

Report to the Upstream Downstream Steering Committee Regarding Work of the Subgroup

(9/11/07 – Final)

by

Susan Kelly

Associate Director

Utton Transboundary Resources Center

BACKGROUND:

At the end of the final Upstream Downstream workshop¹ last September the regional representatives expressed a strong interest in continuing to work together, but were unsettled on how to move forward. Given that the regional plans were developed locally and that the three regions share the same water source, it is clear that at some point, the regions will have to cooperate “as a basin” to implement their individual strategies without impeding implementation of the other plans. Following is an excerpt from end of the 3rd workshop which illustrates the thinking of the group:

“Participants considered whether or not they had completed their work. There was some frustration that three workshops had not been enough time to develop relationships, get answers to tough questions, and tackle conflicts. They agreed that the threat hanging over them as a group is the prospect of not meeting compact deliveries. They acknowledged that much of their discussion in the workshops had centered on initiatives that were more appropriately handled at the regional level. If they were to continue meeting, they identified actions that are truly basin-wide and require cooperation among the regions:

- *Support for implementation of regional water plans*
- *Use the Governor's Year of Water to gain support for the planning process and the Upstream/Downstream objectives.*
- *Tackle conflicts, identify trigger points*
 - *Shortage sharing strategies*
 - *Water transfer policies*
- *Work on a planning water budget for the basin*
- *Address certain policies together:*
 - *Statewide building code to save water*
 - *Incentives for farmers to conserve*
- *Keep regions communicating with each other*

In addition, the group identified two needs that fall in the arena of a contractor:

1) development of a water balance for the basin, that tracks amounts of water in and out of the basin; and 2) identification of points of inconsistency in terms and definitions for measurement and monitoring among the regional plans, including different methodologies

¹ The New Mexico Water Dialogue, with a grant from the McCune Foundation, sponsored the workshops in partnership with the Interstate Stream Commission and the Utton Center.

and conservation performance calculations, and recommendations for resolving the inconsistencies.

The Utton Center: Susan Kelly offered to work with a sub-group to develop ideas for working together as a basin. She described her view that it will take resources to help the three regions address conflicts between the regional plans and move towards areas of potential cooperation. A written description of the objectives may help to get the necessary resources. She would convene two meetings with a sub-group to explore how to approach such a description of work, which would build on the information gained from the existing regional plans. The subgroup meetings would continue to develop the six topics identified above. The regional representatives would be responsible for getting the information back to their groups for input.”

The participants agreed to this approach. Following is a report on the work of the subgroup and the various topic areas it explored. The work led up to the proposals being presented at the 4th workshop (August 22, 2007).

PROCESS:

The Utton Center prepared a strawman draft scope of work before the first subgroup meeting (11-3-06 draft, Attachment 1) which was based roughly on the six topic areas that were identified in the third workshop. The draft proposed developing a water budget for the Basin, supporting implementation of regional water plans, identification of conflicts among the plans, and development of an approach for the three regions to continue to communicate and work together. The Utton Center incorporated revisions and comments from the subgroup and distributed notes and documents back to the subgroup. The concept was to generate a proposed scope of work for approaching the Interstate Stream Commission.

There was general agreement that the subgroup should look for positive implementation strategies that the three regions could work on together. The subgroup reasoned that if the basin participants could start out by working together on a common project or issue, the groundwork would be laid for eventually being able to tackle tough issues, such as reconciling conflicts among the plans.

In this vein, the subgroup tried to identify the implementation strategies in each plan that were common to all three as a basis for funding projects that would be most effective if worked on jointly, rather than by the regions independently. With information compiled by the Interstate Stream Commission, we created a matrix of implementation strategies in the regional plans.² (Attachment 2.)

There was agreement on the importance of consistency or standardization among the basic elements of the plans – for example, time of condition and handling of shared water budget elements.³ Beyond that a wide range of activities was discussed. Following guidance from OSE

² The matrix does not include the Rio Jemez and Rio Puerco Subregion’s recommendations.

³ Reconciling the regional water budgets had been the focus of a presentation with recommendations by S.S. Papadopulos & Associates, Inc. at the September 25, 2006 workshop.

and ISC staff, the subgroup tried to avoid limiting the scope to planning activities. The concern was that planning as a stand-alone activity might not be supported.

The subgroup tried to discuss projects identified in the three regional plans that were common to all three plans and consider which of the projects might be more beneficially approached at a basin level, as a joint activity, rather than by separate agencies or the individual regions. We struggled with these activities. Some felt that we should be focusing on bigger picture topics, such as sharing of shortages, water transfer criteria, and reducing evaporative loss in the reservoirs. Others felt we should start with a few manageable topics to establish group structure and relationships. Attachment 3 is a later version of the group's thinking (Draft Proposal 2-23-07).

CONCLUSION:

In the end, we moved away from a description of work format and agreed to propose three items at the 4th workshop: 1) to achieve a level of consistency among the three plans, 2) to create a joint template to assess implementation progress, leading toward balancing a basin water budget, and 3) to present a draft description of the problem, clearly describing the basin water future and the need to cooperate.

Some perceive these to be too-small-steps and others may feel they are ambitious. Regarding the consistency proposal, the subgroup agreed that until we have the basic information in a more readily understandable format, the basin will not be able to explain the issues or get organized to move forward. Likewise, preparing a template for how to assess implementation progress across regional boundaries will be a huge step in "thinking like a basin" and moving towards a basin budget. A statement of facts summarizing the hydrology and future conflicts, and stressing the need for cooperation among regions will provide material for explaining the importance of the Upstream Downstream work to elected officials and constituencies.

SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS OF THE ISSUES:

Following are excerpts of the subgroup meetings and comments concerning many of the issues that were discussed. All of the proposals have merit and the subgroup welcomes your ideas.

Standardization / consistency: There is a need to standardize certain elements of the three plans in order to be able to articulate the water supply and demand projections at a basin-wide level and move towards implementation. Each plan uses somewhat different assumptions. It would be possible, without re-doing the plans, to create an integrated document which gets to the bottom line and illustrates the importance of implementation and resolution of conflicts between the plans. There is a value in having consistent terminology and clearly laying out the problem.

This issue is multi-layered: local budgets should be consistent with regional budgets and regional budgets consistent with the State Water Plan. There is a need for consistency between local jurisdictions so we are comparing apples to apples and can assess progress. Without consistency, people can avoid facing issues due to uncertainty or lack of clarity.

The result of these discussions is the consistency/standardization proposal presented at the 4th workshop -- to develop a report which reconciles the budgets of the three plans and allows the three regions to communicate with each other on implementation progress, common activities and conflicts among the plans.

Water Budget: A water budget for the basin is needed that shows by use sector the effect of implementation actions across the basin as a whole. There is a need to evaluate which components of the basin and regional water budgets are uncertain and can be better quantified. This would include assessing what methods are available for improving accuracy and application of these methods to the budget to reduce uncertainty.

The subgroup proposes Upstream Downstream begin work on the budget with the consistency/standardization proposal and creation of an implementation template. An S.S. Papadopoulos Report (dated October 22, 2006) was included with the agenda for the 4th Upstream Downstream workshop and it lays out one approach to building a template. There are others and the proposal is that a subcommittee be formed to work on this. The implementation template can develop into a process for integration of the plans, quantifying uncertainties in the budget, coordinating implementation actions and balancing the budget.

Water Planning: There was interest in examining the structure of water planning and creating an environment where the regional plans have standing and are considered in all levels of decision-making, including allocation of funding. For example, there could be a requirement that any bill introduced in the legislature include an analysis of how the bill ties into the regional water plans. There is also the relationship between the regional plans and the State Water Plan. The subgroup discussed related efforts such as the Ad Hoc Committee (renamed the Regional Water Plan Advisory Committee), the update of the State Water Plan, and the anticipated updates of the regional plans. The sense of the subgroup was that ultimately, the basin needs to go through the steps of planning to eventually work out a method for resolving conflicts among regions.

Water Transfers: Evaluating the effect of current and potential water transfer policies was a big part of the discussion at the subgroup. Resolution of the conflict between downstream plan policies (encouraging retention of water rights in Socorro County) versus upstream plans (relying on transfers to meet some portion of future demand) is a key reason for some participants to be at the table. They believe the basin should develop ground rules for resolving conflicts. The subgroup would like to make progress on understanding some of the legal aspects of water transfers, such as the effect of the past dedication policy. The transfer process should be more transparent and acknowledge public welfare considerations. Water transfers will continue, but people in the basin need to understand the ramifications of moving water around. There is a big problem with lack of enforcement. Some felt that working on a water budget is fruitless if we haven't quantified the uncertainty over water rights.

Role of Upstream Downstream: There was concern about the authority of the Upstream Downstream group: who does it report to and how does it fit into giving advice to agencies and others? Most felt that the broad representation in the Upstream Downstream group provided a strong coalition of interests, to be able to move the legislature and OSE/ISC to take action on

issues of mutual interest among the regions. At a minimum, the group is perceived to have value as a venue for sharing information and ideas that affect the basin. This group could be a think tank to help propose solutions to water managers and others who have the authority to make changes.

Water Supply: The subgroup discussed the need to get a good inventory of basin water resources, including deep water brackish resources. There was some discussion of cloud seeking, surface water capture, and aquifer storage and recovery, but the subgroup focused on demand side strategies.

Water Conservation: There was support for Upstream Downstream to address water conservation. There was a sense that by starting with conservation, Up Down could proceed to work on other basin issues. There was a clear recognition that many conservation initiatives are in progress at the local level and don't need help from a basin-wide initiative. But since all three plans identify conservation implementation strategies, the subgroup examined whether any strategies might be more effectively approached from a basin-wide standpoint. Several participants were concerned that conserved water would be used to fuel growth. At one point, the subgroup coalesced around conservation as a proposed Upstream Downstream activity, because although conservation alone cannot not solve the basin's future deficit issues, it can provide a buffer against market pressures, providing time and space to work on the tougher issue of water transfers and their effects. The subgroup looked for conservation strategies in both the municipal and agricultural sectors.

At the municipal level there were several basin-level activities suggested: conservation education (e.g. supporting smaller communities' educational efforts); standardization of measurement and reporting (working together to develop common metrics so that comparisons and progress could be measured across regions); and development of building codes that result in water savings. The subgroup was also interested in pursuing a proposal for leak detection as a coalition of jurisdictions in the basin. Regarding agricultural conservation, the concept was to examine the potential, the feasibility, and the problems associated with agricultural conservation strategies. The sense of the group was that although there are diverse opinions on this subject. It would be worthwhile to explore agricultural conservation issues and prepare a report trying to clarify the reality of agricultural conservation as a viable approach to meeting future demand in the Middle Rio Grande Basin.

The subgroup met with the Interstate Stream Commission and Office of State Engineer staff in Santa Fe to discuss municipal and agricultural conservation and get more information to refine the draft proposals. The subgroup left this meeting feeling encouraged to work on standardization of reporting on municipal water usage and conservation (perhaps as a sounding board for OSE's on-going work with municipalities in this area) and discouraged from working on agricultural conservation. This was due to the ISC experience on the Pecos, the complexity of the hydrology in the Middle Rio Grande in assessing the effects of agricultural efficiency on reducing consumptive use, and the fact that in the Middle Rio Grande Basin, agricultural usage isn't a relatively big proportion usage compared to other parts of the State. The discussion in Santa Fe was illuminating and the subgroup wanted to present part of it for the full Upstream Downstream group.

Growth, new development and construction: Participants in the subgroup were divided about working on building code standards for water conservation. Some felt these were more appropriately addressed elsewhere. The subgroup considered a proposal that basin participants work together to develop guidelines for water use that could be used by the various jurisdictions within the basin. This would be different than working on building code standards. For example, when a large project is proposed, alternative approaches should be considered to get at the minimum practicable water use. Upstream Downstream could develop basin-wide standards for water use in new developments – e.g. for a certain type and intensity of development, various water conservation measures should be incorporated. There was a discussion about whether these standards would be advisory or regulatory. They might start as advisory, but some of the local jurisdictions may use them when confronted with a major or controversial proposal. Development is an issue that crosses regional boundaries and working together on common guidelines would be helpful to most of the jurisdictions in the basin. It was acknowledged that a big problem exists that there is little tie between land use plans and the regional water plans. This will be a difficult issue for Up Down and other groups to approach

Basin-wide forums/education: There is no mechanism to encourage the coordination of the plans in the three regions that make up the basin. The subgroup believes such a mechanism is needed along with a way of funding it. The consistency document, implementation template and problem statement will help in outreach efforts in the basin to educate policy-makers and others about our shared water future and the need to coordinate. An annual forum in the basin with new information on topics that affect all of the jurisdictions may be a means of both educating people and bringing them together to begin thinking like a basin. Participation of the tribes is extremely important.

Sharing of shortages: The ultimate challenge of Upstream Downstream might be to provide input into sharing of shortage arrangements. In the future, during water short years, curtailment will be required in order to meet the terms of the Rio Grande Compact. Overdrafting in any use sector or region will affect all of the others. In the absence of adjudication, water administration in the basin will be challenging (a gross understatement!). Upstream Downstream has the potential to provide a place where the dialogue about how to share shortages can begin.

Reservoir storage: Whether Upstream Downstream is the right group to look at finding ways of reducing evaporative losses was discussed. This is a subject that affects all entities in the basin.

Problem Statement: There was agreement on the need to clearly explain the problem that water use will eventually exceed demand even with implementation of all of the regional plan alternatives. Upstream Downstream participants need to more fully study and understand the consequences to the basin of not being in balance in its future water usage, including economic, social, and ecological consequences. Finally, a better understanding of the myriad consequences of non-compliance with the Rio Grande Compact and the vulnerability of the basin to long-term drought and climate change is needed.

DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK (11-3-06):

1. Context: Describe background and objectives of Upstream/Downstream; provide a short summary of the outcome of the 3 workshops; and describe the need for professional services (water resource planning, etc) to work on issues at a Basin-wide level (this will be several paragraphs)
2. Working with a Steering Committee as designated by the 3 planning regions (*needs discussion*), develop a plan to address the following areas:
 - a. Work on a water budget for the basin:
 - i. Utilizing the three regional plans (including background reports and studies as necessary) and the reconciliation work conducted by SSPA, prepare a report which consolidates the three budgets of the three plans.
 - ii. Use consistent terminology and units of measurement; describe rationale.
 - iii. Illustrate the report graphically.
 - iv. Clearly describe the points of difference and outline any data gaps.
 - b. Support for implementation of regional water plans:
 - i. Identify priority areas where cooperative action at a basin level may provide assistance in implementation of regional plans.
 - ii. Identify priority areas where State action may provide assistance in implementation of regional plans.
 - iii. Provide direction on specific strategies and potential means of cooperation/funding sources.

(I believe this covers the point in the notes, "Address certain policies together" so I left that bullet out. I also left out the Govr's Year of Water since if something is going to be done, it would need to happen short term and doesn't belong in this scope. Susan)
 - c. Identify conflicts:
 - i. Provide a report (or section of the report which identifies the conflicts between the three plans). Interview regional plan participants if necessary to fully understand these issues. Use the Upstream/Downstream report for a discussion of several of the areas.
 - ii. Provide information as necessary to illustrate the conflicting policies.
 - iii. Discuss options to pursue – either short or long term - in order to resolve the conflicts (Including, at least; 1) address potential pathways and constraints to developing shortage sharing strategies, and 2) addressing recommendations for water transfer policies.)
 - d. Prepare a communication plan – outline your approach to working with the three regions, the OSE/ISE, other technical resource agencies, and local governments as necessary.
 - e. Suggest an organizational structure for continuing future communication among the three regions.

**REGIONAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES MATRIX
FROM ISC - DRAFT**

(Working Copy - modified to show only the three Up-Down regions - Nov. 06)

	Region	Jemez y Sangre Region 3	Middle Rio Grande Region 12	Socorro- Sierra Region 15
RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES				
DEVELOPMENT (INFRASTRUCTURE)				
1	Maintain/Manage/ Construct Reservoirs	Investigate potential for new reservoirs. Dredge existing reservoirs to increase storage capacity (Santa Cruz and Nambe).#16	Move EB water upstream	Store Elephant Butte water in upstream reservoirs to reduce evaporation losses counted against the region. Establish a permanent recreation pool in Elephant Butte. Investigate feasibility of new reservoir between El Vado and Socorro.
2	Construct New/ Manage Well Fields	Improvements to existing well fields, install new well fields, create/improve new/existing community water systems.	City of Albuquerque	
3	Watershed Management	Potential yield is evaluated for each watershed. Most land where management would be applied is in wilderness areas and would not be treated.	Investigate and plan.	To improve yield from forest and pinon/juniper zones
4	Brackish Water Desalinization	Investigate potential. Long range.	Import treated brackish water (Estancia Basin)	Long range; pilot project
5	Underground Resources Investigation	Develop additional ground water.		San Augustin Basin
6	Aquifer Storage and Recovery	Investigation into use of municipal wastewater.	Support research and implement; storm flows	Support research
7	Flood Control - Aquifer Recharge	Storm water management	Provide appropriate infrastructure.	
8	Reclaimed Water Reuse	Return flow credits, ASR, irrigation, mfg or industry. #13	Grey water reuse; treated effluent;	Municipal infrastructure
9	Surface Water Treatment	San Juan Chama Project water. Recommendation #23	San Juan Chama Project	
10	Surface Water Capture	Catchment basins, water harvesting and ASR; additional storage in Abiquiu Reservoir. #2 Appropriate flood flows. #7 and #14	Control runoff for recharge	
11	Water Importation	San Juan Chama Project water. Recommendation #23	San Juan Chama Project	
12	Rainfall Augmentation (Cloud Seeding)	Investigate and implement pilot program. #3		
13	Public Drinking Water Systems	Repair leaks.	Albuquerque Drinking Water Project	
14	Construct New Sewer	Pojoaque/Espanola Valleys		
15	Produced Water			

**REGIONAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES MATRIX
FROM ISC - DRAFT**

(Working Copy - modified to show only the three Up-Down regions - Nov. 06)

	Region	Jemez y Sangre Region 3	Middle Rio Grande Region 12	Socorro- Sierra Region 15
16	Measuring and Monitoring Program		Establish program and necessary infrastructure.	Gage diversions from the Low Flow Conveyance Channel; MRGCD canals; metering on farm deliveries
17	Control Brush and Weeds			Needs funding of \$30,000 per year for each county. See also invasive plant removal.
18	Irrigation Conveyance System Improvements	Line ditches to reduce losses (Santa Cruz, Velarde) #15		Improve efficiency; improve on farm efficiency; line and pipe systems
19	Regional Water Plan Update	Region is active with staging implementation of the recommendations in the regional water plan. Funds are needed now or feasibility studies.	Establish permanent source or funding for updates. Implementation program is designed.	Ensure region is included in water management decisions that affect the region. Establish continuous funding for water planning in the region.
20	Bosque Restoration		Construct/protect wetlands, evaluate instream flow, healthy ecosystems, etc.	
21	Develop regional database		GIS program - coordinate with measuring and monitoring	
MANAGEMENT				
22	Acquire/Retire Water Rights	Develop additional ground water.	Adjudicate and settle the water rights. Provide for active administration (OSE). Move water rights upstream from Socorro County.	No condemnation of water rights (see legal issues).
23	Adjudicate Water	Above the Ottowi Gage		
24	Conjunctive	Recommendation #6		
25	Agricultural Water		See water bank.	See water bank.
26	Control Domestic Wells	In critical management areas. #5	Establish a policy	Identify critical locations. No development of agricultural lands and transfer of rights to subdivisions.
27	Construct New			
28	Declare Basin			
29	Critical Area Administrative Criteria	Control domestic wells in critical management areas.	Strengthen conjunctive use management techniques	
30	Establish Water Authority	Investigate the opportunity.		Oversee water bank and research
31	Reduction of depletions			See Irrigation System Improvements
32	Appropriate Groundwater	Investigate new well field locations and establish declarations.		

**REGIONAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES MATRIX
FROM ISC - DRAFT**

(Working Copy - modified to show only the three Up-Down regions - Nov. 06)

	Region	Jemez y Sangre Region 3	Middle Rio Grande Region 12	Socorro- Sierra Region 15
33	Water Market	Identify available agricultural water rights for M&I use. Recommendation #24.		Retain water rights in region
34	40 year (municipal) water plans			
35	Computer Model	Numerical model is needed. #4	Continue to update	
36	Local Ordinances	See Conservation.		See Conservation plan.
37	Water Trust Fund (Regional)		Establish permanent source	
38	Public Education			See conservation.
39	NMOSE Basin Criteria			
40	Climate Monitoring Program			
41	Drought Management Plan	Methods are discussed. Responsibility will be local government.		
42	Growth Management	Implement controls that assure a sustainable supply is available. Recommendation #22	Limit new golf courses. Tie land use plans to water resources plans. Impose impact fees.	Require proof of sustainable water supply for new development; zoning; offset requirements; conservation easements; area of origin protections; public welfare of the region's economy
43	Invasive Plant Removal		Bosque.	Remove exotic vegetation, control brush and weeds; develop economies around waste materials; estimated cost is \$1000 per acre.
44	Reduce Reservoir Surface Area		Elephant Butte	Engineered locations; control releases to coordinate flow with demand
45	Riparian Area Protection			
46	Water Bank	Administrative procedures and use for drought management.	Develop clear policy. Pursue legislation. Include short term leasing, forbearance.	Retain water rights in region; investigate program
47	Control Surface Water Evaporation			Both surface and engineered locations; complete Pilot Channel; store water in low elevation reservoirs in high elevation reservoirs.
48	Interregional Management	Transfer water rights across the Otowi Gage.		Facilitate agreements.
49	Regional Water Plan Update		Implementation strategy - continuous water resources planning program.	Establish permanent funding for planning

**REGIONAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES MATRIX
FROM ISC - DRAFT**

(Working Copy - modified to show only the three Up-Down regions - Nov. 06)

	Region	Jemez y Sangre Region 3	Middle Rio Grande Region 12	Socorro- Sierra Region 15
50	Inter-regional management		Work with adjacent regions on water resources issues.	
CONSERVATION				
51	Water Audit	Implement for municipal or community water systems.#17		
52	Plumbing Retrofit		Convert to low flow	
53	Water Conservation M&I	Local ordinances and programs.	Xeriscape; harvest rainwater; price structures;	Local programs; including drought contingency
54	Water Conservation - AG	Line ditches to reduce losses	Upgrade conveyance systems; level fields;	Rotational scheduling; balance flood irrigation with drip and sprinkler systems; use of serge valves, gated piping; see also Appendix H
55	Metering		See monitoring.	See Development
56	Watering Practices			See Water Conservation
57	Codes and Ordinances			Municipal
58	Evaluate Existing Infrastructure			Canal seepage losses, evaluate the Socorro Ditch, lining and piping of major canals
59	Public Education		Augment existing programs.	
60	Water Conservation Plan			See Appendix H
WATER QUALITY				
61	Public Education			Region's economy is rural agriculture.
62	Monitoring Program	Areas where septic systems proliferate	Sampling regularly.	
63	Well Head Protection	Identify areas vulnerable to contamination (mining sites, municipal sewers, landfills, UST sites	Identify point sources.	Identify areas vulnerable to contamination (mining sites, municipal sewers, landfills, UST sites
64	Sewer System	Construct regional systems.		
65	Septic Tank Effluent	Removal of trace constituents; construct regional systems.	Mitigate with centralized system	Rules and Regulations
66	Manage Watersheds			Improve water quality

DRAFT PROPOSAL (2-23-07)

1. Develop a water planning budget for the MRGB.

- a. Standardize the water budgets of the three regional plans. Utilize the plans, background reports prepared for the plans, other relevant studies, and the reconciliation work conducted by SSPA. Clearly describe the points of difference and outline any data gaps and disparities in the level of data. Use consistent terminology and units of measurement; including demand projections, water usage and conservation reporting, and projected water supply. Prepare a report which reconciles the budgets of the three plans; illustrates the reconciled budget graphically; and fully describes the conclusions and rationale.
- b. Identify within each region whether regional budgets are consistent with the planning of major water management agencies within the region.
- c. Review the inventory of water resources used in the Middle Rio Grande Water Supply study and the regional plans and evaluate whether all viable sources are addressed. Identify where data and research is needed.
- d. Develop a matrix for each region which shows inflows and outflows by both subbasins and water management entities.
- e. Modify or run existing water supply models to compare and contrast the possible outcomes of implementing proposed projects on the MRGB water budget.

2. Cooperate at a Basin level to implement specific regional plan recommendations for water conservation. Cooperate on strategies that benefit from a basin-wide focus, and do not duplicate local efforts. Strategies for consideration include:

Municipal conservation:

- a. Support stricter building code regulations to level the playing field for builders and increase conservation. Determine the impact of proposed changes in building codes on water use.
- b. Encourage economic development activity that is "water-wise."
- c. Promote water conservation education and publicity for success stories basin-wide. Provide support to smaller communities by sharing resources. Work with State to obtain funding and develop programs to fill needs.)
- d. Develop a standard way of comparing gallons per capita per day (gpcd) for varying ratios of commercial and industrial activity per capita. This would allow more effective comparison of water use in the different cities and towns in the Basin.
- e. Work together on unaccounted for water reduction plans. Share data and make a joint proposal for leak detection funding and technical assistance.

Agricultural Conservation:

- a. Examine what can be done to make agricultural water conservation successful. Consider all background materials, proposed legislation, State Engineer studies and policies, and related initiatives. Consider property tax revisions and incentive programs. Include analysis of unintended consequences of agricultural conservation strategies, such as impairment and effects on the hydrology in the basin. Develop a report with recommendations. For approaches not deemed feasible, clearly state findings.
 - b. Investigate the evaporative losses saved by reducing Project Diversion Requirements (PDR) and Farm Delivery Requirements (FDR) and explore incentive programs. This probably would involve the installation of better measurement equipment and filing conservation plans in advance that can be monitored and, if effective, reward the farmer with water for lease or sale.
 - c. Develop clear recommendations on regional water banking, addressing such issues as voluntary short-term transfers to address emergency conditions; enforcement of conditions of transfer; and others.
3. Create a basin-wide water education program, including water conservation education and publicity for success stories, and also basic information about water in our basin. Develop a training program for elected officials and decision-makers.
 4. Establish a Basin watershed forum. Propose two meetings per year with new information for attendees on basin issues. Meetings would be by open invite, but include broad-based group of agencies, citizens, tribal officials. This will help us move towards thinking like a basin and bring in people who were not actively involved in the regional water planning process.