

Van Dyke, Nick

From: Jordan, Blake
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2009 7:57 AM
To: Van Dyke, Nick
Subject: RE: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

All other water rights historically were diverted from PODs that are within adjacent cells from the POD in section 4 including the rights in section 4; except for the water rights in section 10. Every time we ran the model going from section 10 to section 4 we would get a greater than 10% impact to the BLKFoot to Neeley Reach. The 9.69 cfs comes from the total water rights involved in the transfer except for the rights in section 10 (29-8188 and 29-8230). The only way we could avoid mitigation is to not transfer the water from the POD in section 10 to the POD in section 4, so we reduced the diversion rate for the POD in section 4 by what was authorized under water rights 29-8188 and 29-8230.

Blake

From: Van Dyke, Nick
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2009 3:07 PM
To: Jordan, Blake
Subject: RE: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

Blake,

How'd you arrive at the 9.69cfs to avoid mitigation? Don't need exact numbers, just methodology.

Nick

From: Jordan, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2009 10:14 AM
To: Van Dyke, Nick
Subject: RE: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

Nick,

The results are the same when you run the model the way you suggested. Going from the well in section 10 to the well in section is a problem no matter if you run the worse case scenario or the way you proposed.

Blake

From: Van Dyke, Nick
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2009 9:49 AM
To: Cox, Sharla
Cc: Jordan, Blake; Skaggs, Pam
Subject: RE: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

Sharla,

I gave Blake some feedback on the ESPA modeling. He said he was going to re-run it with some changes. Haven't heard anything back.

From: Cox, Sharla
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2009 9:43 AM
To: Van Dyke, Nick; Jordan, Blake
Cc: Skaggs, Pam

Subject: RE: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

Pam or Nick, can you tell us what the status of this transfer is?

Thank you!

Sharla

Sharla Cox
Administrative Assistant
Idaho Department of Water Resources
900 N. Skyline Dr. Ste. A
Idaho Falls ID 83402
208-525-7161 - telephone
208-525-7177 - fax
sharla.cox@idwr.idaho.gov

From: Van Dyke, Nick
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2009 10:24 AM
To: Jordan, Blake
Cc: Cox, Sharla
Subject: RE: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

Blake,

I've glanced at the ESPA analysis on this one, got a general question on it –

I understand that you've run it as a worst case scenario (moving the full 18.6cfs authorized by all 7 of Chubbuck's rights) from the well in section 10 (cell 97, 121) to the wells in section 4 (cell 95, 121) and Section 34 (cell 95, 122). In this manner all three mitigation conditions are met on the Section 4 well. Limiting the rate to 9.69cfs out of this well avoids mitigation.

Would it be more proper to run the model with a starting date of 1996 with only the available rate from rights 29-8188 and 29-8230? 29-8188 has a '96 priority and 29-8230 would come in 3 years later with a '99 priority. It looks like these are the only two rights authorized out of the section 10 well. The well log shows a completed date of 4/17/96.

Nick

From: Cox, Sharla
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2009 2:42 PM
To: Skaggs, Pam
Subject: 75304 City of Chubbuck - FIRST LOOK

Pam, here is a new one from Blake. I have enclosed the Draft Approval along with the scanned map that will go with the approval when finished.

<< File: 75304.RTF >> << File: img-427140429.pdf >>
Please let us know when ok to approve. It's been through advertising.....

Sharla

*Sharla Cox
Administrative Assistant*