

MEMORANDUM

To: Files 36-07739, 36-08335, 36-07741 and 36-08729

From: Kay Walker *KW*

RE: License Recommendations

Date: February 20, 2002

.....

In review of these permits for licensing, we found that the SRBA decreed rights on the same sources of water had specific limits in regard to combined Rts. 36-00001, 36-00002 and 36-00003H. The SRBA limits all 3 rights when combined to 28.55 cfs. We tried to figure out where this limit came from but only determined that it was done during a settlement conference of the SRBA.

We discussed this with Steve Clelland, as the agent who recommended these claims for decree. Steve stated that he was not included in the settlement conference and when he received the partial decrees issued for these rights, he tried to find out where the 28.55 cfs derived from, and he never got an answer. Steve believes that the right holders received more than an inch per acre under these rights. In review of the rights I found the following:

Rt. 36-00001	Riley Creek	12.00 cfs
Rt. 36-00002	Riley Creek	10.45 cfs *
Rt. 36-00003H	Billingsley Creek	<u>11.90 cfs</u> **
	TOTAL =	34.35 cfs

*Includes 5.96 cfs for conveyance loss

**Includes 6.10 cfs for conveyance loss

These rights are used conjunctively on a 761-acre place of use. If you subtract the conveyance losses from them it leaves 22.29 cfs for 761 acres, which comes out to be 0.029 cfs per acre that is consistent with Steve Clelland's thought on this matter.

Since the limitation of 28.55 cfs appears to only deal with the irrigation of the place of use identified under these rights, we are not including this limitation on the proposed licenses. We are convinced, through our review, that the right holders are making beneficial use of the 34.35 cfs that they have been diverting since the New International Mortgage Bank vs. Idaho Power Company decree.

LICENSE REVIEW CHECKLIST

Permit No. 36-7741 Date: 2-7-02 Reviewer: Kay Walker

Change/OK

Name/Address OK

Source OK

Point of Diversion: OK

Does change clarify original intended source? If no, void permit.
Change (P39/P49) Add (P45/P44) Feds (P40)

W32 (multiple in 1/4/1/4)
W36 (overlap)
W59 (subdivision description)

Place of Use add

Change (P41/P49) Add (P41/P44) Feds (P43)

W60 (subdivision description)
W27 (ppu acre limit)

Overlaps: Right(s): 36-00001, 36-00002, 36-8729
File reviewed _____ Profile reports printed ✓

P/D & P/U amend (P37) Feds (P48)

Rate of Diversion:

Permitted rate 24.0 cfs
Fee Limit 20+ cfs
Measured _____ cfs
Theoretical 48.68 cfs

Recommended Total Diversion Rate 24.0

22.45 ← per decreed
Rts. 36-00001
+ 36-00002

Season of Use per new Standards

Water Uses OK

Change (P46)

Irrigation _____ cfs _____ af
Stockwater _____ cfs _____ af
Domestic _____ cfs _____ af
_____ cfs _____ af
_____ cfs _____ af
Total _____ cfs _____ af

Irrigation - overlap(R58-R61, R62-R65, R66-R69)
supp. Gw (WB7/065/104)
overlap spec combined rts (W35)
<1 acre (W31)
Domestic (W01/wb5/070/071/075)
Power (W42 or W43/025/027/R22 or R23)
Fish (042)
Fire (077)
Water Quality (106/R07)
Payette - (W22/047/27A)
Stockwater for US (R37)

$22.45 \times 1.9835 \times 365 = 16253.29$
 $22.45 \times 1.9835 \times 365 \approx 16300$

Volume Determination

24 cfs x 1.9835 x 365 days = 17375.46 af

(vs) _____ acres x _____ (FHR) = _____ af

Remarks: _____

Additional Conditions _____ Watermaster Control
_____ GW Measurement/Measuring Device
_____ Other
Trust R55 - remove 051
Non-trust (048)

GW Dist? _____
Water Msmt. Dist? _____
Crit. GWMA? _____
GWMA? _____
Government Lots? _____

Advance Priority? yes If yes, explain why below.

no
SRBA Claim? Not req'd

Adjust memo _____

Amend Letters _____ P87, S06 Second Amendment Notice _____ S06

irrig. season: $22.45 \text{ cfs} \times 1.9835 \times 246 \text{ days} = 10954.3 \text{ AF} = 11000.0 \text{ AF}$
non irrig. season: $24 \text{ cfs} \times 1.9835 \times 119 \text{ days} = 5664.8 \text{ AF} = 5660.0 \text{ AF}$
16660.
~16700.