

**Northeast Basin Advisory Group
Meeting Record
Niobrara County Fairgrounds – Lusk
August 17, 2000**

Welcome

The facilitators opened the meeting at approximately 6:10 pm. They introduced themselves and welcomed participants to the meeting. The facilitators explained that name tents have been prepared for BAG members and the tents will be distributed with the reference notebooks. Participants introduced themselves by stating their name, affiliation, and place of residence. The facilitators sent a sign-in sheet around the room and explained the agenda to set the expectations for the meeting.

Planning Team Issues

Jon Wade gave a status report of the basin plans underway for the Bear and Green River Basins. Both basins are nearing completion with results to be presented in the near future. BAG members are reviewing draft products.

Jodie Jackson distributed reference notebooks to BAG members. The record of the June 15 BAG meeting was also distributed and BAG members were instructed to insert the record behind Tab F in the notebook. Jodie then described the contents of the notebook binders and the updates that will be mailed to BAG members prior to each meeting. These updates will include items to be filed in the reference notebooks with instructions where the materials are to be filed. She explained only individuals who receive the notebooks will receive the updates.

Barry Lawrence distributed and explained the list of BAG members for both the Powder/Tongue and Northeast studies. Barry reported all nominees for the Northeast (NE) BAG were contacted and most agreed to serve on the BAG. He indicated there are still sectors and geographic locations that are not represented and he requested names of individuals who could be contacted for those sectors. Barry indicated that the membership list also includes names of alternates. Question: Were any additional county commissioners contacted to serve as alternates? Response: Not yet, but they will be contacted.

Barry brought up the issue of having representatives of state and federal agencies included on the BAG. He indicated the Powder/Tongue BAG requested representation by the Wyoming Business Council and Dave Spencer agreed to represent the Business Council on that BAG and has indicated his wishes to also serve on the Northeast BAG. Question: Is Dave Spencer the appropriate person to represent the Business Council since he is not the representative for this area. Response: Dave Spencer indicated he should serve on both BAGs.

The planning team was also approached by State Parks and Recreation indicating their desire to also serve on the NE BAG. BAG members discussed the advantages and disadvantages of having state and federal agency representation. The BAG agreed to have these state agencies represented on the BAG. The facilitators indicated agency representatives would be given reference notebooks and updated on previous BAG meetings.

The facilitators explained the BAG had previously selected the following meeting dates and locations: October 12 in Gillette; December 14 in Newcastle. The BAG agreed to hold the subsequent meeting on February 8 in Moorcroft.

Consultant Update – HKM Engineering

Joe Lord of Lord Consulting and Wade Irion of HKM Engineering presented a review of the scope of work to be completed by the Consulting Team. The work to be performed under each of the seven tasks included in the scope was explained. A question and answer session followed the presentation.

There was a discussion of stock water use and how it will be addressed in the plan. It was noted that stock water consumption is included in the gages and will be accounted for in the hydrologic modeling. The BAG felt that stock water was an important issue in the basin.

Question: How many nodes will be used in the model and will the selection of the nodes be brought to the BAG for review? Response: The number and location of nodes is not known at this time. Each basin will be modeled separately and nodes will be selected within the basins to define the models. The BAG will review the modeling work, including the selection of node locations.

Question: Will private landowners be contacted to determine what they are doing to enhance and protect groundwater? Response: Private landowners will be contacted and the BAG will need to identify those individual landowners.

Question: Will the irrigation study include flood irrigation by spreader systems? **Response:** Flood irrigation systems will be included in the study.

Future Meetings of Interest

BAG members were informed of two meetings being held which should be of interest to the group. The first was the Environmental Quality Council meeting on August 31st regarding proposed revisions to the Chapter 1 stream classification system. This meeting will be available through the state video conferencing system. The second meeting deals with the proposed new rules for water supply and sewage systems for new subdivisions. The later meeting will be held on September 12th in Sundance at 2 pm.

Issues Identification Process

The facilitators explained the process followed at the last BAG meeting to identify issues. They explained the objective for the meeting was to prioritize the issues by river basin. The BAG members proceeded to prioritize issues and subissues with the results presented in the table on the following page.

Comment: Bag members should review the remaining issues and subissues relative to the prioritization process prior to the next meeting. Topics remaining include conservation, groundwater, regulatory, water rights, quantity, quality, and uses.

Question: If the BAG is going to identifying issues over the next several months, will the work the planners are doing now and in the next few months be relevant? Response: The issues identification process, and the discussion that occurs during the process is important to the planners and will be used as it occurs. The issues identification process will be most important during Task 5 when future use opportunities are identified and evaluated.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 pm.

**Northeast Basin Advisory Group
 Prioritization of Issues and Subissues by River Basin**

Issue/Subissue	Niobrara River	Little Missouri	Cheyenne River	Belle Fourche
-----------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------

Issue: Related Lands

Subissues:

Private Land Rights	1	1	1	1
Noxious Weeds	2	2	1A	2
Streambank Erosion	X	X	2	3

Issue: Funding

Subissues:

Funding for implementation	All Basins 1 – Federal, 2 - State, 3 - Private			
-------------------------------	---	--	--	--

Issue: Surface Water Development

Subissues:

Agricultural	1	1	1	1
Recreation	3	X	2	3
Municipal	2	X	X	2

Issue: Economic Development

Subissues:

New and existing roads	3	1	3	1L, 3U
Subdivisions	1	2	2	2
Industrial	2	3	1	1U, 3L

1 -- denotes the highest priority, 3 the lowest

X -- indicates the subissue is not a major issue for the basin

1L, etc. indicates the issue is priority number 1 in the lower portion of the basin, etc.