

Robertson, Jean

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 1:05 PM
To: 'rlh@jub.com'
Subject: FW: City of Richfield

Hello Rex,

Got a little feedback from our S.O. in Boise regarding this permit (see below) and they suggested the City might want to amend the application again to **2.85 cfs**. The new amount would still fall under the original \$330.00 they have already paid and since we haven't advertised yet, there would be no additional fee to do this. I thought I would run this by you first and then I guess I can contact them. Or would you like to take care of it with them? Thanks, Jeanie

From: Padilla, Cherie
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 12:14 PM
To: Robertson, Jean
Subject: RE: City of Richfield

Hi Jeanie!

Thanks for the heads up. I took a look at the information submitted by JUB and were they every thorough...gotta like that. Anyways, I am starting to question if this application is for RAFN. I say this because they say the current peak demand is 993 gpm or 2.21 cfs. Their current water rights are for 1.92 cfs. so if this was an immediate need, the application would only need to be for 0.29 cfs.

On page 6-2 of the report it goes on to say that by 2028 the city will need 2140 gpm or 4.77 cfs.

JUB reports that the current system has a capacity of 1160 gpm (2.58 cfs) and that the city will need to install another well with a capacity of 980 gpm (2.18 cfs) to meet the 2028 figure of 4.77 cfs.

What the applicant didn't account for was their current water rights are only worth 1.92 cfs not 2.58 cfs...so the difference needs to be accounted for in this application which would make it for 2.85 cfs instead of 2.18 (if they are wanting this to be for RAFN).

Here's some of my calculation in case my narrative doesn't make sense

<u>Current Water Rights</u>	<u>Current Peak Demand</u>	<u>Projected Demand for 2028</u>
1.92 cfs	2.58 cfs	4.77 cfs

Total CFS the Application for Permit should be for: $4.77 - 1.92 = 2.85$ cfs

If they do submit another amended application we should have them put down 20 years under the development period question too since I think that's what they're really looking for.

We can talk about this more tomorrow if you have any questions or give me a call. Thanks for all your correspondence to the applicant about this and getting all that info in the database.

Thanks
Cherie

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 11:39 AM
To: Padilla, Cherie
Subject: City of Richfield

Hi Cherie,
The stuff submitted by JUB has been scanned and is now available for you to take a look at! Jeanie