Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan[1]

Public Comments from August 23, 2017, Hearing at Colorado Water Congress

Source of Comment	Comments
Travis Smith and Mike Preston, Forest Health Advisory Council	• The sections of the Colorado Water Plan that are most closely aligned with the mission of the Forest Health Advisory Council (FHAC) are: Section 7.1 (Watershed Health and Management); Section 7.2 (Natural Disaster Management); and Section 10.3 F (Critical Goals and Action Watershed Health, Environment, and Recreation). The FHAC would like to assist the Legislature, the CWCB, and the Colorado State Forest Service on moving critical action on these elements of the plan towards implementation. • The FHAC sees great potential in the role that basin roundtables can play in broadening communication within each basin and among basins concerning forest health. The roundtables may also provide a very useful means of aggregating forest health and wildfire preparedness efforts in each basin into a statewide perspective. The role is very consistent with the role of roundtables in developing the Colorado Water Plan (CWP).
Colorado Water Congress	A survey of members of the Colorado Water Congress identified the following priority topics for the CWP (in order of highest to lowest support for each priority): • include a comprehensive discussion on funding for water storage and other water infrastructure; • identify specific water projects that the state can endorse; • explain how the state will help implement and fund basin implementation plans; • specify how the permitting process for water projects will be streamlined; • explain the role of the state in securing a stable water supply; • focus on how to capture and store any surplus water under the South Platte River compact to meet future in-basin water demands; • identify how the state should develop an "insurance policy" to protect against involuntary curtailment of existing uses due to compact compliance; • include specific information about how public-private partnerships may help pay for water infrastructure projects; • explain how state funding could be used to help offset the cost of irrigation efficiency improvements; • identify how to increase conservation and efficiency of residential and commercial water use; • have an inventory of abandoned mines that threaten water quality and identify criteria for prioritizing state, federal, and local efforts to mitigate this threat; and • identify funding needs for municipal conservation system improvements, such as smart metering technology and more efficient customer billing and communication systems.

[1]Comments in this table are a summary of comments provided during public hearings of the Water Resources Review Committee, as well as comments submitted in e-mails, letters, and completed questionnaires.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments from September 7, 2017 Meeting at the State Capitol

Source of Comment	Comments
Alexander Funk, Western Policy Director National Young Farmers Coalition Also submitted a written copy of his testimony that is available on the WRRC website and completed an on-line questionnaire with similar recommendations..	• **Elevate soil health and on-farm water stewardship as key solutions to long-term water supply challenges.** NYFC encourages the state to consider adopting a comprehensive soil health program to help farmers and ranchers with limited resources access current research on soil health practices and provide technical and financial assistance to encourage on-farm soil and water conservation practices. Objectives of the program should include: (1) coordinating Federal and state technical assistance programs to help limited resource producers access available cost-share programs to implement on-farm soil health practices; (2) providing direct financial assistance to producers to implement on-farm soil health practices through a combination of small grants and loans; and (3) providing financial assistance to conservation districts and other organizations to support targeted soil health outreach and education programs. • **Improve access to specialized conservation equipment.** NYFC recommends that the General Assembly establish the Conservation District Revolving Loan Fund to provide low-interest loans to Colorado's conservation districts for securing, by purchase or otherwise, necessary equipment, materials, and supplies needed to further on the ground conservation programs and projects. The loan fund would be administered by the Colorado State Conservation Board (CSCB) with expenditures approved by the Board. CSCB would prioritize the use of the revenue stream by 1) Providing additional loan opportunities to Districts; 2) Stabilizing depleted program areas such as District matching grants; and 3) Providing additional funding streams, on a competitive basis, for Conservation Districts The intention of this program is to create long-term stable and sustainable funding opportunities for Conservation Districts and CSCB. To establish this fund, a one-time appropriation of $5 million from the Severance Tax Operational Fund is requested. • **Promote financial incentives to promote more efficient outdoor water use and technology.** NYFC encourages the state to consider financial incentives to promote the use of more efficient outdoor water use irrigation technology and to reduce outdoor consumptive use. The CWP (pg H-4) calls for the CWCB to explore a tax-credit program to incentives water providers to retrofit higher water-use landscapes with lower water-use landscapes. Several examples from other states are worth consideration. Arizona law provides an individual taxpayer with an income tax credit for installing water conservation systems in the taxpayer's residence including systems designed to collect rainwater or graywater. California's Turf Replacement Initiative provides rebates to individuals and public entities to remove turf and to replace it with landscapes that require less water. NYFC encourages the state to consider these measures as tools to reduce growing municipal demand and reduce pressure on agricultural water supplies across the state. • **Promote alternative transfer mechanisms (ATM) as a means to protect working agricultural lands.** NYFC encourages the state and local government to continue supporting similar ATM projects. In supporting ATM projects, the state should give priority to projects resulting in the permanent protection of working agricultural lands. Larimer County recently approved the first project where water will be shared from agricultural to municipal use in perpetuity. The project began in 2016 when Larimer County purchased a local farm with the goal of keeping the farm in active production while offsetting the cost through a water-sharing agreement with the City and County of Broomfield. Through this agreement, the partners demonstrated that it's possible to conserve fast-disappearing farmland at a reasonable cost while securing water for growing cities.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
J. Paul Brown Southwest Basin Agriculture Comments submitted through online questionnaire	• The water plan does not stress the importance of in-stream storage enough. According to a recent study, 8 million acre feet of water has escaped Colorado to downstream states in the South Platte River. This water can and should be stored to satisfy the growing urban demands of Colorado and to reduce the need to dry up productive agricultural land. This should be the number one goal of the Colorado Water Plan because it is the most realistic goal in actually conserving water.
Molly Mugglestone, Business for Water Stewardship Gunnison Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire	• Provide funding and assistance in order to reach the Water Plan's urban water conservation goal. • Invest in stream management plans, and ensure the implementation of those plans is done across the state. • Increase flexible water use and agreements between cities and agriculture. • Do not direct funding or resources towards the planning or constructing of new, large dams and water diversion projects, particularly projects that propose to move water from the West Slope to the Front Range. • Decision makers should apply the Water Plan's criteria checklist and ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent on projects that will benefit our rivers, recreation economy, and communities, and are cost effective, sustainable, collaborative and meet a demonstrated need. The plan was created with an enormous amount of statewide input and should therefore enforce criteria for any new projects and follow the goals and objectives of the plan. • State leaders must ensure that the state is identifying the funding needed to implement these essential components of the Water Plan.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Theresa Jehn-Dellaport, Quantum Water & Environment South Platte Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire.	• I support the collaborative effort and the depoliticize water issues for the good of the entire state. Managing the water resources for the good of all should be a priority. Increasing the funding needs to address the challenges. Full development of compact entitlements, cooperative projects, environmental protection, and high conservation standards. • Chapter 4 has only a brief discussion on groundwater in the State of Colorado. The lack of essential discussion on the groundwater of the State is to imply it's not a resource that is worth bothering about. This could not be further from the truth. The State Engineer issues approximately 5000 well permits a year for domestic, irrigation, municipal and industrial use so therefore, the people of Colorado are using the groundwater and will continue to do so as surface water becomes less and less available. There are significant unexplored aquifers in the State. For example, northeastern Colorado has 3 aquifers that are available for water supplies that are not mentioned (Upper Pierre, Upper Laramie, and the Laramie Fox Hills). Conjunctive use, aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) also referred to as managed aquifer resources (MAR) should also be discussed in greater depth. The statement in the plan "While groundwater storage…..it also has its challenges, including slow recharge rates and challenge associated with controlling the recharged water, retrieving the water and delivering the water to the customer" is erroneous and lacks references for these statements. Las Vegas for example can inject over 300 acre feet a day for further storage and has the largest ASR wellfield in the world (http://www.scwa.ca.gov/files/docs/projects/srgw/info_brief_enhanced_gw_storage.pdf). The discussion in the CWP implies that groundwater is not a resource that should be pursued because its "considered a nonrenewable supply". This is completely untrue. Some groundwater aquifers are not recharged at the same rate as the withdrawal (as the plan states), however, they can be recharged by humans and these efforts should be encouraged and not brushed off as some adventurous detour in water planning as the CWP implies. Other aquifers are recharged on an annual basis that do meet and exceed the withdrawal rates. Although the CWP has some limited figures for the aquifers in the State (with several missing), there should be more details and more thoughtful discussion. Groundwater should have its own chapter and I would be more than happy to volunteer to help write sections of it. • This plan was a collaborative extensive effort with stakeholders from throughout the state. The efforts were outstanding and required significant consensus building to reach the level it did.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Mike Sorensen,Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association Yampa-White Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire.	• Tri-State offered comments on Section 6.3.5 in the drafting process and after the release of the First Draft, again offered comments in September of 2015 on the final draft, and appreciates the opportunity to offer them for a third time. Tri-State is supportive of the state's desire to equitably plan for future water supplies into the future for all water users. • We oppose the following provisions of the plan: "Actions" listed for the Self-Supplied Energy Sector in Chapter 6 must avoid recommendations which conflict with existing authority of various federal and state agencies. For the third time, Tri-State restates our concern that "Actions" Nos. 7, 8, and 9 may conflict with Colorado laws, Public Utilities Commission resource planning obligations and the authority provided to various federal agencies, including Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, North American Electric Reliability Corporation and the Environmental Protection Agency. At the very least, Tri-State requested that the Plan explicitly recognize that these Actions conflict with the authority of various federal and state agencies. This did not occur. The State Water Plan's potential funding sources for water infrastructure needs must not unfairly burden rural Coloradans. Chapter 9.2 discusses the "true cost" of water and possible funding mechanisms for water infrastructure needs. In this discussion, the State Water Plan calls for severance tax increases and the removal of Federal mineral lease and severance tax fund cap limits as some ways to pay for the projects supported in the State Water Plan. Tri-State has grave concerns regarding any severance tax increases. Increases in severance taxes would result in increased electricity costs to consumers and would unfairly burden rural Coloradans who would fund water projects that are primarily for the benefit of the Front Range. Furthermore, the severance tax base will continue to shrink over time as electricity providers include more renewables. References to increases in severance tax and the removal of severance tax fund cap limits should not have been included in the State Water Plan. Also, in Chapter 9.2, as part of the Plan's discussion of the true cost of water, the Plan asserts that water is more capital-intensive than other public utilities including electricity. We disagree with this assertion. More importantly, we fail to understand the value of comparing one public utility's capital needs against others. All public utilities require significant capital investment and the range of such investment varies significantly depending on the scope of the project. We had hoped the CWCB would rework this discussion. • Tri-State would hope that increases in severance taxes would be removed from the list of potential options for funding sources. Additionally, Tri-State would ask that the CWP not include preferred fuel sources for electric generation and respect that electric utilities, like all water users, have equitable rights to utilize their water rights through Colorado Water Law. Tri-State will continue to ask that the CWP and its recommended actions not unfairly burden rural communities though funding mechanisms and policies.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Richard Van Gytenbeek, Trout Unlimited Colorado River Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire.	• The Colorado Legislature should: 1) continue and, if possible, expand funding for the implementation of the Colorado Water Plan and continue (and expand) funding for Stream Management Plans; 2) develop a permanent statewide funding source for the implementation of the Colorado Water Plan; and encourage the CWCB to revise the description and criteria for Stream Management Plans grant funding as described. • The framework of the Colorado Water Plan is expressed in Chapters 6-9. These chapters inform the goals and objectives which are contained in Chapter 10. If a water project is consistent with the goals and objectives found in Chapter 10, then it is likely consistent with the underlying framework. Chapter 11 describes the water plan as being a "dynamic document that incorporates Colorado's changing economy, water supplies, water needs, and stakeholder efforts. " TU believes that if a continually evolving and updated Colorado Water Plan remains a current reflection of the state's water priorities, that it's goals and objectives can provide an effective review tool for proposed water projects. • Trout Unlimited (TU) supports all the "Measurable Objectives" identified in Chapter 10. In particular we strongly support Objectives "B. Conservation"; "D. Agriculture"; "F. Watershed Health, Environment and Recreation" and "G. Funding". • TU further supports the "Critical Goals and Actions" associated with all the "Measurable Objectives" with particular attention to: a. Agriculture, Action #2 Encourage ditch-wide and regional planning to explore system-wide conservation and efficiency opportunities and trade-offs, the potential for water sharing, and long-term infrastructure maintenance needs. TU supports these planning efforts because they can have positive effects on agriculture and the environment. They also can provide important information to communities working on Stream Management Plans. b. Agriculture, Action #3 Provide grants, loans, and technical support to update and improve Colorado's aging agricultural infrastructure, especially where improvements provide multiple benefits. Providing funding to upgrade irrigation infrastructure addresses the economic barriers that producers face when considering upgrades. Other barriers such as the perceived risk of partial abandonment of water rights should be addressed in such a way that water right holders have confidence that their rights are protected. c. Watershed Health, Environment and Recreation, Action #2 Develop a plan that compiles and develops near-term projects and methods to support economically important water-based recreation. TU strongly supports projects and methods that develop economically important recreation opportunities. Opportunities for river based recreation projects and methods can often address multiple benefits such as fishing, boating and wildlife watching, etc. As such, a single original investment can generate multiple economic benefits. d. Watershed Health, Environment and Recreation, Action #3 Develop stream management plans for priority streams (identified in a BIP or otherwise) as having environmental or recreational value. As part of this work, the CWCB will provide guidelines and templates for developing stream management plans, and will conduct ongoing analyses through SWSI. CWCB should strongly encourage the involvement of the agricultural community in stream management plans.. Stream Management Plans are an opportunity to better understand current water use and management with a look to discovering new opportunities to improve the future of both consumptive and non-consumptive users.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Kelsey Haworth and Ralf Topper, Colorado Groundwater Association Denver Metropolitan Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire.	• We support all of the water supply management strategies proposed in the plan including: conservation and reuse, alternative agricultural transfers, implementation of identified projects and processes, and environmental protection with recreational enhancement projects. • We oppose the concept that the plan requires the public to recognize that water rights are property rights. This statement is fundamentally contrary to the Colorado Constitution, and this concept has no place in state agency crafted document. Article 16, Section 5 of the Colorado Constitution clearly states that the water of every natural stream, within the State of Colorado, is declared to be the property of the public, and is dedicated to the use of the people of the state, subject to appropriation. The waters of the State are a public resource. • In 2015, we provided comment on the draft version of the Colorado Water Plan (CWP) as we felt the content regarding the state's groundwater resources was inadequate. We are very pleased that the latest version of the CWP has incorporated much of the information and graphics provided to the CWCB by our Legislative Committee chairman, Ralf Topper, in Chapter 4 of the plan. • The CGWA would like to focus its comments on two aspects of the CWP that we feel still need additional discussion: 1) the inclusion of groundwater resources in the state's water supply portfolio for meeting future supply needs, and 2) specific implementation strategies to successfully incorporate aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects as alternative storage mechanisms. • Colorado's complex and varied geology has resulted in numerous aquifer systems throughout the state. These aquifers have been delineated and summarized in the Ground Water Atlas of Colorado (Colorado Geological Survey, Special Publication 53). CGWA feels that it is a significant omission to not identify and include the potential future development of the state's groundwater resources in the planning process. Groundwater supplies 18-20% of the state's total water supply needs. U.S. Geological Survey data indicate that the groundwater component of the total water supply exceeds 20% in 23 of Colorado's 64 counties. We believe that one of the reasons that groundwater is not adequately addressed in the CWP is that the plan is an outcome of the Roundtable process. Groundwater is the dominant water source for domestic supply, stock watering, and lawn/garden irrigation in rural areas of the state where municipal water systems are non-existent. The vast majority of Roundtable members have little expertise in groundwater. Roundtable membership is dominated by people utilizing or associated with surface water systems. The other dominant reason that more groundwater resources aren't developed is a legal hurdle. Outside of the Denver Basin, a specific statutory classification, groundwater development is hampered by the statutory constraints imposed in the definition of nontributary groundwater (37-90-103 (10.5), CRS) an overly-conservative, unmeasurable, and developmentally restrictive criterion.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Colorado Groundwater Association (cont)	• The second topic deserving greater discussion in the CWP is a more affirmative commitment to implement aquifer storage and recovery projects as a viable alternate storage methodology. ASR is discussed in the CWP in regard to attaining an additional 400,000 acre-feet of water storage by 2050, and is conceptually incorporated in east slope Roundtable Basin Implementation Plans. Specific aquifer storage opportunities, however, have not been identified in the CWP even though the state has investigated and published two significant studies providing assessment of available storage capacities in both alluvial and bedrock aquifers (Colorado Geological Survey, Artificial Recharge of Ground Water in Colorado, and CWCB, SB06-193 Underground Water Storage Study). Implementation of ASR projects in Colorado, outside of the Denver Basin, is also hampered by legal uncertainty. While alluvial aquifers in our state offer the best storage implementation opportunities, the concept of transient storage has not been addressed in Colorado water law. The recent passage of HB17-1076 opens the door for implementation of ASR projects in nontributary aquifers outside of the Denver Basin. Unfortunately, obtaining a nontributary designation is difficult due to the overly-conservative and ultra-restrictive definition of nontributary groundwater (37-90-103 (10.5), CRS). • In summary, the CGWA applauds the improvements made in the current version of the CWP regarding groundwater resources. We believe, however, that additional discussion is warranted regarding: identification and development of additional groundwater resources to meet future water supply needs, and promoting strategies for successful implementation of ASR projects as alternate water storage mechanisms. • While state funding does not necessarily need to exclude viable water projects that are not consistent with the CWP, the state's alignment of resources and policies need to be more coordinated to achieve the goals and outcomes identified in the plan • The Colorado Groundwater Association applauds the improvements made in the current version of the CWP regarding groundwater resources. We believe, however, that additional discussion is warranted regarding: identification and development of additional groundwater resources to meet future water supply needs, and promoting strategies for successful implementation of ASR projects as alternate water storage mechanisms.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Allen D. (Dave) Miller, Central Colorado Project Arkansas River Basin Comments submitted in e-mail to Water Resources Review Committee and online questionnaire.	• The Central Colorado Project (CCP) can and should be Colorado's primary Colorado Water Plan for both sides of the Divide, including Colorado's ten down river states. Colorado' major research institutions could soon confirm CCP's unprecedented, U.S. Patented concept, for worldwide clean water, energy, and air needs. Colorado's Water Resource Review Committee should be commended for reserving their State Legislature's right to require consideration of innovative high altitude multi-river pumped-storage in our state's first official Colorado Water Plan. • Colorado's first and only governor authorized Colorado Water Plan of December 2015 is a counterproductive collection of individual basin plans that will soon make Colorado our nation's most inefficient , highest cost, water supply state.. • Colorado's 10 year attempt to take local politics out of state water planning using non-professional, basin-oriented, private citizens with personal financial interests is obviously counterproductive and harmful for Colorado's economic and environmental futures. Colorado's current Water Plan is clearly not valid, because it intentionally ignored all alternatives to further develop Colorado's vast unused legal shares of the Colorado River, which has been CWCB's primary, unchanged, legislative mandate since 1937. As I have documented numerous times for CWCB, and Colorado's single basin water planners, Central Colorado Project's U. S. Patented, high altitude, multi-river, pumped-storage concept is uniquely designed to solve escalating clean water, energy, and air needs, while lowering costs throughout Colorado and its downriver states on both sides of the Continental Divide. • Colorado's Legislature should immediately unite to direct and fund at least one objective modeling evaluation of Colorado's ignored U. S. Patented Central Colorado Project's clean water, energy, and air solutions proposal for Colorado and its down river states on both sides of the Continental Divide. The results will clearly confirm innovative high altitude, multi-river pumped-storage projects can soon become clean water, energy, and air solutions for worldwide needs. • Unfortunately, Colorado's 2015 Water Plan is inconsistent with Colorado Water Conservation Board's 1937 Legislative purpose to "PLAN, PROTECT, AND DEVELOP COLORADO'S INTESTATE ENTITLEMENTS FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS". Colorado's 2015 Water Plan and ongoing "Trans-mountain Reuse-to-Extinction Projects" for Front Range growth are also inconsistent with National Environmental Policy Act rules, requiring detailed scoping comparisons of all reasonable alternatives. These evaluations would quickly reveal Central Colorado Project's (CCP) U. S. Patented high altitude, multi-river, pumped-storage concept is vastly superior for all mankind's clean water, energy, and air needs. • Colorado's ongoing, higher cost and harmful Front Range trans-mountain reuse-to-extinction projects could and should be replaced with Central Colorado Project, as soon as possible, to greatly enhance Colorado's economic and environmental futures. CCP is also designed to recharge local and multi-state ground water reserves, such as Eastern Colorado's excessively depleted Ogallala Aquifer. Please see my September 11, 2017 letter to President Trump, with article titled: Solving our world's clean water, energy, and air needs, dated 9/8/17, with enclosures.
Jeremy Carlson Submitted in e-mail to Water Resources Review Committee.	• Dams? Water diversions? Expensive! Damaging! Unsustainable in the long run. We humans are very clever but we need to truly be smart as we move forward with the Colorado Water Plan. And that means prioritizing — and funding — intelligent, effective water management strategies, such as: Water CONSERVATION! Water reuse! Stream management! Flexible agreements between urban and agriculture. These strategies are all we Coloradans need to thrive. And they need your support in the upcoming legislative season.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
David Moran, Energy Field Security Gunnison Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire	• Leave the western slope water alone.
Susan Simone Denver Metropolitan Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire	• Homeowners Associations should not be allowed to mandate that up to 70% of landscapes be kept as green grass as is the case in many developments now. Metering to avoid public watering on rainy days needs to be implemented. • We need to reduce our usage of the Colorado River. • Allow farmers with water rights to sell their water to municipalities (this may already be happening). • I believe the emphasis of the water plan is for human use and no emphasis is placed on supporting flora and fauna needs. This sentiment also needs to be included in the water plan. • Stop the Gross Dam expansion and implement LEDPA (the least environmentally damaging practical alternative) which is a Federal mandate.
Robert Viscount South Platte River Basin Comments submitted through online questionnaire	• I support balanced water solutions that are important in sustaining healthy flowing rivers for wildlife and people. River and watershed health and resilience are critical parts of Colorado's water infrastructure, and support clean reliable water for communities, agriculture, and wildlife. Colorado's Water Plan helps the state move forward toward a more balanced water future – for people, and the environment. • Implement watershed and stream management plans. Colorado's healthy flowing rivers are the bedrock foundation for clean water and our multi-billion dollar recreation economy, and they critically support all water uses and wildlife. • Improve flexible water sharing abilities between cities and agriculture. Agriculture plays a key part in Colorado's heritage, maintenance of our rural towns and economies, and supports critical bird habitat. • Increase water conservation and efficiency in our cities and towns. • Apply the Water Plan's criteria checklist to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent on projects that will benefit our rivers, recreation economy, and communities, and are cost effective, sustainable, collaborative and meet a demonstrated need. • Increased water conservation and efficiency in our cities and towns. • Apply the Water Plan's criteria checklist to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent on projects that will benefit our rivers, recreation economy, and communities and are cost effective, sustainable, collaborative and meet a demonstrated need. • The majority of existing funding from the state or water utilities supports traditional water infrastructure like storage. To reach crucial Water Plan goals for stream and watershed resilience, improvements for agriculture, and municipal reuse and conservation, Colorado needs dedicated resources to implement these parts of the Plan that are currently underfunded and that truly benefit people all across the state.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Richard Strauss South Platte Basin	• Emphasize relatively inexpensive "demand" reduction. • The legislature should understand and legislate "water footprint." It should legislate to identify, quantify and reduce (or eliminate)/increase the "water footprint" cost/saving of the *most/least water Polluting, Intensive, Exporting and Diverting (PIED) animal and plant agriculture consumption and production*.
Comments submitted through online questionnaire.	• Legislate to change to, phase in and implement Colorado public school labeled "water footprint" friendly meal program to cost effectively and inherently raise awareness and reduce (or eliminate) demand of Polluting, Intensive, Exporting and Diverting (PIED) plant and animal agriculture production and consumption that saves, rather than wastes, water. • Recent (8/17) articles have stated that the Colorado Water Plan's currently expressed goals and objectives would cost $40+ Billion. An awareness raising program to reduce water demand by integrating the "water footprint" into the school meal program's diet and labels while phasing in by starting at, say, K-5 age levels would be far more cost effective, simple and manageable to realize. • The goals and objectives of the Plan are biased towards increasing water supply projects that are obviously cost- and water quantity- prohibitive.
Joe Chastain	• Well, reservoirs are nice and some are necessary, however they alone will not meet our state's demand. We need more solutions that will leave as much water in the water sheds as possible.
Comments submitted through online questionnaire.	• Tiered water rates. Every family should have a livable amount of water monthly - free. After that increasing rates at certain levels of usage. • State wide rules to "encourage" xeriscape style landscaping. Less water on non-native grass. • Extractive (mainly oil and gas) industries should be required to recycle all water used hydraulic fracturing. It could be re-used in their business or required to be cleaned such that it can be returned to the water shed. Likewise any production water from producing wells should be mad suitable for injection into aquifers or discharge into watersheds. • Conversations and initial investigative engineering work should be started with the goal of "toilet to tap" water systems. Please see https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-australia-can-teach-the-world-about-surviving-drought/

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
Form Emails	
This e-mail, with minor variations, was submitted by 890 individuals. Western Resources Advocate website encouraged persons to submit this form e-mail.	• I am writing to you today in support of Colorado's clean drinking water, thriving communities, flowing streams, and healthy fish and wildlife. I encourage you to pursue critical priorities of our Water Plan at the upcoming legislative session. • Many of the priorities in the Plan remain underfunded, and we must focus on the most cost-effective and realistic projects moving forward. • Colorado can meet our water needs through effective strategies like water reuse, water conservation, and other innovative solutions, and avoid constructing expensive new dams and unsustainable water diversion projects. • I ask that the Interim Water Resources Review Committee prioritize the following: • Increase water conservation in our cities and towns and provide funding and assistance in order to reach the Water Plan's urban water conservation goal. • Invest in tools that benefit river health, like stream management plans, across the state. Healthy rivers are the foundation for a healthy environment and our billion-dollar recreation economy. • Support flexible water use and beneficial agreements between cities and agriculture—to preserve our agricultural heritage. • Do not support the planning or constructing of expensive new dams and water diversion projects when water reuse, water conservation, and other innovative strategies effectively meet our needs.
This e-mail, with minor variations, was submitted by 487 individuals. The Sierra Club's website encouraged persons to submit this form e-mail.	As a Colorado resident, I support balanced water solutions that are important in sustaining healthy flowing rivers for wildlife and people. River and watershed health and resilience are critical parts of Colorado's water infrastructure, and support clean reliable water for communities, agriculture, and wildlife. Colorado's Water Plan helps the state move forward toward a more balanced water future – for people, and the environment. As the Water Plan moves into implementation I ask you to prioritize the following list. • Implementation of watershed and stream management plans. Colorado's healthy flowing rivers are the bedrock foundation for clean water, our multi-billion dollar recreation economy, and critically support all water uses and wildlife. • Improvements for flexible water sharing abilities between cities and agriculture. Agriculture plays a key part in Colorado's heritage, maintenance of our rural towns and economies, and supports critical bird habitat. • Increased water conservation and efficiency in our cities and towns. • Apply the Water Plan's criteria checklist to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent on projects that will benefit our rivers, recreation economy, and communities, and are cost effective, sustainable, collaborative and meet a demonstrated need. • Colorado should not direct resources towards new, large dams and water diversion projects, particularly transbasin projects and should rather look for ways to rely on conservation, efficiency, and flexible water use. • The majority of existing funding, from the state, or water utilities, supports traditional water infrastructure like storage. To reach crucial Water Plan goals for stream and watershed resilience, improvements for agriculture, and municipal reuse and conservation, Colorado needs dedicated resources to implement these parts of the Plan that are currently underfunded and that truly benefit people all across the state.

Feedback on the Colorado Water Plan (Cont.)

Public Comments Provided Outside of Committee Meetings

Source of Comments	Comments
This e-mail, with minor variations, was submitted by 374 individuals. The source of these recommended comments is unknown.	As the Water Plan moves into implementation, I ask you to prioritize the following list: • Implementation of watershed and stream management plans. Colorado's healthy flowing rivers are the bedrock foundation for clean water and our multi-billion dollar recreation economy, and they critically support all water uses and wildlife. • Improvements for flexible water sharing abilities between cities and agriculture. Agriculture plays a key part in Colorado's heritage, maintenance of our rural towns and economies, and supports critical bird habitat. • Increased water conservation and efficiency in our cities and towns. • Apply the Water Plan's criteria checklist to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent on projects that will benefit our rivers, recreation economy, and communities, and are cost effective, sustainable, collaborative and meet a demonstrated need. • Colorado should not direct resources towards new, large dams and water diversion projects, particularly transbasin projects and should rather look for ways to rely on conservation, efficiency, and flexible water use. • The majority of existing funding, from the state, or water utilities, supports traditional water infrastructure like storage. To reach crucial Water Plan goals for stream and watershed resilience, improvements for agriculture, and municipal reuse and conservation, Colorado needs a sustainable source of funding to implement these parts of the Plan that are currently underfunded and that truly benefit people all across the state.