

Robertson, Jean

From: Jason [jason.helms@brockwayeng.com]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2007 4:58 PM
To: Robertson, Jean
Subject: RE: BLM and Woodland Transfers

I don't know why the splits ended up out of proportion, perhaps this is related to the fact that the portions on BLM property weren't released by BLM so those portions couldn't be addressed in the ownership split... I think the way I wrote the part 2's on the transfers takes care of that problem but I am not sure if it can be corrected easily now.

If we can set aside the current splits and work from the split agreement signed by Youngs and Woodlands this can still all work out as intended. The attached map shows the spirit of the split agreement (with as little activity on the BLM portion as possible; i.e. No acres moving off BLM ground, but one acre moving to BLM ownership based on irrigated area in the BLM tract to allow continuing irrigation of 32 acres rather than 31 as currently authorized)

Jason C. Helms, P.E.
Brockway Engineering, PLLC
(208) 736-8543

From: Robertson, Jean [mailto:Jean.Robertson@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2007 3:42 PM
To: Jason
Subject: RE: BLM and Woodland Transfers

Sorry, I'm back and I have a new problem. If I go ahead and use the new numbers 36-16455 and 36-16457 to split for the BLM and Woodlands, I am not sure what to do about the parts Jeff split off last year for Large/S&R Investments, 36-16454 and 36-16456. They do not agree with your charts. The diversion rate does, but not the acres or the volume amounts. Jeff's show a total of 45 acres, with one limited to 33.4 acres and the other 11.6 acres. He shows a total combined diversion volume of 180 AF (45 X 4). Yours show a total of 26.7 acres to Large/S&R Investments, with one limited to 19.8 acres and the other to 6.9 acres and the combined diversion volume of 106.8 AF (26.7 X 4). I'm gonna have to talk to Jeff about this since he did the ownership change/splits and I can't find anything scanned on-line to look at as to how and why he did things....Jeanie

-----Original Message-----

From: Jason [mailto:jason.helms@brockwayeng.com]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2007 10:15 AM
To: Robertson, Jean
Cc: lisa_jaro@blm.gov
Subject: RE: BLM and Woodland Transfers

Jeanie,

The transfers were prepared before the splits, if you need me to rewrite the transfers to the new right numbers, I can do so. The Woodlands split contains both the BLM and Woodland remaining portions on the Large property. The remainder was to be transferred to Keco (Youngs). It was the intent and basis of the split agreement signed by Youngs and Woodlands that the remaining rights allow irrigation as currently configured at that time. When it is all said and done, I still believe the rights should be configured as shown below which maintains flow, volume and priority proportions as in the original water rights without the previously flawed acreages identified in the original rights. Please look over and help me understand why the rights cannot be split as shown.

EXISTING (Large) RIGHTS		
	1256	314.0 Ac.
Seq#	36-10090	36-2268A
Priority	3/15/1984	8/30/1954
Flow	1.14 cfs	4.49 cfs

Split To	
BLM	
128 afa	32.0 Ac.
36-10090	36-2268A
3/15/1984	8/30/1954
0.12 cfs	0.46 cfs

Split To S	
107 afa	
36-1009	
3/15/198	
0.10 cfs	