

**Laramie County Control Area Steering Committee**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**November 2, 2015**  
**Herschler Building, Cheyenne, WY**

Draft for Review

Approved

**Participants:**

Bill Bonham, *Laramie County Stock Growers*  
 Jay Burnett, *Irrigator*  
 Bill Edwards, *Southeast Wyoming Builders Association*  
 Greg Gross, *Ag/Irrigators*  
 Kristi Hansen, *University of Wyoming*  
 Jim Hastings, *Alternate*  
 Gary Hickman, *Cheyenne/Laramie County Health*  
 Scott Horgen, *Industry*  
 Judy Johnstone, *Small municipalities*

Rick Kaysen, *City of Cheyenne*  
 Jim Lerwick, *Ag/Irrigators*  
 Leslie Mead, *South Cheyenne Community Development Association*  
 Jim Murphy, *Cheyenne Board of Public Utilities*  
 Kate Noble, *Industry*  
 Bonnie Reider, *South Cheyenne Community Development Association*  
 Troy Thompson, *Laramie County Commissioners*  
 Tim Wilson, *Cheyenne Board of Public Utilities*

**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 10/5/15 meeting summary
3. Discussion of Groundwater Management Plan Guidance Document Sections 1—3
4. Adjourn

**Handouts:**

1. 11/2/15 Draft Agenda
2. 10/5/15 Draft Meeting Summary
3. Table 3.1 (updated)
4. Groundwater Management Plan Guidance Document updated from discussion at November 2, 2015 Meeting

**Action Items Pending**

Revisit the name for the Wyoming area of the lodgepole drainage

**Summary:**

*Q=Question      R=Response      C=Comment*

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

Shannon Glendenning opened the meeting and introduced the agenda.

Committee members introduced themselves.

Jay Burnett was welcomed to the group after last meeting's discussion about including an irrigator from the Carpenter area.

**2. Review and adoption of the 10/5/15 meeting summary**

No changes to meeting summary. Meeting summary was adopted.

**3. Discussion of public input and management area boundary delineation**

*Section 3.1.4- Checking in on whether the group wants to continue to pursue conservation measures*

Jim M: Conservation management measures should be produced from the municipalities and other jurisdictions.

Jim L: We need to get to the question of how do we manage a local decision process. Should we allow for majority vote? Should we seek consensus? Who has veto power? Does each management area decide on its own what should be implemented? We need to consider how actions that affect all areas would be

decided. This needs to be a grass-roots effort.

Scott H: Should people in one management area have more say on a particular issue that affects them in a greater way than another area?

Jim M: We need to separate public involvement and public say in the management plan from implementation of the plan.

Greg G: Will this end being a bunch of different user agreements?

Shannon: Is the group still interested in pursuing the idea that this committee will set broad objectives and the management areas will establish their own, more focused objectives?

General agreement to that statement.

Judy J: the local government role is only to work with their citizens to develop conservation measures in those jurisdictions.

Gary H: Long explanation of local control – the “local” in local control is the County. We don’t have a mechanism for divesting regulatory authority.

Kate N: The term local control isn’t really what we want to aim for, primarily for reasons of inconsistencies among local areas. There has to be some capacity for planning.

Jim M: Local control means the ability to participate in the development of the plan.

Greg G and Kate N: Yes I agree with that.

Jim M: Implementation decisions

Rick K: Who are the managers in the management area?

Judy J: The management actions that will have any real impact will be those that affect the irrigators. It is the irrigation issue that we are working to fold into this plan, and it is the irrigators who need to have input.

Gary H: Each user will determine their “stuff” and that’s what will be going into the plan. Homeowners may decide among themselves through covenants, outside of that we need to consider regulatory authorities of government.

Scott H: A water right attaches to the point of use.

Jim L: We’re focusing on managing the point of draw, not the point of use.

Shannon: Do you want to include county authority in this plan, or limit actions in the plan to only what the SEO can regulate and authorize?

Bill B: Yes I think that we can make a recommendation to the County and it is up to them to carry that out.

Bill E: I agree with you. The county can and should review covenants. The county can enforce a covenant, but it is by way of civil action. The enforcement and what kind of organization enforces this is still in question. We are at the front end of creating this new structure.

Shannon: Let’s separate this into approaches:

1. Local input in the plan
2. Local implementation or at least representation in implementation of the plan.

Bill E: We have to be aware of the county’s authority. The county has much to say about conservation, and this goes beyond merely encouragement.

Kate N: We need to refine our language here and be sure of what we mean by ‘local control.’ Local control brings of the question of who has standing.

Jim M: I don’t think the term ‘local control’ should be used in the plan. Instead, we want to ensure that we have local input into the plan.

Bill B: Don’t forget that people have ‘local control’ in their input into decisions made by the Control Area Advisory Board.

Jim L: Is there an ability for people to have veto power on the SE’s decisions?

Jim M: Once we have a developed a plan we call all agree to and the SE accepts it, than no one really has veto power over what he decides.

Bill B: If the irrigators form an irrigation district, then they can have veto power within their district. If we incorporate the district's management actions in the plan, then they have the option of making changes within the district as they see fit.

Shannon: Should people have veto power and how does it get authorized? Is the power to veto what is going to go into the plan or further down the line?

Greg G: As people in a management district see something coming their way that they don't want to happen, then they should have some way of preventing it from happening. If is reflected in the plan, then they should have the opportunity to make sure that it doesn't get put into action.

Lisa L: You all are getting into the weeds on this. The SE has very specific means in the statute to regulate water use. It is your role to give the SE recommendations on how he can use his authority to regulate groundwater use.

Jim M: We are developing a plan that the people in each management area will decide where the drawdown areas are located, where are the conservation areas, etc.

Jim L: Yes, but we need to be sure that use is coordinated between districts so that it no one negatively affects someone else.

Shannon: How does this committee want to involve the public in each management area to set the parameters of the plan?

Lots of discussion/conversation about what the implications of this might be

Judy: Question about water districts. Should those in the most affected areas be forming their special districts and deciding their needs so we as the committee for the entire area don't make decisions that step on their toes?

Les: Need to take into consideration the type of wells, their location, the amount being pumped, and the use of the water.

Jim L: Interest is to change the way the Control Area Advisory Board is elected).

Dahlgren: question to Jim L: domestic wells do not have go in front of the Control Area Advisory Board. Are you advocating that all well permits need to go in front of the CAAB?

Dahlgren challenged the committee on the wisdom of their undertaking.

Kristi: Extension and Conservation District can provide education to people to help them make informed decisions.

Jim L: This committee can generate the questions to ask residents.

A vote was held on whether to use drainage boundaries as the new CAAB district boundaries. The proposal was approved and a map with new management district boundaries was drafted. The map will be circulated to committee members for review and approval at the next meeting.

Next meeting 5:30-8:00 Nov 16.

#### **4. Meeting adjourned**

##### **Next Meeting**

**Date: November 16, 2015 5:30-8**

**Location: Herschler Building, Room 1699 "Hearing Room," 122 West 25th Street, Cheyenne, WY**