

7/14/05

WPTP: Muni Subcommittee

Intro's

D Coles

Smith (Norfolk)

AB

RD

Kirk Fr.

JT

Eugene Lock

R Bishop NRDS

J Reye

D Kraus

D Bluh

Don Crowder

J Ball

Dean Shoban

Mike Lucas ()

Steve Huggenberg

Lash Chappin (League)

Jack Vavra York

Bob Rager

~~John~~ (Holdrege)

Steve Kelly -

Beatrice

Rod Dan

Brian Brub

Straw Dog Proposal (DC)

2 Comments.

- 1) How deal w/ cities NOT yet designated?
- 2) " " " " " already designated?

AB - Q - distinction ^{B/T} people possibly "1" vs. possibly + are design.?

D? - Just latter. If not designated - chance of right are not that likely.

Gene - Take into acct future?
RP include in procedures?

RV - Not yet.

DC - Came out of last meeting.

Roger intended to look @ full permit w. part used.

Got to thing - expand idea - when Dept looks @ basin - look @ main use - if trans. permit - Dept. look @ full art of permit.

To provide for growth look @ last decade. City x growth 15% + water use growth = x project same level of growth over 20-25 yrs. Idea to project growth next 20 yrs. as rule determ. of F/A.

Becomes part of baseline.

DC - not in Rule - If concept acceptable - take to TF exec. com. + they make

recommendation to WPTF - + TF would
recommend to Dept. that they amend rule -
Aug. or Sept. - then need another hearing.

D Crowley - so this not part of Aug. 11 hearing?
DL - no.

D Blak - if pop. projected to decline - water
so get larger of existing water projected
growth

RP - 3 things -
- exist
- proj. - 20 yrs. } greater of
- GW permit cond's. } 3?

D Bl. - yes.

RB - why for design purposes?

D Bl. - and serves as baseline.

RB - So if use projected - project 28 yrs -
area design. F/A - then as use increased
toward project -

RP - Look @ existing commitments against ex. supply
re: commits - would up it -
so flip trigger to F/A sooner
As long as growing 4% in projected
baseline - OK

Conceptually - as long as water - OK.

if greater growth - need offset.

AB - if truly F/A today + adding 28 yrs T
water use - they want it all here is at

expense of everyone else.

DBL - yes.

DL - By using human trans. part -
direct = Orala / Lincoln.

Other places - human use not big enough
to cause adverse impacts by putting
it in this way.

Rich F - A lot not growing -

Why not give all 50% proj. so cushion
& cut say down road to differently?

Everyone hopes to grow - even if declining.

DBL - Do as NRO wide thing. Some show higher %

JT - everyone gets base - ~~if~~ if growing
faster get more.

DL - Floor - 50%. Calc. as if at least 50%

DBL - Multiple basins - not clear in doc -
basin - by - basin analysis.

RP - Good - physical analysis.

Re: human transfers - how stock up?

< Compared to projected growth >

E.g. 100% growth vs permits would allow to
double.

NBL - looked @ yrs ago - no carel.

JT - 42 villages - 3 Trans. per

Harvard - 1000 people - 2M gal/dy

Walsworth = 2K gal/person/day

Use - ?

(Highest of 3).

FREIGHT = 98m = 3893/capita/day.

Didn't check others.

LC - McCook / Beatrice type but all over pd.

DBL - Single concept - still from D. Smith -

Cities liked Smith's single approach -

Tx as if in country + flat acre alloc.

View - needed @ least B''.

SH - Q's -

Dept - devolved to GW permits to no
more than build facilities.

Handful of communities got thru
induced recharge or systems

GW perm. + ind. reb -

28 yr.

DBL - B/C those permits under SW its -
assume takes care of or own.

SH - Re: F/A design.

DBL - takes into acct these.

RP - Yes

DL - 2nd Part - re: Platte Report - UNW -

DBL - Thought re: equity / fairness -

if NRD allows - some alloc. for

land area of city up to certain pt

ALTERNATIVE (of greater) cum. amt

of trans. permit.

Just forms basis of alloc. of grow
above -

Statutory approach

DL - Would become part of control §
<46-739?>

D Bl. - per acre inch # -
also discussed floor of gal per
day per capita that reflects use
E.g. - WRD - is @ 13 1/2 in.

If basin @ 14 in. to start +
has to cut to 12 in. - has to
be point for cities that you
don't go below.

So fence goes down - but
city stops when reach floor.

might be more effective as gal/day/capit

AB - Same # for whole state?

DC - Yes. only applies to areas w/ allow.

JB - #2 provision for O-A / FIA is a floor
based on minimum of 13". Why talking
about gal/person/day?

DL - # would be the same.

R.P. - 13" = pumping.

AB - If allow goes to 10" - still be 13" for city?

Gene D - if not deduced O-A - still apply?

AB - They apply if allow. is WRD?

- Yes.

RB - What about in area req. 40 allows?
Will reduce acres instead.

D Bl. - Doesn't address.

JT- Halvort -

"Society to look @ " to show how 13" would go.

RP- JT approach - blended.

JT- b/c of McCool (big area / small pop.) - used a blend of 2 approaches

of @ 13 - problem would be Henderson - politically diff. to bring it live - but not hard to do.

JR- How arrive @ 280 base?

JT- Don't recall.

DBL - URNRD = similar?

RP- Concept buffers were down a bit. Get \approx 400 gal. when do this.

JT- Gray - e: per capita per day - don't be too tight. Be careful.

DL - Set level sufficient.

Way to do = average of man's across state + do average

Don Skid - Look @ Service area of system.

NOT area of city.

If make averages of cities - take same look @ whether cities generate own power

KF - Don't look @ industries either.

DSK - Small cities generally don't have State average stores in.

DL - NRPS - Address how see fit. To have some buffer - are not as comfortable w/ NRPS - so wasted concept.

RP - Est. floor taking mean into acct & industry on top.

End result = same formula to capact so fair to everyone.

Assume this might to give you something close to current use. Can't be way outside or more has to eat it.

Close - w/ cushion.

Jack Vero - (next to L. Choff) - Floor never reached B/C signif. water chg in city.

Other issue - acreage as fair as capact

Don't know if Frenot has looked at

of restrict - how restrict city in its water use - how work?

J. Glod - do need more water - an offset.

JV - How get an offset? How deal w/ short-ten?

AB - irrigators have same problem - don't do daily or weekly - use e.g. 3 yr. average.

JV - irrigator = easy to police.

DBI - financial penalties for overuse - incentives for cities

L. Choff - Discussed concept of per capita - people didn't like so much didn't talk re: blended, too.

Per capita gets difficult quickly.

Simplicity of acreage = appealing. - more readily bid.

Didn't discuss blended

DC - Looked @ us way to avoid conflict

JR - Echo. Fares no prob. 4 domestic -
but perception of 10" for irrig. + 13" for
domestic. Realized might slight (I) s.

DC - minimize push back or opposition -
L Clay - Cities have been frugal.

Realized for what they've already done
Henderson = no relief

most ~~set~~ cities in state have meters -

have been frugal,

maybe floor not 13" but 11" or 9"

Like acreage B/C same - know

what have + how chgs.

DC - not suggesting diff. #. If consensus re: floor
suggest substitute to get passed -

~~as way to avoid future conflicts -~~

GG - ^{Pick one of L.C.} Not way rear water used 5-10 yrs ago

if set per acre low enough - wait displ. -

best if @ 15- if leave higher - get

away from acreage or farmer perception
won't be happy.

DC - To elim. uncertainty ~~to~~ O-A basin.

@ end of day city needs to know
what avail. to it

Rural econ. - need to diversify - spread
out.

JB - @ 13" - supply needs + growth for 25 yrs -
if fares give 10" - Philosophically - Commit

have been conservative - but hope for growth
80% in communities - way to make everyone
comfortable w/ regulation - + Farm Community
wants to use 95%.

Everyone in state realize farmers need huge
amount. Quid Pro Quo = can't be

@ expense of people in communities.

if acreage = 13" - + QPQ = everyone
comfortable w/ farm use of 95% - equity
w/ comfort w/ 2 concepts

"you will not use > 1 drop more 10%
feel I can't get it in my corn"

can't get to conclusion all can live w/.

Acreage works best across state need guar.
of 13" even if farm com. drops below
< Comfort level of 95% then >.

Allows this to be in hx. position re:
support farm comm. around.

Tragedy = placed all locally in
strong competitive situation where people
not neighbors they used to be. NOT
COMFORTABLE. Have to get over division.

How to go thru many levels:

Sub - Exec - WPTF - DNR - NRC - Legos.

Gal / person / day = easy per accident...

BBards. Re. id / power - outside of committees -
group sh. consider - if allow growth in

cities in pla - need to allow for outside
of cities - too - E.g. Edward Park.
WPTF - needs to look @ some type of all.
outside of communities.

L Ch. - Jay asked re: per capita - may not
be as simple in its face.
may be value to JT blended approach
to deal w/ all concerns.

Our members haven't thought of in detail.
might have saliency outside of Sidney
(blended). May be so confusing.

JT - need to think thru. is confusing.

L Ch. - Come up w/ per capita to reflect 13" -
① JT has whole pp...

DL - Step back - re: where it:

2 concepts - conceptually - agreed from # -
everyone comfortable w/ concepts?

RP - 1st an - (re: non-designated) - on
other - not sure -

This idea re: guess. bad - OK w/ - as
long as not subst. above what now
being used. B/c if subst. above - WPTF
has to find somewhere else.

Idea of one community higher than another = OK
Blended - seems fine - don't shift WPTF into
reg. address then wouldn't be ita - B/c P/A

not necessarily allocs.

DL - idea of floor OK.

RP - idea of not backing down - if lots req'd.

RB - Designed for O-A + F/A?

DL - B/c of not complying w/ Congress may have to
back up.

RB - of 1/106?

DL - of allocs.

RB - of no allocs?

DL - N/A

AB - Back up acres?

DL - Control re: limiting use - apples.

RP - Area NOT desig. F/A - 20 yr.

period

project. growth

Areas F/A - O-A - min. year. level of supply
for all muni's in area

RB - Present? Future?

RP - Good Q - if grows over time - have to
make up?

AB - Realize if in IMP?

of desig 1/1 as F/A + only diff =

1/1 desig. didn't become proactive - year

50% - but current desig. DON'T.

CPNED - Joint Act Plan - already F/A.

WBBNED - didn't -

of made detem 40 50% - would be F/A
would be slightly over - penalizes CPNED ^{B/E}

already F/A.

Dist. distig. Now is. $1/1$ - distig. F/A vs. O-D.

D Kraus - "if do in there I want some deal" (#1)

RP - No. #2 could do everywhere

DL - IMP allows as control - this would do that. Could have allow reposition projects growth - but if have to back up train this kids in.

AB - 5% growth worked in? (current F/A)

DL - No - b/c already there.

AB - Results. b/c productive...

JB - Some indiv's \rightarrow 3 County NRD - purin
 \rightarrow water tra used by all communities in
NRD. If no growth factor - you're asking
people (80% of pop) to accept allow. that
give 1 person \rightarrow water tra 80% of
pop. is using. do currently using
philosophical - cost support.

if find way to say - give person if
not $1\frac{1}{2}$ B (yr - no, not get -
communities need to grow - person may
get 1.4 B - trade-off = grow.
people able to grow communities. -
Then community can support use of
 1.4 B by farmer.

RP - no prob. - but water has to care for ourselves.
dof just grow 40 reg. - took sources
water + can do.

AB - important - keep in mind distinction
setting baseline what human can expect
Could say - "Here's baseline, but will
give Sidney more." IWP = flexibility

JB - Concern - re: people working on IWP looking
here for guidance - concern that
will guide process. Could be more flex -
But always will have prob. - got
1.45 B vs. 1.5 entitled to - large
users on IWPs important. Don't think
there will be more flex.

RP - Regard - every farmer reduced +
cities not. That's reality.

JB - Don has 13". Solved problem there -

RP - Farmers gave up water + cities OK

LC - DC asked people if OK 4 concept +
RB shook head "no"

RB - do not design. - Dept look @ - no
prob. w/ #1 ~~concept~~ concept.

the O-A areas - have to load up
load / reduce use. There = no
prob. load on used + wait deep below
then you have 3rd case - P/A areas

Care given - suggest will be more
of F/A - indicate "all OK now" - continue
to use what using.

Envision - "whatever you use is fine."
+ whatever acres farmed now = fine.

Maybe wet season + chgs. over tie to drought
but long term in balance + F/A - so
NOT req. cities & farmers just B/C
weather did.

of farmer expands - need to offer
of cities chg. use - need offer.

Ways to do: e.g. Henderson 4/100
meters - put on meters + cut back
use + ca grow.

e.g. York + G.I. / Kearney -
have out + effort to aq.

Committees - part of offer.

To keep track of - in process of
study of Acctg. system of committees.

E.g. central city - interlocal agree -
we keep track of expansion +
replace of irrig. use by direct use
find use = less consumption than
irrig. was.

Expect greater redup as go West.
So talk re: bases means I have to
rethink what we were going to do.

To give cities guarantee - ask them for 20-30 yr. devel. plan. We approve. As new ind. cues to town - can get private plan for expansion + new use approved by NRW. Need offset - but will set up water billing / acctg. Will help finalize purchase. All 40 setting up minimum for cities. Hope in chg.

DL - War - just re: allow used zoning done by plan 40 allow. - if grow - do offsets

This doesn't interfere / address / chg that
Just re: NRW 40 allow. - gives FLOOR to min's.

Objec. to concept?

RB - but ~~if~~ applies to O-A areas. To set guar. to min's. - re: wait rather than below minimum

DL - Just discussing agree. to concept - then need to come up w/ #'s

IV - used Henderson -

Can grow 40 interfering w/ other priv.

RB - Find in Platte, too.

JV - As grow get allow.

LC - FIA - O-A distinction - if had static #'s - as try to create acctg system - could manipulate acctg + give

self "free water." Could you work system
to your advantage?

RB - A lot of redup. not accented for.
Savings to take advantage / credit for.
Smith doesn't work for Norfolk.

JB no decision re: voted st. of person to
specific use.
Need to find way for TForce to allow
community to support.

RB-DK - Don't believe what saying.

DK - RB point re: allow - Could have allow
of 13" for O-A - then go to
situations re: too much / not - how
get to statute? To continue concept w/
how to deal w/ human's in O-A

RB - No prob of setting floor - even if go
below for other uses.

Rod Han - JB disappointing - IWP working
10 months. If set in - you'd be
larger user saying "no prob of
allowing growth of city."
You're getting negative comments.
Our group has req. from all areas -
Smaller subcomm re: water bling
(I) eg. KA comments.
Just want to comment - have been -
bling - comm. dev. - C B K - thrust.

don't want to restrict econ growth.

Goal of group read -

Mr. Ball not on adv group - but have rep.
from communities.

Continue uses out there - but entire group = either
P/A or D-A need mech. to allow econ dev

Adopted resolution - to provide (@ NRP level)
offals for econ. devel. of over certain
level - try to come up w/

Smaller group (7/5) G. Pers - discussed
baseline info for ag / ind. / commercial -
next year = credits.

Trying to look @ positive side. Group
of people that want to work together.
Want to see vibrant main.

RP - making good progress / addressing I's - not
easy tho.

RH - no but CAN WORK.

GG - Dave & Dan Bl. have done well getting
proposals together. No prob w/ ethics.

Suggest work under #2 better to
deal w/ econ growth outside from access.
Cubic JT ideas - if can't be done in
single way - OK. No prob w/ 2.
may need to doctor #5 re: #2

DL - where at - seem no objex. re: #1 -
propose core had w/ draft language to
go into whatever rule DNR adopts

Re #2 #1's - RP?

RP - Get people together.

Den suit may have demands outside
of area - This does that. Add of
beyond service area.

★
LC - In - Dave - RP get together?

Good concepts to JT are pg formula
the run by our cities.

RB - of the statute - way to protect
sophisticated locality. Not every F/A

NRP can create locality system. If OK
of concep. - work to create state

Even if allors in place can sign
interlocal.

DBL. what RB is group.

RB - Will make the tie.

RP - Water Billing pers - @ minimum need
ledger system

LC - do the city anywhere w/ well in
one NRP + waste discharge in another?

RP - Arapahoe - Oaha.

JT - Having good l.g. - Works out fine

RP - Not inter - basin transfer.

★
DL - Will flesh out #2 + try to work in
blended approach.

+ will core back w/ more specifics
under #1 - adding S/W component

JT - OK w/ floor - keep flexible @ distinct levels

DC - Concept of floor. The NRD on W sites
above floor = more flex.

LC - Re req. option - any NRD on basin
res. miniscule amt - this is so close
would throw out of no req. to F/A?

DBL - Don't know if true - conceivable.

GG - needs to have that effect - better to
take hit now + not have to back up
than to be NOT just F/A but O-A
in future.

LC - most would be miniscule.

DBL - ~~to~~ large units - Omaha
in area potentially ...

DC - Anything else?

DBL - Couple of communities re: new well
fields + read communications suggests
impact of a GC that could impact
stream flow may be viol. of ESA. -
No known minimum stream flow.
Just so all are aware (over 100
miles from stream).

LC - gain fed ~~to~~ but not invasive.

DC - FOWL friends - State will try to have
discussion re: letters re: ESA compliance.

Next try?

RP - To present to spec. - conceptual 4/20 #

DC - Language + #'s - what make 8/2

DL - Dates?

8/18 - N. Platte?

8/11 - 2 p.m. ? Keaney.

~~*~~

DNR to send notices.