

I'll take a look at the other one & then we can discuss the combined mitigation plan & how it affects both.

Pam

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

From: Robertson, Jean
Sent: Thursday, November 02, 2006 11:14 AM
To: Skaggs, Pam
Subject: 72393 G & G Dairy (Del Kohtz) FIRST CONTACT

Hi Pam,

This is one of the transfers that Del Kohtz has been bugging me about. Mary finally got it scanned so now you can take a look at it in Workflow. (The original application listed right 36-8735 - which is still a permit, so I told them they would need to deal with that right by amending the permit. I will tell Erin about that.) There is also another transfer (72389) that he submitted at the same time cause they used one mitigation plan for both transfers. I've attached a copy of an email and response that I sent to Jason at Brockway regarding the mitigation plan. I'm not sure about his response, but see what you think. They actually submitted two plans, the first said no reduction was necessary then a few days later they submitted a revised mitigation plan which showed some pumping reduction was necessary, but only on this one. (These may have been around here since August of 2005, but I never received the revised transfer to match the map till March of 2006, so I don't feel too bad.) The draft document and my memo are on A012. I think I've got everything done on this but it's been awhile so let me know if I need to change or add anything. (I'll send the other transfer notice in a separate email so we can work on them individually.) Thanks, Jeanie

Jeanie,

Depending on how the model is setup determines whether mitigation is required. I don't recall exactly why I ran it the two different ways. The first run which showed no mitigation requirement included the entire historical use of the Idaho Water Co. water right 36-7378 while the second version only included the portion actually being transferred which is probably more appropriate? In any event, worst case analysis (only involving the portions being transferred) required Idaho Water co to forgo pumping for the first year after transfer with full pumping available afterwards while G&G would face a stepped pumping schedule of 65% of the transferred volume the first year after approval and full transferred volume available afterwards. Sorry for the confusion, I expect my clients would be able to abide either determination as they were made aware of the possibility of initial pumping reduction requirements to meet ESPA guidelines.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Jason C. Helms, PE

Brockway Engineering

(208) 736-8543

From: Robertson, Jean [mailto:Jean.Robertson@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2006 3:43 PM
To: Jason Helms
Subject: Transfer #72389 - Idaho Water Co.

Hi Jason,

I'm back trying to work on this again. (I think I've finished working on the G&G Dairy one (72393) and as soon as I get a handle on this, I will send them both to Pam.) Anyway, I'm confused and thought you might be able to answer a question for me. When you initially submitted the two applications, you also submitted a model run which showed no mitigation would be required and stated this in your letter. You also stated that the two transfers were being mitigated in one package. Then a couple weeks later you submitted another revised model run which

showed a stepped reduction would be necessary. **My question is, would only the G&G transfer need the reduction or would Idaho H2O also need a reduction in pumping? It's just not clear to me.** As I understand it, one is going over 20 miles North and West down-gradient across the ESPA (G&G) and the other is going about 9 miles North and East up-gradient (ID-H2O). I haven't messed with the whole model thing in awhile and I'm just confused...When you get a chance to take a look at this, please let me know! If I could understand this, I could explain to Pam when she asks. Thanks, Jeanie