

Mount, Misty

From: Conrad, Vic [Vic.Conrad@simplot.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2006 8:36 AM
To: Mount, Misty
Cc: Usabel, Mike
Subject: RE: 2-6, 2-15, 2-2166

Misty,

At this time, your recommendation at the bottom of the message below best fits with the operation of the system:

" We can change the recommended diversion rate to what was claimed in the SRBA which is 5.78cfs, or recommend it at 4.98 cfs which is the diversion rate measured for the 2-2166 license. For either situation we will add a condition limiting 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 to 9.05 cfs"

I would prefer having the quantity recommended for 2-6 at the rate claimed (5.78cfs) together with the combines use limit of 9.05 cfs under all three rights (2-6, 2-15 and 2-2166 combined).

As you can imagine, it is difficult to verify flow rates in December and January. Once the system becomes operational in March we will confirm the flow, then decide if an objection to this amount is necessary. Thanks.

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

From: Mount, Misty [mailto:Misty.Mount@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 3:48 PM
To: Conrad, Vic
Subject: re: 2-6, 2-15, 2-2166

Mr. Vic Conrad,

In response to your questions regarding the recommendations for claim number's 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 I have tried to back track a bit to see how the recommendations came about. The quantity recommended for these claims are as follow's:

2-6: 2.04 cfs for 356 acres - quantity was recommended based on a field exam conducted on 8-23-83

2-15: 1.31 cfs for 300 acres - quantity was recommended as claimed.

2-2166: 5.7 cfs for 294 acres - quantity was recommended as per license.

The total cfs diverted by these recommendations adds up to 9.05 cfs - which is the capacity of the pumps - based on the measurements taken during the 1983 field exam. It appears that the point of diversion for the land described on the recommendations is the same system, which would explain why we did not recommend the 5.78 claimed for 2-6 as it would exceed the capacity of the system. Outlined below is the history of the claim file for 2-6

4-5-83 - signed claim for 6.03 cfs

8-23-83 - field exam by Don Shaff which yielded the pumps capacity of 9.05cfs and a recommendation of 2.04 cfs as per examiner.

2-28-89 - signed claim for 5.78 cfs
5-5-05 - recommended 2.04 cfs for 356 acres

The recommendation for 2-6 allows 2.4 cfs on 356 acres. Combined with 1.31cfs from 3-15 of those 356 acres 300 acres would get 3.35 cfs, just over ¼ inch per acre.

Hopefully this helps explain how those recommendations came about, and here's what we can do to modify the quantity for 2-6.

We can change the recommended diversion rate to what was claimed in the SRBA which is 5.78cfs, or recommend it at 4.98 cfs which is the diversion rate measured for the 2-2166 license. For either situation we will add a condition limiting 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 to 9.05 cfs

Please let me know if you agree with this and how you would like to proceed. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by email or by phone. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Misty

Adjudication
287-4940

Mount, Misty

From: Conrad, Vic [Vic.Conrad@simplot.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 4:51 PM
To: Mount, Misty
Subject: RE: 2-6, 2-15, 2-2166

Ms. Mount,

Thank you for the response. I prepared a notice of error reply which is signed and ready to file in connection with the quantity recommended under 2-6. However, I do not think it is necessary to send the notice when considering the communication we are having on the subject. Do you prefer that I send the notice for your records?

It would be helpful to see Don's 1983 field report you referenced below. Could you fax this to me (389-7333)? or scan it and email the PDF image to me?

Out of the options identified below my preference is to identify the full claimed flow rate, but have a combined maximum flow limitation on all of the water rights. It would surprise (but I am checking to confirm) if the pump station is equipped to vary its flow rate depending on specific areas of the farm that are irrigated. I expect the operational flow is held fairly constant when irrigating. I am checking with our farm manager to confirm.

Please let me know if we could receive a copy of Don's report.

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

From: Mount, Misty [mailto:Misty.Mount@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 3:48 PM
To: Conrad, Vic
Subject: re: 2-6, 2-15, 2-2166

Mr. Vic Conrad,

In response to your questions regarding the recommendations for claim number's 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 I have tried to back track a bit to see how the recommendations came about. The quantity recommended for these claims are as follow's:

2-6: 2.04 cfs for 356 acres - quantity was recommended based on a field exam conducted on 8-23-83

2-15: 1.31 cfs for 300 acres - quantity was recommended as claimed.

2-2166: 5.7 cfs for 294 acres - quantity was recommended as per license.

The total cfs diverted by these recommendations adds up to 9.05 cfs - which is the capacity of the pumps - based on the measurements taken during the 1983 field exam. It appears that the point of diversion for the land described on the recommendations is the same system, which would explain why we did not recommend the 5.78 claimed for 2-6 as it would exceed the capacity of the system. Outlined below is the history of the claim file for 2-6

4-5-83 - signed claim for 6.03 cfs
8-23-83 - field exam by Don Shaff which yielded the pumps capacity of 9.05cfs and a recommendation of 2.04 cfs as per examiner.
2-28-89 - signed claim for 5.78 cfs
5-5-05 - recommended 2.04 cfs for 356 acres

The recommendation for 2-6 allows 2.4 cfs on 356 acres. Combined with 1.31cfs from 3-15 of those 356 acres 300 acres would get 3.35 cfs, just over 1/2 inch per acre.

Hopefully this helps explain how those recommendations came about, and here's what we can do to modify the quantity for 2-6.

We can change the recommended diversion rate to what was claimed in the SRBA which is 5.78cfs, or recommend it at 4.98 cfs which is the diversion rate measured for the 2-2166 license. For either situation we will add a condition limiting 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 to 9.05 cfs

Please let me know if you agree with this and how you would like to proceed. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by email or by phone. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Misty

Adjudication
287-4940

contact: Vic.Conrad@simplot.com

Mr. Vic Conrad,

In response to your questions regarding the recommendations for claim number's 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 I have tried to back track a bit to see how the recommendations came about. The quantity recommended for these claims are as follow's:

2-6: 2.04 cfs for 356 acres – quantity was recommended based on a field exam conducted on 8-23-83

2-15: 1.31 cfs for 300 acres – quantity was recommended as claimed.

2-2166: 5.7 cfs for 294 acres – quantity was recommended as per license.

The total cfs diverted by these recommendations adds up to 9.05 cfs – which is the capacity of the pumps – based on the measurements taken during the 1983 field exam. It appears that the point of diversion for the land described on the recommendations is the same system, which would explain why we did not recommend the 5.78 claimed for 2-6 as it would exceed the capacity of the system. Outlined below is the history of the claim file for 2-6

4-5-83 – signed claim for 6.03 cfs

8-23-83 – field exam by Don Shaff which yielded the pumps capacity of 9.05cfs and a recommendation of 2.04 cfs as per examiner.

2-28-89 – signed claim for 5.78 cfs

5-5-05 – recommended 2.04 cfs for 356 acres

The recommendation for 2-6 allows 2.4 cfs on 356 acres. Combined with 1.31cfs from 3-15 of those 356 acres 300 acres would get 3.35 cfs, just over ½ inch per acre.

Hopefully this helps explain how those recommendations came about, and here's what we can do to modify the quantity for 2-6.

We can change the recommended diversion rate to what was claimed in the SRBA which is 5.78cfs, or recommend it at 4.98 cfs which is the diversion rate measured for the 2-2166 license. For either situation we will add a condition limiting 2-6, 2-15, and 2-2166 to 9.05 cfs

Please let me know if you agree with this and how you would like to proceed.

Thank you,

Misty

Adjudication
287-4940