


IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Water Right 31-00062U, 31-00063U

Township 7N Range 36E Section 22, 27



0 1320 Feet

- Point of Diversion - This Water Right
- Point of Diversion - Other Water Rights
- Place of Use - This WR
- Place of Use - Other WR
- Sections
- Quarter-quarter Sections



IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
Adjudication Recommended Right Report

WATER RIGHT NO. 31-63U

Owner Type Name and Address
Current Owner REESE SANDERS
 PO BOX 236
 HAMER, ID 83425
 (208)662-5405

Original Owner HAMER CANAL CO

Priority Date: 05/01/1928
Basis: Decreed
Status: Valid

Source: GROUND WATER

<u>Beneficial Use</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Diversion Rate</u>	<u>Volume</u>	<u>Subuse Code</u>
IRRIGATION	05/01	09/01	0.78 CFS	191.8 AFA	
Total Diversion			0.78 CFS	191.8 AFA	

Point(s) of Diversion:
 Township Range Section 1/4 of 1/4 of 1/4 Lot County
 07N 36E 27 NW NE NW JEFFERSON

Place(s) of use:

Place of Use Legal Description: IRRIGATION JEFFERSON County

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Lot</u>	<u>Tract</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Lot</u>	<u>Tract</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Lot</u>	<u>Tract</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Lot</u>	<u>Tract</u>	<u>Acres</u>
07N	36E	22	11	SESW		35	SWSW							
		27	14	NENW		23	SENW		35	NWNW				

Conditions of Approval:

1. C18 THIS PARTIAL DECREE IS SUBJECT TO SUCH GENERAL PROVISIONS NECESSARY FOR THE DEFINITION OF THE RIGHTS OR FOR THE EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION OF THE WATER RIGHTS AS MAY BE ULTIMATELY DETERMINED BY THE COURT AT A POINT IN TIME NO LATER THAN THE ENTRY OF A FINAL UNIFIED DECREE. SECTION 42-1412(6), IDAHO CODE.

Remarks:

1. Place of Use - Irrigation USE OF THIS RIGHT WITH RIGHT NO. 31-62U IS LIMITED TO THE IRRIGATION OF A COMBINED TOTAL OF 118.0 ACRES IN A SINGLE IRRIGATION SEASON.
2. Purpose of Use THE USE OF WATER FOR IRRIGATION UNDER THIS RIGHT MAY BEGIN AS EARLY AS APRIL 1 AND MAY CONTINUE TO AS LATE AS OCTOBER 31, PROVIDED OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE RIGHT ARE NOT EXCEEDED. THE USE OF WATER BEFORE MAY 1 AND AFTER SEPTEMBER 1 UNDER THIS REMARK IS SUBORDINATE TO ALL WATER RIGHTS HAVING NO SUBORDINATED EARLY OR LATE IRRIGATION USE AND A PRIORITY DATE EARLIER THAN THE DATE A PARTIAL DECREE IS ENTERED FOR THIS RIGHT.
3. Quantity USE OF THIS RIGHT WITH RIGHT NO. 31-62U IS LIMITED TO A TOTAL COMBINED DIVERSION RATE OF 2.36 CFS AND TO A TOTAL COMBINED ANNUAL DIVERSION VOLUME OF 413 AF.

Comments:

<u>Author</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Comment</u>
---------------	-------------	----------------	----------------

bcontor 10/3/00 Recommendation
bcontor 10/3/00 Annual Volume

See comments to cCVR 31-62U. They explain recommendation and all combined use limitations.
Annual volume is based on operation @ 0.78 cfs from May 1 through Sept 1: day 246 (Sept 2) - day 122 (May 1) = 124 days. 124 days X 1.9853 acre ft/cfs/day X 0.78 cfs = 191.8 acre feet.

Dates:

Licensed Date:
Claim Received Date: 02/21/2000
Decreed Date:
Date Filed with Court:
Objection Filed Date:
Response Filed Date:
SF5 Filed:
Special Master Recom Signed Date:

Element Reviewed/Verified Dates:

Element	Last Review Date	Reviewer	Last Verified Date	Verifier	Status
Summary	10/3/00 2:29:37 PM		10/3/00 2:29:37 PM	bcontor	Complete

Other Information:

Receipt Number(s):
State or Federal: S
Water District:
Civil Case Number:
Old Case Number:
Decree Plaintiff:
Decree Defendant:
Presumption Flag:
Notice of Error Flag:
Swan Falls Trust or Nontrust:
Swan Falls Dismissed:
DLE Act Number:
Cary Act Number:
Mitigation Plan: False

Verification Log:

Element	Date Time Stamp	Reviewer	Log Text
POD	10/3/00 2:22:35 PM	bcontor	Edited PLS
POD	10/3/00 2:22:16 PM	bcontor	Edited point location
Summary	10/3/00 2:29:34 PM	bcontor	1. (NO) The basis of the claim is not beneficial use. 3. (NO) There is no indication that there has been a five year period of continuous nonuse that could result in a recommendation of forfeiture or partial forfeiture. 5. (YES) General remark was required. 6. (NO) Explanatory remark was not required. 7. (NO) Additional condition was not required. 8. (YES) Wanted to view the recommended right. 9. (YES) This is a split right. 10. (NO) This is not a combined right. 11. (NO) Documents were not linked or attached to this file. 12. (YES) Set the verification date.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS

IN RE THE GENERAL ADJUDICATION
OF RIGHTS TO THE USE OF WATER FROM
THE SNAKE RIVER BASIN WATER SYSTEM.

CIVIL CASE NUMBER: 39576

Ident. Number: A31-00063U
Date Received: 2/21/2000
Receipt No: X777777
Received By: _____

COPY FOR
YOUR FILES

NOTICE OF CLAIM TO A WATER RIGHT
ACQUIRED UNDER STATE LAW

COPY FOR
YOUR FILES

A310063U

1. Name: REESE SANDERS
Address: PO BOX 236
HAMER ID

208-662-5405

83425

2. Date of Priority: MAY 1, 1928

3. Source: GROUNDWATER

Trib. to:

4. Point of Diversion:

Township	Range	Section	1/4 of	1/4 of	1/4	Lot	County
07N	36E	27		NE	NW		JEFFERSON

5. Description of diverting works:

6. Water is used for the following purposes:

Purpose	From	To	C.F.S.	(or)	A.F.A.
IRRIGATION	05/01	09/01	0.780		

7. Total Quantity Appropriated is:
0.780 C.F.S. (and/or)

A.F.A.

8. Total consumptive use is

Acre Feet Per Annum.

9. Non-irrigation uses:

10. Place of Use:

Township	Range	Section	1/4 of	1/4	Lot	Use	Acres
07N	36E	22	SW	SW	33	IRR	
			SE	SW	11	IRR	
		27	NE	NW	14	IRR	
			NW	NW	35	IRR	
			SE	NW	23	IRR	

11. Place of use in counties: JEFFERSON

12. Do you own the property listed above as place of use? YES

13. Other Water Rights Used:

31-00062U

14. Remarks:

TRANSFER 4923 SPLIT 31-00063H INTO 31-00063S AND 31-00063T.
AJ SPLITS COULD NOT USE SAME SUFFIXES SO CLAIM A31-00063H
WAS SPLIT INTO A31-00063T, A31-00063U. FEES RECORDED UNDER
E-22740. CLAIMED IN FULL. BCONTOR 2/2000.

15. Basis of Claim: DECREED

Case Number:

Court :

Decree date: / /

Decree Plaintiff

vs

Decree Defendant

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Water Right 31-00062U, 31-00063U


Township 7N Range 36E Section 22, 27



0

1320 Feet

- ⊙ Point of Diversion - This Water Right
- Point of Diversion - Other Water Rights
- Place of Use - This WR
- Place of Use - Other WR
- Sections
- Quarter-quarter Sections



01/25/2001

**NOTICE OF ERROR
REPLY**

Please type or print clearly, fill out this form completely and mail.

Return this reply form to IDWR by the deadline date printed below if you want IDWR to change your recommendation or you want to let IDWR know that you agree with its recommendation.

YOUR DEADLINE FOR RETURNING A NOTICE OF ERROR REPLY IS: March 9, 2001

Water right number: 31 63U

REESE SANDERS

PO BOX 236

HAMER ID 83425

Telephone Number: (208)662-5405

1. Describe the portion of the proposed recommendation with which you disagree (e.g. priority date, period of use, source):

2. Describe the changes you wish to make in the proposed recommendation:

3. Give a brief explanation as to why you disagree with these portions:

X I AGREE with this proposed recommendation: no changes need to be made.

DATE:

Mar 6/01

SIGNATURE:

Reese Sanders

Please print your name: _____

IDWR Regional Office, 2735 Airport Wy, Boise, ID 83705, 2083342190

Reese Sanders Summary of Div. Rates
B. Carter 7/13/00

A) Claims

A31-00062T	0.59 ³ cfs	matches T4932
A31-00063T	0.15 cfs	matches T4932
A31-00062U	1.87 cfs	matches WR 31-00062S
A31-00063U	0.78 cfs	matches WR 31-00063S
A31-07318	1.52 cfs	matches WR 31-07318
A31-10659B	0.20 cfs	(consider amend claim to 19 acwt 0.38 cfs)
A31-04026	1.50 cfs	matches 243 claim
Total	6.61	31-04026

B) WMD exams (see file A31-04026)

25 hp new pump (627/63T) 326 GPM Good Confid.
 $326/449 \approx 0.73$ cfs vs. Transfer 0.74

Golden Eagle 20 hp (4026) 348.9 GPM Good Confid.
 $348.9/449 \approx 0.78$ cfs

25 hp (4026/10659B) 310.7 GPM Fair confid.
 $310.7/449 \approx 0.71$ cfs

These two pumps $\Sigma = 1.49$ cfs claims $\Sigma = 1.70$ cfs

Reese Sanders Summary of Div. Rates p 2

B) Continued

40 hp (7318) 837.5 GPM fair confid
 $837.5 / 449 \approx 1.85$ cfs vs. license 1.52


40 hp west of highway (624/634) 825 GPM
 $825 / 449 \approx 1.83$ cfs vs. Transfer 2.65
(note that not all conditions were measured)
(copy of exam not incl in file)

C) Conclusion

Licensed and transferred rights can be recommended
at licensed or transferred rates. Actual
Capacity is approximately appropriate.
Mr. Sanders may wish to consider transferring
some excess div. rate from 624/634
to 7318.

Ben use rights can be recommended for a
sum of 1.49 cfs as acres allow.
See individual files for calculations.

Dupee A. Coutor
7/13/00

To: Competing AJ splits of WR 31-00062Q and 31-00063Q
Fr: Bryce A. Contor
Date: 5/9/2000 
Re: Phone conversation w/ Dan Murdock

Today I talked to Dan Murdock regarding his claims based on the original Hamer Canal rights.

1. In his opinion the stock certificates represented both ownership of water rights and ownership of physical assets.
2. Dan acknowledged that Murdock's paid Rene Shurtliff \$5,000 for Rene's share of the well and ditch, but that no stock certificates were exchanged. He agreed with Dalling that as individuals pulled out of the canal, the remaining parties purchased their share of the wells and pumps, but this is a different situation than the sale of "shares" which represented a portion of the water rights. (Note that documentation in the file indicates that a share was viewed as the right to 5 miners inches of water.)
3. Dan asserts that Ashcrafts couldn't have surface irrigated more than 60 to 80 acres from the Hamer Canal due to the rolling terrain. I acknowledged that my inspection indicated the same thing.
4. Dan also stated that Ashcrafts did not use the Hamer Canal water for many years, but relied on their licensed wells. In this respect they were like Yearsleys, who simply abandoned their Hamer Canal water and relied on licenses.

In fact, according to Dan it was Ashcrafts who plowed in the canal from the upper wells. This would have made it impossible for Ashcrafts to have utilized water from the Hamer Canal. Note, however, that Ashcraft is one of the signers of the shareholder agreement allowing some of the parties to withdraw their shares.

5. Dan reported a phone call with Keith Driver, past president of Hamer Canal. Driver reportedly says that Shirley lost his shares through non-payment of assessments. Driver was insistent that the shares taken back from Shirley by the company represented both water and physical assets. Driver asserts that the shares were then sold to Dan Murdock and his father. Dan Murdock is going to drive to Jerome tomorrow to obtain a written affidavit to this effect from Driver.

Note that Dalling acknowledged that Shirley said he "gave something" back to the canal company. Dalling's position is that in Shirley's mind it only represented ownership of the physical assets. Dalling has been invited to produce affidavits.

6. Dan also stated that the Shirley lands went unfarmed for a number of years.

7. According to Dan, the Sanders, Shurtliff, and McGarry formal transfers constituted enlargements in that the new sprinkler systems irrigated lands that had not been historically irrigated from the Hamer Canal. Particularly, the new Sanders pivot north east of Hamer constitutes an enlargement because there weren't enough acres dried up on the pivot west of the freeway to account for the acres in the new pivot.

I told Dan that this may be so, that the department's investigation may have been incomplete and that people who were aware of this may not have filed objections. However, since the formal administrative procedure has been followed, everyone has had due process, and I can't change those transfers in the recommendation process.

My recollection of the Sanders, Shurtliff, and McGarry places of use confirms that there are areas that couldn't have been flood irrigated. I haven't reviewed the transfers to see what was represented as original places of use. It does seem that the Sanders pivot west of the freeway irrigates almost the entire parcel, it is hard to see how 40 acres worth of dry corners exist on that spot.

8. Note that per Skip Jones, the denied transfer referenced in the claims file is not for the lands claimed, but for lands further west. The lands claimed were under irrigation in 1987 according to the GIS, so an accomplished transfer is not out of the question.
9. If the Driver affidavit comes and says what Murdock represents it will, Dalling's claim will likely have to be disallowed and Murdock's allowed as an accomplished transfer.
10. Driver's affidavit may cast new light upon the Ashcraft claim. If indeed Ashcrafts abandoned their Hamer Canal shares (or sold them), then an accomplished transfer of POD to the licensed wells will be inappropriate. Dan said he would ask Driver to put in the affidavit what he remembers of Ashcraft's situation.

To: Splits of A31-00062 and A31-00063
Fr: Bryce A. Contor
Date: 3/16/2000

Re: Split analysis, competing claims.

These water rights are the splits of the original Hamer Canal Co. rights. They shared a common POU and common POD's. 31-00062 was for 21.2 cfs with priority 10/31/1917. 31-00063 was for 8.8 cfs with priority 5/1/1928. Total is 30.0 cfs. Both are groundwater rights.

Transfer 1584 added points of diversion. Subsequent transfers split off parts of the original right, as individual shareholders began diverting their shares from private wells on their own POU. Some subsequent transfers change POU or POD of these split-off portions. Adjudication claims have been received corresponding to each of these splits by formal transfer.

Following the formal transfers, a portion of the original rights remained unchanged, as recorded in WR record 31-00062Q and 31-00063Q. Competing adjudication claims have been filed on this remaining portion.

This memo outlines the history of splits, and gives some information on competing claims. It relies on the following documentation, which is filed with A31-00062A:

- GIS maps of history of formal transfers. Pages 1 through 10.
- GIS map of competing claims for the remaining portion (WR splits "62Q" and "63Q"). Page 11.
- GIS map showing 1987 irrigation of lands under WR splits "Q." Page 12.
- 1980 NAPP showing 1980 irrigation of lands under competing claims. Pages 13 and 14.
- Close-up from USGS map W41 showing Hamer Canal delivery system, enhanced by GIS. Page 15.
- Memo from president and past presidents of Hamer Canal Company regarding ownership of shares, June 25, 1983. Page 16.
- Affidavit from officials of Hamer Canal Company regarding ownership of shares, 1984. Page 17.

- Stipulation and Agreement of shareholders of Hamer Canal Company, 1980. Page 18.
- Ernie Carlsen memo of conversation w/ Neal Savage, June 1980. Page 19.
- Excerpt from USDA Water Facility Operations Proposal for the Hamer Canal Company, 1941. Pages 20 and 21.
- Second copy of Stipulation and Agreement with cfs notations. Page 22.
- Review of claims and comparison with Stipulation and Agreement. Pages 23 and 24.

The memo also relies on some documentation found in file A31-00062L regarding denied transfer application 2890, and conversations with Harold Jones and Ernie Carlsen. Jones and Carlsen were involved in the original transfers and in the investigation of application 2890.

I. History of Place of Use

While the decreed place of use covered approximately 3140 acres, Mr. Jones and Mr. Carlsen indicate that this was at best a service area rather than an actual place of use. With the severe leakage of the canal and the sandy soils in the area, 30 cfs would have been adequate for only a fraction of the original decreed acres.

GIS map # 12 shows that some of the areas covered by WR splits "Q" were not under irrigation in 1987 and likely had not been for some time. Jones and Carlsen recall that additional GW licenses were developed for other lands under the Hamer Canal. Documentation in 31-00062L shows this for the Wade Yearsley places of use, and the WR and AJ databases bear this out for lands in section 23. Other places of use were not investigated.

It appears that all of the competing claims "L," "K," "Q," and "S" all were under irrigation in 1980 and 1987. "L," however, is in a location that could not physically have been served by the Hamer Canal but would have to represent an accomplished transfer. This claim in fact is based upon the denied transfer application 2890. Jones and Carlsen indicate that they found no evidence that no original Hamer Canal lands were dried up to accommodate the transfer. Conversation memos in A31-00062L indicate that the claimant acknowledges that all the original Hamer Canal lands were still being irrigated.

Claims "K," "Q," and "S" are in locations where irrigation from the Hamer Canal would have been physically possible.

II. Overlapping Water Rights on Competing Claims

Claims "L" are overlapped by license 31-02337 and claim A31-02337. The license authorizes 1.68 cfs on 84 acres (0.02 cfs/acre). The AJ claim is for 112 acres, which is substantiated by GIS analysis.

The claimant appears to have an ownership claim on the unallocated Hamer Canal rights (see "ownership" below). Because no Hamer Canal lands have been dewatered, the Hamer Canal rights will have to overlap the licensed right, rather than cover the enlargement acres. The license is already for 0.02 cfs/acre, but since the lands are surface irrigated, a Hubble analysis might justify additional diversion rate on the licensed 84 acres. However, this becomes problematic in light of the enlargement; how do we justify a need for additional diversion rate, and at the same time justify additional acres without additional diversion rate? (Note that NWMD measured over 6.0 cfs; the license is for 1.68.)

Claimant has been requested to provide additional documentation of the history of the use of the claimed right. Further analysis and investigation will be filed in A31-00062L. At first blush it appears that even though claimant may have title to the right, there has not been a valid accomplished transfer or enlargement of the original Hamer Canal rights. Upon receipt of documentation I will continue review.

Claims "Q" are not overlapped by any WR or claim. I've requested documentation of use and ownership from claimant. Upon receipt, I will begin CVR investigation.

Claims "S" are overlapped by beneficial use claim A31-10503 and license-based claim A31-07203. These overlaps have not been investigated. Ownership review below indicates the claimant does have an interest in the Hamer Canal rights. I have also requested documentation and will proceed with CVR review upon receipt.

III. Ownership

Documentation of ownership is incomplete and contradictory:

1. Memo from past presidents of Hamer Canal Co. (1983, p. 16) indicates that "existing water rights in the Upper Hamer Canal Company, now belong to Dave Murdock and Loren McGarry." This is contradicted, however, by Rene Shurtliff's ownership documentation in transfer 4911 (1997). It is unclear if there may also be others with legitimate claims to the water apparently granted to Murdock by this memo. Specifically, it is unclear who now has title to the shares of Shirley and Lounsbury (see items 3, 4, and 5).
2. Affidavit of officials of Hamer Canal Co. (1984, p. 17) indicate that Dave Murdock "has purchased water rights in excess of the amount he is still using" and that he specifically had purchased the rights to 212 acres in sections 22

and 28. Wade Yearsley, owner of the lands, provided an affidavit that the Hamer Canal Water had been used on those lands but no longer is, and that he had no claim on the Hamer Canal shares. However, documentation in A31-00062L shows that those places of use continued to be irrigated under other rights and claims.

3. Stipulation and Agreement (1980, p18) accounts for 18.1 cfs of the 30.0 decreed cfs. The Neal Savage conversation memo (1980, p. 19) indicates that all the shareholders signed the Stipulation and Agreement. However, the list itself appears to only be a list of shares proposed to be transferred out of the company. No number of shares is listed for signers Ralph Lounsbury, Loren McGarry, or Dan Murdock. Further, "zero" shares are listed for Rene Shurtliff.
4. Water Facilities Operation Proposal (Pages 20 and 21) indicates that in 1941 there were 322 shares of stock outstanding. The stipulation asserts 5 miners inches per share. $30 \text{ CFS} \times 50 \text{ inches/cfs} \times 1 \text{ share/5 inches}$ indicates 300 shares outstanding.
5. The copy of the Stipulation and Agreement with cfs notations (Page 22) accounts for all of the stipulated shares except Lynn Shirley's.
6. Review of Claims (Pages 23 and 24) identifies claims associated with McGarry ("A"), Murdock's original shares ("K"), and Shurtliff ("J").

Murdock's "L" claim, and Dalling's "Q" claim, are not linked back to any signers of the Stipulation and Agreement or any of the stipulated shares.

The review accounts for all the stipulated shares except Shirley's and all the signers except Lounsbury and Shirley.

IV. Diversion Rate

The decreed diversion rate was 30.0 cfs. However, the Water Facilities Operation Proposal (Pages 20 and 21) indicates that in 1941, the canal was "assessing 322 shares of stock... and delivering approximately two miner's inches of water per share." This is only about 13 cfs. However, it is likely that part of the proposal, and part of transfer 1584, were efforts to recover diversion capacity lost to declining pumping water levels.

The formal transfers were all processed under the assumption that the original diversion rate was valid and I plan to do the same with AJ claims, as ownership and historical use documentation allows.



State of Idaho

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

900 N. Skyline Dr., Suite A, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402-1718 - (208) 525-7161- Fax (208) 525-7177

EASTERN REGION

DIRK KEMPTHORNE
GOVERNOR

KARL J. DREHER
DIRECTOR

February 21, 2000

Reese Sanders
P.O. Box 236
Hamer, Idaho 83425

Re: Transfer 4923

Dear Mr. Sanders:

Transfer 4923 split water right 31-00062H and 31-00063H. As part of the review of Adjudication Claims, I have split Adjudication Claims A31-00062H and A31-00063H. Copies of the new claims are enclosed for your convenience. No action is required at this time.

This spring, I will contact you again for an appointment to measure the diversion rate for your wells.

Please call me at 525-7161 or 663-4853 if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Bryce A. Contor
Senior Water Resource Agent

WR5809NP
No. 31-00063S

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
WATER RIGHT PROFILE REPORT

DATE: 02/18/00
PAGE: 12

OWNER CODE	NAME & ADDRESS	PRIORITY DATE	WATER USE	USE PERIOD FROM TO	DIVERSION RATE	DIVERSION VOLUME
C	REESE SANDERS HAMER ID 83425	05/01/1928	IRRIGATION	05/01 09/01	0.780 CFS	
TOTAL DIVERSION:					0.780 CFS	

Water Source: GROUNDWATER Tributary to: Stage: DECREED

Point(s) of Diversion: T07N R36E S27 NENW JEFFERSON County

Point of Diversion Name(s):

		Name				Rate		Number																						
Place of use Legal Description for: IRRIGATION																														
NE																														
NW																														
SW																														
SE																														
T	R	S	: Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	: Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	: Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	: Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	Lt	Ac	: SUM	
07N	36E	22	:								:											:								46.0
07N	36E	27	:								:	14	35									:								72.0
TOTAL ACRES																										118.0				

Pou County: JEFFERSON

Remarks: GEN TRANS. 1584 & 2425.

Dates: App. Received: Priority Date: 05/01/1928
Proof Due Date: Proof Made Date:
Exam Made Date: Exam Sent to S.O.:
Licensed Date:

Misc: Water District Number: 31 Field Exam Fee:

Comments: Date: 03/17/1997 User-ID: PSKAGGS Subject: TRANSFER NO. 4932
Transfer No. 4932 changes the point of diversion & place of use
under a portion of Right Nos. 31-00062H & 31-00063H, splitting
each right into parts S and T.

Audit: 10/09/96 RBODELL 03/17/97 PSKAGGS 02/06/98 CLEARFLD

To: Splits of A31-00063
Fr: Bryce A. Contor
Date: 2/17/2000

Bryce

Re: Split History

Attached are split histories for the WR side and AJ side. Primary documentation is in A31-00063A. Additional documentation is in A31-00062J, and A31-00062H.


Note that transfer 4932 declared 0.09 cfs of original right 31-00063 to be abandoned. Memo in file A31-00063A.

Claim A31-00063H, corresponding to WR 31-00063H, needs to be split per T4923. Transfer split WR into portions "S" and "T," but claim "S" has already been used to represent a part of original WR 31-00063Q.

Four claims -- A31-00063K, A31-00063L, A31-00063Q, and A31-00063S -- appear to have their basis in WR 31-00063Q. These will need careful research of ownership history, original POU, and accomplished transfer. While original right 31-00063Q is overclaimed, 31-00062Q is underclaimed. It may be that all these are legitimate claims, but the diversion rates have been reversed between corresponding splits of '62 and '63.


Note that Hamer Elementary School has an irrigation well that may also reflect part of the original Hamer Canal Co. right. See file A31-10292.

Split History of 31-00063 - WR Side



AF claims vs.

Split History of 31-00063 - WR Side



B. Conter
2/18/2000