

Sherman HPA SH-1
November 3, 2008 Meeting
Participant Comments (C) / Questions (Q) and District Responses (R)

Q: How many irrigated acres are in GMD 4?

R: Approximately 400,000 – but the actual number is unknown due to water right overlaps and other data accounting conditions.

C: Questioned the use of the ¼ Township process to aggregate HPA sections

R: Not much can be done about this at this time, but will relay the comment to the board.

C: There should be a philosophy of all within the HPA sharing the solution.

R: This is a stakeholder position which will be provided to the board and which appears to be consistent with the HPA process and current statutes and regulations.

C: Don't like triggers. They result in lines that don't treat neighbors the same.

R: Not much can be done about this at this time, but will relay the comment to the board.

C: How much pumpage needs to be reduced to bring this HPA's decline rate to the GMD average?

R: The groundwater aquifer model (due soon) will give us the best answer. Such an approach would require the most recent average HPA decline rate of 1.5 feet/yr to become .5 feet/yr. However, the average HPA decline rate changes depending on what specific years (time period) are considered. Another way to look at it is: An average of 22,000 AF pumped annually in this HPA has been resulting in an average 1.5 feet/yr decline rate. 11,000 AF pumped should approach a .75 feet/yr decline rate – all else being equal.

C: The HPA goal should be to reduce the area's average decline rate by 1 foot/year within 2-5 years by voluntary incentive (WTAP approach) only.

R: This is a stakeholder position which will be provided to the board and which appears to be consistent with the HPA process and current statutes and regulations.

Q: Can GMD4 raise enough money to conduct a WTAP approach for this HPA entirely with local funds?

R: Depends on how much time we want to apply such a local program. Certainly not in the 2-5 years suggested above. Maxing our water user charge over the entire GMD (assess \$1 per AF rather than the current \$.33) would raise an additional \$540,000.00 per year for WTAP purposes.

Q: Can the GMD increase its water user charge above \$1 per AF?

R: Not without a statutory change (current rate caps are set by statute).

C: GMD should max the water user charge and do a local WTAP program, by HPA, starting with the most severe (most decline) HPA.

R: This is a stakeholder position which will be provided to the board and which appears to be consistent with the HPA process and current statutes and regulations.

C: A listing of each HPA's discussion points and options considered should be posted on the website.

R: Will be considered.

C: Another meeting is desired

R: District will work with the board to set another meeting later this winter for this HPA, and sufficiently advertise to get the word out.

(NOTE: The above items were merely captured as comments/questions/discussion points. No final decisions or recommendations were made by the meeting participants regarding any of them.)