

From : Drury
To : Spangle, Herm (ECY) <HSPA461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Short, Jaime (ECY) <JSHO461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Tolleson, Daniel F. (ECY) <DTOL461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Subject : RE: Greiff Changes.
Received On : 10/20/2022 4:20 PM

Crop rotation argument is weak. Looks like they need to reassess the acreage numbers.

Gene Drury

Water Master - NE Washington
Water Resources Program
4601 N. Monroe St.
Spokane, WA 99205
(509)385-3464

From: Spangle, Herm (ECY)
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 3:56 PM
To: Short, Jaime (ECY) ; Tolleson, Daniel F. (ECY)
Cc: Drury, Gene E. (ECY)
Subject: FW: Greiff Changes.

So just got off the phone with Tim explaining the problems with stacking the water rights on the same place of use when they are all primary water rights. The surface water right is subject to a lowflow at the mouth of Wethey Creek and if we had to regulate the right we would need to identify the area under the water right. Also if any proposed changes were to occur to any of the 3 water rights it leaves the prospect that all the rights would be for 100 acres each. That's a problem. I explained that the end result would still allow the 100 acres total but identifying the place of use for each. The rights need to be evaluated separately not as a single 37 acre water right. The surface diversion and well are all tied together and with the flowmeters Mr. Greiff would be limited to the quantities approved. Mr. Greiff does not want to do seasonal changes for the high duty water rights to be moved around on the 100 acres. I told him I have already talked to you both and others in the office and we believe there is a problem with the changes as proposed. He believes since the Board approved the changes they are legal and should be approved.

From: Tim Reiersen <tim@water-consultant.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 11:36 AM
To: Spangle, Herm (ECY) <HSPA461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Subject: RE: Greiff Changes.

Talked with Bob, Sr. I think this can work for them with one change to your example. The Greiffs would agree to limit each right to be additive acres, adding to 100. Difference from your example would be that each water right keeps the same place of use (same as board decisions). This is because of need to rotate location of crops. Alfalfa hay is the high water user, typically 40 acres, but they need to change location of the stand for agronomic practices over time. Don't want to do change application every time they move it.

It's looking like it will be 40 acres at a higher duty, and 60 acres at a lower duty, to make it work for how they farm it. I need to look at the rights to see specifically what acres would go to each, to accommodate that. I'll get that proposal to you. Please consider the place of use description request. Thank you.

From: Spangle, Herm (ECY) <HSPA461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 11:01 AM
To: Tim Reiersen <tim@water-consultant.com>
Subject: Greiff Changes.

So I was thinking that the 3 water rights would be evaluated separately for an ACQ and each one would have a specific legal description (20 acres, 30 acres and 50 acres for the total of 100 acres. A map would identify each water right acres in the event of regulation or future changes/transfers. Thanks, Herman.
