

Moore, Kristin

From: Carlsen, Ernie
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 11:36 AM
To: Ruberry, Allen; Moore, Kristin
Subject: FW: Irrigation or Municipal for 22-13130 and 22-13131?

Allen and Kristin,
For claims 22-13130 and 22-13131 follow the results of the email discussion cited below.
Ernie

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

From: McHugh, Candice
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 11:27 AM
To: Carlsen, Ernie
Subject: RE: Irrigation or Municipal for 22-13130 and 22-13131?

Yes. That was my thought actually. Then, they can object and then prove that any additional capacity was developed in anticipation of future need and we can go from there.

Candice

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

From: Carlsen, Ernie
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 11:26 AM
To: McHugh, Candice
Subject: RE: Irrigation or Municipal for 22-13130 and 22-13131?

Candice,

Carter's reply indicates the munipicle use for Pocatello's golf course was limited to the irrigation season with a volume limit based on the number of acres irrigated. For consistency should we follow those recommendations? I suspect these wells are not connected to the munipicle system and have always been used to irrigate the parks.
Ernie

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

From: Fritschle, Carter
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2005 8:56 PM
To: McHugh, Candice; Carlsen, Ernie
Cc: Moore, Kristin; Ruberry, Allen
Subject: RE: Irrigation or Municipal for 22-13130 and 22-13131?

The City of Pocatello has the right (29-2382) for the well that irrigates the Highland Golf Course, that was originally developed as a "private" irrigation right. Through the accomplished transfer statute, the city now has a municipal right with the irrigation season as the period of use and a diversion volume that is the "standard" volume per acre for the area times the number of irrigated acres in the golf course. It became a municipal right but retained an irrigation season period of use with a diversion volume based on the number of acres irrigated. The original license did not have a period of use or diversion volume.

Carter

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

Put in a remark
↓
POU = 62 ac
Municipal
Q = 1.24 cfs 219.48 AF
SON = 4/01 - 10/31

From: McHugh, Candice
To: Carlsen, Ernie
Cc: Moore, Kristin; Ruberry, Allen; Fritschle, Carter
Sent: 10/17/2005 2:33 PM
Subject: RE: Irrigation or Municipal for 22-13130 and 22-13131?

Good questions! Is this potable water? I'm assuming that with fairly little effort they could hook these systems up to their municipal systems? I think it is best characterized this as municipal use since the statute specifically includes watering of "parks" and "open space." 42-202B(6). But, I'm emailing Carter to see what we did with Pocatello's golf course, just for consistency. And, I think it would be year-round use . . . with no volume.

Carter, thoughts?

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

>From: Carlsen, Ernie
>Sent: Monday, October 10, 2005 11:47 AM
>To: McHugh, Candice
>Cc: Moore, Kristin; Ruberry, Allen
>Subject: Irrigation or Municipal for 22-13130 and 22-13131?

>

>Candice, Included in the many municipal claims filed by the City of
>Rexburg are two beneficial use claims 22-13130 and 22-13131. The place
>of use for both claims is in the city limits. However, the well for
>each claim is not connected to the municipal system and have always
>been used for irrigation of Smith Park and the municipal golf course,
>respectively. Though the claimed nature of use is municipal should we
>recommend irrigation and list the number of irrigated acres with the
>appropriate volume limit? Do we recommend a season of use of 4-1 to
>10-31 even though the claim is for year around?

>

>Ernie