

Weaver, Mathew

From: Weaver, Mathew
Sent: Friday, October 01, 2010 5:28 PM
To: 'Roxanne Brown'
Cc: 'Terry Scanlan'
Subject: FW: City of Nampa Permits

Roxanne,

I received your supplemental material dated August 27, 2010 regarding permits 63-32337 and 63-31949. I had hoped it would address the three items that I felt still needed to be addressed as described in my previous email, see below. Your supplemental material adequately addresses item (1). In regards to item (2) I'm not sure I can buy into the composite hydrograph theory as it relies on data acquired after proof of beneficial use was submitted. Never the less, based on data collected in 2009 prior to submittal of proof, I think we can come up with numbers for "total annual volume" (I propose 183.6 AF) and "maximum daily volume" (I propose 4.3 AF). Unfortunately your letter did not address item (3), which I feel is critical. Namely, how do we prove that the diversions that occurred under the two permits represent additional increments of beneficial use unique to the combined PI system.

In my email I proposed that if we could identify a time in which the combined PI system was solely source by ground water we could argue that since system capacity and system demand exceeded ground water diversion capacity, then all ground water diversions are needed and therefore represent additional beneficial use to the system. To that end I have poured over the monthly diversion records from Table 2-5 of the Master Plan. From the data in Table 2-5 I don't think I can state that the system ever receives more than 46% of its water from ground water, in those months in which the combined diversions exceeds your reported combined ground water diversion rate of ~71 CFS.

I'm not sure where we go from here. The relationship I was hoping for may be evident in daily records, assuming they exist for all sites, but I do not have access to that data. I am certainly open to suggestions.

I'm out of the office on Monday but in the rest of the week. Perhaps we can schedule a conference call or meeting to discuss the matter in more detail at that time.

Thank you,

Mat
IDWR

From: Terry Scanlan [mailto:TScanlan@spfwater.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 03, 2010 3:12 PM
To: Weaver, Mathew; Roxanne Brown
Subject: RE: City of Nampa Permits

Thanks, Mat. We'll see if we can't finish off these items while you are gone. Have a great vacation.

From: Weaver, Mathew [mailto:Mathew.Weaver@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 03, 2010 1:11 PM
To: Terry Scanlan; Roxanne Brown
Subject: City of Nampa Permits

Terry & Roxanne,

Please find attached a draft memo of my summary review of the Field Exams and supplemental material, and subsequent recommendation for the Water Rights Group in licensing permits 63-31949 and 63-32337. Per feedback from Shelley Keen and our recent discussions I believe there are three outstanding items that need to be addressed before I can finalize the memo and the recommendations contained within. The outstanding items include the following:

- (1) We need to establish that 3.34 CFS was actually diverted at the Vista Ridge pump station (63-31949) during the development period through either a historical measurement from the development period, a combination of a current measurement and affidavit from the permit holder stating that it occurred historically, or some other form of evidence I have not considered.
- (2) We need the outstanding data required by condition nine of permit 63-32337; the Field Exam report provided the "maximum instantaneous rate of flow diverted", but did not include the "total annual volume" or the "maximum daily volume". It sounds like the City has this information for 2009 and it is just a matter of getting it included with the Field Exam.
- (3) From the Master Plan we can determine that the irrigation demand during the development period was approximately 95 CFS. For much of the irrigation season this demand is supplied by a combination of surface and ground water sources. One way in which we can conclude that an incremental addition of beneficial use occurred with both permits, is to confirm that at times during the irrigation season ground water is the predominant supply of water to the irrigation delivery system, such that the portion of the demand being met by ground water is equal to or greater than 71.12 CFS (approximately 75% of the demand is met by ground water).

Thank you,

Mat Weaver, PE

Staff Engineer

Idaho Department of Water Resources

(208) 287-4914

<<Draft Memo 7-30-10.pdf>>