

8:19 AM 11-13-02

Justin called, he has 6+8" Mainline
with 4" Handlines. Irrigation from
the well is in SENE & NESE of Section 28,
SW NW & NW SW Section 27 to the hill.
approximately 138 acres.

Bird, Cindy

From: Carlsen, Ernie
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 2:41 PM
To: Bird, Cindy
Subject: RE: Hermese Crump rights

Cindy there is no remark for resumption of the right. However, your recommendation should be based on the extent of beneficial use. Unless there is a an irrigation system in place that uses the well there is no beneficial use. If the system is present and covers 240 acres then recommend 240 acres with the reduced rate.
Ernie

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

From: Bird, Cindy
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 11:02 AM
To: Carlsen, Ernie
Cc: McHugh, Candice
Subject: Hermese Crump rights

Ernie,

We have had several discussions about the Hermese Crump rights (now Justin Williams). The particular discussion was on the well under license 29-2455 that had not been used since the 70's. During our discussions you said if he could get the system working before the preliminary report we could make a favorable recommendation to the court. Well he did.

He finally got power to the well and the pump company tested the well. Justin sent me a copy of the results. If you average the two possible flows it would be 0.53 cfs. This is less than a 1/3 of the original license. The license describes 240 acres in the POU for 1.86 cfs (less than an inch per acre). They claimed the same 240 acres in the SRBA. Should I recommend the same 240 acres with the new flow or decrease it proportionally? Is their a particular Remark or Condition that needs to be added for him to resume this right?

Thanks,
Cindy

Bird, Cindy

From: Bird, Cindy
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2002 11:02 AM
To: Carlsen, Ernie
Cc: McHugh, Candice
Subject: Hermese Crump rights

Ernie,

We have had several discussions about the Hermese Crump rights (now Justin Williams). The particular discussion was on the well under license 29-2455 that had not been used since the 70's. During our discussions you said if he could get the system working before the preliminary report we could make a favorable recommendation to the court. Well he did.

He finally got power to the well and the pump company tested the well. Justin sent me a copy of the results. If you average the two possible flows it would be 0.53 cfs. This is less than a 1/3 of the original license. The license describes 240 acres in the POU for 1.86 cfs (less than an inch per acre). They claimed the same 240 acres in the SRBA. Should I recommend the same 240 acres with the new flow or decrease it proportionally? Is there a particular Remark or Condition that needs to be added for him to resume this right?

Thanks,
Cindy

11/8/02 Resumed use of the well by Justin Williams

Discharge rate:

$$225 \text{ gpm} * 0.00223 = 0.502 \text{ cfs}$$

$$250 \text{ gpm} * 0.00223 = 0.5575 \text{ cfs}$$

Average: 237.5 gpm

Discharge rate:

$$237.5 \text{ gpm} * 0.00223 = 0.5296$$

Irrigated Acres: Based on average discharge rate.

$$\frac{0.53}{0.02} = 26.5 \text{ acres.}$$

During my discussions with Eric Nelson he said if Justin resumed use of this well before the preliminary report is submitted, any possible groundwater contamination is the owner's.

7/2/02 Discussion with Steve Heddon.

Kern Crump operated Hermes's property and he left in the late 70's.

Brent Crump left the Valley in the late 1986/87.

This information fits with what Nyles told me about the well not being used since the late 70's.

TELEPHONE & VISITOR LOG

Date: 6/25/02

Time: 11:38 AM

Call X Visit

Name: Justin Williams

Address:

Phone No.: 648-2938

Claim No(s): 29-2455

=====

RE: Well not used.

Conversation: I told Justin (Purchasing H. Crump property) that according to Nyles Crump the well had not been used since 1979, and because of that I wasn't planning on recommending the claim. Justin said he talked with Nyles wife and when they were married in 1984 the well was being used. I explained.

=====

Action Required:

- Justin is getting evidence of the well's use prior to 1987 (5 yrs)

EXAM INFORMATION

Exam Date 6/17/02

Exam Time 5:30 pm

CLAIM(S) _____

NAME Hermese Crump

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (____) _____ HOME

_____ WORK

_____ CELL

DOMESTIC____ STOCKWATER____ IRRIGATION X OTHER____

OTHER RIGHTS _____

DIRECTIONS _____

farm - @ the bend going to
Chesterfield on Chesterfield Road.

DOGS _____

DATE 6/14 APPOINTMENT Hiles Crump

6/14/02 - requested power records from Niles Group

6/17/02 - Niles Brothers operated this area of the farm

He moved out of the Valley in 1988/89. He abandoned/
(or forfeited)
the well in 1979 because they didn't get enough
water from the well to offset the power bill.

According to Niles, they can't get power records because
the meter has been pulled because it hasn't been used.
and their records don't go back that far.

I recommending this claim be disallowed under
P04 Forfeited/abandoned from 1979 to current.