

Laramie County Control Area Steering Committee

Meeting Summary

May 18, 2015

Herschler Building, Cheyenne, WY

Draft for Review

Approved

Participants:

Bill Bonham, *Laramie County Stock Growers*
Jim Cochran, *LC Conservation District*
Bill Edwards, *Southeast Wyoming Builders Association*
Kristi Hansen, *University of Wyoming*
Jim Hastings, *Alternate*
Gary Hickman, *Cheyenne/Laramie County Health*
Brenda Johnson, *Alternate*
Judy Johnstone, *Small municipalities*
Rick Kaysen, *City of Cheyenne*

Jim Lerwick, *Ag/Irrigators*
Jim Murphy, *Cheyenne Board of Public Utilities*
Joe Patterson, *Southeast Wyoming Builders Association*
Bonnie Reider, *South Cheyenne Community Development Association*
Lisa Tabke, *Cheyenne Board of Realtors*
Troy Thompson, *Laramie County Commissioners*

Facilitators:

Steve Smutko, *UW Ruckelshaus Institute*
Shannon Glendenning, *UW Ruckelshaus Institute*

Agenda:

1. Welcome; Steering Committee member introductions; Agenda review & approval; Announcements
2. Review and adoption of the 05/04/15 meeting summary
3. Harry LaBonde, Director, Water Development Commission
4. Report back from Committee members
5. Next Steps Document Review:
 - a. "Visions of plan"
 - b. Clarify Objectives
6. Review Proposed Future Steps
7. Adjourn

Handouts:

1. 05/18/15 Draft Agenda
2. 5/4/15 Draft Meeting Summary
3. Next Steps for the Laramie County Control Area Plan Steering Committee
4. Economic Assessment of Alternative Groundwater Management Scenarios in Laramie County. Possible Research Proposal to WWDC/USGS

Presentations:

Harry LaBonde, Director, Water Development Commission

Action Items Completed:

Agenda approved
5/4/15 Meeting Summary Approved

Summary:

C=Comment Q= Comment R=Response

1. *Welcome; Steering Committee member introductions; Agenda review & approval; Announcements*

Steve Smutko opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

Committee members introduced themselves.

Steve described the purpose of the meeting as focusing around where the committee left off, talking about the development of a groundwater management plan. Harry LaBonde is present to answer questions and describe the role of the Wyoming Water Development Commission. Laramie County Planners are here to provide information about the Laramie County Comprehensive Plan update that is happening right now. The agenda was approved.

2. *Review and adoption of the 05/04/15 meeting summary*

A change to page 5, should read “there are 145 new homes per year, which is the same as $\frac{3}{4}$ of a center pivot in water usage. In 20 years, that’s the same as putting 20 center pivots in Cheyenne.”
The meeting summary was approved with changes above.

3. *Harry LaBonde, Director, Water Development Commission*

Steve contacted Harry LaBonde so he could report on cost sharing of metering and the activities of the Water Development Commission

Harry: The Wyoming Water Development Commission has been funding water projects since the 1980s. You see the agency name with weather modification efforts. The governor’s water strategy is front and center in the agency, 10 reservoirs in the next 10 years.

Our general water project starts with a Level 1 study, a master plan reconnaissance study where you look at a water system and the report has an inventory of the system and the needs and some prioritizations of the projects. Then a Level 2 study, a feasibility study, the owner picks a project i.e. a water storage tank, a pipeline replacing a diversion structure, and then it looks at the issues, and develops a game plan to implement the project with a good cost estimate. Then a Level 3 study looks at design and construction of the project. Then the agency will grant up to a 67% grant to that entity and a potential for a loan for the rest, then a proposal is made and bid out. That’s how we make projects.

If you look at the water development authorization statutes, Title 41 Chapter 2 are the water development statutes. Water Development has a broad reach. We can get involved in anything with water, i.e. flood control, conservation, new water development, recreation and environmental issues. It’s a broad piece of legislation. From our authorizing statutes, there are other things that start to restrict our involvement in water projects and one is the Wyoming Constitution. Article 16 Section 6: *“Neither the state nor any county, city, township, town, school district, or any other political subdivision, shall loan or give its credit or make donations to or in aid of any individual, association or corporation, except for necessary support of the poor.”* We can’t work with individual people or corporations. We deal with public entities including municipalities, irrigation districts, water and sewer districts, improvement and service districts, watershed improvement districts, and to a lesser extent Conservation Districts. Conservation Districts aren’t operators of water systems. There are other entities that do that. We get involved with Conservation Districts because we do watershed studies. The sponsors that bring projects to us are public entities.

The other thing that has happened over time is that we have a broad range of water issues, but like any government entity, our funding is limited. We’re funded with a percentage of severance taxes that flow into the severance tax distribution account. It’s capped at \$155 million. Water Development account 1 gets 12.45% and account 2 gets 3% and account 3 gets 0.5%. That’s the entire revenue stream. We manage projects from those three accounts. Water development account 1 is for new development, account 2 is for rehabilitation of exiting projects, and account 3 is for building new dams and reservoirs.

If you look at our operating criteria, one thing we do in here, we have criteria that has been approved by the commission and within the document it talks about priorities of projects for new development. It gives you a list of projects, multipurpose storage, and irrigation, municipal, rural, domestic, and domestic with independent water supplies, hydropower studies. What you don’t see are things like erosion control, flood protection, recreation, and environmental projects. Specifically, we have a section on projects we are not funding.

Why has the commission taken the step of saying we’re not going to get involved in those projects, and the reason is strictly funding available? If we get involved in flood control or erosion control projects then we aren’t going to have enough funds to build new reservoirs, municipal water systems, irrigation districts. The Commission has decided that with the limited funding stream, we need to focus on development of new water in the state.

Another priority of the commission is rehabilitation. We may not fund a distribution system that is a 6 inch pipeline to a city system, we will fund a 24" pipeline that brings water from the source into town. We're really about development and rehabilitation of existing facilities. We need to be able to take care of what we have before we build anything new. The rehab account gets used for irrigation systems around the state.

I've been following this process. I used to work for the State Engineer. There are two ways where it could be said Water Development can help. The first item if the issues is the groundwater withdrawal is too great, can Water Development get involved with purchasing those wells and then retiring those water rights, abandoning the water right. Knowing that our goal is new water development or rehabilitation of existing facilities is something we have not done in our history, is retiring water rights. We are not in the business of abandoning water rights, we're in the business of developing new water rights. That's a stretch based on our history. That's something we've not done, and I don't know how the commission will look at that. Is it within our authorities? Yes. But I'm not sure how that would be received, that we've turned our program around and are trying to take out of production water out of the state. I understand we're producing too much water out of the aquifer. That's something we've not funded before. Our rehabilitation account, we have issues there where we can't fund all of the rehab projects coming to us.

The other issue is the cost of putting meters on these wells by virtue of the State Engineer's Order. Water Development has funded meters on new municipal wells, where we develop a well, we drill the well, put the pump in there, and part of that is putting a meter. We have paid for 'turn outs' on irrigation systems that might have a weir. It's not a meter, it's a method to measure water so the irrigation districts can know how much water they are delivering down the lateral. In those cases, those are public facilities that are owned and operated by that respective government subdivision.

Back to private wells, this is not a new issues with the Commission. It's been 5 or 6 years ago there was an Order issued in Big Piney, that superintendent ordered water measurement facilities on over 200 surface water diversions in the Big Piney, and the Cottonwood Creek drainage, and they do that because if they are getting called to regulate water, they have to know how much water is going down ditch. There was a request for Water Development to fund it. It's a public order, but it's an obligation of the water user if so ordered by the state engineer or the superintendent. There was a recent order out of Horse Creek. There was an order that required metering on all ground and surface water uses. Some discussion at that time, can water development help? We got into the issue that it was going to benefit private water irrigators, and water development is not the entity to fund that. It's the limitations we have on funding and constitutional issue that says we can't give funds for private development. I'm willing to take questions.

Q: At our last meeting we talked about the possibility of developing a groundwater management plan. Does that fit in the commission's wheelhouse?

R: It is a planning effort, but it is something the Commission would have to weigh in on. In the history of the commission, we get involved in watershed studies, but we have not reached down to the point where I would say it's a county planning effort. That's not to say we couldn't. A comprehensive plan at the local level is not something we've gotten involved in. Any comprehensive plan should have a water component. I'll be negative about that because our charge and mission is to develop water. If the plan is to develop more water and we do plans for groundwater development. If the purpose is to restrict water development I'm not sure that's how we'd be received. That might be an effort that's better at the county level.

Q: Do you see the situation that Laramie county is facing, spread across the state?

R: As populations grow you'll continue to see more conflicts with groundwater usage and withdrawals. The most common conflict we see is conjunctive use, that groundwater wells are installed later in the system than surface water diversions. A big part of Nebraska v. Wyoming litigation in 1986. There were 300 shallow wells basically taking surface water which that Nebraska was entitled to 75% of the surface water and

Wyoming said it was groundwater. The ruling was in favor of Nebraska.

In Gillette, started with wells in the vicinity of the community, and they have outgrown that, and in the late 1970s, there was the Madison pipeline to bring water into town from 40 miles away and within the next few years, we'll finish a \$217 million project to bring a second pipeline and additional water sources in. Inside Gillette, they have struggled with declining aquifers. The State Engineer has spacing requirements on new wells going in, and that has precluded new development in the Fort Union formation.

Groundwater is a component of Montana v. Wyoming litigation. Green River, not so much. As demands on the aquifers grow, then you'll see more and more of these impacts.

Q: Throughout our discussions we've talked about highest and best use which has led to the idea of an economic analysis for the county and where the highest and best use of our water resources should be. It's my understanding that the Wyoming Water Development Commission has funded those studies in different communities in the past.

R: I am not aware of a highest and best use. Our planning studies with municipalities ask 'what does the system entail? What kind of growth is the community experiencing? What are current water supplies and how does it match up with population and projections? Looking at where new water sources may develop'. I'm not aware we've gone to the question of "preferred uses" municipal and domestic supply being a preferred use over irrigation or railroads and hydropower at the bottom. Because society has changed in the last 100 years we're no longer as much of an agricultural supplier, and since ag water rights are more senior, there is a move towards taking that irrigation water and moving it to a higher or preferred use. My thoughts to that idea is let the economic model work. Highest and best use is best determined on the market. If you look at the Dave Johnson Power Plant, on the North Platte River, it has a junior water right on the North Platte system. They weren't going to make that investment without a firm water supply. They went out to the open market place and they acquired senior irrigation rights and changed the use from irrigation to industrial in that circumstance. To me, let the marketplace work rather than having government try to dictate what is the highest and best use. This conversation is going on in California right now. Where people need water now, so let's take it away from the ag sector. I don't think our water law system will support that.

R: An analysis of how the water is being used would be of value to us.

R: The State Engineer may have a fair amount of information. In our water planning efforts, we will go through a river basin and we're updating the Platte River Plan, which includes the South Platte. We're looking at the industrial uses, municipal uses, irrigation uses. By and far, 85% of the water used in the state is irrigation and there's 15% that shows up in industrial and municipal uses.

I would urge caution about highest and best use. I can guarantee you there are people in the Lower Colorado Basin that will say they are more efficient in what they can produce on a volume of water. That's a dangerous risk for Wyoming. Our water was divided by a compact in the Colorado River Basin. Wyoming has an allocation on that basis, Wyoming should decide how to use the water.

Q: I'm from Burns and I want to say thank you for all you have done for our town.

R: You're welcome, in the development of the State Engineer's Order I worked to figure out the well that was drilled as a test well, and we make this investment in Burns.

I don't mean to be negative. My program is geared to developing Wyoming water resources. There is a lot of water for Wyoming to develop, not as much in the Platte Basin. In other basins, we look at storage projects. If we don't have new water to develop, is there a place to put water?

Q: Development of water, in that fits the potential water from of out of basin coming to Laramie County, which you have been involved in. The next step is, once that water is here, the potential for that to be utilized several times. Starting at the municipal level, then collected and allowed to recharge streams that have been depleted, the Crow Creek model that we have. The pieces of that you indicated you could and couldn't work with were clear. The pipeline to bring it to Laramie County is an option, then once it's put in the municipal system or in a public entity's system, the collection of that from residential, does that fit

within your prevue if the ultimate objective is to use that water to recharge, that can be used for irrigation downstream?

R: Certainly, if Cheyenne wants to pursue trans basin, under their municipal permit for that water Cheyenne is allowed to use that to extinction. So what Cheyenne has done with that water is to go through an additional step with waste water treatment and used in town for irrigation purposes. We know that it has a fair amount of that water going down Crow Creek is probably trans basin water. Here's the rule from the State Engineer, Cheyenne can continue to use it as long as they keep control of that water, keep it in the plant, in pipelines, but once they discharged to Crow Creek or Dry Creek then it becomes water available for appropriation downstream. Surface water rights downstream have access to it. But it also provides recharge benefit you're talking about. Are you talking about a project to take the water further east in this County to recharge or just about the recharge in Crow Creek?

R: The duplication of that system in Lodge Pole creek, that we can draw groundwater from the Lodge Pole drainage, blend it with the out of basin water to duplicate the Crow Creek model to recharge from Hillsdale east in the aquifer to support economic activity in the east half of the county. IT would take an agreement by all parties, that the water is used at least twice.

R: The one hurdle that you'll run into, and for the SEO, Cheyenne has a permit to divert that water for municipal use in their service area. If you want to take that water, via pipeline, outside of their municipal service area, then it's no longer part of their municipal permits. The State Engineer will require an additional permit that will have a 2015 priority date for that use. If somebody down Crow Creek were to call, it would probably call out that 2015 permit. That gets to be a tricky question. The municipal use is only within the Cheyenne drainage, after that it's not covered by the current permit.

R: The reality is that Cheyenne is drilling into the lodgepole drainage. Crow Creek is working well, and that's because of policy decisions, blended with water rights. It seems to me as we look at the county and lodgepole, there is groundwater available upstream lodgepole to be blended with out of basin water and duplicate that model, depending on where the City of Cheyenne puts it. How much of that infrastructure, how much of that development transfer and treatment can you participate in to facilitate that solution to the groundwater issue?

R: We could fund transmission pipelines. We do not fund treatment of water. We have done a few pilot studies for the City of Cheyenne for aquifer recharge and their well field and we've done a recharge study in Laramie for the Spur well field. We're interested in recharge. We've never been asked to fund a recharge project. Transmission lines, pump stations that is probably something we can declare as an eligible cause.

Q: Under this concept, is there a way to fund a study to determine if this makes sense economically?

R: I think that's something we can take a look at. I'd like to see some pieces in place first. I'd want something from the State Engineer's Office, is this something that they may consider as appropriate and then Cheyenne would be your strongest applicant, in terms of bringing up a request for water development. I think we could look at that from a study standpoint.

4. Report back from Committee members

Jim Cochran: Scott was going to look at the possibility of the NRCS cost-sharing on meters and then what sort of priority did other areas use in their buyout programs.

The NRCS does have funding for ag wells for metering, but that would exclude other wells, but ag wells would be eligible for NRCS cost-share if for EQIP or CSP. The biggest hurdle with working with the NRCS is they want to fund a complete management system, not just a part of it. A producer would have to sign up for a meter and with a purpose for the meter so there was an end product. Like some water savings or better management on this field. There is some money. CSP is similar but has similar twists, but it's a complete management system they would fund. If it works out that's something they wanted to go after. They don't do percentages, they do scenarios like if you do soil moisture metering, and other systems plus metering. It varies by location. It's hard to put a percentage on that.

Q: What is CSP?

R: Conservation Stewardship Plan. It's a 5 year program.

R: They would sign up for a multiple component program. It's a major exercise to do. You say you will do

all of these components and it's a major commitment.

The other question raised was how other entities decided on which wells to buy out on their AWEP programs, but they are in the same boat we were, when the Farm Bill changed they don't have it anymore and it's not on their website. I went off memory and what the districts in Nebraska were basing their buyouts on was how close you were to the stream. They went as far, the districts were providing money, if you weren't a certain distance you'd only get the NRCS portion, not the District portion of the money.

C: North Platte NRD, it's 50% federal from NRCS and 50% state and local. The amount of money you get depends on proximity to the river.

C: In Pumpkin Creek, they have retired 15% of their acres in Pumpkin Creek. The North Platte NRD has a draft report out, how much water they have saved from idling and retiring land, and it looks significant. They are observing a response to the policies they have put in place in terms of stream flows. It is about 15%, but we'll have to wait for the final report.

Q: They have retired 15% of the acres. There's 30,000 acres on Pumpkin Creek and they have retired 4,200 acres.

C: In the Albin area, there has been about a 15% reduction over the last 10 years either with retirement or buyout. They have done that without government dictate.

Kristi Hansen

Provided handout "Economic Assessment of Alternative Groundwater Management Scenarios in Laramie County."

Over the past few months we've talked about an economic assessment so I've scoped out what that might look like. This is something I would run through the USGS pot of money. It's focused on one part of our conversations and the 5 alternatives are scenarios we've been discussing. It asks, what are the economic impacts of these courses of action? This is focused on ag because it's 85% of water use in the state and higher in the control area and because new water use is addressed in the Order. I should have talked about the County and land and water use planning.

Clarification of the scenarios would be great. Who are you saving water for? If there is universal agreement, then there's no need to model both.

R: I was disappointed in Harry's response to funding a groundwater plan. It's a county issue. If the county were to go in with an application to develop a groundwater management plan, and include some of the items for funding. I'm baffled because I've seen a lot of things studied and funded by the water development commission.

C (Brett walker): There may be other sources for grants.

C: If we can't get funding from them, then we should push for as much from the research side.

C (Harry): We have a UW water research program, it is intended for water research and it has a lot more flexibility. This project here, does have real potential for UW water research program funding. It's driven by UW professors and graduate students to work on this.

Q: The second page that you would develop, does that enhance, looking beyond irrigation uses, does that enhance the chances of funding?

R (Harry): I would say yes, in that it would be all encompassing and look at all water uses. As Cheyenne and Laramie county grows there's a water development component and it would make sense.

C: I like these, but I would suggest you study all of them so we can say 'ok, if we can find funding for 10% reduction from a buyout, and 2-3% reduction with transfers' then we can put values to these scenarios. Any and all of them need to be considered and blended. It's not one solution for this problem. I'm not sure we're getting out of the Control Area, and the county area planning document. We can make recommendations for the control area, but there are things that need to be addressed county wide.

Q: As you're developing this stuff I would hope that you would have access to water development and the SEO and mine the information they have first. I'm sure they would cooperate.

C: We now have 9 inches of rain and looking we are now higher than 2009 levels in the monitored wells.

C: What that speaks to is there's a lot we don't know about the hydrology. It's important that whatever we decide on needs to be flexible.

C: No one seems to know where the metering data is, and no one is looking at it. The budget cuts 5 years ago cut out monitoring in the irrigation wells. The assumptions in models should not be used, the real data should be used.

5. Next Steps Document Review and Discussion

Steve: The way we're thinking about this, we're making suggestions to think about this and how Ruckelshaus Institute can help you move forward. The idea is, we're responding to the desire to develop a water plan for either the control area or the county and what that might look like moving forward. There are some things you want to develop before you embark on the planning process.

The document gives example vision statements, and objectives. If you can clearly articulate the vision and objectives and hand it to someone to do the plan.

C(Brett Walker): We've started the initial process for the Comprehensive plan update. There is some overlap. Water has been identified as a major concern for the county and will play a big role in the comprehensive plan and now it's a matter of figuring out what the board wants to do. Our comprehensive plan is advisory in nature. We won't go as far in as developing the tools to implement the plan. We can work on these objectives and visions as part of the plan, and then go further into detail in a separate document or agreement. We're open to it, we have a strict time table in which we want to get the comprehensive plan approved in. We don't want to duplicate work or contradict a plan. We can draw on a plan created by this group.

There's a lot of work on this tail end that might be needed. We're willing to explore what we're capable of doing in the timeline for both groups. If you want to talk to the comprehensive plan steering committee and be around down the road when we're having our open houses to share and keep the ideas going, we welcome that.

Q: What is your timeline?

R: Early 2016 for an adopted draft

Steve: What do you, the committee, think? We can do the visions and objectives in a few meetings. 2-3 more meetings could get you a solid foundation to move forward from there.

C: Is the expertise available?

R: In terms of the regulatory tools, I can look up best practices that are out there but it's not my usual area.

Q: What will it take for you to get on board?

R: Time. I'd have to evaluate that a little further in terms of getting a heavy case load.

C: We keep tossing around the term 'highest and best use' without a definition. If you look at the California problem. You have to define what it means and what components make it up. It doesn't have a definition.

R: My general impression is the scope of findings and study that I had in mind for this groundwater plan would be outside the purview of the county planners. We're looking for something more in depth. We're looking to drill down something more specific that this committee can have input on, but developing the plan isn't for this committee. I'm interested in getting a bunch of help.

C: It's a collaborative process, this control area group, and that's our charter. We have to develop a groundwater plan and it should be with the city of Cheyenne, the governor, the county. We need good communication. This is a larger objective but it needs to go along with other plans.

C: The steering committee for the comprehensive plan that has been referenced, is this a county wide plan? Is the city involved?

R: Yes. We have ongoing request to the councils office

C: Funding is a problem. We could use the county to get it started and using an outside person to build off of these ideas. I like the idea of having the county doing it since they know what the problems are, and I also like someone else reviewing it to see where there are holes that can be filled in.

C: I feel confident that given enough time we can do this, but I don't know how much time there is.

R: We could build off of what the county does.

C: We're talking two scopes of capabilities. For the comprehensive plan we have monies for is in the vicinity of \$15,000 from the commissioners to complete the study. Our funding is from user fees from issuing permits. We're still under the prevue to keep government small. By trying to take on more than we have the capability and funding would be a disaster. We would have to have measures to take this on and be successful. Taking it on now is not realistic at this time.

C: We could incorporate visions and objectives and implementation strategies.

C: The reason I had initially thought it would be good for them to attend an occasional meeting is because the discussion, my concern is developing a new strategy for approving lot size in Albin, for example, when we know the water supply won't support that right now. I wanted to make sure everyone was aware of the other committees.

C (Brett): I plan on attending future meetings. I want to make sure there's still a place to have discussions.

C: I think it's fair to tell them that our timeline is not set at any point. We're talking about 6 months to 6 years. We need to understand the parameters of the control area, give a water plan to the SEO to replace our order. And it is in our best interest for it to not contradict the county plan. The SEO has said we have a lot more latitude on spacing than he does. We have to stay within the control area, but be aware that we may impact the county plan.

C: One of the findings of facts was the comprehensive plan

C: Of someone makes lot sizes and spacing based on science, the county doesn't have the tool to make those recommendations based on science. To regurgitate the SEO's order that's fine, but we can use better information.

C: I think it's appropriate they are here. How can you develop a comprehensive plan without considering water? They shouldn't make recommendations to the SEO, but they can make some comments. If we get into this, it will take more focus in areas that may be missing will come forth.

Steve: I think you do need someone who knows water planning. We put some stuff from other documents we've seen into this document. I'm not a water planner. There are some best practices that someone knows and can help you implement.

Bill: We have wonderful tools, the AMEC study, the references that have been brought up, so maybe there is a planner that will serve us well, I'd like to know who they are. Find them.

C: This is the first time I've heard about hiring a planner.

C: What about the funding to hire these people?

C: Are we going to develop a plan for groundwater reduction, why wouldn't the SEO just do that? I think this committee is tasked with coming up with that. We came together to make a plan and I keep seeing us side step around that. The County's not going to hire somebody. The planners aren't going to do that. If someone was going to hire a planner, the SEO will do that. I don't think we've made a good enough effort.

C: I disagree. Through all of these hours of meetings we have chewed on a big elephant. The State funded

the AMEC report, I believe the SEO has listened to our discussions and the order reflects our discussion and good science that came through the AMEC report. I agree we're having a difficult time getting to a written document. I think that's where the planner comes in. I've been around this community and I don't know where the shelf is, but it's lined with studies. I think some of the studies could have been done by non-professionals. If there is someone who can help us get over the bump we're at now, we should at least look at it. There's a lot of good stuff that we have, we've corralled a bunch of problems but we don't have a lid on it.

C: Isn't that the purpose of this committee? Using the AMEC as the basis for decisions.

C: I think we have to get it boiled down, we're closer than people think.

C: Our focus when we first got here, we've expanded and contracted the control area. He gave us hints as to where his focus is. We may have created a bigger elephant. Do we use these guidelines to go back to the control area, and then maybe expand it to the county? As we see success, do we focus on the people who need help today? Where do we want to put our energy, dollars and expertise?

C: I understand the frustration. We have to develop a plan, not advisory, but a water plan and it must be comprehensive, include all users, and not damage any person non-signatory.

C: We should be concentrating on the control area.

C: We have to think about all of the areas, and until we break it into user groups and those groups say 'this is what utopia is to us' and then compare it to the other groups and see where the damage is and is not. We can make progress with this.

C: Having heard all of that, for us, we're going to work on the control area, but if you put in land use requirements, it will be county wide. Why would you let someone else get into the same mess later down the road. On page 4, it would make sense that the irrigators lead that discussion and the rest of us decide if it harms me.

C: I've listened and it seemed that like in the beginning we dumped out puzzle pieces, these are pieces I can put together. I want to ask questions, instead of having a planner, can all of us, the county, the city attorney, we need to get this 100 page document, but it needs to be in legal-ese, can we put those people together?

C: The attorneys will have something to look at for them to identify where the interests are. So bringing in people is too early.

C: Our attorney just wrote me a resignation letter, saying he's taking on a job with the governor. There's legal advice available. The SEO said his legal team is at our disposal. Once there's meat to look at, then we can bring the legal pieces together.

C: We have bones now, now we need to find meat to put on those bones.

C: I think we've reached the point, where we're going around and around. No one is willing to make a commitment. What on Kristi's paper can the irrigators live with? Let's get down to doing something with the information we have. What can we live with?

C: I think we're close to that. If we break out the user groups. We're ready to dig into each user group. Then we can start making recommendations.

C: We're going to have to have people making voluntary commitments.

C: the SEO can do the controls. What he wants is a plan that is the most benefit to the most, with the least pain.

C: Conservation is a big part of this, how we'll have water in future generations. One of the top 5 actions we decide on has to be conservation.

C: I think we expect to have conservation addressed within the comprehensive plan. That's why we don't want to contradict something.

Steve: As we put this together, our plan was to move you from left to right on the graphic. Some of these decisions you've already made with the SEO's initial proposal. So the question is will be, are these things

you want to do? How far is it you want to deliberate?

C: We can't go that far without stepping on your toes?

R (Phil): This committee to develop a groundwater management plan. If he receives that he will consider that.

C: A plan is not an ordinance.

R (Phil): There are plans that have regulatory components in them. He needs a plan with specific recommendations.

Steve: We can move the line to the right if you want. Let's start having discussions around 'do you want to have a discussion around each box' then go down that branch. Then you also have to consider that one of your main audiences is the SE, but there are other audiences it will address, for example county planning. We'll move through these decision points here. Then what does that look like?

C: My answer, is we do everything on the left, and it will influence what's on the right. Then we could have subcommittees can bring information into this area with good experience and science. This is to replace the whole order.

Steve: Is everyone on board with that?

C: I like that bottom up approach.

C: The statute is clear that he must replace his order with a plan. We have a job to present something good enough where he can't find fault and is compelled to action.

C: I think you're right.

C: I think the Order is comprehensive.

Steve: Kristi's work probably won't get started until next year. It will give you information on how to act. So decisions you make before that study is complete, may be premature.

Next time: Do you want to meeting in 2 weeks? If you do Shannon will facilitate

C: you need to make it known how imperative it is for people to attend the next meeting. We'll assign people to go and get information.

C: I question whether meeting twice a month is working. I think the hard work needs to start amongst the groups to make sure the people we represent are heard and involved. We only need to meet once a month.

C: If we're going to break into smaller committee and meet in between the monthly meetings, I think that will work.

C: Let's meet the first of June, so we don't lose momentum on this, and then find mutual dates before the fall.

Steve: Before the next meeting, look at the boxes. I want you to consider how you might want to enter into the conversation for land use development strategies. Think about what each box entails so you're prepared for the discussion.

C: Where it says 'buyout strategy', let's talk about a transfer strategy.

C: That's in Objective 2

Steve: Let's get to specifics on what you want to do and allocate your time to make the recommendations. We'll be on the left side of the line for now.

Next Meeting

Date: June 1, 2015 5:30-8:30

Location: Herschler Building, Room B63, 122 West 25th Street, Cheyenne, WY