

Notes

5/9/05 Storage right 27-7008B.

$3.33 \text{ cfs} \times 1.984 = 6.606 \text{ AF/day.}$

18.5 AFA limit when combined with 27-7008A.

Bird, Cindy

From: McHugh, Candice
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2005 1:48 PM
To: Bird, Cindy; Carlsen, Ernie
Cc: Williams, Ray
Subject: RE: 27-7008

They cannot add a use to their prior licensed water right. If the additional use occurred prior to 1987, perhaps an accomplished transfer in purpose of use could have occurred but that would require an appropriate reduction in the water right and I believe we would need to determine whether adding a storage component would cause injury.

I find the 18.5 AFA a curious limitation, however. With a 3.33 cfs diversion rate, wouldn't they be able to reach that limit in just a few hours?

Candice

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

From: Bird, Cindy
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 2:19 PM
To: Carlsen, Ernie; McHugh, Candice
Subject: 27-7008

hi Ernie,

Another Rhodia claim. 27-7008 was split into an A & B on the water right side. It was licensed as Road Maintenance. In the adjudication they claimed under the A portion, Industrial use. But under the B portion they claimed Industrial Storage 50 AFA, and Industrial 3.33 cfs. The A & B portions were licensed for 3.33 cfs and an annual volume limit of 18.5 AFA for each one. The wording for the purpose of use is probably fine in the Adjudication but I was wondering about them now claiming industrial storage of 50 AFA?

Cindy

INTER-DEPARTMENT MEMO

27-7008A

TO: Pauline
FROM: Cindy

SUBJECT: Ownership Change
DATE: Oct 19, 2004

Please update the ownership on these preliminary recommendations and resubmit the report.

Rhodia Inc. ATTN: Director of Site Services
CN 7500
Cranbury, N.J. 08512-7500
1-609-860-3446

Ownership change form in 27-7125.

() For your information

CB
signature

10/19/04
email to Ence
on
Industrial &
Industrial Pond Storage
Road Maintenance.

Bird, Cindy

From: Steven M Spencer [sspencer@fs.fed.us]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 9:46 AM
To: ecarlsen@idwr.state.id.us
Cc: cbird@idwr.state.id.us
Subject: Claims 27-7008A & B, 27-7125 Rhone-Poulenc

I've shortened this message, but this word I have is that Rhodia LLC is currently authorized to operate on NFS land under a valid federal mineral lease. I appreciate the Departments attention to this matter. They are authorized to conduct mining activities including dust abatement under the federal law. We haven't specifically given permission to divert water. It appears that they appropriately received that from the state by going through the licensing procedure for these two water rights. So, the only change there may need to be is that the water right holder might need to be Rhodia LLC rather than Rhone-Poulenc because Rhodia LLC is the current holder of the federal mineral lease.

I would ask that the Department consider some change in the .02 domestic use on 27-07125. This is a mining operation authorized on federal land. There is absolutely no domestic use authorized. If possible, could the .02 domestic be added to the existing .04 industrial with a remark that the water right includes use at what ever "mining" facilities they may have identified in their application or that are known from the field examination. I'm suggesting that "domestic use" at their offices, and workers complex that may include showers, drinking water and kitchen facilities is solely a function of the mining operation and would be appropriately included as such. Another thing we have done on similar situations is have the beneficial use changed to "mining - domestic", but that limits it to 2,500 gpd as a line item. If it was just consolidated to total .06 with the remark clarifying use at the mine including all operations necessary for or pursuant to authorized mining operations, that would suffice for us.

Our concern is in some instances a "domestic" water right at a mining property has been wrongly held by a company (usually the last manager on site) as the "right" for him to stay forever at the site in some building after all mining operations have ceased. Then we get into a costly contest trying to evict the gentleman after the company has pulled out of the area because we would be "taking" the domestic water right away from him. So, we try to get those "domestic" uses described as a function of the overall mining operation to cease when the mining terminates. Then we avoid a frustrating occupancy problem.

Thank you. If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me.

Steve Spencer	(208) 331-5944
Boise Adjudication Team	(208) 387-0842 FAX
161 E. Mallard, Suite A	e-mail: sspencer@fs.fed.us
Boise, ID 83706	

Jeff
Jones/R4/USDAFS

10/19/2004 06:38

To
Steven M Spencer/R4/USDAFS@FSNOTES

AM

cc
Jamie Gough/R4/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Lee
Leffert/R4/USDAFS@FSNOTES

Subject

Re: Fw: claims 27-7008A & B,
27-7125 Rhone-Poulenc(Document
link: Steven M Spencer)

Steve, Rhodia LLC. is the current leaseholder for what was the Wooley Valley Mine. Their predecessors, Stauffer Chemical and later Rhone-Poulenc Chemical, operated a reservoir in the head of Angus Creek to provide sediment control for their mining operations and to provide water for dust abatement. That reservoir still exists. In 2002, the regulated dam, under Special Use Permit issued by the Forest Service was reconstructed when the spillway collapsed under the winter's ice. The overflow was lowered beneath the 10 foot pool height. It was formerly regulated by Idaho Department of Water Quality. Their records in the Idaho Falls office should reflect this change because they cooperated on the project.

This dam no serves to maintain a small pool to capture sediment and as a chemical reduction site for Se and other contaminants released from the waste dumps upgradient in the watershed.

I'm in training this week and won't return to the office until Friday.

If you have other questions, I can be reached there.

Jeffrey L. Jones
Minerals Management Specialist/CERCLA Program Manager
Caribou-Targhee National Forest
Soda Springs, Idaho 83276

e-mail: jjones13@fs.fed.us
Phone number: 208-547-4356
Cell: 208-313-7907

Steven M
Spencer/R4/USDAFS

10/14/2004 03:42
PM

To
Jeff Jones/R4/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc
Lee Leffert/R4/USDAFS@FSNOTES,
Jamie Gough/R4/USDAFS@FSNOTES

Subject
Fw: claims 27-7008A & B, 27-7125
Rhone-Poulenc

IDWR is inquiring about two licensed water rights on Soda Springs Ranger District that are licensed to Rhone-Poulenc of Montpelier. I don't know which of the staff people on the district might be administering this particular use. The water is for dust abatement for haul roads for mining. Are these folks still operating and in good standing? You may want to look at the water right information in the attachments at the end of the message string to see if you have any concerns. Absent any concerns or problems the water rights will probably continue through the SRBA as they are here in the name of Rhone-Poulenc. It appears that the current user may be Rhodia, Inc. Please contact me as quickly as you can if you have any questions or see any problems so that I can respond back to IDWR. Thank you.

Steve Spencer
Boise Adjudication Team
161 E. Mallard, Suite A
Boise, ID 83706

(208) 331-5944
(208) 387-0842 FAX
e-mail: sspencer@fs.fed.us

----- Forwarded by Steven M Spencer/R4/USDAFS on 10/14/2004 03:28 PM -----

"Carlsen, Ernie"
<ECarlsen@idwr.state.id.us>

10/14/2004 12:38 PM

"Steve Spencer (E-mail)"
<sspencer@fs.fed.us>

To

cc

"Bird, Cindy"
<CindyBird@idwr.state.id.us>

Subject

FW: claims 27-7008A & B, 27-7125
Rhone-Poulenc

Steve can you tell me if the Forest Service has a current lease and or arrangement with Rhodia Inc or other entity to divert water under licenses 27-7008A and 27-7125 for dust abatement on haul roads crossing FS administered land? If not a current arrangement when did the former arrangement expire?

Thanks
Ernie

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Bird, Cindy
> Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 12:14 PM
> To: McHugh, Candice
> Subject: claims 27-7008A & B, 27-7125 Rhone-Poulenc

> good morning Candice,

>
> In January of 1990 Rhone-Poulenc filed adjudication claims on the above mentioned licenses. Rhone-Poulenc is a New York firm that is no longer doing business in the state of Idaho. They conveyed there interest in Rhone-Poulenc Basic Chemicals Co. (formally know as Stauffer Chemical Corp.) to Rhodia Inc in 1998. In that conveyance they conveyed land that was owned by the company to Rhodia. None of which is described as the

POU

> or POD in the above listed claims. The legals described under the water
> rights is owned by USFS. Should we get a copy of their lease? The
> licenses were filed for road maintance on the haul roads while mining
ore.
> Will we end up with objections on these claims by the recommending them?
>
> Suggestions?
>
> Cindy

Notes

Conveyed To them in the purchase agreement and get back to me. CB

1-7-04 Barbara Please check to see who owns this property now.

1-9-04 Canadian Assessor; Roland Oiler L+L owns NWSE of Sec. 25. B&D

1-9-04 US Forest Service has a stockwater claim on Angus Creek; 27-11506 Please send a Notice of Ownership change form to Roland Oiler. Also, find out how this water is now being used or if it's being used.

1-9-04 Letter to Claimant re ownership change & nature of use B&D Response date 2/9/04
2/12/04 recommend as claimed. CB.

9/30/04. USFS land north of the pod to Rasmussen mine. N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW Sec. 25; all sec. 24, NE of Sec. 29; Secs. 1, 2, 3, 12, 11, 13, NE, SE, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW of Sec. 14.; SE, NE, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW, SE NW of Sec. 10. also all of Sec. 36. all in T7S, R43E.

Notes

10/9/03 ownership/address needs to be verified because our SRBA mailing was returned 2-2003.

1) need license/field exam

2) copies of any transfers

3) verify owner/address.

10-20-03 Sent ownership change to NuWest

12-4-03 Called Quinn NuWest (547-4381). The person said he wanted someone call us. Either Allen Skinner or Al. Harlan. BP

12-8-03 Called Allen Skinner. He forwarded the letter to someone else. He will call them + have them call us. BP

12-12 Monty Johnson called. Said to send the forms to him + he would get them to the proper people for action BP

12-20-03 Letter to NuWest re ownership change. BP

1-7-04 Chuck Durcell -NuWest called to say they don't own this property but can they retain the W/R? Chuck doesn't know who owns the land. He's going to research if it was

Contacts Data Entry Form

Owner Type Full Name Address City State Zip Phone

Current Owner: Rhone - Poulenc

Name connector: and _____, or _____, and/or P.O. Box 160 Montpelier VT

Current Owner: _____
Current Owner: _____ 83254

Representing Attorney: _____ Phone Number: _____

Accompanied By: _____ Phone Number: _____

Relationship to Claimant: _____

Date of Field Exam: _____ Time: _____

Directions to Property (if different from above) and/or update owner information:

New owner according to the accessors
office is Roland Allen L+L.

2/12/04 No response to our request for
an ownership chg.

Recommending as claimed.

Reviewer: _____

CB

Date: _____

2/12/04

Priority Date Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-7008A

Water Right Priority Date: _____ Water Right Basis: _____

Claimed Priority Date: _____ Claimed Basis: _____

Recommended Priority Date: _____ Recommended Basis: _____

☒ Use Claimed Priority Date and Basis as Recommended Priority Date and Basis

Document the evidence submitted/reviewed for the priority date claimed, include your analysis of the evidence:

License

Reviewer: CBDate: 10/9/03

Priority Date

Claim No. _____

1. Should this water use have been included in a later court decree of the water rights from this source? Yes () No (☒)
If Yes, go to 2
If No, go to 4
2. Was the owner or the owner's predecessor in interest of the place of use joined in the later decree? Yes () No ()
If Yes, go to 3a
If No, go to 4
- 3a. Is the date the decree was entered after the date a permit is required for the source and the water use? Yes () No ()
If Yes, consult the attorney assigned to the Basin. Go to 3b
If No, go to 4
- 3b. Do the facts support disallowing the claim, or recommending the claim as an enlargement or an expansion? Yes () No ()
If Yes, go to 11
If No, go to 4
4. Is the basis of claim a decree or license? Yes (☒) No ()
If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 7
5. Does the decree or license have a Priority Date? Yes (☒) No ()
If Yes, go to 6
If No, Consult the attorney assigned to the Basin, go to 15
6. Did the Claimant claim the decreed or licensed Priority Date? Yes (☒) No ()
If Yes, recommend the Priority Date claimed. If questions 1. and 2. were both answered yes, consult attorney. Go to 15
If No, Obtain an amended claim if necessary. If questions 1. and 2. were both answered yes, consult attorney. Go to 15
7. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application? Yes () No ()
If Yes, go to 10e
If No, go to 8
8. Is the basis of claim a posted notice? Yes () No ()
If Yes, consult the attorney assigned to the Basin, go to 15
If No, go to 9
9. Is the Priority Date claimed after the date a permit is required for the source and the water use? Yes () No ()
If Yes, go to 11
If No, go to 12
- 10e. Will the license be issued prior to filing the Director's Report? Yes () No ()
If Yes, recommend the Priority Date shown on the license, go to 15
If No, recommend the Priority Date shown on the Permit. All other elements should be recommended as shown on the Permit. Add Condition Code A01 to the Recommendation, go to 15
11. Is the claim for an expansion or enlargement under 42-1416B or 42-1426? Yes () No ()
If Yes, go to 12
If No, disallow with condition P01.
12. Does the claim file contain sufficient evidence of Priority Date? Yes () No ()
If Yes, recommend the date supported by the evidence submitted, go to 15
If No, Request additional evidence of Priority Date, go to 13
13. Has additional evidence of priority date been submitted? Yes () No ()
If Yes, recommend the date supported by the evidence submitted, go to 15
If No, recommend a Priority Date based on available evidence if possible. If some of the claimed water uses can be recommended with the Priority Date supported by the evidence, then do so, go to 14
14. Can any portion of the claim be recommended as a valid water right? Yes () No ()
If Yes, go to 15
If No, disallow with condition P01.
15. Is the basis of claim coded correctly? Yes (☒) No ()
If Yes, go to 16
If No, Enter the appropriate basis of claim. *license*
16. Is a Priority Date remark and/or condition required? Yes () No (☒)
If Yes, Enter the appropriate basis of claim. Priority Date review is complete
If No, Priority Date review is complete.

Point of Diversion and Source Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-7008A

Water Right Point of Diversion: T____, R____, Sec. _____, _____, _____, _____, County: _____

Source: _____ Tributary: _____

Claimed Point of Diversion: T____, R____, Sec. _____, _____, _____, _____, County: _____

Source: _____ Tributary: _____

Recommended Point of Diversion: T____, R____, Sec. _____, _____, _____, _____, County: _____

Source: _____ Tributary: _____

☒ Use Claimed POD and Source as Recommended POD and Source

Twp	Rge	Sec	Gov Lot	QQQ of QQ of Q	County	Source
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GPS Coordinates: _____						
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GPS Coordinates: _____						
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GPS Coordinates: _____						
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GPS Coordinates: _____						
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GPS Coordinates: _____						
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
GPS Coordinates: _____						

Other rights from this POD? none

Document how the POD and Source were verified and/or Pump and Motor data:

license

Transfers Changing POD noReviewer: CBDate: 10/9/03

Point of Diversion

Claim No. _____

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree or License?

If Yes, go to 4

If No, go to 2

Yes (☒) No (☐)

2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?

If Yes, go to 3

If No, go to 6

Yes (☐) No (☐)

3. Has the License been issued?

If Yes, go to 5

If No, recommend the POD as shown on the Permit. Go to 10

Yes (☐) No (☐)

4. Does the parent right have a POD?

If Yes, go to 5

If No, go to 6

Yes (☒) No (☐)

5. Can the claimed POD be verified using the water right file?

If Yes, recommend the POD as shown in the water right file. Go to 10

If No, go to 6

Yes (☒) No (☐)

6. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the POD?

If Yes, go to 7

If No, go to 9

Yes (☐) No (☐)

7. Can the change be verified as an accomplished transfer?

If Yes, add condition C03, go to 9

If No, Notify claimant that a transfer is necessary before the claimed POD can be recommended. Go to 8

Yes (☐) No (☐)

8. Was a transfer filed?

If Yes, recommend the POD as shown on the approved transfer. Go to 10

If No, go to 9

Yes (☐) No (☐)

9. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the POD?

If Yes, recommend the POD as it existed on 11-19-1987. Describe how the POD was verified. Go to 10

If No, collect the necessary information. Conduct field exam if necessary. Recommend the POD as it existed on 11-19-1987. Go to 10

Yes (☐) No (☐)

10. Is a POD remark and/or condition required?

If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. POD review is complete

If No, POD review is complete.

Yes (☐) No (☒)

Source

Claim No. _____

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree or License?

Yes (☒) No (☐)

If Yes, go to 4

If No, go to 2

2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, go to 3

If No, go to 6

3. Has the License been issued?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, go to 5

If No, recommend the Source as shown on the Permit. Go to 11

4. Does the parent right have a Source?

Yes (☒) No (☐)

If Yes, go to 5

If No, go to 7

5. Can the claimed Source be verified using the water right file?

Yes (☒) No (☐)

If Yes, recommend the Source as shown in the water right file. Go to 11

If No, go to 7

6. Is the basis of claim a Posted Notice?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, consult the attorney assigned to the basin. Go to 7

If No, go to 7

7. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the Source?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, go to 8

If No, go to 10

8. Can the change be verified as an accomplished transfer?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, add condition C02, go to 10

If No, Notify claimant that a transfer is necessary before the claimed Source can be recommended. Go to 9

9. Did the claimant file a transfer?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, recommend the Source as shown in the transfer. Go to 11

If No, go to 10

10. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the Source?

Yes (☐) No (☐)

If Yes, recommend the Source as it existed on 11-19-1987. Go to 11

If No, collect the necessary information. Recommend the Source as it existed on 11-19-1987. Go to 11

11. Is a Source remark and/or condition required?

Yes (☐) No (☒)

If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Source review is complete.

If No, Source review is complete.

Place Of Use Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-7008 A☐ Use Claimed POU as Recommended POU

Claimed Place of Use

Twp	Rge	Sec	QQ	Q	County	Lot Num	Acres	Purpose of Use

Total Acres _____

Recommended Place of Use

Twp	Rge	Sec	QQ	Q	County	Lot Num	Acres	Purpose of Use

Total Acres _____

Document how the POU was verified:

Not required, license

Transfers Changing POU noReviewer: CBDate: 2/12/04

Place of Use

Claim No.

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree or License?

If Yes, go to 2a

If No, go to 2b

Yes (☒) No (☐)

2a. Is a POU required?

If Yes, go to 5

If No, go to 14

Yes (☐) No (☒)

2b. Is a POU required?

If Yes, go to 3

If No, go to 14

Yes (☐) No (☐)

3. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?

If Yes, go to 4

If No, go to 7

Yes (☐) No (☐)

4. Has the License been issued?

If Yes, go to 6

If No, recommend the POU as shown on the Permit. Go to 14

Yes (☐) No (☐)

5. Does the parent right have a POU?

If Yes, go to 6

If No, go to 7

Yes (☐) No (☐)

6. Can the claimed POU be verified using the water right file?

If Yes, recommend the POU as shown in the water right file. Go to 14

If No, go to 7

Yes (☐) No (☐)

7. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the POU?

If Yes, go to 8

If No, go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

8. Can the change be verified as an accomplished transfer?

If Yes, add condition C05, go to 13

If No, go to 9

Yes (☐) No (☐)

9. Does the change include an enlargement of the POU?

If Yes, describe the evidence that supports that there has been an enlargement in the POU. Go to 10

If No, describe the evidence that supports the change occurred after 11-19-1987. Notify claimant that a transfer is necessary before the claimed POU can be recommended. Go to 12

Yes (☐) No (☐)

10. Was an enlargement claim filed?

If Yes, go to 13

If No, notify claimant that an enlargement claim is necessary. Go to 11

Yes (☐) No (☐)

11. Did the claimant file an enlargement claim?

If Yes, go to 13

If No, recommend the POU as it existed on of 11-19-1987. The size of the POU is limited to the size that existed on the date established as the priority date of this right. Go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

12. Was a transfer filed?

If Yes, recommend the POU as shown on the approved transfer. Go to 14

If No, recommend the POU as it existed on of 11-19-1987. The size of the POU is limited to the size that existed on the date established as the priority date of this right. Go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

13. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the POU?

If Yes, go to 14

If No, collect the necessary information. Conduct field exam if necessary. Go to 14

Yes (☐) No (☐)

14. Is a POU remark and/or condition required?

If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. POU review is complete.

If No, POU review is complete.

Yes (☐) No (☒)

Purpose of Use Data Entry Form

Claim Number: 27-7008A☒ Use Claimed Purpose of Use as Recommended Purpose of Use

Water Right Purpose of Use

Water Use	Number of Homes	Number of Stock	Acre Limit	Number of Other

Claimed Purpose of Use

Water Use	Number of Homes	Number of Stock	Acre Limit	Number of Other

Recommended Purpose of Use

Water Use	Number of Homes	Number of Stock	Acre Limit	Number of Other

Document how the Purpose of Use was verified:

License

Transfers Changing Purpose of Use noReviewer: CBDate: 2/12/04

Purpose of Use

Claim No. _____

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree or License?

If Yes, go to 4

If No, go to 2

Yes (☒) No (☐)

2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?

If Yes, go to 3

If No, go to 6

Yes (☐) No (☐)

3. Has the License been issued?

If Yes, go to 5

If No, recommend the Purpose(s) of Use as shown on the Permit. Go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

4. Does the parent right have a Purpose of Use?

If Yes, go to 5

If No, go to 6

Yes (☒) No (☐)

5. Can the claimed Purpose of Use be verified using the water right file?

If Yes, recommend the Purpose(s) of Use that is (are) claimed and shown in the water right file. Go to 13

If No, go to 6

Yes (☒) No (☐)

6. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the Purpose of Use?

If Yes, go to 7

If No, go to 11

Yes (☐) No (☐)

7. Can the change be verified as an accomplished transfer?

If Yes, add condition C04, go to 11

If No, go to 8

Yes (☐) No (☐)

8. Does the change include an enlargement of the Purpose of Use?

If Yes, describe the evidence that supports that there has been an enlargement in the Purpose of Use. Go to 9

If No, Describe the evidence that supports the change occurred after 11-19-1987. Notify claimant that a transfer is necessary before the claimed Purpose(s) of Use can be recommended. Go to 12

Yes (☐) No (☐)

9. Was an enlargement claim filed?

If Yes, go to 11

If No, Notify claimant that an enlargement claim is necessary. Go to 10

Yes (☐) No (☐)

10. Did the claimant file an enlargement claim?

If Yes, go to 11

If No, recommend only the Purpose(s) of Use that existed on the date established as the priority date of this right. Go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

11. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the Water Use?

If Yes, recommend the Purpose(s) of Use in existence on 11-19-1987. Go to 13

If No, collect the necessary information. Conduct field exam if necessary. Recommend the Purpose(s) of Use in existence on 11-19-1987. Go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

12. Did the claimant file a transfer?

If Yes, recommend the Purpose(s) of Use shown on the approved transfer. Go to 13

If No, recommend only the Purpose(s) of Use in existence on 11-19-1987. Go to 13

Yes (☐) No (☐)

13. Is a Purpose of Use remark and/or condition required?

If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Purpose of Use review is complete.

If No, purpose of Use review is complete.

Yes (☐) No (☒)

Period of Use and Quantity Data Entry Form

Claim Number: 27-7008A☐ Use Claimed Period of Use and Quantity as Recommended Period of Use and Quantity

Water Right Period of Use and Diversion Rate

Water Use	Start	End	Rate	Volume

Overall Diversion Rate _____

Overall Diversion Volume _____

Claimed Period of Use and Diversion Rate

Water Use	Start	End	Rate	Volume

Overall Diversion Rate _____

Overall Diversion Volume _____

Recommended Period of Use and Diversion Rate

Water Use	Start	End	Rate	Volume
Industrial	7/1	10/31	3.33	18.5

Overall Diversion Rate 3.33Overall Diversion Volume 18.5

Document how the Period of Use and/or Diversion Rate were verified:

License

Reviewer: CBDate: 2/12/04

Period of Use

Claim No. _____

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree or License?
If Yes, go to 4
If No, go to 2
Yes (☒) No (☐)
2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?
If Yes, go to 3
If No, go to 6
Yes (☐) No (☐)
3. Has the License been issued?
If Yes, go to 5
If No, recommend the Period of Use as shown on the Permit. Go to 18
Yes (☐) No (☐)
4. Does the parent right have a Period of Use?
If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 6
Yes (☒) No (☐)
5. Can the claimed Period of Use be verified using the water right file?
If Yes, go to 14
If No, go to 6
Yes (☒) No (☐)
6. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the Period of Use?
If Yes, go to 7
If No, go to 12
Yes (☐) No (☐)
7. Does the change include an enlargement in the Period of Use?
If Yes, go to 9
If No, go to 8
Yes (☐) No (☐)
8. Can the change be recommended as an accomplished transfer?
If Yes, add Condition C10. Describe the evidence that supports the change occurred after 11-19-1987. Go to 12
If No, notify claimant that a transfer is necessary. Go to 11
Yes (☐) No (☐)
9. Was an enlargement claim filed?
If Yes, go to 12
If No, notify claimant that an enlargement claim is necessary. Go to 10
Yes (☐) No (☐)
10. Did the claimant file an enlargement claim?
If Yes, go to 12
If No, recommend the Period of Use as it existed on 11-19-1987, subject to completing the review. Go to 12
Yes (☐) No (☐)
11. Was a transfer filed?
If Yes, go to 14
If No, recommend the Period of Use as it existed on 11-19-1987, subject to completing the review. Go to 12
Yes (☐) No (☐)
12. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the Period of Use?
If Yes, go to 13
If No, collect the necessary information. Conduct field exam if necessary. Go to 13
Yes (☐) No (☐)
13. Is the basis of claim a decree, license or a transferred beneficial use right that has had the Period of Use administratively determined?
If Yes, go to 14
If No, go to 15
Yes (☐) No (☐)
14. Is irrigation claimed as a purpose of use?
If Yes, go to 16
If No, recommend the Period of Use of the parent right. Go to 18
Yes (☐) No (☒)
15. Is irrigation claimed as a purpose of use?
If Yes, recommend the "standard" Period of Use for the location of the POU. Go to 18
If No, the Period of Use is usually recommended as claimed. Go to 18
Yes (☐) No (☐)
16. Is the Period of Use on the decree, license or transfer shorter on either the start date or end date than allowable under current IDWR standards?
If Yes, go to 17
If No, recommend the Period of Use of the parent right. Go to 18
Yes (☐) No (☐)
17. Was the Period of Use shortened by a Transfer to a "standard" Period of Use that is shorter than the current standard Period of Use?
If Yes, recommend the current standard Period of Use if the Period of Use of the parent right prior to the transfer was not established, equal to, or longer than the current standard. If the Period of Use of the parent right prior to the transfer was shorter than the current standard, recommend the Period of Use of the parent right and add the appropriate shoulder remark. Consult attorney assigned to the Basin if the Period of Use was an element transferred. Go to 18
If No, recommend the Period of Use of the parent right. Add appropriate shoulder remark. Go to 18
Yes (☐) No (☐)
18. Is a Period of Use remark and/or condition required?
If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Period of Use review is complete.
Yes (☐) No (☒)

Quantity

Claim No. _____

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree or License?

If Yes, go to 4
If No, go to 2

Yes (☒) No (☐)

2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?

If Yes, go to 3
If No, go to 6

Yes (☐) No (☐)

3. Has the License been issued?

If Yes, go to 5
If No, recommend the Quantity shown on the Permit. Go to 11

Yes (☐) No (☐)

4. Does the parent right have a diversion rate and/or volume?

If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 7

Yes (☒) No (☐)

5. Can the claimed diversion rate and/or volume be verified using the water right file?

If Yes, go to 8
If No, go to 7

Yes (☒) No (☐)

6. Is the basis of claim a posted notice?

If Yes, consult the attorney assigned to the Basin. Go to 7
If No, go to 7

Yes (☐) No (☐)

7. Is a flow measurement required?

If Yes, attach all related measurement documents. Describe the flow measurement that was made. Go to 9
If No, describe why a flow measurement is not required. Go to 9

Yes (☐) No (☐)

8. Does the parent right have an annual diversion volume limit?

If Yes, go to 10
If No, go to 9

Yes (☒) No (☐)

9. Is the source Ground Water and does the purpose of use require a diversion volume limit?

If Yes, go to 10
If No, go to 11

Yes (☐) No (☐)

10. Is irrigation a purpose of use?

If Yes, view the map of field irrigation requirements. Show the calculation of the annual diversion volume or describe how the annual diversion volume was determined. Go to 12
If No, recommend an annual diversion volume. Show the calculation of the annual diversion volume or describe how the annual diversion volume was determined. Go to 12

Yes (☐) No (☒)

11. Has a diversion volume limit for this water use been established by a decree, license or transfer?

If Yes, recommend an annual diversion volume. Show the calculation of the annual diversion volume or describe how the annual diversion volume was determined. Go to 12
If No, go to 12

Yes (☐) No (☐)

12. Is a Quantity remark and/or condition required?

If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Quantity review is complete.
If No, quantity review is complete.

Yes (☒) No (☒)

Summary

Claim No. _____

1. Is the basis of claim a Decree, License, Permit, Application or Posted Notice?

If Yes, go to 2
If No, go to 3

Yes (☒) No (☐)

2. Does any evidence indicate a five year period of continuous nonuse occurred that could result in recommending forfeiture or partial forfeiture?

If Yes, consult the attorney assigned to the Basin. Document the period of time the right or portion of the right was not used. Go to 4
If No, status will be set as Active. Go to 5

Yes (☐) No (☒)

3. Is the water being used for all of the purposes claimed and to the extent claimed?

If Yes, status will be set as Active. Go to 5
If No, consult the attorney assigned to the Basin. Recommend only the uses found and limit the elements of those uses to the extent of the beneficial use found. Go to 4

Yes (☐) No (☐)

4. Is any portion of the claim being recommended?

If Yes, status will be set as Active. Go to 5
If No, claim will be disallowed. Enter the appropriate condition code. Status will be set as Disallowed. Go to 5

Yes (☐) No (☐)

5. Is an additional remark and/or condition required?

If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Go to 6
If No, go to 6

Yes (☒) No (☐)

6. Would you like to view the recommended right?

If Yes, go to 7
If No, the review is incomplete. The recommendation must be viewed to complete the review.

Yes (☒) No (☐)

7. Is this a "split" or "combined" right?

If Yes, go to the Update Pedigree Process in Workflow when the review is complete. Do any necessary data entry. Go to 8
If No, go to 8

Yes (☒) No (☐)

8. Do you have documents you would like to attach or link to the file?

If Yes, go to PowerDOCS and profile the documents. Go to 9
If No, go to 9

Yes (☐) No (☒)

9. Would you like to set the verification date?

If Yes, the review is complete.
If No, the review is incomplete. The recommendation must be verified to complete the review.

Yes (☒) No (☐)

Summary Data Entry Form

Claim No.: _____

Remarks and Conditions (Include Type, Category and Code if applicable):

C18

E05 Qty R. 27-7000B 18.5 AF.

005 Gen Cond. Subject to control of the watermaster
of the Blackfoot River.

Split or Combined Right Analysis:

27-7008 A
B

Attached Field Notes or Other Documents:

Claim No.: 27-7008A

Reviewer

CB

Date

2/12/09