

Robertson, Jean

From: Zach Latham [zach.latham@brockwayeng.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 12:04 PM
To: Robertson, Jean
Subject: RE: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Ah ha! Now does it make sense? I rounded to the nearest acre and came up with a total of 2508.5 as is listed on the application. I can send you the shapefile and associated files if you need them. Please let me know if you have any other questions, thanks.

Zach Latham

Hydrologist
Brockway Engineering, P.L.L.C.
2016 Washington Street North, Suite 4
Twin Falls, ID 83301
t. 208-736-8543
c. 208-308-0739
f. 208-736-8506
zach.latham@brockwayeng.com

From: Robertson, Jean [mailto:Jean.Robertson@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 12:01 PM
To: Zach Latham
Subject: RE: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Wait a minute, I think you are right! That's one of those weird sections, isn't it? Sorry, my bad!

From: Zach Latham [mailto:zach.latham@brockwayeng.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 11:34 AM
To: Robertson, Jean
Subject: RE: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Jeanie-
Here is what I come up with:

Section 24 = 239.6
Section 36 = 631.1
Section 31 = **316.6**
Section 4 = 356.4
Section 5 = 562.3
Section 8 = 81
Section 9 = 319
Total = **2506.00**

Our differences seem to be in Section 31, where there are a few lots to deal with.

If all of the Quarter Quarters are rounded to the nearest acre, the total then becomes (as listed on attachment A) **2508.5** acres. Am I missing something? Thanks for your help and assistance.

10/13/2009

Zach Latham

Hydrologist
Brockway Engineering, P.L.L.C.
2016 Washington Street North, Suite 4
Twin Falls, ID 83301
t. 208-736-8543
c. 208-308-0739
f. 208-736-8506
zach.latham@brockwayeng.com

From: Robertson, Jean [mailto:Jean.Robertson@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 9:46 AM
To: Zach Latham
Subject: FW: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Zach,

We were off yesterday...what number do you come up with? This is what I come up with. (The double-up of acres was in the SW 1/4 of Section 31, not the SE 1/4)

Section 24 = 239.6
Section 36 = 631.1
Section 31 = 236.5
Section 4 = 356.4
Section 5 = 562.3
Section 8 = 81
Section 9 = 319
Total = 2425.9

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 12:23 PM
To: 'Zach Latham'
Subject: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Zach,

The place of use "box" that you submitted with the map, which has the acres in the qq's labeled, do not match. (There is especially a problem in the SE 1/4 of Section 31.) When I used the acres from the map, I come up with a total of 2425.9 acres instead of the 2508.5 that you said. Please make them match and submit a new "box", I guess. Thanks, Jeanie

Robertson, Jean

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 9:31 AM
To: 'Zach Latham'
Subject: FW: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Zach,
We were off yesterday...what number do you come up with? This is what I come up with. (The double-up of acres was in the SW 1/4 of Section 31, not the SE 1/4)

Section 24 = 239.6
Section 36 = 631.1
Section 31 = 236.5
Section 4 = 356.4
Section 5 = 562.3
Section 8 = 81
Section 9 = 319
Total = 2425.9

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 12:23 PM
To: 'Zach Latham'
Subject: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Zach,
The place of use "box" that you submitted with the map, which has the acres in the qq's labeled, do not match. (There is especially a problem in the SE 1/4 of Section 31.) When I used the acres from the map, I come up with a total of 2425.9 acres instead of the 2508.5 that you said. Please make them match and submit a new "box", I guess. Thanks, Jeanie

Robertson, Jean

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 12:23 PM
To: 'Zach Latham'
Subject: Jentzsch-Kearl...

Zach,

The place of use "box" that you submitted with the map, which has the acres in the qq's labeled, do not match. (There is especially a problem in the SE ^{SW} 1/4 of Section 31.) When I used the acres from the map, I come up with a total of 2425.9 acres instead of the 2508.5 that you said. Please make them match and submit a new "box", I guess. Thanks, Jeanie