

**Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015**

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
1	10/13/2014	Colorado Dept of Public Health and Environment, Colorado Water Quality Control Division, Source Water Protection Work Group	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	6.6, 7.1, 7.3	Letter from Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, Colorado Water Quality Control Division, Source Water Protection Work Group regarding comments on Colorado's Water Plan.	1 document	CWCB appreciates the CO WQCD's comments and will make the changes as appropriate in the second draft of Colorado's Water Plan.
2	10/30/2014	Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	6.3, 6.5, 9.4	Please find attached a letter, and the attached set of guiding principles, as formal comment on the formation of the Colorado Water Plan on behalf of Colorado's business community.	1 document	CWCB appreciates the letter from the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce and involvement by the business community. The principles outlined in the letter are in line with the values driving development of Colorado's Water Plan.
3	11/1/2014	Mary Ratz, Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	2, 6.6	These items should be addressed. 1) The rain and snow pack received annually is ours to use. We should not have to let ANY of it flow to other states and should not have to prove we own that water and that we need all of it. This is a state RIGHT, not for the federal government's to decide. 2) The Colorado River is all ours and should not be feeding the lawns in Las Vegas or any other Nevada, Arizona or California areas. Our other major rivers should NOT be flowing freely out of state, the Arkansas, the Platte, etc. 3) We should build more reservoirs and lakes to retain our water. This should be done thoughtfully saving important natural areas and endangered species. We have many natural areas with the geologic formations to do this. This simply would create more riparian and water species instead of mountain or desert species. 4) We should allow each and every smaller stream to keep its ability to flow freely and naturally. If we do all of these things our future and our children's futures would be safer and more secure.	N/A	Interstate compacts, which are agreements between two or more states, govern specific interactions among those states and require consent by the U.S. Congress. For more information on Colorado's interstate compacts visit the CWCB website. The state is working vigorously with other upper basin states and the Colorado River Basin as a whole to mitigate any risks Colorado may face with regard to compact compliance and other interstate issues. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific water projects. The CWCB encourages multipurpose projects and full mitigation. CWCB maintains and operates In Stream Flow and Natural Lake Level programs, both of which are highly regarded as some of the most successful programs of their kind in the Western U.S. Nonconsumptive needs are critically important aspects of the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan. Although not fully tested, instream flows can be designed to directly benefit riparian areas, and the CWCB Stream and Lake Protection Section is working with the BLM to design an approach to in-stream flows by providing a flood flow component in the spring.
4	11/10/2014	Boulder County Parks and Open Space	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	4, 6.3, 6.6	Letter from Boulder County regarding comments on Colorado's Water Plan.	1 document	CWCB appreciates Boulder County's letter and support of Colorado's Water Plan, as well as Boulder County's representation on the South Platte Basin Roundtable. The comments within the letter are in line with the values driving development of Colorado's Water Plan. Finally, regarding the comments related to Interruptible Supply Plans (ISPs), Boulder County should know that ISPs and other agreements are options and not intended to force existing water rights holders into these agreements.
5	11/17/2014	Richard G. Hamilton, Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	2	Find here [as an "attachment"] a historical review [with associated statute, case law, and law review observations] pertaining to Colorado legislative discretionary status within the arena of Colorado water law and Colorado water allocations. Am aware that the "public comment" period for comment to the Plan proposal has closed – am also aware that further analysis, and review [prior to any legislative deliberation of the measure], of that proposed Colorado State Water Plan could ensue and, theoretically, supervene. Of particular note within Professor Schorr's (see Appropriation as Agrarianism , ECOLOGY LAW QUARTERLY [Vol. 32:3] 2005]) testament is the contention / conclusion that: "With regard to constitutional issues relating to the Colorado water estate – clearly owned by the people of the state, the issues of "Reasonable Use" v "Beneficial Use" were solved by the Colorado Supreme Court in Coffin." (Coffin v. Left Hand Ditch Co., 6 Colo. 443, 449-50 (1882). see also: Coffin v. Left Hand Ditch Co. (No. 885), Colo. St. Archives). Colorado's water legal estate was, therefore, defined by two absolute precepts: · Ownership of the water within the state was held by the people, not the state. · The right to the use of water in Colorado could only be defined by use.	1 document	Thank you for your observations and for providing the historical review. Chapter 2 of the 2014 draft Colorado's Water Plan, specifically section 2.1 (Colorado water law & administration) addresses the usufructory nature of water rights within Colorado and the prior appropriation system. In particular the description of "The Colorado Doctrine" addresses the issues of water as a public resource, and a discussion of "beneficial use" as a measure and limit is located at the top of page 8 in section 2.1.
6	11/18/2014	Gary Wockner	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	6.5, 9.4, South Platte BIP	Tomorrow (Wednesday, Nov. 19th) the staff of the CWCB is presenting the draft Colorado Water Plan to you at the CWCB meeting in Berthoud. Here is input from Save The Poudre and Save The Colorado. After reviewing the draft Plan, Save The Poudre and Save The Colorado believe it is heading towards being a "River Destroyer's Manifesto." 1. The Colorado Water Plan relies on the "Basin Implementation Plans" (BIP) which in the South Platte/Metro is fatally flawed because it does not include any voices from groups that want to protect and restore rivers. Save The Poudre was excluded from this process. 2. The Colorado Water Plan relies very heavily on the South Platte/Metro Basin Implementation Plan which endorses every proposed statewide river-destroying project including the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP), Moffat Project, Windy Gap Firming Project, etc., and endorses a new major Trans-Mountain Diversion like the Flaming Gorge Pipeline (it even calls for a "conceptual review" of the Flaming Gorge Pipeline). Another conceptual project mentioned in the South Platte/Metro BIP is the "Big Straw," a major diversion from the Yampa River west of Steamboat Springs over to the Front Range. The South Platte/Metro BIP would further destroy the Cache la Poudre River by endorsing every proposed dam project including NISP, Halligan, Seaman, and the Bellvue Pipeline. 3. The Colorado Water Plan gives sweeping new power and authority to the State of Colorado (through the Colorado Water Conservation Board, Interbasin Compact Committee, and Legislature) to "streamline" and potentially gut regulations, and to lobby for and fund new dams and river destruction projects. 4. Save The Poudre and Save The Colorado's input into the Colorado Water Plan -- which includes a coalition of 18 conservation groups -- has so far been completely ignored Thank you! Gary P.S. Mr. Eklund, if you could please forward this email to the individual Board members, that would be appreciated.	N/A	Regarding point 1: Each Basin Roundtable is made up of a diverse set of stakeholders and the inclusion of both an environmental and recreational representative is required by the Colorado Water for the 21st Century Act. In addition, representatives from each county, municipalities within each county, industry, agriculture, and domestic water suppliers are required. Lastly, a representative from each water conservation and conservancy district are also stipulated. There are also several other at large seats, and many of these are held by environmental interests, and many of the local government representatives are also focused on environmental and recreational issues since their citizens care about these topics and the area may be dependent on tourism. Additionally, all Basin Roundtable meetings are open to the public. Regarding points 2 and 3: Please review Section 6.6 Environmental & Recreational Projects & Methods and Section 9.3 State Water Rights & Alignment for more information on environmental and recreational efforts. CWCB has been in regular communication with environmental groups and many of their comments on the plan were incorporated. Colorado's Water Plan does not endorse any specific projects. Regarding point 4: At each CWCB Board meeting since September, 2013 there has been a public input agenda item regarding Colorado's Water Plan. All of the comments received via the Colorado's Water Plan website or by email to cwaterplan@state.co.us were included in the CWCB Board packets for review and comment and are also linked below. Depending on the date of submission, input has or will be reviewed at the next scheduled CWCB Board meeting. While not every individual receives a direct email reply regarding their input, a CWCB staff response and/or recommendation regarding all input received is included in a summary spreadsheet within the related Board packet and also available for review online, the link is provided here: Additional deadlines for input received beyond that can be found online here: https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cwaterplan/get-involved/record-input-received-date .

**Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015**

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
7	11/20/2014	Drew Beckwith, Western Resource Advocates	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	6.3, 6.6	Please find attached a written version of the testimony I provided to the Board at yesterday's meeting.	1 document	Thank you for providing a transcription of your verbal comments. CWCB is working on the issues presented and will continue to engage stakeholders in developing conservation goals.
8	11/23/2014	Charles Howe, University of Colorado Boulder	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us		Members of the CWCB and All Plan Participants: First let me congratulate all who have contributed to the State Plan effort from the very first Basin Round Table meetings that continue to provide broad deliberative input into this critical Plan formulation. One of my great colleagues, David Getches (fighter for effective governance and fairness in public policy, Director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources and Dean of the CU Law School) long argued that Colorado needed to have a Water Plan, following the examples of Texas, California and other States. That challenge has now been answered by the current efforts. I would like to comment in a constructive vein on a few of the features of the draft plan, somewhat in response to last week's article by Bruce Finney that appeared in the Boulder Daily Camera and the Denver Post concerning the draft State Water Plan. (1) The plan appears to depend too heavily on further imports from the Western Slope where the Colorado River is already severely overdrawn. This point requires no elaboration. (2) In this connection, the Plan appears to overlook the fact that parts of Weld County are actually underwater with the groundwater table flooding home basements and making agricultural fields unworkable. This is in part due to the fact that hundreds of irrigation wells that are meant to provide water for some of the best soils in the State have been shut down since 2006 due to conflicts between our water law (priority doctrine and calls on the river) and the most effective uses of our water supplies. These conflicts can be resolved and warrant further study. (3) Colorado delivers more water from the South Platte to Nebraska than is required by compact, water that could be used in Colorado with some imaginative consideration of tributary flows, exchanges and other strategies; (4) The draft Plan exaggerates concern with "drying up agriculture". As everyone knows, agriculture consumes 80% of the water available to the State and is an important economic and cultural sector of the State economy. Constructive proposals for alternatives to "buy and dry" have been made by the CWCB and at least two Roundtables. Through leasing if not sale, large volumes of water from further tightening of irrigation systems and cutting back lesser valued crops can be made available to the mutual advantage of farmers and urban areas. Farmers' retirement security in the future will be closely tied to their ability to sell or lease water. (5) The important role for water markets in effecting the steps noted above is not given sufficient attention. The history of trading water rights and short term leases goes back a century and shows that water markets, more informal than formal, have been effective in moving water among uses in a "willing seller-willing buyer" framework. A great example is found in the Northern District's market for allotments (shares). Some modifications of current interpretations of our water law could facilitate the working of these water markets. Hopefully, these suggestions may prove useful in the further formulation of the Plan.	N/A	1. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific transmountain water project, but it will discuss how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work. 2. There are ongoing groundwater discussions that are explicitly addressing some of the concerns addressed by Charles Howe. The results of this discussion will be incorporated into the second draft of Colorado's Water Plan. 3. The commenter expresses concerns about the amount of water leaving Colorado and going to Nebraska. These concerns do not take into account the three states agreement concerning endangered fish species and the rarity of having sufficient flows to justify storage. However, the South Platte Basin Implementation Plan is exploring whether or not there are any viable options. 4 and 5. Alternative transfer methods are aimed at improving opportunities that can compete in the "market" while at the same time reducing permanent agricultural dry-up.
9	12/5/2014	Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council, and the Southern Ute Indian Tribal Council	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	2	Please see the attached proposed revisions to the Chapter 2 that you sent on October 17. We also included a stand-alone document with a suggested replacement for the Tribal portion of Section 2.5. Please let me know if you would like to schedule a time to talk about this. I will be at CRWUA next week (as will Cathy Condon and Chuck Lawler from the SUIT), or we could schedule a time to talk by phone.	2 documents	CWCB appreciates the comments and will make the suggested changes in the second draft of Colorado's Water Plan.
10	12/5/2014	Tershia d'Elgin, Eaton Cattle Company	Mailed letter to CWCB		Letter regarding comments on Colorado's Water Plan	Letter	The commenter provides many comments regarding population growth, the importance of agriculture, and climate change. In general, it is important to note that these are the same issues that were discussed through a diverse and lengthy stakeholder process. The plan reflects Colorado's diverse community and the consensus reached on these topics thus far. 1. With regard to population growth, Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes three growth scenarios: low-growth, mid-growth, high-growth. As water planners, Colorado must prepare for any of these future possibilities as we do not have control over the state's economy and how many people are born or choose to move here. While some communities choose to limit growth, doing so on a broad statewide scale is untenable and unconstitutional. 2. Colorado's Water Plan recognizes the critical importance of agriculture, which is why much of the plan is aimed at reducing permanent loss of irrigated acres. 3. While the plan does not go as far as the commenter would like in terms of the costs of externalities, it does incorporate thorough discussions and actions in relation to water quality, environmental resiliency and the like as related to water development. 4. Colorado's Water Plan does not acknowledge the expertise of Front Range water providers over those from the rest of the state, rather it takes a balanced, statewide approach. 5. Climate change is considered in-depth and is integrated throughout the document. Sections and chapters focusing on climate change include those on supply, demand, and scenario planning. Colorado needs to be prepared both for climate change and population increases. Both of these are largely beyond the control of water stakeholders and planners. 6. While the plan is committed to education, Colorado needs to be prepared for the real possibility of how social values may be shaped by future events, which cannot be predicted. 7. Food production is critical, so is the right of water rights owners to sell their rights. Alternative transfer methods provide another option to incentivize the market. Conservation alone and not planning for a future with growth are not sufficient strategies to meet Colorado's current and future water needs.
11	12/9/2014	Unidentified Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	6.3	Comment: Page 64 of 169, Chapter 6, Water Supply Management, Colorado Water Plan/DRAFT. Suggested change: Last sentence should read: "Graywater could and should be important to existing residential water use by way of retrofit, as well as an important component of new construction."	N/A	CWCB will consider incorporating this comment in the second draft of Colorado's Water Plan.

Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
12	12/16/2014	Wayne Schwab, Trinchera Irrigation	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	3	Would it be possible to correct the error on page 48 of the ColoradoWaterPlan draft? The link to the RioGrandeBasin water plan is actually for the North Platte.	N/A	The link is corrected within the current version linked from the Colorado's Water Plan website.
13	12/23/2014	Eagle River Water & Sanitation District and Upper Eagle Regional Water Authority	Letter mailed to CWCB		Comments on organization and content of first draft of Colorado's Water Plan	Letter	At the direction of the CWCB Board, CWCB staff crafted a "textbook" water plan. This includes 27 pages of goals and actions throughout Chapters 6-11. It is the vision to further develop the Executive Summary over 2015, which will focus on a shorter and easier to read action plan.
14	1/4/2015	Chris Michalowski, Colorado Citizen	Email to cwaterplan@state.co.us	6.3	Large transbasin diversion projects are not the answer for Colorado and should not be promoted in the Plan. Such projects will hurt our rivers, fisheries, and west slope communities, and it isn't even clear that there is enough undeveloped water legally available to support the projects in the future. Conservation and innovative partnerships for water sharing are better solutions.	N/A	With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific transmountain water project, but it will discuss how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone might not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be explored. These topics are explored in Section 6.3.
15	10/14/2014	John Wiener, University of Colorado but acting as private citizen	Webform	6.5, 6.6, 7.1, 9.2	Individual Comments on Colorado Water Plan, from John Wiener, 14 October 2014, in addition to previously submitted individual comments. 6.5 – Municipal, Industrial and Agricultural Infrastructure Projects and Methods (previously ch 5) 6.6 – Environmental and Recreational Projects and Methods (previously 5.9) 7.1 – Watershed Health and Management (previously 5.3) 9.1 – Economics and Funding (previously ch 7)	1 document	Comments on phreatophytes are thorough and explain the complexities of phreatophytes as they relate to water use. CWCB and other agencies support the removal of invasive phreatophytes and they are further discussed in relation to saved and salvaged water in Section 6.3.4. Costs, including those needed to support the environment and watershed health, will be more fully examined in the SWSI update.
16	10/15/2014	Steve Harris, Southwestern Water Conservation District	Webform	9.4	Chapter 5.10 "Creating More Efficient Permitting Processes" In the second paragraph of the sub-chapter there is the statement "The state is prohibited from predetermining the outcome of an environmental permit, certification, or mitigation plan." The chapter adequately explains why this applies to the federal government but does not address what law(s) prohibit the state. I would suggest that the legal basis for this statement and a thorough description of when the prohibition applies and more importantly when it doesn't apply and/or when the prohibition ends in the permitting process. For instance, after a certification and/or mitigation plan is completed can the state then advocate for an IPP with the federal government? Also is there compartmentalization on state permits, can CPW advocate for an IPP if the only state nexus is a 401 certification from WQCD (or vise versa)?	N/A	One goal of the water plan is to better coordinate state agencies. Once state 401 water quality certifications and wildlife mitigation plans are completed, at least preliminarily, the draft suggests the state could advocate for the project.
17	10/15/2014	Charles Howe, University of Colorado-Boulder-retired	Webform		We must have a section on the increasing importance of water markets. I attach a paper describing the most efficient and useful water market in the U.S.: that of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District. Water markets are the solution to much of the conflict between surface water users and groundwater users. I'll be happy to draft such a section.	1 document	As additional work on alternative transfer methods and water banking and legislative options are developed further exploration of water markets may be warranted.
18	10/16/2014	Tom Easley, Rocky Mountain Climate Organization	Webform	4	Letter from Rocky Mountain Climate Organization regarding Colorado's Water Plan.	1 document	The comments were addressed as appropriate in the first draft of Colorado's Water Plan.

Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
19	10/24/2014	Scott Kadera	Webform	2, 7.3, Southwest BIP	<p>I live in La Plata County, not far from the airport. While we have been in a drought for a number of years, you would not know that by driving around that part of the county. During the summer, water flows freely and constantly through irrigation ditches and over fields. While many of these fields have a legitimate agricultural use, a number of land owners are just watering pasture land for a horse or two, or in some cases no animals at all. But, if they don't use the water they will lose their right to it. It isn't logical or fair to punish people that may want to conserve water or do not have a need for it at this time. The use it or lose it policy has to change.</p> <p>Also, I have some concerns about fracking and its effect on our ground water. I understand that the water and chemicals are being injected deep into the earth but I don't think anyone knows what the long term effects are going to be. As we have seen with some of the capped mines in Silverton, CO, water finds a way to escape. When they cap one part of a mine the water will find its way out somewhere else. The same thing could happen to our ground water. Wells and springs could get contaminated and once that happens the water will be good for nothing.</p> <p>Another concern of mine is the first priority of the Southwest Basin Roundtable. It states, "Ensure endangered species' needs do not negatively impact future in-basin uses." I might be able to see why this would be a priority if we were being responsible with the water we have but we are not. As stated above, the use it or lose it policy results in a waste of thousands, if not, millions of gallons of water each year. To say that we would rather waste water rather than save endangered species is morally wrong.</p> <p>Finally, there seems to be a disconnect on the Front Range about their water usage and the compacts that we have with lower basin states. It is only logical that the biggest opportunity for water conservation would come from the biggest user, the Front Range. Why should the Western Slope have to pay the price for Denver residents to have green lawns? If we all practice responsible water management and conservation then there will be enough water for future building, agriculture, the environment and recreation.</p>	N/A	<p>Nine out of every ten years some portion of the state experiences some level of drought. Moreover drought can carry serious economic and environmental consequences. Therefore it is a natural hazard that the state takes seriously. Colorado is a national leader in drought mitigation and planning efforts, much of which is outlined in the State of Colorado Drought Mitigation and Response Plan. Pieces of that plan have been incorporated into Colorado's Water Plan where appropriate. Colorado's Water Plan seeks to uphold Colorado's current water law system. Colorado water allocation and governance has always been guided by local users meeting local needs and Colorado's Water Plan will not change that. Rather than diminishing local control or authority over water, Colorado's Water Plan seeks to strengthen local decision-makers' ability to achieve regional and statewide water solutions. These principles are fundamental to Colorado water administration and law and Colorado's Water Plan requires them to succeed. Please review Chapter 2 of the 2014 draft Colorado's Water Plan, specifically section 2.1 (Colorado water law & administration) which addresses the usufructory nature of water rights within Colorado and the prior appropriation system. Fracking currently uses approximately 18,000 acre feet per year, which is a very small proportion of Colorado's overall water use. However, there may be some areas where there are greater regional effects. In addition, power plants that burn natural gas to make energy use less water than traditional power plants. Therefore, from an overall resource management perspective, fracking and the resulting energy production do not consume a significant amount of water compared to current levels. Colorado's Water Plan seeks to work collaboratively to uphold Colorado's water values and does not put a value judgment on any one beneficial use. The Water Quality Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) regulates water quality issues of this nature in the state. Water Quality has been recognized as critical for Colorado's water future. The CWCB is working closely with the Water Quality Control Division and the Basin Roundtables in order to address Colorado's Water Quality needs. This is further explored in Section 7.3. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone might not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be explored. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. CWCB will pass these comments on to the Southwest Basin Roundtable.</p>
20	10/28/2014	Joseph Grantham	Webform	Arkansas BIP	<p>In reviewing Arkansas Draft BIP of July 31, 2014, mistake on bottom of page 29 re: small capacity wells. Says limit is 15 gpm and this is incorrect. See 37-90-105, C.R.S. Up to 50 gallons per minute. Local ground water management districts may adopt rules to reduce this amount or increase up to no more than 80 a.f. per year per 37-90-105(7)(a).</p>	N/A	<p>CWCB will pass these comments on to the Arkansas Basin Roundtable.</p>
21	11/12/2014	Justin West, Hearing Officer, Colorado Ground Water Commission & DWR	Webform	6.3, 6.6	<p>Our watershed is our life. Its our Heath and well being on all levels. It is Our heaven to escape to. Fly fishing and fish with many endangered native cutthroat, hunting, hiking biking a more all depend on our rivers. They depend on them because the seasonal flows supports the ecological web of our woods. As a Colorado native for three generationsI have noticed thru my elders how when one thing changes in nature, everything is impacted. It may take time to see but everything changes. Aside from the emotional and spiritual and physical well being our waters provides the residence of our watersheds, it is also our economic engine. I know all my friends depend on seasonal water for fishing guides, raft guides, and more. Then other friends of mine rely on those same tourist that came for the water to eat in their restaurants and buy their clothes in the store. Our seasonal flows bring in tourist and Durango is a tourist town, without them we would be in extreme economic despair. Last I want to say that to rob a watershed of its life, it's blood, is to irreversibly affect it forever and is morally wrong. Solutions to our water shortages should not be to rob and rape our Mother Earth for more than she can give, but to use our minds as human beings, stewards of our mothers lands, and find ways to reduce, reuse, and recycle out water usage. We as humans can live in union with nature and to put in more pipelines and reallocate water is to commit a serious crime against our children and grandchildren for they will not know the natural world for what it is.</p>	N/A	<p>Thank you for your comment. The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. The CWCB and the Basin Roundtables are working to support conservation, environment, and recreation in the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan.</p>
22	11/13/2014	Peter Grosshuesch, Town of Breckenridge	Webform	6.3	<p>Local governments should establish their own water conservation goals such as GPCD or overall production/consumption, and identify and implement measures to reach them.</p>	N/A	<p>Local water providers currently establish conservation goals through water conservation plans. Any goals within Colorado's Water Plan will allow for local flexibility in water conservation plans.</p>
23	11/17/2014	Frank (Buck) Skillen, Trout Unlimited	Webform	6.6	<p>In developing the State water plan, it is vital that the economic impact of fishing and hunting be considered. From a fishing standpoint many millions of dollars come into all of our communities from both residents and visitors. Further, Colorado fisheries are known for pristine cold, clear running water which is vital to a healthy tourism and recreation industry. Thank you for your careful consideration of these points. Respectfully submitted, Frank (Buck) Skillen.</p>	N/A	<p>Thank you for your comment. The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. The CWCB and the Basin Roundtables are working to support conservation, environment, and recreation in the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan.</p>

Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
24	11/17/2014	Aaron McDowell, Citizen of Colorado	Webform		Some market approaches should be used to manage Colorado's waters. Mountain forests and wetlands provide important water storage and filtration services to communities throughout Colorado. Important watersheds should be protected to maintain the viability of these services. Municipalities could purchase or lease these areas as their water source(ex. New York City's efforts in the Catskill/Delaware watershed.) The Front Range should use its own water; no diversion from the West Slope. Let water users statewide pay full price for water. Water rights need to be fixed: water is a public good, not private property. Perhaps farmers and ranchers could buy water leases, allowing them a certain level of water use for a period of time. Priced by water availability in the basin annually. These could be purchased by agricultural cooperatives. We must incentivize water conservation practices in urban and agricultural practices. Xeriscape, drought-tolerant lawns, and smart irrigation. Making users pay a fair price for water will discourage use, encourage conservation, and fund water management projects.	N/A	CWCB is working with stakeholders to assess funding mechanisms to support watershed health. Denver Water and other water providers have invested tens of millions of dollars into supporting watershed health, and there is greater recognition of these ecosystem services. This is incorporated into Colorado's Water Plan. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific transmountain water project, but it will discuss how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work. Colorado's Water Plan seeks to uphold Colorado's current water law system. Colorado water allocation and governance has always been guided by local users meeting local needs and Colorado's Water Plan will not change that. Rather than diminishing local control or authority over water, Colorado's Water Plan seeks to strengthen local decision-makers' ability to achieve regional and statewide water solutions. These principles are fundamental to Colorado water administration and law and Colorado's Water Plan requires them to succeed. Please review Chapter 2 of the 2014 draft Colorado's Water Plan, specifically section 2.1 (Colorado water law & administration) which addresses the usufructory nature of water rights within Colorado and the prior appropriation system. With regard to your comments concerning agriculture, there are several opportunities to allow for agricultural sharing, but more work needs to be done to make this a viable options. The draft plan explores several avenues. Xeriscape lawns are allowed statewide. Colorado water allocation and governance has always been guided by local users meeting local needs and Colorado's Water Plan will not change that. Rather than diminishing local control or authority over water, Colorado's Water Plan seeks to strengthen local decision-makers' ability to achieve regional and statewide water solutions. To that effect, Colorado's Water Plan will work to encourage, rather than mandate, several of the points presented in the comments. The CWCB and the Basin Roundtables are working to support conservation, environment, and recreation in the Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan. Meeting Colorado's nonconsumptive needs is a critical aspect of Colorado's Water Plan.
25	11/19/2014	Ziska Childs	Webform	2, 4, 6.3	We need a multi-State multi-National approach to the headwaters of the Colorado. Nineteen States and Mexico get their water from this river. Putting 8 more diversions where most of the water is generated endangers half a Continent. Reversing desertification should be the CWCB's top priority. Serious re-evaluation of rainwater harvesting laws , watershed protection law and agricultural methods needs to happen. Conservation first. http://vimeo.com/110705548 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i_JOTeMg7Cw A Colorado voter.	N/A	The state is working vigorously with other upper basin states and the Colorado River Basin as a whole to mitigate any risks Colorado may face with regard to compact compliance and other interstate issues. Nine out of every ten years some portion of the state experiences some level of drought. Moreover drought can carry serious economic and environmental consequences. Therefore it is a natural hazard that the state takes seriously. Colorado is a national leader in drought mitigation and planning efforts, much of which is outlined in the State of Colorado Drought Mitigation and Response Plan. Pieces of that plan have been incorporated into Colorado's Water Plan where appropriate. Rainwater harvesting does have some limitations within current Colorado water law. The Prior Appropriation Doctrine, which is in Colorado's Constitution, typically dictates that rainwater is used by a downstream user. However, the CWCB maintains a rainwater harvesting pilot program to explore how rainwater harvesting can be used. This is further discussed in Subsection 5.6.1. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone might not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined These topics are explored in Section 6.3.
26	11/19/2014	Bonnie Behrend	Webform	6.3	Please - Less diversion from the relatively short Roaring Fork to the Front Range! If 80% of the state's residents live on the Front Range, then maybe 80% should adopt mandatory conservation measures instead of robbing the Roaring Fork. I hear 1% would make a huge difference. We can't let the Western Slope or agriculture and environmental needs dry up. Or continue with the "downstream be dammed (sic)" approach. The beautiful, reliable and -abused- Colorado River trickles to the Gulf. Vegas always a water drain. How about mandatory water conservation of 1% in Vegas as well. Also less recreation in the Northstar Preserve's precious tundra. It's a Preserve not a playground. Thank yo very much for your consideration and help	N/A	With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific transmountain water project, but it discusses how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone might not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be explored. These topics are explored in Section 6.3.
27	11/24/2014	Ed Hegwood, Red Rocks Community College/Rocky Mountain Education Center	Webform	6.3	Simple energy conservation will save more water with a better ROI. Is this part of our water plan? United States Water Consumption per kWh of Energy Consumed by State: (NREL Data) Colorado Thermoelectric power production 29,312,000,000kWh @ 0.51Gallons/kWh http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy04osti/33905.pdf Simple energy conservation will save more water with a better ROI. Is this part of our water plan? Ed Hegwood, LEED AP O+M Program Coordinator Ready to Work Academy and Energy Efficiency	N/A	The water-energy nexus is discussed in Section 6.3.5 of Colorado's Water Plan.

**Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015**

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
28	11/24/2014	Carmine Ladarola, AquaSan Network	Webform	6.3	Pleased to see that the proposed Water Plan addresses water impact fees. The major users of the new water, new development, will have fees based upon the amount of water they use or projected to be used. We all know that flat rates are one of the largest wasters of water, but too many water utilities base their impact fees on flat rates. A single family home, apartment building, commercial buildings often charge the same amount despite whether they have implanted conservation measures. Thus, a LEED certified apartment building will pay the same as a "high end" apartment building despite the significant difference in the amount of water consumed. We have the technology to monitor projected use, should the water consumption change.	N/A	Thank you for your comment regarding water impact fees that are discussed in Section 6.3.3. CWCB will continue to consider water impact fees in the second draft of Colorado's Water Plan.
29	12/1/2014	TERRI LAMERS, RESIDENT	Webform	9.2	I've attended some of these water meetings. Storage seems to be one key issue. Why couldn't the GOCO (lottery) monies be used to build storage and recreation at the same time?	N/A	Funding options related to Colorado's Water Plan are discussed in Section 9.2 Economics and Funding. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific water projects. The CWCB would like to encourage multipurpose projects and full mitigation.
30	12/7/2014	Brian Kimmel, colorado native/resident	Webform	5	We keep hearing that the State demographer is telling us to prepare for 5 million more people and some obviously lesser amount in the Southwest Basin (50,000 ?). We are also told that not only is our water a more or less a finite resource, but previous compacts were based on bumper water years and now we have to do with less. So why do we have to prepare for more people when we are facing issues with supplies already. Why do we assume that we "have to" accommodate another 50,000 residents in the Southwest Basin? I neither hear nor see any reference to population and water resources other than expecting the additional residents. Why are we not connecting water supplies in each region to the population (which includes ag, industry, municipal, etc) it can sustain? Why are we not connecting the known water resources to planning and zoning to create controls against over development? Is a water plan that proposes to accommodate any and all newcomers myopic and foolish? If this is a form of population control, so be it; without adequate water you will have no viable population.	N/A	Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes three growth scenarios: low-growth, mid-growth, high-growth. As water planners, Colorado must prepare for any of these future possibilities as we do not have control over the state's economy and how many people are born or choose to move here. While some communities choose to limit growth, doing so on a broad statewide scale is untenable and unconstitutional. The CWCB is working with each basin on their Basin Implementation Plan and will continue to encourage all interested parties to do the same.
31	12/10/2014	Tom Wood, Colorado Citizen	Webform	6.5	I think the State & Denver Water should re-look at the proposed dam on the South Platte near Deckers - Two Forks? It seemed to make the most sense years ago ... And still does today for increased water storage near the front range population areas.	N/A	The Two Forks Dam project is not currently proposed by any water provider. Further, the project was deemed to be not feasible by the Environmental Protection Agency. Regardless, Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific water projects. The CWCB encourages multipurpose projects and full mitigation.
32	12/11/2014	Tom Wood, Colorado Citizen	Webform	6.5	The implementation plans to date have ignored key issues and need to provide realistic alternatives for water supply that are not vague and hopeful. We need to re-look at new reservoirs that can provide meaningful supply to the Front Range. The ideal solution is to revive the Two Forks Dam project on the South Platt River and bite the bullet. I know there will be wails and moans - but it is the elephant in the room that must be dealt with. I strongly support action to move this project forward. The politicians need to step up and insist that this happens. We don't have too many other real alternatives in the long term, in my opinion.	N/A	The Two Forks Dam project is not currently proposed by any water provider. Further, the project was deemed to be not feasible by the Environmental Protection Agency. Regardless, Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific water projects. The CWCB encourages multipurpose projects and full mitigation.
33	12/11/2014	Tom Wood, Colorado Citizen	Webform	6.5	The EPA and the federal government vetoed previous dam proposals in Colorado - even though they predicted the ruin of downstream agricultural opportunities and larger environmental impacts if the Two Forks dam was not built (see attached article - from 1990.) Rather than spread these impacts across the state - let's have one area impacted and not compromise on the rest. I would like to strongly urge reconsideration of the Two Forks Dam project on the South Platte River.	1 document	The Two Forks Dam project is not currently proposed by any water provider. Further, the project was deemed to be not feasible by the Environmental Protection Agency. Regardless, Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific water projects. The CWCB encourages multipurpose projects and full mitigation.

Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
34	12/15/2014	Tim Loncarich	Webform	6.1, 6.3, 7.3	Water is a complex issue that is interconnected with many other issues. As written, the draft plan is not a sufficient framework to cope with probable future scenarios. The plan needs to address the massive use and contamination of water by the fracking industry. It should also support the idea of limiting population and include greater requirements to reduce water usage. Climate change needs to have a greater weight in the plan. Realistically, the needs of humans must be balanced with those of nature, but nature ultimately has to come first. Without a functional eco-system we will cease to exist.	N/A	The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. Given the uncertainties of future water supply and demands, CWCB adopted a planning approach now used by many major water planners across the west: scenario planning. The use of scenario planning assumes that the future is unknown and provides flexibility in responding to various future conditions. Rather than trying to predict the future by looking at the past, scenario planning allows us to identify and account for key uncertainties operating within the planning period. To learn more about scenario planning and how it is used in Colorado's Water Plan, please read Section 6.1 Scenario Planning & Adaptive Strategies. Fracking currently uses approximately 18,000 acre feet per year, which is a very small proportion of Colorado's overall water use. However, there may be some areas where there are greater regional effects. In addition, power plants that burn natural gas to make energy use less water than traditional power plants. Therefore, from an overall resource management perspective, fracking and the resulting energy production do not consume a significant amount of water compared to current levels. Colorado's Water Plan seeks to work collaboratively to uphold Colorado's water values and does not put a value judgment on any one beneficial use. The Water Quality Control Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) regulates water quality issues of this nature in the state. Water Quality has been recognized as critical for Colorado's water future. The CWCB is working closely with the Water Quality Control Division and the Basin Roundtables in order to address Colorado's Water Quality needs. This is further explored in Section 7.3. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan will incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone might not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be explored. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. Colorado's Water Plan and the technical work that supports it includes three growth scenarios: low-growth, mid-growth, high-growth. As water planners, Colorado must prepare for any of these future possibilities as we do not have control over the state's economy and how many people are born or choose to move here. While some communities choose to limit growth, doing so on a broad statewide scale is untenable and unconstitutional. The CWCB is working with each basin on their Basin Implementation Plan and will continue to encourage all interested parties to do the same.
35	12/22/2014	Conservation Colorado Field Organizer	Hand delivered packet containing letter and over 900 names of individuals who submitted form letters	6.3	As a Coloradan, I know how important water is to our state. That's why I'm signing into this petition to ensure we must keep Colorado's rivers healthy and flowing for our economic and environmental reasons. As our state's communities grow, our rivers are becoming increasingly strained. Maximizing our current water supply and using it more wisely through conservation and efficiency are proven to work. We can meet the most of our new demands with cost-effective conservation, re-use and other common-sense solutions. This keeps our rivers flowing and helps support river-dependent fish and wildlife, tourism, and outdoor recreation. Colorado's Water Plan has the potential to chart an innovative path forward for our state and to break from the status quo of building transmountain pipelines and drying up our farms. I urge you to stand up for measures to protect and restore our rivers, push for conservation, and for cities to live within their means. We need to help agriculture modernize and increase efficiency, and stop looking to the Western Slope and our farms to solve our water issues. We need to maintain agriculture, support our communities, and protect river health. Please ensure that Colorado's Water Plan uses our state's ingenuity to be prepared for our water future.	Letter and List of Names	The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3.
36	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Tell Governor Hickenlooper - Make Water Conservation the Priority in Our Cities and Towns	695 form letter emails - petition from American Rivers on Change.org	6.3	As a citizen of Colorado, I want to thank you for your leadership as you draft our state's first ever water plan. And I want you to know that I support prioritizing water conservation in our cities and towns. As you know, water conservation is faster, better, and cheaper than new water projects, which would cost billions to build, harm our environment, wreck our rivers, and increase our water bills. With just a 1% per year reduction in our water usage, we can conserve enough water to serve 1.8 million families in Colorado. We should adopt this 1% per year goal through 2050 in our state water plan. Thank you for your leadership, and for protecting the future of Colorado's rivers.	N/A	The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3.
37	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Support conservation, not dams and diversion, in the Colorado Water Plan	22 form emails	6.3	In your State of the State address, you have said that "every discussion about water should start with conservation." I could not agree more -- now it's time to put your words into action! Many of Colorado's rivers -- including the Colorado River itself, which flows from Colorado to Los Angeles and Mexico -- are already drained and depleted. Further, climate change is a new and bigger threat that will likely decrease the water flowing in our rivers. Despite this, some Colorado cities are trying to build more dams and diversions to take even more water out of our rivers. This is the wrong path forward! We need to protect and restore the rivers in Colorado so that people in the Southwest can have safe, clean, drinking water and healthy rivers flowing throughout our region of the U.S. As you and your staff formulate Colorado's Water Plan, please provide leadership in three key areas: 1. Push for water conservation, reuse, and recycling as key steps in securing our future water needs. 2. Do not support new dams and diversions from Colorado's rivers. 3. Start focusing on river restoration. I urge you and Colorado's Water Conservation Board to protect Colorado's future by safeguarding our rivers for future generations.	N/A	The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific transmountain water project, but it discusses how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.

Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
38	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Taking the Lead on Conservation	139 form emails	6.3	I am writing in support of your efforts to create Colorado's Water Plan and urge you to include a high statewide conservation goal in the Plan. As a water resources engineer, I believe that conservation is a sure step in securing our water future without damaging rivers or diminishing agriculture. Water conservation is effective, cost efficient and has bipartisan support-- a recent poll shows that 78% of Coloradans support investment in finding new ways to use current water supplies more wisely. Colorado is counting on your leadership to protect the resources that make our state great and maintain our quality of life. Conservation is a commonsense approach to smart water management. By including a statewide conservation goal in the plan, we have a shared commitment to using water wisely and the freedom to decide how to best reduce use. Please make sure we have a state plan that turns to conservation first, our rivers, rural communities, local economies and concerned Coloradans will thank you for it.	N/A	The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan recognize the importance of watershed health. Those four values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife.
39	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Please fund Stream Flow Management Plans	73 form emails	6.3, 7.1	Thank you for creating the first state water plan. As we hear about water crises around the West, we know it's time for a plan to protect Colorado's water. I am writing to express my concern that the plan prioritize keeping our rivers healthy and flowing. For decades we have treated our rivers like workhorses, diverting them until they are dry. We must change the status quo in order to preserve our environment and river based economy for the future. A healthy river is like a healthy circulatory system. Just as cardiovascular activity flushes out toxins; healthy flushing flows can move sediment, support ecosystems, and create recreational opportunities. That's why we need stream flow management plans to quantify the flows needed to preserve the environmental and recreational attributes, identified by basins, within specific river stretches, and commit to stream flow protections going forward. These basin-level stream management plans should be a top tier priority within the basin plans and the state plan.	N/A	The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan recognize the importance of watershed health. Those four values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife.
40	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Avoid Diversions, Protect Our Rivers	77 form emails	6.3	I am writing in support of your efforts to create Colorado's Water Plan and urge you to look to means other than transmountain diversions to secure our water future. We must make the choice now, while we still can, to move away from new diversions and look to conservation, efficiency, and water sharing practices to meet our water needs. With the Colorado River already oversubscribed, we cannot use water as though Colorado's rivers still have more to give. What's right for our rivers is right for Coloradans. We need an innovative state water plan that turns away from the status quo of diverting water across the state and instead looks to pragmatic solutions of the future. As said by the state, "our current statewide water trajectory is neither desirable nor sustainable." Keep new transmountain diversions out of the Colorado Water Plan, we are counting on your leadership.	N/A	The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific transmountain water project, but it discusses how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.
41	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Protect Our Rivers	4 form emails	6.3, 6.4	I am writing to support your efforts to create the first ever statewide water plan. Thank you for reiterating the importance of the plan, and water conservation, in your recent State of the State address. As our state's communities grow, our rivers are becoming increasingly strained. That means we need to change the status quo. We need our rivers to be clean and flowing - to support our fish and wildlife, tourism, recreation, and future generations. Colorado's Water Plan has the potential to chart an innovative path forward for our state. I urge you to stand up for measures to protect and restore our rivers, push for conservation, and for cities to live within their means. We need to help agriculture modernize and increase efficiency, and stop looking to the West Slope to solve our water issues. We need to maintain working landscapes, support growing communities, and protect river health. Please ensure that Colorado's Water Plan uses our state's ingenuity to "be prepared" for our water future."	N/A	The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to help meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not be enough. The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan recognize the importance of watershed health. Those four values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. Agricultural water sharing and modernizing agricultural efficiencies are aspects of Colorado's Water Plan and included in Section 6.4 and Subsection 6.3.4. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. Colorado's Water Plan will not include any specific water projects. The CWCB encourages multipurpose projects and full mitigation. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific transmountain water project, but it discusses how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.
42	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Prioritize Urban Water Conservation in CO Water Plan	5 form emails	6.3	I want you to know that I support prioritizing water conservation in our cities and towns. As a citizen of Colorado, I cherish our state's healthy and free-flowing rivers and streams. I also value the wildlife and recreation-based economies that are dependent on healthy river systems. As you know, water conservation is faster, better, cheaper and more flexible than new water projects, which would cost billions to build, harm the environment, shortchange recreation, wreck our rivers and increase our water bills. With just a 1% per year reduction in our water usage, we can conserve enough water to serve 1.8 million families in Colorado. We should adopt this 1% per year goal through 2050 in our state water plan. Thank you for your leadership, and for protecting the future of Colorado's rivers.	N/A	The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan recognize the importance of watershed health. Those four values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific transmountain water project, but it discusses how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.

Colorado's Water Plan - Public Input Received
October 11, 2014 through January 4, 2015

Item Number	Date	Input Provided By	Method of Input Submission	Related Chapters/ Sections of CWP	Summary of Input	Documents Submitted for Review	Staff Responses and Recommendations
43	10/11/2014 - 1/4/2015	Make Colorado's Water Plan Emphasize Healthy Rivers, Conservation, and Partnerships	2 form emails	6.3	<p>As you work to finalize Colorado's Water Plan in 2015, I urge you to ensure that the final plan puts its greatest emphasis on aggressive water conservation, maintaining healthy rivers, and promoting water partnerships - and avoids controversial and damaging new projects for large transbasin diversions. Healthy rivers are a vital part of Colorado's quality of life, recreational economy, and environment. Irrigated lands are also key in providing locally-produced food, sustaining local economies, and providing quality habitat. Instead of drying up our rivers and farms, Colorado should emphasize water conservation so that we can use our water supplies as wisely as possible. Colorado's Water Plan should set strong but achievable goals - reducing per capita consumption by even 1% a year would help reduce the drain on rivers and agriculture, and represents a level of conservation improvement that we've easily exceeded over the past 10 years -- yet the Draft Plan does not embrace even this modest goal. Conservation needs to be more strongly emphasized. Colorado also needs to invest in its healthy rivers. Unlike other water uses where end-users pay for their water supplies, investment in healthy rivers depends on the State to make investments on behalf of its citizens. Investing in the health of our rivers is simple common sense given the vital role rivers play in Colorado's multi-billion recreation economy, in drawing other businesses, residents, and visitors to our State, and in maintaining a high quality of life for our citizens. Large transbasin diversion projects are not the answer for Colorado and should not be promoted in the Plan. Such projects will hurt our rivers and damage west slope communities, and it isn't even clear that there is enough undeveloped water legally available to support the projects in the future. Conservation and innovative partnerships for water sharing are better solutions.</p>	N/A	<p>The four values driving Colorado's Water Plan recognize the importance of watershed health. Those four values are 1) vibrant and sustainable cities, 2) viable and productive agriculture, 3) a robust recreation and tourism industry, and 4) a thriving environment that includes healthy watersheds, rivers, streams, and wildlife. The Basin Implementation Plans and Colorado's Water Plan incorporate conservation and reuse as critical components to helping meet future water needs, however those strategies alone are not be enough to meet Colorado's future water needs. Additional balanced options need to be examined. These topics are explored in Section 6.3. With regard to new transmountain diversion projects, the IBCC provided a draft conceptual agreement which explored innovative ways to address this issue in a balanced manner. Scenario planning indicates that a new transmountain diversion may not be needed in the future, however some futures suggest that new transmountain diversions may be a necessary part of Colorado's water supply portfolio. Colorado's Water Plan does not include any specific transmountain water project, but it discusses how we can move forward with this option should it be needed, based on the IBCC's work.</p>