

WPTF: Municipal Subcommittee Mtg.

8/22

J Ball rec's

DCookson-§§ = areas where 1mp but no allows. as foot

option 1 = inches per acre.

Part 2 - Turnbull part = other alternative

Where does new § fit?

Part 3 covers all for non-allow.

J Ball - so would cover both?

DC - 1 + 2 are 2 options where allows used as foot. 3 = where no allows.

if no allows. - need something to cover

JB - do agree to the.

DC - "w/o mini offset"

re: Part 1 - trees up next (I)

necessity for offset in F/A / O-A if grow beyond floors?

DB -

DC - NRD will give allows to existing cert. uses

Re: Part 1 - if city annexes 80 acres of land.

Annex 80 acres irrig. land - would be offset for 80 acres.

(I) cover up re: if mini. annexes 80 acres dry land - 13" offset

to new part of footprint - so new use where new uses are to be offset?

DB - O re: option 1 or 2.

AB - def # = 13" → city annexes dry land

get 13" w/o offset?

2nd Q = abg 13" incls?

DB- not re: abg. 13" but re: offset.

J Turnbull - Q. Confusing.

DKrans - agree.

JT - pick option?

DL - no - provide fees. Y in law  
for WRD/city to adopt whatever  
fits situation. Idea to provide  
Part 1, 2, 3 as options for WRD/DNR  
must to craft IMP.

JT - not leaving option in IMP - you're  
drafting it. Don't agree Y that or  
Y 13"

DB - out there each city.

DL - I says you WRD has to adopt.

JT - what of subareas? Threat of alloc in city only

DL - LPWRD - have had threat of city alloc.

JB - level of capex - if alloc - alloc for all

DB - Orig. - Option 1 as legis OR Option 2 as legis -  
but Y's recognition - Part 3 has to be  
in there no matter what.

DL - some like incls / alloc. Some don't.

Doesn't have to be either/or.

DK - JT on 2nd pg. - not yet F/A?

DL - Correct, but if get desig.

DK - Pg. 2 - start there - alloc. there.

Then - layer pg. 1 on pg. 2. mind

beginning.

DB - not intended to layer on...

DC - idea to est. baseline of min use for  
certainty & sure growth.

OK for cities like Omaha / Lin. - get out of present

DB -

AB - means. could be desig. of area some  
b/c of projected growth.

JT - just callus - base of some growth  
built in.

AB - Timing of when - not re: rules for  
of are F/A.

DC - Re: F/A - in RB's district - RB develops

map - may use allows as tool. Tried to  
accomplish slow so min would know  
what go below.

Potentially - if LPNKR - could be desig. F/A -

as RB said - if proactive works may not  
need allows. But - if doesn't meet

objective & goals - use. Then, this kicks in.

Cities in F/A areas would have some certainty

they'd not go below level.

CF - City of York - Not F/A yet.

Look @ progress - SRO is bigger and -

plug in SRO - may start grow rapidly.

When exceed SRO would have to choose an  
option?

DB - Point we've tried to anticipate.

DB- If exceed out - may go to point NRD would have to ask how it would want to proceed. If institute allows, city would have a heavy quantity.

JT- Cities w/ transfer permits - some cities at terrible disadvantage.

AB- State = no permit if the city.

Don't have to have in any event.

May want to think of this; Allow city to get permit ~~the~~ doing &.,

RB- Look @ transfer permits for consistency/equity.

DB- Haven't looked at. Some not equity among them.

AB- Standard is low = city has to "prove up"

46-642 (1).

JT- One prob. - if city = trans. permit - + greater than current use; could throw loan ~~at~~ into P/A.

DC- Recognize municipalities make signif. investment.

Potential serious legal problem if have used

AB- need to deal w/ this in out PR.

RB- ~~do~~ do those area not yet design. One design - 46- [ ]

Q- 15 yrs. after design. - look @ acreage 7- populus area? (Who look at?)

DC- Who make detem. for Pt. 1 + Pt. 2??

@ the P/A design??

or do you account for growth?

Q = Who's resp. for offset??

Does everyone absorb as part of IMP?

A degree of "fudge."

Take away on coaks 13", won't get other than!

AB- may be places you can allow new used to offset. need to go toward too.

LC- Auto. so minimal - possible to say "w/o

offset"?  
Preference.

DK- w/o offsets = huge (I).

What happens in O-A area? How sure words are expectation for O-A area

Allow ongoing mini uses?

I'd say so broad now, includes industrial.

# plans are outside mini. - Should they get same?

Potential growth not counting.

Q's - so: bigger (I)

Stacy - ✓

DL- Exam NAD's decide.

Q = of his that a fixed floor up designed.

Part 2 was involved. industrial ~~concerns~~ ~~concerns~~

DB- mini/etc. in equal pricing.

DL- 250 gp person p day. To need human ~~engagement~~ use.

CF- Chgd from where <sup>consumptive</sup> started. Wants to protect mini use. Now protecting sue

Industrial. Blow up.

DB - Fiscal point. Other part re: growth.

CF - Wait to push for that.

Lloyd Neller - DC still re: offer for ~~ethanol~~ ethanol plants. Not practical support to NRD w/ B.C. of

interests of Am + Others.

Minute 20 - if we get bar - will talk re: acre - sections.

AB - missed point. Should wait have to do

offer. Flip side = if B/C allowed 20 eth.

plants - NRD resp. to have existing use whole

Lloyd  
Neller

"No offsets would undermine 962"

< Re: might be able to ride bike > Q -

Concerned if attempt to put this in state law. More comfortable if accepted + used guidelines. NRD + DNRC are ready to us. Leave with flexibility.

DL - So clear - flexibility over + about this - creates a minimum.

DL - NRNRC have level of ~~devel.~~ devel.

JT - "Perdy was" ?

DC - all the "permit in, but not using yet".

AD - Permit have to be approved.

DL - status < can play w/ language.

JT - Bona fide effort by city to do something. Need to review what's being done w/ the resource. Don't want to lose out to try to figure it out.

AB- exp to require things like  
recycling in IMP. Get into  
interesting area. (re: wells). need to  
work on high ends to be sure don't  
give away something important.

DL- Are these filed so expansive due to  
growth would req. offsets - by whom  
vs by estate etc.

~~DL~~ d view is - under Part 1 - need offset.  
so if annex dry land - offset  
for ↑ use.

Re: Part 2 - Yetiapt of 5-6 parcels  
S/B giving + offset by IMP.

AB- Areas of states where if allow to  
grow - ~~will~~ will cause effect.

JL Q = who offsets.

DL- Big users probably covered under  
transfer permits. Covered for  
projected growth.

~~DL~~ LC - 40 units. 34 not growing.

DB - (D) to leave to NRP.

Steve Krajewski -

DL - Deped-

RB - if house - will offset. if  
~~single~~ ethanol plant - work.

800-1000 acres of corn to offset water  
consumption of ac plant.

DK - + exists / planned. duplicate - vague  
JB - How handle industrial?

JT - Existing = base.

If any entity put in new system;  
500 of / yr. - need special h-c study  
1/4 put in. "To sort out."

Need to see if ag. will support what was  
to do.,

JT - Wondered what "pending" meant.,

AB - You said "pending" - means permitted  
by NRD

JT - Agreed if registered, that was it.

DB - Define "pending" that way.

DC - Q - who's resp. for offsets if grows beyond  
where was @ tie of ~~Q~~ designation.

RB - Has permit - except 250 is typical to  
cover commercial / industrial / domestic.

Has permit if determine grant that was  
domestic [ that's ~~not~~ covered? ]

Would put limits on same level as other  
industrial users.

DK - domestic = resp. of IMP.

LC - Area not talked about. Need time  
to discuss.

JT - Also total area of in limits + area  
outside of limits ??

DC - Logical answer - Cestras.

JT - Rural water dist. - Fairbury selling.



?

JB - Have small subdw. by airport - outside.  
10 mi. W. of city / need to get credit for  
areas.

JT - Q is how to control size,

LC - open to suggestion.  
LN - Rural water system

- BREAK -

DB - Where we are re: options presented -

Consensus - willing re: 13" / acre out window -  
throw out.

Want Turbull option as written w/ some  
clarification:

1) Growth on per capita basis as grows.

- As 12yrs out today OK @ time of design.

PLUS

- Per Cap. 250 gpppd

JB - covers water system outside municipality  
too.

DL - if NRWS want to do 13"?

DB - Don't want it in legs. If NRWS want &  
provide = or > than Turbull -  
can go with

LC - Would be winners & losers in main  
group. Early on - don't know if

understood work in Upper Blue...

Re: average growth - huge sacrifice...

Something we can internally try to work out.

DL - 2nd Q = do 250 the right #??

DB - This group says 250.

RB - 250 = retail average country ind. + commercial.

A lot would have trouble w/ a WPTF.

Domestic volume = different.

AB - 250 gpcpd.

capita/person

LC - Cities can't always break out domestic use

RB - Do as average across states

JV - Commercial is domestic.

Industrial uses usually very minimal.

DK - Underlying premise is will still have offsets anyway + IMP will cover - Q = how funded.

DL - 250 g PPPd → if rural domestic = 250 gpm 4 people x 20 min/day - Nor w/ @ able.

RB - 1000 gal. tank - family will get thru in one day - even watering lawns

JT - Comfortable w/ 250.

SH - Can come up w/ Eg's using > 250/day.

AB - Need to justify #'s.

RB- Also those #'s have other in it -

Some think of peeling out livestock.

CF- meters coming.

Summarized:

RB- Use part 2 + part 3 to develop a base @ tie  
of ~~allocation~~ designation.

+ cities grow up to base

PLUS

expand @ 280 gpppd for new growth  
no offset.

AB- & everything else has to be offset  
by indiv. or entities.

DL- Unless WRD decides to do diff.

Look @ ~~2~~ as a floor and ceiling.

DB- Allow go down if lose population?

DL- Yes.

AB- No offset just means city has  
no offset.

JT- Just want no offset.

Change the law.

DL- Fundamental I - We are ok w/ ~~proposed~~  
proposal revision & will ask municipalities to  
put together justification for  
280 gpppd.

Consensus on 2 + 3. —

DK- Q's re: items —

Laid out livestock & commercial &  
industrial - volume for power generation.

"Amy"??

DB - What exists today.

DK - Revisions to language?

DL - Proposal - everything BUT 2503pppd  
reg's offer unless was part of lease.