

Skinner, Corey

From: Jason Helms [jason.helms@brockwayeng.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 8:46 AM
To: Skinner, Corey
Subject: RE: Kechter Transfers

Corey,

You are correct that the SWSE-11 should not be included since it is owned by BLM while the NENE-15 should be included and is owned by the applicant. I apologize for the error.

Jason

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

From: Skinner, Corey [mailto:Corey.Skinner@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2006 2:20 PM
To: jason.helms@brockwayeng.com
Subject: Kechter Transfers

Jason,

I am working on processing a couple of transfer applications that you prepared and submitted to our office back in 2003. The applications are filed in the name of Richard Kechter. One of the applications appears to have a discrepancy in the proposed place of use description and the proposed place of use locations indicated on the map included with the transfer application.

More specifically, the application that proposes the 2785-acre permissible place of use identifies 40 acres in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 11 (T08S, R21E), but this land is not identified as part of the proposed permissible place of use on the map that was included with the application. I believe that this particular tract is owned by the BLM and it also appears that this tract does not currently have any water rights appurtenant to it. Furthermore, review of deeds in the SRBA claim files indicates that this land is not listed on Mr. Kechter's deeds.

In addition, the map included with the application identifies 40 acres as part of the proposed permissible place of use in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 15 (T08S, R21E), but this particular tract is not identified on the proposed place of use description included with the application. It appears that there is a mini pivot on this particular tract and our tax lot information indicates that Richard Kechter owns this land. Review of deeds in the SRBA claim files indicates that Mr. Kechter purchased this land in 1994.

I assume that the proposed permissible place of use description included with the application probably is in error and that the map actually correctly describes the intent of the transfer (*land in SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 11 should not be included, but the land in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 15 should be included*). If this is the case, could you verify this for me and e-mail me back and then I will proceed with processing the transfer accordingly?

Thanks,

5/30/2006

Corey