

7/11

TASK Force Muni Subcommittee

Option 1 =

Option 2 = per gal / per day / per person PLUS
alloc above that.

Add all up.

Deviates in language and result % see.

Ran by muni's.

Area Not Yet Designated

Wrote such that ONLY if dist choose to
allocate, go this route. If dist - N/A.

DC - Deal w. offset in IMP.

Ops 1+2 only apply in F/A or O-A AND

IMP uses alloc as a control.

Narrowed (D) to what to do re: alloc. when
being used as right tool.

DK - Building in 20 yrs. of growth - from
uncertain.

DC - Becomes part of IMP process.

RB - Area not yet designated / city holds
a permit.

DB -

DCrowley - if allow 20 yrs growth -

We design 40-50 yrs growth.

Consequence to us beyond that? We'd

want whatever permitted to be in baseline,
DB- Permitted 54?

DL - + max 104.

DB- 20 yrs. for now using 40m?

if the NRD allows - you can

use full amt. of permit

but offset for that - part of baseline.

DL - Clarify of date ref. "incl. future uses"
in 48-713(1)(a).

& the "for purpose of 48-713(1)(a) -
existing ~~uses~~ ^{farmers' uses} include - 2 concepts.

20 yrs. growth or full amount of permit.

RP - needs for existing uses...

DL - Prob. = stat. lag. 713 + 714 talks

of existing uses.

existing uses / current uses.,

RP - Play 4 words.

include in water already committed

20 yrs. of need ~~PROVIDE~~ or permit

amt - whichever is greater.

DB - See these carries out to option 2.

RP - Sense re: 13" of 16" ag. alloc.??

DB - Problem is - will you alloc. to

farmers re: what use in bases?

RP - Logic of diff. inch #'s??

Hard to explain.

DB - Could be diff. than Ag. alloc. - no

less than 13.

DL - Turnbull option gives absolute loss +
adding an add'l.
multi-level.

dr Turnbull - could go 4 inches allow
to land.

Jordan Ball - concern = 18 hole golf course / park
4 sprinkler system.

if no longer able to water -

Concern - (R) for 16" is so work together
NP - NRD = land to year irrig. golf course.

JP - diff = philosophical - saying to people
in community who don't use as much
as ag does to buy into larger
use.

Way to do = "Don't worry about your
use B/c small - you can buy into
support, big user B/c you have
plenty of water."

RP - Get to some pt. of tie to them.

if go 4 option B + tied to Ag.

LC - 4" ag allow. has degree of
arbitrariness to it too.

A bit of arb. nature to almost
any allow.

Having fixed # in stat. allows

degree of planning.

Gives caput zone instead of trying to NED.

RP - Problem of this - everyone else fine?

Politically hard to sell.

DK - Alloc. to farmers re: mini use outside city?

RP - do we allocate. - doesn't fly.

DK - How deal w/ growth?

Adjacent cut back now to allow for growth?

Need to back up train for Ag.

Will have to back up zone.

How sell.

KB - Correct concept.

DK - Gradually mini = ok.

But - allow growth + back up further trouble.

C. Fries Turnbull says D re: industrial.

DB - Rule - of ind. outside - sep alloc.

This not intended to

(York)

DK - Conservation info going out last several yrs.

DB - Focus more on # new wells / not pumping.

Pumping per well down - but # is ↑.

RP - Achieve goals of use Turnbull.

still over current use / think can sell.

York - How grow commercial uses?

— - Turnbull increases as pop. & area ↑.

Gary M - Tying ^{munis} irrig. allow to the alloc. for irrig.
ag. (ag have bc).
CPT #2 - then ($\frac{1}{3}$ Ag) * (Ag allow
for irrig. lands)

Gene G - Side w/ RP. Has to be same as Ag. -
good idea to tie to irrig. land ^{4th}
munis...

DL - of area $\frac{1}{3}$ - approx.
of $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$
 $\frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4}$

90 pct directed towards green space.

LC - $\frac{1}{3}$ = arbitrary.

CF - Don't look @ all munis.

RP - Look @ for each city.

DL - idea of provision to allow water to address
green space ①'s.

Look @ ea. muni & green space.

JB - Care for his. His Plan (John's) does
that.

DL - Wondering if don't leave it - rather than
fixed # - # % of footprint
so what would get.

Wonder if not more equitable to do
city by city.

LC - Lowest possible NRB alloc. possible to
even make sense??

RP - Probably will be in Regub.
6-7"

DK - 6.7" this yr.

JB - If you can sell little be viewed as equitable & whatever irrigators will get will look @.

Dealin' by min. states cont.

if tell to look @ space - gets away from minimum.

- Re: green space - that important an
(I) ? Dealin' by CU.

DB - 90% of min uses aren't CU.

York - Looking @ space not for water lining -
but for use.

JB - Way to look acceptable to do that - find way for polit. acceptable for community growth.

DL -

Gm - if # & higher than ag.

DK - Not point of higher.

if higher than what need - that's the part that's questionable.

IMP has to offset - spend add'l \$ to offset for add'l growth over + above '05.

Gm - Point = Bulk for option 2 = per capita. Telling a fraction of 3-4%

of water used by hunde.
Worth going thru extended process of
measurement - relatively small amt.

DK - Fair Q.

RB - 250 / person include water, yard.

DB - Usually does.

Covers yard / garage / commercial uses.

RP - 250 / person + add 5.3" / acre + 16"
for areas irrigating - how much in
excess does that allow

DL - Getting to folks actually irrigating.
- 16 inches / acre will jump out against ag. allow
6-12'

LC - See different averages. Statistics oversimplified.

TS - Solution - need legis. to commit to
dedicated funding. Don't need debate.
Fix upper plates + regular
Funding to go so far as include
storm water (D)'s.

Funding every yr. Can't go to legis.
every yr. hoping to solve problem

AB - Easier to get funding w/ no AG vs. hunde
fight.

RP - need to pull together.

DK - Live w/ option ??

CF - We could get under it.
A fraction ... over / take out industrial

DB - going over.

York - How define ind. use.

CF - Haven't.

York = resid / non-resid.

CF - if network could allow auto.

Feel comfortable when look @ #'s.

Gm - Cost 16 to ag. = thing to do.

DB - your district allow?

RH - Not there yet. 12-15 if go there.

LC - Q's point out genius.

CANAD trying to take credit for water not used. Allow system doesn't do.

AB / DK - Could do both.

JB - Critical res option 2 - no park drops out along the way.

RP - Work in or / stick together "if change away - the deal's off."

DB - Frenar had huge prob. Had dewatering wells.

Gm - GI power generation use - pump - cool - to river. Assumed hydraulics provided logically.

DK - Existing? Future?

DB - Write res existing.

CF - Preceding 10 yr. period.

Plug in for small towns. If have excess -
transfer to near-by community.

RP - Town A - prev. 10 yrs. lost growth.

"but is no ever less than 5%"

everyone theoretically has ability to grow.

AB - if don't do what CF says - anyone declines
now is doomed to further decline.

AB - if did use + use 400 gpcap. near
critical 400 gpcap. ?

AB - Q - "water use" near "hx. use" ?

Henderson - 470 near critical 420.

CC - Cities w/ ↑ use - may be P/c cities
w/ one person in each house

~~is~~ in town - family.

Cities growing - few or higher
per-capita use.

RP - Chart 199.

Family straight - forward.

RP - Q - re: 20 yrs. growth -

water doesn't have to be offset?

RP - no P/c ...

RP - include re: 1/06 ?

RP - if get on track.

RB - Diff. ^{B/T} what's been design vs what will be design.

Will apply to all but us - TP + CP.

SP + NP = larger areas O-A

DK - + F/A.,

RB - Outside O-A, but in F/A?

JB - Gurley - Dalton

RB - Would ^{not} apply to them?

RP - Correct

RB - Would it apply to O-A.

RP - Correct

RB - Everyone else gets 20yrs. Gravel.

RP - Those people get option 2.

RB - Assuming if allow.

RP - If no allow - no allow a mini's.

AB - Offset (Z)

- chd. wells not taking out of mini supplies.

Not taking out: many wells. but 5/8 intended in calc. so don't back battle.

Particularly ethanol plant...

Will be operational til next yr.

Dist was allow. on aq. provide to benefit plant.

CF - Not in F/A yet.

AB - Good & - ind. well not in city on

par w/ what cities would get for sale.

RP - did not used - $\frac{TK}{offset}$

CF - 9 no - -

TK - just irrigation.

CF - 9 no. thing - of dual

49 - 714 (3) (K)

AB/RP - need offset

AB - need equities city / no - city

invest in ag. areas < 50 gpm - why should they get free ride?

JB - Don't want to cut down...

AB - uses in + outside city need see tx

Lloyd
Waylor < Rd number? > - 50 gpm or less are diminishing / will continue to diminish rapidly. Going out of style / won't be relevant. need something workable.

York - a lot of acreages popping up.

RP -

Policy - star. write re: can't launch future ag water.

AB - If no P/A - no permits ag. use.

RP - Ag. grow may have permit.

AB/TR - Some don't give permits.

RP - Econ. Devel. -

DB - Usually community benefit.

RP - Suggest - proposal re: care out of
Jt. discussion + take to full task force.

At the time design. F/A - -

@ you'd have permits in place for
ind. devel. that's not fully devel.

DK - Built into codes.

DL - of F/A - RP - take up table as
"committed" @ time of determ.

DK - 706 as chg. to def.?

DL - To put it into effect for 1st go-around
would need to amend rule.

RB - Re: option 1 + 2.

Build into families + grandfather.

Under other options - build in

20 yrs. growth/expansion -

& being grandfathered.

Several communities = F/A.

If everyone else gets growth -
& want growth built in.

RP - How do you 2 if not allocated?

RB - Don't know.

DB - Capped re: consumption. No growth.

RB - then use reg's offset

RB - City can't get allow. unless allow. to farmers

Require offset to anything they do

DK - Trade what doing + offset

RB - Yes.

CF - Could trigger us sooner.

AB - RB dist. asked to do JAP $\frac{1}{4}$ get allow.

DK - RB point = good.

Opt 1+2 mixes apples + oranges.

Hudson - a growth is: Opt 2.

Equity (I)

RB - Hudson could have a lot of growth if
put restrictions on.

DL - 20 yr. only is: what's F/A

AB - if goes into baseline.

York - Even irrig. allow some water.

RB - We'll have allow.

Controlled irrig. by acres.

RB - 46-706 meets it better.

RP - Need to make-up the...

RP - When design. use is part of what's
committed.

RB - that's the point. Advantages over RB's
cities.

RB - GI not protected under system here - as
growth - have to offset.

Not fair GI has to do + Columbus
that may get water from Platts - gets
20 yr. growth.

RP - Have to be offset.
Inlook use has to be offset in eq.

RB - F/A - take option 2

RP - Rt.

RB - Overst below base? or can grow it.

DK - Option 2 = Cap.
Develop up to cap

GM -

AB -

RP - Does it show out of balance where need
to adjust it away - or down the road.

RB - We want the same ability in our district.

DK - As build in - Be sure that says
doesn't have to be offset b/c under cap.

RP - The Rebalance - comes from SW people at GM

GG - Stan Stubb -

Formula to agree on for not only
ethanol but other industry under
construction in '06?

Have to assure CEO bill get water
for plant.

Not just for ethanol - for steel
mill, etc.

AB - why do calcs. + we see "in balance"
where does water come from?

NPD could figure where Cues for...

SS - Standard one of few growth industries
in country.

RP - also short term - ~~no~~ doesn't see

13 vs. 13 1/2

in long term - need to adjust.

RP - Approach would do it. AB - need to make
Cues from

SS - Am say -

RP - You are. Long term know good
to go + DNX/NKD know cancelled.

AB - Know no fee lunch.

SS - understood.

Central City

- Break -

Option 2 of stat 4i - no offset.

DK - 1) 962 req's offsets into

2) broke offset as grows above stat.

Imp picks up #1 of a gap.

Phase 2 -

Want to put in state law?

nr - Who covers alloc?

if none who covers?

Draw as base pop. grows?

DL - Look @ pop. growth in muni's over last 10 yrs. in areas were worried about

LL - Assumed was a moving base.

RP - Calc. what formula would give you for base

G-Golke Steps in problem.

1st step - = guar. base / way for cities to address industry.

Now shift to offset

Guar. = there - if go over

base - have to offset

Q = are we providing muni's way to guar. expansion? & that have

York - Don't of a low now \rightarrow to take jobs.

AG - Doesn't formula provide?

Then cooperation YNRD.

DB - Q = what do you have to do to offset.
Don't know.

York - Effort - can do 40 tons over
irrig. load - an offset.

AB - Do these state - wide law or
then 1MP?

DB - Don't have answer. Cities would
like some attorney...

RP - offsets is for 1MP process.
grow as population did?

CF - yes.

DB - must increase of growth need offset
under this?

RP - Not by this.

DB - By NRD?

RP - Consider "committed" his full permit of 75%
of \rightarrow hole - rebalancing thing.

AB - Eiter approach Now - haven't done a
lot of writing dates

Plan in place - writing - see how
far off decision was - figure
offer. Don't know what gives
ability to keep growing while
we figure out.

GM - F/A - O - A

RB - Can use Option 2 instead
of X of alloc. it would be
X of average errig. use.

For base.

Could go up to base w/o worry
of offsets.

Keep track of offsets so when
have to balance can use offset
to balance.

if grow into pasture - land
have base - don't worry re: offsets

RP - Need to understand.

Re: yet to be designated areas

Cuts - 5th idea.

Permits for ind. use.

Rewrite accordingly. Word
smithing.

Get together again.

DL - To have informal discussion need
data re: 250.

RP - LC to talk to Puppilin.

8/22 - 10^A Kearney