

Bird, Cindy

From: Bird, Cindy
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2004 11:45 AM
To: Carlsen, Ernie
Cc: McHugh, Candice
Subject: RE: 29-30,31, 2379

The rationale on recommending the 8/8/1932 was just an error on my part. I was thinking the decree date was 8/7 not 8/6 and 8/7 was the extended SOU date not the decree date.

Carl is correct the area in section 24 are in T7S, R38E. They are in the NENE AND SENE of section 24. It's a little tip that crosses the range line.

As far as the additional acres he wants in section 19, that is also news to me.
Cindy

-----Original Message-----

From: Carlsen, Ernie
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2004 3:16 PM
To: Bird, Cindy
Cc: McHugh, Candice
Subject: FW: 29-30,31, 2379

Cindy since the claim files identified below are not at Eastern I hope you have them at Soda Springs. If you will provide me with the answers to Candice's questions I will complete the data entry.

Thanks
Ernie

-----Original Message-----

From: McHugh, Candice
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2004 1:47 PM
To: Bird, Cindy
Cc: Carlsen, Ernie
Subject: 29-30,31, 2379

I spoke with Mr. Phillips. It seems there's a typo in the POU for 29-2379, should be Range 38E Section 24 NOT Range 39E Section 24. Since this water right has been partially decreed, I need to write a letter to the court with a corrected recommendation. I want to first confirm that there's a typo. Second, Mr. Phillips wants more acres in section 19. This issue is unclear to me. He's sending some information that Keith Wilson has apparently sent to him. This would not be a typo and would require Mr. Phillips to file a motion to set aside the partial decree in order to add more acres.

Also, Ernie, Mr. Phillips claimed his decreed priority dates (1889, 1887?) for water right nos. 29-13320, 13321. I was wondering what the rationale was for recommending 8/8/1932 and not 8/7/1932 for his extended season claims. If we made an error and it should be 8/7/1932, we need to correct that.

Thanks

Candice

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged information exempt from disclosure under applicable law. This message is intended only for the use of the individual or individuals identified above. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message. Please delete the message from your system and do not review, disclose, copy, or distribute any information contained or attached to the message. Thank You

Bird, Cindy

From: Wilson, Keith
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2004 4:14 PM
To: Bird, Cindy
Cc: Wilson, Keith
Subject: Phillips 29-0030 transfer

Cindy,

Carl Phillips came into the office today to complete a transfer to add a point of diversion on what appears to be the Downey Canal. It appears that the Downey Canal is being considered the Portneuf River. I talked with Rob Brochu, Army Corps of Engineers, he said the Corps considers the canal as the Portneuf. This would agree with the point of diversion NENESE Sec 18, T07S, R39E that the Adj. recommendations has for 29-0030. Is this correct?

In addition Mr. Phillips said that he had talked with you about the land that is not currently part of the shape file in the S1/2NW & N1/2SW Sec 19, T07S, R39E. Apparently he feels that that area should be included within the POU. I have enclused a photo of how the POU looks in ArcView as of this morning. Is this area going to be included within the POU?

I have no idea of how to proceed with Mr. Phillips transfer. Could you enlighten me as to how you are viewing the Downey Canal in that area, and will you be including the area in Sec 19 as part of the place of use?

Thanks,
Keith



phillips29_0030.jpg

Notes

11-17-04 email from Keith Wilson on a transfer for this night.

11/19/04 - I looked on the Iwster page for the SRBA Court. It appears that The Marsh Valley Canal Co objected on the enlargement claims but Carl didn't object to the pro from what I can tell from the page.

I did email Candice and asked her but she is out until Monday, 22nd of November.