SUBMIT OPTION SUBMITTAL FORM BY:
1. EMAIL TO: COLORADORIVERBASINSTUDY@USBR.GOV
2. U.S. MAIL TO: BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, ATTENTION MS. PAM ADAMS, LC-2721, P.O. BOX 61470, BOULDER CITY, NV 89006-1470
3. FACSIMILE TO: 702-293-8418

Option Submittal Form

Contact Information (optional): ☐ **Keep my contact information private.**

Contact Name: _____ Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: E-mail Address:

Date Option Submitted: 1/27/2012

Option Name:

Informal Basin-wide Stakeholder Governance Process

Description of Option:

The purpose of this option is to establish an informal governance mechanism by which a broad range of non-governmental stakeholders can engage with each other with regard to long-term, basin-scale solutions for water supply and management challenges in the Colorado River Basin, and provide collective input into formal governmental decision making processes. This option would establish a process designed to build on the findings of the Basin Study and carry that work forward following its completion.

In this option, Colorado Basin stakeholders would, on their own initiative, establish a "parallel process" that would serve as a forum for discussing long-term water solutions for the basin. All interested non-governmental Colorado Basin stakeholders, as well as Native American tribes, would be welcome to participate in the process. Meetings would be open to the interested public, and to representatives of the basin states and the Bureau, although participation would be limited to representatives of the various stakeholder groups. The participants would meet regularly to discuss ongoing issues and proposals, including the options and opportunities analyzed in the Basin Study. The group would function as a forum for sharing views on issues in Colorado Basin water management, for developing proposals related to water management, and for providing input to the basin states and Bureau as appropriate opportunities arise. The group would set its own rules for decision making, which could be by consensus, by majority vote, by supermajority, or any other model the group chose to adopt. The group would set its own rules for decision making, which could be by consensus, by majority vote, by supermajority, or any other model the group chose to adopt.

The "parallel process" would not have any formally recognized status in statute or regulation, and its recommendations would be advisory only. That said, any

recommendations that emerged from a broad and inclusive stakeholder group would likely be highly influential. Moreover, some existing regulatory mechanisms provide a direct avenue for agencies to consider input from such a group. *See, e.g.,* 43 CFR § 46.110 (providing that in decisions subject to the NEPA process, the Bureau must consider alternatives produced by consensus-based processes).

A variety of politically neutral public or private institutions could serve as the instigator/ convener of the stakeholder process. This could be public universities – as was done in the case of the Universities Consortium on Columbia River Governance - or an appropriate charitable foundation or non-governmental organization, similar to an entity, for example, such as the Great Lakes Coalition. The process could be funded through various mechanisms, including public and private grants.

The parallel process would provide important benefits. A wide range of stakeholders - including environmental groups, Tribes, rural farm communities, and others - have a strong interest in the outcome of Colorado Basin water management decisions, but no direct representation in the negotiations among the basin states and Bureau of Reclamation through which most such decisions are typically made. A governance mechanism would provide a forum in which these stakeholders could discuss various solutions options in a structured way, with the goal of producing a set of solutions that enjoy public support among a broad range of interests. The stakeholder group would be an important source of input for the basin states and Bureau to consider in negotiations involving long-term water management. Solutions vetted through a diverse stakeholder group will be less likely to undergo litigation, more likely to receive public funding, and will be easier to implement effectively.

Location: Describe location(s) where option could be implemented and other areas that the option would affect, if applicable. Attach a map, if applicable.

Basin-wide

Quantity and Timing: Roughly quantify the range of the potential amount of water that the option could provide over the next 50 years and in what timeframe that amount could be available. If option could be implemented in phases, include quantity estimates associated with each phase. If known, specify any important seasonal (e.g., more water could be available in winter) and/or frequency (e.g., more water could likely be available during above-average hydrologic years) considerations. If known, describe any key assumptions made in order to quantify the potential amount.

SUBMIT OPTION SUBMITTAL FORM BY:

1. EMAIL TO: COLORADORIVERBASINSTUDY@USBR.GOV
2. U.S. MAIL TO: BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, ATTENTION MS. PAM ADAMS, LC-2721, P.O. BOX 61470, BOULDER CITY, NV 89006-1470
3. FACSIMILE TO: 702-293-8418

N/A

SUBMIT OPTION SUBMITTAL FORM BY:
1. EMAIL TO: COLORADORIVERBASINSTUDY@USBR.GOV
2. U.S. MAIL TO: BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, ATTENTION MS. PAM ADAMS, LC-2721, P.O. BOX 61470, BOULDER CITY, NV 89006-1470
3. FACSIMILE TO: 702-293-8418

Additional Information

Technical Feasibility: Describe the maturity and feasibility of the concept/technology being proposed, and what research and/or technological development might first be needed.

This option is feasible. Stakeholder groups have been used in various US river basins and have proved a workable means of providing stakeholder input into natural resource governance decisions. A prominent example is the Universities Consortium on Columbia River Governance.

Costs: Provide cost and funding information, if available, including capital, operations, maintenance, repair, replacement, and any other costs and sources of funds (e.g., public, private, or both public and private). Identify what is and is not included in the provided cost numbers and provide references used for cost justification. Methodologies for calculating unit costs (e.g., $/acre-foot or $/million gallons) vary widely; therefore, do not provide unit costs without also providing the assumed capital and annual costs for the option, and the methodology used to calculate unit costs.

The stakeholder group would have a budget in the range of tens of thousands of dollars per year, most of which would relate to travel and meeting costs. The most likely sources of funding would be a mix of agency and foundation grants matched with in-kind donations from member groups.

Permitting: List the permits and/or approvals required and status of any permits and/or approvals received.

N/A

Legal / Public Policy Considerations: Describe legal/public policy considerations associated with the option. Describe any agreements necessary for implementation and any potential water rights issues, if known.

The stakeholder group could assist the implementation of various other solution options. For example, by providing a forum for airing differences and working out compromises between different stakeholder factions, the group could streamline the process of designing and implementing a wide range of physical and institutional options such as: rules governing water banking/ transfers; size, location, and operation of storage reservoirs; flow regimes for existing reservoirs; design, location and mitigation measures associated with augmentation options.; and others.

Implementation Risk / Uncertainty: Describe any aspects of the option that involves risk or uncertainty related to implementing the option.

Establishing an effective and representative stakeholder group with a sustained presence will be a challenge, given the size and complexity of the Colorado River Basin. Success is not assured; however, there are no significant risks or downsides if the effort is unsuccessful.

Reliability: Describe the anticipated reliability of the option and any known risks to supply or demand, such as: drought risk, water contamination risk, risk of infrastructure failure, etc.

SUBMIT OPTION SUBMITTAL FORM BY:

1. EMAIL TO: COLORADORIVERBASINSTUDY@USBR.GOV
2. U.S. MAIL TO: BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, ATTENTION MS. PAM ADAMS, LC-2721, P.O. BOX 61470, BOULDER CITY, NV 89006-1470
3. FACSIMILE TO: 702-293-8418

Water Quality: Identify key water quality implications (salinity and other constituents) associated with the option in all of the locations the option may affect.

N/A

Energy Needs: Describe, and quantify if known, the energy needs associated with the option. Include any energy required to obtain, treat, and deliver the water to the defined location at the defined quality.

Energy Required	Source(s) of Energy
N/A	

Hydroelectric Energy Generation: Describe, and quantify if known, any anticipated increases or decreases in hydroelectric energy generation as a result of the option.

Location of Generation	Impact to Generation
N/A	

Recreation: Describe any anticipated positive or negative effects on recreation.

Location(s)	Anticipate Benefits or Impacts
N/A	

Environment: Describe any anticipated positive or negative effects on ecosystems within or outside of the Colorado River Basin.

Location(s)	Anticipated Benefits or Impacts
N/A	

Socioeconomics: Describe anticipated positive or negative socioeconomic (social and economic factors) effects.

The option would have significant positive socioeconomic effects to the extent that it gives a broad range of affected groups – rural farm communities, Tribes, conservationists, small agricultural operators, and others – an effective forum to voice their concerns and have input into water governance decisions. It would have positive economic effects to the extent that it built broad political support for solution

sets, which would tend to avoid litigation, help secure funding, and improve implementation.

Other Information: Provide other information as appropriate, including potential secondary benefits or considerations. Attach supporting documentation or references, if applicable.

See the report *Governing Like a River Basin – Options for Expanded Stakeholder Engagement in the Colorado River Basin*, Carpe Diem West 2011.