

Saxton, Craig

From: Williams, Ray
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2010 9:59 AM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: RE: SRBA Recommendations 63-32481 & 63-32482: Hearing 2-23-10

Thanks, Craig. If you think of it, if you could let me know when the licenses are issued, that would be great.

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2010 9:22 AM
To: Spencer, Nick
Cc: Williams, Ray; Shurte, Jan
Subject: RE: SRBA Recommendations 63-32481 & 63-32482: Hearing 2-23-10

Thanks Everyone. I think I have the picture and will move to get the licenses issued before the hearing date.

Thanks,
c

From: Spencer, Nick
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 2:33 PM
To: Saxton, Craig
Cc: Williams, Ray; Shurte, Jan
Subject: FW: SRBA Recommendations 63-32481 & 63-32482: Hearing 2-23-10

Hi Craig.

I am not aware of any substantive action going on in the SRBA regarding these rights. Generally anytime the SRBA Court gets recommendations listing "permit" as the basis of the recommendation, it holds off on decreeing them until they are licensed. This is because the court does not want to create any confusion about whether a permit--if decreed in the SRBA--can subsequently be modified by the department pursuant to the issuance of the license. So, what the court does, when it gets a permit, is to schedule periodic status conferences just to find out how the department is coming on getting the permit licensed. Only when we report the license has been issued, and file an NCAP with the court describing the right per the license, does the court then go forward and decree it.

The bottom line is that I don't think there is anything going on in the SRBA Court that will limit you in any way as to how you license these permits. Feel free to put on any standard conditions that allocations uses to address any POU overlap issues, or any other issues, and issue the licenses accordingly.

Jan, am I overlooking anything here? NBS

From: Williams, Ray
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 10:51 AM
To: Saxton, Craig; Shurte, Jan
Cc: Spencer, Nick
Subject: FW: SRBA Recommendations 63-32481 & 63-32482: Hearing 2-23-10

Craig,

Andrea forwarded this to me. This is one that Nick worked on. The last hearing was to ascertain that status of the licensing proceeding. I think we were waiting on updated ownership info to be filed. If I recall correctly, the field exam was

done earlier this summer. I was thinking that if this gets licensed, the hearing can be vacated, but I wasn't aware of the POU issue.

Jan,

You know a lot more about this than I do - what do you think?

Thanks,

Ray

From: Courtney, Andrea
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 7:28 AM
To: Williams, Ray
Subject: FW: SRBA Recommendations 63-32481 & 63-32482: Hearing 2-23-10

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 4:20 PM
To: Spencer, Nick; Courtney, Andrea; Shurte, Jan; Music, Vicky
Subject: SRBA Recommendations 63-32481 & 63-32482: Hearing 2-23-10

Hey Everyone,

I received draft licenses 63-33283 and 63-33284 for me to finalize with notes saying, "**Please Expedite if Possible, AJ action is pending.**" Since I am an AJ fan, I of course will try to get this done.

63-8782 was split into 63-33283 and 63-33284:

License 63-33283 is in the name of Wayne L Tuft LLC.

License 63-33284 is in the name of Shirley T Johnson Family Trust

Overlap analysis shows that draft license 63-33283 overlaps SRBA recommendation 63-32481 ..on paper. Notes in the license file state that despite that these rights overlap on paper, they don't in the field.

Questions:

Is the hearing set on Feb 23, 2010 hearing to find out the progress of licensing 63-33283 and 63-33284?
If it is, are you waiting to find out what kind of POU will be licensed?

I am just wondering what the hearing is about and if there is potentially going to be a change in the recommended POU for 63-32481 depending on how allocations licenses 63-33283. I just don't want to add a condition on the license that limits the POU between 63-32481 and 63-33283 if the result of this hearing is going to be to change 63-32481 to reflect what is really going on in the field and thus making the condition limiting POU inaccurate.

I am not doing well explaining this. If you are familiar with this, will you call me.

Thanks,
c