

12/8

Muni Sub Committee

LC - drags re: industrial use.  
1) don't distribute  
2)

AB - To get CU - 1 - return  $\times$  prop # = CU.

hed offg = 2 mill galb..

LC - Good upper limit might be 3K af.

RB - would be a big #.

DL - would be 1 mill.

JT - 2 speed star (a list).

LC - ideas?

JT - Don't want to make up offset for someone else's gain.

DB - Suggestions for CU? What # might look like?

RB - CU # of 25 mill gal per yr. - to replace that - requires 115 acres of com ground v return.

SH - Existing industry is in. Almost NO new industry we could bring in to an offset.

RB - Food processor, red hfg. - Coker = CU.

14 of the 35 are below 25 mill.

JT - Thousands at use - look @ recycling?  
(hed hfg. - e.g. 577 mill purged / 515 mill return)

DB - Acres re: 25 mil gal?

RB - 115 acres - a that equivalent of water use or consumption:

Using 8" in one acre

KH - Low in one area

RB - you're 9 or 10, west = 10 or 11.

Whatever do - hope we talk about CU part of it.

Our NRD could handle the red. rfg -

2 mil. use.

DB - minimum + NRDs could go above.

RB - Propose to our Bd. + town's that we set up a water bk to help 4 other industries that are larger. That it doesn't all fall to us, but that we help set up - there - avail. - cheap rates.

DL - Calc. gals for 130 acres?

RB - Just calc'd 8" / acre & 30 mil gal / yr -  
= what can covered

DL - most pivots will be 130.

RB - Retire center pivot.

DL - of water bk - likely adjustment 4 or 1/4 section

DB - Ethanol plant in city - how work?

JT - if used now for 130 af - gets built, but mini or some case up w/ cost to rec'd offset.

DB - How know in advance?

JT - Play by new rules.

DB - industry wants to know cost + how evaluated.

RB - Come to us ahead of the time to see if water in the water bank.

JT - Price set by mkt. @ time of inquiry.

RB - Our intent w/ water bk is going to be have water bk avail. to encourage industry + based on what it costs us. Rate as cheap as possible. Will recover just what it costs us.

DB - important thing is they can go to you + find out what's available.

GM - Where from?

RB - B-1 < flood control strip. >

KF - For those not in IMP - a root post.

RB - Right.

JT - a water poor district - if do this proposal + NRD can't come up w/ water?

DB - if you're the industry - decide to go elsewhere.

JT - way directed - it's the NRD's problem.

RB - may be a problem in some districts.

JT - Rights.

AB - To me extent - real decision will come out of allocated supplies. Other NRDs out west could be in that situation. Possible escape clause.

JB - Don't like "escape." Legis minimum - escape sounds like moving away from philosophy.

AB - Agree - but if ↑ # - increase problem for NRD that's already short. ↓ # - diff. result.

JB - Presumed cities would take resp.

AB - Struggling of coming up w/ # cities +  
NRDs could feel comfortable w/.

LC - Gross vs. net #.

GM - makes sense - if area of state = short of  
water - etc. that needs to look elsewhere.

Not sure how you would like to say that...

SH - Only guarantee = for population. After 20 yrs -  
they have to secure water etc.

GM - if large user lands tomorrow - how does NRD  
deal w/ that?

JT - Who shoulders cost of offset.

DB - Run # - does one of a lot - NOT etc.  
use two.

Ka - Takes care of part of it.

RF - Per business that comes in - NOT per year.

JT - NRD faced w/ ceding properties to roll up  
short fall?

JVana - Are you saying it should be city or state?  
Would always be in municipality.

AB - Cap concept not in current draft.

DC - Call limit for each industry that comes in?

RB - Yes.

PL - Out where water less avail. Do grid where

city / NRD in agreement where water will come

Could write for O-A basis. But necessity ~~from~~

of mechanism already set up (in order to  
protect people where water is short)

DL - Could distinguish w/ O-A + F/A.

AB - Already in concept?

DL - Just draft said could have growth - if  
retire bases, we get. Not sure as saying  
"You get to grow IF."

AB - Usage Cap. Always option for city + NRD  
to go above.

DL - Proposal re: growth (20 yrs) + that baseline.

Current re: industries - so a CAP.

All don't say = to take advantage of

ind. growth component, say - can do  
this but in O-A areas - have not  
have agree by.

Trying to address situation where water NOT  
as available.

Break

$h \times \# \times 2.50$

let = 25 mile cu for 20 yrs + after that  
ind. = req. for water

Point - Test has last ten - per cap. = low

⊛ NRD offset 1<sup>st</sup> 20. - ev for big nes.

↳ then offset above 25 mill.

JT - Wait agree of out of lie w/ average in district.

→ JT - Hederson has to cut back if goes to allow.

DB - Permit if in place <sup>1/4</sup> eff date of stat.

JT - Only applies to current permit - NOT future.

BB - eff use h<sub>x</sub> use - cut use rapidly.  
Set at bands + prove if want more??

RB - 250 person + ind. use.

JT - Per cap per day includes industrial.

AB - They do.

Break w/group -

Single industrial  $\geq$  above 25 mill. in add'l use.

Existing commercial land - ?

DL @ the legs. passed.

DB - adjust next 20 yrs?

AB - Existing using 30 mill?

DB - do baseline "as is."

{ Plant uses 150 mill l<sub>yr</sub>. + closes. Then we get new operator - is it in my base??

DB - notion of 20 yrs. growth. Q re: increase of big users.

Simplify re: per cap per day + ind. growth to certain point - OK of that?

SH - have a bit from that.

AB - Current use = grandfathered.  
The 200 - 250 / day perpetuity  
The 25k / project for next 20 yrs.

SH - All other users except large ind.  
uses - which are over 25 mill.

AB - We 25 mill does our offer.

JT - per user for yr.

DB - Est. Plant expansion,

176 mill program - don't know CU. -  
offer expanded plant by 12/06.

JV - If over 25 mill - what's offer?

LC - Every NRD will have to decide.  
may require offer all -

JT - Expansion of existing plant - How deal w/

AB - We'd cover if 25 mill or less.

AB - 7 is 60 day period, full meeting of NRD re:  
there is process.

DL - We need to define "existing".

All comm. / ind. uses in yr. in yr.  
preceding cal. yr. of legs plus any  
commercial use which constitutes  
already legs.

Exists could / ind use - existing  
transfer.

DB - Why define?

DB - Use is whatever it is.

DL - Whatever transfer point - if someone wants

to approx + not clear include in - process  
transfer permits - eliminates ambiguity.

Connet - would like conit - ind. highest of  
last 5 yrs.

DL - If captable w/ "existing" + let NRDs  
decide what it means.

Km - Don't want transfer to fall thru.

DB - Draft setting up.

LC - We can define so academic.

DL - TF reg. 12/22 - want in final form for  
TF ahead of time.

AB - Construction Plan - does it matter if not owners?  
Optus - look better to have it.

DL - To TF the 19th.

DL - Phone conf. - no.

LC - DB DL - AB will draft.

JT - only F/A + V-A areas.

DB - Problem??

JT - If outside that area - no restriction on growth.

Gm - As long as doesn't connect that NRD could  
refer to lower standard.

JT - That's exactly what I need.  
DB - Just write deal yet.  
LC - Affected cities OK yet.

DB - only applies to F/A O-A  
Cases. Ple req'd

Allow = higher than permit OR per cap at < based  
on where it starts >  
+ elderly child / home.

Can grow if not ↑ than 25 mill  
for any costs

After 20 year period - all ~~cost~~ increase  
in ind. household have to be offset (whether above  
or below 25 mill)

AB - states use of 25 mill wants to equal -  
where can they go to?

RB - Will cover 25 mill. expansion.