

Current stat. date in site

5/24

WPTF Subcommittee (SW Transfers)

#3 - Problem w/ I strike your out approval.

Send letter B/U → (2 notices - Approval & B.U. date coming up...)

B.U. date = 10/1

in January - we send reminder.

Mostly used in perfection of new with it.

B.B - Why is adj. S. ?

SF - 46-229 - says only way to cancel

Conditions - note (strike).

pass water during shortage (capitation)

Would not apply to a new meter request.

(*)

#4 Work on wording.

#6 - What would that form be?

SF - Other rept. from landowner that says he hasn't irrigated.

BB - How do I know what it is?

SF - We'd have to give you notice. You'd know basis for action.

46-229.03 - you'd have to give description

info. used to reach prelim. determination.

(*) < #6 - work on ?

#7 -

BB - How transfer to SW use?

Add to permissive language??

If well gets 2800 from stream + now

gets 10000 from ...

What's date?

Well = 10000 from stream
But if only '12 -
should not get
full from stream

SF Only using wells that apply to ...

→ Only have cell % dly in part of diversion.

Jr Nelson - Q re: river rows - was 50+ now
40.

SF - Have to do it.

DK - 46-240.01 = NF 46637 = NF

BB - But if trans. to ind. - no longer reg's
SW permit.

SF - Could it be to a well.

BB - A lot of complications.

SH - Why not to a well?

SF - PIC not a SW approp. even if
in middle of stream.

Don't have auth. to reg. well.

SA - one that had gotten idoned rechange
permit

SF - Don't know.

SF. SW at 7 in 50' now down to
well 7 in 50' for other pups - don't
know if can do b/c no auth. re;
well transfers.

BB - Q whether 46-637 S/B on a list @ all
if go from inc. to inc. - OK.
BUT if go to another use
~~Q~~

DK - Q re: "storage" aspect → mixing
terminology - Does that clarify or make
more confusing.

delete
word
"storage"
or
include
"natural
flow for storage"

#8) - SF would cut (c) entirely.
b/c we have to look @ ban anyway.

BB = § is intra-basin transfer §.
Purpose behind is to keep from happening.

SF - 46-288.

(*)

DK - 7 in one basin - [write up doesn't
match statute - should have deleted
all of (c)]

BB - if on trip, go to middle - can

do.

SF - Long to Platte OK - but NOT Platte to Long.

BB - Prob.

DK - "Spend" water from NRlets to S Platte system -
process to move water ...

BB - Higher opposed to getting rid of 1st part.

Why get rid of limit of transferring ⁱⁿ the
same basin ...

Why part 2 a prob.?

SF - Transfer trib to wash, but not rain
to trib.

Long = trib. to Platte -

BB - if get rid of (ii) - cut go either way.

SF - correct.

#9 - BB - if dependent - notify

AS - Orig. intent for ID to address - not
to build indiv. water int. go in + out

no approval. My problem is -
then are dist. water int. - gives

water district absolute with re:

My district Bl. of

SF - 46-290 - indiv. approp - but ID
carries water.

AS - K didn't address Bl. not a (I)

BB - Simplest to go back + need K.

AS - Why would I need if d'n jr. that can
give?

AS - clarify - "dependent on another dist - notify"

SF - Rule - "Anyone using facilities must show that person agrees to it."

Seems should be solved outside of process.

DS - E.g.?

AS - Don't use canal - use diversion dam to divert $\frac{3}{4}$ of dist. water

SH - Same dilemma wire use - will have to buy off ID to get approval.

SF - Can still use expedited.

AS - N. Long + Twin Longs has same situation.

SF - non-expedited - everyone gets voted.

ID - would get notice + could object.

BB -

AS - If someone wants to take lead over worried if close not to approve - it - eventually in 5 yrs. ---

DS - Could vote

~~AS~~ - not if will approve

#10 - BB - Register of Deeds will file.

BB - Done for reason - a lot of indiv's don't know how to do...

Reg'net?

SF - not until 962

DK - When do?

SF - Notice.

BB - not big prob. 7

BB - no prob. 7 it.

BB - Dawson County problem.

DK - "As is OK."

#11 - SF - b/c reg'd train. Part want of dnr's
have to. Q = is the use still there.

Duane - if no contact - not rebuttable presumption

SF - Get rid of 15 yrs + say "adjud" - ?

They was never every 15 yrs. -

SH - inconsistent - if no objection & dir
not satisfied - can go to him. -

Duane - Concern - maybe what happens = dir. or
Cem's files pro forma re: still find/
still benefits. if no prob - rubber stamp.
if objection - could Dept. have ability to
bring in more evidence??

DK - Approp. unit know if objection or not.
Need to file based on conditions.

LH - "Documentation" - what does it mean?
Not a lot of prob. of proposed

change of like Long ^{Pike} Creek?

DK - This may not do that but - just clarify if no objections, go ahead.

BB - Reel (I) - if add evid. needed - would GSP or Dist. have to get if needed?? if contested need to. < Dept. a Dept. procedures - need more time if being + contested >

Jim Nelson - if IS Flow caused now - need to show it's necessary.

#12 - Jim Nelson Q: Rec. added teeth re: well modifications?

Jim Nelson - Diff. of @ 50' diff?

SF - Differs input to surrounding wells.

Q - if dist are the same?

SF Dist do anything... We would use as "dist file paper work a bit."

Also - if have to make a ruling - "it appears will not legal @ this point."

#15-46235.04 Prefer single well field.

Get said out on this.

Other (I)'s?

SF memo:

① Transfers Adjudications

SF - Work has or deplete flows.

if not going to: proportionate amount for both.

46-294 (1)(d)(e)

+ (2) rebuttable presumption.
(reading it as "under that appropriate.")

SF - But 46-714
imp "the imp.") BB - 46-714(2) - S/B "under that appropriate"

46-294

BB Q = does 46-714(

→ DS - Should it inhibit SW transfer.

Have it to transfer it under law.

SF - do need tie?

DK - Oblig. of IMP in need tie.

BB - NRD Conting that acres as GW
acres anyway.

SF - Not sure.

② Map Transfer

DK - need to go to IMP. (need auth.
to do that)

DK - Problem - TCU - but don't agree
should list the transfers.

SF - Can start thru the process.

DK - Dept. position. ↑ CU addressed in MP -
won't inhibit transfer.
If no ↑ CU - go on down the road.

SF - Another eq.


indiv. approp - - 3 approps -
put up up all 3 + stock.

Ⓟ = 2 yrs. shut off @ times.

During those times, want to
be able to irrig. So could be
an ↑ in CU.

Most states don't allow. Should we
allow spreading + stock when total
acres don't ↑.

SF - new law - can take CU - but not
whole thing. <BB thought could ~~of~~ stock
under new law>.




SF - might allow under current law -
but only by CU.

DK - of O-A or F/A = more probs -
but don't know ~~what~~ what
law says.

46-294 may have overlapping, except
[DK - is decreasing water for another appropriation]

SF Eg.

Power Plant - Permit 4 water



Chg of use of 4 approps - Can only transfer
 CU. < lets power-to-power - no chg
 in point of diversion >
 CU ~~may~~ may be only 10% of 1300 cfs.,

SF - Thinking - in past - 2x no new diversion,
 but add use permitted.

E.g. - Sutherland cooling approps. "no new water"
 + Canada - got new approp. for 1 cfs.
 + had to offset.

SH - How diff. the use mini. grows??

SF - most cities - diversion limit. < Not limit
 to boundaries >.

SW Transfer (I)

ID issues. Expedited can go expedited.

BB - dirig. - 2(b) - don't have to prove (d)

SF - get out of 2(d).

BB - (e) = OK.

46-714 (2) - Arg = & says transfer has

to be consistent w/ 46-714(2)(b).

[It's anti-spreading - not anti
transfer].

BB- Believe intended - if not provided for.,