

**DRAFT Water Acquisition Committee Conference Call Summary  
July 25, 2008, 8:30 a.m.**

Participants: Dan Luecke, Jana Mohrman, Robert Muth, Angela Kantola, Brent Uilenberg, Andy Moore, Tom Pitts, Michelle Garrison, Randy Seaholm, Patty Schrader-Gelatt, Matt Lindon, Ray Tenney, George Smith, and John Shields.

Assignments indicated by a ">" and at the end of the document.

Convene: 8:30 a.m.

1. 15-Mile Reach PBO Depletion Accounting Report, 2001-2005 – This draft report was last discussed by the Water Acquisition Committee on March 29, 2007. A revised draft report was sent to the Committee on June 12. Tom Pitts provided comments on the report on June 16. Jana and Dan met with Randy and Andy on July 17 for a background discussion on the use of the State's consumptive use model (StateCU) in depletion accounting for the 15-Mile Reach. Jana said the Service believes the intent of the PBO was to run both the StateCU and the StateMod models, but did not since all the data are not currently available to run StateMod, hopefully both can be included in the next rendition of this report in 2011. The Committee had an extensive discussion regarding the difference between these two models. Tom Pitts asked what the PBO requires re: 1995, 2000, 2005, and 2010 depletion levels. Andy Moore said back-cast demands from transmountain diverters are a key element to run StateMod.

Randy asked what we really want to see from this depletion accounting, noting that we were looking at the C1 and C2 runs to: 1) address what's happening with climate variability; and 2) determine how development of existing depletions is occurring (or whether extra water is being taken from transmountain diversions to meet additional demands). Appendix B of the PBO contemplated that the CU model would analyze whether the current level of consumptive uses is increasing or decreasing and StateMod would look at climate variability and how growth was affecting the amount of transmountain water being taken to meet additional development. The problem in using StateMod now is that back-cast data are not currently available from all the transmountain diversions. They should have StateMod in place for the South Platte in the next few years (and can then better estimate its transmountain diversions), but they also will need the Arkansas DSS in place, which won't be completed within the next 5 years (thus, this will remain a problem since Fry-Ark and Southeast are two of the big data needs). Dan Luecke asked if Randy is saying that when we looked at StateCU as the basis for tracking depletions and intended StateMod to look at climate variability in the context of tracking depletions (however, StateMod isn't necessary right now in light of the fact that StateCU shows decreased depletions)? Randy replied that we're trying to determine whether depletions have changed in the last five years, and he believes we can do so effectively with StateCU. Dan Luecke agreed. Randy said StateMod was to look at what Denver, Aurora, etc. are diverting and see how their demand has been increasing, particularly w/ respect to climate variability. Andy said the StateCU approach is limited to historic data, whereas StateMod approach gives the "what if" capability, the ability

to go back and change the demands. StateMod gives us the ability with back-casting to better quantify changes.

Ray Tenney said CRWCD is troubled that we're using StateCU to generate numbers related to the west slope, but the transmountain diversions are basically a black box. Andy disagreed; saying transmountain exports are the actual historical records. Ray agreed, but said we can't tell if the transmountain exports are related to demands or surplus. This creates a hole in the analysis and allows transmountain demand to be reflected only by their diversions. Ray recognizes we have limited data now, but ultimately, it would be better to understand demand (since that's what the PBO 60,000 af and 120,000 af are based on, recognizing that actual diversions would vary)

Tom Pitts asked about StateMod based on demands for the South Platte – does this mean that calculated depletions from the west slope may be different than actual? Andy said yes, because it places, for example, a 2005 demand level on historic data. And the amount they divert depends on whether they even have reservoir storage, too (can have demand, but have to have somewhere to store it). Ray said this is their concern, because demand for transmountain diversions are fed from the South Platte, Arkansas, and Colorado rivers, and to only consider what goes through the tunnel as their demand is not what the west slope agreed to. Andy said that's not relevant to this accounting; Ray agreed, but said that long-term, the demand represented by the Front Range can be served in a number of ways and diversions may be more or less based on what's available on the front range, conservation, etc.

Tom Pitts clarified that the Committee is trying to address two questions: 1) how we did the accounting in the current report; and 2) how we'll do this accounting in the future. Tom said he'd like to see another draft of the current report based on comments submitted, and then commit time for a separate discussion of what we'll do in the future. The group agreed. Tom said we also will need to agree on procedures for back-casting, etc. Dan agreed and said that the time he and Jana spent with Randy and Andy helped them understand the state's challenge in running StateMod and requiring back-casting from transmountain diverters. However, he would like to meet soon, while this is still fresh in our minds, to discuss how we'll do the future depletion accounting. Tom Pitts added that the report should clarify why we're using the procedures we did and include a recommendation to meet to determine the future approach. Any of the residual questions from this week's e-mails should be taken up in our discussion of how we'll do this in the future.

>The committee agreed that:

- a) any additional comments on this report are due Friday, August 1;
- b) CWCB will provide a new draft to the committee by August 15;
- c) the committee will have until Aug. 29 to comment on the new revised (and hopefully final) draft via e-mail

The Committee will meet on September 4 in the Service's Regional Office from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. to begin discussions of future depletion accounting (>Jana will arrange a meeting

room). >Randy, Andy, Jana and Dan will work up the list of issues in advance of that meeting (Randy and Andy will do a first draft, share it with Jana and Dan, and send it to the Committee by August 22. Randy added that in addition to Appendix B of the PBO, we also should discuss Appendix F, which talks about hydrology.

2. Jana noted some recent CROS questions, and >will raise those to the Committee via e-mail.
3. Angela mentioned that the Management Committee on August 12 hear a brief update on the proposed Green River Pumping Plant project, which is contemplated to have a new depletion of ~8,500 from the Green River. > Matt Lindon will let the engineers know that the BA must come from the Federal agency which will be consulting with the Service on the project. Bob Muth said that while the Service can't pre-judge the outcome of a consultation, they are willing to have preliminary conversations about the project.

#### Assignments

1. The committee agreed that:
  - a. any additional comments on the 15-MR Depletion Report are due Friday, August 1;
  - b. CWCB will provide a new draft to the committee by August 15;
  - c. the committee will have until Aug. 29 to comment on the new revised (and hopefully final) draft via e-mail.
2. Jana will arrange a meeting room for September 4.
3. Randy, Andy, Jana and Dan will work up the list of issues future depletion accounting in advance of the September 4 meeting (Randy and Andy will do a first draft, share it with Jana and Dan, and send it to the Committee by August 22).
4. Jana will raise recent CROS questions to the Committee via e-mail.
5. Matt Lindon will let the GRPP project engineers know that the BA must come from the Federal agency which will be consulting with the Service on the project.