

Kelly, Patrick

From: Kelly, Patrick
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 1:04 PM
To: 'Dave Shaw'
Subject: RE: Budell storage apps

Yes, absolutely. In systems where the system does not remain full for the complete season, we do not want to consider refill for evaporation. We leave it as capacity only. Thanks for clearing this up Dave!

From: Dave Shaw [mailto:dshaw@eroresources.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 10:24 AM
To: Kelly, Patrick <Patrick.Kelly@idwr.idaho.gov>
Subject: RE: Budell storage apps

Thanks Patrick,

On the Padgett Creek side once the creek dries up the evaporation can't be replaced until fall or when the creek begins to flow. Most of the evaporation likely occurs when there isn't any water in the creek to replace the evaporation loss and when the pond refills both the water used by livestock and lost to evaporation will be refilled, hopefully, up to the capacity of the pond. I don't want to overthink this application but it appears both the stock water and evaporation would be captured in the 15 AF. Does that make sense?

Thanks again,
Dave

David Shaw

ERO Resources Corporation

208.365.7684 dshaw@eroresources.com | www.eroresources.com

From: Kelly, Patrick <Patrick.Kelly@idwr.idaho.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Dave Shaw <dshaw@eroresources.com>
Subject: RE: Budell storage apps

Morning Dave,

Yes we can make the changes for advertising but will need amended apps before draft approvals are circulated to all parties. For Padgett Creek then do we want to go with 15 af capacity, 4.0 af evaporation for a total of 19.0 af? For Little Squaw, at 9 ft max and surface area of 3.8 we get a capacity of 13.7 af, the application for 20 af would cover the 6.0 evaporation so no amendments would be required.

From: Dave Shaw [<mailto:dshaw@eroresources.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2019 3:43 PM
To: Kelly, Patrick <Patrick.Kelly@idwr.idaho.gov>
Subject: RE: Budell storage apps

Patrick,

Thank you, to include evaporation do we need to amend the applications to show evaporation? I anticipate on the Padgett Creek side the stream will be dry most of the summer but as long as water is available replacing evaporation

would make management much easier. On the North Fork side replacing evaporation would be desirable until and unless a delivery call requires any water to be bypassed.

What is the easiest approach to include evaporation? Do the applications need to be amended?

Thanks,

Dave

David Shaw

ERO Resources Corporation

208.365.7684 dshaw@eroresources.com | www.eroresources.com

From: Kelly, Patrick <Patrick.Kelly@idwr.idaho.gov>

Sent: Monday, August 26, 2019 3:27 PM

To: Dave Shaw <dshaw@eroresources.com>

Subject: Budell storage apps

Dave,

Just wanted to confirm the numbers with you prior to advertising, again. On the Little Squaw Creek reservoir, we have 9 ft depth, 3.8 ac surface area, at 40% slope totals 13.7 af. The application is for 20 af, but does not include mention of evaporation (6.0 af). The Padgett Creek storage recognizes an *average* depth of 6 ft and surface area of 2.5 ac for a total capacity of 15 af. Evap for this pond would be 4 af. If 6 feet is max depth, 40% of the storage use would be 6.0 af. Please confirm the dimensions and whether the applicant wishes to keep the ponds full year round by including evaporation.

Thank you!

Patrick Kelly

Water Rights Supervisor

Emergency Agency Coordinator

2735 Airport Way

Boise, Idaho 83705

o: 208.334.2190

patrick.kelly@idwr.idaho.gov