

**Sheridan HPA SD-6
November 10, 2008 Meeting
Participant Comments (C) / Questions (Q) and District Responses (R)**

Q: What is the district's timeframe?

R: District has no set timeframe. Whatever pace is comfortable for the participants. However, an inordinately slow time frame may allow the process to be questioned.

Q: What have other HPA's done?

R: They have all begun discussions with few decisions being made. View the GMD4 webpage where each meetings' discussion topics will be posted.

C: To affect the water level decline rate, any adjustments will need to come from pumped water, not appropriated water.

R: This is likely an accurate statement.

Q: Are we getting close to having to do something?

R: This is what the participants need to be deciding for your area and recommending to the GMD board.

Q: Does information on individual water rights (quantity, reported use, etc.) exist?

R: Yes. Next meeting staff will make it a point to provide a listing of data sources that anyone can view on the internet.

Q: Can we get an idea of what results might be achieved from different pumpage reduction rates?

R: When the hydrologic model is complete we should be able to. But the model needs to run a scenario that the group is interested in seeing the results of.

C: Run the model in several increments between pumping 30,000 AF annually and 15,000 AF annually – with each increment being implemented in 5 years, 10 years and 15 years.

R: Will try to get this done. How are the results to be provided? Mailed out? Another meeting?

C: Request another meeting in 2-3 months if the model runs have been made.

R: Will try to provide this information in order to facilitate further discussions.

C: Run the model assuming possible cropping alternatives alone.

R: This should be a stakeholder decision with recommendations to the GMD board.

C: Amazed that only 9 wells are annually measured in the HPA area. There should be more.

R: Comment will be submitted to the board for consideration.

C: Meters have helped known pumpage data.

R: Agreed.

C: Certain management options will not be equitable across the range of water rights involved.

R: Agreed. Your process may want to consider this situation as it deliberates possible approaches.

Q: Can the hydro/economic results be presented?

R: Yes.

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

Q: Could the GMD present some options to help the discussions?

R: If requested to, Yes.

Q: Can the GMD outline or specify what legal options are available?

R: Staff will try to outline legal options available at the next meeting.

C: Enhanced recharge could/should be part of the solution

R: If a supply of recharge water can be found that will not affect other water rights, yes.

Q: What happens if the State independently addresses the problem?

R: No way to predict when or how the State might address the problem in the absence of local efforts.

Q: What would have to happen to eliminate an area from high priority status?

R: The trigger or triggers that identified the area initially would have to be mitigated.

C: The 5-10 year timeframes suggested earlier should be shortened to 2-5 years – the longer timeframes may be too late for workable solutions.

R: This is a stakeholders issue that can and should be expressed to the GMD board.

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