

Saxton, Craig

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 9:58 AM
To: Baxter, Garrick; Cooley-Denney, Suzy
Subject: Incorrect Late Claim Fee and other 75-2065 & 75-2105

I corrected the Basin Numbers in this E-mail;

Hey Garrick and Suzy,

What we have here are two late claims filed by the same claimant: Nancy Roe Conway

Ms. Conway appears to have paid: \$152.00 for 67-2065
 \$152.00 for 67-2105
 Total = \$304.00

Fees should be:

75-2065
 \$ 50.00 late fee
 50.00 claim fee
50.00 variable fee (\$1 per acre for 50 acres claimed)
 Total = \$150.00

75-2105
 \$ 50.00 late fee
 50.00 claim fee
15.00 variable fee (\$1 per acre for 15 acres claimed)
 Total = \$ 115.00

Total fees for both claims = \$265.00

If both claims are approved and \$304.00 of fees were paid, the claimant should receive a refund of \$304 – 265 =
\$39.00

Place of Use:

The claimed POU for both claims does not fit the map that accompanies each of the claims. But the map is clear and the discrepancy between the POU description on the claim and on the map is due to confusion on how to fill out the claim form (not uncommon) topped with the difficulty in describing the legal description when an HES spans several QQ's. It would be my preference to wait till the motions are accepted by the court, then the agent reviewing the claim can determine if an amended claim is needed at that time rather than trying to figure out the exact right POU description now, when we don't even know if the motion is going to be granted.

In essence, it is going to take an agent to figure out how to describe the POU and I don't want to put man hours into it until we have a valid claim. To add, ~~67~~⁷⁵-2065 claims a POU in HES 428 yet the licensed POU is HES 57. This could present problems.

~~67~~⁷⁵-2105 claims a POU that fits with what was licensed according to the map submitted with the claim.

Craig

10/24/2008