

argued that it ought to be based upon total acres owned. Well let's take for example that I own a quarter section of land and it is all irrigated and the district decides that they're going to put a ten acre, ten inch per acre limitation upon that quarter section. That means that for every hundred and sixty acres I can apply ten inches of irrigation water to each acre. Suppose that they put it on the basis of acres owned. If the district chose to allow the same ten inches of water per owned acre and only half my land was irrigated I could, in effect, put twenty inches of water on every irrigated acre and there would be no control. If on the other hand I owned six hundred and forty acres I could put forty inches of water per acre on the irrigated acres. So you have to have the control. The allocation must apply to irrigated acres or there is no control, there is absolutely no control. Now there have been those that have argued that the irrigated acre, the total acre concept would protect and limit development. It might well do that. If I owned sixteen thousand acres, for example, and wanted to limit the development we might only allocate one inch per total acre. You would have to own sixteen thousand acres in order to get ten inches of water on sixteen hundred. I do not think that is what we really call good conservation either. So this protects the individual and protects the ground water at the same time. Rotation is a method which has been discussed a great deal, one which perhaps will find more use in the future but one of the very problems that exist and one of the reasons why there needs to be flexibility in any plan is because of the changing atmospheric and weather conditions. One year we have an extreme drouth, we have withdrawal of ground water. Then this year beginning about the 15th of July we find we're in the midst of a very heavy rainfall period and so we have some recharge and there is sometimes a lag and sometimes a resurgence. So we don't know really why when that occurs but we're learning. So there needs to be some flexibility and we have pretty well provided for that. The matter of the review, Section 13. It is very important I believe that we recognize that as new applications for water use come in the district must review the total needs, review the demands, review the reservoir supply and decide if new allocations must be made. Well spacing requirements are the same as those which we presently have and very frankly, I think they are reasonable. Section 15 provides for the modification of the ground water plan and the dissolution of the management area. The matter of funding is always one which creates some interest and I want to call that to your attention. I have been criticized in the past and a number of others have been critical because they felt that the management plan did not provide sufficient