directing of saved water. • The Shoshone hydro power call should be protected.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Colorado Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 6 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should recognized that no water is available for new TMDs. • Disagree with the Interbasin Compact Committee's (IBCC) principles for new TMDs; i.e., that new TMDs only divert during surplus or wet periods when the additional diversions would not increase the risk to existing uses and that the diverter take hydrologic responsibility for risk associated with new TMDs. • High water flows are needed for in-basin for recreational and environmental purposes, and to help meet compact delivery obligations. • Front Range growth should be considered. Front Range water users should know where they get their water. • It is unclear whether new storage to capture water in unusually wet years is practical. • Water on the West Slope for recreation and environment benefit all residents of Colorado. The Front Range and West Slope need each other. • The legislature should also consider making adjustments to the doctrine of prior appropriation to address evolving water needs and to avoid crises.
Table 7 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change should be made to the doctrine of prior appropriation and the CWP should consider adjusting compact delivery obligations to lower basin states to account for evaporative losses in Lake Mead and delivery obligations to Mexico. • CWP should promote block water rates, ensure that water users know how much water they are using, and provide financial incentives to use less water. • Payments for land fallowing should be based on loss of total income, not just net income to protect agricultural communities. • There are concerns about a water bank that uses West Slope agricultural water rights to help meet a compact call. • Water banks should not harm the West Slope, should be voluntary, and should not be used for new supplies. • Fairways and parks in Denver should deficit irrigate and the Front Range municipal and industrial users should not be expected to bear a disproportionate burden of meeting Colorado's compact delivery obligations. • The water budget of the Sterling Ranch residential development in Douglas County should be used as a model for new subdivisions.
Table 8 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Splitting comments on the draft CWP into constituent groups is not useful because persons may be multiple types of water users. • Land use and water use should be linked and water conservation should be maximized. • County 1041 powers should be maintained to enable basins of origin to protect themselves. • The burden of a compact call should not fall disproportionately on the West Slope. • TMDs limit the ability of Colorado to meet a compact call. • The CWP should go beyond 2050 especially when considering the needs of agriculture and the impacts of climate change. • State law should also be amended to encourage conservation. • The public must be educated about the cost of their water use. • Baselines for instream flow needs should be quantified and funding should be made available to help quantify these needs, especially for head water streams.
Table 9 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional residential outdoor water conservation should be supported. • Water should not be taken from agriculture to supply residential growth. • New residential developments should be required to have an adequate water supply.

Public Comments from August 27, 2014 Southwest Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Brad Blake, a member of the Florida Cooperative Ditch Board, representing himself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should preserve and protect water rights and there should be more discussion about the plan. • The plan should identify who is responsible for implementing, managing, and enforcing the law. • Expressed concern that the voices of people from the Florida River area are not being heard and that the federal government wants to control every drop of water.
Patti Buck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urged the public to submit comments on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) draft regulations (defining the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act). • Explained her family chose to buy a ranch with water rights to protect its value and ensure that water would be available for cattle.
Wayne Buck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about the EPA's draft regulations (defining the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act) and how they may extend to all water in the state including rain captured in buckets. • Spoke in support of additional storage to retain Colorado's compact entitlement.
Don Schwindt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed support for legislative involvement with the CWP but cautioned the committee about unintended consequences. • Stressed the importance of meshing the CWP with the prior appropriation doctrine.
J. Paul Brown (also testified at the June 18 meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that the purpose and content of the CWP is unclear. • Recommended that it protect the doctrine of prior appropriation and consider the need for additional water storage. • The CWP should address the problem of obtaining federal permits for water project. • It should also recognize the importance of return flows to downstream water users.
Mark Catlin, Montrose County Also testified at the June 18 and August 21 meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about requiring agriculture to change consumptive uses to address municipal water needs. • Recommended that phreatophytes be eradicated prior to requiring agriculture to reduce its consumption through land fallowing or other means.
Rod Proffit, President of the San Juan Water Conservancy District, and a member of the Southwest Basin Roundtable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Said that the CWP should be considered a necessary first step for legislation to implement processes and projects for the state to move forward.
Margaret Cozine, retired librarian Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about water used in the basin for lawn watering and recommended that the laws be amended to allow greater use of rainwater harvesting and the reuse of grey water.

Public Comments from August 27, 2014 Southwest Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group did not reach a consensus on all issues. • Number one component of the CWP should be conservation and how to support agriculture. • Need a higher standard for conservation if an entity is buying and drying. • Disappointed with the Governor's veto of the water efficiency bill and questioned the need to take care of the Front Range without "buy and dry" of agriculture. • Expressed concern about the disproportionate impact of a compact call on certain basins. • Although the San Juan-Chama Project takes 90,000 acre feet per year from the San Juan basin over to the Rio Grande basin, the San Juan basin was never compensated with any West Slope storage. The Dry Gulch storage project could help address that oversight. • Consider eliminating the "use it or lose it" from Colorado Water Law to eliminate the concern about abandonment. The Southwest Basin Roundtable recognizes that all uses are valid and consumptive versus non-consumptive use is not the issue. • Consider a sunset on conditional water rights but noted that some projects take decades to move forward, so there is a need for a long period of time. • The plan should acknowledge that agricultural conservation may affect return flows that also benefit the environment. • It would be helpful to have water judges who are very familiar with water law.
Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A compact call threatens all water users and water for municipalities should not receive greater priority over types of water use. • Expressed support of greater water conservation. However, agriculture has no incentive to save water due to "use it or lose it" Partnering with people who are conserving will help protect stream flows. • Land planners seem disconnected from water planners but should be coordinating their efforts. • Expressed concern about the disproportionate impact of transmountain diversions on the basin of origin because of the loss of return flows. • The East Slope needs to increase conservation. • Ski areas should not have to give up their water rights to renew their federal leases. • The potential impact of climate change should be studied and adequate funding should be provided for such studies.
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every drop of water in Colorado starts on federal land but doesn't belong to the federal government. Instead, water belongs to water users in the state of Colorado. • Goals in the water plan need should be given equal weight. • The state needs to learn to live within its means in our current time. • Conservation is very important for the CWP but if we conserve water in the Southwest Basin, the down-basin states will want to use the water saved in Colorado. • Important to protect agriculture which is being lost at a record rate. • Watersheds and forest management should be very important because of fires. • Need to keep the water in the mountains longer. • Need to protect the quantity of water in order to keep pollutants in check. • Loss of livestock allotments is a problem that is reflected in the health of the state forests and range.

Public Comments from August 27, 2014 Southwest Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lawn bill sponsored by Senator Roberts (SB 14-17) was a good idea and a good start but not a solution for everything. • Water harvesting should be expanded but this is difficult under the prior appropriation system. • People want to harvest precipitation because they care about conservation and local food. • Municipal waste of water needs to be addressed at the local level. • More storage should be considered. • Water quality and citizens being able to access water even for indoor use, and for a call on Colorado's water, are concerning. • Federal actions that have impact on local entities, such as the definition of waters that are subject to the Clean Water Act, is concerning. • West Slope water should be kept on the West Slope.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western slope should have support of the rest of the state in terms of water distribution. • Deficit irrigation should be used more in urban situations rather than for agriculture. • Priority of water rights should not be changed. • The Eastern Slope needs storage. • Needs to be better representation of agricultural users throughout the process. • Need to consider the economic impact of water use and stop federal double dipping. • Make better use of landscape plants and getting rid of Tamarisk and Russian Olive. • Water should be used many times before it goes back into the stream, such as applying grey water to golf courses.
Table 6 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EPA is trying to change the Clean Water Act to put all Colorado water under federal jurisdiction to take control of state's water and land. • A lot of water leaves the state because of lack of storage but the Endangered Species Act and other federal regulations hinder the building of storage. • Important to eliminate the "buy and dry" of agricultural water in order to keep agriculture going. • First in time, first in right, priority system must be adhered to in the CWP. • Forests need to be better managed to have more water. • Agricultural lands should not be fallowed to meet a compact call. • Hydropower should be considered an eligible renewable energy resource. • Water conservation bill related to lawn water might have unintended consequences related to property rights.
Table 7 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skeptical of the statewide water plan and its effect on their water rights. • Prior appropriation doctrine must be protected. • Because only five percent of the state directly own water rights, it will be difficult to persuade them that their rights will be protected under the CWP. • The CWP is being rushed. More time needs to be allocated to for public comment. It has also been too top down and the public has not had a sufficient opportunity to develop the CWP. • CWP must be based on opposition to federal government actions that will harm private water rights obtained on federal land. • Storage should be central to any water plan.

Public Comments from August 27, 2014 Southwest Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 8 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the protection of agriculture, prior appropriations in state water law, and private property rights. • Support the full multiple use of public lands and using water multiple times before it leaves the state. • Would like to see less state regulation and less expensive permitting for water storage and conservation projects. • Southwest Basin has lots of smaller municipalities that need more common sense regulations for water treatment so they can plan for the future without building plants that become obsolete in five years.
Table 9 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a plan for storage is critical and that sufficient water flow is important for the health of environment. • Forest health also needs to be considered. • Needs and concerns of the southwestern part of the state should be given the same value as the rest of the state. • The southwest should not bear a disproportionate burden of helping the state comply with compact requirements. • Quality and quantity should be balanced in the CWP. • Property rights should be protected.
Public Comments from August 28, 2014 Rio Grande Basin Hearing	
Ron Brink, member of the Rio Grande Basin Roundtable Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should maintain the doctrine of prior appropriation and reflect each basin's unique water needs and characteristics.
Rio de la Vista, member of the Rio Grande Basin Roundtable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should recognize the importance of forest, rangeland, and soil health in ensuring an adequate water supply and a healthy watershed. • It should recognize that measures to improve soil health can also help store carbon and help offset impact from climate change. • The state should also provide adequate funding for the basin roundtable process and for water projects identified by the basin roundtables.
Chuck Reel Also submitted comments in a questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed restrictions on in-house-only well permits that prevent him from using his well water to grow a small garden for personal consumption without an augmentation plans. • Opposed the law that prevents him from using rainwater that he collects from his property to irrigate his garden. • Opposed the use of water for "fracking" in energy development.
Dale Pizel, Colorado Parks and Wildlife Commissioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should be based on collaboration of water users. • It should be of sufficient value that water planners and providers will want to use it. • The CWP should be periodically updated to reflect new information about what works in water planning.

Public Comments from August 28, 2014 Rio Grande Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Mike Gibson, Manager, San Luis Valley Water Conservancy District, Rio Grande Basin Roundtable Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legislature should recognize significant assistance provided by volunteers for the Rio Grande Basin Roundtable activities and in the development of the Rio Grande Basin Roundtable Basin Implementation Plan. • It should also provide sufficient time for the basin roundtables and the Colorado Water Conservation Board to develop the CWP. • State and federal regulations should be reviewed to identify measures to streamline the permitting process for water projects.
Susan Wolfrey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke in support of being conscious of the needs of the Earth and urged people to work cooperatively for the benefit of humanity.
Steve Navratil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should reflect the connection between energy use and water availability and consider climate impacts caused by the burning and production of fossil fuels. • It should also encourage greater use of renewable energy, including solar energy. • The state should provide incentives to use land from farms that are participating in a land following program in the Rio Grande Basin for renewable energy generation.
Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3rd goal of the Rio Grande Basin BIP should be to "restore" the aquifers in the Rio Grande Basin rather than to "sustain the confined and unconfined aquifers. . ." as it currently reads • Goal 5 of the BIP is to "manage water use to sustain optimal agricultural economy throughout the basin's communities." "Optimal" should be changed to "diversified" to reflect the broad range of agricultural activities in the basin including ranching and farming. • Goal 6 is to "support the development of projects and methods that have multiple benefits for agricultural, municipal and industrial, and environmental and recreational water needs." After "water needs" recommend adding "according to the doctrine of prior appropriation" and that such projects be collaborative. • Concerned about additional transbasin diversions that export water from the basin.
Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended collaboration between water users in the valley to help the basin address its water supply challenges. • CWP and CWCB should assist small communities in addressing their water infrastructure needs. • Supports the Rio Grande Basin BIP and agreed that basin roundtables should evaluate water projects based on their consistency with BIP goals. • The legislature should allow sufficient time for basin roundtables to develop the CWP and not interfere with its development.
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rio Grande Decision Support System identifies depletions caused by phreatophytes in the basin. The BIP should also identify the need to replace these depletions and encourage the restoration of native vegetation in the basin • The legislature should consider measures to streamline the permitting process for water projects that meet BIP goals and have broad support from the basin. • Unlike other basins in the state, the RGB is under regular compact calls. Adequate funding should be provided for SNOTEL and other water monitoring systems in the basin to help ensure that it is able to comply with the compact. • Rules and regulations concerning ground water pumping in the basin should be provided sufficient time to work. • Exports from the basin will be strongly opposed by the basin. • The Rio Grande Compact protects the basin and should not be amended.

Public Comments from August 28, 2014 Rio Grande Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process to develop the CWP has helped unify the basin. • Supports multi-use and collaborative projects to address the basin's and the state's water supply needs. • Need to keep senior water rights use near the river to protect return flows to the river and the need to use water efficiently. • Concerned about population growth and the possibility that other basins would look to obtain water from the Rio Grande Basin to help meet that growth. • Urban areas must use water efficiently prior to looking for new supplies and urban users should be made aware of the source of their water supply. • Maintain the prior appropriation doctrine while allowing flexible water use.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable water use should be encouraged and that ways to decrease water use be considered. • Innovative solutions should be used to satisfy new water demands including the use of water cleaning technologies, and that greater biodiversity in agricultural lands be encouraged. • Supports provisions of the RGB BIP concerning soil health. • The status quo should be maintained in terms of transbasin diversions into and out of the basin. • Water users should collaborate to identify win-win solutions. • Land use planning for outdoor water consumption should be included in CWP.
Table 6 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWP should support both large-scale commercial agriculture and small-scale residential agriculture and it should encourage the development of hydrologic modeling to improve water management decisions and guide project funding decisions by the CWCB. • It is important to comply with the Rio Grande Compact and the need for new water storage in the basin to create more consistent stream flows in the basin and in downstream states. • CWP should recognize that climate change is occurring and should identify measures to offset its effects including cloud seeding. • Public should also be educated about the the Water Supply Reserve Account and other sources of funding that are available for water projects. • The CWP should have broad public "buy in." • Forest health is important to watershed protection.
Table 7 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rio Grande Basin is unique from other basin. The CWP needs to recognize the unique aspects of each basin. CWP should recognize property rights of water rights owners and provide alternatives to buy and dry of agricultural water rights. • CWP should address impacts from land fallowing in the basin to sustain the aquifers. • Success of the CWP will depend on the development of new storage. • State should streamline its regulations for new reservoirs and improvements to existing reservoirs. • Process to develop the CWP has been positive because it encouraged the basin to focus on its water needs.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Arkansas Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Gary Bostrom, Chief Water Services Officer for Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CWP should recognize that each community is unique in terms of its customers, hydrology, climate, and water rights portfolio and that will determine how these communities will meet future water supply needs in the most cost-effective manner. • High level water conservation savings will not solve the water supply gaps. Low to medium conservation measures are more reasonable and achievable. SWSI overestimates the potential for water conservation and does not adequately recognize conservation measures already undertaken by some communities. Proposals that mandate indoor to outdoor water use ratios have unforeseen consequences and only comprise 3.5 percent of water usage in the state. • Water providers are implementing a number of measures to stretch their supplies through conservation and reuse. • Adequate amounts of storage must be located in the right location and built within reasonable time. • 60 to 70 percent of CSU water comes from the Colorado River, so CSU is concerned about a compact call on that river. • There needs to be a balance between the need to develop the state's compact entitlement with the risk of over-development. • Colorado will need to develop additional supplies in the Colorado River Basin if the state is to meet its future water supply needs. • The CWCB should encourage the development of in-basin and TBDs projects that are developed in a responsible manner and provide joint benefits, such as the Eagle River MOU Project. • CSU supports leasing, fallowing, deficit irrigation, and interruptible supply agreements. Alternative transfer methods (ATMs) are important to closing gaps in water needs, and the CWP needs to discuss barriers to ATMs. • CSU understands the need to mitigate problems in water supply projects that hinder the success of the projects. • The CWP should include specific recommendations about the regulations that should be streamlined to facilitate water development.
<p>Sean Chambers, President Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority, Cherokee Metro District GM</p> <p>Also submitted a letter to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some communities in El Paso County need to reduce their reliance on nonrenewable ground water supplies and develop renewable water supplies. • The permitting process should be streamlined to encourage water development. • State and local entities should rely on a single set of reports and analysis to avoid duplication of time and expense. • Overlapping state regulatory requirements should be eliminated. • The state fish and wildlife mitigation plan and the water court's terms and conditions to prevent injury to water rights should guide other state and local regulatory agencies. • A permanent state clearinghouse should be established to assume oversight for all state permitting requirements and to interact with federal permitting agencies. • Large-scale ground water storage projects should be considered and obstacles to such projects should be removed.
<p>Bob Leach, developer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should not be one-size-fits all state legislation for landscaping. Instead, such land use decisions should be made at the local level.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Arkansas Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Marge Vorndam, Trout Unlimited</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting water for agricultural use also supports upstream recreational users. • The CWP needs to address limiting growth and there needs to be an analysis of how much population can be sustained with the state's water supply. • Non-consumptive goals need to address wildlife needs. • Channelization related to moving water rights can harm the environment. • There is a need to support tributaries and to preserve creeks for wildlife.
<p>Benjamin Wurster, President Chapter 509 Trout Unlimited and outfitter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A formal emergency action plan should be included in the CWP and the BIP to address times when the water is shut off to a stream. He would like to have a phone number and action plan when an emergency is identified by a recreational or agricultural user such as high temperature water, to increase the water temporarily to reduce the water temperature and protect fisheries.
<p>Kiera Hatton, Pueblo Planning Commissioner, representing herself</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empty gravel pits should be used store water. • There needs to be an interconnection between land use and water use. • She wants a grey water system in her home but the city doesn't know how to authorize it. Local planning departments should be educated about the benefits of grey water use. • Residents should be able to collect and use rainwater. Such collection would also address storm runoff problems.
<p>Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to protect current water rights and prevent injury to junior water rights in the CWP. • Finalize the Arkansas River Decision Support System to better manage ground water. • Need additional storage basin wide and an information center where someone could get information on available state and federal funding. • Concern over how the water plan will be implemented and reconciled with local control. • Need for public outreach, watershed health coordination, and rainwater harvesting in the CWP.
<p>Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWP should not be a one size fits all plan or create economic burdens. • Too much regulation makes it harder to get projects online and storage is very important. • Concerned about legislation to limit lawn size in residential developments. • Needs to be an incentive to increase conservation instead of "use it or lose it." • Need to be incentives to control invasive species. • Future diversions should be kept away from the federal government. • Water sharing should be encouraged.
<p>Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't rush the plan's development or legislation to implement the plan. • Flexibility in water use should be extended to all user types. • Concern over how BIPs are going to be integrated especially for organizations located in multiple basins. • CWP should address keeping water in agriculture rather than taking it out of agriculture.

Public Comments from August 21, 2014 Arkansas Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with aquifer depletion in the lower Arkansas Basin. • All storage is good. • Need more flexibility in the CWP and continuous improvement. • Invasive species are water wasters and a major problem. • Concern that there is no incentive to conserve water. • Precipitation harvesting and grey water use should be encouraged. • Stream health is very important. There needs to be a water emergency plan during droughts to provide emergency flows to protect stream biota. • The CWP should avoid unintended consequences. • Water planning needs to be integrated among all responsible agencies.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More storage is needed. • Need streamlined permits in water court, and for the EPA and other federal permitting agencies to get out of the way. • The CWP should address phreatophytes and public education.
Public Comments from September 16, 2014 Yampa-White Basin Hearing	
Jackie Brown, Routt County Conservation District and Yampa-White Basin Roundtable (BRT) member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone should understand that the basin roundtable and BIP represents years of roundtable members learning and developing trust in one another. • She believes that the BRT did a good job and hopes that its efforts can be translated into the CWP in a way that interprets how their community values water.
Carolina Manriquez, Forester, Colorado State Forest Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that there is a continued need for forest management in the district.
Ken Brenner, Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District, Friends of the Yampa, Yampa River Legacy Project, Colorado Mountain College trustee, representing himself Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about the possible role of the state in funding new water supply projects and requested assurance that project sponsors will be responsible for funding such projects. • The Front Range has the ability to continue to improve conservation efforts, reuse water, refine water sharing between agriculture and municipalities. This could be simplified with legislation. • Front Range local governments must not approve water consumptive land uses prior to proving that there is a sustainable water supply for such development. • The highest and best use of the Yampa River is as a consistent and reliable source of water to meet the Colorado River Compact obligation. • Objects to federal intervention or extensive following like what is occurring in California. • A negotiated equitable apportionment strategy needs to be identified before any projects move forward. • The Yampa River is the cornerstone of the basin's economy, and transmountain diversion (TMDs) would damage that economy. • Several portions of the Yampa River are suitable for wild and scenic designations from the BLM and several endangered species depend on these waters.

Public Comments from September 16, 2014 Yampa-White Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Anthony D'Aquila</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the BIP but thinks its too supply centered and needs to look more at demand management. • Colorado needs to lead in water conservation to protect our quality of life. He would like to see reuse, reduction, reclamation, and efficiency in all sectors, not just the municipal sector. • Planners who developed the Yampa-White BIP should reconsider the water use numbers that are the basis for projecting shortages in the basin. He explained that these numbers are too high and recommended that these assumptions be reduced to reflect higher conservation levels. • Concern for water quality should be incorporated in the process.
<p>Jon Hill, Rio Blanco County Commissioner and Yampa-White Basin Roundtable member</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers agriculture to be most important aspect of his county and discussed the contribution to stream flows from agricultural return flows. • The Front Range needs to think about storage projects there in addition to increased conservation. • The western slope has a high percentage of public land, and it's necessary to bring those agencies on board with the CWP.
<p>Kelly Heaney, Water Resources Manager for the City of Steamboat Springs, Yampa-White Basin Roundtable member, Colorado Watershed Assembly, and Community Agriculture Alliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testified that the City of Steamboat Springs will continue to engage and monitor the process for the development of CWP.
<p>Kevin McBride, Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that there is not enough water to supply all demands for water in the Colorado River Basin and that the various demands for water need to be balanced. • Noted that society deals with things after they occur and that its important to look at climate variability to better prepare for the future. There will be wet and dry times in the future so we must make smart decisions and the CWP needs to work for all the possible conditions.
<p>Cody Perry, college outdoor education teacher, Friends of the Yampa,</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that a diverse range of biomes depend on the Yampa River and that it is important to educate students about the value of the river. • Spoke in support of a sustainable future and expressed concern about water development that reduce flows in the river and can cause irreparable impacts downstream. • He explained that water is the key to everything in the west and said that the CWP should be considered on moral grounds and it should address the kind of world we want to leave for others.
<p>Soren Jespersen, President, Friends of the Yampa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that the tools, assessments, and models have value but they hide the value of the Yampa River. The Yampa River is one of the longest free flowing river in Colorado. There have been attempts to put dams in the river but those were rejected. The people in the valley protect the river. • Noted that it's important to live with resources we have and explained the river is important for hunters, anglers, wildlife, and the basin's economy. He also expressed concern about water projects that may impact the basin.

Public Comments from September 16, 2014 Yampa-White Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Charlie Preston-Townsend Vice President, Friends of the Yampa Steamboat Springs, Colorado</p> <p>E-mail to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state of Colorado must view the Yampa River as a significant and reliable source of water to meet Colorado River Compact obligations. • Colorado must hold non-consumptive 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 principles will be utilized to protect our many important junior water rights. • Maximum efficiencies through reduction and reuse programs shall be fully implemented before any further trans-basin projects are undertaken in the Yampa River basin and across Colorado.
<p>Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Yampa-White Basin's projects and methods study examines potential scenarios with emphasis on high demand and low hydrology, specifically looking at IPPs and how they affect the hydrology. Projects that allow flexibility and the ability to turn the projects on and off depending on the hydrology should be preferred and no IPP scenarios should be excluded. • Growth and development should adapt to what storage a basin already has. • Basins should develop their own source of supply rather than taking water from agriculture. Buy and dry should not occur. • Additional storage is needed for the White River for energy development and other purposes. The lack of water supply will not stop energy development. If the water isn't available energy companies will go after water from agriculture. • The United States Geological Survey and the CWCB need to add measuring devices in all the basins to understand how water use is impacting flows in the rivers and to help identify ways to better use water. • The Colorado River compact is a concern for the entire West Slope. Over development elsewhere will put Yampa-White Basin's use at risk. Additional TMDs could create conflicts with Colorado River compact. Climate change creates additional challenges. • Watershed management is not well addressed in the BIP, but environmental and recreational needs are well addressed. Fires in the Rio Grande, Arkansas, Cache-La Poudre watersheds demonstrate the importance of forest health.
<p>Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that the Yampa-White Basin has junior water rights relative to other basins and expressed concern about unfair administration under the compact call scenario. There needs to be a better understanding of basin's role in helping Colorado comply with the Colorado River Compact. • Need additional storage and the tools to enable the basin to meet the goals of its BIP. • Questioned whether large conditional water rights need to be extended. • Need flexibility in water administration. • The basin needs to come up with its own solutions to its own problems, rather than one-size-fits-all solution.

Public Comments from September 16, 2014 Yampa-White Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption of river flow disrupts the quality of life. • Basin's current method of agricultural irrigation is working but is inefficient and reduces flow to the river. Switching to sprinkler systems would not benefit wetlands to the same extent as flood irrigation. • Change the term "agricultural water use" to "agricultural water priority." • Want the release of water from storage timed so as not to diminish quality of life downstream. • Support sharing water through the fallowing process to provide water for instream flows. • Concerned about how the Colorado River Compact and endangered species affect downstream water rights. • There needs to be better land use on the Front Range before there is more development (TMDs, for example). The state need to learn to live within its means.
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Yampa-White Basin does not have extra water when accounting for future growth in the basin and the state's need to comply with the Colorado River Compact. • Growth in the state should only occur where water is available. • Feeding the state and country will be hard with the loss of agricultural water. Alternatives should be developed to help farmers pay for their retirement with having to sell their water rights. • Difficult to maintain the values that bring people to Colorado while doubling the population. • Water quality and ecological systems need to be considered when planning for future growth. • Technology and science should be developed to better understand this interaction between surface and groundwater in the basin. • Recreation is very important to the economy and livelihood of the basin.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want better public access to the data and assumptions underlying the tables in the Yamp-White BIP. • Generally supportive of the BIP and tenet of equitable apportionment. • The plan should focus less on the supply side and more attention should be given to the demand side. • The BIP's goal of preserving historic use should be reconsidered because some current uses maybe inefficient and could be improved upon. • Concerned that the BIP focuses too much on nonconsumptive needs for endangered species and not enough on nonconsumptive needs for watershed health. • Concerned about maintaining the culture of the basin and preserving the manner in which the basin has operated.
Public Comments from September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin Hearing	
Glen Colton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is impossible to double the population of the state between now and 2050, and there is not enough water to support such a large number of people.
Diane Marschke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential conservation efforts will not proceed until water is more expensive. • The Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) threatens the Poudre River.
Kevin McCarty, Little Thompson Watershed Restoration Coalition Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that municipal conversions have not happened because available water supply is insufficient. He reported that, in Pinewood Springs, there are places where the river is running dry. The gap is not in 2050, but right now. • Noted that the Little Thompson is not currently mentioned in the South Platte BIP.

Public Comments from September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Richard Kommsusch, Fort Collins Community Action Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline projections used to prepare the CWP overestimate the amount of water that will be available in the future due to climate change.
Carole Hossan, artist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While there is emphasis placed on efficiency and production in the CWP, less emphasis has been placed on the beauty and tranquility of the river. More consideration should be given to nature rather than to economic growth.
Theresa Conley, Conservation Colorado Also testified at the October 1, 2014 Metro Basin hearing and submitted a letter with comments on the CWP (excerpts provided under the October 1 summary).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is room for innovation in the CWP, and it should focus on demand management. There needs to be a closer connection between land use and water use. There should more flexibility for water sharing. There is a need for additional data on nonconsumptive needs, and funding to collect this data.
Dick Jefferies, Rocky Mountain Flycasters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CWP needs to protect and restore healthy streams, improve streamflows, include environmental and recreational needs in the structure of water planning, and identify ways to address the disconnect that exists between the development community and local government, and overuse of water for development purposes. SB 14-023 and HB 14-1026 represent progress. There should be no new large trans-basin diversions from the Colorado Basin.
Dale Karlin, Larimer County Farmers' Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agricultural producers should work with Colorado State University to develop farming techniques that conserve water. They should also consider use of drip irrigation. Municipalities should focus on conservation, grey water usage, and new technologies that allow for wastewater reclamation. The industrial sector, including oil and gas producers, should mitigate the effects of their industry on the water supply.
Kevin Jones, Fort Collins Area Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current shortfalls are due to past failures to plan for drought and water shortages, and the water supply in Northern Colorado should be increased by the expansion of Halligan Reservoir and NISP. Reasonable demand management through conservation, water reuse, and prevention of waste should also be pursued. The public should be educated about demand management.
David Smeltzer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population limits should be discussed in the CWP, because growth in population will eventually outstrip available supply. Healthy rivers and streams are important. The Upper Colorado River is an example of an over-appropriated river that has lost insects and aquatic habitats as a result. Data about minimum stream flows necessary for stream health should used for water supply planning.
Gary Wockner, Save the Poudre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A coalition of environmental organizations believe the information presented in the South Platte BIP is controversial. The CWP should not endorse any water supply projects. Dams and reservoirs destroy rivers. Restoring rivers should take precedence. The state should not fund water projects or streamline the permitting process for projects. No additional water should diverted from the Poudre River.

Public Comments from September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Robert Longenbaugh</p> <p>Also testified at the October 1, 2014, Metro Basin hearing and submitted a letter with comments on the CWP (excerpts provided under the October 1 summary).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Platte BIP should not claim that there is no unappropriated water in the South Platte. Too much water is being sent to Nebraska. The loss of this water is a waste and could be used to help address the supply gap. • Phreatophytes should be controlled to make additional water available to address the supply gap. • The beneficial use of surface water and groundwater should be maximized and these waters should conjunctively used.
<p>Joseph Piesman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goal of the CWP should be to balance the needs of agricultural, municipal, and recreational users. • Minimum stream flows should be maintained for the benefit of anglers, birders, and anyone who walks along the river and enjoys it.
<p>Jim Eartman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population growth is exponential, and that the limits on the environment's carrying capacity are significant. • The human spirit needs natural places unaffected by humans. • Some homeowners are over-watering their lawns and cutting them too short.
<p>Sue Reed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation alone is unable to address water shortages. Technology and storage should also be considered.
<p>Gina Janett</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Platte Roundtable did not include enough environmental participants, and it was dominated by water user constituencies. • NISP should be removed from the CWP because it would severely damage the Poudre River. • Demand management should be maximized prior to developing new water sources.
<p>Joe Duda, Colorado State Forest Service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management of healthy forests is important to ensure a healthy river system.
<p>Chris Kraft</p> <p>Also submitted comments in a questionnaire (included in Table 1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NISP has no intention of hurting the Poudre River. Instead, it will enhance the river rather than damage it. The Fort Morgan community would also benefit from this project. • Agricultural use is also a city use, in that farmers produce food consumed in cities along the Front Range.
<p>Peter Bridgman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More water storage and more conservation is imperative. • The oil and gas industry should be required to recycle the water it uses to the quality at which they bought it.
<p>Terry Farrill, Fort Collins-Loveland Water District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state needs to be a strong advocate for permits for water projects at the federal level. • NISP will enhance the flow of the river during months when it is currently low. • Conservation can only go so far.
<p>Nancy York</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NISP will not benefit the Poudre River. • The challenge posed by a growing population must be met through conservation. • Rainwater harvesting, as practiced in Arizona, could be a useful approach. • The state should not build massive storage, but conserve water and electricity.

Public Comments from September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Roni Sylvester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CWP's first priority should be to fortify existing water rights according to prior appropriation. Water in the South Platte Basin is someone's property, and it has been bought and sold.
Roger Hoffman Letter to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has not been enough representation of the broad public interests particularly with respect to maintenance of adequate river flows. While the need for conservation is acknowledged, too little is being done in this regard and too much emphasis is given to additional water storage. Much greater emphasis should be placed on water conservation, and better statewide support for water sharing. Due to Colorado's water law and use it or lose it, agricultural users have little incentive to implement conservation technologies, and to this day continue to rely on dated, inefficient technologies simply because there remain disincentives – along with lack of any contrary incentives, for conserving water. The state can do much more in terms of enabling water sharing that benefits both urban and rural users. The state has already taken some modest steps in terms of enabling “reuse” of water; more should be done. It's also quite clear, from the disparity in per-capita consumption between various communities that far more can be done to directly encourage conservation among the urban users. Providers should, for example, be required to offer tiered water rates that reward those who use water frugally and which disincentivize wasteful practices. Annexation and development practices should be updated to reflect the reality of limited supplies. The changing climate is a game-changer. The state must be much smarter in adapting to the emerging realities.
Andy Jones, Steve Malers, and George Wallace, Poudre Basin Water Sharing Working Group Letter to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column). Mr. Malers also submitted comments in a questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CWP should not try to be a "one size fits all" plan. The Water Resources Review Committee should encourage the kind of flexibility that will be required in order meet watershed and area-specific needs and produce the innovation necessary for meeting competing interests in water - especially between agriculture, urban water providers, open space programs, and others. Though a number of water projects are being planned and discussed, the group requested multiple-purpose storage that will serve agriculture (which has a water gap too), urban utilities, and the environment. There is also opportunity for new projects but also shared storage in existing reservoirs, gravel pits, and aquifers that is not being realized. The legislature should continue to provide incentives, funding, and legislative support for ATM development, pilot projects, and evaluation. The CWP should encourage new partnerships that provide an ATM element, such as the "buy and supply" concept of purchasing farms or ranches with water, conserving those farms and then leasing or selling those farms to producers with ATM conditions included for drought firming, emergencies, or base supply.
Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An information campaign is needed to educate the public about the value of water. Must continue to allow historical flexibility in the use of water at the local level. The CWP ought to promote and finance innovative and efficient uses of water, particularly by ending agricultural "buy and dry." Viable alternatives include increased efficiency of agricultural water use, and financing alternative transfer mechanisms (ATMs). The permitting process is being impacted by issues that are outside of the process and has become a catch all for other issues. The CWCB should continue to include a discussion of water quality concerns with respect to environmental and recreational water uses.

Public Comments from September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to transmountain diversions. • Focus should be placed on demand management, water sharing, and water reuse strategies. • Environmental interests are under represented on the South Platte Basin Roundtable and ought to receive additional attention. • Agricultural water users risk losing a portion of their water right if they implement certain water savings measures. • Opposed to the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) because of its effects on the Poudre River.
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the creation of additional storage capacity in multipurpose reservoirs in the South Platte Basin. • Municipal and industrial conservation should be prioritized and should include graywater and rainwater harvesting. • Water and land use planning ought to take place in conjunction with one another. • Agricultural users are also expected to conserve water, including by implementing improved irrigation systems. • Communities should be educated about the relationship between agricultural and municipal water use. • Total water management should address both surface and groundwater supplies.
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should take a more active role in the federal process for water projects. • The South Platte Basin's aquifer requires better management. The state should allow pumping from the aquifer to maximize beneficial use of the water we already have. • Regulators must consider the impacts of large engineering projects on the environment.
Table 5 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities and individuals should play a larger role in the planning process. • Healthy forests are important for a clean water supply.
Table 6 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified Projects and Processes (IPPs), conservation, new supplies, and ATMs all merit inclusion in the CWP. • Education and transparency should also be prioritized. • The CWP needs to account for the impacts of climate change, including effects on water supplies and forest health. • There ought to be a discussion of water use by energy providers, including oil and natural gas extractors.
Table 7 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum stream flows must be determined and guaranteed as a part of the CWP and the South Platte BIP. • Uncertain as to how compact obligations affect planning for the South Platte Basin BIP. • Conservation should be incentivized. This requires a revision of the current "use-it-or-lose-it" provision in Colorado water law.
Table 8 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado water users should fully utilize all water available under interstate compact requirements. • Reuse and conservation is important and ought to include graywater use. • Modifications to water law must be careful to account for effects on other water laws. • Land use and zoning requirements should be considered to limit urban and suburban lawn sizes. • Instream flow language should be included, with recognition that instream flows benefit from multipurpose infrastructure.

Public Comments from September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 9 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Bill 14-115 meetings are difficult for the public to attend, as they require physical attendance during normal business hours. In the future, public meetings should accommodate testimony via videoconferencing and take place during the evening. • Demand should be studied at the level of individual homes and businesses. • Minimizing outdoor municipal water use is more important than minimizing indoor use. • The inefficiency of flood irrigation is often outweighed by the benefits provided by autumn recharge flows. • Industrial water contamination deserves attention.
Table 10 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table was unable to reach a consensus on several issues, including the utility of additional storage. • Fragmentation among local decision making bodies requires the intervention of the state, even though local control is generally preferable. • Innovative water storage could utilize subsurface aquifers to minimize water loss. • Lawn sizes are indicative of a need for outdoor municipal water conservation. • Population growth should be slowed, as should issuances of building permits. • Local food production and farming is important.
Table 11 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The value of a tiered water system ought to be studied. • Development of CWP requires leadership from the state government. • Land use planning should emphasize water security for both the Eastern and Western Slopes. • Agricultural users should adopt pivot irrigation to support conservation endeavors. • Support a more robust and accessible instream flow program.
Table 12 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural and municipal users must cooperate to address water quality concerns. • ATMs should be evaluated with attention to their sustainability. • Agricultural uses must be protected in order to avoid economic losses to rural community. • Storage will help address the coming water gap, but strategies must be multipurpose. • Water and land use planning must be integrated.
Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Jennifer Barrow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BIP should include a high conservation strategy. • New supplies will not be able to address new demands alone. Climate change may further reduce the available supply. • New development should include water-wise landscaping.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)	
Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Robert Stocker</p> <p>Also submitted written testimony</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BIP should recognize our generation's moral responsibility to future citizens and to the future of life itself. The CWP should be sustainable and environmentally responsible. • Strategies to protect the environment should include: 1) establishing science-based standards for flow characteristics required to maintain plants, fish, and wildlife dependent on our streams and rivers for propagation and survival; 2) modifying water policies to assure that environmental standards are met before water is extracted for other uses; 3) appreciating the prairie as an ecosystem worthy of protection; 4) requiring minimal standards for returning industrial water to the environment, including water use for fracking; 5) and recognizing stream health as a beneficial use and allowing non-governmental water rights to be established for maintaining stream health. • Conservation is by far the most cost-effective way to deal with water shortages. • Recommended legislation to: 1) encourage water-responsible landscaping and outlaw covenants that require maintaining water-hungry bluegrass lawns; 2) track losses in municipal water systems and eliminate leaks; 3) allow homeowners to collect rainwater for later use in their yards; and 4) modify water law to discourage waste. Our current "use it or lose it" water policy does just the opposite. Agriculture is the largest water user in Colorado. "Buy and dry" is not all bad. If farmers can grow the same crops with less water, they should be able to sell or lease the excess to someone else. • Consider subsidizing reductions in consumption by purchasing additional instream flow rights.
<p>Julio Iturreria, Arapahoe County, Metro and South Platte Basin Roundtable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for balance and being proactive in water planning. • Colorado is the last western state without a water plan.
<p>Devon Buckels, Coordinator for the South Platte River Urban Waters Partnership, a partnership hosted by the Colorado State Forest Service</p> <p>Also submitted written testimony</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWP should support the protection and restoration of the lands that support the hydrology which provide and convey the water for our use. • The CWP should support the incorporation of green infrastructure and the work of regional collaborative organizations like the Urban Waters Partnership. • Fires and flooding affect water quality and also affect the financial cost of water provided to the metro area. Meanwhile, trees in the forest affect snowmelt, and trees in the urban area help to manage stormwater runoff reducing storm water treatment costs for local communities. Forest management work achieved through partnerships with forest service agencies can help protect our watersheds and water supplies. • The CWP should support the protection and restoration of the lands that support the hydrology, including forests, riparian corridors, creeks, and streams which provide and convey the water for our use. • The plan should also support the incorporation of green infrastructure as the region addresses its aging water infrastructure system and associated costs. • The CWP should support the work of regional collaborative organizations like the Urban Waters Partnership, which facilitate coordinated solutions to complex problems by bringing together water providers, government, academic, private sector, and environmental stakeholders. We leverage resources and prioritize actions for greater collective impact. Together, we can maintain the critical watershed elements that contribute to quality of life and economic health in the region while addressing water needs for the future.
<p>Brian Loma, President, Metropolitan State University Water Association of Students Stewards Urban Program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Use it or lose it" should be changed to encourage water conservation. • Graywater infrastructure needs to be developed for new growth. • Recycling of fracking water should be required. • The CWP should include smart sprinkler systems and requirements for additional technology.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Nancy Stocker</p> <p>Also submitted written testimony</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency as a potential source of water is underestimated in the South Platte BIP. • Composting saves water that would otherwise be used to flush food down the drain and should be encouraged. Waterless toilets can save additional water. • Change the law that makes farmers use all their water rights for the awarded use or lose it. Make it so they can lease out their water. Somehow, the most basic human and environmental needs should be met before leasing is allowed for other uses, particularly new uses. • Consider all other means of getting water before making more trans-basin diversions. They damage the basins from which water is taken. They increase the likelihood of occasional severe flooding in the basin to which water goes. And they are expensive. • Fracking water must be recycled over and over and over. Both carrots and sticks should be applied. Recycling would reduce both fresh water demands and the problems of disposal.
<p>John McKenzie, Executive Director Ditch and Reservoir Company Alliance</p> <p>Also submitted 9-page memorandum (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the importance of Colorado’s ditch and reservoir companies, it would be appropriate to provide these entities with a separate “Ditch and Reservoir Company” chapter within the CWP. • The CWP can be developed that includes decisions that minimize risk, taking into account climate change, demographic patterns, identified projects, and including cultural and political considerations. The alliance has reviewed the DRAFT 5.1: Scenario Planning and Developing an Adaptive Water Strategy and believes that the process of formulating plausible scenarios has been useful in developing consensus to the extent possible and orienting the next steps. Now, scenarios and drivers need to be identified from the output of a model, ones that are determined after a carefully constructed analysis of Colorado’s water system is complete. • There is a need to recognize the contribution of ditch and reservoir companies to the culture and environmental qualities of Colorado. These delivery systems include the diversion structures, the canals, the laterals, the reservoirs, the farms and ranches they serve, and the return flows. • Colorado’s food system should be defended by protecting individual water rights and historic uses through the existing prior appropriation system. • There is not a good database of ditch companies and their service areas, and practices. Baselines can be created to be used as a reference point in determining trends and future changes to the amount of water carried, water use, changes in the service area, amount of water tied to the ground, and financial viability of ditch companies. • Ditch companies have been providing substantial benefits to society, both directly and indirectly. Mechanisms for compensating ditch companies need to be explored, both monetary and non-monetary approaches. • Better planning capabilities for ditch and reservoir companies could make it easier for those companies to adapt to changing social and environmental pressures. Planning activities in the medium and long-term should be strengthened. Funds need to be set aside to help ditch companies plan for their futures for many know what needs to be done but need additional resources. • More educational efforts should be undertaken to promote ATMs. For ATMs to be used in a free market system with willing participants, the various options need to be made clear and understandable. Models of financial impact to the parties need to be developed. More activities like the Following Leasing Pilot Program (HB 13-1248) are important but need to be enhanced and promoted.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Ditch and Reservoir Company Alliance (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of recognition by many decision makers and water rights owners on the impacts that climate change will have on ditch and reservoir companies. Individual ditch companies need to better monitor and begin recording their own data including flow patterns, water availability, temperature, evapotranspiration data, and annual precipitation. Seeing the effects of climate change through locally collected data that is more granular. • The financial, recreational, agricultural, and environmental costs for the long term as well as the present, along with an increasing concern for the Colorado River Basin, leads to the strong impression that additional transmountain diversions should be considered only after other solutions have been exhausted. • The CWP needs to focus on the development of guidelines and standards that reduce transaction costs and risk by providing more certainty in local regulations, easement definition, storm-water regulations, property rights disputes, taxation, and lender relationships. Guidelines and standards can take the form of model regulations and laws, as well as conceptual principles that may encourage more effective cooperation between ditch companies and local communities. • Basin implementation plans include requests for approximately \$8 billion for projects that are mainly focused on meeting future municipal water supply gaps and firming existing M&I supply. Despite the fact that ditch companies handle and distribute far more water across very large and productive areas, the plans omit sufficient requests for the funding of ditch companies and agricultural needs, including infrastructure (diversion, conveyance, on-farm improvements, and storage) that will help ditch companies and agriculture prosper and shelter them from an uncertain future of climate variability, a growing state population, and other pressures. • Many ditch companies feel that although improvements to their systems may be of benefit, the benefits do not justify the costs and risks. Other incentives should be considered such as: 1) creation of a transferable state tax credit for improvements much like the ones currently used for conservation easement; 2) lowering the rate of CWCB loans for infrastructure loans; and 3) providing or promoting mechanisms where private individuals can furnish funds for ag ditch company improvements. • Storage water will play a critical role in maintaining and enhancing the water portfolio of mutual ditch and reservoir companies. Transaction costs (permits, required studies) in today's regulatory climate make it too costly, and therefore infeasible for limited resource ditch companies to expand, let alone build, new reservoirs. Until a more streamlined permitting process for reservoir expansion results, few storage expansion projects will be undertaken. • Once water demand overtakes the available supply, sources of water once considered unfeasible or improbable will need investigation. Higher costs may also lead to the widespread utilization of graywater and even the reuse of domestic water. However, conservation and reuse may not be sufficient. All options should be explored including piping water from the water-long area of the Missouri/Mississippi River system to Colorado. Storage could be provided in eastern Colorado in off stream reservoirs or stored in aquifers.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Robert Longenbaugh</p> <p>Also testified at the September 17, 2014 South Platte Basin hearing and submitted a letter on the CWP (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft SPBIP does not adequately consider the quantity of ground water now stored in the South Platte and Republican River drainage basins. Nowhere in the report does it recognize the 10.5 million acre feet of water now stored in the South Platte alluvial aquifer some of which can clearly be put to beneficial use to further water needs of Colorado, if managed properly. • The history of how irrigation wells were drilled to supplement inadequate and undependable surface water supplies is crucial to understand current water administration problems. • The ground water aquifers and their use for storing excess river flows when precipitation is above normal must be one of the top priorities in the State Water Plan. • Both the surface and ground water must be managed to maximize the water available to meet future Colorado citizen's needs. The 1969 Ground Water Administration Act specifically requires the management of both the ground and surface water while also preventing injury to vested water rights. Current water administration only address the prevention of injury issue. To plan for 2050 we must return to an aggressive program of conjunctive use. • Prudent ground water pumping must be allowed to provide water for irrigation, municipal use and industrial needs when there is insufficient river flows such as early spring before the snow melt, in the fall and winter periods and especially during drought periods. Current well pumping with augmentation does not allow the wells to supply water during droughts. • For ground water management you need data on volumes pumped, volumes recharged, water table levels, and geologic information. Both calibrated ground and surface water models would be beneficial to better manage Colorado's water resources. • The South Platte River is now in a very dynamic state. Both physical and hydrologic conditions are changing in both time and space. Conservation, reuse, and using noncontributory ground water and transbasin diversions to extinction are having major impact on river flows. It is well documented that river calls and dry up of stream flow reaches is occurring more frequently. Projections for 2050 using past rates of change in this case is not good science or technology and will result in critical errors of the projected deficiencies for all water users. • Water administration must be changed to allow the State Engineer flexibility in how he distributes excess surface runoff from storm events. • There are significant problems with how state water officials are administering water. There are statutes that require the State Engineer to prevent waste, maximize beneficial use, prevent injury, administer water in the priority system, and impose retained jurisdiction in augmentation decrees to correct how those decrees are administered to prevent over augmentation. The Division I Engineer tells me he does not honor those statutory requirements because either the Bijou Irrigation District vs. Simpson Colorado Supreme Court Case in 2002 or the legislation passed in 2002, 2003, or 2004 specifically requires him to only consider the accounting of depletions due to pumping and accretions due to artificial recharge in the existing augmentation decrees. If this conflict exists, then the Legislature needs to take action to resolve this problem, clarifying the way the State Engineer should administer the water. • We don't now have priority administration. All the irrigation wells that were drilled prior to 1965 have priority dates senior to the artificial recharge structures (first decree for artificial recharge was in 1972). Why can't irrigation wells pump some water in their own priority? Why do we have over 100 new well permits issued since 2005 in Weld, Morgan, Logan and Sedgwick counties which have resulted in new wells irrigating new lands never before irrigated, while we have over 4,000 wells curtailed that have senior appropriation dates? This situation needs to be evaluated to measure future potential problems.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Robert Longenbaugh (Cont)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are now wasting water in the South Platte Basin: Excess flows (400,000 acre feet per year on the average) go to Nebraska; Phreatophytes are consuming over 450,000 acre feet per year and that number is increasing; Increased evaporation from the soil surface due to the high ground water levels could easily be over 100,000 acre feet/yr. If we could salvage just a portion of each of those three wastes, then the projected 2050 M&I deficiency could be greatly reduced which would reduce or eliminate the need to import water from the Colorado River Basin. • There are references in the SPBIP that there are expected changes (problems) coming: 1) in the fractured rock aquifers in the foothills and mountains; 2) the Ogallala irrigation wells in the Republican Basin; and 3) the Denver Basin Bedrock Aquifers because of declining piezometric ground water levels. There doesn't appear to be specific action items listed to be implemented prior to 2050 to address these critical water issues. Hopefully the State Water Plan would schedule and initiate action items. • The SPBIP has been structured to implement the recommendations from SWASI 2010 and includes action items: conservation, implement IPP's, address and limit agriculture transfers, and import water from the Colorado River Basin. This is commonly referred to as the "four legs of the stool." A very important issue that is not being considered is preventing waste and implementing changes to current water administration that could greatly increase our current supply. Returning to conjunctive use like we had for 25 years (1974-1999), but carefully evaluating and making changes that will prevent injury to vested water rights that occurred during that period must be considered and implemented. • Rising ground water levels in several reaches of the South Platte River must be addressed right away to prevent permanent damage to farmland productivity. Clearly putting ground to beneficial use in areas of high ground water levels will prevent waste from occurring. • There are a number of inaccurate statements in the July 31, 2014, draft of the SPBIP that should be corrected.
<p>Theresa Conley, Conservation Colorado</p> <p>Also testified at the September 17 South Platte Basin hearing and submitted a letter on the CWP (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on demand management first, before exploring "new supply" and developing additional Colorado River Water. This starts with increasing indoor and outdoor conservation as well as increasing the use of recycled water. SB 14-103 (phase-out of the sale of certain low efficiency plumbing fixtures) and HB 13-1044 (authorizing the use of graywater) are two recent bills that have sought innovative ways to decrease the demands we put on fresh, potable water by increasing the efficiency of bathroom fixtures without impacting their effectiveness and exploring ways to use graywater, such as in our toilets or lawns. These are relatively easy changes that result in a significant impact. • We can and should connect land use planning and water planning. We know the population of Colorado is growing with an additional four million people expected by 2050. A lot of our future water needs are within this new population group. Colorado should partner with counties, land use planners, and water utilities to embrace integrated planning that will lower the water footprint of new urban development. While education and training is an important first step, we will need additional measures. • We need to continue the legacy of innovation that Colorado was founded on and find new ways to work smarter, build better, and use less water in the process.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Theresa Conley, Conservation Colorado (Cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased flexibility in water sharing. Creative water-sharing agreements (Alternative Transfer Mechanisms (ATMs)) can support agriculture, meet growing communities' needs, and protect Colorado's rivers. Currently buying and then drying up agricultural land is the easiest way to get water from agriculture. It was repeated several times at my table during small group discussion that we need more sharing opportunities and more flexibility in our water rights system (not an entire overhaul). The state should support water sharing agreements—ones that are voluntary, compensated, temporary, and flexible—to help meet future municipal and healthy flow needs while making agriculture more profitable. Of course, water rights need to be respected but farmers and irrigators should be rewarded for conservation practices, efficiency improvements, and sharing and not penalized. • Cross-basin comparison. I provided a matrix comparing the Basin Implementation Plans to each other on certain aspects – conservation, reuse, trans-mountain diversions, environmental and recreation methods and projects and agriculture (Basin Implementation Plans Matrix) as well as the several elements coming out of the BIPs that are noteworthy (Shareable BIP Elements). Another good comparison would be to examine how the Basin Implementation Plans (BIPs) match up to the Interbasin Compact Committee's (IBCC) No/Low Regrets Action Plan. Some basins meet the goals laid out by the IBCC's action plan while others do not. I call your attention to conservation levels, projects or methods designed for meeting environmental goals and success rates of identified projects and processes (IPPs). • Funding & Research. We need funding for and stream management plans. These plans quantify the flows needed to preserve environmental and recreational attributes, identified by the basins, within specific river reaches. These basin-level stream management plans should be a top tier priority within the BIPs and the CWP. Of note, while watershed management plans are important, stream management plans (SMPs) specifically evaluate the flows and are needed independent of any larger watershed plan. SMPs allow local stakeholders to better assess river resources that need protecting.
<p>Pauline P. Reetz, Conservation Chairman, submitted written comments on behalf of the Audubon Society of Greater Denver (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Conservation. The Plan should include a significant focus on water conservation (the cheapest, easiest and fastest way to "create" more water), including municipal water conservation, municipal reuse, agricultural efficiency, and water-efficient energy supplies. These measures can save substantial amounts of water and can help ensure that no new water diversions are needed from our already-depleted streams; they can make water available to restore degraded stream reaches. Some of these measures may require changes in Colorado law. We support conservation measures such as: 1) municipal and industrial wastewater reuse and recycling, water metering, tiered pricing, leak detection and repair, xeriscaping incentives, limiting development near stream banks, restoration of stream banks, and incentives for upgrades to water-saving appliances; 2) temporary water sharing agreements between agriculture and cities when agriculture has surplus water; 3) regulations that ensure that adequate and proven long-term water supplies are available, before new developments are approved; and 4) significant increases in water efficiency by agricultural users. • Quantification of Non-consumptive water needs. So far the documentation for the plan has focused on quantifying the need for water for agricultural, municipal, and industrial uses - the consumptive uses of water. However, Colorado's economy and our Colorado lifestyle benefit from a strong tourist industry based on our scenery, fish and wildlife resources, and these non-consumptive uses should also be quantified and added into any consideration of future water allocation in Colorado. Non-consumptive uses or "attributes" have been mapped, but much more work is needed to quantify the amounts of water required to keep our rivers healthy and productive. Rivers need scouring flows in the spring, adequate winter flows to support aquatic life and summer/fall flows to maintain invertebrate and vertebrate aquatic species and riparian vegetation.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Pauline P. Reetz (Cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River and stream restoration. Over the last 100 years we have drained, dammed and diverted our rivers and streams to the detriment of most species and to the detriment of the rivers themselves. As you are fully aware, we are not starting out in this planning process with healthy rivers! Most of Colorado's rivers are imperiled, diminished, and sometimes drained completely dry. Any further diversions will cause the loss of the water-based recreation (such as rafting and fishing) and wildlife resources that add billions to Colorado's income each year. The State Water Plan needs to outline a strategy to restore ecological health and balance to our rivers and streams and preserve and enhance our remaining riparian ecosystems. Additionally, the state needs to plan/provide resources for more detailed inventory and assessment of river ecosystem conditions and actual water needs. • Coordination between land use, growth, and water supply. Until recently no developer had to consider where the water for his development would come from, and consumers had no information about it. This has changed slightly since 2008, but we still have a long way to go to integrate water supply planning and land use. While many Coloradans oppose the "buy and dry" option because it would eliminate productive farmland, that is likely to be our future source of water if we don't plan ahead. Water providers claim that they cannot be responsible for land use planning, but some of that is happening even now. Why not integrate water and land use, rather than depending on the helter-skelter, water-wasteful system we have now? • Minimum stream flows are not adequate. While they are a good idea, minimum stream flows are not adequate as a sole protection for environmental needs and values - they are too little, and too recent. Streams need spring floods to flush out sediment as well as adequate flows the rest of the year to support riparian and river bottom ecosystems. • Minimize construction of new dams and reservoirs. These store water on the surface where a large percentage is lost to evaporation. "Smarter" storage should be encouraged: underground, in aquifers, or in deep gravel pits where evaporation can be minimized. The State Water Plan should be flexible enough to deal with changes caused by the warming of our planet due to fossil fuel consumption and the ensuing increase in evaporation and transpiration rates. Storage in itself does not equal new water supplies. • Rivers and streams need to be viewed as continuous systems, not isolated reaches. Diversions and pollution upstream can have severe impacts on downstream ecosystems. The state should be protecting the upper reaches of our mountain streams, for example, even when they are intermittent, so as to ensure water quality and quantity for downstream users and resources. • Ground and surface water should be viewed as interrelated systems. Recent controversy over the use of ground water in the South Platte alluvium should have taught us a lesson: often ground water and surface water resources are closely related. Water planning needs to take this into account and acknowledge that ground water depletions can affect the quantity and quality of surface water in some areas. • Transbasin diversions should be a last option. The Colorado River is over-appropriated and, due to climate change, it is unlikely that additional water will be available from that river basin. The Front Range should not count on augmenting our water supplies via diversions across the Continental Divide. In addition, mitigation for water removal from a basin cannot be satisfactorily accomplished, especially in light of degradation that has already occurred. Rather, we should focus on conservation and efficient use of our native water on the Front Range. • Audubon's mission, to advocate for the environment by connecting people with nature through education, conservation and research, fully supports Governor Hickenlooper's Executive Order of May 13, 2013 which states "...the Colorado Water Plan must incorporate... a strong environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers and streams and wildlife".

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
<p>Doug Swartz</p> <p>September 30, 2014 letter to the committee (excerpts provided in the following column).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2050 “water supply gap” is presented as a basic fact upon which much of the Roundtable’s work is based. This gap is predicated on a plethora of assumptions which could be questioned and which, if modified, might lead to quite different conclusions. One fundamental assumption is that the state’s population will continue to grow at a rate determined by factors other than water supply. In fact, in semi-arid Colorado, water may be a limiting factor for that growth rate, as it becomes more scarce and expensive. • The current planning process picks up at the present; i.e. the starting point is the present status of Colorado’s waterways. This suggests that the existing environmental degradation caused by the myriad water diversion, storage and usage projects developed in the past (hundreds if not thousands) is accepted. However further degradation from projects recommended for development under the SBPIP cannot be considered on a standalone basis; it must be evaluated from the standpoint of the cumulative impacts of past and new projects and new projects together. • The draft plan tries to convey that it’s possible to do it all: restore healthy waterways, improve recreational opportunities and develop significant additional water supplies. This doesn’t pass the sniff test; it’s not going to be possible to meet all of these needs and wants. In fact, it is clear that the plan’s highest priority is to increase development of IPPs and new “multipurpose” projects, with a much smaller slice of the pie going to the restoration pieces. • Mention of the possibility of the development of new large-scale water projects and trans-basin diversions. The era of development of such projects is over, with better understanding of their deleterious impacts (and the lack of availability of federal funding for implementation). • A push for streamlined permitting processes for new water development. I could support this only if environmental protection aspects receive increased, not decreased attention, as part of a process change. • The statement at the end of the Implementation section of the Executive Summary: “Broader political and financial support is essential if the state is to use integrated projects to meet the supply gap.” Is this a plea for the state to take a larger role in advocating for and funding new water development projects? This is very concerning. • Areas of the planning effort that need additional emphasis and/or more research include: a discussion of carrying capacity must be part of the discussion about Colorado’s water future; a shift in emphasis from development of additional supplies to conservation, efficiency, recycling, and creative water-sharing options. If there are obstacles in Colorado water law, we must work to improve the law rather than be handcuffed by it. Significant protection/restoration/enhancement of riparian environments must be accomplished before further degradation is considered. A meaningful plan must include adequate funding for implementation of these goals. A more realistic drought-planning criterion compared with the current 1-in-50. Though such a stringent criterion is desirable from a human-centric perspective, it is unrealistic in the climate in which we live and is not desirable from a more holistic perspective that recognizes both the intrinsic value of other species and that the health of the human species is inextricably tied to the health of these other species.

Public Comments from October 1, 2014 Metro Basin Hearing (Cont.)

Source of Comment	Summary of Comments
Table 1 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural water efficiency or transfers can hurt downstream uses. Municipalities should only be able to take or transfer the consumptive use. • Land use planning needs to include a focus on water efficiency. • Growth should not be subsidized. • Water should be used more holistically such as rainwater capture and storm water capture. There needs to be a study and data to determine the impacts of rainwater and storm water capture and their impacts or non-impacts on the downstream users. • Alternative uses/demands need to be more accessible and cost effective. • People need to be educated about living in an arid state and offered incentives to xeriscape. • Expressed opposition to the Chatfield Reservoir expansion because reservoirs are inefficient and the CWP should look at underground storage. • Legislation should be considered to prevent HOAs from requiring inefficient water use. • The state, water providers, and other users must educate people coming into the state about water efficiencies be made aware of the state's arid environment.
Table 2 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed the need for conservation and whether that should be mandated or incentivized. The table noted that 87% of water goes to agriculture and they talked about the efficiencies and roadblocks to increase agricultural efficiencies. This included challenges with interstate compacts and the need to store water that we're entitled to but goes downstream. • Recreation, ecosystems, and environmental concerns are important to the state's economy. • Questioned whether transbasin diversions should be part of the CWP. • Each basin is unique and questioned how all the BIPs can be blend together into a statewide plan. • What impact will Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations have on the state? • Water reuse and recycling of water is important. • Water education is important The Colorado Foundation for Water Education Citizen's Guides are a great resource.
Table 3 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data for the models used in the BIP should be better explained in the South Platte BIP. • Alluvial storage in the South Platte Basin deserves more attention. • Concerned about losing the value of East Slope agriculture due to "buy and dry." • Conservation should result in a reduction in consumptive use. • A better understanding of the water inventory is needed to better manage the water supply. • The legislature's duty is to protect the public's interest in water as well as priority rights to that water.
Table 4 Small Group Discussion Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water used for fracking should be reused. • More land use and water planning is needed locally and statewide. • Questioned whether there could be legislative support for local green infrastructure. • Flora and fauna are important for filtering water and watershed health. • Forest management is important. • Better management of storm water is needed. • High mountain reservoirs are important. • The Federal Environmental Impact Statement process could be streamlined to reduce costs.