

# Categorized input gathered at January 19<sup>th</sup> 2010 Water Workshop and Feb. 1 public meetings

*(This document organizes the input from the table notes, recorded notes, and individual participant work sheets. None of the wording has been changed. In a few instances I moved the contribution to a more appropriate category. When in doubt I left it in the category in which it appeared. The number in parentheses is the number of times a topic was mentioned. This is not an exact figure as there is some duplication between what was written on the table templates and the notes recorded in the front of the room during the meeting. Mary)*

| Types of Water Use | Benefits   | Concerns/Implications   | “Hot Ideas”  | Conditions under which acceptable   |
|--------------------|--|---|--|---|
| In stream purposes | Fishing/fisheries (17) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protects fishery (3)</li> <li>▪ Could improve fisheries (3)</li> <li>▪ Fish for recreational fishing</li> <li>▪ Fish for commercial fishing</li> <li>▪ Enhance salmonid fishery—summertime requires minimum flow and water quality</li> <li>▪ Salmonid rearing and spawning in mainstem</li> <li>▪ Sec. 1707 transfer to accomplish salmonid concerns/benefits</li> <li>▪ Fisheries and wildlife benefitted</li> </ul> | River (16) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aquaculture waste water (2)</li> <li>▪ May not benefit estuary or the rest of the river (2)</li> <li>▪ Too much water could hurt the estuary (2)</li> <li>▪ No evidence that releasing water is necessarily the answer or a benefit to the river</li> <li>▪ Seasonal fluctuations/use must be taken care of</li> <li>▪ Aquaculture—clean water return</li> <li>▪ Impact of gravel extraction</li> <li>▪ Potential impacts on estuaries</li> <li>▪ Effects on sediment load</li> </ul> | Increased hydro power (9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Power production (2)</li> <li>▪ Potential for enviro-friendly power generation</li> <li>▪ Hydro-power generation—multiple technologies</li> <li>▪ Allocate portion of water rights—split between hydropower (which reduces greenhouse emissions) and a second hydro plant in Blue Lake</li> <li>▪ Hydropower generation</li> <li>▪ More hydropower generation and another dam</li> <li>▪ Increased hydro power</li> </ul> Aquaculture (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aquaculture—off channel</li> </ul> | River quality/fisheries/environment (13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmental studies needed (3)</li> <li>▪ Appropriate studies of effects on estuary and fisheries</li> <li>▪ Studies done to ensure increased flows actually benefit fisheries/recreational use</li> <li>▪ Monitoring to insure same quality water returns to the river</li> <li>▪ If aquaculture power—water must be the same quality when return to the river</li> <li>▪ Restore watershed to that Chinook and Coho can get past mile 53</li> </ul> |

| Types of Water Use             | Benefits   | Concerns/Implications  | “Hot Ideas”  | Conditions under which acceptable  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| In stream purposes (continued) | <p>Ecology/environment (8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Species habitat—biodiversity</li> <li>▪ Ecological resilience in times of drought and climate change</li> <li>▪ Less marine pollution</li> <li>▪ Wetlands/ estuary maintenance</li> <li>▪ No pollution</li> <li>▪ No negative environmental impact</li> </ul> <p>Increased recreational use (8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recreation—wading in river</li> <li>▪ Recreation at Mad River and all other recreational users</li> <li>▪ Recreation opportunities—kayakable</li> </ul> | <p>River (16) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Change downstream flow with regard to exporting water from watershed</li> <li>▪ Negative impact on estuary?</li> <li>▪ May not benefit the river or the estuary</li> <li>▪ Long term viability</li> </ul> <p>Revenue/economic (13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Benefits wouldn't support revenue coming in for infrastructure improvements</li> <li>▪ This option wouldn't generate revenue</li> <li>▪ Will it help cover costs/ address rate concerns?</li> <li>▪ No direct revenue generation</li> <li>▪ Economic benefit?</li> <li>▪ No money coming in to support capital improvements and habitat</li> <li>▪ Does not generate revenue</li> </ul> | <p>Lake/waste water marsh (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Put in waste water marsh</li> <li>▪ Blue Lake—waste water marsh</li> <li>▪ Lake in Blue Lake—is there economic benefit?</li> </ul> <p>Enhance Fisheries/wildlife (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sell water to an environmental group (controlled by Mathews Dam) that they use for fish and wildlife enhancement</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sell water credits</li> <li>▪ Use water towards carbon sequestration uses</li> <li>▪ Ask for a permit that looks back 20 years</li> <li>▪ Abandon industrial side</li> <li>▪ Market recreational use to generate revenue</li> </ul> | <p>River quality/fisheries/ environment (13) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cause no harm</li> <li>▪ What will more freshwater do to the estuary?</li> <li>▪ Balance with up-river</li> <li>▪ Code 1707</li> <li>▪ No ecosystem damage</li> </ul> <p>Revenue/economy (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Finance by non-profits</li> <li>▪ Unemployment rates remain low</li> <li>▪ No revenue from aquaculture? Then be sure a revenue generating option is available later</li> <li>▪ As long as we can get it back if needed for other uses (ways to generate \$ for other needs)</li> <li>▪ Who pays?</li> <li>▪ Money to study impacts</li> <li>▪ Doesn't raise rates</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>      | <b>Benefits</b>  | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>   | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>   | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>   |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| In stream purposes (continued) | <p>River and watershed quality (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhances watershed conditions (2)</li> <li>▪ Effect on sediment load</li> <li>▪ For species</li> <li>▪ Wetland restoration—below 101</li> <li>▪ Riparian corridor</li> <li>▪ Could benefit the river estuary as well as the rest of the river</li> </ul> <p>Tourism/Economic (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grant funds for estuary studies</li> <li>▪ Natural amenities attract entrepreneurs</li> <li>▪ Eco-tourism?</li> <li>▪ Tourism</li> </ul> <p>Improve water quality (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Low flow season water quality</li> <li>▪ Improve water quality</li> <li>▪ 9303-D listing</li> </ul> | <p>Revenue/economic (13) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not alleviate financial pressures</li> <li>▪ Low to no employment opportunities</li> <li>▪ Might not offset rates (no one to pay)</li> <li>▪ Who'll pay for the studies?</li> <li>▪ Doesn't offset costs to municipal users</li> <li>▪ Not biggest bang for buck</li> <li>▪ Payment?</li> </ul> <p>Species (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not worried about species' populations being detrimentally impacted</li> <li>▪ Too low—algae and other toxicities</li> <li>▪ What is optimal flow for species?</li> <li>▪ Fish don't pay cash for infrastructure</li> </ul> | <p>Miscellaneous (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Legalize marijuana</li> <li>▪ Develop market for bull frogs</li> <li>▪ Wetland maintenance</li> <li>▪ Maximize Mad River in stream reservations for fish so that other jurisdictions do Not obtain rights to water lost by the HBMWD</li> <li>▪ Gravel transport</li> <li>▪ Grant funds for estuary studies</li> </ul> | <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appropriate studies done to determine if benefits are actually beneficial</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>      | <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>   | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b> | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b> |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|--|
| In stream purposes (continued) | <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintain water rights and local control</li> <li>▪ District</li> <li>▪ As a means of “banking” water use for other future uses</li> <li>▪ Improved potential for aquaculture</li> <li>▪ Maximize water use—Secure 1701</li> <li>▪ Power production</li> <li>▪ Long term viability</li> <li>▪ Research</li> <li>▪ Cheapest way to use water since no infrastructure cost</li> <li>▪ Supports community values</li> </ul> | <p>Species (7) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Seasonal—depends on species</li> <li>▪ Can we even save the salmon at this point (is it too late?)</li> <li>▪ Optimal for native species</li> </ul> <p>HBMWD (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased burden on water district to regulate uses</li> <li>▪ Regulatory burden</li> <li>▪ Burden to manage new recreation</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How realistic is hydro-power? How much generated?</li> <li>▪ Targeted to use—need to show benefit</li> <li>▪ Need more beneficial uses than just in stream</li> <li>▪ Show additional beneficial uses under water rights</li> <li>▪ Tribal water rights?</li> <li>▪ Legal viability?</li> </ul> |                    |  |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>    | <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>   | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>   | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>  |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Within</b> HBMWD District | <p>Revenue/economic (25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Decrease rates. Larger rate base (5)</li> <li>▪ Jobs (4)</li> <li>▪ Expand economic development (4)</li> <li>▪ Financial and economic benefit</li> <li>▪ Any new use that generates revenue will benefit rate payers</li> <li>▪ Expand economic benefit</li> <li>▪ \$’s to pay rates</li> <li>▪ More economic benefit</li> <li>▪ Economic beverage water (?)</li> <li>▪ Manufacturer may locate here</li> <li>▪ Generate revenue</li> <li>▪ Maintain system dollars</li> <li>▪ Support agricultural production—irrigation</li> <li>▪ More residents/ customers</li> <li>▪ Inspire small business</li> </ul> | <p>Revenue/infrastructure cost (8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cost of installing infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Cost of maintaining industrial infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Costs of infrastructure and who pays for them</li> <li>▪ Increased need for storage</li> <li>▪ Cost of electricity production</li> <li>▪ Cost of treatment plant</li> <li>▪ Non-water infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Not enough money generated to offset costs</li> </ul> <p>Local impact (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What impact on local industry or competition with existing businesses?</li> <li>▪ Will increase in “treated” water use, i.e. beer/bottled water impact the quality and duration of use for municipal customers</li> </ul> | <p>Attract/develop new businesses (12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Try to utilize aquaculture—recruit businesses (2)</li> <li>▪ Water intensive agriculture (i.e., rice)</li> <li>▪ Treat water and sell to new users</li> <li>▪ Hemp processing</li> <li>▪ Grow hemp!</li> <li>▪ Attract water-using industry</li> <li>▪ Use as an economic driver to attract/ develop business</li> <li>▪ Pulp mill collectively purchased by water district and subsidized when profitability drops so that there is steady purchase of large amounts of water. Rate payer would benefit</li> <li>▪ Work to re-open pulp mill</li> </ul> | <p>Environmentally okay (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clean, non-toxic, low environmental impact</li> <li>▪ Non-toxic enterprise</li> <li>▪ Environmentally benign</li> <li>▪ Non-plastic container</li> </ul> <p>Politically okay (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Politically viable</li> <li>▪ Expand uses? Must be politically viable businesses (e.g., LNG issue)</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Show clear benefit</li> <li>▪ Legally viable</li> <li>▪ Effects on dairy production – land use changes</li> <li>▪ If waterbag sales are considered “in District” (Potential water bag sales—are they considered “in district?” It depends on Point of Sale if its outside or inside the district)</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>    | <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>  | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>  | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>   |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| <i>Within</i> HBMWD District | Support existing...(8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expanding services to areas already in District</li> <li>▪ Supporting existing land uses/business</li> <li>▪ Utilizing existing infrastructure—improve what’s already there</li> <li>▪ Could support existing businesses or land use</li> <li>▪ Utilize existing infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Expand residential, domestic, industrial use within HBMWD (cost effective to permit)</li> <li>▪ Maximum water usage</li> <li>▪ Increase capacity</li> <li>▪ Cheapest way to use existing infrastructure</li> </ul> | Local impact (5) (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How much developable space that coincides with water access is actually available?</li> <li>▪ Conflicts with CSD licenses</li> <li>▪ Potential conflicts with licensing of munis</li> </ul> Local control (2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If we don’t use it, we will lose it</li> <li>▪ Permitting</li> </ul> | Attract/develop new businesses (12) (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shifting water to municipal and licensing 60 mgd = 30 to municipal, 30 mgd to industrial</li> <li>▪ Support agriculture in district through irrigation</li> </ul> Expand district boundaries and sell water “regionally” (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create new revenue source by annexing/ expanding district by drilling a tunnel and serving lower Eel, Van Duzen watershed</li> <li>▪ Support other watersheds; Eel, VanDuzen, Jacboy Creek Freshwater</li> </ul> | Miscellaneous (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use water in sustainable industries</li> <li>▪ No cotton!</li> <li>▪ Show a clear benefit from increased use within district</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>    | <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>  | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>   | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b> |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Within</i> HBMWD District | <p>Local control (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Keep it all in the family—may be easiest option with SWRCB</li> <li>▪ Maintain local control</li> <li>▪ Keep our water local</li> <li>▪ Keep our rights</li> <li>▪ Easier to change beneficial uses than new permit—potentially no change needed</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increasing municipal flow from industrial and might be able to serve other areas (this may then go outside HBMWD)</li> <li>▪ Power production</li> <li>▪ Municipal source</li> <li>▪ Industrial source</li> </ul> | <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How does this impact water conservation law?</li> <li>▪ Growth?</li> <li>▪ Not stable or a sure thing</li> <li>▪ Use may not be stable—the industry could leave</li> <li>▪ Drinking water had different cost than industrial due to treatment therefore cost and competition of industry that wants drinking water quality water is a concern</li> <li>▪ Hard to find customers?</li> <li>▪ No customer big enough</li> <li>▪ Let’s not fall into complacency of earlier boards—things come and go</li> <li>▪ Capacity of municipal?</li> </ul> | <p>Expand district boundaries and sell water “regionally” (3) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand delivery to other areas—Elk River, Old Arcata Road—current extraction is affecting the river—a limit of extraction would be a benefit</li> </ul> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand hydro electric uses</li> <li>▪ Sell water at the same rate it costs to pump from wells (e.g., Sun Valley)</li> <li>▪ Forestall infrastructure projects to help off-set rate increases</li> <li>▪ Increase recreational value at Ruth Lake</li> <li>▪ Vineyards anywhere between the watershed below Ruth Lake</li> </ul> |  |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b> | <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>   | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>  | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>   |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Outside HBMWD</b>      | <p>Revenue: rates and infrastructure (14)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Generate revenue for rate payer relief (2)</li> <li>▪ Revenue generation—reduce rate payer payments</li> <li>▪ Keeps rates low</li> <li>▪ Generate \$’s for District</li> <li>▪ \$’s to decrease rates and build infrastructure/ provide maintenance</li> <li>▪ Support capital improvements</li> <li>▪ Expanding services more expensive</li> <li>▪ Outside sales could finance water infrastructure locally</li> <li>▪ Could reduce rates, provide funding for infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Exporting produces capital for fixing the port</li> <li>▪ Generate revenue for infrastructural development (port and rail)</li> </ul> | <p>Local Control (13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Loss of control/ right (4)</li> <li>▪ Can we retain our water rights (3)</li> <li>▪ Protecting legal rights</li> <li>▪ Would long-term sale to other municipalities be revocable or would we risk losing the right?</li> <li>▪ NAFTA impact on outside sales</li> <li>▪ Easier to lose local control</li> <li>▪ Stewardship—loss of control over how the water is used (we care that it is used “well” anywhere)</li> <li>▪ Create a dependency and legally vulnerable—what if we need the water?</li> <li>▪</li> </ul> | <p>County/region (12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expanding District—from low gap, adjacent watersheds aquafer recharging Van Duzen?</li> <li>▪ Transfer water to VanDuzen and treatment for domestic use (Loleta, Ferndale, Fortuna, Rio Dell)</li> <li>▪ Pump water to the south fork of the Trinity River</li> <li>▪ Pump to Eel River valley or transfer at low gap</li> <li>▪ Sell to municipalities within Humboldt County (Trinidad, Loleta, Fortuna, etc.</li> <li>▪ Annex VanDuzen and Lower Eel into District</li> <li>▪ Expand to areas not currently served Elk River, Cutten, Old Arcata Rd., Indianloa</li> <li>▪ Hydroplant in transfer tunnel to VanDuzen</li> <li>▪ Supply water to Fieldbrook, Trinidad, etc.</li> </ul> | <p>Water rights (13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Don’t jeopardize water rights</li> <li>▪ No risk for abandonment</li> <li>▪ Retain local control</li> <li>▪ Not use rates long-term (2)</li> <li>▪ As long as it wasn’t in perpetuity (2)</li> <li>▪ Contract would be limited to two years or less for transfer (3)</li> <li>▪ No extension of contract</li> <li>▪ Maintain local control of water rights</li> <li>▪ Sales only if permit right can be protected</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>        | <b>Benefits</b>  | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>   | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>   | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Outside HBMWD (continued)</b> | <p>Revenue: rates and infrastructure (14) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transport—income</li> <li>▪ Outside expansion could help pay for it</li> </ul> <p>Revenue: environment and economic development (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Brings money in</li> <li>▪ Bring money from outside</li> <li>▪ Jobs</li> <li>▪ Generate revenue to do environmental work in our district</li> <li>▪ Use revenue to benefit environmental improvements</li> <li>▪ Reduce agricultural impacts</li> </ul> <p>Local control (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Keep water rights for district—could be as high as are currently permitted</li> <li>▪ Maximize water use</li> <li>▪ Keep our water rights for the district</li> <li>▪ Could keep/maintain local control</li> </ul> | <p>Costs (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Whether its treated or untreated—larger district issue of who pays for what: industrial untreated or drinking water</li> <li>▪ Expensive, requires changes to permit infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Cost for transport/infrastructure development</li> <li>▪ Expanding services and the District are more expensive and = more legal time and money</li> <li>▪ Infrastructure costs</li> <li>▪ Cost of treatment plant</li> </ul> <p>Politics (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Politically difficult</li> <li>▪ Political fall out</li> <li>▪ Humboldt residents wouldn't like it (don't want SoCal to have our water)</li> </ul> | <p>County/region (12) (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand water services area to outside Fortuna and Trinidad</li> <li>▪ SoHum water transfer</li> <li>▪ Blue Lake could have a lake</li> </ul> <p>Outside region (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sell to SoCal</li> <li>▪ Wetland banking mitigation, Cal Trans and the 101 corridor</li> <li>▪ If technically feasible, sell the excess industrial water from an industrial site on Samoa Peninsula where it can be treated or left untreated and loaded on barge or in water bags and shipped elsewhere to a California port</li> <li>▪ Sell water to San Diego</li> </ul> | <p>County/region first (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Take care of local region, e.g., SoHum</li> <li>▪ So-Hum—correct Eel River concerns but not at HBMWD expense</li> <li>▪ Take care of folks inside of county first</li> <li>▪ Don't jeopardize water rights—prioritize county and region prior to going outside the district</li> <li>▪ Local economic development preference</li> <li>▪ Where and how far away are we comfortable with?</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>        | <b>Benefits</b> | <b>Concerns/Implications</b>  | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b>  | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|
| <i>Outside</i> HBMWD (continued) |                 | Environmental (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact on in stream flows</li> <li>▪ Environmental impacts</li> <li>▪ Transportation and GHG emissions</li> </ul> Miscellaneous <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demand could consume all of our supply</li> <li>▪ Export?</li> <li>▪ Ruth Lake has been full—recreational uses may be impaired if drained more</li> <li>▪ Lower lake level at Ruth</li> <li>▪ Transport</li> <li>▪ LAFCO</li> <li>▪ LAFCO process to expand boundaries</li> <li>▪ Tribal rights?</li> <li>▪ Long-term viability?</li> </ul> | Outside region (5) (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Drought insurance policy for barging water to Marin, Sonoma and Contra Costa. Delivering would be only for drought relief and not to allow increased build-out in those counties</li> </ul> Miscellaneous <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inspire small business</li> <li>▪ Mitigations?</li> <li>▪ Agriculture</li> <li>▪ Sell raw water (export)</li> <li>▪ Bottle water</li> <li>▪ Marijuana cultivation</li> <li>▪ Vegetable processing</li> </ul> | Cost (5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduce rates and off-set infrastructure costs (2)</li> <li>▪ Cost-share for infrastructure expense</li> <li>▪ Compensated adequately for the value of water</li> <li>▪ Cost of delivery is not out of district but cost is borne elsewhere</li> </ul> Miscellaneous <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Last resort</li> <li>▪ Bottled water must use corn starch bottles and be bio-degradable</li> <li>▪ Protect environmental conditions in the watershed</li> <li>▪ No option that dries the river</li> <li>▪ Show clear benefit</li> </ul> |

| <b>Types of Water Use</b>        | <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Concerns/Implications</b> | <b>“Hot Ideas”</b> | <b>Conditions under which acceptable</b>  |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| <i>Outside</i> HBMWD (continued) | Miscellaneous <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Drought relief—emergency response</li> <li>▪ Special agricultural uses</li> <li>▪ We would lose it anyway</li> </ul> |                              |                    | Miscellaneous (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Legal viability</li> <li>▪ LAFCO</li> <li>▪ Affects on dairy production—land changes</li> <li>▪ Limit out of district sales to 20-20mgd</li> <li>▪ No cotton production</li> </ul> |