

INTER-DEPARTMENT MEMO

TO: Barbara

SUBJECT: POU

FROM: Cindy

DATE: 1-26-05

Please Cogo Ganski's deed to see if we can determine his irrigated POU.

There is a county map in the file that should help determine his property boundary.

() For your information

(X) Response required

CP
signature

Notes

1/24/05 If this turns out to be part of the Daniel Miller water (priority 4-1-1883) then Ganske needs to amend his claim to the earlier priority date.

Send Skip an email explaining the situation and he will take a look at it. CB.

2/1/05: This is Daniel Miller land with Miller water. Recommend 3" to Ganske from Miller water. CB. Recommend as noted on the paper ECVR.

Notes

7/13/04 LaVarelle & Deanna Sticklein came into the office and Linda McDaniels conveyed all 20" of Welch water to them. So, I requested proof from Ganske that he should have 3" of the water.

7/21/04 2 pieces from Seth Brown,
1 piece from Anna Hill which is the grand-daughter of Rite Hansen.
Robert will get the warranty deeds from Seth Brown and from Anna Hill.

He also wanted to know about Amending the claim & told him that we don't need to amend the claim.

Robert is going to get me copies of the warranty deeds for all three pieces.

7-23-04 Received 3 deeds. RT

1/26/05. This right is not James Welch water. This right ^{appears to} ~~should be~~ Daniel Miller water with a 4-1-1883 priority. The claimant originally filed on the 1880 priority under Fox and Whitten 27-23. Skip has the information to sort thru 27-23. I'm going to have him verify that this isn't Fox and Whitten before I recommend it under Daniel Miller. Because Linda McDaniels conveyed the 20" to LaVarelle, and Ganske's deed just conveys the water apparent to the property.

2/27/04 Cont. CB.

Notes

The property east of Roberts to the Blackfoot River is owned by Lavelle Stecklein. Robert Ganske owns 3.4 acres total

3/2/04 - Amend claim:

Correct Priority date, and Pou to 3 acres, change diversion rate for the 3 acres on O.O.B.C.S. - CB.

3-2-04 Sent Mr. Ganske amended claim to sign & notarize for

3-9-04 Received amended claim from claimant. DB

3/15/04 On 3/8/04 I met with Murlin Yancy in I.F. documentation he gave me indicates that this right might be part of an expansion of the Welch Water.

4/22/04 Part of Lavelle Stecklein 27-37B right. according to Murlin Yancy it fits into part of the Matilda Mergers right for 20" of Welch Water.

4/22/04 Ready for LCVB & layout CB

7-7-04 Letter to claimant re POD correction. BT response 7-21-04 CB

7/13/04 Sent claimants a letter requesting a copy of their warranty deed and any deeds back to Seth Brown that conveyed the Welch water to them. 7-27-04 deadline

Notes

2/26/04. After reviewing Mr. Hanske's fax, I have some additional questions.

1. What is the road west of Mr. Hanske's property that runs North & South also, where it turns and goes due east is it the same road or different? River ton Rd. 1 mi S. of home is lower River ton Rd.

2. It refers to 20 inches of Blackfoot water? Are there any other documents discussing water decree number? Priority date? Mar. 20 1886 27-37 CB

3. Do you have shares in Blackfoot irrigation Co? NO 2/27/04 CB

2/26/04 9 AM left a message for Robert to call me.

2/27/04 Robert Hanske called me to discuss the question. Robert doesn't have any Blackfoot irrigation Co. water. He has 3" of water from the Central Ditch. The documentation has the priority date for the Welch water.

Seth Brown is Stan McDaniel's grandfather. Brett McDaniel is Stan's son, great grandson of Seth Brown.

Seth purchased 40 acre. Part is what is owned by Larrick Stuckless.

INTER-DEPARTMENT MEMO

27-10550

TO: Barbara/Pauline
FROM: Cindy

SUBJECT: Delivery of water
DATE: 2/18/04

Please look through the watermaster reports
from 1975 to 1988 for delivery of Blackfoot
water to Seth Brown & Robert Hanske.
Please note the years that water was
delivered.

() For your information

X ~~Recessed~~

CB
signature

Notes

2/5/04 Please contact Benjamin Co, &
try to use our spatial info to determine
which Sacus Mr. Ganske owns.
If you can't please write Mr/Mrs. Ganske
to request a plat with their property
outlined CB

* Remove Central Ditch as a source,
tributary to Blackfoot. CB

2-12-04 Letter to Claimant re POU. BOP

2/18/04 Seth Brown - original owner - per
Robert Ganske. When he purchased the
property he was told it was irrigated.
He said that Merlin Gancey submitted
documentation to support the claim.
I explained the only documentation
that I know of is for the creek water.
Robert is going to check with Merlin on
this claim. He's also supposed to send
me a copy of his warranty deed, and a
plat map with his property outlined.
I told Mr. Ganske that we would look
through the 1975-1988 water master reports
for delivery of this water to Seth Brown
or Robert Ganske.

INTER-DEPARTMENT MEMO

TO: Pauline

SUBJECT: Evidence of priority

FROM: Cindy

DATE: 7-17-03 4:51pm

Evidence of priority requested on 5-7-03,
with a June 26, response date. No evidence
Please refer to Candice.

You might check with the County Assessors office
to determine what price he owns.

7-18-03 called this afternoon left message.
on Robert Ganske's answering machine.

() For your information

☒ Response required

Cindy E Bird
signature

Notes

I emailed Candice on Monday, 7-21-03 asking her to send a letter to Mr. Ganske.

8-11-03 Robert Ganske phoned this morning. He said he was returning my call that I left on his answering machine. I asked him if I could return his call after I looked up his file. He said he was at work and that he would call me back later.

8-13-03, Robert Ganske phoned this morning. I explained how he needed evidence to support the 1880 irrigation date and if he couldn't show evidence to support that date, we would have to change the date to the earliest he could provide evidence. He said O.K., he would see what he could do.

11-14-03 Left message on machine. BP

12-5-03 Robert Ganske called. He is going to the Court house to search for records. BP

Priority Date Data Entry Form

Claim Number: AZ-7-10550

Water Right Priority Date: _____ Water Right Basis: _____

Claimed Priority Date: _____ Claimed Basis: _____

Recommended Priority Date: Mar 20, 1886 Recommended Basis: Decree☒ 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:

Decree

Reviewer: _____

CB

Date: _____

2/5/04

Priority Date Data Entry Form

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 (X)
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 (X) No ()
If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 7
5. Does the decree or license have a Priority Date? Yes (X) 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 (X) 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 (X) No ()
If Yes, go to 16
If No, Enter the appropriate basis of claim. *decree*
16. Is a Priority Date remark and/or condition required? Yes () No (X)
If Yes, Enter the appropriate basis of claim. Priority Date review is complete
If No, Priority Date review is complete.

Priority Date

Point of Diversion

Claim No. 127 - 16550

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 ☒

* Remove Central Ditch as a source
Trib to Blackfoot -

Point of Diversion

Source

Claim No. 27 - 10550

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 Source as shown on the Permit. Go to 11
Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Does the parent right have a Source?
If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 7
Yes ☒ No ☐
5. Can the claimed Source be verified using the water right file?
If Yes, recommend the Source as shown in the water right file. Go to 11
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 there evidence that there has been a change in the Source?
If Yes, go to 8
If No, go to 10
Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Can the change be verified as an accomplished transfer?
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
Yes ☐ No ☐
9. Did the claimant file a transfer?
If Yes, recommend the Source as shown in the transfer. Go to 11
If No, go to 10
Yes ☐ No ☐
10. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the Source?
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
Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Is a Source remark and/or condition required?
If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Source review is complete.
If No, Source review is complete.
Yes ☐ No ☒

Source

Purpose of Use Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-10550☒ 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:

None

Transfers Changing Purpose of Use _____

Reviewer: CBDate: 2/5/02

Purpose of Use Data Entry Form

Purpose of Use

Claim No. 27-10550

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 ☒

Purpose of Use

Place Of Use Data Entry Form

Claim Number: 27-10550☐ 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
3S	34E	13	NESE		Bingham		1.5	Irrigation

Total Acres 1.5

Document how the POU was verified:

Bingham Co. Assessors
1988 Napp photography.

Transfers Changing POU NOReviewer: CB

Date:

2/1/05

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 (☒)

Place of Use

Claim No. 27-10550

Period of Use and Quantity Data Entry Form

Claim Number: 27-10550☐ 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
Irrigation	4/1	10/31	~~2.00~~ 0.06 ^{3"}	

Overall Diversion Rate ~~2.00~~ 0.06

Overall Diversion Volume _____

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

decree
warranty deeds
central ditch shares

Reviewer: CBDate: 2/1/05

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 Period of Use as shown on the Permit. Go to 18
4. Does the parent right have a Period of Use? Yes ☐ No ☒
If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 6
5. Can the claimed Period of Use be verified using the water right file? Yes ☐ No ☐
If Yes, go to 14
If No, go to 6
6. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the Period of Use? Yes ☐ No ☒
If Yes, go to 7
If No, go to 12
7. Does the change include an enlargement in the Period of Use? Yes ☐ No ☐
If Yes, go to 9
If No, go to 8
8. Can the change be recommended as an accomplished transfer? Yes ☐ No ☐
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
9. Was an enlargement claim filed? Yes ☐ No ☐
If Yes, go to 12
If No, notify claimant that an enlargement claim is necessary. Go to 10
10. Did the claimant file an enlargement claim? Yes ☐ No ☐
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
11. Was a transfer filed? Yes ☐ No ☐
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
12. Does the file contain all of the necessary information to verify the Period of Use? Yes ☒ No ☐
If Yes, go to 13
If No, collect the necessary information. Conduct field exam if necessary. Go to 13
13. Is the basis of claim a decree, license or a transferred beneficial use right that has had the Period of Use administratively determined? Yes ☐ No ☒
If Yes, go to 14
If No, go to 15
14. Is irrigation claimed as a purpose of use? Yes ☒ No ☐
If Yes, go to 16
If No, recommend the Period of Use of the parent right. Go to 18
15. Is irrigation claimed as a purpose of use? Yes ☐ No ☐
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
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? Yes ☐ No ☒
If Yes, go to 17
If No, recommend the Period of Use of the parent right. Go to 18
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? Yes ☐ No ☐
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
18. Is a Period of Use remark and/or condition required? Yes ☐ No ☒
If Yes, enter the appropriate remark and/or condition. Period of Use review is complete.

Period of Use

Quantity

Claim No. 27 - 10550

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 (☒)

Quantity

Summary

Claim No. 27-10550

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

Summary Data Entry Form

Claim No.: _____

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

C18

F01

Exp remark

Central ditch

P21

Exp Rem

27-37

Split or Combined Right Analysis:

See attached

Attached Field Notes or Other Documents:

Claim No.:

27-10550

Reviewer

CB

Date

2/5/04

Basin No.	Sequence Number	Split Suffix	Name	Basis of a Claim	yyyy-mm-dd Priority Date	Remarks	Usage	Other Water Rights Used	Stevens Decree	Total CFS	Recommended diversion (inches)
27	37	L	Anderson, Donald	Decreed	1886-03-20	Welch Irrigation Co. T.52	irrigation	27-2125	s	1.08	54.00
27	37	C	Bean, Audrey H.	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation	27-4F	s	0.97	48.50
27	37	P	Bergeman, E. V.		1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.28	14.00
27	12017		Clements, Casey A.	Decreed	1886-03-20	Parent is 27-12067	irrigation		s	0.38	19.00
27	11997		Coffman, Harvey	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.10	5.00
27	10550		Ganske, Robert L.	Decreed	1886-03-20	Claim based on Miner's shares & F&W 27-23B. AMENDED	irrigation		s	0.06	3.00
27	10844		Gay, Walter A.	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.17	8.67
27	37	M	Hamilton, Wesley	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation	27-4G	s	1.30	65.00
27	12015		Hansen, Helen	Decreed	1886-03-20	Parent is 27-12067	irrigation		s	0.03	1.50
27	37	F	Hill, Stanley	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.12	6.00
27	12016		Hospkins, Robert	Decreed	1886-03-20	Parent is 27-12067	irrigation		s	0.03	1.50
			LDS Church	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s		0.00
27	10358		Leiseth, Jason	Decreed	1886-03-20	probably 27 T#52. Welch Irrigation	irrigation		s	0.00	0.00
27	37	A	McDaniel, Brett	Decreed	1886-03-20	Parent right 27-11120	irrigation		s	1.76	88.00
27	11994		Nation, Howard S.	Decreed	1886-03-20	Parent is 27-12067	irrigation		s	0.015	0.75
27	12014		Novosad, Joyce	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.16	8.00
27	11995		Romrell, Don	Decreed	1886-03-20	Parent Right 27-11120	irrigation		s	0.015	0.75
27	37	E	Rowbury, Rex C.	Decreed	1886-03-20	T#52	irrigation		s	0.12	6.00
27	37	B	Stecklein, LaVerelle	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.00	0.00
								27-27B, 7065, 2126, 10552, 10555, 26B			
27	37	G	Stecklein, LaVerelle	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.69	34.33
27	37	J	Winter, Norman	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.10	5.00
27	37	H	Worthington, Dallen	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.04	2.00
27	37	K	Wright, Franklin D.	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation	27-27C, 23F	s	0.04	2.00
27	37	N	Yancey, Merlin	Decreed	1886-03-20		irrigation		s	0.50	25.00
								TOTALS		7.96	398.00

Tax Lot: Phyllis Wright
38 acres

Exception E

Tax Lot: Ganske

Tax Lot: Ganske

Tax Lot: Ganske

Tax Lot Owner: Rounds

Exception B

Exception C

Exception D

Tax Lot: Paul McDaniel

Tax Lot: Laverelle Stecklein
35.12 acres

SWSE


NESE

13



27-37B (27-12051)

1545E4
13-35-34



THIS SKETCH IS MADE SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF
ASSISTING IN LOCATING THE PREMISES AND THE
COMPANY ASSUMES NO LIABILITY FOR VARIATIONS
IF ANY, WITH AN ACTUAL SURVEY.
FIRST AMERICAN TITLE COMPANY

SCHEDULE "A"

420838

*don't know
what does this
belong to*

Township 3 South, Range 34 E.B.M., Bingham County, Idaho

Section 13: NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, EXCEPTING THEREFROM the W. 25 feet for
County Road

A
AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Beginning at a point 950.5 feet N. of the SW corner of said NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 13; thence E. 172 feet; thence N. to the E. line of the Riverton Ditch; thence in a Northeasterly direction along the E. line of said ditch to a point that is E. 248 feet and S. 34 feet from the NW corner of said NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$; thence N. 34 feet; thence W. 248 feet to the NW corner of said NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$; thence S. 369.5 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

B
AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Starting at a point 781 feet N. of the SW corner of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 13, and running thence E. 169.5 feet; thence N. 169.5 feet; thence W. 169.5 feet; thence S. 169.5 feet to the point of beginning.

C
AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Beginning at the SW corner of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 13; thence N. along the W. line of said NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 694.5 feet to the point of beginning; thence N. along the W. line of said NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 86.5 feet; thence E. 169.5 feet; thence S. 86.5 feet; thence W. 169.5 feet to the point of beginning.

D
AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Beginning at the SW corner of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 13; thence N. along the W. line of said NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 558.5 feet to the point of beginning, thence N. along the W. line of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ 136 feet; thence E. 169.5 feet; thence S. 136 feet; thence W. 169.5 feet to the point of beginning.

E
AND FURTHER EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Beginning at a point on the E. line of a county road that is S. 89°02'00" W. along the Section line 1320.20 feet and N. 00°16'40" E. along the center line of a county road 1343.21 feet and S. 88°26'20" E. 24.00 feet from the SE corner of said Section 13; thence S. 88°26'20" E. along a fence line 290.40 feet; thence N. 00°16'40" E. 150.00 feet; thence N. 88°26'20" W. 290.40 feet; thence S. 00°16'40" W. along said road right-of-way 150.00 feet to the point of beginning.

TOGETHER WITH 20 inches of Welsch Water and Ditch rights.

L. H. M

*20 inches
Blackfoot ditch*

Bird, Cindy

From: Bird, Cindy
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2005 10:09 AM
To: Harold Jones (E-mail)
Subject: Fox and Whitten 27-23 analysis

hi Skip,

Robert Ganske originally filed and adjudication claim under 27-10550 with a priority date of March 25, 1880. This would indicate that the water should fall under the Fox and Whitten water. When Mr. Ganske was asked to provide us with evidence to support the claim it appeared from the evidence that the water was James Welch water with a priority date of March 20, 1886. After a more extensive review of the James Welch water it was determined that it was not James Welch water but possible Daniel Miller water 27-26. But before we amend the claim again to the April 1, 1883 priority date of Daniel Miller I would like to be sure that it wasn't actually Fox and Whitten 1880 water. The place of use claimed under is right is in the NESE of section 13, T3S, R34E. This land was owned by Daniel Miller but there appears to be some Fox and Whitten water that may have been moved onto some of the land originally owned by Daniel Miller. Daniel Miller had more land then he had water decreed to him. Although the Fox and Whitten water appears to be in the SWNE of section 13, 24 and 23 in T3S, R34E which is owned by Gary Wright.

Thanks,
Cindy

Notes

2/19/04 Called Candice about adding Robert Ganske to the list of Welch water. Candice said last Friday^(2/16) her and Susan had a meeting and Susan feels that we can't defend this as mining water because the department approved a transfer in the 1920's or 30's acknowledging this as irrigation.

Candice spoke with Ernie about this and thought he would of said something to me by now.

This doesn't however change the fact that the basis was claimed as beneficial use; remark refers to Fox and Whitten water 27-230?

Mr. Ganske is supposed to talk with Merlin Yancey and get back to me. CB

2/23/04. Robert Ganske will fax the information that I need - CB.

2/25/04 received fax CB

18 February 2004

Memo to File

Claim 27-10550

I searched the Water Mater's Reports for 1975-1988.

1975-1977

Seth Brown was listed as Secretary of the Central Ditch. Decreed Inches were 643.

1978-1988

Stan McDaniels was listed as Secretary of Central Ditch. Listed rights were

27-04

27-25

27- 27

27-37

Blackfoot Irrigation

No specific amount of water was found.

I did not find any mention of Robert Ganske.

Barbara

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the name 'Barbara' written in a stylized, cursive script.

Remarks	Y N/A Layout	Other Water Rights Used	Conservation #	Conservation #	Total CFS	Claimed Diversion (Inches)	Recommended diversion (inches)	Difference in inches	
in Co.		27-2125		37	0.64	32.00	30.00	(2.00)	
		27-4F		37	1.17	58.50	58.50	0.00	
				37	0.28	14.00	14.00	0.00	
				37	0.60	30.00	30.00	0.00	
				37	0.10	5.00	5.00	0.00	
based on er's & F&W L DED				37	0.06	3.00	3.00	0.00	
				37	0.43	21.65	4.50	(17.15)	
		27-4G		37	2.10	105.00	62.00	(43.00)	
				37	0.26	13.00	6.00	(7.00)	
				37		0.00	2.00	NOT CLAIMED IN SRBA	
July 27				37	0.06	3.00	0.00	(3.00)	
Welch on				37	1.76	88.00	88.00	0.00	
Right 27				37	0.03	1.50	0.75	(0.75)	
Right 120	Y			37	0.03	1.50	0.75	(0.75)	
				37	0.60	30.00	30.00	0.00	
				37	0.40	20.00	17.00	(3.00)	
		27-27B, 7065, 2126, 10552, 10555, 26B		37	0.80	40.00	21.50	(18.50)	
				37	0.05	2.50	0.00	(2.50)	
				37	0.04	2.00	2.00	0.00	
		27-27C, 23F		37	0.10	5.00	0.00	(5.00)	
				37	0.50	25.00	25.00	0.00	
		TOTALS			10.01	500.65	400.00	(102.65)	

Claim Summary Worksheet

Claim No. 27 - 10550

Completion of claim is dependent on processing the following documents and/or actions.	Requested	Response date	Received	Completed	Notes
OWNERSHIP					
Ownership Change Form					
Warranty Deed					
Map(s)					
Is this a split? Y N					
AMENDMENT					
Notarized amended claim	3-2-04	3-12-04	3-9-04		
Correction in POD/Source					
Correction in POU	3-2-04	3-12-04	3-9-04		
Change in Priority Date	3-2-04	3-12-04	3-9-04		
Change in Diversion Rate					
ENLARGEMENT					
1. Advised claimant need to file enlargement claim					
2. Receive enlargement claim					
3. Eastern registration process					
4. Notarized claim					Enlargement Claim # -
SPLIT CLAIM	Obtain information from Eastern				Parent Right # - : CFS
Ownership					Children # - : CFS
					Children # - : CFS
					Children # - : CFS
					Children Total: CFS

Children total must agree with parent right.