

STATE OF IDAHO
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
IN-OFFICE REVIEW/BENEFICIAL USE FIELD REPORT

A. GENERAL INFORMATIONPermit No: 63-34143

Exam Date: 1/120/2017

1. Does this qualify for an in-office field exam (IDAPA 035.02.r)? X Y N
- Irrigation of 5 acres or less
 - Storage of up to 14.6 AF for stockwater purposes only
 - Any use other than irrigation or storage, if the combined diversion rate is 0.24 cfs or less
 - Other < >

2. Current Owner: Name: Jaya Sievers and Gloria Quackenbush
 Owner of Record Correct? X Y N
 Address of Record Correct? Y N
 If No: Address

Tax lot data shows Jaya Sievers and Gloria Quackenbush as the owners of the property.

3. Beneficial Use Fees have been paid: X Y N Receipt No: C0

4. **SOURCE** TRIBUTARY

Ground Water

Method of Determination: Well Driller's Report, GIS, and Tax Parcel Data

Change in Source: Y X N

B. OVERLAP REVIEW

1. Other water rights with the same place of use: NO Overlap

Water Right No.	Source	Purpose of Use	Basis

Comments: There are 7 water rights in the same 40 acre tract, but none of those rights are a direct overlap to this permit. It appears as if they are using a domestic exempt use for their in-house use. The well was drilled in 1991, and 1992 aerial photography confirms that there was a home on the property around that time. The permit holders elected to not include their domestic use on this permit, so it appears as though they don't want to lose the priority established by the well log for the exempt use. This property is also in the United Water Municipal borders, but the file suggests that they use the well for their in-house use.

2. Other water rights with the same point of diversion: NO Overlap

Water Right No.	Source	Purpose of Use	Basis

Comments: There are 7 water rights in the same 40 acre tract, but none of those rights are a direct overlap to this permit. It appears as if they are using a domestic exempt use for their in-house use. The well was drilled in 1991, and 1992 aerial photography confirms that there was a home on the property around that time. The permit holders elected to not include their domestic use on this permit, so it appears as though they don't want to lose the priority established by the well log for the exempt use.

C. DIVERSION AND DELIVERY SYSTEM**1. LOCATION OF POINT(S) OF DIVERSION:**

Source	Govt. Lot	¼	¼	¼	Sec.	Twp.	Rge.		County
Well	3		NW	SW	7	2N	2E	B.M.	ADA
								B.M.	
								B.M.	

Method of Determination: GIS and Tax Lot data.Change in POD? X N Amendment Required? X N**2. PLACE OF USE:** Use: Irrigation

TWP	RGE	Sec	NE				NW				SW				SE				Totals
			NE	NW	SW	SE	NE	NW	SW	SE	NE	NW	SW	SE	NE	NW	SW	SE	
2N	2E	7										2							2
		Lot #										3							
Total Acres =																			

Method of Determination: GIS and Tax Lot DataChange in POU? X N Amendment Required? X N Delivery System Diagram Attached (required). Indicate all major components and distances between components.

Indicate weir size/pipe as applicable.

 X Aerial Photo Attached (required for irrigation of 10+ acres). Photo of Diversion and System Attached

4. Well or Diversion Identification No.*	Motor Make	Hp	Motor Serial No.	Pump Make	Pump Serial No. or Discharge Size
Well	Unknown				

*Code to correspond with No. on map and aerial photo

D. FLOW MEASUREMENTS

1.Measurement Equipment	Type	Make	Model No.	Serial No.	Size	Calib. Date
NONE						

2. Measurements: No measurement is required for an in-house exam.

E. FLOW CALCULATIONS

____ Additional Computation Sheets Attached

Measured Method:

There was no information in the file describing the pumping system for this permit, so a theoretical calculation was not possible. I used the standard irrigation requirements allowed for the irrigation of property less than 5 acres of 0.03 cfs per acre allowed in Processing Administrative Memorandum #17.

Acre Limits = 2 acres X 0.03 cfs per acre = 0.06 cfs

Permit allowed = 0.14 cfs

I am recommending a diversion rate of 0.06 cfs, since this is the maximum rate per acre allowed according to Administrative Processing Memorandum #17.

F. VOLUME CALCULATIONS

1. Volume Calculations for Irrigation:

$$V_{I.R.} = (\text{Acres Irrigated}) \times (\text{Irrigation Requirement}) = 2 \text{ acres} \times 4.5 = 9 \text{ af}$$

$$V_{D.R.} = [\text{Diversion Rate (cfs)}] \times (\text{Days in Irrigation season}) \times 1.9835 = 0.06 \text{ cfs} \times 260 \times 1.9835 = 30.9 \text{ af}$$

$$V = \text{Smaller of } V_{I.R.} \text{ and } V_{D.R.} = 9 \text{ af}$$

2. Volume Calculations for Other Uses:

N/A

G. PURPOSE OF USEIrrigation ☒ X ☐ Y ☐ N # Stock _____ Domestic # of Homes _____

Other: < >

Change in Purpose of Use? ☐ Y ☐ NMethod of Determination: Taxlot data and conversations with owner.

If Yes: From Use _____ To Use _____ Amount _____ CFS _____ AFA _____

H. NARRATIVE/REMARKS/COMMENTS

This permit is qualifies for an in-house exam. The only real issue with this permit is that they didn't include the domestic use on the permit, and there is no domestic water rights shown on this property. A domestic exempt water right for the home appears to have been established since the 1990's, so this shouldn't be an issue. If they wish to file an adjudication claim for their domestic use, it should be limited to in-house use only, since this permit covers the irrigation use.

This property is approximately 3 miles south of the Basin 63 Ground Water Restricted area. According to the well log the permit holder's well is screened from 298 feet to 338 feet, so there should be no restrictions on this well. This well is also approximately 1 mile west of the Boise Front Moratorium area/Boise Front Ground Water Management Area, so this permit shouldn't be affected by Boise Front Moratorium or Boise Ground Water Management Area. The Southeast Boise Ground Water Management Area is approximately 5 miles east of the place of use described in this permit. This permit is surrounded by several different restricted areas, but it isn't within the borders of any of them. Therefore, there should be no need for any additional conditions than what were placed on the permit.

Condition #1 (046) on the permit should be removed at licensing as is standard. Condition 2 (121) should be changed to condition 103 as is standard, and condition 3 (R69) should be carried forward to licensing. No additional conditions are required.

Have conditions of permit approval been met? ☒ X Yes ☐ No

I. RECOMMENDATIONS**1. Recommended Amounts**

<u>BENEFICIAL USE</u>	<u>PERIOD OF USE</u>	<u>DIVERSION RATE</u>	<u>ANNUAL VOLUME</u>
Irrigation	03/01 to 11/15	0.06 CFS	9 AF
<u>Totals:</u>		0.06 CFS	9 AF

2. Recommended Amendments

☐ Change P.D. as reflected above ☐ Add P.D. as reflected above ☐ None

☐ Change P.U. as reflected above ☐ Add P.U. as reflected above ☐ None

Other: < >

J. AUTHENTICATION – DANIEL A. NELSON – Water Right Analyst 3

Field Examiner's Name



Date

1-20-17

Reviewer

Date



Permit 63-34143 Field Exam Map

The acres irrigated are in the yellow border and the well is designated with the yellow dot. These are the same acres that have been irrigated since 2004. The 2016 Google Earth aerial photography also shows the same acres irrigated.