

**Sheridan HPA SD-6  
June 17, 2009 Meeting  
Participant Comments (C) / Questions (Q) and District Responses (R)**

**C: I am still thinking “allocations” as the solution. Something needs to be done to reduce water use.**

**C: Whatever is done, it must be enforceable. Voluntary solutions will not work or be fair.**

**Q: Are there as of yet undiscussed options?**

R: One program that has not been discussed is the currently available multi-year flex accounts (MFA) – using this voluntary procedure to bring about reduced water use. The advantages are: can be done outside an IGUCA; can be tailored to any goal statement chosen; allows maximum flexibility of use for water remaining under the converted right; and is a 5-year process subject to review (and probably adjustment) every 5 years. Disadvantages are: currently a voluntary program – we’d need to find a way to make it mandatory; the MFA permits issued are based on actual historical water use, so they will be less equal than an allocation approach (tending to advantage those who pumped higher amounts of water); and currently requires the chief engineer to evaluate each water right and set up a MFA account individually.

**C: Clarification – an allocation approach will require an IGUCA and an MFA approach will not?**

R: This is mostly correct. While an allocation approach will require an IGUCA, the MFA approach would not require an IGUCA. However, to make it mandatory will require a local regulation - which is being explored at this time, but is currently unknown. Moreover, if an IGUCA is requested, the IGUCA could require either approach so long as a strong enough case is built, and the chief engineer so decides.

**C: For any HPA reduction in water use it seems the HPA area will be subsidizing non-HPA neighbors. Don’t think we’re pumping any more per well than users outside the HPA, we just have a higher density of wells pumping. As such, we need to reduce the wells.**

R: This is the exercise at hand. Reducing pumpage can come in a number of ways – reducing wells completely, reducing pumpage from all wells, scheduling pumpage, etc. The neighbors facing each other on either side of a HPA boundary is always going to be an issue.

**C: We need to ease into the problem. I’d support an initial 10% reduction for 5 years and then step back and take a look before continuing on.**

R: This is a possibility.

**Q: How was the area designated? Was it based on the 9 observation wells?**

R: The observation wells were used to generate an interpolated water level value for the center of every section. The 1997 section-center values were subtracted from the 2006 values and any section that declined 9% or more was identified. The reported water use was also aggregated for every section and any section that had more than 275 AF of annually reported water use was identified. Next, any ¼ Township that had two or more identified sections, was designated as a HPA ¼ Township. Finally, the ¼ Townships were combined to form the 6 HPA areas.

**Q: Should a survey be sent to all water users asking for input on alternatives?**

R: GMD 4 would support such an effort if desired. (This idea was discussed and consensus was that it would likely do little good)

**C: Organization is critical. The SD-6 HPA needs some form of organization. How do we provide a goal and a desired approach to the board without a recognizable organization?**

R: The group is free to organize any way they feel best or are comfortable with – formally or informally.

**Q: Can the MFA data that was discussed be placed on the website?**

R: Yes, it will be posted as soon as we can – likely tomorrow.

**C: The entire group present today should become the steering committee to begin advancing alternatives for consideration by everyone involved. Brent Rogers and Mitch Baalman should head the effort to capture several possible approaches to reducing water use. The resulting list should then be sent to all water users for consideration/discussion and soon thereafter another HPA meeting should be set.** (This comment was agreed to by all present and will be promoted.)

(NOTE: The above items were merely captured as comments/questions/discussion points. With the exception of the last comment, no final decisions or recommendations were made by the meeting participants. If any participant feels these notes are in error or need more clarification, GMD staff should be contacted about those concerns.)