

Saxton, Craig

From: Stanton, Jim
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 5:01 PM
To: Saxton, Craig
Cc: Stanton, Jim
Subject: RE: Licensing Question

Craig – I told the person I spoke to representing the fish people that we would need a written request if they wanted the licenses issued, and I have not heard anything more on it. So I would not do anything more on these permits at this time. Will let you know if I hear otherwise. Thanks.

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 3:56 PM
To: Stanton, Jim
Subject: RE: Licensing Question

Jim,

I just want to confirm that as far as we know, at this time there is no reason to make licensing these a priority? I don't mean to bury them again, but if they aren't a "fire to put out", I have other fires we probably need to put out first.

Thanks,
c

From: Stanton, Jim
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2010 9:57 AM
To: Saxton, Craig
Cc: Stanton, Jim
Subject: RE: Licensing Question

Craig – This situation came about because a possible purchaser of the fish facility is interested in these water rights. But the deal has not yet been finalized; they were just inquiring as to what might be possible. I told their agent that we could not take any formal action without a written request from the permittee. Their agent told me this morning that he would get back to me in a week or two if they decide to go ahead with this, so we will see what happens. The buyers want to convert this place from raising trout to raising sturgeon, so would need to modify the existing system to accomplish this. Apparently they are also looking at other facilities in the area, so this may or may not happen. Will let you know if I hear more. Thanks.

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2010 11:24 AM
To: Stanton, Jim
Subject: RE: Licensing Question

Jim,

Got the file for 02-7472 which was grouped with 47-8356 and 47-8357. All have draft license records.

02-7472 (draft license) overlaps with:

47-8356 (draft license)

47-8357 (draft license)

47-7758 (license issued 2-21-06: SRBA claim not required, but there is a temp record on the database)

36-7239 (partially decreed)

So here are some thoughts. Simply looking at this overlap analysis, I think it is going to take some time to get it worked out. At initial glance, the overlapping conditions are messy. I agree with Shelley's point about not wanting to file another permit to introduce in this mix if a transfer could fix their problem.

I certainly can put this at the top of the list of things to do. Like everyone else, we are short handed so the fires get put out first. What kind of time frame would be acceptable to try to get these three licenses issued? Are we talking days or weeks?

Let me know your thoughts on this.

Thanks,
Craig

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 7:21 AM
To: Stanton, Jim
Subject: RE: Licensing Question

Jim,

Got your voicemail this morning and I am sorry I didn't get back to you sooner. Thanks for reminding me. The short story is I do what I can to put this on the fast track to get the license issued. Let me dig and find out if there are any obvious obstacles to getting that license issued and I will report back to you.

Thanks,
c

From: Keen, Shelley
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2009 10:28 AM
To: Saxton, Craig
Cc: Stanton, Jim
Subject: FW: Licensing Question

Craig,

Please work with Jim to develop a solution for this issue. In general, I'd prefer not to process an application for permit when a transfer could also work. We should avoid increasing the number of water rights with combined use limits when we can. The availability of staff to work on licenses remains a big challenge. Our licensing priorities should be:

- Permits claimed in the SRBA or NIA
- Permits that need licensed so they can be transferred
- Permits that need licensed to facilitate a property sale

Shelley

From: Stanton, Jim
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2009 4:23 PM
To: Keen, Shelley
Cc: Stanton, Jim
Subject: Licensing Question

Shelley – Allen did a licensing exam in 2005 on Permit 2-7472 (Canyon Springs). I here is a draft record showing what the license would look like, but from what I can tell it has not actually been issued; there are a couple more related draft records related to this one. I have had an inquiry about the possibility of adding another pump to bring Snake River water to the existing hatchery in Sec. 32 & 33 to supplement Alpheus Creek water during low spring flows/priority cutbacks. Water from the upper facility flows down into the lower facility in Sec. 29, which is covered by 2-7472. When can we issue the license on this permit so they can file a transfer if they want to? Or does a lack of manpower preclude issuance at this time? They could apply for a new permit if the transfer process is not available; I just need to be able to understand their options. We issued this permit in 1997 or 98; would you see any problem in issuing a similar permit now? They need about the same flow rate but using bigger pumps due to the higher lift involved. Thanks.