

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

42-222 POD - 07/18

JUN 05 2019

MAY 31 2019

STATE OF IDAHO
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Department of Water Resources

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

APPLICATION FOR TRANSFER OF WATER RIGHT – POINT(S) OF DIVERSION

This form may be used to apply to change and/or add points of diversion for existing water rights and to report an ownership change for a water right(s) in connection with the proposed point of diversion change(s). Do not use this form to apply for changes to other elements of a water right. See the [Application for Transfer Instructions](#) for help completing this form and for mailing addresses of Department offices where your application can be submitted.

Check all that apply:

- ☐ Change diversion point(s) ☒ Add diversion point(s) ☐ Ownership change ☐ Ownership split
☐ Transfer is for changes pursuant to [Idaho Code § 42-221.O.8](#). Attach an explanation and any supporting documentation.

1. APPLICANT(S) Falls Irrigation District Phone 208-226-5227
2. MAILING ADDRESS 310 Valdez St City American Falls
State ID Zip 83211 Email fallsirr@cableone.net

- ☐ If the applicant is not an individual and not registered to do business in the State of Idaho, attach documentation identifying officers authorized to sign for the applicant.
☐ If the applicant is not the current water right(s) owner, attach documentation of authority to file the application.
☐ If the application includes a change in ownership of water right(s), attach a copy of the conveyance document, such as a warranty deed, court decree, contract of sale, etc. The conveyance document must include a legal description of the property conveyed or description of the water right if no land is conveyed. Additional fee(s) are required for water right ownership changes; see Item 9 for the [fee schedule](#).

If the ownership change resulted in the water right(s) being split, how did the division occur? Mark one:

- ☐ The water rights or claims were divided as specifically identified in a deed, contract, or other conveyance document.
☐ The water rights or claims were divided proportionately based on the portion of their place(s) of use acquired by the new owner.

- ☐ If the application is not signed by the applicant, attach a Power of Attorney or other documentation providing authority to sign for the applicant.

3. LIST WATER RIGHT NUMBER(S) 29-2341, 29-11169

- ☒ Attach a copy of the water right(s) as recorded, available at [idwr.idaho.gov](#), *Water Right Transfers, Step 1*, or by contacting any Department office.

4. TOTAL AMOUNT OF WATER transferred is 2.00 cubic feet per second and/or _____ acre-feet per annum.
(diversion rate) (storage volume)

5. POINT OF DIVERSION – Describe all the point(s) of diversion to be included on the water right(s) after the proposed change.

- ☒ Attach Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA) analysis if this transfer proposes to change a point of diversion affecting the ESPA. ESPA analysis information is available at [idwr.idaho.gov](#), *Water Rights, Water Right Transfers, Modeling Resources*.

New?	Lot	¼	¼	¼	Sec	Twp	Rge	County	Source	Local name or tag #
		NW	SE	SW	32	7S	31E	Power	Ground Water	
X			SE	NE	13	8S	30E	Power	Ground Water	New Well No. 1

6. GENERAL INFORMATION

- a. Describe the complete diversion system, including how you will accommodate a measuring device and lockable controlling works should they be required now or in the future:

The District will drill and operate an additional well point of diversion located along the District's canal system on private property in order to better utilize existing groundwater rights.

- b. Who owns the property at the point(s) of diversion? John Mayer

If other than the applicant, describe the arrangement enabling the applicant to access the property for the diversion system:

Private Agreement with the Landowner - see attachment.

- c. To your knowledge, has/is any portion of the water right(s) proposed to be changed:

Yes No

- ☐ ☒ undergone a period of five or more consecutive years of non-use,
☐ ☒ currently used in a mitigation plan limiting the use of water under the right(s), or
☐ ☒ currently enrolled in a Federal set-aside program limiting the use of water under the right(s)?


If yes, describe:

- d. Is any portion of the water right(s) proposed to be changed currently leased to the Water Supply Bank? ☐ Yes ☒ No

- ☐ If yes and there are multiple owners, attach a Lessor Designation form.
☐ If yes, the individual owner or designated lessor must complete, sign and attach an IRS Form W-9.
(Disregard if these items are on file and ownership has not changed.)

7. **MAP** – ☒ Attach a map of the diversion, measurement, control and distribution system. Include the place of use if a split of the water right occurred. Clearly label the map with township, range, section and $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ of section information. You may create a map at idwr.idaho.gov, *Water Rights, Water Right Transfers, File a Transfer Application, Step 2C*.

8. **SIGNATURE** – The information in this application is true to the best of my knowledge. I understand any willful misrepresentations in this application may result in rejection of the application or cancellation of an approval.


Signature of applicant or authorized agent

Shawn Tischendorf, Manager
Print name and title if applicable

S-31-19
Date

Signature of applicant or authorized agent

Print name and title if applicable

Date

9. **FEE** – ☒ The application filing fee provided in Idaho Code § 42-221.O, must be submitted with the application for transfer. Applications for changes pursuant to Idaho Code § 42-221.O.8. require a filing fee of \$50 per water right. All other application fees are based on the total amount of water proposed for transfer in Item 4: the larger fee for either cubic feet per second (diversion rate) or acre-feet per annum (storage volume). The Fee Schedule is available at www.idwr.idaho.gov, *Water Right Transfers, Step 4* and in the Application for Transfer Instructions.

FOR DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

Transfer includes _____ pages of attachments.

Received by _____ Date _____

Fee paid 840.00 Date 5/31/19

Receipted by RD Receipt # C106928

Preliminary review by _____ Date _____ Active in the Water Supply Bank? Yes ☐ No ☐

W-9 received? Yes ☐ No ☐ Name on W-9 _____ W-9 forwarded to fiscal? Yes ☐ No ☐

(Do NOT scan the W-9 – confidential information is held by fiscal only)

ADD'L FEE \$1300 ON 10/22/18 REC# E044473 (\$580 THIS TRANSFER)

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
Proof Report

6/14/2019

Water Right 29-2341

Owner Type **Name**
Current Owner UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ACTING THROUGH
Priority Date: 10/29/1953
Basis: Decreed
Status: Active

Source **Tributary**
GROUND WATER

Beneficial Use	From	To	Diversion Rate	Volume
IRRIGATION	04/01	10/31	2.000 CFS	
	Total Diversion		2.000 CFS	

Source and Point(s) of Diversion
GROUND WATER NWSESW Sec. 32, Twp 07S, Rge 31E, POWER County

Place Of Use
IRRIGATION within POWER County

Large POU not displayed
Right Acre Limit = 107.0
Total Acres = 12,621.0

Conditions of Approval:

1. E60 USE OF THIS RIGHT WITH RIGHT NO. 29-11169 IS LIMITED TO A TOTAL COMBINED DIVERSION RATE OF 2.59 CFS AND TO A TOTAL COMBINED ANNUAL DIVERSION VOLUME OF 466 AF.
2. F05 RIGHT NO. 29-11169 IS ALSO DIVERTED THROUGH POINT OF DIVERSION DESCRIBED ABOVE.
3. 127 Place of use is within the boundary of Falls Irrigation District pursuant to Section 43-323, Idaho Code.
4. The beneficial use of the water represented hereby is for the landowners within the Falls Irrigation District pursuant to Contract No. 14-06-100-851, dated December 9, 1955 (as may be supplemented or amended) between the United States of America through the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Falls Irrigation District for irrigation and other permitted purposes as authorized by the Act of August 31, 1954, Ch. 1159, 68 Stat. 1026, of the Michaud Flats Project.
5. The rights listed below are limited to the irrigation of a combined total of 12,621 acres in a single irrigation season. Combined right nos. 01-13, 01-2061, 01-2064, 01-2068, 01-4051, 29-2262, 29-2267, 29-2288, 29-2306, 29-2307, 29-2310, 29-2341, 29-2380, 29-2568, 29-2614, 29-10044, 29-11167, 29-11168, 29-11169, 29-11170, 29-13388, 29-13389, 29-13426, 29-13427.
6. E55 USE OF THIS RIGHT WITH RIGHT NO. 29-11169 IS LIMITED TO THE IRRIGATION OF A COMBINED TOTAL OF 116.5 ACRES IN A SINGLE IRRIGATION SEASON.
7. C18 This partial decree is subject to such general provisions necessary for the definition of the rights or for the efficient administration of the water rights as may be ultimately determined by the Court at a point in time no later than the entry of a final unified decree. Section 42-1412(6), Idaho Code.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
Proof Report

6/14/2019

8. C05 RIGHT INCLUDES ACCOMPLISHED CHANGE IN PLACE OF USE PURSUANT TO SECTION 42-1425, IDAHO CODE.
9. K06 THIS RIGHT IS LIMITED TO THE IRRIGATION OF 107 ACRES WITHIN THE PLACE OF USE DESCRIBED ABOVE IN A SINGLE IRRIGATION SEASON.

Dates and Other Information

Decreed Date: 3/16/2004

Civil Case Number: 39576

Judicial District: FIFTH

State or Federal: S

Water District Number: 120

Mitigation Plan: False

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
Proof Report

6/14/2019

Water Right 29-11169

Owner Type **Name**
Current Owner UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ACTING THROUGH
Priority Date: 5/16/1962
Basis: Decreed
Status: Active

Source **Tributary**
GROUND WATER

Beneficial Use	From	To	Diversion Rate	Volume
IRRIGATION	04/01	10/31	0.590 CFS	
	Total Diversion		0.590 CFS	



Source and Point(s) of Diversion
GROUND WATER NWSESW Sec. 32, Twp 07S, Rge 31E, POWER County

Place Of Use
IRRIGATION within POWER County
Large POU not displayed
Total Acres = 12,621.0

Conditions of Approval:

1. E60 USE OF THIS RIGHT WITH RIGHT NO. 29-2341 IS LIMITED TO A TOTAL COMBINED DIVERSION RATE OF 2.59 CFS AND TO A TOTAL COMBINED ANNUAL DIVERSION VOLUME OF 466 AF.
2. 127 Place of use is within the boundary of Falls Irrigation District pursuant to Section 43-323, Idaho Code.
3. C18 This partial decree is subject to such general provisions necessary for the definition of the rights or for the efficient administration of the water rights as may be ultimately determined by the Court at a point in time no later than the entry of a final unified decree. Section 42-1412(6), Idaho Code.
4. E55 USE OF THIS RIGHT WITH RIGHT NO. 29-2341 IS LIMITED TO THE IRRIGATION OF A COMBINED TOTAL OF 116.5 ACRES IN A SINGLE IRRIGATION SEASON.
5. The beneficial use of the water represented hereby is for the landowners within the Falls Irrigation District pursuant to Contract No. 14-06-100-851, dated December 9, 1955 (as may be supplemented or amended) between the United States of America through the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Falls Irrigation District for irrigation and other permitted purposes as authorized by the Act of August 31, 1954, Ch. 1159, 68 Stat. 1026, of the Michaud Flats Project.
6. The rights listed below are limited to the irrigation of a combined total of 12,621 acres in a single irrigation season. Combined right nos. 01-13, 01-2061, 01-2064, 01-2068, 01-4051, 29-2262, 29-2267, 29-2288, 29-2306, 29-2307, 29-2310, 29-2341, 29-2380, 29-2568, 29-2614, 29-10044, 29-11167, 29-11168, 29-11169, 29-11170, 29-13388, 29-13389, 29-13426, 29-13427.
7. F05 RIGHT NO. 29-2341 IS ALSO DIVERTED THROUGH POINT OF DIVERSION DESCRIBED ABOVE.

Figure 2a - Project Area Map (Well #1) Falls Irrigation District Wells Project




Scale 1:24,000

Data Displayed in UTM Zone 12, NAD83

T8S, R30E

USGS Quadrangle: Neely / Indian Springs

0 0.5 1 Kilometers




0 0.5 1 Miles



Date Created: 5/4/2017

83356

Figure 3a - Area of Potential Effect (Well #1) Falls Irrigation District Wells Project



Scale 1:1,000

Data Displayed in UTM Zone 12, NAD83

T8S, R30E Section 13

USGS Quadrangle: Neely / Indian Springs

0 100 200 Feet

0 25 50 Meters

Date Created: 5/4/2017

83356

DATED this 7 day of June, 2019.

ST


I, John Mayer, of 936 Pistol River Way, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80921, give permission to Falls Irrigation District to construct a new irrigation facility within the boundaries of the permanent easement right-of-way located on land that I own. The location of the new irrigation facility will be in the SE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 13, Township 8 South, Range 30 East, of the Boise Meridian located near the W-E turnout on the south-side of the West Main Canal.




STATE OF Colorado)
) ss.
County of El Paso)

On the 07 day of Jun, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared John Mayer, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed in the instrument, and acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year written above.





A Notary Public in and for State of Colorado
Residing at: 906 Pistol Riverway
My Commission Expires: January 26, 2020



Falls Irrigation District

Political Subdivision of the State of Idaho

310 Valdez St. • American Falls, Idaho 83211
(208) 226-5227



IDWR
900 N. Skyline Dr. Ste A.
Idaho Falls, ID 83402-1718

To Whom it May Concern,

As president of the Board of Directors for the Falls Irrigation District, I am issuing this letter to confirm that Shawn Tischendorf is the manager, employed at Falls Irrigation District. Further, the Board of Directors has authorized Shawn Tischendorf to execute, and sign documents on behalf of the district for the transfer application with IDWR.

Thank you,

Steve Isaak,
President of the Board of Directors

Falls Irrigation District Transfer

ESPA Model Results Summary

Brockway Engineering, PLLC

GEP – July 26, 2018, Revised May 3, 2019

Six of the decreed groundwater irrigation rights held by Falls Irrigation District are diverted from four wells. A transfer has been prepared and proposes to add three additional points of diversion. Subsequently, IDWR requested that the transfer be divided into three transfers. This analysis evaluates the impacts of the proposed transfer(s) to the Snake River by using the ESPA Model v. 2.1 under steady state and transient conditions. An overview map of the proposed transfer is shown in Figure 1.


The current conditions of diversion of groundwater under the following irrigation rights (water right nos. 29-2288, 29-2306, 29-2341, 29-11168, 29-13426, and 29-13427) assumes the authorized number of acres allowed under the water right and IDWR's consumptive use for the Fall Irrigation District area of 3 acft/acre. The total consumptive use volume per year for these rights was calculated to be 1873.2 afa. The proposed transfer seeks to allow for consumptive use volume to be diverted from the proposed wells. Table 1 outlines the associated consumptive use volume attributed to ESPAM cells for each of the existing wells under the current condition. Table 2 outlines the consumptive use volume associated with the existing and proposed wells under the proposed transfer condition. IDWR then requested that the evaluation be separated into the three respective transfers. Table 5 outlines the consumptive use under the current conditions for the three transfers and Table 6 presents the consumptive use volume with the proposed transfers.

The steady state ESPAM results for one transfer are shown in Table 3. The results are in acre-feet/year. There is a negative impact of 11 acre-feet to the Neeley to Minidoka reach of the Snake River. However, there is a simulated 9 acre-feet benefit to the Near Blackfoot to Neeley reach. These reach results have been combined together in past transfers because of the locations of the proposed wells are close to the reach dividing line. It is my opinion that combining the Near Blackfoot to Neeley and the Neeley to Minidoka reaches would be appropriate in this case. The steady state ESPAM results for the three transfers are shown in Table 7.

The annual consumptive use volumes from Tables 1-2 and 5-6 were shaped based on typical seasonal consumptive use demands for the area near Falls Irrigation District to generate a seasonal consumptive use curve for evaluation in transient conditions. The ESPA model was then evaluated in current conditions and proposed transfer conditions to calculate the transient impacts of the transfer. Figure 2 shows the transient response to the single transfer and Figures 3-5 show the transient response to the three transfers. Again, the combination of the Near Blackfoot to Neeley reach is also shown combined with the Neeley to Minidoka reach.

The mitigation analysis tool that IDWR uses to evaluate transfers within the ESPA boundary to determine if mitigation is required was used. Table 4 shows the results of the mitigation analysis tool for the single transfer. With separate river reaches, it was determined that 10.5 acre-feet of mitigation is required under this transfer. But when the analysis considers the Near Blackfoot to Neeley and the Neeley to Minidoka reaches combined as a single reach, the evaluation shows no mitigation is required. Tables 8-10 show the mitigation analysis for the three transfers, with no mitigation required.

Path: F:\Projects\Falls Irrigation District\ArcMap\Overview.mxd



N
1 in = 2 miles

BROCKWAY ENGINEERING
GEP - JULY 27, 2018

FALLS IRRIGATION DISTRICT TRANSFER MODEL ANALYSIS

ESPAM 2.1 MODEL GRID
NAIP 2013 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH

Falls Irrigation District

Data Used for Model Evaluation

ESPA Steady State Model Results

Brockway Engineering, PLLC

GEP, PE

7/26/2018

Table 1: Current Conditions of Consumptive Use Diversion

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume	Acres Basis
95, 99	29-2341	321.0	107 METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
97, 93	29-13427	145.5	48.5 METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
93, 104	29-11168/29-2288	424.2	141.4 METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
92, 106	29-13426/29-2306	982.5	327.5 METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
		1,873.2	

Table 2: Proposed Transfer Consumptive Use Diversion

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume
95, 99	29-2341	198.0
97, 93	29-13427	55.4
93, 104	29-11168/29-2288	252.2
92, 106	29-13426/29-2306	333.8
97, 96	29-2341	268.0
95, 102	29-13426/29-13427	198.3
95, 104	29-11168/29-2288/29-2306	567.2
		1,872.9

Falls Irrigation District

Proposed Transfer Evaluation

ESPA Steady State Model Results

Brockway Engineering, PLLC

GEP, PE

7/26/2018

Table 3: Steady State ESPA Model Results

River Reach	Flow Change		Combined Reach	
Ashton to Rexburg	0	acft/yr	0	acft/yr
Heise to Shelley	1	acft/yr	1	acft/yr
Shelley to Near Blackfoot	4	acft/yr	4	acft/yr
Near Blackfoot to Neeley	9	acft/yr	-2	acft/yr
Neeley to Minidoka	-11	acft/yr		
Devils Wasbowl to Buhl	-1	acft/yr	-1	acft/yr
Buhl to Thousand Springs	-1	acft/yr	-1	acft/yr
Thousand Springs	0	acft/yr	0	acft/yr
Thousand Springs to Malad	0	acft/yr	0	acft/yr
Malad	0	acft/yr	0	acft/yr
Malad to Bancroft	0	acft/yr	0	acft/yr
Total	0	acft/yr	0	acft/yr

Figure 2: Proposed Falls Irrigation District Transfer
10-year Transient ESPA Model Results




Table 4: IDWR Mitigation Tool Analysis results

New Water Right (GModelo):

WR No.	Div. Rate (CFS)	Con. Vol. (AFA)	No. of Irr. Acres	Priority Date	POD Location	Dedicated Vol. AFA/ AFT	Model Node	Impact by Reach (AF/Annum)					Combined		Dev. Wbl. Tr Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft
								Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Bickft	Nr Bickft To Neeley	Neeley to Minidoka	Nr Bickft to Minidoka							
Transfer 1: Proposed Steady State Impacts following Transfer								36.57	109.16	331.97	1103.76	61.07	1164.83	67.36	76.50	33.97	21.43	19.61	1.22	
								36.18	107.99	328.37	1,094.51	72.26	1,166.77	68.22	77.46	34.39	21.69	19.86	1.24	
Transfer 1: Worst Case Transient State Impacts following Transfer								13.53	74.50	282.47	959.76	52.26	1,012.02	49.56	56.95	25.16	15.82	14.23	0.87	
								13.24	73.21	278.03	947.76	62.78	1,010.54	49.65	57.07	25.21	15.85	14.25	0.87	
Steady State Analysis								Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Historical:	-1.1%	-1.1%	-1.1%	-0.8%	18.3%	0.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
								Mitigation Check 2: > 6 AF/A:	-0.4	-1.2	-3.6	-9.3	11.2	1.9	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.0
								Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Total:	1.2%	3.6%	10.8%	36.1%	2.4%	38.5%	2.3%	2.6%	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%
								Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
								Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	-0.4	-1.2	-3.6	-9.3	11.2	1.9	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.0
Transient State Analysis								Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Historical:	-2.2%	-1.7%	-1.6%	-1.3%	20.1%	-0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
								Mitigation Check 2: > 6 AF/A:	-0.3	-1.3	-4.4	-12.0	10.5	-1.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
								Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
								Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	-0.3	-1.3	-4.4	-12.0	10.5	-1.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Read Me

Read Me

83356

Falls Irrigation District

Data Used for Model Evaluation

ESPA Steady State Model

Brockway Engineering, PLLC

GEP, PE

5/3/2019

Table 5: Current Conditions of Consumptive Use Diversion**Transfer 1**

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume	Acres	Basis
95, 99	29-2341	321.0	107	METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre

Transfer 2

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume	Acres	Basis
97, 93	29-13427	145.5	48.5	METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
92, 106	29-13426	405.0	135	METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre

Transfer 3

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume	Acres	Basis
93, 104	29-11168/29-2288	424.2	141.4	METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
92, 106	29-13426/29-2306	577.5	192.5	METRIC ET Data and IDWR CU of 3 acft/acre
Total Volume		1,873.2		

Table 6: Proposed Transfer Consumptive Use Diversion**Transfer 1**

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume
95, 99	29-2341	198.0
97, 96	29-2341	123.0

Transfer 2

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume
97, 93	29-13427	200.4
92, 106	29-13426/29-2306	151.8
95, 102	29-13426/29-13427	198.3

Transfer 3

Model Cell	Water Right No.	CU Volume
93, 104	29-11168/29-2306	252.2
92, 106	29-2306	182.0
95, 104	29-11168/29-2288/29-2306	567.2
Total Volume		1,872.9

Falls Irrigation District

Proposed Transfer Evaluation

ESPA Steady State Model Results

Brockway Engineering, PLLC

GEP, PE

4/23/2019

Table 7: Steady State ESPA Model Results, values rounded to nearest whole number.

River Reach	Transfer 1		Transfer 2		Transfer 3		Combined Transfer	Combined Transfer and Reach
Ashton to Rexburg	>0 ^a	acft/yr	>0 ^a	acft/yr	>0 ^a	acft/yr	1 acft/yr	1 acft/yr
Heise to Shelley	1	acft/yr	1	acft/yr	>0 ^a	acft/yr	2 acft/yr	2 acft/yr
Shelley to Near Blackfoot	2	acft/yr	3	acft/yr	1	acft/yr	5 acft/yr	5 acft/yr
Near Blackfoot to Neeley	7	acft/yr	8	acft/yr	1	acft/yr	15 acft/yr	-2 acft/yr
Neeley to Minidoka	-7	acft/yr	-9	acft/yr	-1	acft/yr	-17 acft/yr	-2 acft/yr
Devils Wasbowl to Buhl	-1	acft/yr	-1	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	-2 acft/yr	-2 acft/yr
Buhl to Thousand Springs	-1	acft/yr	-1	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	-2 acft/yr	-2 acft/yr
Thousand Springs	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	-1 acft/yr	-1 acft/yr
Thousand Springs to Malad	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	<0 ^b
Malad	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	<0 ^b
Malad to Bancroft	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	acft/yr	<0 ^b	<0 ^b
Total^a	>0^a	acft/yr	>0^a	acft/yr	>0^a	acft/yr	>0^a	acft/yr

^a Model results are slightly greater than zero, but round down to zero

^b Model results are slightly less than zero, but round up to zero

Figure 3: Proposed Falls Irrigation District Transfer 1
10-year Transient ESPA Model Results




Figure 4: Proposed Falls Irrigation District Transfer 2
10-year Transient ESPA Model Results




Figure 5: Proposed Falls Irrigation District Transfer 3
10-year Transient ESPA Model Results




Table 8: IDWR Mitigation Tool Analysis results for transfer 1

New Water Right (GModelo):

WR No.	Div. Rate (CFS)	Con. Vol. (AFA)	No. of Irr. Acres	Priority Date	POD Location	Dedicated Vol. AFA/ AFT	Model Node
Transfer 1: Proposed Steady State Impacts following Transfer							
Transfer 1: Worst Case Transient State Impacts following Transfer							

Impact by Reach (AF/Annum)					Combined							
Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Bickft	Nr Bickft To Neeley	Neeley to Minidoka	Nr Bickft to Minidoka	Dev. Wbl. Tr Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft	
-5.91	-17.62	-53.56	-184.71	-17.88	-202.59	-12.07	-13.70	-6.08	-3.84	-3.51	-0.22	
-5.74	-17.10	-51.95	-177.99	-24.87	-202.86	-12.67	-14.37	-6.38	-4.02	-3.68	-0.23	
-2.08	-11.67	-44.53	-158.22	-15.93	-174.15	-8.43	-9.72	-4.29	-2.70	-2.42	-0.15	
-1.94	-11.02	-42.31	-149.56	-22.45	-172.01	-8.49	-9.79	-4.32	-2.71	-2.43	-0.15	
Steady State Analysis												
Historical:	-2.9%	-3.0%	-3.0%	-3.6%	39.1%	0.1%	5.0%	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	
> 6 AF/A:	0.2	0.5	1.6	6.7	-7.0	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7	-0.3	-0.2	0.0	
> 10% of Total:	1.1%	3.3%	10.0%	34.1%	4.8%	38.9%	2.4%	2.8%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.2	0.5	1.6	6.7	-7.0	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7	-0.3	-0.2	0.0	
Transient State Analysis												
Historical:	-7.0%	-5.6%	-5.0%	-5.5%	40.9%	-1.2%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	
> 6 AF/A:	0.1	0.6	2.2	8.7	-6.5	2.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.1	0.6	2.2	8.7	-6.5	2.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Read Me

Table 9: IDWR Mitigation Tool Analysis results for transfer 2

New Water Right (GModelo):

WR No.	Div. Rate (CFS)	Con. Vol. (AFA)	No. of Irr. Acres	Priority Date	POD Location	Dedicated Vol. AFA/ AFT	Model Node
Transfer 1: Proposed Steady State Impacts following Transfer							
Transfer 1: Worst Case Transient State Impacts following Transfer							

Impact by Reach (AF/Annum)

Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Bickft	Nr Bickft To Neeley	Neeley to Minidoka	Combined Nr Bickft to Minidoka	Dev. Wbl. Tr Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft
-10.48	-31.27	-95.06	-314.32	-28.25	-342.57	-20.78	-23.58	-10.47	-6.60	-6.04	-0.38
-10.17	-30.32	-92.15	-306.37	-37.43	-343.80	-21.65	-24.55	-10.90	-6.88	-6.29	-0.39
-3.76	-20.89	-79.52	-268.81	-24.90	-293.72	-14.64	-16.85	-7.44	-4.68	-4.20	-0.26
-3.53	-19.82	-75.78	-258.17	-33.45	-291.62	-14.80	-17.04	-7.52	-4.73	-4.24	-0.26

Steady State Analysis

Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Historical:	-3.0%	-3.0%	-3.1%	-2.5%	32.5%	0.4%	4.2%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%
Mitigation Check 2: > 6 AF/A:	0.3	0.9	2.9	7.9	-9.2	-1.2	-0.9	-1.0	-0.4	-0.3	-0.2	0.0
Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Total:	1.1%	3.4%	10.3%	34.4%	4.2%	38.6%	2.4%	2.8%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.0%
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.3	0.9	2.9	7.9	-9.2	-1.2	-0.9	-1.0	-0.4	-0.3	-0.2	0.0

Transient State Analysis

Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Historical:	-6.1%	-5.1%	-4.7%	-4.0%	34.3%	-0.7%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%
Mitigation Check 2: > 6 AF/A:	0.2	1.1	3.7	10.6	-8.5	2.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.2	1.1	3.7	10.6	-8.5	2.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Read Me

83356

Table 10: IDWR Mitigation Tool Analysis results for transfer 3

New Water Right (GModelo):

WR No.	Div. Rate (CFS)	Con. Vol. (AFA)	No. of Irr. Acres	Priority Date	POD Location	Dedicated Vol. AFA/ AFT	Model Node
Transfer 1: Proposed Steady State Impacts following Transfer							
Transfer 1: Worst Case Transient State Impacts following Transfer							

Impact by Reach (AF/Annum)						Combined							
Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Bickft	Nr Bickft To Neeley	Neeley to Minidoka	Nr Bickft to Minidoka	Dev. Wbl. To Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft		
-20.18	-60.27	-183.35	-604.73	-14.94	-619.67	-34.50	-39.22	-17.41	-10.98	-10.05	-0.63		
-20.11	-60.06	-182.71	-603.98	-16.04	-620.02	-34.59	-39.31	-17.46	-11.01	-10.08	-0.63		
-7.68	-41.89	-158.20	-531.99	-11.39	-543.38	-26.21	-30.10	-13.31	-8.37	-7.54	-0.46		
-7.64	-41.68	-157.47	-530.98	-12.42	-543.40	-26.22	-30.13	-13.32	-8.37	-7.54	-0.46		
Steady State Analysis													
Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Historical:						0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Mitigation Check 2: > 6 AF/A:						-0.3	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Total:						38.4%	2.1%	2.4%	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Mitigation Required?:						NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):						-0.3	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transient State Analysis													
Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Historical:						0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Mitigation Check 2: > 6 AF/A:						0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mitigation Required?:						NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):						0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Read Me