

Saxton, Craig

From: Keith C. Wilson [kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2011 1:26 PM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

I talked with the engineer and he's contacted the individual that operated the system. Apparently some records do exist but I have no idea what it will look like. Looks like it will be at least next Tuesday before we can get the records.

Hopefully, we'll be able to get this resolved. We've had to coax the city personnel to come up with the information.

As soon as I get the information I'll make sure that you get a copy.

Keith C. Wilson
Senior Water Rights Analyst
kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Saxton, Craig [mailto:Craig.Saxton@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2011 4:02 PM
To: Keith C. Wilson
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Hey Keith,

I have to look at what was developed during the authorized development period, before the well was tied into the City of Driggs municipal system. If the permit holder, during the authorized development period, pumped 90-100 day's a year at 2.0 cfs and beneficially used 396.7 acre-feet to supply water to the permitted POU before it was tied into the City of Driggs system, then your client needs to provide supporting evidence.

Thank you very much for your work on this Keith. I am sure you are ready to move onto other things. It is time to move forward and it just might be time to agree to disagree.

I will be in touch.

Craig

P.S. The limit of 2500 gallons per day is a product of 42-111(b) to describe the extent of use that is exempt from the permitting process. My guess is that the 2500 gpd limit for non-domestic uses was added as a condition to the permit to allow for the permit to be processed. That particular condition on the permit seems to indicate that they were issuing a permit for a bunch of 42-111 uses, be them 42-111(a) or 42-111(b). Could be why there is that condition that doesn't allow for golf course irrigation etc.

From: Keith C. Wilson [mailto:kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2011 10:28 AM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

I appreciate you working with us. As you can see from the email from Paul Scoresby at a minimum they need 100 days of pumping at the diversion rate for the water right to be effective as a summer production well.

$$\text{Volume needed/year} = 2.00 \text{ cfs} \times 1.9835 \times 100 \text{ days} = 396.7 \text{ afa (ac-ft/annum)}$$

Is there a way that you could allow the City of Driggs the 396.7 afa?

I find it interesting that for a business to qualify for domestic it is or would be limited to 0.02 cfs, not to exceed 2500 gallons/day, and if licensed would most likely get 0.6 afa.

With that in mind consider the following calculations:

- a. Business Open 8:00 AM to 10 PM (12 hours/day)
- b. Business closed on Sundays. Number of days operated/year = (52 weeks/year X 6 days/week = 312 days)
- b. Pump runs 2 hrs per day @ 0.02 cfs (2 hrs/24 hrs = 0.08333 or 8.3 % of the day)

Calculations:

$$\text{Number of 24 hour days per year} = (0.08333)(312 \text{ days}) = 26 (24 \text{ hr})\text{-Days}$$

$$\text{Annual Volume} = \text{Div.Rate} \times 1.9835 \times \# \text{ Days/year} = 0.02 \text{ cfs} \times 1.9835 \times 26 \text{ days} = 1.03 \text{ afa (ac-ft/year)}$$

$$[\text{Gallons/day @ 0.6 afa} = (0.6 \text{ afa} \times 325850 \text{ gallons/af}) \div (365 \text{ days}) = 535.6 \text{ gallons/day.}]$$

Keith C. Wilson

Senior Water Rights Analyst

kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Paul Scoresby [mailto:pscoresby@schliesseng.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2011 12:06 PM

To: Keith C. Wilson

Cc: Roger Warner

Subject: Re: FW: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

At least they keep the diversion rate. The offered volume allows them around 50 days of running the well at the diversion rate. They need 90-100 days of pumping at the diversion rate for the water right to be effective as a summer production well.

2011/8/16 Keith C. Wilson <kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com>

Keith C. Wilson

Senior Water Rights Analyst

kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Saxton, Craig [mailto:Craig.Saxton@idwr.idaho.gov]

Sent: Monday, August 15, 2011 2:27 PM

To: Keith C. Wilson

Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Hey Keith,

What if we meet in the middle @ 199 AF. I reached this number by estimating development of 221 domestic uses and up to 19 acres of irrigation.

221 domestic uses * 0.6 af per domestic use = 133.6 AF

19 acres at 3.5 AF per acre = 66.5 AF

Total Volume = 199 AF

Take a look. Let me know what you think by Aug 24th. If I don't hear from you, I will issue the license for municipal use with a diversion rate of 2.0 cfs and a diversion volume of 199AF.

Thanks.

Craig

From: Keith C. Wilson [mailto:kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2011 2:15 PM

To: Saxton, Craig

Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

I consider that all lots are stubbed-in.

The database for the permit does not explain how the 2.00 cfs for municipal was calculated.

I propose that the volume for municipal use be calculated as follows:

1. Flow of 2.00 cfs if not continuous 24 hrs/day, 365 days per year
2. Assume that 2.00 cfs is diverted continuously for only part of the day.

Example:

The Spring & Summer Season $\approx$ 200 days (Like Irrigation season), leaves 165 days for the Fall & Winter period.

During the Spring & Summer Season: Continuous Diversion is $\approx$ 8 hr/day

$$8 \text{ hr}/24 \text{ hr} = 0.33 \text{ of a day} = (0.33)(200 \text{ days}) = 66.7 \text{ days}$$

During the Fall & Winter Season: Continuous Diversion is $\approx$ 5 hr/day

$$5 \text{ hr}/24 \text{ hr} = 0.208 \text{ of a day} = (0.208)(165 \text{ days}) = 34.4 \text{ days}$$

Total 24 hour days = 66.7 days + 34.4 days = 101.1 days/year (24 hr days)

Municipal Volume = (2.00 cfs)x(1.9835)x(101.1 days) = 401.1 ac-ft/year

This is just a suggestion (hours/day may be more or less) but calculations along these lines seems more that sufficient.

Let me know what you think.

Keith C. Wilson
Senior Water Rights Analyst
kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Saxton, Craig [mailto:Craig.Saxton@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2011 1:50 PM
To: Keith C. Wilson
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Keith, how many lots are we saying that were stubbed in?

Thanks,

c

From: Keith C. Wilson [mailto:kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2011 12:52 PM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

We have been able to come up with a pump test performed prior to the 10/01/2005 Proof Due Date that would document the diversion rate of 2.00 cfs. Paul Scoresby PE & I agree that it appears all the lots were stubbed in but we have not been able to obtain any verifiable documentation, however, I feel confident that all the lots were stubbed in within the development period.

I'm still working on the volume.

Keith C. Wilson
Senior Water Rights Analyst
kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Saxton, Craig [mailto:Craig.Saxton@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 12:55 PM
To: Keith C. Wilson
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Thanks Keith.

From: Keith C. Wilson [mailto:kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 11:57 AM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Sorry,

I was working on another project that needed to be out or I would have responded quicker.

I called the Engineer that did the e... and he was to get back with me. I guess... dropped the ball. All I know was that all of the lots were stubbed-in. I believe that having all the lots stubbed-in was part of the agreement the developer had with the City.

I'll try and get with the engineer ASAP.

Keith C. Wilson

Senior Water Rights Analyst

kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Saxton, Craig [mailto:Craig.Saxton@idwr.idaho.gov]

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 3:25 PM

To: Keith C. Wilson

Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Hey Keith,

Any luck getting that information for the City of Driggs water right?

Thanks,

Craig

From: Keith C. Wilson [mailto:kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 9:08 AM

To: Saxton, Craig

Subject: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

It looks like next week before I can come up with the documentation.

Keith C. Wilson

Senior Water Rights Analyst

kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Keith C. Wilson [mailto:kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 3:34 PM

To: 'Saxton, Craig'

Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

I'll try and get some info this week so I hope to have all documentation to you by June 24, 2011.

Keith C. Wilson

Senior Water Rights Analyst

kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

Saxton, Craig

From: Keith C. Wilson [kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 3:34 PM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Craig,

I'll try and get some info this week so I hope to have all documentation to you by June 24, 2011.

Keith C. Wilson
Senior Water Rights Analyst
kwilson@rockymountainenvironmental.com

From: Saxton, Craig [<mailto:Craig.Saxton@idwr.idaho.gov>]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 2:27 PM
To: Keith C. Wilson
Subject: Permit 22-7814 - City of Driggs

Hey Keith,

I just wanted to thank you again for taking the time to talk that through with me. I also wanted to make sure I was on the same page as you are. I think we left off that you were going to try to find evidence or supporting documentation that the 2.00 cfs was diverted during the authorized development period, and that you were going to try to figure out exactly how much development was in place in 2005, including any stub-ins, so we can try to come up with a diversion volume.

I also wanted to confirm that I can support calculating the volume for the irrigated portion of the municipal use based on the Field Headgate Requirement standard of 3.5 AF per acre.

What kind of time line were you thinking about as far as how long it will take to gather the diversion rate and volume evidence?

Thanks,
Craig