

MEMORANDUM

TO: Transfer Nos. 72668 and 72383

FROM: Sharla Curtis

DATE: March 10, 2008

RE: Evaluation of Sufficiency of Information Submitted

After a complete review of all headgates within the Noble Ditch Co. delivery system and a close look at the Lands described by the water rights, it was learned that several 40-acre tracts were erroneously included in the SRBA and one 40-acre tract had been omitted (one $\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{4}$ was added by the transfer application but five $\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{4}$ s were also deleted, therefore, the minimal transfer fee of \$100 was charged). The transfer was filed for the sole purpose of correctly identifying the boundaries of the place of use served by the two rights. The total number of acres authorized for irrigation within the boundary of the company remains the same.

After a complete review of all headgates within Farmers Cooperative Irrigation Co. delivery system and a close look at the lands described by the water rights, it was learned that several 40-acre tracts originally described in the Payette River adjudication had been erroneously removed from the place of use described by the rights in the SRBA. This transfer is being filed for the sole purpose of correctly identifying the boundaries of the place of use served by these rights. The total number of acres authorized for irrigation within the boundary of the company remains the same. The transfer fee for this transfer is described in a memo dated 3/2/06.

Authority to File: The applicants are the owners of record for all rights involved in both transfers.

Water Right Validity: Rights presumed to be valid because the partial decrees were all issued in July of 2002 and the transfer applications were filed in 2006.

Injury to Other Water Rights: None anticipated.

Enlargement of Use: No enlargement of use is proposed; the number of acres authorized to be irrigated within the boundaries of each company is not increasing.

Local Public Interest: No negative impacts are anticipated.

Beneficial Use/Conservation of Water Resources: Applicants propose beneficial use consistent with conservation of water resources in Idaho.

Review of the applications finds there is no clear inconsistency with criteria of I. C. § 42-222 preventing processing of the applications.

Assuming no other information contradicts the above analysis, and assuming it is determined the applications should be approved, the conditions of approval listed on the draft transfer approvals should be applied.

These transfers will not be advertised per discretion of the regional manager. These transfers propose correcting the legal descriptions of the boundaries of both irrigation companies and advertising has been determined not to be required. The watermaster is aware of these applications and has given verbal sanction of them.