Water Transfer Working Group Meeting

1:00 PM, Monday, November 5, 2012

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation YFO Conference Room


Chuck opened the meeting with the approval of the previous meeting minutes, with no changes from the group. Chuck continued with the new proposals since there were no previous proposals. Jason commented that a previous proposal on Wenas Creek is still a work-in-progress and he hopes to bring it back to the group in the future.

2013-01 Tidwell/Washington Water Trust – Jason began by explaining this proposal stating that Tidwell will be fallowing 10.8 acres, with 0.28 cfs instantaneous quantity of water and 0.56 cfs when surplus water is available. The consumptive use is estimated at 20.71 acre-feet. The Petition for Order Pendente Lite (OPL) has been submitted to the court to temporarily authorize this transfer and is on the docket for the December 2012 water day court. It is a change in point of purpose and place of use to instream flow use, with a separate change in point of diversion that will be needed for the small portion of the Tidwell water right retained for irrigation use by the new owners of part of the Tidwell property. Tom asked about the Hecks’ water right, and mentioned a discrepancy with the court Motion to Divide and Substitute Party. Jason explained this water right change/transfer was divided into two separate actions. The division of the water right between Tidwell and Heck was finalized in court on August 9, 2012 (which is reportedly currently being revised), and this transfer of the portion of the right retained by Tidwell to WWT is the other one. Stan talked about the discrepancy; that this is a permanent fallowing of the 10.8 acres of former Tidwell land; and Tidwell sold 3 parcels of their land to the Hecks, but kept all of the water right except 5 acre-feet sold to the Hecks [0.02 cfs, 5.0 af/yr, for irrigation of 0.77 acre (0.8 acre?), ~1.53 af/yr of CU water]. Stan and Jason talked about how much quantity is retained by the Hecks, and Stan pointed out the total of 11.6 acres irrigated under the Tidwell water right, the 10.8 acres fallowed, and the 0.8 acre difference (or 0.77 acre) that the Hecks will continue to irrigate. Jason mentioned there was an error in the division the parcel. Tom asked if this will be added to the target flows at Parker, and Jason said yes. Bob explained the classes of water in the Teanaway subbasin and how this right can be subject to a priority call during serious drought years (like the William’s right in previous meetings). Kurt talked about the use of clover proxy for estimating the Tidwells’ historic crop irrigation water requirement and Jason explained the use of clover in the calculations. Stan talked about past discussions, back to 2001, on Timothy Hay and that in the WIG, Clover is the proxy crop we’ve historically used to estimate the CIR for Timothy Hay. Kurt talked about how the method of quantifying the water as it goes into trust is the same method used when it comes out. The group gave a thumbs-up recommendation.

2013-02 Kellogg-Smith/Scatter Creek Resources LLC – Joe Rehberger began by explaining this proposal for one home, to irrigate 1,815 square feet of lawn and garden, 1 ERU, with a 0.21