
From: Weaver, Mathew
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 4:08 PM
To: Robertson, Jean
Subject: RE: ESPA Ground Water Model Transfer Analysis

Not yet. How much water is getting transferred in each case?

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 3:17 PM
To: Weaver, Mathew
Subject: RE: ESPA Ground Water Model Transfer Analysis

No, that's all they submitted. Should I ask for more? I'd be happy to!

From: Weaver, Mathew
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 3:16 PM
To: Robertson, Jean
Subject: RE: ESPA Ground Water Model Transfer Analysis

Jeanie,

I can take a look at it. Did you happen to get a copy of the actual spreadsheet itself?

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 2:34 PM
To: Weaver, Mathew
Subject: ESPA Ground Water Model Transfer Analysis

Hi Mat,

Zach from Brockway submitted these two sheets, one for each portion of two rights being transferred into a PPU through pending transfer 74429. He indicated that Greg Sullivan, also of Brockway, had created this spreadsheet analysis either with your help or approval after they were quite confused with the new transfer memo. Would you mind checking them over real quick and see if the sheets provide sufficient information to show that no mitigation is required? Thanks, Jeanie

<< File: img-Y09151512.pdf >>

Transfer 1:

WR No.	Div. Rate (CFS)	Con. Vol. (AFA)	No. of Irr. Acres	Priority Date	POD Location	Dedicated Vol. AFA/ AFT		Model Node
Transfer: Proposed Steady State Impacts following Transfer								
36-16549	0.16	64.4	16.1	4/21/1989	NESW09T8SR25E	64.4	21.5	SP079068
36-16549	0.16	64.4	16.1	4/21/1989	NESW09T8SR25E	64.4	21.5	SP072070
Transfer: Worst Case Transient State Impacts following Transfer								
36-16549	0.16	64.4	16.1	4/21/1989	NESW09T8SR25E	64.4	21.5	SP079068
36-16549	0.16	64.4	16.1	4/21/1989	NESW09T8SR25E	64.4	21.5	SP072070

Impact by Reach (AF/Trimester)

Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Blckft	Nr Blckft To Neeley	Neeley to Minidoka	Dev. Wbl. To Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft
0.3	0.3	2.2	7.9	3.3	3.9	1.5	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.0
0.3	0.3	2.4	8.3	2.4	4.1	1.6	1.0	0.1	0.9	0.0
0.3	0.3	2.2	7.9	3.3	3.9	1.5	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.0
0.3	0.3	2.4	8.3	2.9	4.1	1.6	1.0	0.1	0.9	0.0

Steady State Analysis

Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Total:	1.3%	1.5%	11.1%	38.7%	11.3%	19.1%	7.4%	4.7%	0.5%	4.4%	0.2%
Mitigation Check 2: > 2 AF/T:	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	-0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Historical:	5.8%	5.7%	5.5%	4.9%	-27.6%	5.1%	5.6%	5.7%	5.8%	5.9%	6.0%
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	-0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0

Transient State Analysis

Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Total:	1.3%	1.4%	10.8%	37.8%	13.3%	18.7%	7.2%	4.6%	0.5%	4.3%	0.2%
Mitigation Check 2: > 2 AF/T:	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	-0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Historical:	5.8%	5.7%	5.5%	4.9%	-12.8%	5.1%	5.6%	5.7%	5.8%	5.9%	6.0%
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	-0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0

Transfer 2:

WR No.	Div. Rate (CFS)	Con. Vol. (AFA)	No. of Irr. Acres	Priority Date	POD Location	Dedicated Vol. AFA/ AFT		Model Node
Transfer: Proposed Steady State Impacts following Transfer								
36-16794	0.3	59.2	14.8	10/20/1980	NESE22T85R25E	59.2	19.73	SP081069
36-16794	0.3	59.2	14.8	10/20/1980	NESE22T85R25E	59.2	19.73	SP072070
Transfer: Worst Case Transient State Impacts following Transfer								
36-16794	0.3	59.2	14.8	10/20/1980	NESE22T85R25E	59.2	19.73	SP081069
36-16794	0.3	59.2	14.8	10/20/1980	NESE22T85R25E	59.2	19.73	SP072070

Impact by Reach (AF/Trimester)

Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Blckft	Nr Blckft To Neeley	Neeley to Minidoka	Dev. Wbl. To Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft
0.2	0.3	2.0	7.0	3.7	3.4	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.0
0.3	0.3	2.2	7.6	2.2	3.8	1.4	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.0
0.2	0.3	2.0	7.0	3.7	3.4	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.0
0.3	0.3	2.2	7.6	3.4	3.8	1.4	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.0

Steady State Analysis

Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Total:	1.3%	1.5%	11.1%	38.7%	11.3%	19.1%	7.4%	4.7%	0.5%	4.4%	0.2%
Mitigation Check 2: > 2 AF/T:	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	-1.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Historical:	9.6%	9.5%	9.2%	8.1%	-39.2%	9.8%	10.4%	10.5%	10.7%	10.9%	10.9%
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	-1.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0

Transient State Analysis

Mitigation Check 1 - >10% of Total:	1.2%	1.4%	10.5%	36.6%	16.2%	18.1%	7.0%	4.4%	0.5%	4.2%	0.2%
Mitigation Check 2: > 2 AF/T:	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	-0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Mitigation Check 3 - >10% of Historical:	9.6%	9.5%	9.2%	8.1%	-8.1%	9.8%	10.4%	10.5%	10.7%	10.9%	10.9%
Mitigation Required?:	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Mitigation Vol. Req'd (ac-ft):	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	-0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0

Steady State Summary of Modified Stream Depletions Following Transfer(s)

Impact by Reach (AF/T rimester)

	Ashton to Rexburg	Heise to Shelley	Shelley to Nr Bickft	Nr Bickft To Neeley	Neeley to Mindoka	Dev. Wbl. To Buhl	Buhl to Kspr	Kspr	Kspr to Malad	Malad	Malad to Bancroft
1a	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	-0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
3a	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	-1.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
4a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1b	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3b	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4b	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5b	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3c	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3d	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4g	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3e	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4d	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4e	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3g	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4c	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5c	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Summary:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0