

08/17/2006

NOTICE OF ERROR
REPLY

Please type or print clearly, fill out this form completely and mail.

Return this reply form to IDWR by the deadline date printed below if you want IDWR to change your recommendation or you want to let IDWR know that you agree with its recommendation.

YOUR DEADLINE FOR RETURNING A NOTICE OF ERROR REPLY IS: September 29, 2006

Water right number: 63-199B

NAMPA & MERIDIAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT
C/O RINGERT CLARK CHTD
ATTN DAN STEENSON
PO BOX 2773
BOISE ID 83701-2773
Telephone Number: (208)342-4591

1. Describe the portion of the proposed recommendation with which you disagree (e.g. priority date, period of use, source):

See Notice of Error Reply for 63-19847 (enclosed) and attached letter.

2. Describe the changes you wish to make in the proposed recommendation:

''

3. Give a brief explanation as to why you disagree with these portions:

''

____ I AGREE with this proposed recommendation: no changes need to be made.

DATE: 9/29/06 SIGNATURE: *Daniel Steenson*
Please print your name: Daniel Steenson

IDWR Regional Office, 322 E Front St
PO Box 83720, Boise, ID 83720-0098, 2082874800

September 28, 2006

BY HAND DELIVERY

Donald Shaff
Idaho Department of Water Resources
322 East Front Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098

Re: Preliminary Recommendations for Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District's
(NMID) Water Rights

Dear Don:

As we discussed by phone today, enclosed is a letter from Daren Coon, NMID's Secretary/Treasurer, identifying a parcel of land that should be included in the place of use for NMID's water rights.

As we also discussed today, the statement under the quantity element of NMID's water rights related to the Green Ranch diversion should state the amount of water to be used from that diversion as 4.5 afa per acre, rather than 3.5 afa per acre.

Water right 63-30181 has the shorter statement regarding the authorized rate of flow for the Surprise Valley diversion, but does not have the language relating to the amount of water to be used from the Surprise Valley diversion that is in 63-198AJ, 63-199B and 63-200B.

If possible, it would be helpful for future reference if the remarks could be in the same order in each of the water rights.

Today you confirmed that the explanatory material is included in the recommendations for internal IDWR record-keeping purposes only, so that, for ease of reference in IDWR's files, transfer conditions are associated with SRBA decrees. The court will not consider the explanatory material, and it will not be included in NMID's decrees. There is, therefore, no opportunity or need for NMID to object to any of the statements in the explanatory material. Any inaccuracies in those statements can be corrected later at an appropriate time.

Donald Shaff
September 28, 2007
page 2

I have, nonetheless, reviewed the statements in the explanatory material sections of each of the recommendations for NMID's water rights. The following statement in the recommendations for water rights 63-199B and 63-200B concerns me: "The place of use for industrial and groundwater recharge purposes under right nos. 63-199B and 63-200B is limited to the lands served by the Surprise Valley diversion." I recognize that the statement is one of the conditions in the water right as a result of the transfer to add the Surprise Valley diversion and lands served by it. I think the statement is correct as to groundwater recharge, but I think it is not entirely accurate with respect to industrial use in light of I.C. § 43-335, which allows an irrigation district to lease water rights for use on industrial lands within its boundaries under certain circumstances:

LEASING OF WATER RIGHTS BY IRRIGATION DISTRICT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BY DISTRICT'S WHERE LANDOWNER CAN RECEIVE WATER THROUGH THE DISTRICT'S IRRIGATION SYSTEM. Any irrigation district which has within its boundaries residential, commercial or industrial lands, or any combination of those lands, and which holds water rights for those lands, shall have the right to lease, to any municipality, municipal provider, public utility, domestic water users organization which furnishes water service to those lands, or to any other entity for the distribution of water to those lands for uses other than culinary purposes, those water rights which are held for any residential, commercial or industrial lands for which the owner has elected not to receive his proportionate share of the irrigation district's water through the irrigation system of the district; provided, however, that no water right under which water is delivered through a community ditch shall be leased without the written consent of the ditch users who do not elect not to receive water from the district. For purposes of this chapter, the terms "municipality" and "municipal provider" shall be defined as provided in section 42-202B, Idaho Code; "culinary purposes" shall mean the use of water for direct human consumption, cooking, sanitary purposes, and other such uses. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as amending or affecting the laws of Idaho pertaining to the control and regulation of public utilities, municipal providers or water corporations.

Since the statements in the explanatory material are not at issue in the SRBA process, this is really an academic issue at this point. The situation contemplated by the statute is, I believe, the only one in which the referenced statement in the explanatory material and the water right is not entirely accurate.

As we discussed over the phone, we are verifying the 40 acre limitation in water right 63-198AJ. Subject to double-checking, it appears that NMID does not have any other concerns with the preliminary recommendations.

Donald Shaff
September 28, 2007
page 3

I will talk to you tomorrow after you have had an opportunity to review this letter and enclosure.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Daniel Steenson". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Daniel V. Steenson

Enclosure

cc: Daren Coon
John Anderson