

12/8

WPTF - Funding Subcommittee

Dave S. - Jay - Lumir - Don Kraus - Tom Schwarz - Gene Co
AB - J Cannon - AOD - SG - ~~ex~~
Ron Bishop -

Gene:

Rand Robi

Bishop - Go for referendum a tax. New idea =
a method to slow irrig. down a state
The idea = have a 25¢/acre charge for
irrig. for all irrigators across the state -
goes to fund to take care of problems -
everything from studies to returning acres.
\$2 m statewide

Erickson -

Gittles -

Healt -

Lumir

Jedlicks - Fert. taxes haven't passed. (Have in KS).
Lottery \$

D. Suggert

Don K - Concept = something like what Dave S. set
out would be helpful for tomorrow.
Helps to have straw dog for tomorrow.
Could revise a bit.

Other thing to think about = poll idea

J Raze - Thoughts - in email late yesterday -

After visiting 7 state senators -

1) idea of asking legis. for funds for incentives NOT visiting 7 from.

2) Resistance to idea of referendum re: sales tax (D)'s. - Just the climate.

3) Look @ near-term the long-term -

A) Op + exp. 962

B) interest in asking some DNR/UNL have \$ for modeling needed
Looks like wish list 8/7 \$2-3m.

Approp. committee = receptive re: more \$ to research & modeling.

Broad coalition around that

C) incentives -

near-term - if DNR/NRDS

FDs can I.D. 4-5 things

helpful/useful to do in

Regul. to start next year-term.

Then go to legis. "here are things - here is \$ cost"

Then see re: Platte.

Cataloging redup since 197.

Go w/ ideas to legis. + work for that.

D) Provide NRDS 34 (not 40).

E) Leverage as many fed \$ as can.

F) Where get receipts. (Inds).

G) 5-10 m water redup program.

Dedicated funding / ballot referendum
recommended.

Disagree w/ Dave S. re: TF doing
a poll re: public acceptance.
I'd be willing to see about creating
private group re: survey so more control
over it. Would be political
problem if TF does survey.
would explore w/ Farm Bureau
getting funding for that.

Dave S. Agree w/ Jay.

- 1) important to state up front need
dedicated funding source.
Playing to the press, etc.
- 2) referendum - private poll for preferable.
Trying to get at not that TF pay
for - maybe "work of partners".
But was really getting at "lets run a
poll".
Until get a poll - no one knows
what opportunities are. If get a
poll + positive - will gain steam.
Re: taxes - Selling pt. for ref. if
they get cur + we bring it back.

4) Trying to get at what Da said
in his email - to expect to get

* for incentives decreases string of regulation.

Schwartz - no major probs. if have a gap.
more specific re: source of funding, the better.

Get hydro-revenue going to genl. fund should go to us.

DK - let's threads - maybe \$50K.

Need to hit a $\frac{1}{2}$ states - in short term, do thru genl. fund or other sources.

Need to chase ballot referendum.

This will have more support than we think.

TR - Good idea re: short vs. long term. -

Referendum - even if gov - not effective for a couple of yrs.

Specific list easier to sell.

AB - Gov. thoughts: Admittedly opposed.

Told gov. thought TR would make recommendations to re. But when I put $\frac{1}{2}$ word req. to Gov. - would discuss w/ Gov. 1st.

1) What TR looking for

2) What DNR asking for, give Gov's stance.

Concern - re: re coming forward w/ matter

he couldn't suggest.

Suggest TF keep saying "that's what's needed in long term" But don't just tithes up.

GL - Another (P) to have poll...

AB - 2nd thing Gov. discussed = need to do something soon a Repub. - + focus on that near term.
Reminded Gov. can't ignore Platts.

3rd thing - Don't NRDS get a few state? I said do thru DNR + other state.

Tell NRDS to give some to Repubs.

1.545 m. going to NRDS from state treas. Split by law on 70 basis based on temp levy + temp rev.

If that were way we went, would take a chg of law.

[If NRDS close to go - whether could do.

NET - talking re: "signature project"

as opposed to a lot of smaller projects.
Talled a bit w/ Dept of Ag. +
GAP re: combining into signature
project # to retire irrig. land +
allow dryland farm + work w/ UH
re: best way to dry land farm
& using pivot canals as habitat
& put together program + figures
~~to~~ go to budget + get rev's
from that.

Tap into Lottery funds w/ heavy hand
of doing so directly.

Other current = Dept. working w/ IDs +
NMDs in Regub. re: Plan to deal w/ drought
Have plans w/ #'s (in-house). Could
put together specific Plan w/ #'s.

↓
Not comfortable sharing that tomorrow.

Range of possible dollar figures?

AB - range under re: range to retire
#'s + that wait fly. Work w/
other proposals.

GA - Calls for media. Q = if you can't
bring Regub. into Compliance., 1st Q =

Will this put water in rivers?

A Q we need to be prepared to answer.

AB - Answer = yes. Depends on option - will be in sooner or later.

GG - Don't understand lag effect.

AB - not really a hazard. A hazard is that if we turn off upland wells - won't immediately put water in river.

Pumping wells + dipping into river - use lag time to your advantage - so depletion don't show up until out of drought. Problem = you'd have to be far from river + pipelines are expensive.

Ideas range from veget. control, to buying acc - reg. @ bottom of list, but is a list.

GG - Ray S. will be there. Asked him to give impression re: impacts of do by all regulation.

Impacts by incentives. - Farmer Community

AB - Diff. ^{3/1} CREP + EQIP.

What I've run into - who start talking

re: return irrig. acres short term -
base for fed. programs affected.

GG - Rules from Risk Management Agency
re: if low water - could they still
get preventive plating?

AB - Don't know answers.

GG - Good friend advised not to roll
waters too much. Maybe allow
preventive plating to be considered
another yr. - but if gets to Washington,
may be cut out...

AB - Good to know.

GG - main idea for discussion this
a.m. = proposals on table.

Tomorrow = ideas from Suggala -
Osloves office will be there: give
us a feel re: what can expect re:
EQIP + CERP

AB - Anything we've discussed will be covered
about re: Press.

DK - Idea of poll. (TF vs. private)

GG - Don't say we want to conduct the poll.

DS - may not want to discuss the poll.
maybe say want to work w/ partners
to explore possibility of referendum

GG -

OS - of press ads re: rearing - say will talk to a lot of people.

DK - COHYST - of saying doing another model
→ COHYST area need to talk about.

JR - Discussion has been COHYST =
Cadillac - Elk Horn - Long need.

DK modeling efforts out there - but
funding not there.

AB - Tech. Studies. Think about how funding.

NOT for public. ~~too~~

Gov. request almost the full \$3.5 mil
\$2.0 mil cost. share 2/3 to 1/3 basis.

1.5 mil. re: tech studies thru DNR.

Gov. = supportive of that. Want to focus
short-term on incentive-based
plans & leave tech. as from legs &
then down road think of changing
< after get sales tax >.

GL - Elk Horn Long discussions - was
COHYST yesterday - Worried.

Also looking for things they can do to
defer possibility of FA - like Bishop
is doing. Don't have tech. info. in
those areas & think they need it to

~~plan~~ prevent probs. in future.

AB - Jr. study of Upper Long/Elkhorn w/ USGS. Discussions in lower part of basin re: modelling.

I've done all NRDs we want to work w/ them on studies.

@ this pt. - Gov. supports 2 more modelers for DNR to work w/ NRDs
GG - made clear to Univ. - they want to be careful - not duplicate research already out there.

JR - Q re: strategy. Is carbon that just for now & might retract & going to water reduction.

AB - Incentive & is really a big Q in E part of state. Other side of coin = if Gov. willing to support for test - even tho tax cut in budget - to push more than that other - will be take it away from other side.

JR - Is that risk. Erators = receptiveness re: more money on tech. side.

AB - Will trust JR judgment B/c don't have experience.

JR - Threw in 2-2 1/2 hr. - could be at only totals \$500K... maybe just go for as little as possible to reduce risk.

GG - Appears very likely - if dot mention
add needs - a couple of state senators
may try to get funding for studies in
then areas. Think we need to keep it
in our list re: things to be addressed -
but wait & see how hard to push

AB - Like to keep it on the list,
may - when TF comes forward - want
to distinguish B/C what you think will
be in budget.

GG - Technically - no bus. dealing 7 Reg. Valley,
Change - to address conflicts B/C SW + GW
users. That's conflicts of other states -
not SW + GW.

AB - Disagree.

GG - Not saying shouldn't address. But -
look @ change - way I read it - if
get & done on Reg. - state will
have to address. See re: Platte B/C
Coop. Agree

AB - Delivers down on canals. Our change
as part of TF is to address that.

DK - (I) case up. One Compact conflict
addressed - SW interests would be addressed.

AB - True. That's why not need to make O-A
determ. But - SW + GW is an aspect
TF to address.

DK - Case re: equities B/C SW + GW not being

addressed.

AB - Agree.

GG - And we're working on it. Strict reading of change to TF & way involved in Congress - what we say has little to do w/ it.

AB - Answer = it's NOT just a Capex D.

DK - Q for Ron & Linn. Capex table adding suggestions to list? (of Jan)

Ron - Suggestions - can fit in there very well. Linn - not real comfortable. But jump into idea re: taking state \$ for NRDs - we're using \$ for studies re: whole divide NRD -

Ron - Recollection is that some, if not all, came to us w/ % state diverted local tax dollars for us. Some is "make-up" \$. It's not fair. Might as well tell us to raise our local property tax.

GG - Linn + ch. added to Jan's laundry list?

DK - Add under #4.

Jan - Agree. Animal reg. - wasn't any support in our group re: instilling fees @ state level. If have fees - we can't re: authority @ NRD level rather than state level.

GG - Suggest - if Jan or Dave have time - merge 2 proposals into 1 & add in

What discussed today.

GG - OK w/ all?

JK - on my list - already have "done-deal"
stuff - keep or?

AR - } leave a list id. as "already approved
DK - } by TF!"

AR GG - Re: follow Tom's thought re: regulation
as last report.

TS - Not saying Reg. NOT a part of this.
Can't sustain economy we have today. do that
run - don't have ability to copy of just
regulation - do that run, need to use all tools.

GG - NRDS - LRNRD (?) - suggested if go to
noting funds, NRDS get credit failures
they take out of products.

Need to decide tomorrow how specific we
want to be.

Give girl suggestion - & then work out details?
or just general.

DK - Jay's has #'s - NOT bad

AS - Agree - use Jay's to remodel B/C to
more specific.

DK - Jay's got approach re: A has sent.

JK - Q re: whether NRDS in bank could
from interlocal agree. - re:
(e.g. CP w/ TR + NP) - to form
program to work in all 3 NRDS -

Quickly to think of re: incentive program.

GG - DS asked re: included by phone

DS - Am = presentation - worth it?

GG - Comfortable w/ input?

DS - Yes - avail. by cell.

AB - One Q - promised Jay re: list of
tech work dates - want avail.??

JR - email to us - we don't talk specifics
tomorrow.

DS - Sent email to list serve re: "don't use
word 'pollin'."

GG - will send email + will alert TF
members re: want be using that term.