

Saxton, Craig

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2002 1:24 PM
To: Carlsen, Ernie; McHugh, Candice
Subject: Rotational Right 29-00285

Hi,

Ok, I did manage to speak with George Chandler. Here is what he said:

He said that 29-00285 was originally decreed to 5 people (we know there were actually 7 users). George said that they rotated every 5 day's were each person got the full 10 inches or 0.20 cfs on day a week (this would work better with the decreed 7 users, but this is what he said).

When asked who the users were on the rotational right now, he confirmed that everyone who had claimed part of 29-00285 were users of the right and used the right. With one exception...he never said that MD Morrison used his portion of the rotational right (which I don't think he does), but George confirmed that it was understood that MD Morrison held a portion of this right.

I asked about current practice. He stated that they split up the right and each use an for example... inch of water at all times at the same time for everyone. This makes me think we might want to pro-rate the diversion rate. In addition, George confirmed that George, Sam, Wes, and Irvin all have a part of one of the originally decreed portions. So...if we prorated the right between the original 7 (example would be 0.0285 cfs for George Whitworths original property), then one of those portions would need to be pro-rated out to the four users (so George's 0.0285 cfs would need to be split 4 times for 0.007 cfs). If we did it this way, we are going to have extra diversion rate because 2 of the original 7 users portions were not claimed....could this be a possible accomplished transfer to save loss of diversion rate?

Different from what Irvin Spraker said: George said that they did hire a water master as recent as 5 years ago, but they did not regulate right 29-00285 as a fully rotated right as originally done at time of the decree.

Your thoughts/guidance?

Let me know if you have further questions.

Thanks,

Craig

11/26/2002

Saxton, Craig**Subject:** FW: 29-00285 Rotational

Hey Ernie,

Attached are several files:

- 1) JPG of Decreed POU
- 2) JPG of possible recommended POU overlying Decreed POU
- 3) Shape file for Decreed POU
- 4) Shape file for possible recommended POU
- 5) Updated 29-00285 spread sheet

Let me know if you don't receive one of these.

Now, to summarize:

Original Owners of Decreed right 29-00285:

Damron, A.J.	Current owners of Property: Morrison, MD Kent, Wes
Ferguson, Phillip	Chandler, James Chandler, Seren
Hargraves, Samuel	Anderson, Melvin
Webb, E.M	Anderson, Melvin
Kelsey, Fred	<i>Not claimed</i>
Richardson, John & Fanny	<i>Not claimed</i>
Whitworth, George	Chandler, Sam Chandler, George Spraker, Irvin Kent, Wes

So, some of the rotational rights haven't been claimed, and some have been claimed by several users.

Lets note some other things:

- 1) Wes Kent only claimed a portion of the rotational right. If he uses the water year round, he should claim portions of 29-00297 and 29-00314 also.
- 2) Absolutely nothing was claimed on Richardson or Kelsey property. No high water, low water, rotational, bene-use, etc.
- 3) Note EM Webbs property could never have been irrigated by Rapid Creek. Could only be irrigated from Webb Creek. Yet he was still included as part of the rotation.
- 4) Even though it is not possible now, MD Morrison's property could have historically been irrigated from Rapid Creek.

1/3/2003

I guess take a look at this and let me know if you would like additional information. When completed, I can pass this stuff onto Candice.

I appreciate your help with this.

Thanks Ernie,

Craig

Saxton, Craig

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2002 1:24 PM
To: Carlsen, Ernie; McHugh, Candice
Subject: Rotational Right 29-00285

Hi,

Ok, I did manage to speak with George Chandler. Here is what he said:

He said that 29-00285 was originally decreed to 5 people (we know there were actually 7 users). George said that they rotated every 5 days were each person got the full 10 inches or 0.20 cfs on day a week (this would work better with the decreed 7 users, but this is what he said).

When asked who the users were on the rotational right now, he confirmed that everyone who had claimed part of 29-00285 were users of the right and used the right. With one exception...he never said that MD Morrison used his portion of the rotational right (which I don't think he does), but George confirmed that it was understood that MD Morrison held a portion of this right.

I asked about current practice. He stated that they split up the right and each use an for example... inch of water at all times at the same time for everyone. This makes me think we might want to pro-rate the diversion rate. In addition, George confirmed that George, Sam, Wes, and Irvin all have a part of one of the originally decreed portions. So...if we prorated the right between the original 7 (example would be 0.0285 cfs for George Whitworths original property), then one of those portions would need to be pro-rated out to the four users (so George's 0.0285 cfs would need to be split 4 times for 0.007 cfs). If we did it this way, we are going to have extra diversion rate because 2 of the original 7 users portions were not claimed....could this be a possible accomplished transfer to save loss of diversion rate?

Different from what Irvin Spraker said: George said that they did hire a water master as recent as 5 years ago, but they did not regulate right 29-00285 as a fully rotated right as originally done at time of the decree.

Your thoughts/guidance?

Let me know if you have further questions.

Thanks,

Craig

11/26/2002

Saxton, Craig

Subject: FW: 29-00285 Rotational

Hey Ernie,

Attached are several files:

- 1) JPG of Decreed POU
- 2) JPG of possible recommended POU overlying Decreed POU
- 3) Shape file for Decreed POU
- 4) Shape file for possible recommended POU
- 5) Updated 29-00285 spread sheet

Let me know if you don't receive one of these.

Now, to summarize:

Original Owners of Decreed right 29-00285:

Damron, A.J.	Current owners of Property: Morrison, MD Kent, Wes
Ferguson, Phillip	Chandler, James Chandler, Seren
Hargraves, Samuel	Anderson, Melvin
Webb, E.M	Anderson, Melvin
Kelsey, Fred	<i>Not claimed</i>
Richardson, John & Fanny	<i>Not claimed</i>
Whitworth, George	Chandler, Sam Chandler, George Spraker, Irvin Kent, Wes

So, some of the rotational rights haven't been claimed, and some have been claimed by several users.

Lets note some other things:

- 1) Wes Kent only claimed a portion of the rotational right. If he uses the water year round, he should claim portions of 29-00297 and 29-00314 also.
- 2) Absolutely nothing was claimed on Richardson or Kelsey property. No high water, low water, rotational, bene-use, etc.
- 3) Note EM Webbs property could never have been irrigated by Rapid Creek. Could only be irrigated from Webb Creek. Yet he was still included as part of the rotation.
- 4) Even though it is not possible now, MD Morrison's property could have historically been irrigated from Rapid Creek.

1/3/2003

I guess take a look at this and let me know if you would like additional information. When completed, I can pass this stuff onto Candice.

I appreciate your help with this.

Thanks Ernie,

Craig

1/3/2003