

APPENDIX X

SUMMARY OF LIVESTOCK SURVEY RESULTS IN REGION C

APPENDIX X
SUMMARY OF LIVESTOCK SURVEY RESULTS IN REGION C

On June 30, 2000, the Region C Water Planning Group mailed surveys to the 16 County Extension Agents in the Region C area. The County Extension Agents (CEAs) were asked to respond to the survey by July 15, 2000. As of July 15th, five of the CEAs had responded to the survey, including Cooke, Dallas, Denton, Grayson, and Tarrant Counties.

On July 20 and 21, the remaining 11 county extension agents were called to be sure they had received the surveys. Table X-1 shows the county extension agents contacted. As a result of these phone calls, three additional surveys were returned (including Collin and Fannin Counties). Several CEAs told me they had received the surveys, but they had not yet had a chance to complete them. I was also informed that the CEAs had a state convention the week of July 10th which added to the delay in the CEAs responding to the survey. The CEAs representing Navarro and Parker Counties returned their completed surveys at the beginning of September. Table X-1 lists the contacts used for the livestock survey and the record of correspondence.

The information for the counties received is tabulated in Table X-2. This table represents the CEA responses to the various questions. Using Texas Water Development Board water demand information for livestock, current estimates for livestock demands were based on the information received from the responding CEAs. The livestock estimates are included in Table X-3. Table X-3 also compares the CEA estimates to the TWDB estimates for the year 2000. The TWDB estimates were very close to the CEA estimates for Collin County. The CEA estimates were higher for Fannin, Grayson, and Tarrant Counties. The TWDB estimates were higher than the CEA estimates for Cooke, Dallas, Denton, Navarro and Parker Counties.

**Table X-1
Contacts for Livestock Survey**

County	Contact Person	Date Completed by CEA	Date Received at FNI	Date(s) of Phone Calls Made by SWG	Comments
Collin	Eddie Baggs	7/10/00	7/21/00	7/20/00	Replied 7/10/00, but never arrived @ FNI by mail. Faxed completed survey to FNI 7/21/00.
Cooke	Craig Rosenbaum	7/10/00	7/11/00	N/A	Arrived prior to the deadline. No phone call was necessary.
Dallas	Milton Arnold	7/5/00	7/10/00	N/A	Arrived prior to the deadline. No phone call was necessary.
Denton	Rebecca Parker	7/7/00	7/20/00	N/A	Arrived prior to the deadline. No phone call was necessary.
Ellis	Gary Stanford	None	None	7/20/00	Refuses to participate in survey. Thinks projections are always wrong and a waste of time.
Fannin	Ricky Maxwell	7/27/00	7/29/00	7/20/00	Did not receive by mail. SWG faxed survey and letter to him 7/20/00.
Freestone	Shane McLellanon			7/21/00 7/24/00	Original letter sent to Wendi Green who forwarded it to Shane. Shane is out until 7/24/00. Called Shane on 7/24 and he had not seen survey. Survey was faxed to him on 7/24/00.
Grayson	Mark Arnold	7/5/00	7/10/00	N/A	Arrived prior to the deadline. No phone call was necessary.
Henderson	Patrick Hirsch			7/20/00	Out until 8/2/00
Jack	David Harmonson			7/20/00	He received it 7/19 and will complete it.
Kaufman	Ralph Davis			7/20/00 7/26/00	SWG left message with assistant 7/20/00. Ralph returned message on 7/26 saying he had not received the survey. Survey and letter were faxed to him on 7/26/00.
Navarro	Mike Gage	9/6/00	9/6/00	7/20/00	SWG left message on voice mail 7/20/00.
Parker	Jon Green	9/8/00	9/8/00	7/20/00	SWG left message with assistant 7/20/00.
Rockwall	Todd Williams			7/20/00	SWG left message with assistant 7/20/00.
Tarrant	John South	7/7/00	7/10/00	N/A	Arrived prior to the deadline. No phone call was necessary
Wise	Gary Clayton			7/20/00	He had received it, but does not know when he will have time to respond.

N/A = not applicable

blank = information has not been received by FNI

**Table X-2
Summary of Livestock Survey**

County	Survey Questions										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Collin	20,000 acres grazing & 165,000 acres hay products	105,000 acres	5,000 acres	65,000	Yes, decline.	Yes, decline.	Yes. Two at 30 acres each.	No.	No.	Yes.	Yes.
Cooke	172,248 acres of pasture & 214,214 acres of open range	131,300 acres	56,000 acres (roads, towns, etc.)	55,000 beef cows; 8,000 dairy cows; 5,000 horses.	No.	No. (New ponds being built)	Not that we know of.	Yes, due to lack of surface water. Mostly in western part of county.	Wells are becoming increasingly expensive to drill (\$15 per foot).	Most of brush in remote areas.	Yes.
Dallas	35,000 acres	25,000 acres	Unknown.	15,000	Decrease as land use changes.	X	Unknown.	Some smaller pastures were short earlier in the year, but they have adequate supply now.	X	N/A	X
Denton	250,000 acres pasture; 200,000 acres of this pasture being used	69,323 acres	50,000 acres	52,000 head of cattle & horses	1% increase each year.	Need will increase with more ranches that are smaller.	Yes. There are approximately 1000 of 0.25-2 acres in size.	Yes, particularly in the northern half of the county. Shortages due to loss of groundwater. Wells drying up due to development and golf courses. Major problem in Argyle area.	Provided Annual Increment Report.	Yes, approximately 500 and the benefit is positive.	Yes.
Ellis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fannin	379,796 acres pasture; about 90% of the livestock pasture currently being used	150,000 acres	3,000 acres	71,800	No.	No.	No, but many SCS structures are old and will need repair in the future.	Currently no - due to the recent rainfall.	Groundwater is of poor quality for agricultural purposes.	Yes, approximately 100 people and there has been some benefit.	Yes.
Freestone											
Grayson	X	X	X	100,000 total	Yes.	Yes.	Yes, 10-20 of varying sizes.	Yes, county-wide shortage of surface water.	X	Yes, 10 people using 5,000 acres of brush control. Brush control as conservation method has been beneficial for surface water and forage production.	Yes.
Henderson											
Jack											
Kaufman											
Navarro											
Parker											
Rockwall											
Tarrant	90,000 acres (most of it being used)	50,000 acres	Urban sprawl is at its all-time high.	50,000 cattle & 25,000 horses	Less cattle. Possibly more horses.	Rely more on community water systems.	No, but lots of homeowners have small ponds and are seeking management information.	Most shortages are due to lack of surface water.	No.	Not that he is aware of.	X
Wise											

X = Question not answered in survey.

N/A = Not Applicable.

- = Not Available

Survey Questions:

- 1 - How many acres of livestock pasture are in your county? How many acres of livestock pasture are currently being used?
- 2 - How many acres of cultivated land are in your county?
- 3 - How many acres of idle land are in your county?
- 4 - What is the approximate number of head of livestock within your county?
- 5 - Do you project any change in livestock over the next five years?
- 6 - Do you project any change in the water needs for livestock over the next five years?
- 7 - In your opinion, are there any Natural Resource Conservation Service (formerly Soil Conservation Service) structures that need to be repaired? If so, approximately how many and what are the sizes of these structures?
- 8 - Is anyone in your county experiencing water shortages for livestock? If so, are the shortages occurring in particular areas or county-wide? Are these shortages due to lack of surface water or lack of groundwater?
- 9 - Is there any other information you think might be helpful in this planning effort?
- 10 - Is anyone in your county practicing brush control for the purpose of water conservation? If so, how many people are using this method and how many acres of land are involved? In your opinion, has there been any benefit from brush control as a water conservation measure?
- 11 - Would you like additional information on the Regional planning effort?

Note: a. Ellis County refuses to participate in this survey.

**Table X-3
Estimated Livestock Water Demands**

County	Type of Livestock	Number of Head of Livestock ^{a.}	Water Demands per Head of Livestock ^{b.} (Gals per Day per Head)	Estimated 2000 Livestock Demands (1,000 gals/year)	Estimated 2000 Livestock Demands (Acre-Feet/Year)	TWDB 2000 Projected Livestock Demands (Acre-Feet/Year)	Difference (CEA Less TWDB Estimates) (Acre-Feet/Year)	Percent Difference
Collin	cattle	65,000	15	355,875	1,092	1,095	-3	-0.3
Cooke	beef cattle	55,000	15	301,125	924			
	dairy cattle	8,000	60	175,200	538			
	horses	5,000	15	27,375	84			
Subtotal		68,000		503,700	1,546	2,256	-710	-31.5
Dallas	cattle	15,000	15	82,125	252	718	-466	-64.9
Denton	horses & cattle	52,000	15	284,700	874	1,256	-382	-30.4
Ellis ^{c.}	-	-	-	-	-	1,287	-	-
Fannin	cattle	71,800	15	393,105	1,206	1,017	189	18.6
Grayson	cattle	100,000	15	547,500	1,680	1,143	537	47.0
Navarro	cattle	53,000	15	290,175	890	1,331	-441	-33.1
Parker	cattle	71,000	15	388,725	1,193	1,290,-97	-97	-7.5
Tarrant	cattle	50,000	15	273,750	840			
	horses	25,000	15	136,875	420			
Subtotal		75,000		410,625	1,260	852	408	47.9

- = Not Available

Notes: a. Current headcount of livestock provided by County Extension Agents through the Region C livestock survey.