

Luke, Tim

From: Fritschle, Carter
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 6:44 AM
To: Skaggs, Pam; Luke, Tim
Subject: RE: quick query

95-8388 could be claimed in the CSRBA with an accomplished transfer for the POD and POU, and it would only cost them \$25.00.

From: Skaggs, Pam
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 4:49 PM
To: Luke, Tim <Tim.Luke@idwr.idaho.gov>
Cc: Fritschle, Carter <Carter.Fritschle@idwr.idaho.gov>
Subject: RE: quick query

Tim,

I don't know about the notification for the NIA claims taking, but this is a deferrable domestic use if they are still using the water. They could claim & correct it if it isn't too late in the CSRBA. If the right becomes a deferred domestic use, it is not eligible for transfer until adjudicated. So, WRs cannot help them correct the right thru the new \$50 historical use transfer. I'll defer to Carter regarding any action from adjudication.

Pam

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Saturday, August 25, 2018 11:49 AM
To: Skaggs, Pam <Pam.Skaggs@idwr.idaho.gov>
Cc: Fritschle, Carter <Carter.Fritschle@idwr.idaho.gov>
Subject: FW: quick query

Pam,

See attached map and reference to water right license 95-8388. Looks like the application for permit identified wrong Township, but got the Range, Section and QQ correct. This error carried all the way through the permit, field exam, and license despite the fact that the map included in the file locates the PD and POU in T 52N rather than 54N. No adjudication claim has been filed so I guess we make no attempt to fix the error? The correct landowner may not have been notified to file a claim given the POU/POD error?

Tim

From: Davis, Linda
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 12:10 PM
To: Luke, Tim <Tim.Luke@idwr.idaho.gov>
Cc: Favreau, Danielle <Danielle.Favreau@idwr.idaho.gov>
Subject: FW: quick query

Tim,

I wanted to look at the missing info and items that currently have the 95_c flag first. I looked at existing spatial records that have the WD-95 flag, and all but one fall (95-8388) within the WD95 spatial boundary. Looks like 95-8388 is a license, has source as Rathdrum creek, but plss puts it a far distance from Rathdrum creek. Attached is a map.

Then I took a look at the squirrely rights in northern to see if any water rights where we are missing shapes are within 95-C. I looked at the source as well as the trs from the analysis that Paula has done. Paula and I just looked at active POD's. The records I found are included within Danielle's analysis as well. I also asked Danielle to take a look at the records (active) that have the 95-C flag that do not have shapes. Below is her analysis. More information after lunch..... I 'm sending this to you before sending on anything to Joe...

Linda,

I looked in Enterprse and identified all Water Right Numbers with the Water District Flag 95C

I compared that list to the POD and POU process layers from WREdit- Water Rights

If shapes were missing, I looked at Claims, and Recommendations process layers from WREdit.

Here are the results:

Missing WR PODs and WR POU's shapes

'95-10981', - no rec or claim POD or POU

'95-7391', - no rec or claim POD or POU

'95-7710', - no rec or claim POD or POU

'95-8387', - no rec or claim POD or POU

'95-9348', - no rec or claim POD or POU

Missing WR PODs not WR POU's shapes

'95-731', - has rec POD

'95-742', - no rec or claim POD

'95-953', - no rec or claim POD

'95-967', - has rec POD

Missing WR POU's not WR PODs shapes

'95-966', - has rec POD

'95-973', - has rec POD

'95-974', - has rec POD

Danielle

From: Davis, Linda

Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 9:50 AM

To: Favreau, Danielle <Danielle.Favreau@idwr.idaho.gov>

Subject: quick query

Are there any water rights or recommendations that do not have a spatial presence but have a WD flag of 95-C?

- Linda