

Notes

28 June, 2005 Ernie redid the shape for 27-7006 to include the piece in the NE NW of sec. 18.

Claim 27-11192 is being recommended by Ernie for domestic and 0.3 cc. of irrigation in the NW NW only.

The Wesserts' will need to file a transfer after A.S. to transfer a portion of 27-7006 to their new well in the NW NW.

According to Bingham Co. Assessors Office the home was built in 1910. Parcel no. RPO370402.

Ernie will send me a new layout and PDR to send with a letter to the Wesserts.

6-30-05 Sent letter to claimant B

7-5-05 Claimant asked for a question: Can he use 3 cc under this right + the rest of the water to be irrigated by the water right, well. Why? Since the well is 500' + pumping out of the same aquifer. I told him that is the subject. B.P.

Notes

6/24/05 Ernie & I talked about this right overlapping with 27-7006. The 0.9 acre piece owned by the Wisserts is covered under 27-7006. (NFA 11-18) The piece in the NW 1/4 isn't covered under the license and then I noticed the date (priority date) is after the March 25, 1963 mandatory permit statute. No irrigation can be recommended under this right only domestic, which would include up to 1/2 acre of irrigation.

This claim should reflect the domestic use in the NW 1/4 section 18. The domestic right need a different priority date than 1964? I'm not sure when the house was built. The irrigation well in the NW 1/4 of section 18 was drilled under license 27-7006 in 1969 not 1964 as claimed under this SRBA claim. The 0.9 acres owned by Wisserts will be recommended under 27-7006 and they will have to file a post A.J. Transfer to change record the POD in the NW 1/4.



WISSERT, WILLIAM I/WINONA M

HURST, H

REMER, SHANE C/SHELLE O

Bird, Cindy

From: Bird, Cindy
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2005 4:23 PM
To: Carlsen, Ernie
Subject: 27-11192

hi Ernie,

Last night Bill and Winona Wissert came to the public meeting in Blackfoot on the above listed claim. We got into the question of this being the correct POU and POD but couldn't check it last night because both Zack and I forgot the Bingham tax lot layer. During our discussion he said that the well is actually located east of his property and they drilled a new well about 3 years ago and installed a sprinkler system so they wouldn't have to deal with the other people. He claimed a priority date of 1964 and the license has a priority date of 1969. He claims he living in the original home.

As I got researching it today I find that 27-7006 issued a license to irrigate 46 acres in the NENW & NWNW of section 18, T3S, R35E. This is the same QQ's that his 2 acres are located in but I can't tell from the copies of the examiners report if the Wissert property is included under the license. The Bingham tax lot information shows Kelly Hurst as the owner of a 0.9 acre piece in the NENW. Mr. Wissert faxed me a copy of his warranty deed today and according to his (1977) deed he owns both pieces. Bingham tax lot information does list the Wissert's on the piece in the NWNW. I realize the tax lot information is only a snap shot in time.

First of all I told the Wisserts that they can't just hire a well driller and drill a new well for irrigation without a water right. I explained to them the only thing they can use that well for at this point is domestic and the irrigation of up to 1/2 acres until they file a transfer to move the irrigation to the well.

But my concerns are that this right should actually be a part of 27-7006 but I can't tell from my copy of the map. According to Mr. Wissert they use the subdivisions well under the license. If it wasn't included in the license has he been illegally using the subdivision well and then ultimately drilled an illegal irrigation well. Can you look and see if you can tell if his piece was included in the licensing exam?

Thanks,
Cindy


Notes

6/8/05 Received a faxed copy of the Wissert's warranty deed.

This poi appears to overlay the Toywood subdivision right 27-7006. The well (original) is the subdivisions well. Mr. Wissert about 20-3 years ago drilled another well and put in an irrigation system on his place. That well is what we show on our layout. Which is not the original well.

This claim may need to be disallowed or recommended as a part of 27-7006. I need to do more research on this or discuss it with Cardie.

The licensing exam isn't real clear on the POH. I can't tell from the map if Wissert's place is in/out of the subdivisions POH. CB.
- Need to remove the domestic from this W/R.



Notes

1-12-04 Shows a total of 1.7 acres. The acres per QQ is different than 1964. Add the C05 Condition to recommendation. If I reduce the irrigated acres by the 1/2 acre under the domestic, he needs irrigation of 1.2 acres.

No evidence to verify the 1910 priority date. There is a wage affidavit from Zane Caldwell about the irrigation in 1960.

The 1964 imagery shows irrigation so am going to use that date.

- division rate: .04 for domestic & .02 for irrigation or .06 total. Intrepid came up with .5 cts, but they assumed everything. So, am going to use the calc. as the recommended. CB

3/3/04 recommended shape 27-11152 - pour slp in the g drive in the recommended shape

6/7/05 785-6445 Bell work
check legal.

about 3 years ago they drilled another well and added a sprinkler system. I explained to them that they are illegally irrigating.

Notes

12-24-03 Received aerial photo + Drawing w/area marked, BP

12-24-03 Received claim from Mr. Wissert DS

1-9-04 Received Mr. Wissert's file for review with amend claim returned. Dave Carlson amended the claim and did not clarify that on the "Notice of claim".

The 1964 imagery does not support Mr. Wissert's claim for 2 acres.

The 1974 Orthoquad Z-39; Morland, ID

appears to have the same irrigated shape as the 1964 imagery. It

appears that there is some building or parking area within the 2 acres.

I'm going to send the letter to Mr. Wissert

about filing a pre-1987 claim or an

enlargement claim for the additional acreage.

1-12-04 256.92' x 339' = 1.199 acres

1.70 acres are irrigated in 1974

NAPP photography. Minor changes

under the claim are 1.7-0.5 = 1.2 acres.

0.22 acres irrigated in the 1964

imagery = 0.98 acres not to be

either in enlargement claim or

pre-1987 pre-1987 claim.

1-12-04 I created a shape G:\bnp\27\shape\27-1-12-04.shp

The 1964 imagery shows 1.7 acres

that appears to be irrigated. The 1987 NAPP

Notes

- 10-27-03 Bill Wissert called. Dan's warrant evidence is acceptable. I briefly explained the purpose of SRBA & sent him a copy of the appropriate "Evidence of this case." The survey is at Carson Creek. 12/1/03
- 12-2-03 Sent disclaimer to Dan. 12/2/03
- 12-9-03 Received application from Z. Carson. 12/11/03
- 12/11/03 Use the deed of trust located in the back of this file to locate the POA. Then see if we have some 1963 imagery to verify the affidavit.
- 12-16 Letter to Dan re Bingham Co. 12/23/03
- 12/23/03 William Wissert called about the letter I sent, he went to I.F. and spoke with Dave Carlson, and was told the warranty deed looks correct. So, what did I want? I explained if he could get me a copy of the plat map from Bingham Co. it might clarify the legal description. If the land is also in the name. Then we need to amend the claim. The 1964 photo only shows 1/4 ac. as irrigated. So he would need to file a pre-1987 application of permit.
- He will go to Bingham Co and get a copy of his plat to send to me.

Notes

5-19-03 27-11192 Wissert
Dr. made note in the file that this is
"Probably A Part of 27-7006" 3/95
When I checked the database 27-7006
is claimed entirely by Steven Mellington
for irrigation of 22 acres NE NW Section 18,
T03S, R35E, and 24 acres in the NW NW
of the same section. Priority dates are different.

I don't think it's part of this license.
Requesting evidence from claimants
to support a 1/1/1910 priority date
Irrigation Jan 1-1910? I think it
should be moved to the irrigation
SOU (5-1-1910)

Purpose should include Domestic.

10-14-03 Requested L.G. to send letter to claimants, etc.

10-22-03 Copy of ltr for NW NW Section 18, etc.

10-23-03 Bill Wissert called to find out
"what crop I wanted". They purchased the prop
in 1976 - with 1000 acres. When I explained
that we needed evidence to support the
1910 priority date he remarked "what date
do you want?" I explained that it was
the date I wanted but when these two acres were
irrigated from the well, I was up explaining
the date to Mr. Wissert.

[illegible]

Date: 1/9/04

Priority Date Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-11192

Water Right Priority Date: _____ Water Right Basis: _____

Claimed Priority Date: _____ Claimed Basis: _____

Recommended Priority Date: 4/1/1964 Recommended Basis: B2☐ 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:

affidavit from Zane Caldwell1964 ImageryReviewer: CBDate: 1/9/04

Priority Date

Claim No. 27-1114

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. *B. U.*
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 FormClaim Number: A27-11192

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

(Amended Claim)

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:

1987 Napp photography, plat map from
Bingham CO.

Transfers Changing POD _____

Reviewer: CBDate: 1/9/04

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 (X)
2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?
If Yes, go to 3
If No, go to 6
Yes () No (X)
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 (X)
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 (X) 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 (X)

Source

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 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 (☒)

Purpose of Use Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-11192☐ 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
Domestic	1			
Irrigation			1.25	
			0.25	

Document how the Purpose of Use was verified:

1964 Aerial photo, 1981 map

Transfers Changing Purpose of Use NoReviewer: CBDate: 1/9/04

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 ☒

Place Of Use Data Entry Form

Claim Number: A27-11192 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	3SE	18	NENW		Bingham		0.5 ^{CB} ~~0.25~~	Irrigation
			NW	NW	"	1		Domestic
			NW	NW	"	1	0.3	Irrigation

Total Acres ~~0.5~~
1.2

Document how the POU was verified:

1964 imagery, 1987/88 NAPP photography,
plat map from Bingham Co

1.7 total acres - 0.5 (Domestic) = 1.2 additionally
irrigated.

Transfers Changing POU Reviewer: CBDate: 4/9/04

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
- 2a. Is a POU required?
If Yes, go to 5
If No, go to 14
- 2b. Is a POU required?
If Yes, go to 3
If No, go to 14
3. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?
If Yes, go to 4
If No, go to 7
4. Has the License been issued?
If Yes, go to 6
If No, recommend the POU as shown on the Permit. Go to 14
5. Does the parent right have a POU?
If Yes, go to 6
If No, go to 7
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
7. Is there evidence that there has been a change in the POU?
If Yes, go to 8
If No, go to 13
8. Can the change be verified as an accomplished transfer?
If Yes, add condition C05, go to 13
If No, go to 9
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
10. Was an enlargement claim filed?
If Yes, go to 13
If No, notify claimant that an enlargement claim is necessary. Go to 11
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
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
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
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 (X)

Yes () No ()

Yes (X) No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes (X) No ()

Yes (X) No ()

Yes (X) No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes () No ()

Yes (X) No ()

Yes () No (X)

Period of Use and Quantity Data Entry Form

 Claim Number: A27-11192
☐ 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

 Overall Diversion Rate 0.06 Overall Diversion Volume _____

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

Standard SOU

 Reviewer: CB

 Date: 1/12/04

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 (X)
2. Is the basis of claim a Permit or Application?
If Yes, go to 3
If No, go to 6
Yes () No (X)
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 (X)
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 (X) 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 (X) 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.
If No, Period of Use review is complete.
Yes () No (X)

Summary Data Entry Form

Claim No.: _____

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

C18

C05

Split or Combined Right Analysis:

None

Attached Field Notes or Other Documents:

Claim No.: 27-11192

Reviewer

CB

Date

1/12/04

INTER-DEPARTMENT MEMO

TO: Barbara

SUBJECT: Layout

FROM: Cindy

DATE: 1-12-04

Barbara, Please use the shape 27-11192-pro Shp
and create a layout for this claim.

Then it should be ready for the CVR.

gi/basin 27/shapes.

() For your information

CB
signature