

Van Dyke, Nick

From: Van Bussum, Monica
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2009 11:06 AM
To: Van Dyke, Nick
Subject: FW: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Woohoo!

From: Williams, Ray
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2009 10:23 AM
To: Van Bussum, Monica
Subject: FW: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Monica -

The *Order of Amended Partial Decree to Correct Clerical Error* was issued by the court yesterday. fyi--

Thanks,

Ray

From: Baxter, Garrick
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2009 12:02 PM
To: Van Bussum, Monica
Cc: Williams, Ray
Subject: RE: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Thanks, Monica. I forwarded the info to Eric. A new order decreeing the right as recommended should come out shortly. Please let Nick know.
-Garrick

From: Van Bussum, Monica
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2009 10:42 AM
To: Baxter, Garrick
Cc: Williams, Ray
Subject: RE: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Hi Garrick,

The address in our database is for Eugene. A check of the taxlots gives us:

PO Box 455
Grand View ID 83624

The taxlot owner record says Agenbroad Grand View Family, which I presume means Agenbroad Grand View Family Trust.

Monica

6/19/2009

From: Baxter, Garrick
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2009 4:03 PM
To: Van Bussum, Monica; Williams, Ray
Subject: FW: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Monica,
Do we have an address for the claimant? See Eric's question below.
Thanks,
Garrick

From: Eric Wildman [mailto:ewildman@srba.state.id.us]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2009 1:05 PM
To: Baxter, Garrick
Subject: RE: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Hi Garrick,

Yes, I looked into it. The error was our screw up and somehow occurred when we uploaded the data for the late claims director's report. We prepared an amended partial decree and order which would have gone out but there is a question regarding the correct mailing address. The original partial decree was previously mailed to the address in the face of the decree (Eugene, Oregon) and was returned. As such, it has been sitting in my "stack" with a sticky on it reminding me to inquire about the address. (Thanks for following up). Do you happen to have an updated address for the claimant? Otherwise it is ready to go out consistent with the recommendation.

Thanks,

Eric

From: Baxter, Garrick [mailto:Garrick.Baxter@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2009 11:04 AM
To: Eric Wildman
Subject: FW: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Hi Eric,
Just following up on this question. Were you able to look into this?
Thanks,
Garrick

From: Eric Wildman [mailto:ewildman@srba.state.id.us]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 4:39 PM
To: Baxter, Garrick
Subject: RE: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Hi Garrick,

We will look into it and follow up with you.

Thanks

EJW

From: Baxter, Garrick [mailto:Garrick.Baxter@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 4:02 PM
To: Eric Wildman; Diana Delaney

6/19/2009

Subject: FW: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Eric and Diana

I was hoping that you might be able to help us solve a bit of a mystery regarding 57-2226. This water right was licensed in 1969. Court granted the motion to file late claim in 3/22/06. Recommendation was issued in 11/9/2007 recommending an accomplish transfer – 59 acres w/in 125 acre permissible place of use and with other combined water right limits. No objections were filed. The right goes forward to the uncontested hearing and a decree gets issued. This is where it gets weird. The decree lists the elements as it was licensed...not as recommended with the accomplish transfer. It was recommended as an accomplish transfer per the claim and per affidavit in our files. Is there anything in your records that explain why it was decreed per the old license and not per the recommendation? We have looked through our files and can't find anything to help explain this. Before I wrote an official letter to the court, I wanted to see if you have anything in your records that shed some light on this. This water right is now involved in a transfer and the allocations section brought this to our attention.

Thanks,

Garrick

From: Van Bussum, Monica

Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2009 9:43 AM

To: Williams, Ray

Subject: 57-2226 (Agenbroad)

Hi Ray,

I was just talking to Nick from Allocations about this water right. It was recommended for 125 acres with the accomplished transfer conditions. Partial decree was issued 4/2008 and did not reflect the recommendation, but did reflect the original license. Any idea why or how this happened? I see no record of objection or additional correspondence to the Court. Thanks!

Monica

6/19/2009