

10/26

- Municipal Subcommittee

DB - Where to start?

DK - 5 (I)'s

1) Rural dist. water (I)

< cities provide water to rural areas outside boundaries >

2) Capitalizing of C Agree

3) Pop Growth - increase provided ind. growth?

RB - a 250 gpm - not just domestic - ind. ind. / com.

v. rule adds those to 250 gpm.

4) Equity of rural-urban dev.

5) Wht ind. use pending -
of pending, 1 yr? 5 yrs?

AB - other (I)'s?

RB - yes - J Turner only one that likes formula
5/3 single way to address cities' concerns
& get it done.

DM - Suggestion?

RB - Sene suggested - grab cities w/ using
today + 10% growth a 10 yr.
growth So future sea expansion
can be w/in what does now & +

& no offer & after that - offsets, etc.

KF - Not fair to mini that's a hi user now
& severe w/ good course program

LC - Apprs. from low-water users who view
as competitive advantage. Would
stall somewhere @ mini level,

DK - Get some standard & after that - you
pay.

DB - How work w/ city w/ GW Permit -
get?

RB - Use to level at now + growth level &
after that, still use but provide offsets.

DK - as CU goes up - offset.

DB - ^{existing use plus} 10 yrs. growth @ 10% + then after that
< up to which no offset > + offsets after

Regardless of permit

SH - We're not buying that.

DB - For mini's, NOT w/ GW Permit?
Although State ant. to up + transfer that ant.
- as long as w/ permitted ant. -

AB - Taking issue.

Critch = law allows adjud. of not using.

DK - Conflicts w/ other SW acts. been addressed??

RB - Transfers granted w/ impact in mind + still adequate water?

AB - What I've looked at - that's the way doc.
Cover = Permitted amounts all over.

KF - ?

AB - Permitted amount - theoretically no conflict
w/ 962

He: grants out in future...

If determine F/A today + allow add'l.

uses to city - if hit @ point -

will come at expense of others.

KF - 8/4 F/A - put #'s in there in
making detem - then no offset, right

AB - 1st time around - can do the first
round - may have been too late

for one basis

Dept. view = diff. not big enough

w/ basis - wide basis to worry about

But - cut across with upper balance -
haven't done detailed analysis

AB - have 4/ward & do 4/0 problem.

KF - use so small would be better.

AB - would be my guess.

SH - Bad to RB's formula - thought bad
here to fix here.
But that's dramatic chg from where
we were at.

RB - Depends - was simpler matter than
arguing over counting acres & uses..

SH - limitation on growth is big issue.

RB - just e.g. -

DK - Capex = div period - more else
is paying for your growth..,
Afterwards you are.

J Ball - Easy cases - re: B" - @ that
time - suggested need for calc. for
mipled use. Went in to address

mixed use + provide growth.

easiest was 708 proposal.

A lot of graded teeth - wasn't easy to get
to mixed use former Backing up + starts
over a huge problem

RB - That's fine. If mixed use acceptable to you -
let's use + refine. % 250 is based on average
of domestic AND industrial.

JB - 250 - in huge trouble immediately.

RB - Domestic use graded in perpetuity for population
growth - probably more like 150-157 than
250..,

LC - Concept of fixed growth - haven't discussed
moving down different road - Probably
should discuss 4 cities.

250 may be accurate average for domestic
in NE.

in NE will be higher than 150.., Data
from KS.
250 probably defensible.

KS Water Dept. - extensive collection of data.
↑ E to W.

<H. O. (2) re: city water use>

AB - Worry re: varying this East to West?

LC - intriguing idea.

DB - Looked @ initially - don't remember what happened

LC - Biggest variable of water use = price.

Not meters, ~~that~~ but price.

250 may be close - may be a little low.

SH - Barometer to check -

KS - excludes all but domestic.

8 Regions.

1 = Western

8 = Eastern.

Diff tables each region.

LC - Tables break down further,

km - p. 8 = average?

LC - Right.

AB - map? - p. 7.

RB - Tables DON'T include industrial?

SH - That's what FN says.

LC - East-West a a bit of a N-S factor too in NE.

AB - NRDS can restrict wells (man-dwn) under
50 gpm.

→ exempt both domestic... (rural + city) -
to keep at bay.

LC - Q = want state-wide average - it's a
bit hard to do that.

0 Sm - GW Fund article ...

LC - no ones collected that info for NE.

Cities don't break it down that way - must be

not average.

Put Hester - data for Jalesbury - Ft Morgan &
then data consist of (a little lower
than) N. data.

250 is defensible.

RB - it may be in the west. Not sure it is in
the east.

LC - anyone have idea how we can break that
down?

RB - no quick way. Probably no easy way.

DK - plan to look @ each + level. Ch
base as opposed to fixed # in statute.

RB - muni's want?

Set aside transfer permits.

Want what have now - plus cycles for
effects for any domestic expansion?
What about industrial?

LC - Part is legal fiction.

Was sizable margin for growth.

We looked @ final # formula created.

Hybrid formula yielded high end

for muni to deal w/.

DK - what saw in CO. - mid word

use .25 - .27 of - person - day -

transfers to a number that included
industrial. - as pop. grows - capacity
grows

AB - TF Column re: if 250 incl.
indust / commercial + then ADD
a number for that - yours double
~~existing~~ counting.

SH - ANY # - one double

AB - Existing = G Factor

if want to add new plant - effect.
Pending is the Q.

LC - no one viewed pending as opportunity
to get a bird in.
Could tighten def.

AB - 250 + existing on top of.

Suggest - take what using now +
250 applies to new growth.

KF - UBNH - near as a high cap % of
Hederson. Were here to set # we
won't go below. Not what we
were looking at.

A little depressive of looking at the floor.

AB - Not so much about the optics.

DB - Single #?

Stick to orig. formula?

SH - Formula then expect com. of what
to throw out - start of elec. com.

BB - If build in growth for cities -
will ask for growth too.

If go to single formula - takes
away that argument.

DB - Draggrop. for this group.

Started as main growth (I).

If they want

LC - None of us speak for econ. devel.

AB - Easier for TF to deal w/ econ. dev.

DB - If want to pursue - go for it. For
this group - would be spinning wheels.

AB - Willing to look @ per capita
& domestic #? {Cities here}

JD - a people #.

AB - So willing to come up w/ #
for domestic only + add others
later.

- Everyone wanted single # for cities.

(12) so hard is P/c trying to control us diff.

AB- 250 a day + exempt?

clg prop. goes up - # goes up -
misunderstanding?

□ / JB- No. People growth formula
Included people growth, not acreage
growth.

JB- Growth as communities + large
annex - would like acreage -
but we gave that up. Was a
way to try to meet what you
were telling us.

Formula - everyone fixated on
upper # - NOT what looks
@ yr - to - yr. Sidney - settling
a top (capit level of growth)
70 offset. Likelihood of use - will
take yrs. to grow into.

Small area. P/c 5 yrs. down
line will be that top and
people can agree to formula &
feel comfortable & NRPs will have
to look for that much water.
But can't see community reaching
top of ~~formula~~ formula in next 2 yrs

CC - Basis of Q = choosing # for base level or
for cities needing growth?

AB - Optics. Hearing people have trouble w/
double counting...

Maybe 250 - but come up w/ # for
domestic + certain amt of land, etc. + that's
per capita growth + rest is baseline + if
want to allow amt now for ind. commercial
use so can add. to areas outside
of town's.

Not arguing 250 -

Whatever # 5/16 domestic only -
GF after existing commercial
- discuss add.

JBull - Domestic / Commercial NOT mutually
exclusive.

Per-person per day amount keeps you
out of that trap.

CC - Sure of discussion might be worth
< need break >

AB - Reply to JB -

"excludes large ind. users"

p. Smith - Commercial use is in statute - can't ignore

DB - Everyone okay w/ RB suggestion from main side.

RB - idea to get away from complex formula.

Preset use + level of growth - yrs of growth

NKR offset.

idea to allow increase for domestic use not offset beyond that for perpetuity - growth # varies across state - 3-4 years.

no - complex - change to by - by a w.

Act. of growth allowed -

So if Co. asks is now can say "yes it's avail."

Suggested 10-15 they sugg. 20-25

So somewhere 15-20

So don't calc. what hi yr. use was til after 15 - 20 yr.

Now + growth = base.

Then increase for domestic use top

↓
Perhaps use as growth

Conservation piece developed used as growth

DB - $Q - P_{10} - Q_{10} =$ offset.
Km - Alt?

KB - Alt. - Thus permit - on approval = alternate to formula.
Would be base then.

D.S. - 10-25 yrs growth for?

RB - Zones for direction - but take effect
after 15-20 yrs.

growth for ...
if no transfer - don't have to worry
perfor

about what'll happen over next 15 yrs.

J Ball - 20 yrs.

AB - Cities returned?

KB - a city's int. to do that b/c the
end of 15 yrs. - base - to extent
can consume - can be used for
add'l expansion.

Km - Base?

RB - Highest use height had per annum
= base. On top of - get a
per capita expansion about
dependent on funds.

RB - Transfer point in place now - can
use trans. act ONLY (with add
per capita) - take higher of
trans. point amount + the
"base act" as base.
(as above described).

DB - you get rid after that.
+ from this - get per capita amount.

RB - NRD gets ~~of~~ all retired ~~was~~ acres -
e.g. pivots - $\frac{1}{2}$ C NRD makes up all
offsets.

JB - of city

DK - Buy pivot in or outside city limits / plan area
if just go buy it - outside limit - it then.

RB - if grow into it - we want credit for
returning it.

JB - 2 pivots in city limits.

might buy in 19th yr. to use.

RB - City grows into land + retired for houses
in 1st 20 yrs. - someone gives offset -
goes to NRPS -

if \rightarrow yr 17 - atn. ceiling +
want room to maneuver $\&$ so buy
it out - city of Sidney's to use as
offset

Kh - Eng's - read something in writing.

BB - Q - Same thing for rural eco devel.
for 20 yr. period?

DS - Yes & a.

Kh - Stakeholder option.

DK - Will lose support if don't allow
equity of concept.

LC - If id. use less than well?

RB - Then excess water to use elsewhere.

OK - Convert to CU.

RB - How for GI when some days/ months put more back than to place than they pump out of wells?

Small amt of water will fight about - ought to be able to export from offset.

RM - 20 yr. period will allow science to catch up w/ imp.

BB - Imp (I).

RB - Will be moving target to extent there's conservation.

AB - Imp has to protect existing users.

EC - Do - RM - Cookson work out wording?

DB - Coop Agree (I) hinges on

DK - Compatible w/ CA.

DS - Rural water Dist's need to be factored in.

DB - Remove?