

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Watershed Management Planning Committee

DATE: April 9, 2018

SUBJECT: Summary of Watershed Management Planning Committee Meeting

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Watershed Management Planning Group (WMPG) is to help protect existing water uses and watershed health in the Upper Gunnison Basin in the face of pressure from increased water demands and permanent reductions in water supply.

A meeting of the Watershed Management Planning (WMP) Committee was held on April 9, 2018 at 6:04 p.m. George Sibley, Michelle Pierce, Julie Nania, Ashley Bembenek, Don Sabrowski, Molly McConnell, Jesse Kruthaupt, Tom Grant, John McClow, Frank Kugel, and Beverly Richards were in attendance. Camille Richard participated by phone.

George Sibley called the meeting to order.

Wilson Water Group Update

Ashley Bembenek gave the update for Wilson Water Group. They continue to refine the model to improve its performance in each of the sub-basins. They are using information gathered in the fall to better represent interaction between ditches, irrigated acreage, and return flows. They will also be adding municipal data to the model.

A retreat was held in mid-March where they worked with the sub-basin coordinators to map issues identified by stakeholder input in each sub-basin. The coordinators are reviewing the initial maps, refining locations, and adding additional information to each list. They will need to provide updates and suggestions by April 13th to allow the WWG team to select assessment locations in the coming weeks.

With regards to flow methods, WWG is using a reach-by-reach approach to create flow recommendations for environmental and recreational flows. Currently, the team is working to identify priority reaches in each watershed. These will include reaches that are currently in good condition and should be protected and reaches that are impaired which could benefit from improvements. The process will include identifying natural flows and existing flows prior to developing any flow recommendations. These recommendations will involve determining when low flows occur and the duration and frequency; riparian health and stream habitat; stream

temperature; and habitat connectivity. This information will be used to generate environmental recommendations.

For environmental reaches the goal will be to create tiered flow recommendations where possible. R2Cross and pebble counts will be used as a baseline flow method at most locations and natural flows may be used to identify optimal flows. Ashley said she will speak with Chris Sturm to get additional recommendations for flow methods. For recreational flows they will be using an area-based approach to characterize flows during low, average, and high flows. These will be based upon 2002 (low) flows, gage period of record (average), and 2011 (high) flows. They will also be completing surveys in the summer to determine seasons of use for kayak, raft, float-fishing, and stand-up paddle boarding. This method will best characterize recreational use patterns.

Jesse Kruthaupt asked if the reach map will also identify the uses on the reach. Ashley said these maps will be broader in the information they provide and will only include general information about the reach. Jesse also asked what timeline was for the draft model, Ashley will contact WWG to ask them the status.

Don Sabrowski suggested the reach information should also include historical use as this will provide information on how the past has created the present. Ashley said this is why current and natural flows are so important in order to determine target flows. Julie Nania said flow targets will also include temperature and water quality standards that might be controlled by the state, so they will have to look at the state requirements as well. Jesse said the model will also show how management benefits the streams due to increased irrigation returns.

Sub-Basin Coordinators Updates

Ohio Creek - Jesse Kruthaupt said that since the coordinators retreat he has been reviewing maps and the list of issues. He has not been able to make many additions to the list as it has been difficult to get information from stakeholders. He will be meeting with the Ohio Meadows Association later this week to speak with stakeholders in that area. There has been a significant turnover with management and ranches in this area. Jesse has met with Dan Olsen from NRCS. They are looking at targeted conservation funding in the area and would like to develop some criteria to rank potential projects. This could be a useful tool for the WMPG as we move toward our pilot projects. These criteria will have to fit with the EQUIP program run by NRCS but it could also be a good source of funding. It was the consensus of the committee that Dan Olsen be invited to the next committee meeting to discuss this subject.

Lake Fork and Cebolla – Camille Richard said they had a stakeholder meeting on March 13th which included attendance by some town trustees and county commissioners. This was an informational meeting with several attendees signing up for working groups which will be organized later this month. Camille said the LFVC, town trustees, and the county commissioners have partnered to begin planning a river recreation corridor through the town of Lake City. They will be working with representatives of the Downtown Improvement and Revitalization Team board and

the plan will include activities to enhance river channel hydrology; riparian and wetland habitats for fisheries and birds; recreational infrastructure; and improve public access.

Camille has also been conducting interviews with several key landowners along the river and these will continue once calving season is complete. She has also contacted the Water Commissioner and will accompany him on his initial rounds this spring. She has included this information on the issues tracking spreadsheet. Camille has also provided Ashley with proposed reaches along the Lake Fork and Henson Creek. These have been divided into 13 segments based on boating usage and fisheries types. She is also planning summer meetings to present inventory and assessment results. Also, she has identified several grant possibilities and is compiling a list for review by the committee.

East River – Julie Nania said she has been working on making sure the spreadsheet is updated with information from her basin. She has also been meeting with CBMR about their plans to increase snowmaking as a part of the proposed Teocali expansion. This would result in a longer draw down on the East River. The discussions have included mitigation and assessment alternatives that might work rather than the longer NEPA process. This will result in assessing this reach in more detail and she feels it is a worthwhile endeavor. The next step will be to begin discussion about getting water from other sources such as Washington Gulch. The next step in the process will be to agree on doing some assessment work and developing mitigation options.

Status of agricultural sub-group meeting

Frank Kugel said he has been reaching out to agricultural water users on the East River. He met with Doug Washburn and many of Doug's concerns are on a parallel path with the Slate River Working Group. Doug's biggest concern on the Slate River was recreational use. He voiced some frustration with the historical pattern of boating on the Slate River. The source of conflict in this area has been worked through for the most part. Ranchers are trying to have their cattle relocated prior to prime boating season. Doug said the main problems center around the lack of restroom facilities and boaters flipping and leaving their crafts. He suggested boater education be included in the management planning process and these should include trespass issues.

Another issue Doug raised was water supply and diversions from upstream junior irrigators. The senior water rights owned by Spann Ranches cannot place a call on the stream due to their inability to dry up the East River at their point of diversion. Absent a call, the junior water users dry up the stream. Doug would like to know how we can help with structural improvements downstream of Crested Butte. Frank will also contact John Rozman, Bill Lacy, and other major users on the East River for their input.

Update on Draft CWCB Status Report

Camille provided her status report and information needs document (included at the end of this memo) for the CWCB report that is due in June. She asked sub-basin coordinators and committee members to go through and provide feedback for anything she may have missed. There was a question about providing a list of completed projects in the status report. Camille said the list of issues has not been circulated to stakeholders. She wanted to know if this information should be included in the status report. It was decided it should be included without respondent names and with a summary of the issues as this will show the CWCB that we are making progress in our plan. Camille also suggested we should look at the statement of work for year two and make revisions and include this in the report.

Discussion of 2018 CWCB Grant Request

Camille Richard asked the committee if we anticipate needing more funding from CWCB for the coming year. The grant requests are due by the first week in November. It was the consensus of the committee to form a sub-committee to discuss grant applications for the next phase of the planning process. Tom Grant volunteered to be a part of this sub-committee.

Development of WMPG FAQs – 10 Common Questions

George said he brought up this item to develop a document to answer frequently asked questions from stakeholders and people we contact. He suggested committee members develop questions based on their contacts and forward to staff for compilation.

Video Production Update

Julie Nania said the video is complete and we will be receiving a file from the production company. This can be shared and some events where it could be presented include the Trout Unlimited film festival, WSCU events, and the Gunnison River Festival. This video will also be posted to the District's Facebook, Twitter, and web pages.

Meeting Wrap-up and Action Items

In preparation for the next meeting the following items were discussed:

- The next meeting for the Watershed Management Planning Committee will be May 14, 2018 beginning at 6:00 p.m.

Action items include:

- Jesse Kruthaupt to contact NRCS to present funding information at next committee meeting.

- Committee members to provide frequently asked questions about the process to staff for compilation.
- WWG and sub-basin coordinators to go through outline for CWCB status report by April 20th for consideration at next meeting.
- Sub-basin coordinators to provide input on reach maps to WWG by April 13th.
- Committee members to provide input on grant opportunities.
- Staff to provide information on trespass issues and guidelines.
- Work on developing specific criteria for projects before December 15th.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

UGRWCD – Upper Gunnison Basin Watershed Planning Year 1 Status Report Outline and Information Needs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – summary of purpose, goals, objectives, tasks, outcomes, next steps for Year 2

PROJECT PURPOSE, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

SCOPE OF WORK AND OUTCOMES

For Each Task:

Description of Task

Methods/Procedures

Project Outcomes/Deliverables as of end of May 2018

Timing/ Reasons for Delays (if any) – have we met our target completion date for task?

Task 1: Stakeholder Outreach

Information Needs from each Sub-basin Coordinator and WWG

- Details of methods used as per Statement of Work
- Number of questionnaires completed – don't need names of respondents
- Number of follow-up interviews – don't need names of respondents
- Summaries of any community meetings and presentations given at those meetings, including agendas
- Most recent issues table and map of issues locations (not solutions – that will go under Task 5)
- List and copies of maps and analyses provided by WWG to coordinators for outreach purposes, along with brief description of how they were used
- List and copies of all outreach materials generated.
- Summary of any watershed plans as they relate to this planning effort?
- Challenges faced – reasons for delays, possible problems with process, etc.
- Next steps for Year 2

Task 2: Inventory and Identification of Information Gaps / Task 3: Needs Assessment

Information Needs from WWG

- Summary Status Report detailing methods used as per Statement of Work and results to date along with pdfs of all maps generated, for both Tasks (knowing that Task 3 is to be completed in Year 2)
- All GIS shapefiles generated
- Challenges faced – reasons for delays, possible problems with process, etc.
- Next steps for Year 2

Task 4: Implement Demonstration Projects

Information Needs from Sub-basin Coordinators and WWG

- List of possible projects identified and summary of how determined
- Design reports generated for projects, including cost estimates (if any)
- Challenges faced – reasons for delays, possible problems with process, etc.
- Next steps for Year 2

Task 5: Identify Range of Options

Information Needs from each Sub-basin Coordinator and WWG

- Options Excel spreadsheet with issues and possible solutions (do not need names of respondents) with map of locations
- Challenges faced – reasons for delays, possible problems with process, etc.
- Next steps for Year 2: How to start working in next sub-basins

Task 6: Project Coordination and Administration

Information Needs from UGRWCD staff

- Dates of contracting
- Dates of reimbursements
- List of all reports and other data and information made available to the public
- Challenges faced – reasons for delays, possible problems with process, etc.
- Next steps for Year 2 – information depository

PROJECT EXPENDITURES

Expenditures – summary of expenditures with reference to detailed table broken down by task and sources of match

Any Changes in Match Requirement? – describe

Discrepancies in Statement of Work versions?

We need to explain any problems between versions and why we have not met the year 1 dates outlined in WWG version of SOW.

Task	Changes in scope?	Completion Date