

Ann Bleed

From: Roger Patterson [rpatterson@dnr.state.ne.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 5:11 PM
To: Ann Bleed
Subject: FW: Expanded Acres

My calculation would say 1 inch is about 24,000 AF. Does that look right?

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

From: Claude Cappel [mailto:ccappel@ocsmccook.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 9:01 PM
To: Roger T Patterson
Subject: Expanded Acres

HI

Thanks for the 13". I hope we can keep it.

I have a question about the allotment the MRNRD got.

If the MRNRD were to roll back some of the expanded acres, would they get a greater allotment than 13"? If they would review each farmer that added acres in 2003 that were not certified at FSA from 1998 thru 2002 or on the county tax rolls as irrigated, there would be probably be around 25,000 to 30,000 expanded acres after taking out prevented planting. I know of instances where farmers abandoned one field and irrigated another during the 1993 to 2003 and got allotment on it all. A lot of expanded acres don't have a water supply to irrigate it all. Some are getting prevented planting and have an allotment. Some just put in a pump in a well drilled several years ago and started irrigating in 2003.

An inch and a half is worth a lot of money when added to 13". It might be possible to get them to review those acres if they was an additional allotment of inches. It might be possible if they don't, to get a judge to make them do it. I'm just wanting to know if it is worth going after. I have talked to some of the board individually and they would like to go back, but feel they can't without a judge or something to force the rollback.

If you can give additional inches, I'd like to know much from a 15,000, 20,000, 25000, and a 30,000 acre reduction.

Since next year is not a water short year, I'm pushing for delaying CREP for a year, and having hearing or something to get the rule better. I see no way a family farmer that is working the land can go into CREP. If a land lord takes away just 20% of his land, he's probably out of farming. With 13", incomes will be down and rents will be going up, especially with farmers trying to increase their size to gross the same amount of dollars. 50,000 irrigated acres will eliminate over 500 farmers as each family farmer can only handle at max 1000 acres. In reality when it affect a part of that family farmers gross, it will probably run out over four times that many farmers and their family leaving the farm. I think there would be a lot less financial harm by cutting allotment more do the job. You have heard it many times, we can do without some of the water but not all. Upfront, I will do what I can to get the expanded acres rolled back and postpone CREP until the rules are though out better.

Thanks

Claude

Ann Bleed

From: Roger Patterson [rpatterson@dnr.state.ne.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 3:07 PM
Subject: Ann Bleed
FW: CREP

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

From: Claude Cappel [mailto:ccappel@ocsmccook.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 10:59 AM
To: Roger T Patterson
Subject: CREP

Hi
One suggestion I have on the ranking for CREP is go after the odd areas, flood fields, pivot corners and end guns. A lot of the CREP area is either formally surface water irrigated or bottom land and all cut up. A lot of the flood fields are less than 40 acres and ineligible. Pivots have been fitted to water these areas. There are odd areas around the pivot, minor grass stretches that are being waters and pivot corners that have a wet water allotment. Those odd areas will be hard to spray efficiently for dry land or irrigated. The way the MRNRD rules are set up, the water allotment for those acres will be stacked or transferred, if not used to water that area, so it would be a definite consumptive water reduction. If these acres were put in it would not hurt the tenant as much and allows a choice.
In our own situation we will stack the water from those acres every third year and limit irrigate the other two. I feel if we don't irrigate the field four of the six years, we will lose the allotment. I don't trust the NERD when it come to a decision of upland over quick response, alluvial and surface water areas.

Sincerely

Claude

DNR MEMO

October 21, 2004

TO: Roger, Ann B., Brad, Kent

FROM: Susan

SUBJECT: Bostwick Irrigation District Map Transfer Process

I finally was able to talk to Mike Delka today concerning the map transfer process. Specifically I discussed with him that we did not believe we would be able to approve an increase in the number of acres irrigated more than the number of acres that were currently in existence for each of the specific canals. Mike was unhappy and said that if that was the case, he could have just done a regular one on one transfer.

Mike said the district wanted to keep the number of acres assessed for each canal. He then gave me the number of acres they assess per canal, and I talked to Brad and Kent and we put together the following:

<u>Canal</u>	<u>Assessment Acres</u>	<u>Water Rights Acres</u>	<u>Actual Irrigated Acres</u>
Naponee	1,628	1,650	
Franklin Pump	2,106	2,090	
Franklin	11,254	10,929	
Superior	5,979	5,848	6,158.7
Courtland	1,968	1,946	

The figures for Superior Canal is what Brad came up with when he went and talked to the landowners. Brad is currently working on the Franklin Canal, and Kent plans to go do the Franklin Pump Canal and Courtland Canal this winter. A map transfer will still be beneficial as they will be able to layer the water rights on top of each other so no question can arise as to whether they are irrigating lands not under appropriation. It will also be the only way we will get a handle on exactly what is irrigated. I don't think they can move rights between canals unless they will be satisfied with only moving consumptive use, and that process is outside of the map transfer process. After I receive any comments from you, I will send Mike a copy of the above table for him to see where we believe we may have problems and will continue dialogue with him.

DNR MEMO

October 21, 2004

TO: Roger, Ann B., Brad, Kent

FROM: Susan

SUBJECT: Bostwick Irrigation District Map Transfer Process

I finally was able to talk to Mike Delka today concerning the map transfer process. Specifically I discussed with him that we did not believe we would be able to approve an increase in the number of acres irrigated more than the number of acres that were currently in existence for each of the specific canals. Mike was unhappy and said that if that was the case, he could have just done a regular one on one transfer.

Mike said the district wanted to keep the number of acres assessed for each canal. He then gave me the number of acres they assess per canal, and I talked to Brad and Kent and we put together the following:

<u>Canal</u>	<u>Assessment Acres</u>	<u>Water Rights Acres</u>	<u>Actual Irrigated Acres</u>
Naponee	1,628	1,650	
Franklin Pump	2,106	2,090	
Franklin	11,254	10,929	
Superior	5,979	5,848	6,158.7
Courtland	1,968	1,946	

The figures for Superior Canal is what Brad came up with when he went and talked to the landowners. Brad is currently working on the Franklin Canal, and Kent plans to go do the Franklin Pump Canal and Courtland Canal this winter. A map transfer will still be beneficial as they will be able to layer the water rights on top of each other so no question can arise as to whether they are irrigating lands not under appropriation. It will also be the only way we will get a handle on exactly what is irrigated. I don't think they can move rights between canals unless they will be satisfied with only moving consumptive use, and that process is outside of the map transfer process. After I receive any comments from you, I will send Mike a copy of the above table for him to see where we believe we may have problems and will continue dialogue with him.

Maximum Reasonable Quantity of Water for Livestock and Poultry

	Drinking water gallon/head/day	Servicing/Flushing gallons/head/day	Quantity/1000 head cbc=1000	
Cattle, beef	15	0 open lot	17	ac ft
	15	100 cbc	129	ac ft
Cattle, Dairy	35	100 cbc	151	ac ft
Swine				
Nursery	1	4 cbc	6	ac ft
Finishing	5	15 cbc	22	ac ft
Sow&Litter	8	35 cbc	48	ac ft
Gestating Sow	6	25 cbc	35	ac ft
Sheep	2	0 open lot	2.2	ac ft
	2	15 cbc	19	ac ft
Horses	12	0 open lot	13	ac ft
	12	100 cbc	125	ac ft
Poultry/100				
Chickens	9	200 cbc	2.3	ac ft
Turkeys	30	400 cbc	4.8	ac ft

Table 1.

Middle Republican NRD
August 2004

Community	2000		Area Sq. mi. Factor	Gallons/Person/Day				mi. sq. factor	
	Census	Sq. mi.		15"	14"	13"	12"		
Bartley	355	0.7	3	1509	1408	1308	1207	0.1	1
Culberston	594	0.9	4	1202	1122	1042	962	0.26	2
Curtis	832	1.3	6	1288	1202	1116	1030	0.51	3
Danbury	127	0.9	4	5624	5249	4874	4499	0.76	4
Hayes Center	240	0.7	3	2232	2083	1934	1785	1.01	5
Indianola	642	1.2	5	1391	1298	1205	1112	1.26	6
Lebanon	70	0.2	1	2551	2381	2211	2041	1.51	7
Maywood	331	0.5	2	1079	1007	935	863	1.76	8
McCook	7994	5.3	22	491	459	426	393	2.01	9
Moorefield	52	0.2	1	3434	3205	2976	2747	2.26	10
Palisade	386	0.4	2	925	863	802	740	2.51	11
Stockville	36	0.3	2	9919	9258	8597	7935	2.76	12
Stratton	396	0.4	2	902	842	782	721	3.01	13
Trenton	507	0.6	3	1056	986	916	845	3.26	14
Wallace	329	0.7	3	1628	1520	1411	1302	3.51	15
								3.76	16
								4.01	17
Average Town	859	0.95	4	831	776	720	665	4.26	18
Total Town	12891	14.3	58	803	750	696	643	4.51	19
								4.76	20
								5.01	21
								5.26	22
Allocation	gal/yr/160 acres							5.51	23
								5.76	24
15"	65170000								
14"	60825333								
13"	56480667								
12"	52136000								

Table 2.

8/13/04

(2)

GP - See opposition to fees - needs to be thought as to where this could occur - ie st compact etc. Use fees for a specific purpose.

- want \$ to stay local - now retire sees where get most: may be outside district.

Gov - What is impact of each district having own program -

RP All state is looking at is - hitting water targets

GP - A local program would have additional flexibility beyond CREP. Want flexibility of land use

Schrock - are boardmembers on CR - 2, afraid to speak out

MRURD - 13" met last night Mayas Center.

RP " would 13" - know less URURD but they added acres - cap on carry forward.

GP If other districts don't come along - what will happen - can we make an agreement @ state?

Gov - Basinwide problem -

If get CREP - you & middle go - then we sit down with lower.

Tom T - Any cut we make, will have econ impact
cause district is already very efficient

GP - Board recognizes if incentives don't work
- back to reg.

Baker - What is timing for pushing for a tax?

We will have to show in CREP our match.

RP - go to WPTF - & then go to leg.

Put a box around where can use incentive plan.

(perhaps where are declines)

Tom T - need to retire QRW so can ship everyone
equally

Tom T on

Steve Smith -

Gov - we will do all we can to work with
all but in end if necessary will
go to IWRB