

**Statewide Nonconsumptive Needs Meeting:  
Entering the Implementation Phase**

October 13, 2011 – 10:00 am to 4:00 pm

Penrose House – 1661 Mesa Avenue in Colorado Springs

**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees**

Kalsoum Abbasi, Arkansas BRT  
Jeff Baessler, Colorado Parks and Wildlife  
Linda Bassi, CWCB  
Heather Bergman, Peak Facilitation  
Jim Berkley, US EPA  
Geoff Blakeslee, Yampa/White/Green BRT  
Jennifer Block, Gunnison BRT  
Jacob Bornstein, CWCB  
Tom Browning, CWCB  
Pete Conovitz, South Platte BRT  
Jeff Crane, Colorado Watershed Assembly  
Alex Davis, CO Dept. of Natural Resources  
Nathan Fey, American Whitewater  
Jennifer Gimbel, CWCB Director  
Steve Glazer, Gunnison BRT  
Mikaela Gregg, Peak Facilitation  
Taylor Hawes, IBCC  
Polly Hays, US Forest Service  
Eric Hecox, CWCB Staff  
Melinda Kassen, IBCC  
Greg Kernohan, South Platte BRT  
Gerry Knapp, Colorado BRT  
Dave Little, Metro BRT  
Becky Long, Colorado Environmental Coalition  
James Luey, US EPA  
Steve Malers, Riverside

John Mathieu, The Nature Conservancy  
Kevin McBride, Yampa/White/Green BRT  
John McClow, Gunnison BRT; CWCB Director  
Ken Neubecker, Colorado BRT  
SeEtta Moss, Arkansas BRT  
Julia Murphy, Metro BRT  
Peter Nichols, Metro BRT; IBCC  
Chuck Ogilby, Colorado BRT  
Mark Pifher, Metro BRT; IBCC  
Chris Pitcher, Riverside  
Jim Prokrandt, Colorado BRT  
Nicole Rowan, CDM  
Jenny Russell, Southwest BRT  
John Sanderson, The Nature Conservancy  
Neal Schwieterman, Gunnison BRT  
Jay Skinner, Colorado Parks and Wildlife  
Travis Smith, Rio Grande BRT; CWCB Director  
John Stulp, IBCC Director  
Chris Sturm, CWCB  
Kerry Sundeen, Front Range Water Council  
Mark Uppendahl, Metro BRT  
Barbara Vasquez, North Platte BRT  
Rio de la Vista, Rio Grande BRT  
Pat Wells, Colorado Springs Utilities  
Lane, Wyatt, Colorado BRT

**Welcome: John Stulp, IBCC Director and Governor's Special Policy Advisor on Water**

Director Stulp opened the meeting with introductory remarks that highlighted the importance of advancing efforts to support the virtues of Colorado's nonconsumptive and consumptive needs and uses, efforts that can take root today in order to support a sustainable future. Director Stulp discussed the important work of and progress being made by the IBCC (Interbasin Compact Committee), IBCC Subcommittees, and the CWCB (Colorado Water Conservation Board) in characterizing and connecting consumptive and nonconsumptive needs. It was noted that while there have been significant State budget cuts, the Water Supply Reserve Account remains a strong avenue for facilitating statewide projects; however, it is increasingly significant for projects to be multi-purpose, engage diverse partners, and interconnect consumptive and nonconsumptive efforts in order to maximize the use and effectiveness of State funds. Director Stulp referred to the Roadmap Memo, indicating that while we need to begin implementing nonconsumptive and multi-purpose projects, we also need to move toward developing implementation plans to meet nonconsumptive needs.

### **Meeting Purpose**

Melinda Kassen provided a brief explanation of the meeting purpose and intended focus. The central purpose of this meeting is to think strategically about what needs to be done to address the following two critical nonconsumptive areas:

1. Address how to plan and implement methods and projects that will help protect identified nonconsumptive values; identify opportunistic methods, methods that may not be a part of the strategic planning agenda but are critical; and outline strategies and resources (from the IBCC and CWCB) needed to help basin roundtables advance nonconsumptive efforts and projects
2. Discuss how to integrate the protection of nonconsumptive needs with meeting identified consumptive needs and other key components (i.e., new supply, identified projects and processes (IPPs), conservation, and alternative agriculture transfers) in order to develop a balanced approach to addressing Colorado's water future

### **Panel: Roundtable Experiences with Nonconsumptive Methods—Moderator, Jacob Bornstein**

Panel participants outlined their basin roundtables' experiences with advancing methods for understanding, quantifying, and implementing projects and methods that have worked.

#### **SeEtta Moss – Arkansas Basin Roundtable**

- The roundtable looked at all the areas with the highest number of attributes and identified several key areas. Some of those areas (like Fountain Creek and the Upper Arkansas) already had significant efforts underway.
- There was a general lack of quantification of nonconsumptive needs in the Basin, especially in the lower Arkansas River.
- Extensive wetland areas in the lower Arkansas have become a key component for advancing efforts to look at recreational resources, migratory bird habitats, etc. within the Basin. The roundtable conducted a study to determine needed water levels in the wetland areas around John Martin Reservoir and the Neenoshe Reservoir system.
- The inability to identify a 20% Basin match in support of nonconsumptive projects led to the development of partnerships and joint projects in order to advance efforts.
- Quantification remains an issue that needs to be addressed, but there is still a good deal of uncertainty regarding how such efforts will gain support and move forward.

#### **Lane Wyatt – Colorado Basin Roundtable**

- Nonconsumptive resources are a critical component to basin and state economics; substantial revenue (millions of dollars) is generated by recreational fishing in the Colorado Basin.
- The Basin roundtable (BRT) took a strategic approach to addressing nonconsumptive needs. The two central issues addressed included: 1) what are the nonconsumptive needs attributes and risks, and 2) what are the flows that need to be protected in order to mitigate impacts on high-risk areas. These efforts further led to the identification and classification of attributes as “compromised” or as “having the potential to be compromised in the future.”
- The BRT received a grant to develop and work with the Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool (WFET) to evaluate the risk of change in the river ecosystems. The information provided by the WFET was further supported with additional evaluation and research, which is also being used to explore the Basin's nonconsumptive flow gap and to identify what projects are available and how nonconsumptive issues and efforts can be incorporated.

#### **Rio de la Vista – Rio Grande Basin Roundtable**

- A central goal of the BRT is to advance water sustainability despite over-appropriation, to secure adequate water to meet both nonconsumptive and consumptive needs.

- The development of partnerships has helped the BRT integrate nonconsumptive needs into almost all projects.
- The securing of water rights through conservation easements for working ranches has been a critical project success and an example of advancing multi-benefit, multi-party projects.
- The ability to develop partnerships with unlikely partners has been a critical component of the Basin successfully advancing nonconsumptive efforts.
- There may be a need to address rainfall as an additional critical component/fifth leg of the stool.

#### **Geoff Blakeslee – Yampa/White/Green Basin Roundtable**

- The BRT has initiated efforts to develop professional workshops, to bring together the environmental and recreational industries to help educate the community on nonconsumptive issues.
- The BRT has worked to identify critical attributes and narrow the critical areas of focus; this effort has helped to form relationships, advance the conversation, and assisted the BRT in reaching a point of nonconsumptive quantification.
- Work with the Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool is being finalized, as are recreational attribute surveys.
- The next phase of work for the BRT will look to developing small consumptive and nonconsumptive projects.

#### Question/Answer and Discussion

- ***What needs to occur in order to connect efforts that address both nonconsumptive and consumptive needs?***
  - It is important to look at where interests converge and what types of projects can meet multiple needs—the more needs that can be met, the better.
  - It is important to seek outcomes that are long-term and have buy-in from multiple stakeholders.
  - There is a need to be strategic and proactive, to look at current issues as well as potential issues.
- ***What strategies have the basins used to determine where to focus quantification efforts?***
  - Basin needs assessments have been used to prioritize critical areas. Looking at the role and impacts of the Voluntary Flow Agreement in the Arkansas Basin is also important.
  - In most cases, it comes down to working with the data that is available: for some basins this is more of an obstacle than for others.
- ***What are some of the other issues that BRTs face when trying to advance nonconsumptive efforts?***
  - The North Platte only has one active gauge, which is not enough to support the use the Watershed Flow Evaluation Tool. It would be helpful to be able to invest in more gauges and/or activate gauges that are currently nonproductive; this would help support much needed data analysis and assessment.
  - In the Southwest, the IPP list is quite conservative and generally based on projects with active support and proponents; this is an obstacle to gaining support for nonconsumptive projects.
  - Due to heavy urbanization, the Metro BRT has to focus on rehabilitation and enhancement efforts.
  - In the Gunnison Basin, all water resources are currently being put to beneficial use and any new strategies will impact existing systems; therefore, the focus is on mitigating and minimizing potential impacts and developing multipurpose, multiuse, long-term solutions, projects, and agreements. It is critical to find common ground.

- There seems to be a sense of placation regarding nonconsumptive efforts in the South Platte after the completion of the Basin map. It has been a struggle to get stakeholders engaged. There is a significant amount of quantitative work that could be done but efforts are meeting resistance as there is a sense that the BRT should focus its efforts on other issues first and then try to connect those with nonconsumptive needs.
- There seems to be a significant amount of support for quantifying nonconsumptive needs and that it may need to be a central focus for BRTs.

**Panel: What Is Needed to Move Ahead? - Moderator, Mark Pifer**

The focus of this panel was to discuss what resources or assistance roundtables need in order to move ahead with specific nonconsumptive projects and implementation efforts (including planning) that are approved and/or ready to go.

**Steve Glazer – Gunnison Basin Roundtable**

- The challenge is determining how to meld efforts peacefully and sustainably, not just determine how to put a shrinking water supply to multi-beneficial use.
- There is a need to identify and support properly functioning habitats (e.g., riparian assessments). Projects and efforts need prioritization assessments. It is also important to look at redesigning and reconstructing divergent structures to meet consumptive and nonconsumptive needs with fewer impacts.
- There is value to be gained from educating landowners regarding the diversity of needs and uses of land and water.
- Finding funding to support nonconsumptive efforts is critical to the advancement of technical and scientific efforts based on the credo of “conserve, protect, and restore.”

**Chris Sturm (CWCB Staff) – Metro Roundtable**

- The roundtable funded a planning effort that completed the vision for the South Platte throughout the Metro area.
- The Greenway Foundation now has a grant to develop the design for some of the high-priority planning elements. This will lead into project implementation.
- There is a need for continued partnerships with a broad range of stakeholders, including all levels of government and urban drainage entities.
- The State needs to market a vision and a picture of the river system we want and need; this vision must be communicated to local communities to help get them to engage and support statewide efforts.
- It is important for implementation to become the central focus in order to maintain the floodplain while continuing to develop strategies for meeting all water needs and uses. There is also a need to address issues of protection and to look at future/potential risks and the need for long-range planning.

**Barbara Vasquez – North Platte Roundtable**

- There is a need to address the voting rights of basin roundtables in order to create a more balanced and representative arena to discuss and advance nonconsumptive efforts.
- In the North Platte Basin it has been important to look at diversions from preexisting agreements and the risks of new diversion developments.
- The completion of the Basin map created a feeling that the BRT was finished with its nonconsumptive needs assessments; however, now there is a need to move into the implementation phase and develop win-win nonconsumptive/consumptive projects.

- There has been a fair amount of pushback on recreational and nonconsumptive efforts in the BRT; it has been a struggle to find a receptive audience and the support needed to develop integrated efforts.
- Specific suggestions for supporting and advancing statewide nonconsumptive efforts include:
  - Encourage BRTs to establish standing nonconsumptive committees
  - Give resident agency and/or non-government liaisons the right to vote on BRTs
  - Provide dedicated funding for nonconsumptive projects
  - Improve support from the IBCC and CWCB for allocation of water for nonconsumptive needs
  - Craft a statewide initiative in support of advancing nonconsumptive needs
  - Work with State oil and gas regulators to develop a set of rules for setting wells

### **Jenny Russell – Southwest Basin Roundtable**

- Needs identified to better support nonconsumptive efforts include:
  - Set aside funding (from CWCB) specifically for nonconsumptive projects and to develop tools to show where flows are and how they can be protected and how to protect attributes
  - Require projects to demonstrate who will benefit
  - Create a task force to investigate and discuss nonconsumptive interest, issues, projects, etc. (similar to the Flaming Gorge Task Force)
  - Encourage political support, engagement, assistance, etc.
  - Demonstrate that the State values nonconsumptive needs
  - Add a recreational representative to the IBCC

### Question/Answer and Discussion

- There may be a need for education and communication between the IBCC and the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) to help protect resources and advance nonconsumptive efforts.
- It may be valuable to address the inability to file for water rights for nonconsumptive uses. If water rights can be gained for consumptive use, why not also for nonconsumptive?
- Storage is a “tool” that has both consumptive and nonconsumptive value.
- There would be value in developing a nonconsumptive task force if it looked at modes to incorporate nonconsumptive and consumptive needs and uses.
- There is a need to raise the public profile of nonconsumptive needs and create a balanced foundation for conversations and efforts that address consumptive needs hand-in-hand with nonconsumptive needs.
- It would be valuable to create a better balance of environmental and recreational representation and voting rights on the IBCC and the BRTs. Roundtables should not be able to call a quorum and pass an initiative without having nonconsumptive representation present and voting.

### Working Lunch: Basin Discussions of Next Steps

Basin roundtable groups were asked to discuss ideas and recommendations for next steps for their BRTs’ methods and/or projects. Each group identified three of their top ideas.

### **Arkansas**

- 1) Work on methodology to assess the risk level of priority areas
- 2) Environmental impacts of agricultural transfers (maybe a white paper to get analysis into agricultural transfer pilot projects)
- 3) When the decision support system (DSS) is completed, use it for analysis

## **Colorado**

- 1) Pre-visualize the train wreck—use WFET, wastewater soil absorption systems (WSAS) Phase II, etc.
- 2) Promote opportunities
- 3) Strategic prioritization of methods, projects, etc. (define method for prioritization)

## **Gunnison**

- 1) Multi-purpose projects (e.g., Heartland Ditch reconstruction)
- 2) Riparian Assessments—prioritize restoration projects
- 3) Gunnison/Arkansas discussion—water bank demonstration case study

## **Metro**

- 1) Partnerships
- 2) Amenity
- 3) Education

## **North Platte**

- 1) Structural
  - a. Establish a statewide nonconsumptive task force
    - i. Create a statewide map of nonconsumptive attributes and establish what needs to be done to protect resources, including flow needs
    - ii. Establish requirements for a nonconsumptive committee for each BRT to serve as liaisons to the task force
- 2) Structural
  - a. Require a fixed percent of Water Supply Reserve Account funds (basin and State) be allocated for nonconsumptive projects
  - b. Both environmental and recreation representatives at the basin level must approve each nonconsumptive project
- 3) State-level support to change political landscape at the basin level
  - a. Give agency and nongovernmental organization liaisons voting rights on the BRTs
  - b. Education of basin roundtable members; bring members of the Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC), IOR, and BRTs to talk about positive experiences (nonconsumptive ambassadors)

## **Rio Grande**

### **(Sustainability)**

- 1) Multi-use/multi-benefit projects
  - a. Reservoir reoperations
  - b. Partnership development
  - c. Using the same water to meet multiple needs
- 2) Decision support tool
  - a. Data for river and wetland health and Compact compliance
- 3) Conservation and restoration
  - a. Continue existing efforts

## **Southwest**

- 1) Create a tool that identifies conflicts between consumptive and nonconsumptive and recommends resolutions
- 2) Carve out funding for nonconsumptive
- 3) Establish criteria for picking nonconsumptive projects (e.g., prioritize projects that aim to protect threatened and endangered species)

### **South Platte**

- 1) Quantification of nonconsumptive needs
- 2) Integrated water plan
- 3) Fundamental change of influence of nonconsumptive representation on the BRT

### **Yampa/White/Green**

- 1) Tamarisk/Russian Olive removal—American Great Outdoors initiative
- 2) White River Programmatic Biological Opinion (PBO)
- 3) Create tools to integrate nonconsumptive and consumptive
- 4) Agricultural water sharing to include nonconsumptive and consumptive
- 5) Restoration/Diversions—Morgan Bottom

### **Panel: Lessons for Creating Multi-Purpose Projects—Moderator; Linda Bassi**

This panel and discussion focused on what water providers, the agricultural community, and members of the environmental community have learned from past and present efforts to create projects that meet water supply *and* nonconsumptive needs.

### **Greg Kernohan – South Platte multi-purpose project**

- Critical components of multi-purpose projects in the Basin include: maximizing the benefits of wetlands with wildlife and recreational projects; developing strong aquifer recharge systems; and creating projects that serve multiple land and water use functions and serve multiple stakeholders (landowners, ranchers, farmers, etc.).
- Trust, the development of multiple partnerships, and the distribution of costs (no partner paid more than 20%) were all critical requirements for the success of a project. It was also critical to focus on the value of water, the shared value to all stakeholders.

### **Dave Little – Denver/West Slope negotiations**

- Identified components for multi-purpose project success include:
  - Address water supply development in conjunction with water enhancement availability and commitments to system flexibility
  - Learn by doing
  - Develop diverse partnerships (including government and private stakeholders); engage people who are willing to sit down together, break down barriers, and generate creative solutions
  - Develop a set of guiding principles as the foundation/neutral zone; this enables entities to be creative, find common ground; and move away from “consultant wars”

### **Chris Pitcher – Rio Blanco River project**

- The lower Rio Blanco River project was a grassroots-initiated project to address problems impacting the river systems downstream from a trans-basin diversion that on average depletes the natural stream flows by 50%.
- Over 150 individual property owners engaged in and helped fund the project. Additional funding came from a Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) grant, a CWCB Water Supply Reserve Account grant, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the Rio Grande Basin account, and the Lower Blanco Property Owners Association. The project successfully incorporated floodgate maintenance, ground water support (in most cases increases), and reshaping the channel structure to effectively mitigate and improve the impacts of a federal diversion.
- Overall, the project cost about \$250,000 per mile.

### **Jay Skinner – Arkansas River Voluntary Flow Program**

- The program was prompted by stakeholder conflicts and divergent positions and missions, resulting in litigation. Mediation was mandated by the court.
- The development process included an assessment of boating and fishing needs, data and information collection, and the quantification of nonconsumptive needs. This information was used to develop a scheme from which to simultaneously manage rafting and fishing needs and to balance environmental needs and uses with recreational needs and uses.
- The program has been renewed twice with little discussion, a demonstration of the project's success.

### **Jeff Crane – North Fork agricultural project**

- The focus of these projects was to improve irrigation diversions while conserving in stream flows, protecting agriculture investments, enhancing wetlands, and developing riparian buffers. During the assessment phase, a critical component was to generate community buy-in and create a community-focused project, a project that all could envision and benefit from.
- Project challenges included:
  - Addressing preconceived ideas and concepts
  - Expanding education and outreach
  - Engaging a diversity of partners (e.g., ditch companies) in order to explore opportunities
  - Developing local leadership
  - Adaptively managing resources
  - Monitoring and maintenance
  - Funding

### Question/Answer and Discussion

- There is a need to incentivize consumptive efforts where there are not regulatory initiatives, suggestions include:
  - Developing projects that help reduce maintenance and up-keep costs
  - Funding a “comfort zone”/neutral foundation for dialogue; developing methods for helping stakeholders change their preconceived notions and opinions
  - Demonstrating the ability to meet the needs of water users in a way that is environmentally harmonious and secure
- There is a need for an entity to stand up as a champion for nonconsumptive needs.
- Most of the examples of successful multi-purpose projects had a trigger point/“spark,” an event that more or less forced people to join together and take action. Examples of project “sparks” include:
  - In the South Platte, drought was the spark that brought people together and incentivized action.
  - In the Arkansas, it took years of water loss and unsuccessful loss prevention before agricultural owners reached the point where they were ready to make a significant investment in a process and in their water future.
  - In the Rio Grande, it took years of unnecessary river damage and failed management efforts before the community gathered together to make a change.
  - The Rio Blanco project was triggered by a homeowners’ initiative after many years of community frustration.
- It is important to start looking at how to work with a diversity of stakeholders and organizations--even those once thought to be adversaries—in order to help develop sparks/triggers for change. Relationships need to develop before the critical issues can be addressed.
- There seems to be a need to remove the threat of litigation from the discussion. However, in some cases, the threat of litigation is the only leverage environmental advocates have.

- Successful projects and programs take time, trust, a sense of urgency, and strong plans and partnerships; funding will follow once these critical elements are in place.
- There is a need to demonstrate to all stakeholders that any solution will require a mix of give and get.
- There seems to be value in creating a unified vision regarding what sustainability looks like (e.g., San Louis Valley), addressing how recreational needs can be aligned with agricultural, how environmental needs can be aligned with municipal needs, etc. Perceptions need to shift to think explicitly about what the value of water is.
- It seems like the 2002 drought and the effects of climate change could be leveraged as “sparks” to incentivize and encourage changes in perception and behavior.

### **Sustainable Funding for Nonconsumptive Needs and Projects—Taylor Hawes**

Taylor Hawes provided a brief summary of the work that has been done to date on identifying sustainable funding for nonconsumptive projects and needs. Highlights from this list of work include:

- The IBCC letter to the Governor(s)
- The work of the IBCC Nonconsumptive Needs Subcommittee
- The CWCB and Water Supply Reserve Account grants
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPaW) and other non-federal resources
- The Nature Conservancy summary of potential funding sources for water projects
- The Tamarisk Coalition’s report on potential funding sources
- Creative options such as the Colorado Lottery, trust funds, severance taxes, ballet initiatives, stewardship certification programs, etc.

### **Question/Answer and Discussion**

The group discussed additional ideas or avenues for pursuing sustainable funding in support of nonconsumptive needs. Notable comments include:

- It is important to look locally for funding resources.
- There is a need to secure current funding sources before seeking new ones.
- It would be valuable to develop tools to facilitate public outreach and education efforts, to help people understand that there is a crisis that needs to be solved.
- There seems to be a need to demonstrate the successful application of current funding resources and advocate for projects through current and past examples.
- It may be an option to connect nonconsumptive efforts with a new supply water transfer fee, or at least discuss the interests and options associated with such an approach.

### **Portfolio Tool and Nonconsumptive Needs—Jacob Bornstein and Melinda Kassen**

Jacob Bornstein and Melinda Kassen provided a brief summary of how the portfolio tool addresses nonconsumptive needs and how that approach came to be. Highlights from the presentation include:

- The IBCC Nonconsumptive Subcommittee is looking at methods to advance how nonconsumptive needs are incorporated in the portfolio tool. Currently, there are a variety of options for analyzing the other components/legs of the stool; however, the nonconsumptive options are less significant and obvious. There is concern that the purpose of the portfolio tool is to demonstrate how to meet municipal and industrial needs yet the ability to analyze the role and impacts of nonconsumptive needs are limited. There are currently two options or screens in the portfolio tool that address nonconsumptive issues. These are: the potential impact of a large trans-basin diversion to West Slope nodes and the accretion/depletion of historical flows to the South Platte.

- Feedback provided to date by the BRTs regarding ways of capturing or addressing nonconsumptive needs in the portfolio tool include:
  - 1) Use tools outside of the portfolio tool
  - 2) Develop a historical accretion/depletion graph for each major river
  - 3) Expand the existing West Slope nonconsumptive slide to spread across more areas and include the full portfolio
  - 4) Allow the user of the portfolio tool to specify the basin of origin for a new trans-basin project and/or allow the source of a new trans-basin project to be split between multiple basins
  - 5) Show the percent of available water going toward nonconsumptive uses compared to other uses

### Question/Answer and Discussion

The group was asked to discuss their reaction to the representation of nonconsumptive needs in the portfolio tool, suggest new ideas or approaches for further incorporating nonconsumptive needs, and provide feedback for the Nonconsumptive Subcommittee regarding alternative methods for nonconsumptive evaluation. Notable comments include:

- It would be valuable to develop estimated percentages of available water that could be applied to nonconsumptive uses and other uses.
- It would be helpful to be able to use the tool to analyze how basin and statewide nonconsumptive and consumptive needs can be met.
- There seems to be a need to look at the full spectrum of available water, to look at the interconnection of how consumptive needs are meeting nonconsumptive needs.
- It is important to recognize that the tool can only analyze so much and that it may be more valuable to develop a specific nonconsumptive tool or method to advance the conversation.
- The portfolio tool may not be the best venue for nonconsumptive analysis as it has a broader, statewide focus and nonconsumptive issues require a more site-specific evaluation and approach.
- There is a specific need for nonconsumptive quantification in order to advance the conversation.
- It does not seem valuable to focus efforts on adding a nonconsumptive component into the portfolio tool; nonconsumptive and consumptive needs are too intertwined and should be addressed as such.
- Is there a way to make it mandatory that nonconsumptive needs be addressed (either directly with the tool or with 'outside' discussion) as a part of developing a portfolio?

### Discussion: Next Steps for Nonconsumptive Needs—Peter Nichols

Peter Nichols led the group in a discussion focused on generating ideas for next steps for understanding, quantifying, addressing, and integrating nonconsumptive needs. The group was also asked to identify specific next steps for the IBCC, IBCC environmental and recreation representatives, IBCC subcommittees, and basin roundtables.

### **Integrate Nonconsumptive and Consumptive**

- Incorporate nonconsumptive needs into all the other components (legs of the stool) in order for progress to be made; the focus needs to be on how nonconsumptive needs can become a part of the discussion in conjunction with all the other components
- Identify specific implementation strategies and methods for consumptive and nonconsumptive needs and uses
- Balance the playing field for how nonconsumptive needs are addressed (in comparison to consumptive issues)
- There is a need for:

- State leadership within the community; reach out to the BRTs and others in order to raise the bar for engagement and discussion of water issues--specifically regarding nonconsumptive needs
- More multi-purpose projects
- Nonconsumptive projects, programs, planning, etc. that is adapted to each basin

### **Education**

- Education is a critical component to advancing nonconsumptive issues; needs include:
  - Addressing the misconception that environmental protection and economic development are mutually exclusive
  - Eliminating stereotypes and fear, and demonstrating the services, benefits, and interconnections between ecosystems and water resources
  - Engaging elected officials, State staff, land users, landowners, ranchers, framers, the general public, sportsman, water providers, attorneys, real estate agents, etc. to help with messaging and education
  - Creating a unified effort and shared message to facilitate education and outreach, while recognizing the need to adapt the “voice” of the message to the audience; there may be a need for each basin to identify the best approach or education and outreach in their basin
  - Developing a resource center (IBCC, CWCB, and the IBCC’s Public Education, Participation, and Organization Committee) to house and manage all the information, materials, and efforts and to guide BRTs and other organizations in outreach and education efforts

### **Basin Roundtables**

- Ensure all BRTs have a nonconsumptive committee to address basin-specific issues and to serve on a task force
- Implement CWCB and IBCC recommendations
- Work to create more balance representation and voting structure

### **CWCB/IBCC**

- Incentivize projects with nonconsumptive components
- Encourage implementation
- Develop a nonconsumptive task force
- Prevent the portfolio tool from becoming a crutch; it is just a tool and should not be a substitute for dialogue, creative brainstorming, and working together
- Develop stronger State leadership regarding nonconsumptive issues and efforts

### **Overarching**

- Separate the focus of process versus substance
- Use available information and data to develop a better understanding of what current conditions are and what future scenarios are possible (the Colorado River Water Availability Study Phase II)
- Find a balance of State and grassroots support and leadership
- Move past the “us versus them” perspectives and perceptions in order to advance projects, develop relationships, and create solutions
- Develop strong leadership
- Share information, data, ideas, resources, etc.

### **Closing Remarks—Director John Stulp**

Leadership has been a topic mentioned often throughout this meeting. It is important to recognize the leaders in the room today, including appointees from the IBCC and Board members from the CWCB.

This representation demonstrates shared perspectives, leadership, and support from the previous and current governments, credibility, and a leadership of broad thinkers. There is danger with a top-down approach; this has been demonstrated and addressed through previous IBCC and BRT dynamics and feedback. Therefore, there is a strong need for the BRTs to support each other and encourage bottom-up conversations and deliverables. It needs to be recognized that the portfolio tool is just a tool, not an end-all solution. It has had success and helped expand conversations and generate creative thinking; people are really getting in to it and wanting to understand the components better, which is good. More importantly, the tool is encouraging and facilitating expanded inter-basin dialogue and cooperation. It is serving its purpose: to encourage and advance conversations, build relationships, and help the BRTs better understand other perspectives and other basins' needs and issues. This is all happening with a statewide perspective and is representative of the successful process—just one component of the bigger picture. The need to add “additional legs to the stool” is a concept that has also been popular throughout this meeting. There are many important issues/components, but eventually we will have to stop “adding legs to the stool.”

The important issue is addressing the Governor's request for a water plan in the next five years. We need to have strategies planned out and have a feel for the public's response to those plans. There is an expectation from the Governor for us to come together—that we *can* come together—as a state. There is no question that nonconsumptive needs are a component of this task and an important part in the development of a state plan. It is a critical component for the state, what brings people to and keeps people in Colorado.

The year 2012 has been deemed the year of water. We need to encourage people to work together and make every year focused on Colorado's water future. Education will be a critical component for everyone to advance. Funding is also a key issue, which is why the idea of multi-purpose projects is significant. We all have a critical task ahead of us and we need to work together to address it.