

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

NOTE TO USERS

The original manuscript received by UMI contains pages with light print. Pages were microfilmed as received.

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

PREVIEW

**Economic Cost of Augmenting Streamflows in the
Republican River in Southwest Nebraska**

by

Osei-Agyeman Yeboah

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Agricultural Economics

Under the Supervision of Professors
Maurice Baker and Raymond J. Supalla

Lincoln, Nebraska

August, 1998

UMI Number: 9903789

PREVIEW

UMI Microform 9903789
Copyright 1998, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

DISSERTATION TITLE

Economic Cost of Augumenting Streamflows in the Republican River in

Southwest Nebraska

BY

Osei-Agyeman Yeboah

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

Maurice Baker
Signature

July 14, 1998

Dr. Maurice Baker
Typed Name

Raymond J. Supalla
Signature

July 14, 1998

Dr. Raymond J. Supalla
Typed Name

Glenn A. Helmers
Signature

July 14, 1998

Dr. Glenn A. Helmers
Typed Name

William L. Miller
Signature

July 14, 1998

Dr. William L. Miller
Typed Name

Derrel L. Martin
Signature

July 14, 1998

Dr. Derrel L. Martin
Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name



Economic Cost of Augmenting Streamflows in the Republican River in Southwest Nebraska

Osei-Agyman Yeboah, Ph.D.
University of Nebraska, 1998

Advisors : Maurice Baker and Raymond J. Supalla

There has been considerable discussion about the impact of groundwater irrigation development on streamflows in the Republican River in Southwest Nebraska.

Groundwater levels in Southwest Nebraska have declined up to 30 feet or more and streamflows at the same guages have declined by nearly two-thirds.

Linear programming and simulation models were used to determine the least cost of reducing the impact of groundwater irrigation on streamflows in the Republican River. The groundwater water was constrained through successive reductions of both gross and consumed irrigation water.

The yield-gross water response function is curvilinear while that with consumed water is linear. Hence in the latter case, land is either irrigated or goes under dryland production.

When gross water is restricted, the optimum response was initially to keep all irrigated land in production but with a slight reduction in applied water and output. At higher restrictions, it becomes economic to shift irrigated land to dryland. In contrast, when consumed water is restricted, the optimal response is to reduce irrigated acres, rather than reduce applied water. The first land to shift to dryland in both scenarios is gravity on sandy soils. Continuous corn is the best irrigated crop under both scenarios, while the best dryland alternatives are wheat-corn ecofallow for silt soils and continuous grain sorghum for both the loam and sandy soils

Also, when costs are defined as the loss in net returns, the average cost per acre foot of reducing consumed water ranged from a high of \$189.34 at a 20 percent reduction in gross application to a low of only \$132.69 at 80 percent reduction.

On the other hand, if consumed water is restricted rather than gross water, the average cost per acre foot of reduced consumptive use is from a low of \$109.93 to a high of only \$129.37 with the same associated percent reduction of gross water.

Thus it is more cost effective to restrict consumed water directly than restricting gross water applications.

PREVIEW

Acknowledgments

This dissertation has benefitted greatly from the incisive comments of both my two major advisors namely Professors Maurice Baker and Raymond J. Supalla. Professor Baker did not only help in constructive suggestion and editing but he went further giving the advice that will help me in writing papers in future. I am deeply grateful to you Dr. Baker.

For Professor Supalla, over the two years I have known him, Dr Ray has taught me more than economics of water resource; he has taught me how to think about economic problems. Also for his help, his supervisory guidance, his patience, but most of all for his friendship and enormous concern about my welfare for the last two years of my entire graduate program at Nebraska. For this I am deeply grateful.

I am also grateful for the comments and help of the other members of my dissertation committee, Professor Glenn Helmers, for the enormous time and help he offered during the optimization phase of the study and also serving on the reading committee. I do really appreciate Professor Helmers. I am also indebted to Professor Derrel Martin for his logistic support and technical advice. Thank you Professor Martin. I also thank Professor William Miller for his helpful suggestion as a reader.

I thank Mr. Ahmad Saeed and Miss Diane Wasser for the computer help they offered me. Mr Saeed spent almost three weeks taking me through EPIC 5300 for my crop simulation model.

I finally, thank my family, my wife Mavis and daughter Bettie for their understanding and support. I also thank my big brother Professor Anthony Yeboah for prayers, concern, and support, and also, the support of my friends Tilak Dias and Saleem Shaik. Lastly, the Almighty Father for the great things He has done.

| Table of Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| The Problem Statement | 3 |
| Objectives | 3 |
| <i>The Study Area</i> | 4 |
| Climate of the Region | 4 |
| Soils | 4 |
| Land Use | 5 |
| Major Crops Grown and Irrigation System Type | 5 |
| Hydrologic System | 6 |
| Lakes and Reservoirs | 6 |
| Groundwater System | 7 |
| Literature Review | 8 |
| Past Applications of Linear Programming to Water Management | 13 |
| Hydrologic Studies on the Republican River | 17 |
| Yield-Water Production Relationships | 19 |
| The Crop Simulation Model | 23 |
| Results of the Crop Simulation Model | 28 |
| Average Maximum Yield | 28 |
| Average Maximum Irrigation | 33 |
| Average Maximum Evapotranspiration | 33 |
| Optimal Groundwater Application Condition for the Unconstrained Model | 50 |
| The Linear Programming Model | 53 |
| Constraint Values Used in the Model: | 55 |
| Estimation of consumptive Use of Irrigation Water | 59 |
| Production Costs | 61 |
| Irrigation Costs | 76 |
| Results of the Linear Programming Model | 86 |
| Description of Various Adjustments | 86 |
| Total, Average, and Marginal Costs of Reducing Groundwater Consumed | 99 |
| Summary | 104 |
| Conclusion and Policy Recommendations | 106 |
| Major Conclusions | 106 |
| Policy Implications | 107 |
| References | 110 |

| List of Figures | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Figure 4.1 Production functions for Corn Under Sprinkler Irrigation by Soil Type | 37 |
| Figure 4.2 Production functions for Grain Sorghum Under Sprinkler Irrigation by Soil Type | 40 |
| Figure 4.3 Production functions for Winter Wheat Under Sprinkler Irrigation by Soil Type | 43 |
| Figure 4.4 Production functions for Corn Proceeding Soybeans in Rotation Under Sprinkler Irrigation by Soil Type | 46 |
| Figure 4.5 Production functions for Soybeans Following Corn in rotation Under Sprinkler Irrigation by Soil Type | 49 |
| Figure 4.6 Value Marginal Product Versus Marginal Cost of Groundwater for Fully Irrigated Continuous Corn under Sprinkler Irrigation on Silt Soil | 52 |
| Figure 5.1 Cumulative Distribution of Wells with Varying Depths, Southwest Nebraska | 77 |
| Figure 5.2 Cumulative Distribution of Wells with Varying Acreage per Well, Under Sprinkler Irrigation, Southwest Nebraska | 78 |
| Figure 5.3 Cumulative Distribution of Wells with Varying Acreage per Well, Under Gravity Irrigation, Southwest Nebraska | 79 |
| Figure 5.4 Cumulative Distribution of Wells with Varying Yields per Well, Southwest Nebraska | 81 |
| Figure 6.1 Total Net Returns to Consumed and Applied Water Under Applied Water Restrictions, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 95 |
| Figure 6.2 Total Net Returns to Consumed and Applied Water Under Consumed Water Restrictions, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 96 |
| Figure 6.3 Average Net Returns to Consumed and Applied Water Under Applied Water Restrictions, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 97 |
| Figure 6.4 Average Net Returns to Consumed and Applied Water Under Consumed Water Restrictions, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 98 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 6.5 Cost of Reducing Groundwater Consumed Under regulatory Scenarios of Gross Water and Net Water Restrictions, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 102 |
| Figure 6.6 Marginal Cost of Reducing Consumptive Use by Restricting Gross or Consumed Groundwater, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 103 |

PREVIEW

List of Tables

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1.1 Average Acres of Major crops Under Irrigation System types 1980-1988, Upper Republican Natural Resource District | 6 |
| 3.1 Adjustments of Production Parameters in Epic for Irrigated crops, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 26 |
| 3.2 Adjustments of production Parameters in Epic for Dryland crops Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 27 |
| 4.1 Average Maximum Irrigated Yields from Average Maximum Irrigation and Evapotranspiration for Alternative Crops Grown on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 29 |
| 4.2 Average Maximum Non-irrigated Non-ecofallow Yields from Average Evapotranspiration for Alternative Crops Grown on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 31 |
| 4.3 Average Maximum Non-irrigated and Ecofallow Yields from Average Evapotranspiration for Alternative Crops Grown on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 32 |
| 4.4 Absolute Yields of Continuous Corn from Irrigation on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 36 |
| 4.5 Absolute Yields of Continuous Grain Sorghum from Irrigation on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 39 |
| 4.6 Absolute Yields of Continuous Winter Wheat from Irrigation on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 42 |
| 4.7 Absolute Yields of Corn Preceding Soybean in Rotation from Irrigation on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 45 |
| 4.8 Absolute Yields of Soybean Following Corn in Rotation from Irrigation on Different Textured Soils, Southwest Nebraska, 1997 | 48 |
| 4.9 Value Marginal Products versus Marginal cost of Groundwater for Fully Irrigated Crops Under Sprinkler Irrigation on silt Soil, Southwest Nebraska, 1996 | 51 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 5.1 Crop Acres by Soil Type, Irrigation System Type Under Groundwater Irrigation for Chase County, 1996 | 55 |
| 5.2 Crop Acres by Soil Type, Irrigation System Type, Water Source, and County Other than Chase County, 1996 | 58 |
| 5.3 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs of Fully Irrigated Corn by Irrigation System Type and Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996 | 64 |
| 5.4 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs of Fully Irrigated Grain Sorghum by Irrigation System Type and Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996 ... | 65 |
| 5.5 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs of Fully Irrigated Winter Wheat by Irrigation System Type and Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996 | 66 |
| 5.6 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs of Fully Irrigated Corn Preceding Soybean by Irrigation System Type and Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996 | 67 |
| 5.7 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs of Fully Irrigated g Soybean Following Corn by Irrigation System Type and Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996 | 68 |
| 5.8 Per Acre Production Costs of Continuous Dryland Corn by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 69 |
| 5. 9 Per Acre Production Costs of Continuous Dryland Grain Sorghum by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 70 |
| 5.10 Per Acre Production Costs of Continuous Dryland Winter Wheat by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 71 |
| 5.11 Per Acre Production Costs of Corn Preceding Soybean in Rotation by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska , 1996. | 72 |
| 5.12 Per Acre Production Costs of Soybean Following Corn in Rotation by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska , 1996. | 73 |
| 5.13 Per Acre Production Costs of Corn Following Wheat in Ecofallow by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 74 |
| 5.14 Per Acre Production Costs of Wheat Preceding corn in Ecofallow by Soil Type, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 75 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5.15 Per Acre Costs for Groundwater and Surface Water with Alternative Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 85 |
| 6.1 Average Costs of Reducing Consumed Groundwater Under Restricted Groundwater Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. | 100 |
| 6.2 Average Costs of Reducing Consumed Groundwater Under Restricted Consumed Groundwater, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. | 100 |
| 6.3 Marginal Costs of Reducing Consumed Groundwater Under Restricted Groundwater Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. | 101 |
| 6.4 Marginal Costs of Reducing Consumed Groundwater Under Restricted Consumed Groundwater, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. | 101 |
| A-1 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Corn on Silt Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 115 |
| A-2 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Corn on Loam Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 115 |
| A-3 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Corn on Sandy Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 116 |
| A-4 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Grain Sorghum on Silt Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 116 |
| A-5 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Grain Sorghum on Loam Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 117 |
| A-6 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Grain Sorghum on Sandy Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 117 |
| A-7 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Winter Wheat on Silt Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 118 |
| A-8 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Winter Wheat on Loam Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 118 |
| A-9 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Winter Wheat on Sandy Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 119 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| A-10 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Corn Preceding Soybean in Rotation on Silt Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 119 |
| A-11 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Corn Preceding Soybean in Rotation on Loam Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 120 |
| A-12 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Corn Preceding Soybean in Rotation on Sandy Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 120 |
| A-13 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Soybean Following Corn in Rotation on Silt Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 121 |
| A-14 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Soybean Following Corn in Rotation on Loam Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 121 |
| A-15 Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Soybean Following Corn in Rotation on Sandy Soil, Southwest Nebraska.. | 122 |
| B-1 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Corn on Silt Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 123 |
| B-2 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Corn on Loam Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 124 |
| B-3 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Corn on Sandy Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 125 |
| B-4 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Grain Sorghum on Silt Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 126 |
| B-5 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Grain Sorghum on Loam Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 127 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| B-6 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Grain Sorghum on Sand Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 128 |
| B-7 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Winter Wheat on Silt Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 129 |
| B-8 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Winter Wheat on Loam Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 130 |
| B-9 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Continuous Winter Wheat on Sandy Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 131 |
| B-10 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Corn Preceding Soybean on Silt Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 132 |
| B-11 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Corn Preceding Soybean on Loam Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 133 |
| B-12 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Corn Preceding Soybean on Sandy Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 134 |
| B-13 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Soybean Following Corn on Silt Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 135 |
| B-14 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Soybean Following Corn on Loam Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 136 |
| B-15 Per Acre Non-water Production Costs for Soybean Following Corn on Sandy Soil Under Sprinkler and Gravity Irrigation with Varying Levels of Water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 137 |
| B-16 Production Cost for Corn in Wheat - Corn-Ecofallow | 138 |
| C-1 Per Acre Groundwater and surface Water Irrigation Costs with Varying Irrigation Levels, Southwest Nebraska, 1996.. | 139 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| D-1 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The Unconstrained Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 140 |
| D-2 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 20 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 141 |
| D-3 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 30 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 142 |
| D-4 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 50 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 143 |
| D-5 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 60 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 144 |
| D-6 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 70 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 145 |
| D-7 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 80 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 146 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| D-8 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 9 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 147 |
| D-9 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 18 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 148 |
| D-10 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 41 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 149 |
| D-11 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 52 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 150 |
| D-12 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 64 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 151 |
| D-13 Cropping Pattern, Total Water Use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 75 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 152 |
| D-14 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 20 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 153 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| D-15 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 30 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 153 |
| D-16 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 50 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 154 |
| D-17 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 60 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 154 |
| D-18 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 70 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 155 |
| D-19 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 80 Percent Reduction Gross Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 155 |
| D-20 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 9 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 156 |
| D-21 Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 18 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 156 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| D-22 | Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 41 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 157 |
| D-23 | Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 52 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 157 |
| D-24 | Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 64 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 157 |
| D-25 | Cropping Pattern, and Net Returns Per Applied or Consumed Groundwater on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems, Southwest Nebraska, 1997. (The 75 Percent Reduction Consumed Groundwater and Constrained Surface Water Application Model). | 158 |

List of Appendices

| Appendix | Page |
|--|-------------|
| A Estimated Net Irrigation Requirement with Alternative Levels of Irrigation for Different Crops on Different Textured Soils. | 115 |
| B Per Acre Non-water production Costs for Different Crops on Different Textured Soils and Irrigation Systems with Varying Levels of water Application, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 123 |
| C Per Acre Groundwater and Surface Water Irrigation Costs with Varying Irrigation levels, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 139 |
| D Cropping Pattern, Total Water use, and Total Net Returns from Groundwater Application on Different Soils and Irrigation Systems for Successive Groundwater Reduction Levels and Constrained Surface Water, Southwest Nebraska, 1996. | 140 |

Chapter I

Introduction

There has been considerable discussion about the impact of groundwater irrigation development on streamflows. This has intensified recently with Kansas arguing that Nebraska is failing to meet the terms of the Republican River Interstate Compact which allocates water between Colorado, Kansas and Nebraska. Kansas contends that irrigation wells are one of the causes for Republican River streamflow reduction to Kansas.

Irrigation is the main consumptive use of groundwater for irrigation within the basin, with relatively smaller amounts used for municipal, industrial, domestic, and stock watering purposes. Irrigated corn acres in Chase County for instance increased from 1400 in 1950 to 125,000 in 1994. Much of this growth took place in the 1970s, when irrigated corn acres nearly tripled, increasing from 38,000 in 1970 to nearly 111,000 by 1980. Most of this increase was from groundwater.

Well development has resulted in significant groundwater table declines because withdrawals for irrigation have exceeded natural recharge. The Frenchman Creek Basin is such an area. Groundwater levels within this area have declined up to 30 feet or more (Steele and Wigley, 1994).

A U.S. Geological Survey (U.S.G.S) report in 1989, predicted a steady decline in the level of the aquifer from 1989 to 2030 resulting from long term pumping at the current rate. The effect of the pumping scenario on streamflow was also noted. For example, the streamflow in French Creek near Imperial at the end of May 1989 was 32.6 cubic feet per second (cfs), while the simulated flow at the same location in May 2030 was only 10.2 cfs.