





Bill Chford, Idaho
30 Aug, 1991

Idaho Water Resources
150 Shoup

Idaho Falls,
Idaho



Dear Sirs,

In regard to your letter in July stating I must prove well rights. The well on my property was dug prior to 1904. As there is a picture in the book "Tolman Family 1952 Copy - Both of Remembrance & Genealogy with Allied Lines compiled by Leonard Dever Mehan. Many copies are in the Yanay & Meclan & Tolman families of Benham Co. A picture can also be found in The Benham County History Book published by Benham County Historical Society 1989, under Yanay History. As I have the original house & well but only 1 1/2 (1.4) acres of the original farm of near 300 acres. We used the water from the well until 1987. Then we were connected to Groveland Sewer & Water Dist. We use it for irrigation of the total amount. We no longer do so but we want to keep our rights to the well, just in case we go back to it and for historical value.

Also in the original Abstract from

Bingham Title & Trust, Blackfoot, Idaho in
possession of Clem Yancy 367W - 150N - Blackfoot,
Idaho 83221 - page ~~37~~¹⁷ it comments of
Griffith Hardware & Plumbing Company: doing a lot
of plumbing to bldg etc. - dated 17 April 1905 - work
being done in 1904. However nowhere do I find
the exact reference to the well or how much
it was used for irrigation. It is commented
that they had large orchards of cherries &
apples by 1912.

Please except this as proof the well
was there.

Doug Chandler
381 W 150 N
Yancy House
Blackfoot, Bingham Co, Idaho

17-Jun-1991

DONA JEAN CHANDLER
381 W 150 N
BLACKFOOT ID 83221

RE: **Evidence of Priority**
NO. A35-04096

Dear Claimant:

The Notice of Claim identified with the number shown at the end of this letter has been filed in the Snake River Basin Adjudication (SRBA). The Notice indicates the water usage is based on "Beneficial Use" or a "Statutory Claim". Water rights of this type are established by the historical use of water, dating back to when water was first used for the purpose claimed, at or on the place of use identified on the Notice. The date the water was first put to use, known as the priority date, has not been confirmed by a License, Decree, or Permit. For this reason, proof must be provided supporting the priority date.

For your reference I have provided a printout of your Notice and the pamphlet entitled "**Evidence of Priority**". The pamphlet describes the types of evidence required and suggests which documents will fulfill this requirement. While I encourage you to read all of the pamphlet, I direct your attention to the two sections entitled "**What Kind of Evidence is Required**" and "**Some Examples of Documents Which May Be Evidence of the Priority Date**".

It is our goal to recommend this historical water rights within the Snake River Basin as accurately as possible. Field exams to verify other items of the Notice have been or soon will be conducted by Department personnel. But, the Department will not recommend the Notice be decreed by the court if no evidence of a priority date is submitted.

Please submit the required evidence supporting the priority date by JULY 15, 1991, referencing all documents with the corresponding Notice number. If you have any questions not covered by this letter or the enclosed pamphlet, please contact this office.

WFOAD: [illegible]
DEC 10 1992

DONA JEAN CHANDLER
A35-04096

page 2

All Notices required to submit this evidence are currently being reviewed for recommendation to the court. Hence, the need for expediency on your part or your agency. Every effort should be made to submit this information within 30 days of the date of this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Verner
Senior Water Agent

EV:rb

Enc. Brochure on "Evidence of Priority"
Proof Report

NOV 20 1992

DEC 10 1992

4/11/1989

SRBA CLAIMS RECEIVING CHECKLIST #2

CLAIMANT'S NAME

Dona Cho

CLAIM INT. NO.

A35-04096

DATE RECEIVED

5-30-89

CK #

AMOUNT \$

YES

NO

Required
Info?

1. Is the name and address complete with zip code? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
2. Is a priority date entered? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
- Is the priority date acceptable in view of mandatory filing dates?
See Adjudication Memos #1 and #4 to determine if a Permit is required. ☒ YES ☐ NO *
3. (a) Is a source entered? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
- (b) Is a tributary to entered? (if required) ☐ YES ☒ NO N/A *
4. Is the legal description of the p.d. sufficient? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
5. Is there a description of the diverting works? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
6. Are the water uses appropriate for the form? The short form is limited
to domestic and stockwater uses with direct diversion. All claims that
include storage or instream stockwater must use long form. ☒ YES ☐ NO *
- Is the period of use included? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
- Is a quantity claimed for each use? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
7. Is a total quantity claimed entered? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
8. If required is a consumptive use entered? ☐ YES ☒ NO N/A *
- Is the consumptive use correct? ☒ YES ☐ NO N/A *
9. Are the non-irrigation uses listed properly? If this claim is on the
short form, and more than one domestic use is listed, single owner-
ship must be stated. If not under single ownership, see
Adjudication Memo # 4. ☒ YES ☐ NO N/A *
10. Is (are) the place(s) of use and purpose(s) indicated? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
11. Is (are) the county(ies) entered? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
12. Is the ownership of p.u. checked? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
13. Are other water rights listed or "none" indicated? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
14. If required, are remarks correct? (If the claimant does not own
the place of use, authority for filing the claim must be
explained in the remarks.) ☒ YES ☐ NO N/A *
15. Is the basis of the claim indicated? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
16. If the claimant requested a monthly docket sheet, is payment enclosed?
(If yes, describe payment status in "Comments" below.) ☒ YES ☐ NO N/A *
17. Is the claim signed by the claimant, and is the signature appropriate?
Organizations must complete the organization block. ☒ YES ☐ NO *
18. Has the claim been signed, sealed, and dated by a notary? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
19. Was this claim filed on time, or was an extension granted? ☒ YES ☐ NO *
20. Is the fee enclosed correct? ☐ YES ☒ NO Exempt *
21. If this claim is based on an existing water right, has the
identification number been entered? ☒ YES ☐ NO N/A *
22. Should this claim be data entered? ☒ YES ☐ NO *

Claim checked by: LSDate: 6-14-89Claim must be returned to claimant: ☐ (Yes) ☐ (No)Claimant must be notified of modifications: ☐ (Yes) ☐ (No)

Receipt Prepared by: _____
 Claim data entered by: _____
 Sent to claimant by: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Checked by: _____

Date: _____

Comments: _____

DEC 10 1992

NO. OF CLAIMS IN POLYGON _____

TRANSFER NUMBER _____

CLAM NUMBERS 35-04096 _____ DATE _____

OBJECTION FILED _____

AGENT _____

TOTAL ACRES FROM RECOMMENDATION _____

GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYSTEM _____

RIGHT NO				NE				NW				SW				SE			
	TNS	RNG	SEC	NE	NW	SW	SE	NE	NW	SW	SE	NE	NW	SW	SE	NE	NW	SW	SE
RECOM	25	358	328																
GIS																			
RECOM																			
GIS																			
RECOM																			
GIS																			
RECOM																			
GIS																			

UPDATED

POLYGON #

UPDATED

B35-DBPOU.DBF _____

ATTRIBUTES OF B35-POU.SHP (483) _____

B35-DBPOD.DBF _____

ATTRIBUTES OF B35-POD.SHP () _____

DONNA JEAN CHANDLERP.O.D. / SOURCE 331 H 2.W.381W 150NT2S R35E S28 1/2BWSWBlackfoot 11. 60221Ph: (208) 785-7101

P/U CONFLICT yes () no ()

P/D CONFLICT yes () no ()

SENT FOR DECREE yes () no ()