

Support Services for the
WATER FUNDING TASK FORCE

September 5 & 6, 2013



***Result of Criteria Ranking for Infrastructure
and Integrated Management***



Infrastructure – *High Priority*

- The extent to which the PPA contributes to multiple water supply management goals, including, but not limited to flood control, agricultural uses, industrial uses, municipal uses, recreation benefits, wildlife habitat, conservation of water resources, and preservation of water resources for future generations.
- The extent to which the PPA protects the ability of future generations to meet their needs (Water Source Protection)
- The extent to which the PPA provides increased water productivity and otherwise maximizes the beneficial use of Nebraska's water resources for the benefit of its residents.
- The cost effectiveness of the PPA relative to achieving the state's water management goals.
- The extent to which the PPA remediates or mitigates threats to drinking water (draft language).

Infrastructure – *Mid Priority*

- The extent to which the PPA maintains water quality.
- The extent to which the PPA assists the state in meeting its obligations under interstate compacts or decrees or other formal state contracts or agreements.
- The extent to which the PPA contributes to the state's ability to leverage state dollars with local or federal government partners or other partners to maximize the use of its resources.
- The extent to which the PPA has been approved for, but has not received funding through an established state program.
- The extent to which the local jurisdiction has utilized all available funding resources to support PPA (draft language).
- The extent to which a PPA addresses a statewide problem or issue.

Infrastructure – *Low Priority*

- The extent to which the PPA reduces threat to property damage.
- The extent to which the PPA contributes to watershed health and function.
- The extent to which the PPA promotes a healthy watershed.
- The extent to which the PPA utilizes objectives described in the Annual Report and Plan of work for the Nebraska State Water Planning and review Process issued by DNR

Integrated Management – *High Priority*

- The extent to which the PPA contributes to multiple water supply management goals, including, but not limited to flood control, agricultural uses, industrial uses, municipal uses, recreation benefits, wildlife habitat, conservation of water resources, and preservation of water resources for future generations.
- The extent to which the PPA provides increased water productivity and otherwise maximizes the beneficial use of Nebraska's water resources for the benefit of its residents.
- The extent to which the PPA protects the ability of future generations to meet their needs (Water Source Protection)
- The cost effectiveness of the PPA relative to achieving the state's water management goals.

Integrated Management – *Mid Priority*

- The extent to which the PPA maintains water quality.
- The extent to which the PPA has been approved for, but has not received funding through an established state program.
- The extent to which the PPA enhances recharge.
- The extent to which the PPA contributes to watershed health and function.
- The extent to which the PPA assists the state in meeting its obligations under interstate compacts or decrees or other formal state contracts or agreements.
- The extent to which the PPA retimes water appropriately.

Integrated Management – *Low Priority*

- The extent to which the PPA contributes to the state's ability to leverage state dollars with local or federal government partners or other partners to maximize the use of its resources.
- The extent to which the PPA utilizes objectives described in the Annual Report and Plan of work for the Nebraska State Water Planning and review Process issued by DNR.

Organizational/Administrative Structure



What We've Heard - *Organization*

- We need more funding
- There is a broader need than what current structures meet
- Any overarching organizational structure has to have diverse representation to represent this broader perspective

A Few Questions - *Organization*

- Do you see the Natural Resources Commission as the organization overseeing LB517 generated funds?
- If so, would it need to change?
- If so, how?

Members Representing River Basins:

N. Richard Hadenfeldt
Dave Deines
Beverly Donaldson
David Kadlecek
Joseph Hergott
Darrell M. Rains
Jeff Steffen
Steven Sudgen
Mick Reynolds
Kevin Fornoff
Garry Anderson
Clint Johannes
Keith Rexroth

Loup River Basin
North Platte River Basin
Missouri Tributaries River Basin
Niobrara-White-Hat River Basin
Little Blue River Basin
Big Blue River Basin
Missouri Tributaries River Basin
Nemaha River Basin
Middle Platte River Basin
Republican River Basin
Elkhorn River Basin
Lower Platte River Basin
South Platte River Basin

Members Appointed by Governor:

Dick Mercer
Thomas L. Knutson
Stan Clouse

Ground Water Irrigators
Surface Water Irrigators
Municipal Water Users

(Current as of March, 2013)

Funding



Funding Feedback

- Portion of Existing Tax
- User Tax on Water
- Bonding and Loans
- Private Industry Sustainability Initiatives
- Tax Credits
- Impact Fees
- Recycling Fund
- Transient Bed Tax
- State-wide Occupation Tax
- Industrial and Municipal Water Use Tax
- Well Head Tax
- Bottle Drink Tax
- Pitman-Roberts Fund
- Lottery Money
- Voluntary Donation
- Excise Tax
- Commodities Tax/Donation
- **Additional Sales Tax**
- **Energy Tax**
- **Commodity Check off Tax**
- **Tax on Intangibles**
- **Fertilizer Tax**
- **Irrigated Acre Tax**
- **Tax on Trash**
- **Tax on Food**
- **Fuel Tax or Toll**
- **Cigarette Tax**
- **Tax on Every Acre**
- **Property Tax**

Questions to be Answered

- How does the funding source impact those that benefit?
- How much money can we create from the funding source?
- What does it require to implement the funding source?