

**SECOND AMENDED
APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CHANGE POINT OF DIVERSION, MANNER
OF USE AND PLACE OF USE OF THE PUBLIC WATERS OF THE STATE OF
NEVADA HERETOFORE APPROPRIATED**

Date of filing in State Engineer's Office FEB 19 2004

Returned to applicant for correction MAR 03 2004

Corrected application filed MAY 03 2004

Map filed MAY 03 2004 under 70885

The applicant **Park Cattle Company** hereby makes application for permission to change the **Point of Diversion of a Portion** of water heretofore appropriated under **Claim 428** as issued in the **Carson River Decree** entitled "**United States of America, Plaintiff v. Alpine Land and Reservoir Company, a Corporation et al, Defendants,**" the same in Equity Docket No. D-183 in the **United States District Court for the District of Nevada.**

1. The source of water is **East Fork of the Carson River**
2. The amount of water to be changed **66.94 irrigated acres**
3. The water to be used for **irrigation and stockwatering purposes, as decreed**
4. The water heretofore permitted for **irrigation and stockwatering purposes, as decreed**
5. The water is to be diverted at the following point **Williams Slough from right bank in SW corner of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 24, T.13N., R.19E., M.D.M., Douglas County, Nevada (as decreed).**
6. The existing permitted point of diversion is located within **Klauber or Cohn or Yori from right bank of Topping No. 1 Ditch about 230 feet below its diversion from Cottonwood Slough NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32, T.13N., R.20E., M.D.M., Douglas County, Nevada.**
7. Proposed place of use **2.71 acres in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, 10.83 acres in the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, 17.09 acres in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, and 36.31 acres in the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ all within Section 24, T.13N., R.19E., M.D.M., Douglas County, Nevada**
8. Existing place of use **2.71 acres in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, 10.83 acres in the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, 17.09 acres in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, and 36.31 acres in the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ all within Section 24, T.13N., R.20E., M.D.M., Douglas County, Nevada.**
9. Use will be from **as decreed to as decreed** of each year.
10. Use was permitted from **as decreed to as decreed** of each year.
11. Description of proposed works **Existing in-stream diversion and earthen ditches**
12. Estimated cost of works **Complete**
13. Estimated time required to construct works **Complete**
14. Estimated time required to complete the application of water to beneficial use **One (1) year**

70893

15. Remarks: Please see attached sheet

R.O. ANDERSON ENGINEERING, INC.
By **Robert O. Anderson, P.E.**
s/Robert O. Anderson
P.O. Box 2229
Minden, Nevada 89423

Compared cmf/sam _____

Protested 7/9/04 by: Hone Family Trust, Settlemyer Ranches Inc., Mack Land & Cattle Co.
Galeppi Land & Livestock Co.

Addendum to:

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CHANGE POINT OF DIVERSION,
MANNER OF USE AND PLACE OF USE OF THE PUBLIC WATERS OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA HERETOFORE APPROPRIATE

Claim 428 (66.94 acres)

15. Remarks:

The purpose of this Application is to replace the point of diversion recognized in the Alpine Decree with what Applicant believes is also an historic point of diversion. In addition, the point of diversion recognized in the Alpine Decree now has severely restricted capacity as a result of urbanization. The lands to which the water right proposed to be changed by this Application is appurtenant are not lands whose water right was transferred to the Allerman Canal when the 1/3-2/3 Alpine Decree provision is in effect. However, Applicant will continue to cooperate with the Federal Water Master in order to avoid litigation concerning the issue of whether this water right may be exercised when the 1/3-2/3 provision of the Alpine Decree is in effect. This voluntary cooperation will continue to be without prejudice to any position the Applicant or the Federal Water Master might take if that issue must eventually be litigated. However, if that issue cannot be resolved, it will have to be resolved by the court having jurisdiction over the Alpine Decree.