

Holmes, Christopher

From: Tessa Sparrow <tessa@racineolson.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 9:40 AM
To: Holmes, Christopher
Cc: TJ Budge; Tessa Sparrow; Lynette Smith
Subject: RE: BRBA Claim 11-290
Attachments: 11-290 Second POD structure.jpg

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Chris,

The client confirmed the location to be correct in the map provided to you in my last email. They provided the attached image of the diversion structure located in the SWSE L3, Section 32, Township 10S, Range 44E. Describing that "the side with running water goes into the L tee line the blocked side discharges into the creek downstream. It measures 20 ft wide by 2 ft deep."

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Tessa Sparrow
Paralegal



201 E. Center Street / P.O. Box 1391
Pocatello, Idaho 83204
(208)232-6101 - Phone
(208)232-6109 - Fax

racineolson.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This email and its attachments may contain information that is confidential, privileged, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you believe this email may have been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately.

From: Tessa Sparrow <tessa@racineolson.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2026 2:32 PM
To: Holmes, Christopher <Christopher.Holmes@idwr.idaho.gov>
Cc: TJ Budge <tj@racineolson.com>; Tessa Sparrow <tessa@racineolson.com>
Subject: RE: BRBA Claim 11-290

Dear Chris,

SCANNED

In response to your email, we have provided the response below.

1. Regarding the diversion listed in the SWNE of Section 4, Township 11S Range 44E (further referred to as SWNE):

It appears we inadvertently included that third point of diversion in the SWNE of Section 4 on the claim. There should only be the two diversions; one in the SENE of Section 4, T11S, R44E, and one in the SWSE of Section 32, T10S, R44E.

2. Regarding the diversion listed in the SWSE L3, Section 32, Township 10S 44E (further referred to as SWSE):

Attached is a Google Earth Map marking the location of this diversion. The latitude and longitude are 42°30'15.20"N, 111°19'59.12"W. We have reached out to the Company about getting more information regarding this diversion and will provide that to you as soon as we get that. Would an amendment be required to include the additional description of this diversion?

Let us know if you have any further questions. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Tessa Sparrow

Paralegal



201 E. Center Street / P.O. Box 1391
Pocatello, Idaho 83204
(208)232-6101 - Phone
(208)232-6109 - Fax

racineolson.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This email and its attachments may contain information that is confidential, privileged, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you believe this email may have been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately.

From: Holmes, Christopher <Christopher.Holmes@idwr.idaho.gov>

Sent: Friday, July 24, 2026 10:00 AM

To: TJ Budge <tj@racineolson.com>

Cc: Tessa Sparrow <tessa@racineolson.com>

Subject: BRBA Claim 11-290

Good morning TJ,

I am working through the evaluation for BRBA Claim 11-290, The Georgetown Irrigation Company. The claim describes 3 point of diversions, however the description for existing diversion works only describes the headgate and pipe system in the main channel of Georgetown Creek. My interpretation of this with topographic mapping is

this describes the diversion in the SENE of Section 4, Township 11S Range 44E. The claim does not describe the diversions located in the SWNE of Section 4, Township 11S Range 44E (further referred to as SWNE) and SWSE L3, Section 32, Township 10S 44E (further referred to as SWSE). Below is a bullet list of questions related to the other diversions:

- SWNE: This diversion exists on the Point of Diversion section of the claim form, but it is not marked on the maps provided. An additional map describing the diversion location and a description of the diversion works is required. This point of diversion is not recorded in the water right backfile, so a description of when this diversion was added, along with evidence, must be provided based on the accomplished transfer rules. If this diversion was included in error, confirmation is required but no further information or amendments are needed.
- SWSE: This diversion exists in the water right backfile but our geospatial data does not accurately describe the location. An additional map zoomed in to the area is needed to more accurately determine the diversion's actual location. Additional description of this diversion works is required because this diversion is not on the main channel of Georgetown Creek and the claim form only describes the main channel diversion. Because this diversion is recorded in the water right backfile and listed in the decree as a ditch from "Left Hand Fork", I do not think the diversion requires a separate claim. If this diversion is no longer in existence, confirmation is required but no further information or amendments are needed and the department will only recommend the diversion system from Georgetown Creek.

The remaining characteristics of the claim can be evaluated in office, but a field exam for the SWNE and SWSE may need to be conducted if those diversions are actually part of the current delivery system. If these diversions should not be included in the water right, a field exam is not required. Let me know at your earliest convenience the answers to the questions above and whether a field exam needs scheduled to confirm diversion locations.

Sincerely,

Christopher Holmes

Christopher Holmes

Water Resources Supervisor

Idaho Department of Water Resources, Preston Field Office

325 East 600 South, Suite 300

Preston, ID 83263

(208) 701-7201 | Christopher.Holmes@idwr.idaho.gov



Georgetown Irrigation Company PODs

T10S44E Section 32

Legend

POD

11-290 and 11-7219 POD

477

Google Earth

© 2023 Google

100 ft



