

**Terry Scanlan**

---

**From:** tmscanlan@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2005 8:50 AM  
**To:** Terry Scanlan  
**Subject:** Fwd: 71731 Wilson Properties (Foxtail Golf Course)

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

**From:** Graves, Lori <Lori.Graves@idwr.idaho.gov>  
**To:** Terry Scanlan (E-mail) <tmscanlan@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tue, 26 Apr 2005 09:31:29 -0600  
**Subject:** FW: 71731 Wilson Properties (Foxtail Golf Course)

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

**From:** Skaggs, Pam  
**Sent:** Monday, April 25, 2005 11:57 AM  
**To:** Graves, Lori  
**Subject:** RE: 71731 Wilson Properties (Foxtail Golf Course)

Lori,

I discussed this again with Jeff. He still feels that we need to have a specific 65 acres identified as the place of use. The other supplemental right is also limited & junior. If it is cut off, we need to be able to have a specific p/u for the transferred right. Otherwise we would risk the use on additional acres or the entire pp/u.

Please notify Terry that we will need specific acres & a shape to match to address the enlargement concern. Correspondence from a consultant/representative can be used to modify/amend an application if all the information is clearly stated. It might be easier for him to submit an amended Page 1 & map.

Thanks for your quick assistance with this issue.

Pam

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

**From:** Graves, Lori  
**Sent:** Monday, April 25, 2005 8:36 AM  
**To:** Skaggs, Pam  
**Subject:** 71731 Wilson Properties (Foxtail Golf Course)

Pam, the following is Terry's response. The field exam I attached to my memo is the permit Terry referenced. Please let me know what you would like Terry to do. Thx Pam. Happy Monday. lg

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

**From:** Terry Scanlan [mailto:TScanlan@spfwater.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 23, 2005 2:09 PM  
**To:** Graves, Lori  
**Cc:** mcc@givenspursley.com  
**Subject:** Wilson Properties (Foxtail Golf Course)

In response to your voice mail, I understand that the State Office wants to know how we can prevent enlargement of the water right if the transfer proposes irrigating 65 acres within an 85-ac PPU. Good question. I suppose we assumed that in any particular year, the transferred water right provided irrigation to 65 acres, and Wilson's 80-acre supplemental permit 63-12092 would provide irrigation for the balance (probably an additional 15 acres).

5/3/2005

The only direct way that I can think to demonstrate no enlargement is to adjust the PPU concept and identify 65 acres within the proposed place of use. If we cut out the driving range and non-irrigated areas, we can get down to about 65 acres. Permit 63-12092 will provide irrigation to the driving range and any other areas not covered by the 65 acres. If necessary, we can put together a map. Would we need to amend the transfer also?

Let me know how to proceed.

5/3/2005