

Question 1

- What about cabins?
How wide spread is this?
- What about farmers/Ranchers?
- Will this be a precedent
for others?
- How many H₂O rights acq.
since 82 in govt name.
- SA do have a Resp. to use
BMP's. Must mng.

#1

Question 2

- Concern that Clause will make it more difficult for pvt entity.
- Public Interest?
 - Laws, statutes →
- How is Ski Area Int guaranteed that altho right the ski area purchases will stay w/ ski area & won't divert it?

Question 2

- Have it be a cond. of govt. tangible item rather than abstract (owned by govt)
- If bought in name of govt
Can they sell them?
- Concern that this could be "over regulation" based on "fear".

Quest. 3

- Tangible vs obtuse
measurable
to permit to show
compliance.
- Need certainty in permit
- Uncertainty = risk
for ski area
- Broad to give ski area
flexibility
- Ski Area needs confidence that
exp. is possible.

#4

Question 4

- Tangibility w/in permit.
Legal req. to maintain
'x' water rights ~~for~~

- Perception is that clause
would adversely impact S.A. Area
Get more clarity.

#5

?

✓ Be transparent ←

engage w/ folks

(Firms/Researchers) & consudits
willing to

open dialogue

— future mtgs.

— How can u do this from
top down feeds whom H2o Right
held by state? Bricing doc?

— Cabins — as long as this use
for — continues ~~this will not~~
H2o right won't Δ.

?

- IS there a way to hold the Rights

in Z names:

Vail + US & both
Entities have to agree
on terms of sale.

Bin Items

- Follow-up
 - # H₂O Rights since 82
in govt
- Have any Ski Area
H₂O Rights have
~~been~~ gone to another
use.