

### **GMD#3 Notes: KFL Allocation Options Summary**

**Started with the idea of putting everyone on the same allocation per acre, similar to Sheridan 6.**

Pros:

- Everyone gets enough allocation that they should be able to continue farming operations.
- No “use it or lose it” aspect.
- Method is currently being implemented elsewhere and has been successful

Cons:

- Big users end up with a very big cut, while small users mostly get cut water they probably wouldn't have pumped anyway.
- Criticized as socialism.
- Ignores property and gives everyone the same allocation.

**Tried an idea where everyone would take a percentage cut, with a cap at the top that nobody would be able to exceed.**

Pros:

- Cut doesn't have to be as big as it would be with a straight percentage cut.
- The cap should help limit declines in some of the high water use areas.
- Everyone gets cut water they are likely to need in the future (skin in the game).

Cons:

- People who have been working to reduce water use have to further reduce their water use, while people who have been using as much as they can get a much bigger water allocation.
- Would require a committee water users would have to go before to justify why they used less water and why they shouldn't be “penalized” with a smaller allocation for conserving.
- Might make people outside of the LEMA area view conservation as less desirable.
- Ignores property and allocates water based upon use instead.

**Straight 15% cut off of recent use (Option 1).**

Pros:

- Everyone gets cut water they are likely to need in the future.

- Everyone is cut off of recent use by exactly the same percentage.
- Simple calculation

Cons:

- People who have been using less water would need to take a bigger cut off of their recent use than they would with a cap, and people who have been using more would get a more favorable allocation.
- Would require a committee.
- Might make people outside of the LEMA area view conservation as less desirable.
- Ignores property and allocates water based upon use instead.

**Implemented the sliding scale to give people who used less water a smaller percent reduction than people who use more (Option 2).**

Pros:

- Everyone gets cut water they are likely to need in the future.
- Below average water users don't have to take as big of a percentage cut as they would with a straight cut.

Cons:

- All cuts still come off of recent use.
- Would require a committee.
- Might make people outside of the LEMA area view conservation as less desirable.
- Above average water users take a bigger cut than with a straight cut.
- Calculation is fairly complicated.
- Ignores property and allocates water based upon use instead.

**Straight cut off of base water right.**

Pros:

- Everyone is treated the same with regard to the percentage cut off of the base water right.
- No use it or lose it aspect.
- People who own more water rights get allocated more water, so property is considered more than in the other methods.

Cons:

- The percentage cut required is pretty big (about 45%).

- Should be noted that this cut is fairly typical of all of the other methods for most water users when looking at what they would be allocated compared to base water right.
- Some water users use close to their full authorization every year so they would be taking more than a 40% cut off of recent use.
- Some water users would be allocated more water than they can pump anyway.

**Cut 40.5% off of well capacity (use maximum recent use), include a safety net so nobody gets cut more than 25% off of recent use (Option 3).**

Pros:

- Allows for a smaller percentage cut than cutting off of base water right.
- Cut is based upon what you own and are physically able to divert, rather than how much you have actually been diverting.
- Less “use it or lose it” aspect than in option 1 or 2.
- Would not require a committee to implement.
- A person who needed their full water right during the drought in 2012 but was conservative at other times would get the same allocation as a person who has used their full water right every year regardless of weather.
- The 25% safety net keeps cuts off of recent use manageable for those who use a similar quantity of water every year.

Cons:

- The percentage cut required is big
- Again, note that this cut provides similar allocations to most users as other methods do.
- While the cut would be based upon a recent water use year, some people would be allocated more water than they averaged over the past 10 years. Some would say that is skin in the game, others would not.
- People with small wells that they keep running year-round and people who just pump their full allocation every year would be required to take a bigger cut than they would with options 1 or 2.