

MITG. and related
and Duplicates

Nebraska Department of Natural Resources

Nebraska Soil and Water Conservation Fund

Republican Basin Water Meter Program Summary

Period 7/1/01 thru 6/30/03

Little Blue NRD	1	\$405.00
Upper Republican NRD	2	\$623.57
Middle Republican NRD	1,057	\$456,737.70
Lower Republican NRD	623	\$279,399.64
Tri-Basin NRD	34	\$14,164.20
Total for State	1,717	\$751,330.11

437

408.17

3430
82

3512

1399891.2

407.655

1431686.1

*Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
Nebraska Soil and Water Conservation Fund
Republican Basin Surface Water Meter Program
Summary
From 7/1/00 To 6/30/03*

<i>NRD Name</i>	<i>Extent</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
Little Blue NRD	1	\$417.60
Lower Republican NRD	62	\$23,885.63
Middle Republican NRD	15	\$6,132.42
Tri-Basin NRD	2	\$802.03
Upper Republican NRD	2	\$557.24
Grand Total	82	\$31,794.92

388

Reply-To: <ableed@dnr.state.ne.us>
From: "Ann Bleed" <ableed@dnr.state.ne.us>
To: <glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>, "Steve Gaul" <sgaul@dnr.state.ne.us>
Subject: RE: Gage evaluations - North Dry Creek nr Kearney & Ft. Kearney Slough nr Newark
Date: Thu, 28 Aug 2003 08:06:11 -0500
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.6604 (9.0.2911.0)
Importance: Low

Sounds good to me. Ann

-----Original Message-----

From: Guy Lindeman [<mailto:glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2003 2:38 PM
To: Steve Gaul; Ann Bleed
Subject: Gage evaluations - North Dry Creek nr Kearney & Ft. Kearney Slough nr Newark

I received evaluation forms from Tom Hayden for these gages. Based on his evaluations, I ranked them at 55.5 for North Dry Creek and 48.5 for Ft. Kearney Slough. This puts them in the middle third of 123 gage sites evaluated. Based on this, I recommend operating these gages as requested by the Tri-Basin NRD provided they pay for the equipment and enter into an operating agreement like the one for Plum Creek near Smithfield.

Guy

Reply-To: <glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>
From: "Guy Lindeman" <glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>
To: "Steve Gaul" <sgaul@dnr.state.ne.us>, "Ann Bleed" <ableed@dnr.state.ne.us>
Subject: Gage evaluations - North Dry Creek nr Kearney & Ft. Kearney Slough nr Newark
Date: Wed, 27 Aug 2003 14:38:06 -0500
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.6604 (9.0.2911.0)
Importance: Normal

I received evaluation forms from Tom Hayden for these gages. Based on his evaluations, I ranked them at 55.5 for North Dry Creek and 48.5 for Ft. Kearney Slough. This puts them in the middle third of 123 gage sites evaluated. Based on this, I recommend operating these gages as requested by the Tri-Basin NRD provided they pay for the equipment and enter into an operating agreement like the one for Plum Creek near Smithfield.

Guy

Reply-To: <ableed@dnr.state.ne.us>
From: "Ann Bleed" <ableed@dnr.state.ne.us>
To: <glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>
Cc: "Gaul Steve \ (E-mail)" <sgaul@dnr.state.ne.us>
Subject: RE: North Dry Creek & Ft. Kearney Slough
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 2003 11:04:18 -0500
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.6604 (9.0.2911.0)
Importance: Low

Guy - what I am asking you to do is write up the justification for us taking over these gages rather than do something else. If you have to get information from Tom, please do so. I think it is important for us to document why we added new gaging stations here and not else where. We do have other gaging sites that we have talked about gaging, why should we do these and not one of the other sites. The evaluation does not need to be long, but it should exist. Ann

-----Original Message-----

From: Guy Lindeman [<mailto:glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2003 8:39 AM
To: ableed@dnr.state.ne.us
Cc: Tom Hayden
Subject: RE: North Dry Creek & Ft. Kearney Slough

Some years ago you gave me a list of 13 tributaries to the Platte River that were considered important for a hydrology study for the Cooperative Agreement. There was talk at the time that we might be the ones to end up operating gages at these sites. The above subject gages were part of that group and ended up in the USGS Coop program along with the Plum Creek near Smithfield gage with the Tri-Basin NRD as the cooperator. Many if not all of the other sites ended up in the USGS Coop with other NRDs as cooperators. This is the extend of my knowledge for justification of for operating these gages. I'm sure there is also some value for fine tuning the gains/losses to the Platte River above Grand Island. I am attaching the gage evaluation form we used in 2002 and sending a cc to Tom. No doubt he has better knowledge of the relative value of these sites. We can see how the sites compare with other gages. With seven full years of record I wouldn't recommend dropping other gages just to make room for these.

Guy

-----Original Message-----

From: Ann Bleed [<mailto:ableed@dnr.state.ne.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2003 12:34 PM
To: glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us
Subject: RE: North Dry Creek & Ft. Kearney Slough
Importance: Low

We need the justification on why we should take them over written down. Ann

-----Original Message-----

From: Guy Lindeman [<mailto:glindeman@dnr.state.ne.us>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2003 12:05 PM

To: Ann Bleed

Subject: North Dry Creek & Ft. Kearney Slough

Ann;

I talked to Tom H. yesterday and he said he no problem with taking over operation of these two gage sites.

ghl

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
GAGE RANKING FORM

NAME OF GAGE or SITE: Fort Kearney Slough nr Newark BY: JHL

S M T

A. REQUIRED FOR DNR OPERATION

rank yes no
Value 1 0

B. HIGH VALUE FOR DNR OPERATION

rank yes no
Value 1 0

C. LENGTH OF RECORD

years <5 5-10 11-20 >20
value 0 1 2 3

D. WATER RIGHT REGULATION (avg. no of times in ten years)

rank 0-1 2-4 5-8 9-10
value 0 1 2 3

E. FISH & WILDLIFE — *Endanger Species*

rank NONE LITTLE SOME HIGH
value 0 1 2 3

F. FLOOD WARNING (FORECASTING) USE

rank NONE SOME SIGNIFICANT HIGH
value 0 1 2 3

H. QUALITY USE (FLORA AND FAUNA, LITIGATION, DOMESTIC SUPPLY)

rank NONE LITTLE SIGNIFICANT HIGH
value 0 1 2 3

I. HYDROLOGIC INTEREST (SUPPLY, *TRENDS*, WATERSHED CHANGES, ETC.)

rank SMALL SOME SIGNIFICANT HIGH
value 0 1 2 3

J. SPECIAL PURPOSE (PROJECT EFFECT, *STUDY AREA*, IN THE MIDST)

rank NONE LOW MODERATE HIGH
value 0 1 2 3

K. COOPERATOR SUPPORTED

NO YES (Equip.) Yes (cost share)
0 1 2

Grand 48.5 (69 of 123)

S= raw score value, M= multiplier value, T= Total score (M x S)

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
GAGE RANKING FORM

NAME OF GAGE or SITE: North Dry Creek nr Kearney

BY: *[Signature]*

S M T

A. REQUIRED FOR DNR OPERATION

<u>rank</u>	yes	no
0 100 0	1	0
<u>Value</u>		

B. HIGH VALUE FOR DNR OPERATION

<u>rank</u>	yes	no
1 20 20	1	0
<u>Value</u>		

C. LENGTH OF RECORD

<u>years</u>	<5	5-10	11-20	>20
1 2.5 2.5	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

D. WATER RIGHT REGULATION (avg. no of times in ten years)

<u>rank</u>	0-1	2-4	5-8	9-10
2 5 10	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

E. FISH & WILDLIFE - Endanger Species

<u>rank</u>	NONE	LITTLE	SOME	HIGH
2 3 6	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

F. FLOOD WARNING (FORECASTING) USE

<u>rank</u>	NONE	SOME	SIGNIFICANT	HIGH
0 5 0	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

H. QUALITY USE (FLORA AND FAUNA, LITIGATION, DOMESTIC SUPPLY)

<u>rank</u>	NONE	LITTLE	SIGNIFICANT	HIGH
0 4 0	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

I. HYDROLOGIC INTEREST (SUPPLY, TRENDS, WATERSHED CHANGES, ETC.)

<u>rank</u>	SMALL	SOME	SIGNIFICANT	HIGH
1 4 4	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

J. SPECIAL PURPOSE (PROJECT EFFECT, STUDY AREA, IN THE MIDST)

<u>rank</u>	NONE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
2 4 8	0	1	2	3
<u>value</u>				

K. COOPERATOR SUPPORTED

	NO	YES (Equip.)	Yes (cost share)
1 5 5	0	1	2
<u>value</u>			

Grand 55.5 (54 of 123)

S= raw score value, M= multiplier value, T= Total score (M x S)