

2008 Annual Evaluation of Availability of Hydrologically Connected Water Supplies

Determination of Fully Appropriated

Published by the
Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
October 16, 2007



Dr. Ann Salomon Bleed, P.E., Director

Natural Resources Planning and Assistance Division

Steve Gaul – Division Head

Contributing Authors

Jesse Bradley
Shuhai Zheng, P.E.
Tina M. Kurtz
Kevin Schwartman, P.G.
Don Adelman, P.E.
Jennifer J. Schellpeper
Jim Schneider
Doug Hallum
Tracy Zayac
Josh Lear

Legal Division

Pam Andersen, J.D.
Jean Angell, J.D.
Ron Theis, J.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDICES	v
TABLE OF TABLES	vi
TABLE OF FIGURES	viii
Report Organization.....	1
1.0 SUMMARY	2
2.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.1 Purpose	3
2.2 Background.....	4
3.0 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS.....	8
3.1 Section 46-713(1)(a) – Annual Evaluation and Report Required.....	8
3.2 Section 46-713(1)(b) – Preliminary Conclusions Following Basin Evaluations	9
3.3 Section 46-713(3)-Determination that a Basin is Fully Appropriated.....	9
4.0 METHODOLOGIES	11
4.1 Legal Obligation of the Department	11
4.1.1 The Legal Requirements of Section 46-713	11
4.1.2 Regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001	13
4.2 Methods Available for Assessing Stream Depletions.....	14
4.2.1 Numerical Modeling Methods	15
4.2.2 Analytical Methods.....	15
4.2.3 Peer Review of the Methodology	16
4.3 Development of the 10/50 Areas	17
4.3.1 Use of Numerical Models	17
4.3.2 Use of Analytical Methods	17
4.4 Evaluating Current Development within a Basin	21
4.4.1 The Role of Surface Water Administration Doctrine	24
4.4.2 The Net Corn Crop Irrigation Requirement.....	25
4.4.3 Determination of Diversion Requirements	26
4.4.4 Calculating Lag Impacts from Current Well Development.....	27
4.5 Determine Erosion of Rights	33
4.5.1 Potential Erosion of Irrigation Rights	34
4.5.2 Potential Erosion of Instream Flow Rights.....	35
4.6 Evaluation of Compliance with State and Federal Laws	36
4.7 Evaluating Predicted Future Development in a Basin	36
5.0 BLUE RIVER BASINS.....	42
5.1 Summary	42
5.2 Basin Descriptions	42
5.3 Nature and Extent of Water Use	44
5.3.1 Ground Water	44

	5.3.2	Surface Water	46
5.4		Hydrologically Connected Area	48
	5.4.1	Big Blue River Basin	48
	5.4.2	Little Blue River Basin	50
5.5		Net Corn Crop Irrigation Requirement	52
5.6		Surface Water Closing Records	54
5.7		Evaluation of Current Development	55
	5.7.1	Future Water Supply	55
	5.7.2	Depletions Analysis	56
	5.7.3	Evaluation of Current Levels of Development against Future Water Supplies ...	57
5.8		Evaluation of Predicted Future Development	58
5.9		Sufficiency to Avoid Noncompliance	59
5.10		Ground Water Recharge Sufficiency	61
5.11		Current Studies being Conducted to Assist with Future Analysis	61
5.12		Conclusions	61
6.0		LOWER NIOBRARA RIVER BASIN	63
	6.1	Summary	63
	6.2	Basin Description	64
	6.3	Nature and Extent of Water Use	66
	6.3.1	Ground Water	66
	6.3.2	Surface Water	68
	6.4	Hydrologically Connected Area	70
	6.5	Net Corn Crop Irrigation Requirement	72
	6.6	Surface Water Closing Records	74
	6.7	Evaluation of Current Development	74
	6.7.1	Current Water Supply	74
	6.7.2	Erosion of Irrigation Rights Upstream of Spencer Hydropower	78
	6.7.3	Fully Appropriated Area	78
	6.7.4	Future Water Supply for Niobrara Subbasin Downstream of Spencer Hydropower Facility	81
	6.7.5	Depletions Analysis for Niobrara Subbasin Downstream of Spencer Hydropower Facility	82
	6.7.6	Evaluation of Current Levels of Development against Future Water Supplies ...	83
	6.8	Evaluation of Predicted Future Development for Niobrara Subbasin Downstream of Spencer Hydropower Facility	83
	6.9	Analysis of Long Pine Instream Flow Surface Water Appropriation	85
	6.10	Sufficiency to Avoid Noncompliance	86
	6.11	Ground Water Recharge Sufficiency	86
	6.12	Current Studies being Conducted to Assist with Future Analysis	86
	6.13	Relevant Data Provided by Interested Parties	87
	6.14	Conclusions	87
7.0		LOWER PLATTE RIVER BASIN	89
	7.1	Summary	89

7.2	Basin Description.....	89
7.2.1	Subbasin Relationships.....	91
7.3	Nature and Extent of Water Use.....	94
7.3.1	Ground Water.....	94
7.3.2	Surface Water.....	96
7.4	Hydrologically Connected Area.....	98
7.5	Net Corn Crop Irrigation Requirement.....	100
7.6	Surface Water Closing Records.....	102
7.7	Evaluation of Current Development.....	103
7.7.1	Current Water Supply.....	103
7.7.2	Future Water Supply.....	106
7.7.3	Depletions Analysis.....	108
7.7.4	Evaluation of Current Levels of Development against Future Water Supplies.....	109
7.8	Evaluation of Predicted Future Development.....	112
7.9	Instream Flow Surface Water Appropriation Analysis.....	118
7.10	Sufficiency to Avoid Noncompliance.....	121
7.11	Ground Water Recharge Sufficiency.....	121
7.12	Current Studies being Conducted to Assist with Future Analysis.....	121
7.13	Conclusions.....	122
8.0	MISSOURI TRIBUTARY BASINS.....	124
8.1	Summary.....	124
8.2	Basin Descriptions.....	124
8.3	Nature and Extent of Water Use.....	126
8.3.1	Ground Water.....	126
8.3.2	Surface Water.....	128
8.4	Hydrologically Connected Area.....	130
8.5	Net Corn Crop Irrigation Requirement.....	132
8.6	Surface Water Closing Records.....	134
8.7	Evaluation of Current Development.....	134
8.7.1	Future Water Supply.....	134
8.7.2	Depletions Analysis.....	135
8.7.3	Evaluation of Current Levels of Development against Future Water Supplies.....	136
8.8	Evaluation of Predicted Future Development.....	136
8.9	Sufficiency to Avoid Noncompliance.....	137
8.10	Ground Water Recharge Sufficiency.....	138
8.11	Current Studies Being Conducted to Assist with Future Analysis.....	138
8.12	Conclusions.....	138
9.0	BASIN SUMMARIES AND RESULTS.....	140
9.1	Blue River Basins.....	140
9.2	Lower Niobrara Basin.....	141
9.3	Lower Platte River Basin.....	141
9.4	Missouri Tributary Basins.....	142

9.5	Results of Analyses.....	143
-----	--------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Public Notices and Additional Information Received from Interested Parties

Appendix B – Nebraska Administrative Code Title 457 Chapter 24

Appendix C – Computation of Rate and Volume of Stream Depletion by Wells

Appendix D – USGS Review Letter

Appendix E – A Groundwater Model to Determine the Area within the Upper Big Blue Natural Resources District where Groundwater Pumping Has the Potential to Increase Flow from the Platte River to the Underlying Aquifer by at Least 10 Percent of the Volume Pumped over a 50-Year Period

Appendix F – Net Irrigation Requirement

Appendix G – Development of Ground Water Irrigated Acres per Well

Appendix H – Basic Assumptions Used in Development of the Department of Natural Resources Proposed Method to Determine Whether a Stream and the Hydrologically Connected Ground Water Aquifers are Fully Appropriated

TABLE OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 4-1 Example calculation of twenty-five year lag impacts.....	32
Table 5-1 Surface water administration in the Big Blue River Basin, 1987-2006.....	54
Table 5-2 Surface water administration in the Little Blue River Basin, 1987-2006.....	55
Table 5-3 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion in the Big Blue River Basin.....	57
Table 5-4 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion in the Little Blue River Basin..	58
Table 5-5 State-line flow targets for the Big Blue River	60
Table 6-1 Surface water administration in the Lower Niobrara River Basin, 1987-2006	74
Table 6-2 Estimated number of days surface water is available for diversion upstream of Spencer Hydropower with current development	75
Table 6-3 Estimated number of days surface water is available for diversion downstream of Spencer Hydropower with current development	76
Table 6-4 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion, Lower Niobrara River Basin upstream of Spencer Hydropower.....	77
Table 6-5 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion, Lower Niobrara River Basin downstream of Spencer Hydropower.....	77
Table 6-6 Comparison between the number of days available to junior appropriators for diversion at the time appropriations were obtained and the number of days currently available for diversion, in the Lower Niobrara River Basin upstream of Spencer Hydropower	78
Table 6-7 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion, Lower Niobrara River Basin downstream of Spencer Hydropower.....	83
Table 6-8 Long Pine Creek instream flow appropriation evaluation.....	86
Table 7-1 Surface water administration in the Lower Platte River Basin above the North Bend gage, 1987-2006	102
Table 7-2 Surface water administration in the Lower Platte River Basin above the Louisville gage, 1987-2006	103
Table 7-3 Estimate of the current number of days surface water is available for diversion above North Bend.....	104
Table 7-4 Estimate of the current number of days surface water is available for diversion above Louisville	105
Table 7-5 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion above North Bend.....	106
Table 7-6 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion above Louisville	106
Table 7-7 Estimate of days surface water is available for diversion above North Bend with current development and twenty-five year lag impacts.....	110
Table 7-8 Estimate of days surface water is available for diversion above Louisville with current development and twenty-five year lag impacts.....	111
Table 7-9 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion above North Bend with current development and lag impacts.....	112
Table 7-10 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion above Louisville with current development and lag impacts.....	112

Table 7-11 Estimated number of days surface water is available for diversion above North Bend with current and predicted future development	116
Table 7-12 Estimated number of days surface water is available for diversion above Louisville with current and predicted future development	117
Table 7-13 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion above North Bend with current and predicted future development.....	118
Table 7-14 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion above Louisville with current and predicted future development	118
Table 7-15 Number of days North Bend instream flow appropriation expected to be met	120
Table 7-16 Number of days Louisville instream flow appropriation expected to be met.....	120
Table 8-1 Surface water administration in the Missouri Tributary basins, 1987-2006.....	134
Table 8-2 Comparison between the number of days required to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days surface water is available for diversion in the Missouri Tributary basins	136
Table 9-1 Summary of comparison between the number of days required to meet 65% of the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days in which surface water is available for diversion, July 1 – August 31	144
Table 9-2 Summary of comparison between the number of days required to meet 85% of the net corn crop irrigation requirement and number of days in which surface water is available for diversion, May 1 – September 30	145

TABLE OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 2-1 Areas originally designated as hydrologically connected to fully and overappropriated basins, subbasins, and reaches	7
Figure 4-1 Stream depletion curve from Jenkins (1968)	20
Figure 4-2 An example of the data and method used in determination of the 10/50 area	21
Figure 4-3 Basin evaluation flow chart.....	23
Figure 4-4 Net corn crop irrigation requirement.....	26
Figure 4-5 Determining depletion percentage from the dimensionless term	31
Figure 5-1 General basin map, Blue River basins.....	43
Figure 5-2 Current well development by number of registered wells, Blue River basins	44
Figure 5-3 Current well locations, Blue River basins.....	45
Figure 5-4 Surface water appropriations by number of diversion points, Blue River basins	46
Figure 5-5 Surface water appropriation diversion locations, Blue River basins.....	47
Figure 5-6 Areas of ground water and surface water connection, Upper Big Blue NRD (from Bitner, 2005)	49
Figure 5-7 10/50 area, Little Blue River Basin.....	51
Figure 5-8 Net corn crop irrigation requirement, Blue River basins	53
Figure 5-9 Annual precipitation, Blue River basins.....	56
Figure 5-10 High capacity well development, Blue River basins.....	59
Figure 6-1 General basin map, Lower Niobrara River Basin	65
Figure 6-2 Current well development by number of registered wells, Lower Niobrara River Basin	66
Figure 6-3 Current well locations, Lower Niobrara River Basin.....	67
Figure 6-4 Surface water appropriations by number of diversion points, Lower Niobrara River Basin	68
Figure 6-5 Surface water appropriation diversion locations, Lower Niobrara River Basin.....	69
Figure 6-6 10/50 area, Lower Niobrara River Basin.....	71
Figure 6-7 Net corn crop irrigation requirement, Lower Niobrara River Basin	73
Figure 6-8 Area designated as fully appropriated within the Niobrara River Basin.....	80
Figure 6-9 Annual precipitation, Lower Niobrara River Basin	82
Figure 6-10 High capacity well development, Lower Niobrara River Basin downstream of Spencer Hydropower	84
Figure 7-1 General basin map, Lower Platte River Basin	90
Figure 7-2 Map of the Platte River Basin highlighting the subbasin above the North Bend gage	93
Figure 7-3 Current well development by number of registered wells, Lower Platte River Basin	94
Figure 7-4 Current well locations, Lower Platte River Basin.....	95
Figure 7-5 Surface water appropriations by number of diversion points, Lower Platte River Basin	96
Figure 7-6 Surface water appropriation diversion locations, Lower Platte River Basin.....	97
Figure 7-7 10/50 area, Lower Platte River Basin.....	99
Figure 7-8 Net corn crop irrigation requirement, Lower Platte River Basin	101
Figure 7-9 Annual precipitation, Lower Platte River Basin	107
Figure 7-10 Mean annual flow, Platte River near Duncan.....	108
Figure 7-11 High capacity well development, Lower Platte River Basin.....	114
Figure 8-1 General basin map, Missouri Tributary basins.....	125
Figure 8-2 Current well development by number of registered wells, Missouri Tributary basins	126
Figure 8-3 Current well locations, Missouri Tributary basins	127
Figure 8-4 Surface water appropriations by number of diversion points, Missouri Tributary basins	128
Figure 8-5 Surface water appropriation diversion locations, Missouri Tributary basins.....	129
Figure 8-6 10/50 area, Missouri Tributary basins.....	131

Figure 8-7 Net corn crop irrigation requirement, Missouri Tributary basins..... 133
Figure 8-8 Annual precipitation, Missouri Tributary basins..... 135
Figure 8-9 High capacity well development, Missouri Tributary basins..... 137

Report Organization

This report is divided into nine sections. Section One is the report summary. Section Two is the introduction to the report and contains the purpose, background, and organization. The pertinent statutory and regulatory language can be found in Section Three and in Appendix B. Detailed descriptions of the methodologies used in the analyses can be found in Section Four. Sections Five through Eight are the evaluations of the Big Blue River basins, Lower Niobrara River Basin, Lower Platte River Basin, and Missouri Tributary basins, respectively. Each basin evaluation includes a description of the nature and extent of present water uses, the geographic area considered to have hydrologically connected ground water and surface water (i.e., the “10/50 area”), preliminary conclusions about the adequacy of the long-term water supply, and whether the preliminary conclusions would change if no additional constraints were placed on water development in the basin. Section Nine is a summary of the basin subsections and the report conclusions. The appendices contain additional detailed information not found within the main body of the report.

1.0 SUMMARY

The Department of Natural Resources (Department) has evaluated the expected long-term availability of surface water supplies and hydrologically connected ground water supplies of the Blue River basins, Lower Niobrara River Basin, Lower Platte River Basin, and Missouri Tributary basins. Based on the evaluation, the Niobrara River Basin upstream of Spencer Hydropower is fully appropriated. The Blue River basins, Lower Platte River Basin, Missouri Tributary basins, and Niobrara River Basin below Spencer Hydropower are preliminarily not fully appropriated at the present time. Analysis of future water supplies in the Lower Platte River Basin indicates that, if no additional constraints are placed on ground water and surface water development and reasonable projections are made of the extent of future development, then the effects on long-term water supply would cause the basin to become fully appropriated in the future.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to fulfill the requirements of section 46-713 of the Ground Water Management and Protection Act (Act) (Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 46-701 through 46-753). The Act requires the Department to report annually its evaluation of the expected long-term availability of hydrologically connected water supplies. This annual evaluation is required for every river basin, subbasin, or reach that has not either initiated the development of an integrated management plan (IMP) or implemented an IMP. No reevaluations were made in this report for basins, subbasins, or reaches that have IMPs, or for which IMPs are being prepared.

The evaluation and preliminary conclusions of this report are grouped into four river basins: the Blue River basins, Lower Niobrara River Basin, Lower Platte River Basin, and Missouri Tributary basins. The report was written this way to reduce repetition; however, each appropriate basin, subbasin, and reach was analyzed separately.

As required by law, the report also describes the nature and extent of present water uses in the basin, shows the geographic area considered to have hydrologically connected surface water and ground water supplies, and predicts how the Department's preliminary conclusions might change if no new legal restrictions are placed on water development in the basin. The report does not address the sufficiency of ground water supplies that are not hydrologically connected to surface water streams. The report includes a description of the criteria and methodologies used to determine which basins, subbasins, or reaches are preliminarily considered to be fully appropriated and which water supplies are hydrologically connected. The report is required to include a summary of relevant data provided by any interested party concerning the social, economic, and environmental impacts of additional hydrologically connected surface water and

ground water uses on resources that are dependent on streamflow or ground water levels but are not protected by appropriations or regulations. Appendix A contains the notice of request for any relevant data from any interested party and the comments received.

2.2 Background

This report addresses requirements that were added to the Act by passage of LB 962 in 2004. That bill was influenced by actions taken as a result of prior legislative activity. In 2002, the Nebraska Unicameral passed LB 1003, mandating the creation of a Water Policy Task Force to address conjunctive use management issues, inequities between surface water and ground water users, and water transfers/water banking. The forty-nine Task Force members, appointed by the Governor from a statutorily specified mix of organizations and interests, were asked to discuss issues, identify options for resolution of issues, and make recommendations to the legislature and governor relating to any water policy changes deemed desirable.

In December 2003, the Task Force provided the Legislature with the “*Report of the Nebraska Water Policy Task Force to the 2003 Nebraska Legislature*”. That report provided draft legislation and suggested changes to statutes. The Legislature considered the Task Force recommendations in its 2004 session and subsequently passed LB 962, which incorporated most of the Task Force recommendations. Governor Mike Johanns signed the bill into law on April 15, 2004.

The provisions of LB 962 require a proactive approach in anticipating and preventing conflicts between surface water and ground water users. Where conflicts already exist, it establishes principles and timelines for resolving those conflicts. It also adds more flexibility to statutes governing transfer of surface water rights to a different location of use and updates a number of individual water management statutes.


Some of the key provisions of LB 962 that are part of current statutes include the following:

- Certain river basins were declared to be fully appropriated or overappropriated. The law automatically placed into fully appropriated status any natural resource district undertaking any integrated management process under previous law for integrated management of hydrologically connected ground water and surface water.
- Portions of the Platte River Basin were declared to be overappropriated by the legislature because the level of water resources development is not sustainable over the long term.
- The Department must make an annual determination by January 1, 2006, and by January 1 of each subsequent year, as to which basins, subbasins, or reaches not previously designated as fully appropriated or overappropriated have since become fully appropriated. The Department must also complete an annual evaluation of the expected long-term availability of hydrologically connected water supplies in the basins, subbasins, or reaches and issue a report describing the results of the evaluation.
- When a basin, subbasin, or reach is declared overappropriated or determined to be fully appropriated, stays on new uses of ground water and surface water are automatically to be imposed. The Department and the natural resources districts (NRDs) involved are required to develop and implement jointly an integrated management plan (IMP) within three to five years of that designation.

- A key goal of each IMP must be to manage all hydrologically connected ground water and surface water for the purpose of sustaining a balance between water uses and water supplies so that the economic viability, social and environmental health, safety, and welfare of the basin, subbasin, or reach can be achieved and maintained for both the near and long term. In the overappropriated portions of the state, the IMP must provide for a reduction in current levels of water use so that it is possible to achieve a balance between water uses and water supplies.
- IMPs may rely on a number of voluntary and regulatory controls, including incentives, allocation of ground water withdrawals, rotation of use, and reduction of irrigated acres, among others.
- If disputes between the Department and the NRDs over the development or implementation of an IMP cannot be resolved, the Governor will appoint a five-member Interrelated Water Review Board to resolve the issue.

Subsequent to the passage of LB 962, a number of basins, subbasins, or reaches have been designated as fully or overappropriated (Figure 2-1). Previous statutorily required reports on the evaluation of hydrologically connected water supplies are available upon request from the Department. This volume is the third statutorily required annual report.

Figure 2-1 Areas originally designated as hydrologically connected to fully and overappropriated basins, subbasins, and reaches



3.0 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

3.1 Section 46-713(1)(a) – Annual Evaluation and Report Required

A river basin's hydrologically connected water supplies include the surface water in the watershed or catchment that runs off to the stream and the ground water that is in hydrologic connection with the stream. For all evaluated basins, the geographic areas of hydrologically connected surface water and ground water, if any, are shown on a basin-wide map that is included in each basin subsection. On each of those maps, the surface watershed basin is shown by a solid line, and the hydrologically connected ground water portion of the basin is depicted by a shaded area.

Surface water supplies are considered to be hydrologically connected to a stream or stream reach if the surface water drains to that stream or reach. In accordance with Department rule 457 N.A.C. 24.001.02, the Department considers the area within which ground water is hydrologically connected to a stream to be that area in which "pumping of a well for 50 years will deplete a river or base flow tributary thereof by at least 10% of the amount pumped in that time" (i.e., the "10/50 area"). For purposes of evaluation, a river basin may be divided into two or more subbasins or reaches. Only those basins that have not initiated development of or implemented an IMP are required to be evaluated.

In preparing its annual report, the Department is required by section 46-713(1)(d) to rely on the best scientific data, information, and methodologies readily available to ensure that the conclusions and results contained in the report are reliable. A list of the information the Department uses can be found in rule 457 N.A.C. 24.002 (Appendix B). The Department is also required to provide enough documentation in the report to allow others to replicate and assess the Department's data, information, methodologies, and conclusions independently. That documentation can be found throughout the report. The raw data used

for these calculations and the spreadsheets with the calculations will be provided by the Department upon request.

3.2 Section 46-713(1)(b) – Preliminary Conclusions Following Basin Evaluations

As a result of its annual evaluation, the Department is to arrive at a preliminary conclusion as to whether or not each river basin, subbasin, and reach evaluated is currently fully appropriated without the initiation of additional uses. The Department is also required to determine if and how its preliminary conclusions would change if no additional legal constraints were imposed on future development of hydrologically connected surface water and ground water. This determination is based on reasonable projections of the extent and location of future development in a basin.

3.3 Section 46-713(3)-Determination that a Basin is Fully Appropriated

The Department must make a final determination that a basin, subbasin, or reach is fully appropriated if the current uses of hydrologically connected surface and ground water in the basin, subbasin, or reach cause, or will in the reasonably foreseeable future cause, either (a) the surface water supply to be insufficient to sustain over the long term the beneficial or useful purposes for which existing natural-flow or storage appropriations were granted, (b) the streamflow to be insufficient to sustain over the long term the beneficial uses from wells constructed in aquifers dependent on recharge from the river or stream involved, or (c) reduction in the flow of a river or stream sufficient to cause noncompliance by Nebraska with an interstate compact or decree, other formal state contract or agreement, or applicable state or federal laws. Since these factors must be considered in making the final determination, they must also be part of the Department's considerations in reaching its preliminary conclusions.

The Department considered whether or not condition (c) would be met with regard to interstate compacts by reviewing the terms of any compacts in each basin and determining when noncompliance would occur if there were sufficient reductions in streamflow. There were no decrees, formal state contracts, or agreements in any of the basins evaluated this year; there is one interstate compact covering the Blue River basins.

With regard to noncompliance with state and federal law, it was determined that only the state and federal laws prohibiting the taking of threatened and endangered species could raise compliance issues that would trigger condition (c). The federal Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1530 *et seq.* (ESA), prohibits the taking of any federally listed threatened or endangered species of animal by the actual killing or harming of an individual member of the species (16 U.S.C. § 1532) and by degrading or destroying a species' habitat so much that the species cannot survive (50 CFR § 17.3). The state Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act, Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 37-801 *et seq.* (NNESCA), also prohibits the actual killing or harming of an individual member of a listed species, but it is not clear whether the degradation of a species' habitat is considered a taking under state law. The Department reviewed information from the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission about the possible existence of species listed as threatened and endangered in the river basins that the Department evaluated; whether those species actually live in the rivers or streams; and, for those species that live in the streams, whether those species' habitat requirements include an identified level of streamflow. The Department reached a preliminary conclusion that reductions in flow will not cause noncompliance with either federal or state law at this time in any of the basins evaluated.

Prior to making its final determination, the Department must also hold a public hearing on its preliminary conclusions and consider any testimony and information given at the public hearing or hearings.

4.0 METHODOLOGIES

Overview

This section provides an overview of the methodologies used in the Department’s basin evaluations and is separated into seven subsections. The first subsection will outline the legal requirements established in section 46-713 of the Ground Water Management and Protection Act and regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001 (Appendix B) as they relate to the analysis. Subsection two will discuss the various methods available to assess stream depletions in hydrologically connected regimes and explain when specific methods were implemented by the Department. Subsection three will discuss the specific methods implemented by the Department to calculate the extent of the 10/50 area. The fourth subsection will proceed through the steps to calculate lag impacts from current wells and estimate long-term sustainability of water supplies. Subsection five will discuss implementation of the “erosion rule” (i.e., regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001.01C) to evaluate impacts to surface water appropriations. Subsection six discusses how each basin, subbasin, or reach is evaluated to ensure compliance with state and federal laws. Subsection seven provides the details of the methods used to predict depletions from potential future development.

4.1 Legal Obligation of the Department

4.1.1 The Legal Requirements of Section 46-713

The methodologies used for evaluation within this report were developed to meet the requirements of section 46-713 of the Act. The criteria set forth in section 46-713 require the Department to 1) describe the nature and extent of surface and ground water uses in each river basin, subbasin, or reach; 2) define the geographic area within which surface water and ground water are hydrologically connected; 3) define the extent to which current uses will affect available near-term and long-term water supplies; and 4)

determine how preliminary conclusions, based on current development, would change if no additional legal constraints were imposed on reasonable projections of future development.

The description of the nature and extent of surface and ground water uses is developed based on information obtained through published reports from the University of Nebraska-Conservation and Survey Division (CSD), the U.S. Geological Survey, natural resources districts, Department databases, and other sources as noted in the text. The information represents the most current publications available. These data include information on transmissivity, specific yield, saturated thickness, depth to water, surficial geology, bedrock geology, water table elevation change, and test-hole information. These data are available on the UNL-Conservation and Survey Division and U.S. Geological Survey websites, <http://csd.unl.edu/> and <http://waterdata.usgs.gov/ne/nwis/gw>, respectively. All data utilized in this report are available from the Department upon request.

The Department is tasked with assessing the geographic area within which surface water and ground water are hydrologically connected. Regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001.02 states that the geographic area within which the ground and surface water are hydrologically connected is determined by calculating where, in each river basin, a well would deplete a river's flow by 10% of the amount of water the well could pump over a fifty-year period (i.e., "the 10/50 area").

The Department's evaluation of the extent to which current uses will affect available near-term and long-term water supplies considers current well development and the twenty-five year lag impacts from that current development on surface water flows. For purposes of this report, lag impacts are defined as the delayed effect that the consumptive use of water associated with well pumping will have on hydrologically connected streamflow and the associated impact on surface water appropriations.

The Department is also required to assess how its preliminary conclusions, based on current development, might change by predicting future development. The predictions of future development account for existing wells and wells that may be added in the next twenty-five years. In projecting the quantity of wells that may be added to the number of currently developed wells, the Department considers the following: 1) availability of lands suitable for irrigation; 2) well-construction moratoriums established by natural resources districts; and 3) trends in well development over the previous ten-year period.

4.1.2 Regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001

Regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001 generally states that a basin is fully appropriated if current uses of hydrologically connected surface water and ground water in a basin cause, or will cause in the reasonably foreseeable future, (a) the surface water to be insufficient to sustain over the long term the beneficial purposes for which the existing surface water appropriations were granted, (b) the streamflow to be insufficient to sustain over the long term the beneficial uses from wells constructed in aquifers dependent on recharge from the basin's river or stream, or (c) reduction in streamflow sufficient to cause Nebraska to be in noncompliance with an interstate compact or decree, formal state contract, or state or federal laws.

In short, regulation 457 N.A.C. 24 states that the surface water supply is deemed to be insufficient if, at current levels of development, the most junior irrigation right in a basin, subbasin, or reach has been unable to divert sufficient surface water over the last twenty years to provide 85% of the amount of water a corn crop needs (the net corn crop irrigation requirement, or NCCIR) during the irrigation season (May 1 through September 30), or if the most junior irrigation right in a basin, subbasin, or reach is unable to divert 65% of the amount of water a corn crop needs during the key growing period of July 1 through August 31. For the purposes of this report, this is deemed the "65/85 rule".

If the requirements of the 65/85 rule are not satisfied, then the final step in a preliminary conclusion of whether a basin is fully appropriated is to apply what has been termed the “erosion rule” (457 N.A.C. 24.001.01C). This rule takes into account the fact that appropriations may be granted even though sufficient water is not available at the time they are granted to provide enough water for diversion to satisfy the requirements of the 65/85 rule. If an appropriation is unable to divert enough water to satisfy the requirements of the 65/85 rule, a second evaluation is completed to determine if the right has been “eroded”. According to regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001.01B, in the event that the junior water right is not an irrigation right, the Department will utilize a standard of interference appropriate for the type of water use to determine whether flows are sufficient for that use, taking into account the purpose for which the appropriation was granted.

4.2 Methods Available for Assessing Stream Depletions

There are several methods for estimating the extent and magnitude of stream depletions. Historically, three broad categories have been used to study ground water flow systems, i.e. sand tank models, analog models, and mathematical models, which include analytical models and numerical models. The first two methods were primarily used prior to the advent of modern, high-speed, digital computers. Since the advent of computers, analytical and numerical models have become the preferred methods for evaluating ground water flow. Limitations of each method must be considered by the user when considering the results of analyses and the appropriateness of each method for a given task.

4.2.1 Numerical Modeling Methods

With user-friendly interfaces and high-speed computers, numerical models have fast become the preferred method of evaluating regional ground water flow. One widely used numerical model developed by the U.S. Geological Survey is MODFLOW (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988). For the purposes of this report, if an acceptable MODFLOW model suitable for regional analysis is available, then it will be utilized to assist in analysis. The only area for which an existing model was utilized in this year's evaluation was the Upper Big Blue Basin. The model was used to evaluate areas of hydrologic connection between surface water and ground water within the basin.

The remaining basins discussed in this report are not currently represented in a suitable numerical model. Development of a numerical model requires a substantial amount of quality-assured data. Current data collection efforts may allow for suitable model development for these basins in the future. However, at present, analytical methods are the best available tool for the analysis of stream depletions within these basins.

4.2.2 Analytical Methods

Analytical methods for the analysis of streamflow depletions have been developed by Glover and Balmer (1954), Maasland and Bittinger (1963), Gautuschi (1964), and others to evaluate the impacts of wells on streams. The Jenkins (1968) method for calculation of stream depletion factors (SDF) (Appendix C) lends itself best to the basin-wide aspect of the task described by this report. This method is based on simplifying assumptions and was built upon previously published equations. The Jenkins method has been utilized by other states, including Colorado and Wyoming, for water administration purposes. For this report, the Jenkins method was used in the evaluation of the Lower Niobrara River Basin, the Lower Platte River Basin, and Missouri Tributary basins.

Modified versions of the Jenkins method have been developed to address more complex situations, such as the presence of boundary conditions (Miller and Durnford, 2005) and a streambed (Zlotnik, 2004). The modifications require additional data that are often not available for the basins in this evaluation. However, the dominant factors in determining the impact of a pumping well on a stream are the distance of the well from the stream and the length of time that the well is pumped. Thus, the impact of any other differences between actual hydrologic and geologic conditions and the idealized assumptions used in the Jenkins method decreases as the distance from the stream and any relevant boundary conditions and duration of pumping increase. Therefore, when looking at regional impacts, the simplifying assumptions of the Jenkins method are much less significant. This concept is supported by comments from Dick Luckey (USGS, 2006). For this reason, and because of a lack of published data necessary for the calculations, no modifications were made to the Jenkins method for the Department's analysis.

In some areas of the state, particularly in the glaciated eastern sections, information regarding hydrologic conditions is inadequate, and no method currently available can be used to determine the 10/50 area or the lag impact of ground water pumping from wells. These areas were not evaluated in the current report.

4.2.3 Peer Review of the Methodology

The methodology developed by the Department and described in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 was independently peer reviewed by the Nebraska Water Science Center of the U.S. Geological Survey in October 2005. The Center concluded, "The NWSC reviewers found the document technically sound." A copy of the peer review transmittal letter is in Appendix D.

4.3 Development of the 10/50 Areas

The 10/50 area is defined as the geographic area within which ground water is hydrologically connected to surface water. A well constructed in the 10/50 area would deplete a river's flow by at least 10% of the water pumped over a fifty-year period. The 10/50 areas are not dependent on the quantity of water pumped, but rather on each basin's geologic characteristics and the distance between each well and the stream.

4.3.1 Use of Numerical Models

The Department reviewed available numerical models to assess their validity in defining the 10/50 areas. The Upper Big Blue Natural Resources District developed a numerical MODFLOW ground water model using Cooperative Hydrology Study (COHYST) data to delineate the extent of the 10/50 area hydrologically connected to the Little Blue River. The Department reviewed the ground water model and deemed it suitable for use in this report. Documentation of this ground water model is available in Appendix E.

4.3.2 Use of Analytical Methods

In areas where an acceptable numerical model has not been developed but where sufficient geologic data exist, the Jenkins SDF methodology was used to define the 10/50 area. The following steps were taken to calculate the extent of the 10/50 area:

1. Collect and prepare data (data will be provided by the Department upon request).

2. Evaluate available data to determine if the principal aquifer is present and if sufficient data exist to determine that a given stream reach is in hydrologic connection with the principal aquifer.
3. Complete Jenkins SDF calculations to delineate the 10/50 boundary for these basins.
4. Develop the 10/50 area.

In all other areas, where sufficient data do not exist or the principal aquifer is not present, the 10/50 area could not be determined.

Step 1: Data Preparation

The following data are necessary for determining the extent of the 10/50 area:

- Aquifer transmissivity
- Aquifer specific yield
- Locations of perennial streams
- Point grid of distances to streams

The aquifer properties used in the study were found in the report “Mapping of Aquifer Properties – Transmissivity and Specific Yield – for Selected River Basins in Central and Eastern Nebraska”, published by the Conservation and Survey Division (CSD, 2005).

The location and extent of perennial streams were found in the permanent streams GIS coverage available from the U.S. Geological Survey National Hydrography Dataset. The main stems of each river and of its tributaries were included in the calculations for individual basins.

A point grid with a spacing of one mile was developed to identify specific distances from the stream and to store those locations which were within the 10/50 area.

Step 2: Identify Principal Aquifers and Hydrologic Connection to Perennial Streams

The extent of hydrologic connection between aquifers and streams was primarily determined from maps generated by the Conservation and Survey Division (CSD, 2005). Other supporting evidence from published reports was also used in some cases to delineate the extent of hydrologic connection between aquifers and streams, and this information is referenced where used. Areas that lie outside of the hydrologically connected areas were not incorporated into the analysis.

Step 3: Perform Jenkins SDF Calculations

The Jenkins SDF method utilizes the following two terms, for which solutions are derived graphically using the curve shown in Figure 4-1.

Depletion percentage term: v/Qt

Dimensionless term: $\frac{t}{SDF}$

Where

v = volume of stream depletion during time t

Qt = net volume pumped during time t

t = time during the pumping period since pumping began


$$SDF = \frac{a^2 * S}{T}$$

where a = perpendicular distance between the well and stream

S = average specific yield of the aquifer between the well and the stream

T = average transmissivity of the aquifer between the well and the stream

Figure 4-1 Stream depletion curve from Jenkins (1968)



As illustrated in Figure 4-1, the dimensionless term will equal 0.359 when the depletion percentage is equal to 10%. The aquifer properties at each grid point and the distance of each grid point from the nearest perennial stream will be utilized to calculate the dimensionless term (Figure 4-2).

The known values for the 10/50 calculation are as follows:

- t is 50 years or 18,262 days.
- T is the aquifer transmissivity.
- S is the aquifer specific yield.
- a is the perpendicular distance from the grid point to the nearest perennial stream.

Figure 4-2 An example of the data and method used in determination of the 10/50 area



Step 4: Developing the 10/50 Area

Once the value for the dimensionless term is derived, those grid points with a dimensionless term value greater than 0.359 are included as part of the 10/50 area. All points that meet this requirement are merged to develop the complete 10/50 area for the basin.

4.4 Evaluating Current Development within a Basin


When determining the status of a basin, the Department evaluates five criteria. The five criteria are 1) that current levels of surface water and ground water development, without consideration of lag impacts

from wells, are able to satisfy the 65/85 rule; 2) that current levels of surface water and ground water development, with consideration of twenty-five year lag impacts, are able to satisfy the 65/85 rule; 3) that erosion of non-irrigation surface water rights based on the standard of interference established by the Department has not occurred; 4) that the basin, subbasin, or reach is in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws; and 5) that future development (including lag impacts) of ground water in the basin will not cause the basin to be unable to satisfy the 65/85 rule.


If criteria one and/or two are unable to be satisfied, then an additional test, the “erosion rule”, is applied to junior irrigation rights. This is used to evaluate whether the ability to divert water by the most junior surface water appropriation has been eroded. Methods for implementation of the erosion rule are discussed in detail in Section 4.5. Figure 4-3 illustrates the evaluation process for determining whether a basin is fully appropriated.

Figure 4-3 Basin evaluation flow chart

Evaluation of Current Development



Evaluation of Future Development



*In general terms, the 65/85 rule states that the surface water supply is deemed to be insufficient if, at current levels of development, the most junior irrigation right in a basin, subbasin, or reach has been unable to divert sufficient surface water over the last twenty years to provide 85% of the amount of water a corn crop needs (the net corn crop irrigation requirement) during the irrigation season (May 1 through September 30) or if the most junior irrigation right in a basin, subbasin, or reach is unable to divert 65% of the amount of water a corn crop needs during the key growing period of July 1 through August 31.

Failure to satisfy criteria one, two, three, or four will cause a basin to be declared fully appropriated.

Failure to satisfy criterion five alone will not cause a basin to be declared fully appropriated, however, but such failure would indicate that future development may cause the basin to become fully appropriated if current development trends continue.

4.4.1 The Role of Surface Water Administration Doctrine

The administration of surface water plays a key role in evaluating the sustainability of development within a basin, subbasin, or reach. Surface water appropriations in Nebraska are administered under the doctrine of prior appropriation. The basis for the doctrine is “first in time, first in right.” When there is a surface water shortage in a basin, subbasin, or reach, the surface water appropriation with a senior priority date has the right to use any available water for beneficial use, up to its permitted limit, before any upstream junior surface water appropriation can use water. To exercise a senior right, the senior water appropriation will put a call on the stream, and the Department will investigate the streamflows and, if necessary, issue closing orders to the upstream junior water appropriations, starting with the most junior right.

Although additional surface water development in a basin will deplete the overall surface water supplies during times when there is excess surface water, under the priority system a junior right cannot cause a senior surface water appropriation’s supply to be reduced. When the Department administers for a calling senior surface water appropriation, all upstream junior surface water appropriations, starting with the most junior appropriator, are shut off in order of priority, no matter how far upstream, until the calling senior surface water appropriation is satisfied. Therefore, in areas where surface water administration is already occurring, additional surface water development will not reduce the number of days surface water is available for diversion by a senior surface water appropriation. In areas that have


not experienced surface water administration, it is not feasible to predict the point at which additional surface water development may cause surface water administration to occur.

The priority doctrine of first in time, first in right which governs surface water administration ensures that, if there is sufficient water for the most junior irrigation appropriation, then all irrigation appropriations will be satisfied. Therefore, the Department analyzed the water available to the most junior appropriator in each basin evaluation. When making the calculation of the number of days that surface water was available to the most junior irrigation surface water appropriator, the Department assumed that, if the junior appropriator was not closed, then he or she could have diverted at the full permitted diversion rate.

4.4.2 The Net Corn Crop Irrigation Requirement

The net corn crop irrigation requirement (NCCIR) was developed to estimate the average minimum consumptive allocation of water necessary to yield a profitable corn crop to an individual operator. The NCCIR is used to determine the number of diversion days required for the most junior surface water appropriation to satisfy irrigation needs under the 65/85 rule (see Section 4.1.2). In developing the NCCIR, corn is used as the baseline crop because the most frequent beneficial use of water in all of the basins evaluated is for the irrigation of corn. The NCCIR accounts for the average evapotranspiration and average precipitation in an area and generally decreases from northwest to southeast across the state (Figure 4-4). The NCCIR distribution for each basin is set out in individual basin subsections. The method of developing the NCCIR is described in Appendix F.

Figure 4-4 Net corn crop irrigation requirement



4.4.3 Determination of Diversion Requirements

To determine a junior irrigator's diversion requirements, the NCCIR is converted to the number of days necessary for an operator to divert water to yield a profitable corn crop using these assumptions: 1) a downtime of 10%, due to mechanical failures and other causes; 2) a diversion rate of 1 cubic foot per second (cfs) per 70 acres (or 0.34 inches/day), as this is the most common rate approved by the Department for surface water appropriations; and 3) an irrigation efficiency of 80%. The steps to determine the number of days necessary for a specific operator to divert include the following:

- 1) Determine the geographic location of the operator.
- 2) Interpolate between the NCCIR contours to determine the specific need of the operator.
- 3) Multiply the NCCIR by 0.65 and 0.85 to find the 65% and 85% requirements.
- 4) Calculate the gross irrigation requirement by dividing the values from step 3 by 0.8 (the irrigation efficiency).
- 5) Divide the gross irrigation requirement by 0.34 inches per day (rate of diversion) and by 0.9 (to account for downtime) to determine the number of days of diversion necessary for an operator.

$$\text{Number of days necessary} = \frac{\text{gross requirement}}{(0.34)(0.9)}$$

The results of this calculation for the most junior surface water appropriator in a basin are used to evaluate whether a basin is fully appropriated by comparing these results to the average number of days over the previous twenty-year period (1987-2006) that surface water was available for diversion. If the number of days necessary to meet either the 65% or 85% criteria is less than the average number of days available for diversion, then the basin, subbasin, or reach may be declared fully appropriated.

This test is the first criterion in the five-tiered test described at the beginning of Section 4.4. If the basin satisfies this test, then the second criterion is evaluated: the addition of lag impacts from current development.

4.4.4 Calculating Lag Impacts from Current Well Development

The second criterion assessed to determine whether a basin is fully appropriated is to estimate the lag impacts from current well development. In those basins for which the appropriate geologic and

hydrologic data were available, the following steps were taken to compute the lag impact from current development:

1. Define the ground water boundary for the study area.
2. Extract all high capacity wells from the Department's database with a completion date prior to December 31, 2006.
3. Account for current year's development.
4. Estimate the volume of water pumped from each well.
5. Calculate the twenty-five year lag impacts.
6. Create lag-adjusted flow record.
7. Determine number of diversion days available.

In those basins for which the appropriate geologic and hydrologic data were not available, the lag impacts were not calculated, due to uncertainty of the degree of hydrologic connection. In many of those cases, the number of days in which surface water is available for diversion far exceeds the number of days necessary to meet the net corn crop irrigation requirement, and the final conclusion would likely not change even with the addition of lag impacts.

Step 1: Define the Study Area Boundaries

The study area surface water boundary for each river basin is defined by the watershed boundary. The study area ground water boundary is defined by certain features that include the location of perennial baseflow streams, location of non-hydrologically connected areas, and ground water table highs that prevent flow to the stream of interest.

An individual well may fall into multiple basin study areas. If a well falls within multiple basin study areas, its total stream depletion is divided by the number of basin study areas that it intersects. For

example, if a well falls into two basin study areas, the depletion is divided by 2. This prevents overestimation of depletions in overlapping areas. A sufficient number of wells in an overlapping area will likely, on average, be halfway between the two basins. Because SDF methodology is distance-based, splitting the depletion in half and assigning half of the total depletion to each basin is justified.

Step 2: Identify High Capacity Wells within the Study Area

In calculating lag impacts, the Department evaluates only high capacity wells, considered to be those wells with a pumping rate of greater than 50 gallons per minute (gpm). High capacity wells include active irrigation, industrial, public water supply, and unprotected public water supply wells (public water supply wells without statutory spacing protection). Other wells, such as decommissioned or inactive high capacity wells, livestock watering wells, and domestic wells were not included, because the database is not complete for those well types. This omission is not considered significant, because these wells use relatively small amounts of water. All active high capacity wells with a completion date prior to December 31, 2006, were used in the analysis.

Step 3: Account for Current Year (2007) Development

Wells are not registered simultaneously with their completion date, so it was necessary to estimate the number of high capacity wells that will be registered as constructed between January 1, 2007, and December 31, 2007. The first step in estimating the number of high capacity wells for 2007 is to average the well development rates within a basin over the previous three-year period (2004-2006), taking into account known limitations, such as moratoriums, on well development. Based on the rates, additional wells are randomly located geographically within the study area on soils that have been defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as irrigable. To ensure that land was available for development, a 1,400-foot-radius circle (slightly larger than the radius of an average center pivot) was drawn around each active high capacity well existing in the Department's water well registration database. All lands within the circles were removed from the inventory of irrigable land available for development. In addition, all

irrigable land areas of less than 40 acres in size that were available for new development were excluded. The wells extracted from the Department's water well registration database with a completion date prior to December 31, 2006, and those estimated to be developed in each basin for 2007 were then combined to serve as the basis for current well development.

Step 4: Estimate the Volume Pumped by Each Well

The volume pumped from a well for consumptive use (Q_t) is determined by multiplying the NCCIR (see Section 4.4.2) by the number of acres irrigated by the well. The number of acres irrigated by each well was estimated to be 90 acres, for reasons documented in Appendix G (DNR, 2005). Industrial and public water supply wells are treated the same as irrigation wells for this analysis.

Example:

If Location of well: Custer County, Nebraska

NCCIR requirement (from Figure 4-4): 11 inches/year

Number of acres served: 90 acres

Then Q_t : 11 inches/year * 90 acres = 990 acre-inches/year or 82.5 acre-feet/year

Step 5: Calculate Twenty-Five Year Lag Impacts

The Jenkins SDF methodology is utilized to estimate the twenty-five year lag impacts to streamflows due to current well development. The Jenkins SDF methodology allows for calculation of the streamflow depletion percentage of each well in the basin. The terms used in this methodology include the depletion percentage term and the dimensionless term, both defined below:

Depletion percentage term: v/Q_t


Dimensionless term: $\frac{tT}{a^2S}$ or $\frac{t}{SDF}$

The goal of this analysis is to solve for the 'v' term, or the volume of stream depletion (in acre-feet/year) over the twenty-five year period. First, the dimensionless term is calculated using the following known variables:

- t is the time since the well was completed (2007-well completion year).
- T is the aquifer transmissivity.
- S is the aquifer specific yield.
- a is the perpendicular distance from the well to the nearest perennial stream.

Next, the dimensionless term is used to determine the percentage of depletion (v/Q_t). For example, if the dimensionless term is equal to 0.7, then the depletion percentage is equal to 0.211, or 21.1% (see Figure 4-5).

Figure 4-5 Determining depletion percentage from the dimensionless term



Finally, the stream depletion is calculated as follows:

$$v = Q_t * \text{percentage depletion}$$

Where v = stream depletion in acre-feet/year

Q_t = volume pumped in acre-feet/year

percentage depletion = value corresponding to the dimensionless term, from the graph in

Figure 4-5

The depletion percentage is multiplied by the volume pumped, as calculated in Step Four, to determine total stream depletion. These results can be converted from annual acre-feet of depletion to cubic feet per second (cfs) by dividing by 724.46 (the conversion factor for acre-feet/year to cfs).

The next step is to calculate the twenty-five year lag impacts. The twenty-five year lag impacts for all current wells are calculated in a similar way, except that the time period for each well (t) is increased by twenty-five years (9,125 days). The total depletions calculated in 2007 are subtracted from the total depletions calculated in 2032 (twenty-five years into the future) to determine the lag impacts. An example of this process is illustrated below (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1 Example calculation of twenty-five year lag impacts

Year	Cumulative Depletion (cfs)	Additional Annual Depletion (cfs)	Lag (cfs)
2006	100	10	20
2007	110		
2031	300	30	
2032	330		

Step 6: Create Lag-Adjusted Flow Record

The twenty-five year lag impacts from all current wells within a basin are summed to generate a total stream depletion figure for the basin. A daily historic flow record is developed from stream gage data for the previous twenty-year period to represent variations in climate and precipitation in the basin. The sum of the lag impacts is subtracted from the daily historic record to develop a new flow record, here termed the “lag-adjusted flow record”.

Step 7: Determine the Number of Days Available for Diversion

The lag-adjusted flow record is used to calculate the average number of days available to the most junior appropriator within the basin for diversion. The new average number of days available for diversion is compared to the number of days necessary for the most junior surface water appropriator to divert in the basin. If the number of days necessary to meet either the 65% or 85% criterion is less than the average number of days available for diversion, then the basin, subbasin, or reach may be declared fully appropriated.

4.5 Determine Erosion of Rights

If a basin has failed either the first or second criterion (described in Sections 4.4.3 and 4.4.4), then the next step in the Department’s analysis is to apply what has been termed “the erosion rule” (457 N.A.C. 24.001.01C). This rule takes into account the fact that appropriations may be granted even though there is insufficient water at the time the appropriation is granted to satisfy the requirements of 65/85 rule. If an appropriation is unable to divert enough water to satisfy the requirements of the 65/85 rule, then the second evaluation is completed to determine if the right has been “eroded”, i.e., if enough water was not available to satisfy the rule at the time the appropriation was granted. As set forth in regulation 457 N.A.C. 24.001.01B, in the event that the junior water right is not an irrigation right, the Department will

utilize a standard of interference appropriate for the type of use to determine whether flows are sufficient for the use, taking into account the purpose for which the appropriation was granted.

4.5.1 Potential Erosion of Irrigation Rights

The erosion rule is applied through the use of historic streamflow data in a two-step process. The first step is to calculate the average number of days the most junior surface water appropriator would have been able to divert during the twenty-year period before the priority date of the appropriation. The second step is to calculate the average number of days the same junior surface water appropriator has been able to divert during the previous twenty years (i.e., 1987-2006). If the number of days available for diversion has decreased, then the right has been eroded. When making these calculations, the Department takes into account the lag effect of wells existing at the time of the priority date, as well as lag impacts from current well development.

The steps for determining whether a right has been eroded are as follows:

1. Gather the daily streamflow records from the twenty-year period prior to the appropriation being granted.
2. Gather the daily streamflow records for 1987-2006 to serve as the current twenty-year period.
3. Determine the twenty-five-year lagged ground water depletions from wells existing on the date the junior surface water appropriation was granted, and subtract them from the daily streamflow record for the twenty-year period prior to the granting of the appropriation.
4. Determine the twenty-five-year lagged ground water depletions from wells existing at the end of the current twenty-year period (using methodologies described in Section 4.4.4), and subtract them from the daily streamflow record for the current twenty-year period (1987-2006).

5. Assume that surface water administration would occur if the flow requirement of a senior surface water appropriation was greater than the depleted historical daily flow.
6. Conduct a month-by-month comparison of the average number of days available for the junior surface water appropriation to divert during the twenty-year period prior to the appropriation and the average number of days available to divert during the current twenty-year period.

If the average number of days available to the junior surface water appropriation for diversion during the current period (1987-2006) is less than the number of days available to the junior surface water appropriation for the twenty-year period prior to the appropriation, then the appropriation is deemed to be eroded.

4.5.2 Potential Erosion of Instream Flow Rights

In the Lower Platte Basin, the junior water rights that require water administration are instream flow permits. Since the purpose of the instream flow permits is not for irrigation, but rather to maintain—but not enhance—habitat for the fish community existing at the time of the priority date on the permit, the Department determined that an appropriate standard of interference would be to determine whether the instream flow requirements that could be met at the time the water rights were granted can still be met today.

To determine if water use development has interfered with the ability of these water rights to obtain water for instream flow purposes, the Department applied the erosion rule in the same manner as described above. One important difference in evaluating the erosion of an instream flow permit, however, is that the number of days available to the appropriation is evaluated throughout the entire year, rather than only during the irrigation season. Results from the average number of days available for the twenty-year

period prior to the appropriation are compared on a month-by-month basis with the average number of days during the current twenty-year period (1987-2006).

4.6 Evaluation of Compliance with State and Federal Laws

To evaluate compliance with state and federal law, it was determined that, currently, only the state and federal laws prohibiting the taking of threatened and endangered species could raise compliance issues under section 46-713(3)(c). The federal Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1530 *et seq.*, prohibits the taking of any federally listed threatened or endangered species of animal by the actual killing or harming of an individual member of the species (16 U.S.C. § 1532) and by degrading or destroying a species' habitat so much that the species cannot survive (50 CFR § 17.3). The state Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act, Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 37-801 *et seq.*, also prohibits the actual killing or harming of an individual member of a listed species, but it is not clear whether the degradation of a species' habitat is considered a taking under state law. The Department reviewed information from the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission about the possible existence of species listed as threatened and endangered in the river basins, subbasins, or reaches that the Department evaluated. The Department then determined whether a reduction in streamflow will cause noncompliance with either the federal or state law endangered species.

4.7 Evaluating Predicted Future Development in a Basin

The Department is required by section 46-713 to project the impact of reasonable future development within a basin on the potential for fully appropriated status. The results of this analysis alone cannot cause a basin to be declared fully appropriated. However, the analysis does provide an estimate of the effects of current well development trends on the basin's future status.

The steps necessary to calculate the impacts of future development on streamflows parallel those steps outlined in Section 4.4.4. The specific steps necessary to conduct an analysis of the impacts of future well development on the status of a basin are as follows:

- Gather information on lag impacts of current wells (from calculations performed in Section 4.4.4).
- Project the rate of future well development.
- Incorporate projected future well development into the study area.
- Calculate the depletions of projected future well development.
- Subtract the depletions from projected future well development from the previous twenty-year lag-adjusted flow record (1987-2006), and recalculate the number of days available for diversion for the most junior surface water appropriation.

Step 1: Gather Information on Lag Impacts of Current Wells

The lag impacts from current well development will be determined through completion of the steps outlined in Section 4.4.4 above, and the lag-adjusted flow record developed in Step 7 of Section 4.4.4 will be used in this section. In using the lag-adjusted flow record, the twenty-five year lag impacts of current well development will be accounted for, and the impacts from future wells can be removed directly from this new flow record.

Step 2: Project Future Well Development

When calculating impacts from future wells, it is necessary to estimate the rate of future well development. This estimation is completed by projecting the linear trend of current high capacity well development within a study area over the previous ten years (1997-2006). The yearly estimated well

development for the study area is equivalent to the slope of the trend line and takes into account known limitations, such as moratoriums, on well development.

Step 3: Incorporate Future Wells into the Study Area

The number of future wells estimated in Step 2 above must be incorporated into the study area. The future wells are located geographically within the study area by randomly placing each future well on a site where the soils have been defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as irrigable. To ensure that land was available for development, a 1,400-foot-radius circle (slightly larger than the radius of an average center pivot) was drawn around every existing well, and all lands already irrigated within the circles were removed from the inventory of irrigable lands that are available for development. In addition, all irrigable land areas of less than 40 acres in size that are available for new development were excluded.

Step 4: Calculate the Lag Impacts of Future Wells

Depletions from future wells are calculated following the same methodology outlined in Section 4.4.4. The depletions of future wells are calculated independently of current well development. The twenty-five year depletions from future well development are removed from the lag-adjusted flow record created in Step 7 of Section 4.4.4 to develop the future lag-adjusted flow record.

Step 5: Create a Historic Flow Record with Lag Impacts from Current and Future Well

Development

The historic record, with the twenty-five year lag impacts from all current wells (created at the end of Step 5 in Section 4.4.4) subtracted (i.e., the lag adjusted flow record), is used as the starting point in developing the future lag-adjusted flow record. The depletions from future wells incorporated into the study area are calculated for each year through the twenty-five year period and subtracted from the lag-adjusted flow record.

The sum of the future depletions is subtracted from the lag-adjusted daily flow record for the period 1987-2006 to create a future adjusted flow record to account for all current well lag impacts and potential future well depletions. The future lag-adjusted flow record is then used to calculate the average number of days available for diversion to the most junior appropriator within the basin. This new future lag-adjusted flow record is compared to the number of days necessary for the most junior surface water appropriator to divert in the basin.

In those basins for which the appropriate geologic and hydrologic data were not available, the impacts of future well development were not calculated due to uncertainty of the degree of hydrologic connection. In many of those cases, the number of days in which surface water is available for diversion far exceeds the number of days necessary to meet the NCCIR, and the final conclusion would likely not change even with the addition of lag impacts.

Bibliography of Hydrogeologic References for Methodologies Section

- Conservation and Survey Division. 2005. *Mapping of Aquifer Properties-Transmissivity and Specific Yield-for Selected River Basins in Central and Eastern Nebraska*. Lincoln.
- Environmental Protection Agency. 2005. <http://www.epa.gov/watrhome/you/chap1.html>
- Fox, G. A. 2004. Evaluation of a stream aquifer analysis test using analytical solutions and field data. *Jour. Am. Water Resour.* 40(3): 755-763.
- Gautuschi, W. 1964. Error Function and Fresnel Integrals. In *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, ed. Abramowitz, Milton and Irene A. Stegun, 295-329. Applied Mathematics, series 55. U.S. Department of Commerce National Bureau of Standards.
- Glover, R.E. and C.G. Balmer. 1954. River depletion resulting from pumping a well near a river. *Am. Geophys. Union Trans.* 35(3): 468-470.
- Jenkins, C.T. 1968. "Computation of Rate and Volume of Stream Depletion by Wells." In *Techniques of Water Resources Investigations*. U.S. Geological Survey, Book 4, Chapter D1. Washington, D.C.
- Luckey, D. 2006. Phone interview, October 12, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Massland, D.E. and M.W. Bittinger (eds.). 1963. Summaries of Solved Cases in Rectangular Coordinates, Appendix A. In *Transient Ground-Water Hydraulics Symposium*. Colorado State Univ. Proc., pub. CER63DEM-MWB70. Fort Collins.
- McDonald, M.G., and A.W. Harbaugh. 1988. "A Modular Three-Dimensional Finite-Difference Ground-Water Flow Model." In *Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations*. U.S. Geological Survey, Book 6, Chapter A1. Washington D.C.
- Miller, C.D. and D.S. Durnford. 2005. "Modified Use of the "SDF" Semi-Analytical Stream Depletion Model in Bounded Alluvial Aquifers." In *AGU Hydrology Days 2005 Conference Proceedings*, 146-159. American Geophysical Union.
- Nebraska Department of Natural Resources. 2005. *2006 Annual Evaluation of Availability of Hydrologically Connected Water Supplies*. Lincoln.
- Nebraska Natural Resources Commission. 1998. *Estimated Water Use in Nebraska, 1995*. Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey. Lincoln.
- Spalding, C.P. and R. Khaleel. 1991. An evaluation of analytical solutions to estimate drawdown and stream depletions by wells. *Water Resour. Res.* 27(4): 597-609.

United States Geological Survey. 2005. Review of “Stream Depletion Line Calculations for Determination of Fully Appropriated Basins for the State of Nebraska.”

Zlotnik, V.A. 2004. A concept of maximum stream depletion rate for leaky aquifers in alluvial valleys. *Water Resour. Res.* 40: W06507.