

MEMORANDUM

TO: File

FROM: Monica Van Bussum

DATE: May 2, 2007

RE: Objection to 67-198 recommendation

There are two elements to the objection, place of use (POU) and contact information. This memo serves as a record of my understanding of the basis for those objections.

Contact information

Claimant wants information changed from "Cuddy Meadows Ranch" to "Cuddy Meadows Ranch LLP." The deed they submitted in 1996 shows the property was conveyed to "Cuddy Meadows Ranch LLP." A claim report printed by IDWR in 2000 shows the name as "Cuddy Meadows Ranch LLP." I do not know when the LLP was dropped but it does appear the claimant should be known as "Cuddy Meadows Ranch LLP."

Place of use

67-198 and 67-199 were claimed as a permissible place of use (PPU). They were decreed to the same QQs in Muir v. Allison. The property description is as follows:

67-198 decreed POU	67-198 recommended POU	
T16N R04W SEC 22 ALL SW	T16N R04W SEC 22 NWSW	25 ac
SENE	NESW	3.8 ac
NWSE	TOTAL:	28.8 AC
S1/2SWNE		
67-199 decreed POU	67-199 recommended	
SAME AS 67-198	T16N R04W SEC 22 NWSW	25 AC
	NESW	17 AC
	TOTAL:	42 AC

It appears this PPU should have been recommended for the entire claimed POU in the decreed QQs and with a condition limiting irrigation to the decreed amount of (in the case of 67-198, 28.8 ac) acres within the total recommended place of use. This recommendation would then have a further combined use limit of 42 acres for 67-198 in conjunction with 67-199.