

**Thomas HPA TH-5
February 2, 2009 Meeting
Participant Comments (C) / Questions (Q) and District Responses (R)**

C: Possibly put the HPA presentations on the web site for reference.

R: Agreed.

Q: Why not go to a 5-year allocation scheme?

R: This is doable, but some goal needs to be set so the allocations can be designed to achieve the goal. Also, be advised that the 5-year allocation will likely require an intensive groundwater use control area (IGUCA) if it is to be applied to all water rights.

C: The HPA is too big and diverse. Perhaps should be broken down into smaller areas.

R: The process has already run and it is too late to be re-forming existing HPA areas and creating new ones. However, there may be other ways the GMD 4 board can address this diversity within this HPA.

C: A 10% reduction scenario should be run in the model.

R: Will schedule such a run.

C: A status quo model run should also be run to bracket the conditions.

R: Will schedule such a run.

C: I don't want to be in the HPA. My section is on the very edge of the HPA and was included based on the conditions of two sections two miles away from mine. The cluster of wells in the very next section East of mine will affect me more, but are not included.

R: The process used resulted in lines being drawn, and in every case the lines may not be perfect. By including every ¼ township that had two or more triggered sections, tended to result in a two-mile buffer around triggered sections for two reasons – 1) to create a hydrologic 2-mile buffer and 2) to merge closely spaced HPA's into more manageable areas.

C: I wish the whole process would go away.

R: Noted.

(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.)