Sun Valley GSA Board of Directors Meeting
Setting Minimum Thresholds (MT): What future are we comfortable with and striving for?

- **Option 1, minimum threshold at 250 feet – advocated by farmers**
  - The costs and impacts for communities and households relying on domestic wells would be substantial, critically challenging their access to water.
  - This would allow the viability of existing agricultural enterprises of the region without the need of farmers to change their water demand and farming techniques.
  - The costs and impacts for farmers would be minimal.
  - Little to no risks of crossing the minimum threshold and triggering state intervention.

- **Option 2, minimum threshold at 180 feet – advocated by small communities**
  - This option requires some changes on existing agricultural water demand and farming techniques.
  - The costs and impacts for farmers would be medium.
  - This would allow the viability of existing community wells production, protecting their access to water.
  - The costs and impacts for households relying on domestic wells would be substantial. According to data, all private wells would go dry with this option.
  - Prolonged droughts could increase the risk of crossing the MT, but there is little to no risk of triggering state intervention if the right actions are in place.

- **Option 3, minimum threshold at 130 feet – advocated by households relying on private wells**
  - This would allow the viability of existing community and private wells production, protecting their access to water.
  - No wells are expected to go dry with this option.
  - This option requires drastic changes on existing agricultural water demand and farming techniques.
  - The costs and impacts for farmers would be high, challenging the viability of existing agricultural enterprises.
  - High risk of crossing the minimum threshold and triggering state intervention if drastic actions are not in place.