BEFORE THE STATE ENGINEER OF OREGON

Jackson County.

IN THE MATTER OF THE DETERMINATION OF THE RELATIVE RIGHTS TO THE USE OF THE WATERS OF LITTLE BUTTE CREEK AND ITS TRIBUTARIES, A TRIBUTARY OF ROGUE RIVER.

SECOND
MODIFIED FINDINGS
AND
ORDER OF DETERMINATION

Now at this time this matter coming on for consideration by the State Engineer, and it appearing that after the modified findings and order of determination of the State Engineer entered in the above entitled proceeding December 31, 1925, were filed with the Circuit Court, additional avidence with respect to exceptions thereafter filed was taken before the Court, whereupon by order of the Court filed December 31, 1927, the proceeding was re-referred to the State Engineer for further findings and order of determination covering the points raised by said exceptions and additional evidence; and the State Engineer having carefully considered all of the evidence submitted, and being now fully advised in the premises, makes and orders to be entered of record in his office the following:

FINDINGS ON EXCEPTIONS

Wm. J. & Ella C. Phillips

Wm. J. and Ella C. Phillips, through their attorney, Elijah H.

Hurd, filed a motion herein as successors in interest to Geo. T. Collins and

J. J. Emmons, showing that certain lands for which water rights had theretofore been allowed under the name of the Little Butte Irrigation Company, were
owned by them, and asked that final certificate be issued to them individually
instead of under the name of said Company. This motion is allowed. The lands
of caid Wm. J. and Ella C. Phillips are as follows: Under date of 1883: 4

acres in SULSUL, Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.; 3 acres in SELSUL, Section 36,

T. 35 S. R. 1 W.; under date of 1998: 5.3 acres in NULSUL, 30.9 acres in SULSUL,
and O.9 acre in SELSUL of Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.; 21.6 acres in SELSUL,
Section 36, T. 35 S. R. 1 W.; 4.03 acres in NULSUL, Section 6, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.

Said lands are tabulated herein under the name of the Little Butte Irrigation
Company, but shall be covered by a separate certificate when water right certificates are issued covering rights finally determined in this proceeding. It
was also sought to show that rights should be recognized for a larger acreage

than that shown conthe State maps of inchoate rights. As against the State map, a map made by H. D. Powell was submitted. It appears that this map was based mostly upon the statements of other parties as to the acreage irrigated, and also that the map was made long after the time fixed for the completion of these rights had expired. This exception is denied.

Olga Blass

The exceptions of this claimant as to acreage are well taken. It appears that her land irrigated in the NEINT of Section 5, T. 36 S. N. 1 E., was omitted from the former findings. She estimates the irrigated land in this forty at lip acres, while the State survey shows it to be 10.2 acres. A right is allowed for 10.2 acres, with priority of 1888.

R. E. Tucker

This claimant excepted to the acreage allowed a water right in the NELSE of Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E. He estimates that 14 acres are irrigated in that forty, in addition to the Staub tract, which has a right under a 1910 filing, for 13.5 acres. He has made no measurement to controvert the State survey, by which the area is shown to be the same as was allowed him, 11 acres. This exception is denied.

Golden Zundel and Harold Zundel

Zundel Brothers are successors in interest to W. C. Daley under Proof No. 1078. It appears that their request for a change in the names of the ditches designated in the former tabulation should be allowed. Their exceptions in this respect are granted, and are carried out in the tabulation herein.

J. D. Culbertson

right, in that the ditch is designated as "Fish Lake and Culbertson Lateral", whereas the water is in fact delivered to his lands through the canal of the Rogue River Valley Canal Company. This exception is allowed, and the tabulation corrected accordingly. This claimant made his appropriation in 1896, from the South Fork of Little Butte Creek. Thereafter, by a contract with the Fish Lake Water Company, predecessor of Rogue River Valley Canal Company, dated February 25, 1901, he granted said company a right of way and permitted the obliteration of his ditch, in consideration of the delivery of his water to his lands through the company canal. In his exceptions and in the testimony, some claim is made to the effect

that in addition to his own appropriation, he acquired water rights from the company under the contract. It appears, however, that the company by said contract conveyed to Culbertson no part of its own appropriation of water but simply conceded that he had a right to the extent of 250 miners inches and agreed to deliver that quantity to him through its canal. And besides, Culbertson has made no use of any additional quantity, and if he did acquire such a right the same has now been lost by non-use. The exceptions in this respect are denied.

C. E. Terrill

This claimant excepts to the acreage allowed a water right in certain subdivisions. He claims more land than that shown by the State survey, but as against the survey he has only his estimate, without any actual measurement. This exception is denied. Claimant also excepts to the allowance of a priority of 1905 for 3.5 acres, and claims the priority should be 1890. Based upon the testimony this priority is changed to 1890.

L. H. Wyant

This claimant is successor in interest of A. H. Thompson and is hereby substituted therefor, in the tabulation herein. The water under this right is delivered through the canal of the Rogue River Valley Canal Company by virtue of a contract made in 1901 between their respective predecessors in interest. Under this contract the company secured a right of way, and agreed to deliver water to said Thompson through its canal, as the construction thereof necessitated the destruction of Thompson's individual ditch. The tabulation herein is corrected accordingly. A claim is made to water by virtue of said contract, as same purported to convey to Thompson a right for 50 minors inches out of the company's appropriation. It appears, however, that said 50 inches has never been put to beneficial use, nor any part thereof, and such right has now been lost by non-use.

Michael Sidley, Sr.

This claimant's exceptions are allowed, insofar as they ask for a correction of the tabulation by changing the name of the ditch designated from "Culbertson" to Hogue kiver Valley Canal Company Canal." The Canal Company delivers water to this claimant's lands under a contract of 1901 similar to those with Wyant and Culbertson. And as in the case of said parties, any water right acquired by this claimant by said contract, out of the appropriation of the Fish Lake Water Company, has been lost by non-use, and claimant's right shall be such as he has perfected under his own individual appropriation.

T. L. Farlow

This claimant has excepted to the former findings because the acreage of land irrigated under the two ditches named is not segregated. This exception is allowed. However, the exceptions and the testimony do not correspond as to the proper segregation under the ditches. Both show an excess over the State map, but as against such map do not constitute satisfactory proof as to the proper segregation, or as to the actual acreage irrigated. Exception was also made that the acreage allowed a 1908 priority should have a priority of 1881. But the testimony under this exception is also unsatisfactory. Considering everything, the priority will be left as it was, and the acreage segregated as tabulated herein.

W. E. Gibson

It appears that this claimant has succeeded to the interests of the Thomas Baldwin Estate and also of Stephenson & Archibald. He is therefore substituted for said parties in the tabulation herein.

Geo. B. Brown

This claimant asserts in his exceptions that the 15.5 acres allowed a water right with priority of 1908 should have a priority of 1863. Of the several witnesses testifying as to the date when water was first used on this land, none testified as to use of water thereon earlier than 1883, of their own knowledge. The priority of this right is therefore changed from 1908 to 1883.

W. E. Butler

This claimant excepts to the former findings giving him a priority of 1908 for 10 acres of land, and asserts that the right for this land should have a priority the same as the 1.5 acres allowed a priority of 1885. The testimony, however, fails to show that this 10 acres of land was irrigated before 1908. This exception is denied.

Wm. M. Hansen

It appears that this claimant has succeeded to the interests of John B. Edsall. He is substituted therefor in the tabulation herein.

M. M. Brown

This claimant excepts to the findings as to the acreage allowed a water right in the $NE_4^1SW_4^1$ of Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E. It appears that the

ŗ

following rights were allowed in this subdivision: Baldwin Estate, 10.9 acres, Mrs. M. M. Brown, 5 acres, C. P. Hall, 2 acres, making a total of 17.9 acres.

This is more than the testimony shows has been irrigated, and 6.4 acres more than shown as irrigated by the State survey. This exception is not supported by the evidence, and is denied.

Geo. A. Hansen

This claimant excepts to the acreage allowed water rights in the SETNWT of Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E. There was originally allowed a vested right for 4 acres, and an inchoate right for 10 acres. The state map of inchoate rights shows a total of 4.5 acres irrigated, and the last findings accordingly allowed a right for an additional one-half acre. The testimony shows, however, that a total of about 7 acres has been irrigated since about 1911, 4 acres of which is under the vested right. The allowance under the completed inchoate right with priority of 1908 will therefore be changed from 0.5 acre to 3 acres.

L. C. Charley

This claimant excepts as to the acreage allowed a water right, and after a careful reading of the testimony, such exception is denied, except that an additional 0.8 acre will be allowed, in the NW4SE4 of Section 14, T. 36 S. R. 1 E., which is shown as irrigated on the state map but not listed in the tabulation of the former findings. This claimant has sold part of his irrigated lands to I. L. Bradshaw, and the water rights therefor are tabulated accordingly.

As to the exception of this claimant with respect to the priority of the right perfected under inchoate rights, see under Inchoate Rights, page 10 hereof.

Mrs. Edna I. Monia

It appears that this claimant has succeeded to the interests of Jacob Monia, and is hereby substituted therefor. The testimony shows that the 52 acres for which a right was recognized with priority of 1908, was irrigated by the Clopton ditch, taken out in 1884, but that 40 acres is the most that has ever been irrigated in any one year. This water right is modified so that same shall be limited to 40 acres, with priority of 1884.

Faye J. Hall

It appearing that Faye J. Hall has succeeded to the interest of Mrs. Susan Hart, as to Tract 49 under the Fryer Ditch Association, Proof 1084, he is hereby substituted for said Susan Hart, in the tabulation herein.

I. L. Bradshaw

It appears that I. L. Bradshaw has succeeded to part of the lands for which water rights were formerly allowed in the name of L. C. Charley. Said Bradshaw has therefore been substituted for said Charley, in the tabulation herein, as to such lands.

Michael Sidley, Jr.

This claimant has succeeded to the interests of Frank Ceol, and is substituted therefor in the tabulation herein.

Little Butte Irrigation Company

The exceptions of this claimant as to acreage, priority, and duty of water, are not well taken and are not supported by the evidence, and are denied.

Emogene Charley

This claimant excepted to the duty of water fixed by the modified order of determination, which question is disposed of elsewhere herein.

Little Butte Irrigation Company and others

The Little Butte Irrigation Company and some fourteen other users of water on lower Little Butte Creek filed exceptions to the allowance of rights to the Rogue River Valley Canal Company, as to priority, acreage and quantity of water. From a careful examination of the evidence, it appears that these exceptions are not well taken, and the same are therefore denied.

Rogue River Valley Canal Company (and Medford Irrigation District)

The exceptions of these parties were directed against the allowance of water rights to M. F. Hanley, and are fully disposed of by the findings herein with respect to said Hanley.

Several parties to this proceeding have rights for lands which are now served by the canal of the Rogue River Valley Canal Company under contracts executed in 1901 or subsequent thereto, by which they gave said Company's

predecessor, the Fish Lake Jater Company, rights of way across their lands for its canal; and as the construction of the canal necessitated the obliteration of their ditches, the Company agreed under the contract to deliver their water through its canal. And, although their ditches were thus destroyed, their water rights remain intact, by virtue of the continued use of the water through the Company so ditch. No rights attempted to be conveyed by said Company under such contracts out of its own appropriation have been utilized by such individuals. They are entitled to the quantity of water they have put to beneficial use, whether under their own appropriations or under that of the Company. But it appears that their original appropriations were ample to cover any rights which have been perfected, and that any inchoate rights which they may have secured by contract have been lost by non-use.

M. F. Hanley

M. F. Hanley has filed exceptions to the modified order of determination of the State Engineer on several points, and other claimants excepted to the allowance made to this claimant by the modified order of determination. The exceptions of such contesting parties were chiefly as to the acreage found to have been reclaimed and irrigated by virtue of the inchoate rights originally allowed to M. F. Hanley. Then the proceeding was last before the State Engineer, upon order of the Court for further findings on exceptions theretofore filed, the questions then at issue had no connection with the determination of the inchoate rights. But the time allowed for the completion of such rights had expired, and it was thought advisable to incorporate with the findings on exceptions, a determination of the inchoate rights. After a preliminary survey by the State, proofs were submitted by the claimants, upon notice, and those not satisfied with the State survey were permitted to file their own maps in derogation of the State maps. In order to get the entire matter before the Court without delay, these proofs and maps were accepted without notice to other claimants, or opportunity being given to refute the same. In other words, the classification of irrigated and non-irrigated lands made by the State's engineer was treated as only prima facie correct, and where controverted by the proofs and by evidence in support thereof, such proofs and evidence were accepted and made the basis of the determination.

All parties have now been allowed ample opportunity to submit evidence, for or against, the claims made under inchoate right proofs, and considerable testimony has been taken on this question. The proofs of Mr. Hanley, and the maps made by his engineer, show a much larger acreage as irrigated, than

that shown by the State maps, as classified by the engineer who made the survey for the State. The Hanley proofs and maps were contested by other claimants, and both sides have had an opportunity to offer the testimony of their own engineers or other witnesses in support of their contentions, and to cross examine the opposing party's witnesses, including the engineer who made the survey relied upon by the adverse party. The only substantial difference between the maps of the two parties, is the acreage shown as irrigated, which apparently results from the difference of opinion as to what land should be considered as having been prepared for irrigation and beneficially irrigated. Although there is some dispute as to the adequacy of the ditch system, it is agreed that certain ditches have been constructed, and that water has actually been diverted and carried through them. The chief question is, then: Has such water been applied to beneficial use on the land in controversy?

It is contended that under the Hanley proofs and maps, considerable areas of land have been classified as irrigated, which are not entitled to water rights. The original order of determination entered in this proceeding April 12, 1916, provided, with respect to the completion of inchoate rights, that "the acreage for which a water right shall be deemed completed and perfected in each case shall include such lands only as found suitably and properly prepared for irrigation, and to which water has been actually applied for beneficial purposes in the production of crops within the time hereinbefore limited." The claimant thus had notice as to what would be required with respect to the completion of his inchoate rights.

It appears that this claimant has large areas of land on his ranch which anyone will recognize as having been beneficially irrigated, without question. In fact some of these areas have been irrigated and producing valuable crops for forty years or more. He has other areas that are not in such a high state of production, but which have been considerably benefited by irrigation. This class of land, it is shown, was classified as irrigated by the Statesengineer in making his survey of lands under inchoate rights. This was proper, as too strict a classification should not be made, where an appropriator has made reasonable effort to reclaim his land, and get fair returns from the water applied.

But the areas in dispute are not of this character. The testimony discloses the fact that these lands are to a great extent rough and rocky, and have not been cleared of the natural growth of trees and brush, nor made smooth and ready for irrigation. It appears that the plan of reclamation adopted by the claimant has been to apply water to the lands in their natural state for two or more years for the purpose of killing and rotting out the brush and trees, and

then to sow clover, alsike or timothy seed among the brush, trees and rocks, the resulting growth being used as pasture for stock during the "dying process." It is urged that this is the only practical method of clearing these lands, as the ordinary method would be too expensive. But the fact remains that the lands have not been reclaimed. The vegetation produced thus far in the openings has been of some value as pasture for stock. But this sort of reclamation is not evidence of due diligence. Claimant insists that he is not through with the work of reclamation. This fact only tends to show lack of diligence in putting the water to beneficial use. His right was initiated many years ago, and a reasonable time to perfect it was allowed him before his proof was taken.

Everything considered, it appears that the classification made by the State's engineer was substantially correct and was fair to the claimant, and that the lands for which completed rights were claimed in excess of those shown on the State maps have not had water beneficially applied to them to a sufficient extent to justify the recognition of a vested right therefor, with priority relating back to the original date of appropriation. It would not be fair to other appropriators, either to hold that the right has been perfected under these conditions, or to allow the claimant additional years to perfect it. He was allowed a reasonable time, and through lack of diligence has lost the priority of his right. The claimant should make a new appropriation in accordance with law, if he desires to reclaim and irrigate these lands in the future. The allowance of vested rights will be confined to the acreage shown by the evidence to have been sufficiently reclaimed and irrigated, as tabulated herein.

The exceptions as to the last part of Paragraph 9, on page 6, as to the stipulation between the Fish Lake Water Company and M. F. Hanley, are not well taken, and are denied.

The exception to Paragraph 5, providing that the rights for irrigation shall be appurtenant to the lands upon which the water has been used, is
denied.

The exception to Paragraph 6, providing for rotation in the use of water between different users, so far as possible, is denied.

The exception to Paragraph 8, as to the stipulation between M. F. Hanley and Jacob Monia, is not well taken, and is denied.

The exception to Paragraph 17, as to the rights of the Rogue River Valley Canal Company under permits from the State Engineer, is denied.

The exception to Paragraph 20, as to contracts between the City of Medford and Fish Lake Water Company or its successors, is denied.

The exception to Paragraph 22, as to the completion of inchoate rights, is denied.

The exception to Paragraph 23, as to the merger of the adjudication proceedings on Rogue River and Little Butte Creek, is not well taken, and is denied.

Priorities of Inchoate Rights

A number of claimants have in their exceptions objected to the fixing of a priority of 1908 for lands irrigated under rights which were inchoate at the time the original findings in this proceeding were made. They allege that this is part of their original appropriation, under which vested rights were recognized for other lands, perhaps under the same ditch, but with priority many years back; and claim that upon completion of the inchoate rights the priority therefor should relate back to the same date as allowed for the lands first irrigated. It appears that the Board in its original findings arbitrarily fixed the priority at 1908, for many of the lands allowed inchoate rights. It is believed that this was proper. The rule is well established that an appropriator of water must, after having initiated a right, put the water to beneficial use within a reasonable time. He must use due diligence, and reclaim and irrigate his lands within a proper time under the circumstances, or ase his right will not relate back for priority to the first step taken. Considering the small areas involved, and the early dates of priority of the rights in question, the additional areas irrigated after the 1916 findings were made should not have rights with priority dating back to the time of the original appropriations. It was therefore proper to fix a later date for such rights. The exceptions to this provision are denied.

Duty of Water

A number of claimants have excepted to the duty of water heretofore fixed in this proceeding, and considerable evidence was offered on this
question, pro and con. It appears that some of the irrigated lands on Little
Butte Creek are gravelly and porous, and while perhaps not requiring extremely
large quantities of water in the aggregate, such lands are difficult to irrigate
unless the water can be diverted and applied in rather large heads. This, it
appears, was the principal fault found with the duty heretofore established. A
large percentage of the lands, however, are of a more impervious nature, and
the exceptions filed do not apply to them.

It appears that some of the quantities specified in the former order of determination should be increased, so as to raise the limitation of continuous flow for certain ditches and for certain lands, in cases where the evidence shows that especial difficulties as to distribution have been encountered. This has been done, in the tabulation herein.

In the former orders of determination the quantities of water to which the various appropriators were found to be entitled were specified in terms of continuous flow. But it was recognized that wherever practicable the water should be applied to the land periodically, rather than continuously, and in larger heads than the rate of continuous flow specified. A provision was therefore made for the use of the water under systems of rotation between the different users, whereby the users could take the water decreed to them at, say, three times the rate specified, but for only one-third of the time. Some claimants have expressed doubt as to the meaning and adequacy of this provision, and the same has therefore been modified, in order to make it more explicit, if possible.

with these changes, and with the enforcement of the rotation provisions so far as practicable, it appears that the allowances are adequate.

Reasonably careful methods must be used for the prevention of waste, and irrigators must give proper attention to the water at all times when water is being diverted to their lands, so that a fair degree of efficiency may be obtained therefrom.

Based upon the foregoing findings on exceptions, the modified order of determination as entered herein on the 31st day of December, 1925, is hereby further modified so as to read as follows:

1.

That Little Sutte Creek is a natural, non-navigable water course, tributary to Rogue River; and that said stream and its tributaries and the lands irrigated therefrom are situated within the County of Jackson, State of Oregon. That the climate in said locality is semi-arid in character, and artificial irrigation is essential to secure the highest yield from the lands, and the most profitable crops. That the crops produced by means of such irrigation are very diversified, ranging from the natural grasses and pasturage produced mostly in the upper part of the water shed, to the orchards, grain, small fruits and gardens which are more common to the lower parts of the watershed of said stream. That considering the methods of irrigation now in use, and the porosity of the soils here involved, and the climatic conditions, it is deemed expedient to fix a duty of water ranging from one-fortieth of a second foot per acre in the case of small tracts, to not to exceed one-sixtieth of a second foot per acre, in the case of larger tracts, except in those cases where the quantity of water has already been fixed and determined by permits issued by the State Engineer, or otherwise.

That the quantity of water set forth in each case in the tabulated statement hereinafter contained shall be measured at the head of the ditch or point where the same leaves the natural stream, and includes an allowance for necessary and reasonable seepage and evaporation losses in conducting the water from the natural stream to the place of use. In no case shall the quantity diverted and used exceed the quantity actually needed and required under reasonably economical methods of use, and in no event shall it exceed the quantity set forth in each case in the tabulated statement, excepting under a system of rotation, as hereinafter provided for, or the use of the water alternately with other water users, and by periods of time rather than continuously. In which event and in case of such rotation, the water user so rotating for his proportionate part of the time shall be entitled to divert and use such amount in excess of the quantity hereinafter allowed him for continuous use as the rotation system or plan hereinafter provided for shall permit. Rotation in the use of water shall at all times be subject to the control and direction of the water master of the district.

3.

That the rights of the several claimants to the use of any of said waters for irrigation purposes are limited to the irrigation season commencing the first day of April and terminating the first day of October of each year; that a right to the use of any of said waters for muhicipal, domestic and stock purposes, or to develop power, shall continue throughout the year, in such amount as is reasonably necessary for such purposes, not exceeding the quantity herein limited.

4.

That the quantity diverted for domestic and stock purposes shall not exceed one-fourth second foot for each claimant having one hundred head of stock or less; and in excess of one hundred head of stock, each claimant having a right therefor shall be entitled to divert one-fortieth of one second foot for each additional hundred head of stock; but during the irrigation season as herein limited, the quantity diverted by each claimant for irrigation purposes, in the amount to which he is entitled to divert the same, shall include the water to which he is entitled for stock and domestic purposes.

5.

That the rights of appropriation of the several claimants, as here-

in determined, are and shall remain appurtenant to the lands of said claimants as hereinafter described, as provided by law.

6.

That a system of rotation in the use of water among the several appropriators of small amounts of water in the same neighborhood, or through the same ditch, has been in use, more or less, upon said stream and its tributaries and adds greatly to the duty which said water may be made to perform. In the absence of an agreement between appropriators arranging for such rotation and the manner in which such water shall be used in rotation, the water master of the district in which said stream and its tributaries may hereafter be situated, may, when practicable, arrange such appropriators in groups or systems of rotation, first giving the appropriator who is first in priority an amount of water equal to the combined appropriations of all the appropriators in said group or system for a length of time bearing the same ratio to the whole time required to make a complete rotation through the whole group of appropriators as the appropriation of the first appropriator bears to the combined appropriations of said appropriators, and shall next serve the next appropriator in priority with a like amount of water for his proportionate time, and so on, until all the appropriators in said group are served; then the distribution of water shall be repeated in the same manner throughout the irrigation season. In case of two or more appropriators in said group or system having the same priority, then the said water master shall distribute the water as between those appropriators having the same priority to the one whose ditch taps the stream nearest the source, first, and the next lower down, next, and so on. In case of two or more appropriators having equal priorities and diverting water through the same ditch, the said water master shall distribute the water as between said appropriators to the one whose lands are first covered by said ditch and nearest the head thereof, first, and to the next lower down on said ditch, next, and so on. Where two or more appropriators agree as between themselves as to a manner and system of rotation in the use of their water, the said water master shall. distribute the water in accordance with such agreement, provided, always, that such arrangement into groups or systems of rotation shall not interfere with the prior rights of any appropriator not a member of such group or system.

7.

That, except as otherwise provided herein, the waters of said stream and the tributaries thereof, shall be diverted under the rights of appro-

priation hereby confirmed in the order of the dates of relative priority of the respective rights of appropriation as hereinafter set forth; and at all times when the waters of said stream or tributaries are not required by those parties having prior rights thereto, the same shall be at the disposal of and subject to use by those parties having subsequent rights of appropriation, in the order of their priority rights; and the said parties shall at all times when practicable, rotate in the use of the water as hereinbefore provided; and at all times the waters diverted by those having a right to do so shall be beneficially, economically and reasonably used, without waste, and no rights of appropriation are hereby confirmed to divert a greater amount of water into the head of the ditch through which such water is diverted than the claimant is entitled to, measured by beneficial use, and in no event, except under a reasonable rotation system as hereinbefore provided, shall the amount so diverted exceed the amount set forth in the tabulated statement herein, or except at such times as the waters so diverted shall not be needed and required by other appropriators.

8.

That a stipulation was entered into and filed herein, between M.

F. Hanley and L. Niedemyer settling a contest between said parties and binding their successors in interest. In accordance with the terms thereof, the rights of Jacob Monia, and his successors, successor of said L. Miedemyer, as tabulated herein, shall be inferior and subordinate to the rights of said M. F. Hanley, as tabulated herein, notwithstanding the dates of priority fixed in said tabulation.

9.

That a stipulation was filed herein, entered into between $\mathbb M$. F. Hanley and the Fish Lake Water Company, as follows:

BEFORE THE BOARD OF CONTROL OF THE STATE OF OREGON WATER DIVISION NUMBER ONE.

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADJUDICATION)
OF THE RELATIVE RIGHTS TO THE USE)
OF THE NATERS OF LITTLE BUTTE CREEK,)
A TRIBUTARY OF ROGUE RIVER, OREGON.)

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the Fish Lake Water Company, and M. F. Hanley, both parties hereto, as follows:

THAT WHEREAS, heretofore, the said Fish Lake Water Company instituted various contests against the water rights and claims of the said Hanley, and

WHEREAS, said Hanley instituted various contests against the claims of said Fish Lake Water Company, for and on behalf of the Upper, Middle and Lower Ditches, out of Long and Wasson Canyons, and for and on account of the water rights of the said Hanley,

through what are called the Manley & Slinger Ditch, the old Hanley Ditch and the Hanley High Line Ditch.

IT IS THEREFORE STIPULATED, with reference thereto, that the Fish Lake Water Company renounces any claim to any of the waters of Long Canyon or Wasson Canyon, and agrees that the same may be decreed to said Hanley.

That as to the rights of the said Hanley to the use of the waters of Little Butte Creek, through said Hanley & Slinger Ditch, the old Hanley Ditch and the Hanley High Line Ditch, the same are as alleged in the answers of the said Hanley, except as specifically modified by the parties hereto.

That so far as the dates of appropriation, amounts of appropriation, continual use and quantity of water used, the facts are as alleged in the several answers of the said Hanley, claimed through said water rights.

That as to the quantity of the waters of the North Fork of Little Butte Creek to which said Hanley is entitled through his said water rights, IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED that as against the said Fish Lake Jater Company, he is entitled to the first right to the use of 1600 miners inches, under a six inch pressure, of the waters of said stream, at all times, and for all useful purposes; subject to these conditions, to-wit:

At least 600 inches shall be so used that the waste or back water thereof shall find its way either into the North or South Fork of Little Butte Creek above the present intake of said Fish Lake Water Company, and that the balance of said 1600 miners inches to-wit: 1000 inches shall be so used that the waste or back waters therefrom shall return to Little Butte Creek at or above the North and South center line passing through the center of Section 5, Township 36 South of Range 1 East of W.M.

That said Hanley shall have the right to make any beneficial use of any of said waters, subject to said limitations, and shall so use said waters upon either the North or South side of Little Butte Creek, or if he shall so desire, so that the same, or any part of the waste waters therefrom, shall enter the South Fork of Little Butte Creek. And he shall make no use of said waters that will so contaminate the same that they will be unfit for irrigation.

The right to the use of the said waters by said Hanley is confined to the use of the waters naturally flowing in said stream and does not extend to any stored water in addition to the natural flow of said stream, nor is the said Fish Lake Water Company obligated to store any water to make up said quantity for said Hanley. However, said Fish Lake Water Company guarantees said Hanley against any interference with his right to the use of the waters as above stipulated resulting from hostile diversion by said Fish Lake Water Company or resulting from the raising of the waters in said Fish Lake by the said Fish Lake Water Company.

IT IS STIPULATED by the said Hanley that he shall not move the headgates of his several ditches, out of the North Fork of Little Butte Creek, above Section 5, Township 36 S. Range 2 E. of W.M. nor down said North Fork of Little Butte Creek below the present intakes of said Fish Lake Water Company.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED, by and between the parties, that it has been proved by the testimony herein, on behalf of the said Hanley, and that if the witnesses were called, said M. F. Hanley, William D. Hanley, E. B. Hanley, Charles E. Terrill and numerous others of said Hanley's witnesses, would testify on his behalf, and it is considered that they have so testified that the lands described by said Hanley in his several answers on file herein, setting up claims to the waters of Wasson Canyon, Long Canyon and to the North Fork of Little Butte Creek, are of such a nature and character, and underlaid with such sub-soil and formation as to require for their irrigation the highest amount of water per acre which the above entitled Board shall find or require for any of the lands irrigated or to be irrigated from said

stream. And that as against any rights of said Fish Lake Water Company said Hanley is entitled to irrigate those said lands which have not yet been irrigated, which belong to him, so long as the quantity of water used by him is not in excess of the amount, or at places different from those above specified, but this latter stipulation shall not restrict the rights of said Hanley to the use of said waters as above specified.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto, that whereas, heretofore, the Fish Lake Water Company sold to the City of Medford, a municipal corporation, 300 inches, miners measurement, under a six inch pressure, of waters to be stored by said Fish Lake Water Company, and its successors, so that the same does not interfere with any of the rights of the said Hanley herein, that the said Hanley shall have the right to be subrogated to the rights of said City to the use of said stored waters if he can contract with said City therefor, and that in that event, the right to the use of said 300 miners inches of stored water shall not be confined to municipal use, but said water may be put to any beneficial use at any point where the same be conducted. And should said Hanley succeed to the interest of said City therein, that his right to the use of said water shall be in addition to the right to the use of said water shall be in addition to the right to the use of said l600 inches, miners measurement, above specified.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the said Hanley that as between the parties to this stipulation the said Fish Lake Water Company is entitled to the use of the surplus waters of said stream so long as such use does not interfere with the rights of the said Hanley as above specified, to the waters of Wasson Canyon and Long Canyon and the North Fork of Little Butte Creek, and said 300 inches of stored water, if the said Hanley should contract with said City of Medford therefor.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, that a decree shall be entered herein by the Board, in accordance with the terms of this stipulation, without further application therefor by either party.

That this stipulation and decree shall apply to, and bind, the successors in interest of said Fish Lake Water Company and all others claiming under, through or by it, and to the heirs, executors, administrators and assigns of the said M. F. Hanley, and all others claiming under, through or by him, or them or any of them.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the Fish Lake Water Company, has, by resolution of its Board of Directors, caused this stipulation to be signed by the undersigned attorney for it, and by its president and secretary, and its official seal to be attached and the said M. F. Hanley has signed and sealed this instrument this 20th day of May, 1910.

FISH LAKE WATER COMPANY
By J. L. Hamilton

President.

FISH LA KE WATER COMPANY

By W. J. Vawter

Acting Secretary.

FISH LAKE WATER COMPANY
By J. N. Smith
Its Attorney.

(SEAL)

M. F. HANLEY
A. E. Reames
Attorney for M. F. Hanley

That the Rogue River Valley Canal Company has succeeded to the interests of said Fish Lake Water Company involved in said stipulation, and as provided therein, the parties thereto, and their successors and assigns, as between themselves shall be bound by the terms and conditions thereof, and the rights of said Hanley as determined herein shall be superior to the rights of said Canal Company. But insofar as said Fish Lake Water Company by said stipulation conceded to said Hanley a right to an amount of water in excess of the amount herein found to be necessary for the proper irrigation of the lands covered by the claims of said Hanley, as theretofore filed in this proceeding, and as allowed a water right herein, said stipulation shall not be deemed to vest in said Hanley a right to such excess amount of water as against said Canal Company, or any other claimant herein; and said stipulation shall not be construed as binding said Canal Company with respect to any water rights which said Hanley may acquire for any lands other than those described in said Hanley's claim theretofore filed, or as allowed a water right herein.

10.

That a stipulation was filed herein, entered into between M. F. Hanley and T. L. Farlow, as follows:

BEFORE THE WATER BOARD OF THE STATE OF OREGON WATER DIVISION NUMBER 1.

IN THE MATTER OF THE DETERMINATION)
OF THE RELATIVE RIGHTS TO THE WATERS)
OF LITTLE BUTTE CREEK, AND ITS TRIBU-)
TARIES, A TRIBUTARY OF ROGUE RIVER,)
JACKSON COUNTY, OREGON.

STIPULATION

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between T. L. Farlow, substituted for J. W. Slinger, in the claims filed for the irrigation of the lands described in the proofs of claim of the said J. W. Slinger filed herein, both as a contestant and a contestee, over the rights to the use of the waters of Little Butte Creek and its tributaries, and M. F. Hanley, claimant to the right to the use of the waters of Little Butte Creek through the Hanley & Slinger Ditch, and the waters of Long Canyon through the Long Canyon Ditch, that as between the parties hereto all contests over the waters for the irrigation of the lands described in the proofs of claim filed by the said Slinger, including the contests affecting the Slinger & Lamb Ditch, the Hanley & Slinger Ditch and the Long Canyon Ditch, and any other contests filed between the parties hereto or their successors, be and hereby are, settled and disposed of by this stipulation.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED, that T. L. Farlow, and his successors in the ownership of the land hereinafter mentioned, shall at all times during each irrigation season have the right to use from the Hanley & Slinger Ditch, where same passes through said lands, sufficient water for the irrigation of said Farlow's lands which lie between the Slinger & Lamb Ditch and the said Hanley & Slinger Ditch, the quantity of water required therefor to be determined by the Board in the present proceeding, and not to exceed seventy (70) miners inches under a six inch pressure.

The Board shall describe in its decree herein, according to its surveys, the land of said Farlow subject to irrigation from said Hanley & Slinger Ditch, and which lies between said Hanley & Slinger Ditch and said Slinger & Lamb Ditch. And the right to use said water for the irrigation of said lands shall be by said decree confirmed in and tied to said lands.

And T. L. Farlow releases to M. F. Hanley, and his successors, all right, title and interest which the said Farlow's lands or the said Farlow may have in or to the waters in the said M. F. Hanley's Upper, Lower and Middle Ditches, and to the waters of Wasson Canyon and Long Canyon.

Said Farlow hereby confirms the right of way in said Hanley and his successors to maintain, repair and use the Hanley & Slinger Ditch upon and across the lands of the said Farlow and to extend the same from its present terminus across said lands on its present grade.

A decree may be entered herein confirming in the said Hanley, or his successors such right of way for said Hanley & Slinger Ditch over and across said premises. The decree shall provide that said Hanley has no interest in said Slinger & Lamb Ditch, and that he is the owner of said Hanley & Slinger Ditch, and water right, subject to the rights of the said Farlow and his successors to said irrigation from the same. The water to be diverted from the said Hanley & Slinger Ditch in such a way as to least interfere with the use of said water ditch and water right by the said Hanley or his successors.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have hereanto set their hands and affixed their seals this 4th day of November, 1914.

Witnesses:

GRACE HENRY
A. E. REAMES

M. F. HANLEY (SEAL)
T. L. FARLOW (SEAL)

That the parties to said stipulation, and their successors, shall be bound thereby, and their respective water rights as hereinafter tabulated are hereby modified to conform to the terms thereof.

11.

That a stipulation was filed herein, entered into between the Fish Lake Water Company and thirty-one other claimants on Little Butte Creek. Said stipulation has to do mostly with the water requirements of the lands of the various parties thereto, and so far as practicable the provisions thereof have been carried out in determining the relative rights of said parties as set forth in the tabulation hereinafter contained.

12.

That a stipulation was filed herein, between Gust Nygren and Art Nichols, as follows:

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMPROL OF THE STATE OF OFFICEN

IN THE MATTER OF THE CONTEST OF GUST NYGREN AGAINST ART NICHOLS INVOLVING THE RIGHT TO THE USE OF WATERS OF SALT CREEK, A TRIBUTARY OF LITTLE BUTTE CREEK IN JACKSON COUNTY, OREGON.

STIPULATION

WHEREAS the contestee in the above entitled cause takes the waters out of Salt Creek, a tributary of Little Butte Creek for the irrigation of his premises situated in Section five (5) in Township 36, South of Range two (2) East of the Willamette Meridian, through two ditches, one taken out on the north side of the said stream and the other taken out on the south side of the said stream, and

WHEREAS said contestant filed before the said Board of Control his contest against the said contestee involving the right to the use of the said waters through the said dit- reches:

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto that the said contest shall be and hereby is determined as follows, to-wit:

That the said contestee agrees to use the waters of said stream to the extent of the present carrying capacity of his ditch for irrigation and domestic purposes on his said premises through the ditch taken out on the north side of said stream, irrigating approximately 70 acres of land, seven days out of each ten days during the irrigation season and agrees to turn the said waters down the said stream through his waste gates three days out of each ten days during the irrigation season, reserving a continuous flow for domestic purposes; and further agrees to utilize the said waters through the said ditch taken out on the south side of said stream to the extent of its carrying capacity three days out of every ten days during the irrigating season and to turn the said waters down said stream through his waste gates seven days out of each ten day period during the irrigating season.

That as between the contestant and the contestee the contestee hereby relinquishes any and all claim on the surplus waters of the said stream after the contestee's needs have been supplied for irrigation and domestic purposes on his said premises as herein and in his original claim before the Board of Control filed and recited.

And the parties hereto hereby request the Board of Control to issue to the parties hereto a certificate of water right based upon the stipulations and agreements herein recited, to the use of the waters of the said stream.

And it is further stipulated and agreed that this stipulation shall become a part of the records of the Board of Control and the same shall be binding on the parties hereto as an adjustment and settlement of the said contest initiated by the contestant and as a full and complete settlement between the parties as to the use of the said waters of the said stream, May 23rd, 1910.

A. E. REAMES Attorney of record for Contestant.

GUS NEWBURY Attorney of record for Contestee.

That the water rights of said parties shall be administered in accordance with said stipulation insofar as practicable and within the limits of their respective appropriations as defined herein.

That J. D. Culbertson, prior to the year 1901, was the owner of a ditch out of Little Butte Creek, and an appurtenant water right, initiated in the year 1896; that by agreement with the Fish Lake Water Company, said Culbertson in said year 1901 permitted the destruction of a portion of said ditch by said company, and since said time said company and its successor, the Rogue River Valley Canal Company, has delivered to said Calbertson sufficient water to irrigate his said lands from the ditch of said company; that the rights of said Culbertson as set forth in the order of determination herein are determined upon the basis of the beneficial application of the waters of Little Butte Creek prior to the agreement above referred to, and nothing herein contained is to be construed as attempting to impair the terms of said agreement, or as a determination of any rights said Culbertson may have as against said company by reason of his contractual relations therewith; that nothing in these findings or order of determination herein shall be deemed or construed to mean that said Culbertson has any interest in said ditch of said company or the water right of said company or other right therein than such right as he may have by virtue of his said contractual relations with said company.

14.

That the quantity of water which J. D. Culbertson, Michael Sidley and L. H. Wyan (as successor to A. E. Thompson) are entitled to divert from said stream by virtue of appropriations made as set forth in the tabulated statement herein, through the Culbertson ditch, is separate and distinct from the appropriations made by the predecessor in interest of the Rogue River Valley Canal Company through its canal, and for the purpose of supplying said water to the lands of said Culbertson, Sidley and Wyant, the use of said company canal should not be considered as intermingling the appropriations of said claimants with those of said company; and any quantities of water which may be diverted through said canal and supplied to said lands shall be considered as additional to the quantity to which said Canal Company is entitled for the lands described in the tabulated statement herein; but nothing in these findings should be construed as finding or determining that said Culbertson, Sidley or Wyant have any right or interest in said Company's ditch, or a right to divert water therefrom, or conduct water through the same, or use water therefrom, other than the rights of said claimants depending entirely upon their said contractual relations with said company, or its predecessors in interest, and which are hereby expressly made not a subject for determination herein.

That under a decree of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Oregon, heretofore made and entered of record by said Court on the 27th day of March, 1911, wherein W. O. Daley was plaintiff and Frank Ceol was defendant, which decree is now in full force and effect, it was determined as between said W. C. Daley and Frank Cool that Frank Cool(or his successor in interest) is the owner of the lands and ditch and water right described in said decree, which ditch is known herein as the Rechter ditch, and that as between said plaintiff and said defendant, or the successors in interest of either, said defendant is the owner of said water ditch and water right, with the right to use so much of the said waters therefrom as may be required for the proper irrigation of the said lands belonging to defendant (said lands being more particularly described in the tabulation hereinafter contained), and if at any time there shall be in said ditch and water right an amount of water necessary for the proper irrigation of the said lands of said defendant, Frank Ceol, the surplus and all thereof over and above the amount actually needed by said Ceol for the said irrigation of the said lands shall be permitted to pass down the said ditch uninterruptedly to the said Daley; that as between said Ceol and said Daley all waters which shall come into said ditch to the lands of defendant Ceol shall be divided as follows between said claimants: The defendant Ceol shall first take all of the water which he needs for the proper irrigation of his said lands and use the same for the irrigation of the said lands, and the balance and surplus of said waters, if any there be after the irrigation needs of the defendant shall be met on said premises, shall be permitted to pass down to the plaintiff without interruption, and such surplus waters shall be waters belonging to the plaintiff, Daley, the irrigation of defendant's premises to be conducted without waste of water; and it was further decreed that plaintiff, Daley, should have a perpetual easement in said ditch for the conveyance of said surplus waters and all the rights and privileges necessary for the protection of the same. That Zundel Brothers are successors in interest of said W. C. Daley, and Michael Sidley, Jr., is successor in interest of said Frank Ceol. That the water rights of said parties shall be administered in accordance with said decree, within the limits of their appropriations as determined herein.

16.

That the terms of the several stipulations filed herein and incorporated into this decree, providing for a special plan in the distribution of the water as between the parties thereto, in each case shall be observed and carried

out by the water master only so long as in so doing the rights of other water users on the stream are not interfered with. But in the event that any other parties who are not parties to the stipulation, are by an enforcement of the stipulation deprived of water which they would otherwise receive, then the rights of said stipulators shall be administered according to their rights as set forth in the tabulation, without regard to the stipulation between them.

17.

That it appears that the Rogue River Valley Canal Company is the successor in interest to the Fish Lake Water Company, and that the rights acquired by virtue of the various applications and permits and appropriations of said Fish Lake Water Company have been acquired by said Rogue River Valley Canal Company, as the successor in interest of said Fish Lake Water Company. That Four Mile Lake appears not to be tributary to said Little Butte Creek, but Fish Lake is tributary to said Little Butte Creek, that the right of said Canal Company to store water in said Fish Lake should be limited to the storage of flood and surplus waters therein; and should not interfere with the rights of prior appropriators to the natural flow of said Little Butte Creek, as provided in the several stipulations of the parties on file herein. That the waters of Four Mile Lake are not involved in this adjudication, and are not subject of adjudication herein.

That by stipulation it has been agreed by the Rogue River Valley Canal Company that the quantity of water necessary for the irrigation of its lands, for which it claims a vested right, does not exceed 420 miner's inches. That said claimant should therefore be limited to the quantity thus stipulated for lands for which it claims a vested right.

That by virtue of its appropriations hereinbefore referred to, the Fish Lake Water Company, and its successor in interest, the Rogue River Valley Canal Company, is entitled to complete and perfect its appropriations initiated by virtue of applications made to and permits issued by the State Engineer of Oregon, for the purposes and uses therein specified, and to furnish the City of Medford with water for municipal purposes, as alleged in its proof herein; but there is nothing in the record to determine the respective rights of said City of Medford and said company, and the relative rights of said parties depend upon their contractual relations, which are hereby expressly made not the subject of adjudication in this proceeding.

That for storage purposes, the said Fish Lake Water Company, and its successor in interest, the Rogue River Valley Canal Company, is entitled to convey the waters of Four Mile Lake into said Fish Lake, so far as the claimants

involved in this proceeding are concerned, and intermingle the stored waters in Fish Lake and Four Mile Lake, and is entitled to use the natural channel of said Little Butte Creek, to conduct the said stored waters down said natural channel, and to divert the same into its canal for distribution for irrigation and other beneficial purposes for which a right was initiated; and said stored waters, lawfully impounded, should not be regarded as a part of the natural flow of said stream; but in the storage of said waters, and in conducting the same down said natural channel, no interference should be occasioned with prior appropriations of the natural flow of said Little Butte Creek, and its tributaries; subject to prior appropriations of the natural flow of said stream, said company should be entitled to divert and use said stored waters in the manner specified in its said applications and permits.

18.

Hurd, filed a motion herein as successors in interest to Sec. T. Collins and J. J. Ammons, showing that certain lands for which water rights had theretofore been allowed under the name of the Little Butte Irrigation Company, were owned by them, and asked that final certificate be issued to them individually instead of under the name of said Company. This motion is allowed. The lands of said Wm. J. and Ella C. Phillips are as follows: Under date of 1883: 4 acres in SWASWA, Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.; 3 acres in SEASWA, Section 36, T. 35 S. R. 1 W.; under date of 1908: 5.3 acres in NWASWA, 30.9 acres in SWASWA and 0.9 acre in SEASWA of Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.; 21.6 acres in SEASWA Section 36, T. 35 S. R. 1 W.; 4.03 acres in NWASWA, Section 6, T. 36 S. R. 1 E. Said lands are tabulated herein under the name of the Little Butte Irrigation Company, but shall be covered by a separate certificate when water right certificates are issued covering rights finally determined in this proceeding.

19.

That all parties having permits from said State Engineer covering appropriations of water from said stream, whether issued before or after the initiation of this proceeding, are entitled to complete and perfect their appropriations in accordance with the terms and conditions of said several permits; and to have their respective rights of appropriation relate back upon completion thereof to the dates of initiation thereof, and to take effect in their priority order.

That nothing in this order of determination shall be construed or regarded as interfering with any existing contract between said Fish Lake Water Company, or its successors in interest, and the City of Medford, a municipal corporation, concerning the sale or delivery to said city for purposes of municipal supply of any of the waters to which said company may be entitled by virtue of appropriation and storage of the waters of Fish Lake.

21.

That the following named persons are in default and have no right, title or interest in or to any of the waters of said stream or any of its tributaries, and should be barred and estopped from hereafter asserting any rights which they or any of them may have heretofore acquired to any of the waters of said stream or its tributaries, (except rights acquired under permits issued by the State Engineer since February 24, 1909), and have forfeited all such rights to the use of said waters, if any they may have heretofore had, to-wit:

Mrs. L. Abbott; John Ashpole; C. C. Beekman; Mrs. Amy Brown; J. F. Brown; William H. Brown; J. H. Carlton; M. Chapman, W. L. Childredth; Dr. J. N. Goghlan; Eli Daback; Mrs. E. Daniels; F. C. Dugan; John Engle; C. C. Felts; A. J. Florey; Mrs. S. Hart; V. W. Harnish; A. L. Hazelton; Mrs. G. W. Hackathorn; J. S. Howard, William W. P. Holt; A. C. Howlett; W. Jack; J. B. Jackson; Mr. ____ Jordan; Thomas Krimey; Mr. Lane; F. L. Lewis; Lofland Bros.; L. Lowden; Joe Moomaw; Leaf Moomaw; William Newbaum; H. Palmer; I. J. Patton; Charles Prewet; Henry Ratrie; Mrs. James Ringer; J. E. Shaw; Mrs ____ Singleton; G. W. Thomas; Fred Tredger; John Watkins; J. B. Williams.

22.

That all parties allowed inchoate water rights by the original order of determination of the State Water Board herein (or their successors in interest), were duly notified by registered mail that at a certain time and place, to-wit: Wednesday, October 21, 1925, at the City Library at Medford, Oregon, they might appear before a representative of the State Engineer and file their written proofs as to the extent of completion of such rights. That a survey had thereto-fore been made under the direction of the State Engineer to determine the extent of such completion, and maps made for the assistance of the water users in preparing their proofs. That it appears that a reasonable time has been allowed for the completion of all of said inchoate rights, and all applications for further time are hereby denied. That based upon the surveys made by the State, or by the claim-

ants themselves in some cases, and the proofs and accompanying affidavits submitted, and the evidence taken at the hearings on exceptions, the rights of the respective parties are hereby determined and limited as set forth in the tabulation hereinafter contained.

That to the extent that the lands of all of said parties heretofore allowed inchoate rights, have not been irrigated, the rights of appropriation therefor shall be deemed to that extent to have been abandoned.

23.

That after this proceeding had been commenced, but prior to the preparation of findings of the State Water Board herein, proceedings were commenced before said Board for the determination of the relative rights of the various users to the waters of Rogue River, and all of its tributaries, forks and branches, above the mouth of the Illinois River, a tributary; that, as heretofore stated, Little Butte Creek is a tributary of said Rogue River; that thereafter such proceedings were had in the matter of the determination of the relative rights to the waters of Rogue River, as required that all evidence and proof theretofore taken in such matter should be opened to public inspection, as provided in Section 5738, 0.L., and each of the various claimants who had theretofore appeared and offered proof in the matter of the determination of the relative rights to the waters of said Little Butte Creek, was duly and regularly notified of the period for inspection in said matter of the determination of the relative rights of the various claimants to the waters of Rogue River and its tributaries; and at the time fixed in said notices, all of said testimony taken in said Little Butte Creek proceeding was opened to public inspection, together with all the evidence and testimony taken in said Rogue River proceeding, and as a part thereof; and all of said evidence and testimony in both said proceedings was kept open for public inspection at the place named in said notice for the full period of time named in such notice, and for the full period required by law. Shat thereafter no contests were filed or entered into as against any of the rights claimed by the various claimants to the waters of Little Butte Creek, by parties who were not parties to the original adjudication proceedings as between the claimants to said Little Butte Creek waters, or otherwise. Therefore, in the distribution of water under the respective decrees entered in said adjudication proceedings, the rights covered by both proceedings shall be administered as in one stream system, the same as if they had all been determined in one proceeding.

That the following named claimants are entitled to a decree and to the issuance of certificates of water right in accordance therewith, determining, establishing and confirming their several rights to the use of said waters of said Little Butte Creek, or tributary under which their names are listed, as of the date of relative priority, and to the amount of water in cubic feet per second of time, continuous flow, for the particular use or uses for which said appropriations were made, and if for irrigation, for the irrigation of the number of acres, through the ditch or ditches, upon the lands or places of use of said claimants, as hereinafter described, as such date, amount, number of acres, use, ditch or ditches, and land or place of use are hereunder set forth in tabulated form opposite the respective names of said claimants, as follows, to-wit:

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Belshaw, Minnie O. & Orchard, J. A., Climax, Ore. (Proof 1148, Vol.15)	1879	0.50	38	Irrigation	Ammel	Rummel Creek, trib. of Antelope Creek	10 acres in NEINEI 5 acres in SWINEI 8 acres in SEINEI 15 acres in NEISE2 Section 1, T. 38 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Bieberstedt, Carl, Eagle Point, Ore. (Proof 1065,	1885	0.08	3.	Irrigation	Bieber- stedt	Little Butte Creek	3 acres in SE2SE2
Vol.15)	1908	0.19	7.5				7.5 acres in SEASEA Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Bieberstedt, Ralph, Eagle Point, Ore. (Proof 1065, Vol.15)	1385	0.80	32	Irrigation	Bieber- stedt -	Little Butte Creek	22 acres in NEANEL 10 acres in NWANEL Section 6, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Blass, Olga Eagle Point,Ore. (Proof 1065, Vol.15)	1885	0.25	10	Irrigation	Tucker	Little Butte Creek	10 acres in NWINWI
7020207	1888	0.25	10.2				10.2 acres in NE4NW4
	1908	0.35	14			-	14 acres in NV2NV2 Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Bradshaw, I. L. (Successor to L.C. Charley) Eagle Point, Ore. , (Proof 1072, Vol.15)	1893	0.50	20.5	Irrigation	Lemon Charley	Little Butte Creek	3.4 acres in SELSWA 2 acres in SWASEL Section 11, 9 acres in NEANWA 6.1 acres in SEANWA Section 14,
	1908	0.54	21.6				8.9 acres in NVANEZ 7 acres in SWANEZ 5.7 acres in NEANWA Section 14, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.V.M.
Britt, Emil & Amelia Jacksonville, Ore. (Proof 1062, Vol.15)		0.90	38	Irrigation	Young and Britt This 346, Trsf	Little Butte Creek	5 acres in Null No. 1 acre in NEL NV. Section 8, 15 acres in NEL NEL 4 acres in NEL NEL 4 acres in SEL NEL Section 7,
							Section 7, 10 acres in Sw2SE2 Section 6,
	1908	0.30	13				2.9 acres in NEINEI 10.1 acres in NWINEI Section 7, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.V.M.
				27	ī	ITTLE BUTT	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -27.

					•		
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	- Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Brown, Geo. B. Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1063, Vol.15)	1863	1.00	42	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Heñry Brown	Little Butte Creek	15 acres in NEANVA 10 acres in SEANVA 4 acres in NWANEA 13 acres in SWANEA Section 10,
	1883	€.40	15.5				0.1 acre in NWASWA 11 acres in SWASWA 4.4 acres in SEASWA Section 3, 7. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Brown, Mrs. M. M., Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1064, Vol.15)	1874	0.13	5	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	5 acres in NP SW Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Butler, W. E., Eagle Point, Ore. (Proof 1065, Vol.15)	1885	0.04	1.5	Irrigation	Bieber- stedt	hittle Butte Creek	l.5 acres in SW2SE2
	1908	0.25	10				10 acres in SWASEA Section 31,
Chapman, 7. S. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proofs 1068-69-70, Vol. 15)	1885	0.40	15	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Rechter	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	15 acres in SEANVA Section 21, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
	1892	0.03	1	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Chapman	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	l acre in SEINWI Section 21, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.V.M.
,	1888	0.33	13	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Peck & Rechter	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	8 acres in SEANWA 5 acres in NWASEA Section 21, T. 36 S. R. 2 E. W.M.
Charley, Emogene Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1071, Vol.15)	1895	0.80	32 . 5	Irrigation	Clay Charley	Little Butte Creek	2 acres in NE2SE2 3 acres in NW2SE2 2.5 acres in SE1SE2 Section 10, 20 acres in SE2SW2 2.5 acres in SE2SW2 Section 11, 2.5 acres in NE2NW2
(This right omit							Section 14,
Charley, L.C. Eagle Point, Ove (Proof 1072, Vol. 15)	1893		,	Irrigation.	Lem Charley	Little Butte (r.	8.8 acres in NENE 10 acres in NWNE 2 acres in SW NE 15 acres in SE NE Section 14,
	1908	0.40	15,8	90		LITTLE BITT	13: acces in SE NE 2? acces in SE NE Section 14, T. 36 S.R. IE. W. M.
			-	28		5011	

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Culbertson, J. D. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1075, Vol.15)	1896	1.90	95	Irrigation	Rogue River Valley Canal Company Canal	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	Section 20, 17 acres in NWANWA 30.5 acres in NWANWA 32.5 acres in NWANWA Section 29,
	(Subject See Par	to agre agraphs	ement v	with Rogue Rive	r Valley Ca	nal Company.	T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Daley, Geo. W. Eagle Point, Ore. (Proof 1077, Vol.15)	1895	0.08	3	Irrigation	Pumping plant	Little Butte Creek	3 acres in $N \sqrt[4]{4} \sqrt[4]{4}$ Section 2,
	1908	0.05	2.1				1.5 acres in NW1NW1 Section 2, 0.6 acre in NE1NE1 Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
		, روح					
Farlow, T. L. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proofs 1125-6, Vol.15)	June 1, 1903	1.43	39	Irrigation .	Slinger & Lamb	Worth Fork of Little Butte Creek	18 acres in NE ₄ SE ₂ Section 21, 21 acres in NW ₄ SW ₄ Section 22, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
	1908	1.87	126.	3 Irrigation	Hanley North Canal	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	16.1 acres in NEW 27.3 acres in SWAN.1. 38.4 acres in SEANW. 40 acres in NEW SWA
	(Subject	to stipu	lation	with M. F. Han	ley. See P	aragraph 10,	Section 22, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Farlow, W. P., Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1081, Vol.15)	May 1, 1900	0.50	21.5	Irrigation	Moore & Farlow	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	5.2 acres in NEINEL 3.8 acres in SELNEL Section 13, T. 37 S. R. 2 E. V.M.
						•	7 acres in Swawa Section 18, T. 37 S. R. 3 E.W.M.
Frey, Geo. W. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1083, Vol.15)	June 1898	0.20	8	Irrigation	Frey	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	8 acres in NELSWA Section 32, T. 36 S. R. 3 E.W.M.
				·	·		
				29	r	ITTLE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -29.

			· I·				
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Fryer Ditch Association Floyd Pearce, Sec'y. Eagle Point, Ore.		2.43	96.85	Irrigation	Fryer	Little Butte Creek	96.85 acres of land under the following appropriations, with present owners, priorities, number of acres and descriptions of irrigated land, as follows:
Proof 1076, Vol.15. (Successors of A.J. Daley)	1885	0.08	3		Ram from Fryer Ditch		3 acres in NW2NW2 Section 2, and NE2NE2 Section 3,
				(Tract 1 - Ga Tract 2 - Me			T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1084, Vol.15. (Successors of J.J. Fryer)	Jan. 31, 1870	0.35	15.1	(Tract 3 - G	ladius F. Pe	arce)	1.45 acres in Swinel and Nwisel
				(Tract 4 - G)	ladius F. Pe	arce)	4.42 acres in NEISWA and NWASE
				(Tract 5 - G)	ladius F. Pe	arce)	0.5 acre in $NE_4^1SW_4^2$
				(Tract 6 - G)	ladius F. Pe	arce)	0.25 acre in SwanE and NWase
				(Tract 7 - M	s. Arglee G	reen)	3.59 acres in NWLSEL, NELSWL, SELSWL and SWLSEL
				(Tract 8 - M	rs. Arglee G	reen)	1.93 acres in NE15W1
				(Tract 9 - Li			0.85 acre in NE25W2
				(Tract 10 -	***		0;25 acre in Swansa
#				(Tract 11 - 1	Dave Cingead	e)	and NW1SE1 0.7 acre in SW1NE2 and NW1SE4
				(Tract 12 - 1	Dolly Matthe	ws)	0.23 acre in SWAWEA
				(Tract 13 -)	. Ayers)		0.46 acre in SWANE
				(Tract 14 -)	. Ayers)		0.2 acre in SWINE
1				(Tract 15 - 1	rs. Arglee)	Green)	0.27 acre in NELS
						•	All in Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1085, Vol.15. (Successors of J.W. Grover)	Jan.31, 1870	0.25	10	(Tract 16 - A	A. A. Newmar	.)	10 acres in SE2SW2 and NE2SW2 Section 3,
							T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
	1908	0.48	19.3	(Tract 16	A. A. Newmar	.)	13 acres in $SW_{4}^{1}SW_{4}^{1}$ and $SE_{4}^{1}SW_{4}^{2}$
				(Tract 17 -	A. C. Mittel	staedt)	2 acres in SELSW4 3.5 acres in SW4SW4
	3			(Tract 18	A. C. Mittel	staedt)	0.8 acre in NE45W4
				·			All in Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
					ı	ITTLE BUTT	E CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -30.
	,			30			•

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use -	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Fryer Ditch Association (continued):		. "					
Proof 1099, Vol.15. (Successors of S. B. Holmes, et al)	1907	0.13	5	(Tract 19 - J. (Tract 20 - Ge (Tract 21 - Wh (Tract 22 - J. (Tract 23 - T. (Tract 24 - W. (Tract 25 - R. (Tract 26 - Ge (Tract 27 - J.	o. Brown Es . Von der H . A. Miller) . F. Nichols . H. Brown) . S. Brown) celia Holme	ellen)	5 acres in NEINEI Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1100, Vol.15. (Successors to Jonas	Jan. 31,	0.3	12	(Tract 28 - Fr	red Thompson)	l acre in NW4SE4
Estate)	2010			.(Tragt 29 - A.	H. Thompson	n)	2 acres in NASEL
				(Tract 30 - Ge	eo. Lewis)		9 acres in Nwisel and NEASEL section 3,
·	1908	0.05	2	(Tract 30 - Ge	o. Lewis)		2 acres in NE4SE4 Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1101, Vol.15. (Successor of W. G. Knighton)	Jan. 31, 1870	0.04	1.3	(Tract 31 - G)	adius F. Pe	arce)	1.3 acres in SWANEL Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1127, Vol.15. (Successor of J. F. Nichols)	Jan. 31, 1870	0.13	5	(Tract 32 - A.	R. MoDonal	a)	5 acres in $NE_{4}^{1}SW_{4}^{1}$ Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1129, Vol.15. (Successors of W. W. Taylor)	Jan. 31, 1870	0/13	5	(Tract 33 - In (Tract 34 - Gr (Tract 35 - 7) (Tract 36 - In (Tract 37 - To	ace Dahack) . W. Taylor) a Grove)		5 acres in NE SW4, NW4SW4 and SE4SW4 Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1136, Vol.15. (Successor of G. H. Wamsley)	Jan. 31, 1870	0.05	2	(Tract 38 - 0.	M. Goss)		2 acres in SWINEL NEESWI SEINWI and NWISEL Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1137, Vol.15. (Successor of Mar- vin S. Wood)	Jan. 31,	0.03	1	(Tract 39- Wa)	lter A. Wood)	l acre in NELSWL Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Proof 1084, V61.15. (Successors of J. J. Fryer)	1908	0.41	16.25	(Tract 40 - William (Tract 41 - Ge) (Tract 42 - Ae) (Tract 43 - Ce) (Tract 44 - E) (Tract 45 - Je) (Tract 46 - Je) (Tract 47 - Je) (Tract 48 - Me) (Tract 49 - Fe)	so. Phillips ia Matthews) atholic Chur Clark) ackson Count ackson Count sckson Count	ch) y} y} y)	and SELSWA and SELSWA O.9 acre in SWANEA 2 acres in NWASEA 0.5 acre in NEASWA 1.15 acres in NEASWA 0.5 acre in NWASEA 0.7 acre in SWANEA 0.5 acre in NEASWA 6.5 acres in NWASEA Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
,					FI	TTLE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -31.

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Furry, A. S. & F. E. Phoenix, Ore. (Proof 1146, Vol.15)	1895	0;13	,	Stock	J.A. Grain	Trib. springs on Lost Prairie	Place of use: Swanda, Sec. 1 and Swansa, Sec. 2, T. 38 S. R. 4 E.W.M.
Gibson, W. E. (Successor to Thos.Baldwin Est.) Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1059, Vol. 15.)	1874	0.28	10.9	Irrigation	Henry Brown	Little Butte Creek	10.9 acres in NE1SW1 Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
(Successor to Stephenson & Archibald) (Proof 1095, Vol. 15.)	1874	1.00	50	Irrigation	Brownsbore	Eittle Butte Creek	15 acres in NELSEL 35 acres in NVLSEL Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Hall, C. P. Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1086, Vol. 15.)	1874	0.05	2	Irrication	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	2 acres in NE SW4 Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Hamilton, I. L. Medford, Ore. (Proof 1087, Vol. 15.)	1889	0.90	53.5	Irrigation	North Side	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	16 acres in Swand Section 31, Section 31, T. 36 S. R. 3 E.W.M. 37.5 acres in Skank Section 36, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
	1892	0.75	45	Irrigation	South Side	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	25 acres in NW4SW4 Section 31, T. 36 S. R. 3 E.W.M. 20 acres in NE4SE4 Section 36, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Hanley, M. F. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proofs 1088 & 1092, Vol.15)	1856	1.25	75	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Upper & Lower Wasson Canyon ditches	Wasson Canyon	24 acres in NEAN 1 36.8 acres in NWANWA 2 acres in SWANWA 6.2 acres in SEAN 3 Section 26, 6 acres in SWASWA
	(Supplem	nental to under da		from N. For o	f Little But	tte Creek	Section 23, Jackson County, Ore., T. 36 S. R. 2 E. W.M.
(Proof 1091, Vol. 15.)	1879	1.5	87	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Long Canyon	Long Canyon	8 acres in NVANEA 7 acres in NEANVA Section 26, 15 acres in NEASVA 4 acres in NVASVA 30 acres in SEASVA 23 acres in SVASEA Section 23, T. 36 S. R. 2 E. W.M. Jackson County, Ore.
				32	T.	ITTLE BUTT	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -32.

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Hanley, M. F. (continued):						.,	
(Proofs 1089 & 1090, Vol. 15)	1881	5.55 (Less the amount obtaine from Wasson Canyon		Irrigation, domestic and stock	Hanley & Slinger (or North Canal)	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	5 acres in NWANEZ 22 acres in SWANEZ 2 acres in SEANEZ -24 acres in NEANWA 38 acres in NWANWA 15 acres in SEANWA 2 acres in NEASEZ Section 26,
		rights fo		n Sections 23 son Canyon as			20.8 acres in NW4SW4 23.1 acres in SW4SW4 Section 23, 21 acres in NE4NE4
							5 acres in NW1NE4 Section 27, 3 acres in NW1NE4 16.7 acres in SW1NE4 27.8 acres in NE4SE4 27.8 acres in NW4SE4 35.9 acres in SW4SE4 33.9 acres in SE4SE4 Section 22, T. 36 S. R. 2 E. V.M.
(Proof 1089, Vol.15)	1908	2.24	134.6	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Hanley & Slinger (or North Canal)	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	19 acres in SWANWA 17 acres in NWASWA 8.2 acres in SWANEA Section 16, 23.2 acres in SEANEA 18.2 acres in NEASEA 18.2 acres in NWASEA 6.4 acres in SWASEA 6.5 acres in SEASEA Section 17, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.V.M., Jackson County, Oregon.
(Proof 1093, Vol.15)	April 1907	6.5	389.6	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Hanley High Line (or South Canal)	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	acres in SWANEA 1.5 acres in SWANWA 24 acres in SWANWA 7 acres in SEANWA 6.9 acres in NEASEA 4.1 acres in NWASEA O.1 acre in SEASEA Section 26, 15.1 acres in NEANEA 29.2 acres in NWANEA 29.2 acres in SWANEA 18.2 acres in SEANWA 18.2 acres in SEANWA 28.9 acres in SWANWA 2.8 acres in SWANWA 16.4 acres in SEANWA
							O.l acre in NW SET Section 27, 5.4 acres in SW SET Section 22, 38 acres in NE NET 13.4 acres in NW NET 6.1 acres in SW NET 10;1 acres in SENE 30.8 acres in NET NW 226 acres in NW NW 22.9 acres in SET NW 25.9 acres in SET NW 25.9 acres in SET NW 25.9
				33	LI	TTLE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -33.

				·.			
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Hanley, M. F. (continued):							
(Proof 1093, Vol. 15 - con't.)	•						18 acres in SWASWA 1 acres in SEASWA 11.3 acres in SEASEA
							Section 21, 4.2 acres in NEINEI Section 29,
				,			27.1 acres in SEASEA Section 20, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
							Jackson County, Oregon.
							er .
Hansen, Geo. A. (Successor to Olive R. Bell)	1874	0.10	4	Irrigation	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	4 acres in SE1NV1 Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1060, Vol.15)	1908	0.08	3				3 acres in SEINWI Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
(Successor to McNary							
and Banker, Melvin successors to E. D. (Proof 1139, Vol.15)	Briggs)	0.30	12.5	Irrigation & domestic	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	12.5 acres in NW15W1 Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.V.M.
Hansen, W. M. (Successor to E. D. Colby) (Proof 1073, Vol.15) Brownsboro, Ore.	1874	0.7	29.5	Irrigation	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	16.5 acres in SWANWA 6 acres in SEANWA 2 acres in NWASWA Section 4, 5 acres in SEANEA Section 5,
	1908	0.09	3.7				T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M. 3.7 acres in SEINE
							Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
(Successor to John B. Edsall) (Proof 1079, Vol.15)	1874	0,13	5	Irrigation	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	5 acres in NW2SW2 Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Hanson, Nels P. Climax, Ore. (Proof 1147, Vol.15)	1875	0.25	10	Irrigation & domestic	Nelson	Antelope Creek	7 acres in $SE_{4}^{1}SW_{4}^{1}$ Section 31, T. 37 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
		·					3 acres in NE NA Section 6, T. 38 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
					L	ITTLE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -34.
		,		54		,	

Name and Postoffice Address	Date of	Amount Cubic Feet	Number			9.	
of Appropriator	Relative Priority	Cubic Feet Per Second	Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Hoefft, Charles, Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1098, Vol.15)	1869	0.86	51	Irrigation	Hoefft & Peck	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	15 acres in NELSWA 8 acres in NWASWA 28 acres in SWASEA Section 33, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Holmes, Wm. M. & S. B. 603 Riverside Ave., Medford, Ore. (Proof 1097, Vol.15)	1872	40		Power 60 H.P.	Daley Mill	Little Butte Creek	Butte Creek or Daley Flouring Mill, at Eagle Point, Oregon, in Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Johnson, T. Slater, & Rogue River Com'l. Orchard Co., Medford, Ore.	1902	0.55	33	Irrigation and stock	Smith and Welch	Antelope Creek	8 acres inSwinEd 11 acres in NwisEd 14 acres in SwisEd Section 19, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Jones, Mrs. Ora E. (Successor to J. L. Ragsdale) (Proof 1122, Vol.15)	1885	1.00	59.5	Irrigation	Rangles and Rag s dale	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	33 acres in NELSWI 16 acres in SELSWI 2 acres in NWISEL 8.5 acres in SWISEL Section 3. T. 37 S. R. 2 S. W.M.
	•						
Lamb, W. R. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1102, Vol.15)	1888	0.30	12	Irrigation	Slinger & Lamb Chapman & Lmb	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	5 acres in SELNEL 5 acres in NVLSEL 6 acres in SWLNEL Section 21, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
7	1904	0.10	4				
Little Butte Irr. Co., a corporation, H. W. Ward, Sec'y., Eagle Point, Ore.	1883	12.6	632	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Little Butte Irr. Co.	Little Butte Creek	4 acres in Swaswa Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
(Proof 1103, Vol.15)	,	by Wm.	J. & eparat	rights allowed Ella C. Phillip e certificate.	s shall be See Paragr	covered	7.5 acres in SW2SE2 3 acres in SW2SE2 3 acres in SH2SE2 Section 36,
· · ·							37. acres in NELSWA 33 acres in NWASWA 40 acres in SWASWA 33 acres in SELSWA 21 acres in NELSEA 32.5 acres in NWASEA 4 acres in SWASEA 12 acres in SELSWA
	·			35	LI	TTLE BUTTE	Section 35, 7 acres in NE4SE4 CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -35.

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Title Duth Ton Co							
Little Butte Irr. Co. (continued):							34 acres in SW4SE4
							40 acres in SELSEL 10 acres in SWLSWL
							15 acres in SELSW4 Section 34,
~ 20							T. 35 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
See No. 520 Vol. 14, 1. 500	Sp. Or. Vol. 6	p.116	- Market page and	9,651	90 TrsfSp.C	r. Vol. 5, p. 28	o 15 acres in NE NE 35 acres in NW NE
1				10.0	l" " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	" 2, p. 28	2.5 acres in SWANEA
							21 acres in Swinyi
				, ' ·			34.5 acres in SELNW.
							32 acres in NW2SW2
							Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
							1 ⁿ
\	1908	3.7	184.1				5.3 acres in NW1SW1
							30.9 acres in Swiswi
							Section 31, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
							4.03 acres in NW1NW1
		•					Section 6, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
-						,	8.41 acres in SW4NW4
							10.6 acres in SELNW.
						Jane	1.1 acres in NEISE
				,		Grand .	11.5 acres in NW2SE4
							21.6 asres in $SE_4^{\frac{1}{4}}SE_4^{\frac{1}{4}}$
			,				Section 36, T. 35 S. R. 1 ₩.₩.M.
							0.46 acre in SWINE
							2.5 acres in SEANE.
							10.3 acres in $SV_4^1SE_4^1$ Section 35,
							T. 35 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
						:	6.6 acres in NELSEL 4.4 acres in NULSEL
7							Section 34, T. 35 S. R. 1 %.W.M.
							4.3 acres in NEINE
							14.5 acres in SW.NE. 2.7 acres in NE.NW4
							12.3 acres in NWANTA
							3.7 acres in NE SW 9.9 acres in SW 2SW 2
							Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
				-			,

8							
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
McCallister, John G. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1111, Vol.15)	Mov. 25, 1906	40	Powe	Power (60 H.P.) Vaim #794	McCal- lister Saw Mill	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	See Power K. No. 794 McCallister Saw Mill in Lot 2, Section 4, T. 37 S. R. 3 E.W.M., Jackson County, Oregon. Water to be returned to stream at point of use and above all diversions below present point of return.
Messal, W. G. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1105, Vol.15)	1882	0.3	12	Irrigation	Messal Nos. 1	Salt Creek	12 acres in SEINEI Section 7, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
· .	1904	0.15	8	Irri $arepsilon$ ation	Messal No. 3	Salt Creek	8 acres in NWINWI Section 8, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Meyer, A. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1106, Vol.15)	1878	0.88	48	Irrigation	A.Meyer	Salt Creek	7 acres in NelNel Section 13, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M. 21 acres in Selswl 1.5 acres in Nelsel Section 7, 6 acres in Nelnwl 12.5 acres in Nv2Nwl Section 18, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Meyer, H. G. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1107, Vol.15)	1872	0.40	20	Irrigation	Meyer	Salt Creek	12.5 acres in NW2SE2 7.5 acres in SW2SE2 Section 7, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Meyers, H. A. & Klingle, C. W., Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1108, Vol.15)	1872	2.00	106.5	Irrigation	Meyer & Klingle	Little Butte Creek	20 acres in SWINEL 2.5 acres in NEINWI 32.5 acres in NWINWI 10 acres in SWINWI 26 acres in SEINWI 8 acres in NEISE 5.5 acres in NWISE Section 19, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
Miller, John A. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1109, Vol.15)	1882	0.41	21	Irrigation	Hutchens	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	8 acres in NELNWL 10 acres in NWLNWL Section 13, 3 acres in SWLSWL Section 12, T. 37 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
	·			37	Ĩ.	ITTLE BUTT	COREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -37.

•

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Monia, Edna I. (Successor of Jacob Monia, successor of L. Niedermyer) Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1113, Vol.15)	1884			Irrigation ights of M. F. page 14.)	Niedermye Hanley. S	r Little Butte Creek	Sacres in SELSEL Section 4, 7 acres in SWLSWL Section 3, 4.6 acres in NELNEL Section 9, 20.4 acres in NWLNN Section 10, T. 36 S. R. 1 E. W.N.
Moore, C. R. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1110, Vol.15)	Feb. 1894	0.39	19	Irrigation Power (4 H.P.) Power (laim #82	Clagg	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	10 acres in NEINEL 9 acres in NWINEL Section 18, T. 37 S; R. 3 E.W.M.
Myers, D. W., Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1112, Vol.15)	Jan. 1893	0.15	6	Irrigation	Lem. Charley	Little Butte Creek	6 acres in SELSWA Section 11, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Neil, R. P. Ashland, Ore. (Proofs 1143 & 1144, Vol.15)	1858	1.50	90	Irrigation	Samuel Grubb	Spencer Creek Dead Indian Creek	11 acres in NELSWL 38 acres in NWASWL 2 acres in SELSWL 40 acres in SWLSWL Section 15, 5 acres in SELSEL Section 16,
	1888	1.30	78				2 acres in NEINEL 10 acres in SELNEL 10 acres in NEISEL Section 21, 35 acres in NWINIL 12.5 acres in SWINIL 2.5 acres in NWISWL Section 22, T. 38 S. R. 3 E. W.M.
Nichols, Gus (Successor to Art Nichols) Eagle Point, Ore.	1870	1.20	70	Irrigation	Nichols Nos. 1 and 2	Salt Creek	31.8 acres in NELSW- 1.4 acres in NWASWA 17 acres in SWASWA 29.2 acres in SEASWA
(Proof 1114, Vol.15)	1898			stipulation wit 1, page 18.)	th Gust Nygr	en. See	9.4 acres in NEASEA 1.2 acres in NVASEA Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
				7/			·
٠.				. '		LITTLE BUTT	e Creek - Second Modified -38.
				38.			,

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use		
Nichols, T. E. Eagle Point, Ore. (Proof 1115, Vol.15)	1860	0.10	4	Irrigation	Nichols	Tributary springs on land	4 acres in Section 30, T. 35 S. R. 1 E.W.M.		
Nygren, Gust Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1116, Vol.15)	1874			Irrigation tipulation with , page 18.)	Nygren Art Wichol	Salt Creek	5 acres in NE SW4 5 acres in NW4SE4 5 acres in SW4NE4 5 acres in SE4NE4 Section 13, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.V.M.		
Obenchain, Mrs. Carebese A., Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1117, Vol.15)	Jan. 1870	0.03	0.5	Irrigation	Browns- boro	Little Butte Creek	O.5 acre described as follows: Beginning at NE corner Lot 1 in NE4 Section 4, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M., thence S. 330 ft; E. 50 ft; N. 330 ft; W. 50 ft. to beginning.		
Owen, C. E. Ashland, Ore. (Proof 1142, Vol.15)	1865	1.70	100	Irrigation	Owen	Dead Indian Creek	100 acres in NW1, N1SW2 and SE1SW1, Section 10, T. 38 S. R. 3 E.W.M.		
Peck, Gus Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1118, Vol.15)	1888	0.38	17	Irrigation	Rangles & Ragedale	South Fk. of Little Butte Cr.	7 acres in SEINWI 10 acres in NWINWI Section 3, T. 37 S. R. 2 E.W.M.		
Peck, R. A., Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1119, Vol.15)	1882 1895	0.50	25 5.5	Irrigation	Tonn & Peck Hoefft & Peck	South Fk. of Little Butte Creek	13 acres in SELSEL 12.5 acres in NV2SEL 5 acres in SELNV2 Section 33, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.		
Rader, J. M. Phoenix, Ore. (Proofs 1140 & 1141, Vol. 15)	1898	0.35	15	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Rader ditches Nos. 1 and 2	Bybee Gulch, trib. of Lost Cr.	Section 1, T. 38 S. R. 2 E.W.M. 3 acres in Lot 1 (NELNEL) 8 acres in Swanel 3 acres in Seanel Section 1, T. 38 S. R. 2 E.W.M.		
				39	E	ITTLE BUTT	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -39.		

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Rogue River Valley Canal Company, a corporation, (Successor to Fish Lake Water Company, a corporation) Medford, Ore. (Proof 1082, Vol.15)	Sept.14,	10.5 (Subject of sti		Irrigation ights of M. F. on of May 20,			Section 14, 10 acres in NEANEA Section 15, 20 acres in SEANEA Section 18, 3 acres in SWANEA 7 acres in NWASEA Section 19, 10 acres in NEANEA Section 30, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M. 18 acres in NEANEA Section 30,
					,		6 acres in NE4SE4 Section 8, 4 acres in NE4SE4 Section 9, 20 acres in SE4SE4 Section 13, 10 acres in NW4NE4 Section 16, 25 acres in SE4SE4 10 acres in SE4SE4 10 acres in SE4SE4 5 acres in SE4SE4 Section 20, 10 acres in SW4SE4 Section 21, 5 acres in NE4SW4 8 acres in NE4SW4 8 acres in NE4SW4 9 acres in NE4SW4 40 acres in NE4SW4 40 acres in NE4SW4
							16 acres in SWANEL 16 acres in SEANEL 160 acres in the NW 30 acres in No SWANEL 20 acres in SWASWA 20 acres in SEASWA Section 29, 8 acres in NVANEL 10 acres in SWANEL 10 acres in NEANEL Section 30, 15 acres in SEASWA Section 32, 38 acres in NWANEL 5 acres in NWANEL 10 acres in SWANEL 5 acres in SWANEL 5 acres in SWANEL 10 acres in SEASWA Section 33, T. 36 S. R. 1 V.W.M.
				40	LI	TTLE BUTTE C	10 acres in NW NEL 8 acres in NELNWI 2 acres in NW

·							
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Rogue River Valley Canal Company (continued):						:	10 cares de Sudarud
(continued):							10 acres in SEANWA 10 acres in NWANWA 19 acres in NWASWA
*							10 acres in SEASWA
							Section 1, 5 acres in NETNET
							l acre in NE4SE4 Section 2, 25 acres in SW4NW4
							25 acres in SEANWA 12 acres in SWANEA
							18 acres in NW SEL
				* in			10 acres in NW2SW2 17 acres in SE2SW2 3 acres in SW2SE2
							Section 11,
							27 acres in NVANET
							Section 12, 10 acres in NE 1 NA 1 10 acres in NW 2 SE 2
							5 acres in SWASEA
•							Section 13, 10 acres in NVANEA 10 acres in SEANEA
							Section 14,
							Section 24, T. 37 S. R. 2 W. W. 70
							15 acres in SEASWA 5 acres in NEASWA
							Section 14,
							Section 21,
S. Ja							10 acres in NE4NV4 Section 22, 10 acres in NV4SV4
							10 acres in SELSWL 20 acres in NWLSEL
							20 acres in NEASEA. 10 acres in SWASEA.
1							Section 24, 10 acres in SEANE4 5 acres in NWASE4
							5 acres in NE4SE4
	•						10 acres in NEWNW Section 25, 40 acres in NEWSW
							3 acres in SW4SW4 Section 26,
							7 acres in SELSEL Section 27,
							10 acres in NW NW 10 acres in SW 10 acres in NE SW 1
1							10 acres in NW SE
							Section 35, T. 36 S. R. 2 W.W.M.
							·
							·
				41	LI	TTLE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -41.
				"蚕; 煮,			

						_	
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Seefield, Charles Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1123, Vol. 15)	Nov. 1906	0.30	12 * Nota;	Irrigation, domestic and stock pt. of div. changed sp. Or. Vol. 5, p. 249	Seefield	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	* 7.5 acres in NE NE. 2 acres in NWANEL Section 10, * 2.5 acres in NWANWA Section 11,
Sidley, Michael Jr. (Successor to Frank Contake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1067, Vol. 15)	1884 (Sub		30 erms o	Irrigation f Court decree.	Rechter See	N. Fk. of Little But Creek	T. 37 S. R. 2 E.W.M. 30 acres in $SW_{4}^{1}NW_{4}^{1}$
Sidley, Michael, Sr. Lake Creek, Ore.	1896	agraph 15	, page 12	Irrigation	Rogue River Valley Canal Company Canal	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	12 acres in NEINEI Section 30, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
		(Subje	ct to	greement with	Rogue River	Valley	,
		Canal	Compa	y. See Paragr	aph 14, pag	e 20.)	
Smith, Phebe M. Ashland, Ore. (Proof 1145, Vol.15)	1865	1.70	100	Irrigation	Minnie Smith	Dead Indian Creek	15 acres in NEINEI 30 acres in SWINEI 15 acres in SEINEI 20 acres in NWISEI 20 acres in SWISEI Section 10, T. 38 S. R. 3 E.W.M.
Spencer, Aden C. Ashland, Ore. (Proof 1128, Vol.15)	1904	0.90	50	Irrigation	Spencer Ditches	West Branch of Dead Indian Creek	11 acres in Swinei 5 acres in SEINEI 9 acres in NEINWI 5 acres in NWINWI 20 acres in SEINWI Section 20, T. 38 S. R. 3 E. W.M.
Terrill, Chas. E. Medford, Ore. (Proof 1130, Vol.15)	1863	0.86	34.5	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Old Henry Brown	Little Butte Creek	16 acres in SWINEL 5 acres in NWISEL 13 acres in NELSEL 0.5 acre in SELNEL Section 10, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
	1890	0.22	8.6				l acre in SE4NE4 4 acres in NE4SE4 1 acre in NW4SE4 Section 10, 2.6 acres in NW4SW4 Section 11, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
Tonn, L. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1132, Vol.15) Pt. of div changed	1882	0.30	12	Irrigation Irrigation	편 o nn & Pe c k Tonn	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	2 acres in NWANEA 2 acres in SEANEA 20 acres in NEANEA Section 4, T. 37 S. R. 2 E. J.M.
5p.Or. Vol. 6, p. 44	1904	0.30	12	arrigation	ronn	ritare Bâi	TE CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -42

	١	•					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Tucker, R. E. Brownsboro, Ore. (Proof 1133, Vol.15)	1875	0.5	21.5	Irrigation	Tucker	Little Butte Creek	6 acres in SWANELL 11 acres in NELSEL 4.5 acres in NWLSEL Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.M.
	1908	0.5	19.5	·			7.8 acres in SWANEA 11.7 acres in NWASEA Section 5, T. 36 S. R. 1 E.W.
Tyrrell, J. H. Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1134, Vol.15)	1878	0.43	20	Irrigation	Tyrrell	Lost Creek	3 acres in MR4SE4 17 acres in SE4NE4 Section 9, T. 37 S. R. 2 E. W.M.
Ulrich, William, Medford, Ore. (Proof 1135, Vol.15)	1883	0.10	4	Irrigation	Little Butte Ditch Company	Little Butte Creek	4 acres in NEANEL Section 3, T. 36 S. R. 1 W.W.M.
Van Winkle, Mrs. L. R. (Successor to Louis J. Hessler) Yamhill, Ore. (Proof 1096, Vol.15)	1902	0.33	13	Irrigation & domestic	Hessler	Little Butte Creek	5 acres in ME SW 8 acres in NW SE 2 Section 10, T. 36 S. R. 1 E. J.M.
Walsh, John (Successor to Charles Randles) Lake Creek, Ore.	1885	0.65	34.5	Irrigation	Randles & Rags- dale	South Fork of V (Lost (Creek	22.5 acres in Swinwight 12 acres in Maiswa Section 3, (12.5 acres in SEISE
(Proofs 1120 & 1121, Vol.15)	1887	0.38	17.5	Irrigation, domestic and stock	Randles		5 acres in NH2SE2 Section 4, T. 37 S. R. 2 E.W.H.
Wilhite, C. E. (Successor to T. L. Farlow) Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1080, Vol.15)	July 1,	0.55	27.5	Irrigation and stock	Farlow	South Fork	3.7 acres in NESVI 0.8 acres in SEISVI 5.2 acres in NWISEI 9.5 acres in SEISEI 8.3 acres in SEISEI Section 11, T. 37 S. R. 2 E
Wyant, L. H. (Successor to A. H. Thompson) Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1131, Vol.15)	May 12, 1896	0.30	12	Irrigation	Rogue River Valley Canal Co. Canal	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	12 acres in SEASEA Section 19, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
		ot to agr aragraph		with Rogue Rige 20.)			diplome and and
				43	p)	MILE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -43.

Name and Postoffice Address of Appropriator	Date of Relative Priority	Amount Cubic Feet Per Second	Number Acres	Use	Name of Ditch	Stream	Description of Land or Place of Use
Young, Nicholas (Heirs of) Eagle Point, Ore.	1899	i.17	56.2	Irrigation	Young and Britt	Little Butte Creek	
				T. C. Dugan -	ann, died was blie die liefe stel and and liefe field of		4 acres in NWINWI Section 9,
				P. L. Young -			4.7 acres in SWASEA 2.3 acres in SWASEA Section 4, ll acres in NWANEA 1 acre in NEANEA
				Clara Young -			Section 9, 8 acres in NW4NE4 Section 9,
				Nick Young		an trade disks to the classes state state are state disks.	12.2 acres in $NE_2^1NW_4^1$ Section 9,
·				Mrs. C. Givan			5.5 acres in SE_2SW_2 Section 4,
				Mrs. James Ow	en		7.5 acres in Swistly Section 4,
							T. 36 S. R. 1 W. W. M.
Zundel, Golden & Harold (Successors t W. C. Daley) Lake Creek, Ore. (Proof 1078, Vol.15)	1871 o 1886	0.90 1.50	35.5 47.0	Irrigation	Daley	North Fork of Little Butte Creek	22 acres in SE4SW4 25.5 acres in NW4SE4 35 acres in SW4SE4 Section 20, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
	1896	0.30	10	Irrigation	Rogue River Valley Canal Co. Canal	South Fork of Little Butte Creek	10 acres in SELNEL Section 29, T. 36 S. R. 2 E. J.M.
7	1908	1.00	59.3	Irrigation	Chapman- Ceol- Daley (Rechter)	Forth Fork of Little Butte Creek	25 acres in NEAS WA 7.8 acres in NWASWA 14.5 acres in SEAS WA 12 acres in NWASEA Section 20, T. 36 S. R. 2 E.W.M.
			ct to age 21	terms of Court	decree. Se	e Paragraph	
							·
					L	ITTLE BUTTE	CREEK - SECOND MODIFIED -44.

And the State Engineer of Oregon, having carefully considered all matters submitted herein, recommends to the Court that the relative rights of the various claimants to the use of the waters of Little Butte Creek and its tributaries, be determined and settled as set forth in the foregoing modified findings and order of determination, and that all motions and exceptions to the contrary, whether specifically mentioned therein or not, be denied and dismissed.

Dated this 17th day of April, 1928, at Salem, Oregon.

State Engineer