

Minutes

Groundwater Management Plan Committee

February 9, 2017

Committee Members:

Joe Melling	Brent Hunter	Spencer Jones	Paul Bittmenn
Paul Cozzens	Paul Nelson	Ramon Prestwich	Rob Dotson
Reed Erickson	Paul Monroe		

Members Excused:

Paul Cozzens
Spencer Jones

Other Attendees:

Nathan Moses – Division of Water Rights
Locke Hahne – Division of Water Rights
Johnathan Stathis – Cedar City Engineer
Kit Wareham – Cedar City Engineer

Surface to Ground Change Applications Supplemental/Auxiliary Water Rights

Joe Melling introduced Nathan Moses and Locke Hahne of the Division of Water Rights, to help this committee better understand the State Engineers position is on changing surface rights to groundwater. Moses explained that the State Engineer currently does not have a policy to restrict surface to ground change applications. When determining the amount of water to be changed, from surface to underground, the SE considers a one-to-one connection showing the surface water being transferred must go into the underground. If it is consumed by another source, then the SE would reduce the water right to the amount that is recharged.

Moses discussed in detail the difference between supplemental, sole supply limitation, and auxiliary water rights:

Supplemental - supplemental water rights or supplemental water sources are water rights or water sources which are used together to meet the needs of a particular beneficial use.

Sole supply limitation - The sole supply limitation is the amount of beneficial use for which the water right is intended to provide the sole water supply. It is the limit of the beneficial use allowed by the water right.

Auxiliary Water Right - an auxiliary water right is a water right that has no sole supply limitation associated with it and is used only to augment the supply from other water rights.

Several committee members were concerned in how the Division of Water Rights manages supplemental and/or auxiliary rights and suggested that there has been a practice which allows individuals to sell off their surface rights and expand their crop acreage thus increasing and water usage.

Sewer Effluent Options

Johnathan Stathis discussed seven different options that Cedar City has analyzed to better utilize the water being discharged from the Waste Water Treatment Plant. They included transporting farms from the south to the north, building secondary water systems and reservoirs throughout the city and recharging the water in different locations throughout the valley. The projects ranged in costs from \$10M to \$25M. He stated that there is approximately 2900 AF being discharged from the plant.

Attached –Auxiliary vs. Supplemental definition, Cedar City Effluent Options, Effluent Law and use

Question was asked Moses how the SE would react to better utilizing sewer effluent and how much of it is already accounted for in our hydrological budget. Moses said if by putting the effluent to a better use or an increased rate of recharge the state engineer would likely recognize those efficiencies and adjust the safe yield.

Dotson – suggested the State Engineer update their policies that reflect science and good data.

Moses recommended reviewing and commenting on the comments that are posted on the Cedar Valley GMP on the Water Rights website.

Next meeting date is March 9 and Monroe suggested discussing our watershed (conifers and phreatophytes) agriculture water use conservation and inviting Chad Reid from the USU extension.

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 17, 1998
TO: Staff
FROM: Bob Morgan
SUBJECT: **Instructions for defining, evaluating, and administering sole supply limitations**

The purpose of this memo is to instruct the staff and to establish coordinated internal procedures for evaluating the sole supply limitation of individual or supplemental water rights in both the adjudication and appropriation programs. In setting forth these instructions, it is necessary to define several terms. The definitions given below will be the standard accepted meaning of the terms within the division. The notes and examples after the definitions are given to help clarify the meaning of the terms. The principles and procedures are given to help in the application of the instructions. These instructions do not apply to water rights developed as part of a Bureau of Reclamation project. These instructions may or may not apply to other water rights owned by the federal government. Each federal right should be considered according to its own situation in deciding whether or not it should also be included under this memo.

Supplemental - supplemental water rights or supplemental water sources are water rights or water sources which are used together to meet the needs of a particular beneficial use.

Sole supply limitation - The sole supply limitation is the amount of beneficial use for which the water right is intended to provide the sole water supply. It is the limit of the beneficial use allowed by the water right.

Auxiliary Water Right - an auxiliary water right is a water right that has **no sole supply limitation** associated with it and is used only to augment the supply from other water rights.

NOTES AND EXAMPLES

A water right may fall into one of several categories depending upon how it was originally filed and approved or how it was perfected. Four categories are summarized in the table below and further explanation and examples follow.

UTAH WATER RIGHTS ADJUDICATION
A Manual of Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

Sole Supply ?	Auxiliary Use ?	Supplemental Use ?	Category
Yes	No	No	1
Yes	No	Yes	2
Yes	Yes	Yes	3
No	Yes	Yes	4

These categories are only for the purpose of explaining the possible situations that might be encountered. Well water rights and irrigation company shares are used in the following examples only to help explain the definition of the above terms. The definitions would also apply to any other types of water rights.

1. The water right has a sole supply limitation, it has no approved auxiliary use, and it is not used supplementally. The amount of water that may be used in a given year is the sole supply limitation.

EXAMPLE: A water user has a privately owned well water right to irrigate 40 acres of land that is not used supplementally with any other rights. The water user's well right has a sole supply limitation of 40 acres. If the water user files an application on the well right to change the nature or place of use, the entire 40 acre sole supply limitation can be changed.

2. The water right has a sole supply limitation, it has no approved auxiliary use, and it is used supplementally. The amount of water that may be used in a given year is the sole supply limitation.

EXAMPLE: A water user has shares of stock in an irrigation company which he uses in connection with his privately owned well water right to irrigate 40 acres of land. The irrigation company rights and the individual right are supplemental to each other on the 40-acre parcel. The water user's well right has a sole supply limitation of 10 acres and the well is regularly relied on to supply the beneficial use of the 10 acres. However, the well right was not approved to be auxiliary to the irrigation company shares on the remaining 30 acres irrigated by the water user. Therefore, the well right may be used anywhere on the 40-acre tract of land, but the use of the well is limited to the irrigation requirements of 10 acres. If the water user files an application on the well right to change the nature or place of use, the 10-acre sole supply can be changed.

3. The water right has a sole supply limitation, it has an approved auxiliary use, and it is used supplementally. The amount of water that may be used in a given year from the right is the amount of the sole supply limitation plus the amount of water needed to augment the water right(s) with which it is supplemental.

EXAMPLE: A water user has shares of stock in an irrigation company which he uses in connection with his privately owned well water right to irrigate 40 acres of land. The irrigation company rights and the individual right are supplemental to each other on the 40-acre parcel. The water user's well right has a sole supply limitation of 10 acres and the well is regularly relied on to supply the beneficial use of the 10 acres. The well

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

right application also stated the right would be used to augment the irrigation shares, so the right is also auxiliary to the irrigation company shares on the remaining 30 acres irrigated by the water user. The auxiliary portion of the well right makes up any shortages in the irrigation company supply and in some years may be used to provide the full supply for the 30 acres. If the water user files an application on the well right to change the nature or place of use, only the 10 acre sole supply can be changed.

4. The water right has no sole supply limitation and it is an auxiliary water right used supplementally with other water rights. The amount of water that may be used in a given year from the right is the amount of water needed to augment the water right(s) with which it is supplemental.

EXAMPLE: A water user has shares of stock in an irrigation company which he uses in connection with his privately owned well water right to irrigate 40 acres of land. The irrigation company rights and the individual right are supplemental to each other on the 40-acre parcel. The water right application for the well clearly stated there was no sole supply limitation associated with it. Therefore, the well right is auxiliary to the irrigation company shares on the 40 acres irrigated by the water user. The auxiliary well right makes up any shortages in the irrigation company supply and in some years may be used to provide the full supply for the 40 acres. Except for point of diversion, the well right may not be changed without a corresponding change in the irrigation company shares.

PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

The following principles and procedures are divided into sections according to whether they have general application or whether they relate specifically to the Appropriation or Adjudication program. However, they should be used wherever applicable in work relating to either the Adjudication Program or the Appropriation Program. They should be implemented in each region with careful consideration for the current Appropriation policy and the situation existing in each area. Although these principles and procedures should be used in most situations, there will be some exceptions which should be discussed with the appropriate section office.

GENERAL

1. In most years, a water right is expected to provide by itself the amount of water needed for the amount of beneficial use included in the right's sole supply limitation.
2. An auxiliary water right is not valid if it is not supplemental with a water right that has a sole supply limitation. In the fourth example given above, the well right may only be used as long as the irrigation company shares continue to be used on the land. If the shares are sold or leased to be used elsewhere in the irrigation company, the auxiliary well right can no longer be used to irrigate the land.
3. When evaluating a water right, the record must be reviewed to determine how the water right was filed and define the limit of beneficial use described. It is important to carefully evaluate the intent of

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

the application as described in the information supplied on the application form and any attachments. In the case of conflicting information in the water right record, the regional engineer should interpret the intent in consultation with the appropriate section office if necessary.

4. If the water right record defines a specific amount of beneficial use for the right, it will be used as the sole supply limitation, as long as there is physical evidence to support the claimed beneficial use. In the case of irrigation, this will apply even if investigation reveals that irrigation company shares are used on the same land.
5. In the case of irrigation, if the actual use covers an area larger than the sole supply limitation defined in the water right record, the balance of the use may be described in the water right as an auxiliary right that is supplemental to another water right, if the original application and the subsequent proof or certification supports this position.
6. If the water right record is unclear whether or not the water right was intended to have a sole supply limitation when it was approved, a sole supply limitation may be established according to the methods outlined in paragraph 8 of this section.
7. If the water right record is clear that the water right was originally approved to have no sole supply, it should be considered an auxiliary water right. The only clear indication would be a definite statement in the water right record to the effect that the water right was established without a sole supply. If the water right record is merely silent concerning sole supply, the issue should be considered unclear (see 5. above). If the water right was established without a sole supply, there can be no sole supply limitation added to the right at some point in the future even if the water user has relied on the right to supply the needs of a definite amount of beneficial use (such as 10 acres of irrigation). To add a sole supply limitation to this type of water right would be an expansion of the water right. Before its original approval, the public notice indicated there would be no sole supply associated with the right, so it would not be proper to add a sole supply later.
8. If there is a need to evaluate a water right and determine its sole supply limitation because it cannot be established according to the other sections of this memo, the following procedures should be used in most instances. There may be exceptions where other methods might make more sense. Contact the appropriate section office to discuss any variation from the methods outlined below:
 - a. The staff should make a reasonable effort to investigate how the water right has actually been used in the recent past (at least five years).
 - b. If the water user can document (by water meter records, diversion records, pump electric meter records, etc.) a regular beneficial use of the water right, the sole supply limitation will be the average amount of beneficial use which could be supplied by the documented water use. **EXAMPLE:** If the water right in question is for a well with documented irrigation use during August and September, the average annual amount of water pumped would be determined. The sole supply limitation would be the number of acres for which that average amount of water would provide a full supply based on the duty for the area.

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

- c. If documentation is not available, staff may determine a sole supply limitation indirectly from the total area irrigated (in the case of irrigation) less the amount of water supplied from any supplemental water rights.
- d. A sole supply limitation cannot be established for any water right where water use cannot be documented or determined indirectly within the past five years. However, in this situation it may be determined to be an auxiliary water right.
- e. The sole supply limitation for a water right must be considered in the context of the water right(s) with which it is supplemental. If there is a sole supply limitation defined for the group of supplemental water rights which is equal to the total amount of water use, the sole supply limitation determined for the water right may not increase the total sole supply limitation defined for the group. In this situation, the water user may recommend how much sole supply should be associated with each water right. In reviewing this request from the water user, the staff should take care to ensure that using the recommendation will not impact the water rights of other water users. The staff should take into careful consideration the relative priority dates of the supplemental rights and the relative sources of supply if different sources are involved. In some situations, the water user may request that the total sole supply limitation for the group be attached to the water right with the earliest priority date. This may be permitted if it appears reasonable to staff and if it appears it will not impact the water rights of other water users.
- f. In dividing the sole supply limitation among a group of water rights, staff should use the flow rate and the production of the water source as a guide. More sole supply limitation should not be associated with a water right than the water right flow rate or the production of the water source would reasonably support. There are two alternatives which might be used when considering flow rate as a guide in dividing the sole supply limitation among a group of irrigation water rights. These alternatives might also be used to evaluate a proposal made by the water user. It is important to be consistent in how these alternatives are applied, but it is equally important to do what seems to be reasonable and prudent for each area. Other methods should be cleared with the section office.
- I. This alternative would be best used with water rights from surface water sources. If the water right has a flow rate associated with it, the number of acres that the right might serve could be determined from a flow rate duty in the form of acres per cfs. A flow rate duty of this nature might be included in the water right record or in pre-existing court decrees for the area, or it might be determined by using a flow rate duty included in a court decree for an adjacent or similar area. If a flow rate duty is not available from one of these sources, it is recommended that the flow rate required to meet the consumptive use needs of alfalfa in July be used.
- Once a flow rate duty has been determined, apply it to the flow rate of the water right with the earliest priority date to determine the amount of sole supply limitation to be associated with that right. Proceed to the water right next in priority and do the same. Continue this process until the entire amount of irrigated land has been assigned to a water right as a sole supply limitation. As a result of this process, some late

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

priority water rights might be left without a sole supply limitation. In this case they would be considered auxiliary water rights.

II. This alternative would be best used with groundwater water rights. Divide the sole supply limitation among the group of supplemental irrigation water rights on a pro rata basis according to the flow rate associated with each water right. If there are no flow rates shown on the group of rights or if only some of the rights have flow rates, recommendations from the owner may be requested or another method of dividing the sole supply limitation may be used. Whatever approach is used, it is important to be consistent with the principles and procedures described in these instructions.

g. If the water right is supplemental with irrigation company shares, the irrigation company right will not be reduced by the amount of the sole supply limitation determined for the right. The original application was not filed by the irrigation company but by the shareholder.

h. The sole supply limitation for irrigation company water rights will be based on the quantity defined in the water right record and on the amount of land within the irrigation company's service area which is being irrigated or which has been irrigated within the past five years. The sole supply limitation of irrigation company water rights will be reduced from the quantity defined in the water right record only if the amount of irrigated land within the company's service area boundary has actually been reduced. The land to be considered as being within the service area boundary is land that has been irrigated by the company, and that can still be irrigated by the company's distribution system.

9. Procedures for dealing with illegal water use such as an expansion of irrigated acreage which is encountered during efforts to evaluate and define the sole supply of a water right:

a. The illegal use must not be given credibility by allowing it to be included on any maps created by the division or accepted for filing by the division without it being identified and labeled "IRRIGATED WITHOUT A WATER RIGHT".

b. Several letters have been created and approved by the Attorney General's Office to warn water users against illegal water use. Staff who encounter illegal water use should use the appropriate letter to notify water users that their illegal use has been detected and to notify them that measures such as an order to cease the use of water and/or legal action might be pursued against them.

APPROPRIATION PROGRAM

1. When a change application is received in the Appropriations Program, the sole supply limitation of the underlying water right should be evaluated or investigated if necessary to prevent the enlargement or impairment of water rights. See the related Appropriation memo.

2. Procedures for evaluating change applications in the Appropriations Program:

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

- a. If the water right record indicates that a sole supply limitation was defined for the water right and if an investigation and evaluation of the water right (done according to the Appropriation memo on enlargement and impairment of water rights) clearly shows that only a portion of the sole supply limitation has been used, the change application may be approved for the amount and nature of beneficial use sole supply determined according to the methods outlined in paragraph 8 of the General Section.
 - b. If the investigation clearly shows no beneficial use of the water right, the change application should be rejected unless withdrawn by the applicant.
3. Applications to change either the nature or place of use may be filed only on the amount of beneficial use or sole supply limitation which has been established for the water right.
 4. An auxiliary water right may be changed in its point of diversion. However, since an auxiliary water right has no sole supply limitation associated with it, changes in its nature or place of use would be possible only with corresponding changes in the water right(s) with which it is supplemental.
 5. If a water user desires to change a water right so it will no longer be supplemental with a group of water rights, a sole supply limitation must be determined for the right according to the procedures outlined above and the sole supply limitation of the group must be reduced by the same amount. This should be documented by doing a "seg-detail" and a "seg-tab" (green sheet) on each file.
 6. Applicants who desire to develop a private irrigation well within the service area of an irrigation company must declare in the application to appropriate how the well will be used in connection with shares in the irrigation company.
 - a. If the well will be used to irrigate land not irrigated by irrigation company shares, the approval of the application must define a sole supply limitation for the right.
 - b. If the well will be used supplementally with irrigation company shares, the application must state the portion of the irrigation season when it is expected the well will be used.
 - I. If the well will be used on an occasional basis or for only a portion of the season, the application may be approved only as an auxiliary water right.
 - II. If the well will be used each year on a consistent basis throughout the irrigation season, the application may be approved right with a sole supply limitation and with a portion which is auxiliary to the irrigation company shares.
 7. New applications to appropriate should be approved for auxiliary water rights only when it seems warranted by unusual circumstances. Applicants should be discouraged from filing this type of application. Instead they should be encouraged to file a change application to modify their current water right to achieve the same result if possible.
 8. Proof of Appropriation for auxiliary water rights will follow the currently established proof procedures and standards but be limited to documentation that the source has been developed,

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

documentation that the water right with which it is supplemental is still viable at the place of use described, and maps of the place of use.

9. Certificates issued on water rights that are purely auxiliary in nature will be stamped “AUXILIARY WATER RIGHT CERTIFICATE”. The certificate will state that the auxiliary right must be used supplementally with the specific water right(s) or irrigation company shares listed on the certificate.

ADJUDICATION PROGRAM

1. In preparing Water Users Claims, a field investigation should be made of each water right and its sole supply limitation should be evaluated and determined.

2. Procedures for evaluating a perfected water right (diligence claim, certificate, decree, etc.):

a. Where the water right record indicates that a sole supply limitation was defined for the water right and the investigation and evaluation of the right clearly shows that only a portion of the sole supply limitation has been used, the sole supply limitation included in the WUC should be reduced to equal the amount and nature of beneficial use determined according to the methods outlined in paragraph 8 of the General Section.

b. Where the water right record is not clear that a sole supply limitation was defined for the water right, the sole supply limitation included in the WUC should be reduced to equal the amount and nature of beneficial use determined according to the methods outlined in paragraph 8 of the General Section.

c. Where the water right record indicates that a sole supply limitation was defined for the water right and the investigation clearly shows no beneficial use of the water right, the Water Users Claim should be prepared and disallowed unless the water right is used supplementally with other rights.

d. If the investigation clearly shows no beneficial use of the water right, but the water right record indicates the right is used supplementally with other rights, the sole supply for the right should be shown as zero and the comment section should state: “This is an auxiliary water right which has no sole supply limitation quantified for it and which may be used only supplementally with water rights numbered _____, _____, and _____.”

3. Hydrographic survey maps should identify and locate the specific place of use for the sole supply limitation of each water right.

a. If the water right is supplemental with other rights, the specific place of use for each right need not be determined and the map may show one undivided place of use for all the rights in the supplemental group.

b. In the case of sole supply water rights not used supplementally, the Water Users Claim and the hydrographic survey map must not indicate an irrigated area which is larger than the sole

APPENDIX A SOLE SUPPLY LIMITATIONS - DEFINING, EVALUATING AND ADMINISTERING

supply determined for the water right unless there is a valid reason, such as the irrigator practices crop rotation which is authorized by the water right. In the case of crop rotation, staff should make some effort to verify the practice. A comment should be included in the Water Users Claim (WUC) and in the Proposed Determination of Water Rights explaining the reason for the difference in area.

c. If staff identifies a situation where the water user is irrigating more land than allowed by the water right(s), the area covered by the water right(s) sole supply should be identified (if possible, the water user should identify which portion of the area is covered by each water right(s)), shown on the map and described in the WUC. The acreage being irrigated without a right should be identified, shown on the hydrographic survey map and labeled "IRRIGATED WITHOUT A WATER RIGHT".

WWTP Return Effluent

OPTIONS

Water Use Information

- Total groundwater use in Cedar Valley is currently 6,000 – 12,000 ac-ft more than the safe yield of the aquifer. The safe yield is the amount of water pumped that matches the recharge in the aquifer.
- City pumping rate at Quichapa is approx. 4,700 ac-ft/year
- City pumping rate at Enoch is approx. 900 ac-ft/year
- Total annual City groundwater use is 6,000 ac-ft/year
- Water use in pressurized irrigation system is approx. 200 ac-ft/year. Water use could expand with a reservoir on the north end. (Revenue lost with expansion would be approx. \$150,000 which is the difference between the culinary & irrigation rates)
- WWTP has 2,900 ac-ft of effluent available annually. Effluent will need to be upgraded to Type 1 water to be suitable for human contact.

WWTP Return Effluent Options

Option #1: Move agricultural operation (hay production) to WWTP land application site

Option #2: New Fiddlers reservoir for use in pressurized irrigation system

- 2.a. Recharge excess and winter water at Coal Creek recharge area on east side of I-15

Option #3: New tank for use in pressurized irrigation system

- 3.a. Recharge excess and winter water at Coal Creek recharge area on east side of I-15

Option #4: Enoch recharge

Option #5: Quichapa recharge

Option #6: Irrigation water exchange – trade effluent water for Coal Creek rights

Option #7: Coal Creek recharge

Descriptions of each Option

Option #1: Move an agricultural (hay production) operation to WWTP land application site

Option #2: Use effluent in P.I. system and recharge excess water at Coal Creek

Option #3: Use effluent in P.I. system and recharge excess water at Coal Creek

Option #4: Recharge 2,900 ac-ft/year near Enoch

Option #5: Recharge 2,900 ac-ft/year in Quichapa area

Option #6: Exchange effluent water with irrigation companies. Use Coal Creek water for recharge.

Option #7: Recharge 2,900 ac-ft/year at Coal Creek

- (Note: Irrigation Company will need to keep flood sediment out of recharge basins to prevent the basins from silting in.)

Cost Estimates

Option #1: Agricultural operation = \$10 million (worst case – final cost based on proposals)

- Option #1 includes the costs to purchase the land, water rights (2,900 ac-ft), and irrigation equipment from a hay grower in the valley and move equivalent hay growing operation to the WWTP land application site.

Option #2: Reservoir (1500 ac-ft) on P.I. system = \$17.1M capital + \$7M O&M (30 yrs) = \$24.1M

Option #3: Tank (3 ac-ft) on P.I. system = \$11.5M capital + \$7M O&M = \$18.5M

Option #4: Enoch recharge cost = \$8M capital + \$5.8M O&M = \$13.8M

- Option #4 would have a limited benefit to the City. The City only has 2 wells in the Enoch area.

Option #5: Quichapa recharge cost = \$14M capital + \$5.4M O&M = \$19.4M

Option #6: Irrigation exchange cost = \$8.1M capital + \$4.5M O&M = \$12.6M

Option #7: Coal Creek recharge cost = \$8.6M capital + \$3.6M O&M = \$12.2M

- Options #6 & #7 may have a limited benefit to the City due to mounding groundwater in this area.

Questions?

Waste Water Reuse Regulations and Laws Summary 2017

In 2006, the Utah Legislature passed the Wastewater Reuse Act Utah Code Ann. §73-3c-101. Previous to that there was not a law recognizing or allowing reuse of waste water. The “Reuse Act” provides that only a public agency may use, or contract with others to use, reuse water. Utah Code Ann §73-3c-202(1). Private end users must therefore obtain the reuse water from the public agency sponsor. The public agency sponsor is the entity that proposes the water reuse project and is the entity responsible to make the necessary applications and obtain water reuse approvals from the Utah Water Quality Board and Utah State Engineer §73-3c-102(5)(a)(i); §73-3c-202(1)(d).

Under the Act, a governmental entity can use or sell the reuse water if (1) the wastewater consists of water supplied under a water right that the entity owns, or (2) the entity has a “reuse authorization contract” with the owner of the water right designated for use in the reuse project. The entity must also receive approval from the State Engineer that the proposed water reuse is consistent with the underlying water right or, alternatively, file a change application. Additionally, the entity must meet water quality standards established by the Water Quality Board. The Act improves upon the original law by (1) establishing requirements and processes under which water reuse projects can be authorized and implemented, (2) develops a framework for water users to protest a reuse application, and (3) promotes increased efficiency and water conservation.

The Reuse Act requires that a public agency must satisfy five requirements in order to use or contract for the use of reuse water:

1. The public agency holds the water rights or has a reuse Authorization Contract for the reuse water.
2. The underlying water right is a municipal water right
 - a. (This is because the reuse water may only be used by, or sold by, the public agency sponsor for municipal purposes. If used for another use you must file a Change App.)
3. The reuse is consistent with the underlying water right, or a change application is filed on the underlying water right to make sure the reuse is consistent with it
4. Approval by the Utah State Engineer, Department of Natural Resources
5. Approval by the Utah Water Quality Board, Department of the Environmental Quality.

Reuse must be consistent with the underlying water right

The third statutory requirement for reuse approval requires that reuse be consistent with the underlying water right. Essentially, this means that the following are the same for both the reuse and the original approvals of the underlying water rights:

1. Quantity of the use of the water
2. Place of use of the water
3. Nature of use of the water (e.g. municipal)
4. Extent of consumption/depletion of the water right.

An example of one application:

Orem City Filed an application to reuse both its own water rights and some of Central Utah Water Conservancy District water rights. The State Engineer denied reuse of the CUWCD water rights because there was no evidence that Orem City had a contract with CUWCD entitling it to use CUWCD water.