30 June 2017

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington DC  20426

Subject: The Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District, Project No. 1417
Article 421, FERC Project Boundary Review of the Remainder of Project (Supply Canal except Johnson Reservoir)

Secretary Bose:

Pursuant to The Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District’s (Central) Updated FERC Boundary Review Schedule (Schedule), Central is to complete a review of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Project Boundary (Project boundary) for the Remainder of Project (Supply Canal except Johnson Reservoir) by December 31, 2016. This due date was extended to June 30, 2017 by FERC staff during a May 2017 meeting. Central has completed that review, and hereby submits to FERC the attached 2017 Remainder of Project FERC Boundary Review Report that provides a summary of the review and the recommendations concerning the Project boundary for the Remainder of Project (Supply Canal except Johnson Reservoir).

Central recommends that the Project boundary be adjusted as described in the report. The recommended changes would result in 2,889 acres± added to the Project and 85 acres± removed from the Project, for a net change of 2,804 acres± added to the Project.

1 Submitted by Central as part of its July 18, 2011 FERC Project Boundary Review 2011 Annual Progress Report and accepted by FERC in its July 29, 2011 letter responding to Central’s 2010 and 2011 Project Boundary Review Annual Reports. This Schedule adjusts the schedule of review provided for in Central’s Land and Shoreline Management Plan.
2 Johnson Reservoir is also known as Johnson Lake.
3 These are in addition to the boundary reviews and proposed boundary changes for Johnson Reservoir filed at FERC on March 6, 2003 (supplemented on May 6, 2003) and June 19, 2013, and for Lake McConaughy and Lake Ogallala filed at FERC on August 9, 2004 and December 30, 2014.
With this report, in combination with the review and recommendations previously submitted for Johnson Reservoir and the Lake McConaughy/Ogallala area, Central has completed its review of the entire Project boundary. Central is at approximately Steps 5 and 6 of the Central’s Plan for Reviewing FERC Boundary. Central recommends that it conduct the following next steps with regard to the recommended boundary changes from this report as well as those previously submitted for Johnson Lake and the Lake McConaughy/Ogallala area:

1. Beginning upon submittal on this report, Central will begin the following processes concurrently:
   a. Consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, and Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office regarding the proposed Project boundary changes;
   b. Seek public comment on the proposed boundary changes; and
   c. Seek FERC-DDSI-CRO review and approval on the removal of the Johnson Reservoir east dike from the Project as previously recommended in the Johnson Reservoir review;

2. Upon conclusion of items 1 a-c above and based on those outcomes, Central will prepare and file with FERC recommended changes to Exhibit G of Central’s FERC License.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Brown
Senior Land Administrator
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Attachment

Copy of Letter with Attachments (PDF via e-mail):
Robert Fletcher  FERC – Washington, DC
John Zygaj       FERC - Chicago Regional Engineer
Scott Airato     FERC – Chicago Regional Office
Eliza Hines      U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Wood River, NE)
Bob Bergholz     Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (Lincoln)
Frank Albrecht   Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (Lincoln)

4 Central anticipates taking 2 years to accomplish the actions listed in item 1 above
Copy of Letter with Figures (paper via U.S. Mail):
   L. Robert Puschendorf  Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer (Lincoln, NE)
Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District  
Holdrege, Nebraska  
FERC Project No. 1417

2017 REMAINDER OF PROJECT FERC BOUNDARY REVIEW REPORT  
(SUPPLY CANAL EXCEPT JOHNSON RESERVOIR)

Introduction

This report summarizes Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District’s (Central) review and recommended changes to the Project boundary for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Project No. 1417, Supply Canal Development, excluding Johnson Reservoir. Central has previously reported to FERC on its completed reviews of Central’s Lake McConaughy, Lake Ogallala, and Johnson Reservoir.

In performing this review, Central considered and took guidance from the following:

- Central’s Plan for Reviewing FERC Boundary
- Standard Form L-3 Article 5 of Central’s FERC License
- 18 C.F.R. § 4.41(h)(2) “Project Boundary”
- Item 14 of FERC’s November 6, 2000 additional information request letter to Central
- Central’s previous boundary reviews for Lake McConaughy, Lake Ogallala, and Johnson Reservoir
- Annual boundary review reports, pursuant to Central’s Plan for Reviewing FERC Boundary
- FERC’s March 8, 2010 request for additional information

---

1 Johnson Reservoir is also known as Johnson Lake.
2 Appendix D of Central’s December 2009 Land and Shoreline Management Plan that was approved by FERC on April 11, 2014
3 These boundary reviews were filed at FERC: Johnson Reservoir on March 3, 2003 and June 19, 2013, Lake McConaughy and Lake Ogallala on August 4, 2004 and December 30, 2014.
4 The additional information request was part of FERC’s March 8, 2010 letter responding to Central’s June 25, 2009 FERC Project Boundary Review 2009 Annual Progress Report.
• Additional information provided by Central in response to FERC’s 2010 request\(^5\)
• Central’s *Land and Shoreline Management Plan*
• Central’s experience regarding the impacts of current Project boundary location on Project management

**General System Description**

Central’s main Supply Canal runs approximately 76 miles, from southeast of North Platte Nebraska, to southeast of Lexington, Nebraska, and carries water for irrigation and hydropower generation. The Supply Canal works include a diversion dam, two river returns, three hydropower plants, and numerous earthen dams, checks, gates, and siphonic spillways.

The Supply Canal is located south of, and approximately parallel to, the Platte River. The majority of the Supply Canal system is located in a loess hills and plateau formation, with minor components in the Platte River floodplain. The canal is constructed by a combination of excavation and fill sections, with several dams and reservoirs located where the canal crosses various drainages.

In addition to the primary purposes of irrigation and power production, the Project waters and adjacent lands have a number of other resources and uses. The canal passes through mostly rural agricultural areas, with flatter lands used predominately for crop production, and more rolling terrain used predominately for low-intensity cattle grazing. Environmental resources include threatened and endangered interior least tern and piping plovers, bald eagles, woodland and wetland habitats, waterfowl, fish, and areas of undeveloped aesthetics. The Nebraska Game and Parks Commission operates state recreation areas, wildlife managements areas, and public boat ramps at several of the Supply Canal reservoirs. Private residential and recreational development, primarily in the form of shoreline-adjacent cabins/houses and shoreline access, occur at several of the reservoirs, with greater concentrations at portions of the larger reservoirs, and smaller concentrations or singly at other locations.

---

\(^5\) The additional information was provided as part of Central’s October 7, 2010 *FERC Project Boundary Review 2010 Annual Progress Report*. 
Criteria/Considerations

Central considered the following Project needs in reviewing and making recommendations regarding the location of the Project boundary:

- Project Works
- Operations and Maintenance Access
- Shoreline Erosion and Stability
- Flood Inundation Areas
- Special Environmental and Cultural Resources
- Public Recreation
- Shoreline Management
- Project Security
- Manageable and Identifiable Boundaries
- No Generic Minimum Buffers
- Exclusion of Residential and Agricultural Uses

Project Works

The Project boundary should include all necessary dams, canal embankments, other water retaining structures; the hydropower plants and their associated facilities; gates, flumes, spillways, and other water control structures; and all canals and reservoirs and their shorelines at maximum normal operating levels and appropriate freeboard.

Operations and Maintenance Access

The Project boundary should include all areas necessary for conducting routine operations and maintenance. This includes adequate room for vehicles and equipment to work along and around the canals, reservoirs, and project works. This also includes regularly used staging areas and borrow-and-deposit areas where the specific location is of importance (for example, the areas regularly used for staging of equipment and deposition of material associated with long-term sand-dredging operations at the diversion dam). This also includes routes of ingress and egress connecting from public roadways necessary for access for operations and maintenance.

Not needed for inclusion in the Project boundary are equipment or material staging sites where the specific location for those sites is not of critical importance to the Project (for example, places where equipment may be regularly parked or rip-rap material regularly stockpiled in close proximity to the Project, but for which alternate locations might work just as well) or routes of ingress and egress that are used as a matter of convenience, but which are not necessary because other adequate routes are available. Also not needed for inclusion in the boundary are areas only
being used for a temporary or short-term basis in support of operations and maintenance (for example, lands located to the north and below Jeffrey Dam being used as a disposal site for reservoir dredging operations until the site fills up and sediment disposal is shifted to another location).6

Shoreline Erosion and Stability

The Project boundary should include sufficient buffers for erosion and slope stability. The Project shoreline has numerous locations where shoreline erosion forces are active, including some reservoir shorelines, high bank areas, and outside bends of the canal. In some high bank and steep topography areas, there can also be upslope stability issues, such as where land may be subject to current or future sloughing, slumping, or otherwise eroding downslope toward project waters, particularly as a result of shoreline erosion. The rate and potential future extent of shoreline erosion varies by location, and are a function of geology and topography, reservoir size and configuration, water depths and fluctuations, canal geometry, weather, recreation-induced wave action, and erosion control measures.

In estimating the needs for future Project erosion, Central engineers and other staff considered Central’s past and current experiences regarding past erosion and erosion control, past rates and amounts of erosion estimated from aerial photographs, and observations from site visits of active erosion areas. Central proposes appropriate expansions of the Project boundary in those locations where the shoreline has already eroded beyond the current boundary, or where Central estimates it may do so in the future. No boundary adjustments for purposes of an erosion buffer are proposed where current erosion control efforts by Central appear to be adequate to prevent shoreline or canal migration.

Flood Inundation Areas

For purposes of protection of Project resources, life, and property, the Project boundary should include those lands subject to sudden or rapid inundation that would result from unplanned or emergency operations in excess of normal maximum operating levels. The proposed Project boundary includes only those lands inundated by waters contained within components of the system, such as lands around a reservoir that would be inundated by the flood waters retained behind the associated dam; the proposed boundary does not include lands that could be flooded by water that is released from the Project, intentionally or unintentionally, such as lands that would be flooded as the result of releasing excess waters from a spillway or lands below a dam that would be flooded as a result of dam failure, except for minor lands in the immediate downstream location of such structures. For purposes of this boundary review, Central believes

6 Should current areas of temporary use become areas of necessary long-term or permanent use, such areas may need to be added to the Project boundary at that time.
that it is sufficient to limit the boundary to including only those areas that could be inundated within a period of 24 hours or less from the onset of the inundation event, on the assumption that sufficient time would exist to vacate and exclude people and items of concern from any areas that would take longer than 24 hours to be inundated.

Sudden or rapid inundation could occur as the result of such things as flood inflows into the system, failure of a system component, or operating error. Which type of event is likely to result in the greatest amount of water level increase and the amount of that increase varies by location, and is dependent on such factors as watershed size, siphon capacities, and relative location with respect to other system components.

For Box Elder, Cottonwood, Snell, Jeffrey, Hiles, West Midway, Central Midway, and Gallagher Canyon Dams and the associated reservoirs, the inundation estimate is based on dam crest elevation plus two feet. These dams are on drainages of 4,000 acres or larger, and it is assumed that flood inflows could fill the reservoirs to overtopping, with failure occurring at water surface elevations no higher than two feet over top-of-dam.\(^7\)

Some smaller dams and reservoirs are so co-located with the above mentioned dams and reservoirs on the larger drainages that the inundation estimate is based on using the same elevation as the co-located primary dam. For East Cottonwood Dam, the inundation elevation is assumed to be the same as that for Cottonwood Dam. For Little West Snell, West Snell, Middle Snell, and West Conroy Dams the inundation elevation is assumed to be the same as that for Snell Dam. For Brown Dam the inundation elevation is assumed to be the same as that for West Midway Dam. For Henderson, Walker, Glen Young, and Schmeeckle Dams, the inundation elevation is assumed to be the same as that for Central Midway Dam.

For Target Dam and Jensen Dam, the inundation estimate is based on the dam crest elevation. These dams are on drainages of approximately 1,500 acres, and it is assumed that flood inflows could fill the reservoirs to just short of overtopping.

For Plum Creek Canyon Dam and Reservoir, the inundation estimate is based on the Gallagher Canyon siphonic spillway operating elevation. Plum Creek Canyon Reservoir has essentially no contributing watershed of its own. Plum Creek Canyon Reservoir is sufficiently removed from the upstream Gallagher Canyon Reservoir that an overtopping event in the Gallagher Canyon would not be expected to translate those elevations to Plum Creek. Any other inundation event

---

\(^7\) The May 7, 2012 Supplement to the Jeffrey Reservoir Inflow Design Flood Study – FERC Project No. 1417 by Mead & Hunt, Inc. shows that flood inflows could overtop and fail Jeffrey Dam with approximately 2 feet of overtopping within a time frame of less than 9 hours. This report is designated Critical Energy Infrastructure Information. The watershed associated with Jeffrey Dam is approximately 8,500 acres.
at Plum Creek Canyon Dam should be small enough in flow rate as to be controlled by the emergency overflow siphonic spillway for this canal segment, which is the one in the canal upstream from Plum Creek and near Gallagher Canyon.

For Phillips, Middle Phillips, East Phillips, and Knapple Dams, the inundation estimate is based on two feet below the dam crest elevation. These dams are located between the Johnson No. 1 and Johnson No. 2 hydropower plants. Contributing drainage areas into this segment are fairly insignificant, and there are no spillways or other water release structures, so virtually all inflows and outflows are controlled by the hydropower plants, with Johnson No. 1 controlling inflow and Johnson No. 2 controlling outflow. Any inundation would be a result of imbalance in inflows and outflows resulting from a hydropower plant component failure (such as an emergency shutdown) or an operating error. Given that the hydropower plants, water levels, and flows are continuously monitored, it is anticipated that any problem in water levels in the segment could be addressed in sufficient time to prevent water levels from approaching overtopping levels.

No inundation elevation estimates were developed for Moran Dam or Dead End Dam. Moran Dam, though having a contributing drainage area of over 7,000 acres, sits in a vast flat floodplain, and Central believes that any inundation that would occur from a flood inflow event at Moran would be the result of the topography of the floodplain itself, and not a consequence of water being impounded by the dam. Dead End Dam has essentially no contributing drainage area, sits at the far upstream end of a canal segment immediately below a canal check gate, and for purposes of this analysis can be treated as if a part of the canal proper.

Special Environmental and Cultural Resources

Federally endangered interior least terns (Sternula antillarum athalassos) and threatened piping plovers (Charadrius melodus) nest on sand piles associated with Project dredging operations at Central’s diversion dam on the Platte River. Central monitors and manages these nesting sites through the nesting season, typically from the end of April to mid-August. Some of these nesting sites lie outside the current Project boundary. Central proposes an expansion of the Project boundary near the diversion dam that will include these nesting sites within the boundary.

American bald eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) concentrate in trees along the Supply Canal below the Project’s three hydropower plants in the winter for purposes of feeding in the ice-free tailraces. Central operates an eagle viewing program for the public at Central’s Johnson No. 2 hydropower plant. These areas are located within both the current and the proposed boundary.

Gallagher Canyon Reservoir has a fairly unique undeveloped and natural-looking aesthetic which Central seeks to preserve as part of its land and shoreline management. Central proposes
to expand the boundary at Gallagher Canyon Reservoir and control development in that area
sufficient to reduce the potential for future adjacent development that would be visible from the
reservoir water surface or shoreline.

There are several archaeological resources known to exist within the current Project boundary,
identified by the August 1991 Cultural Resource Inventory report and the subsequent February
2002 evaluative testing report on eight archaeological sites, including Jeffrey Reservoir (a.k.a.
Jeffrey Lake). Publicly known archaeological resources are Central’s Jeffrey Lodge and the
engineering works of the Project. The identification and location of other archaeological
resources within the Project boundary are kept confidential. None of Central’s proposed
boundary adjustments associated with this review result in any of the publically known or
confidentially kept archaeological sites being removed from the Project boundary.

Public Recreation

The Project boundary should include areas used by the general public for recreation associated
with the Project. This includes areas managed by the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission as
State Recreation Areas and Wildlife Management Areas; lands and waters open to public
hunting, fishing, boating, and hiking; and public boat ramps. This also includes routes of ingress
and egress connecting from public roadways necessary for the general public to access the
Project at designated access locations.

The boundary need not include areas used for undeveloped or unauthorized access points, or for
private, exclusive, or semi-exclusive use or access, such as by adjacent landowners or tenants
and subtenants of the Project.8

Shoreline Management

The Project boundary should include enough buffer adjacent to the shoreline to allow for
sufficient management of the shoreline and shoreline-adjacent lands. This includes the need to
manage and protect lakeshore environments, allow for reasonable public use of Project
shorelines, protect shoreline aesthetics, etc. This also includes the need to control and manage
access to the Project shoreline and waters.

8 This does not mean that such uses or access might not be permissible, only that the location of
the Project boundary need not be set based on such uses or access.
**Project Security**

Central proposes an expansion of the Project boundary to the east of the Johnson No. 2 hydropower plant for purposes of Project security. Johnson No. 2 is located in a somewhat more remote location as compared to the Jeffery and Johnson No. 1 hydropower plants, and as such is at greater risk of attempted vandalism, break-ins, theft, etc. The expanded boundary would be for Central to expand its security buffer, close some access routes, and generally better restrict unauthorized access to the hydropower plant and its associated facilities and equipment.

**Manageable and Identifiable Boundaries**

Central generally recommends boundary lines that are easily manageable and identifiable. Boundary lines that follow straight lines, have fewer course changes, follow established surveys and property lines, or are associated with fixed visible features are easier to manage than boundaries that curve or zig-zag, deviate from established surveys and property lines, or are not easily identified on the ground. In considering where to set and how to describe the boundary, Central considers the overall purposes of the boundary, the current and likely future uses in the area, and Central’s past experience with managing the boundary at each location. In setting the boundary in close proximity to private residential development, Central avoids having the boundary split dwellings or individual residential lots on Central-owned land.

**No Generic Minimum Buffers**

At times, it may be appropriate or expedient to establish generic minimum buffers around a Project for purposes of setting Project boundaries. As the site-specific application of all the various review criteria described above has resulted in what Central believes to be adequate buffers throughout the entirety of the Supply Canal system, Central does not believe that the establishment and application of generic minimum buffers for purposes of establishing the Project boundary is necessary.

**Exclusion of Residential and Agricultural Uses**

Where consistent with other Project purposes, including those criteria and considerations described above, Central has attempted to exclude private residential development and permanent major agricultural structures from the proposed boundary. This effort at exclusion includes efforts to both look at places where the current boundary can be adjusted to remove existing in-boundary residential uses and agricultural structures, and also to minimize the amount of residential uses and agricultural structures added where the boundary must be expanded for other purposes. While Central has been successful with some exclusions, many other exclusions are not possible because of other Project needs.
Results

Recommended Project Boundary Changes

The 31 maps in Appendix A show Central’s recommended changes to the Project boundary as a result of this review. The recommended changes would result in 2,889 acres ± added to the Project and 85 acres ± removed from the Project, for a net change of 2,804 acres ± added to the Project.9

Notable Items

The following are the more significant proposed boundary changes that Central believes are worth noting:

1. Lands near the diversion dam needed for dredging operations and managed as nesting habitat should be added to the Project boundary (Sheet 1, 143 acres ±).
2. Several routes necessary for ingress and egress for Project operations and maintenance should be added to the Project boundary.
3. A private residential driveway near the east end of Cottonwood Dam can be removed from the Project boundary (Sheet 6).
4. Numerous areas require inclusion into the Project boundary for purposes of erosion buffer where future erosion is expected. These areas are primarily along outside bends of the canal in cut sections and on the perimeter of larger reservoirs (Sheets 9 & 10, 260 acres ±; Sheets 20 & 21, 255 acres ±).
5. Some areas also need to be added for management of risk due to flood inundation. These are primarily in sloped lands around the perimeters of reservoirs.
6. Some recommended boundary changes are to correct for apparent errors in the original setting of the boundary (Sheets 9 & 30).
7. The land on which two houses near the north end of Jeffrey Reservoir are so closely located to the reservoir as to require the inclusion in the Project boundary (Sheet 9).
8. Significant expansions of the boundary at Jeffrey Reservoir are necessary for purposes of flood inundation, future erosion, and shoreline management. Most residential development around the perimeter of the reservoir, including all residential cabin lots on Central-owned lands, cannot reasonably be excluded from the Project boundary. Central recommends the use of established roads and property lines along the developed east side of the reservoir as the Project boundary (Sheet 10).

9 These are in addition to the boundary reviews and proposed boundary changes for Johnson Reservoir filed at FERC on March 6, 2003 (supplemented on May 6, 2003) and June 19, 2013, and for Lake McConaughy and Lake Ogallala filed at FERC on August 9, 2004 and December 30, 2014.
9. Several residential cabins/houses are proposed to be removed from the Project boundary at Central Midway Reservoir (Sheet 20).

10. Because several other residential cabins/houses are too close to the reservoir to reasonably permit removal from the Project boundary, Central recommends the use of a combination of established roads and lot lines in the more heavily developed area of Central Midway Reservoir for use as the Project boundary (Sheet 21).

11. Central proposes that the Project boundary at Gallagher Canyon Reservoir include a sufficient buffer for protection of the unique undeveloped and natural aesthetic resource (Sheet 25).

12. Several grain bins encroaching along the canal segment between Gallagher Canyon Reservoir and Plum Creek Reservoir can be removed from the Project Boundary (Sheet 25).

13. The land on which a private residential cabin situated immediately adjacent to the shoreline at Plum Creek Canyon Reservoir and which is currently split by the Project boundary, is recommended to be included so that the entire residence would be located fully inside the Project boundary (Sheet 26).

14. Central proposes that the Project boundary at the Johnson No. 2 hydropower plant be expanded for purposes of creating a security buffer (Sheet 30, 35 acres ±).

15. Central proposes to remove a portion of the Phelps irrigation canal from the Project boundary beyond its headgate near the Johnson No. 2 river return (Sheet 31, 11 acres ±).

16. Central believes that all lands on which private residential development occur that would remain inside the Project boundary following the recommended boundary changes would be justified based on other Project needs.

17. Central also believes that all places where the Project boundary would be located more than 200 feet from the normal shorelines of the Project waters following the recommended boundary changes would be justified based on other Project needs.
Next Steps

Central recommends that the Project boundary be adjusted as described in this report. With this report, in combination with the review and recommendations previously submitted for Johnson Reservoir and the Lake McConaughy/Ogallala area, Central has completed its review of the entire Project boundary. Central recommends that in addition to submitting annual progress reports to FERC, it conduct the following next steps with regard to the recommended boundary changes from this report as well as those previously submitted for Johnson Lake and the Lake McConaughy/Ogallala area:

1. Beginning upon submittal on this report, Central will begin the following processes concurrently:\[^10^]:
   a. Consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, and Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office regarding the proposed Project boundary changes;
   b. Seek public comment on the proposed boundary changes; and
   c. Seek FERC-DDSI-CRO review and approval on the removal of the Johnson Reservoir east dike from the Project as previously recommended in the Johnson Reservoir review;

2. Upon conclusion of items 1 a-c above and based on those outcomes, Central will prepare and file with FERC recommended changes to Exhibit G of Central’s FERC License.

[^10^]: Central anticipates taking 2 years to accomplish the actions listed in item 1 above
The following maps show Central’s recommended changes to the FERC Project boundary as a result of this review and include examples from the Notable Items section.
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