



State of Idaho

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

1341 Fillmore Street, Suite 200, Twin Falls, ID 83301-3380

Phone: (208) 736-3033 FAX: (208) 736-3037

SOUTHERN REGION

DIRK KEMPTHORNE
GOVERNOR

KARL J. DREHER
DIRECTOR

July 26, 2000

Brockway Engineering
ATTN: Charles G. Brockway
2016 N Washington St #4
Twin Falls, ID
83301

RE: Apps. For Transfer, Gerald Bashaw

Dear Chuck;

I have completed the GIS work on these transfers, and a copy of the final map is enclosed for your records. Also included is a land list based on the map, which you can use to prepare a new Attachment B. With regard to Attachment B, the second part (Current & Likely Future Irrigation) is not needed now, although it may be of use in future transfers.

In general, the surface-water transfer needs to deal with the recorded (decreed) amounts and the amounts from the watermaster's records. There appears to be some discrepancies between this data and the claimed amounts, but those can be dealt with later. The Amounts To Be Transferred in Attachment A should be from the watermaster records, not from our records, in the case of split rights. The data is there, it just needs to be rearranged. The drain rights need to be shown in cfs, of course, and that data is in our records. The watermaster amounts may not include what Willis Castle had (as in the case of 37-01082D), so you probably want to recheck this.

The standard irrigation season for that area is now 4-15 to 10-31, and I assume that Boise will approve transfers for this period unless a longer season can be justified by the applicant. But you can show any season that you want to on the applications.

The Part 2's that you submitted for the split rights are not acceptable, as they are incomplete without acres in 2.B.3. Pam Skaggs in Boise confirmed that this is the case. For a land list, you might want to use the 672 acres licensed from groundwater as the present place of use for all these rights. Just label each as the present place of use. Just a suggestion, but it reflects reality much more than a 90-year-old decree does.

T # 5813

With regard to 37-00237B/00448, Bashaw owns 0.22 cfs of the former and 1.30 cfs of the latter according to Lee. So this is what is available for transfer, not the proportional split that you came up with (unless you can find an error in Lee's records). This is also less than what Bashaw has claimed; could this be another case where Castle water was not included?

I agree that 37-00950 is not split. But 944D is split. Lee shows 6.6 inches (0.132 cfs), leaving 13.4 inches (0.268 cfs) as the untransferred portion. These amounts do not agree with your split, however; please correct. Most of your other splits also do not match Lee's and our records.

I was hoping to be rid of these things, but it looks like there is still a little more work to do. Once I get a new Attachment B, I should be able to computerize the groundwater transfer. Obviously the surface transfer still has some problems. We would normally advertise them together, so I expect to hold them until both are ready for publication.

Regards,

James E. Stanton
Sr. Water Resource Agent