

Nelson, Dan

From: Olenichak, Tony
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 9:53 AM
To: Nelson, Dan
Cc: Swank, Lyle; Van Bussum, Monica
Subject: RE: Basin 01 Watermaster Approval of Water Bank Lease

Dan,

I would make at least one correction to your 9/29/2010 memo. Both 22-2125 (1942-priority) and 22-2137 (1950-priority) are considered "high" water rights. In consecutive drought years, it's possible that neither priority is ever filled unless there is a futile call situation. These two water-right priorities are usually only filled in average or above-average water years during the spring or early summer. There is little difference between 1942 and 1950 priority water rights in the Snake River basin. I don't think there has ever been a situation where we've been filling the 1942 priority and not filling the 1950 priority. However, because of its remote location, there hasn't been a great deal of effort to regulate diversions on Horseshoe Creek according to its priorities in the spring or early summer. If this practice should change in the future, it's possible that these "high" water rights wouldn't be able to divert water under these priorities until Horseshoe Creek fails to reach the Teton River, i.e., a futile call situation. I think the futile call situation occurs on Horseshoe Creek later in the summer in all below-average and average water years, and possibly on some above-average water years. Water should be available to fill the pond in the spring and early summer on wet years when Horseshoe Creek is connected to the Teton River, and probably available in late-summer under the futile call situation in drier years.

You also recommended in your memo that the flow rate be limited to 0.2 cfs and 2.2 ac-ft to fill the pond. I didn't see any description of the diversion works or its capacity. If the capacity of the diversion works is 0.2 cfs and the pond holds 2.2 ac-ft, then there isn't any need for changes. However, if the diversion works can divert more than 0.2 cfs into the pond, I would recommend the allowable flow rate to fill the pond be equivalent to the maximum capacity of the diversion works, not to exceed the total flow rate of rights 22-2125 and 22-2137. My experience with filling ponds is that they will fill the pond using the total capacity of the ditch that flows into the pond in a short period of time, rather than filling it with the "paper" flow rate over several days or weeks. I don't see any reason to restrict the flow rate when filling the pond to an amount less than the diversion works if sufficient water is available on Horseshoe Creek and they aren't using rights 22-2125 and 22-2137 for irrigation. A lower flow rate such as 0.04 cfs, representing evaporation and seepage losses, is probably sufficient to maintain the water level of the pond after it has been filled.

Tony Olenichak
Program Manager
Water District #1

From: Swank, Lyle
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 3:16 PM
To: Olenichak, Tony
Subject: FW: Basin 01 Watermaster Approval of Water Bank Lease

Tony,

Please provide comments on the proposed Water Bank Lease and Rental for these water rights.

Thanks,
Lyle

From: Nelson, Dan
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 11:07 AM
To: Swank, Lyle
Cc: Van Bussum, Monica
Subject: Basin 01 Watermaster Approval of Water Bank Lease

October 28, 2010

Lyle Swank, Watermaster, Water District 01

Re: Water Bank Lease and Rental for Water Rights 22-2125 and 22-2137

Dear Watermaster:

Attached are copies of a water bank lease and rental to the Water Bank. This lease is for retirement of an acre of irrigation and using the appurtenant water to fill a pond for fire protection. The applicant is Blue Indian Homeowners Association, Inc. and the pond is located in the in Township 5 North, Range 44 East, Section 27, in the SESE quarter. The pond will be 90 feet in diameter and 15 feet deep. The pond will be approximately 2.2 acre feet in volume.

Please provide your Watermaster recommendations by November 11, 2010.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding the application(s).

Sincerely,

Enclosure Copy of Applications(s)
 Review memo of project

Daniel A. Nelson
Staff Hydrologist
Planning Bureau
Idaho Department of Water Resources
Telephone # (208) 287-4856

<< File: WSB Memo.docx >> << File: Blue Indian Rental.pdf >> << File: Blue Indian Lease.pdf >> << File: Lease and rental Map.pdf >>

Nelson, Dan

From: Olenichak, Tony
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 9:53 AM
To: Nelson, Dan
Cc: Swank, Lyle; Van Bussum, Monica
Subject: RE: Basin 01 Watermaster Approval of Water Bank Lease

Dan,

I would make at least one correction to your 9/29/2010 memo. Both 22-2125 (1942-priority) and 22-2137 (1950-priority) are considered "high" water rights. In consecutive drought years, it's possible that neither priority is ever filled unless there is a futile call situation. These two water-right priorities are usually only filled in average or above-average water years during the spring or early summer. There is little difference between 1942 and 1950 priority water rights in the Snake River basin. I don't think there has ever been a situation where we've been filling the 1942 priority and not filling the 1950 priority. However, because of its remote location, there hasn't been a great deal of effort to regulate diversions on Horseshoe Creek according to its priorities in the spring or early summer. If this practice should change in the future, it's possible that these "high" water rights wouldn't be able to divert water under these priorities until Horseshoe Creek fails to reach the Teton River, i.e., a futile call situation. I think the futile call situation occurs on Horseshoe Creek later in the summer in all below-average and average water years, and possibly on some above-average water years. Water should be available to fill the pond in the spring and early summer on wet years when Horseshoe Creek is connected to the Teton River, and probably available in late-summer under the futile call situation in drier years.

You also recommended in your memo that the flow rate be limited to 0.2 cfs and 2.2 ac-ft to fill the pond. I didn't see any description of the diversion works or its capacity. If the capacity of the diversion works is 0.2 cfs and the pond holds 2.2 ac-ft, then there isn't any need for changes. However, if the diversion works can divert more than 0.2 cfs into the pond, I would recommend the allowable flow rate to fill the pond be equivalent to the maximum capacity of the diversion works, not to exceed the total flow rate of rights 22-2125 and 22-2137. My experience with filling ponds is that they will fill the pond using the total capacity of the ditch that flows into the pond in a short period of time, rather than filling it with the "paper" flow rate over several days or weeks. I don't see any reason to restrict the flow rate when filling the pond to an amount less than the diversion works if sufficient water is available on Horseshoe Creek and they aren't using rights 22-2125 and 22-2137 for irrigation. A lower flow rate such as 0.04 cfs, representing evaporation and seepage losses, is probably sufficient to maintain the water level of the pond after it has been filled.

Tony Olenichak
Program Manager
Water District #1

From: Swank, Lyle
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 3:16 PM
To: Olenichak, Tony
Subject: FW: Basin 01 Watermaster Approval of Water Bank Lease

Tony,

Please provide comments on the proposed Water Bank Lease and Rental for these water rights.

Thanks,
Lyle

From: Nelson, Dan
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 11:07 AM
To: Swank, Lyle
Cc: Van Bussum, Monica
Subject: Basin 01 Watermaster Approval of Water Bank Lease

October 28, 2010

Lyle Swank, Watermaster, Water District 01

Re: Water Bank Lease and Rental for Water Rights 22-2125 and 22-2137

Dear Watermaster:

Attached are copies of a water bank lease and rental to the Water Bank. This lease is for retirement of an acre of irrigation and using the appurtenant water to fill a pond for fire protection. The applicant is Blue Indian Homeowners Association, Inc. and the pond is located in the in Township 5 North, Range 44 East, Section 27, in the SESE quarter. The pond will be 90 feet in diameter and 15 feet deep. The pond will be approximately 2.2 acre feet in volume.

Please provide your Watermaster recommendations by November 11, 2010.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding the application(s).

Sincerely,

Enclosure Copy of Applications(s)
 Review memo of project

Daniel A. Nelson
Staff Hydrologist
Planning Bureau
Idaho Department of Water Resources
Telephone # (208) 287-4856

<< File: WSB Memo.docx >> << File: Blue Indian Rental.pdf >> << File: Blue Indian Lease.pdf >> << File: Lease and rental Map.pdf >>