

Claims: 75-5
75-7
75-17D
75-19E
75-19G
75-21
75-22
75-26A
75-10075
75-10076
75-14465

Notes from meeting re: Arrowhead Water District SRBA claims
Meeting date 08/25/2008
Agent: Monica Van Bussum

Today I met with Bob Kramer, Chairman of Arrowhead Water District, and Gary Leuzinger, a member of Arrowhead Water District. The following is a write-up of the notes I took during that meeting.

As far as Bob and Gary know, the PODs in use by Arrowhead are the only ones that have ever been used and the PODs have never been moved. Gary has only been on the property for the last two years, but has done extensive research on Arrowhead's water rights. Bob has been on the property full-time the last 9 years.

Sometime in the 1970s, the current irrigation diversion was built. It was a ditch previously and continues to be somewhat open ditch with some underground pipeline (see map titled Arrowhead Water District close-up for a diagram of conveyance to Arrowhead lands). Around 1979 or 1980, Dale Smedley bought the property. He put in 2 lines off of Chipps Creek – one for irrigation and one for domestic. From what Gary and Bob have been able to piece together, apparently Smedley's entire purpose in buying the land was to put in a subdivision.

The irrigation line was done through at 14" pipe. Bob and Gary gave me a 1979 ASCS photo that showed a number of open ditches irrigating the property. The sprinkler system was put in when the system was pressurized around 1979 or 1980.

The original subdivision was supposed to be in 3 parts – Smedley I, II and III. Smedley Subdivision III was never approved as a subdivision and constitutes the south side of the ranch. Smedley Subdivision I and II use the domestic system. For the most part, the domestic water only serves in-home use but occasionally they exercise their rights to irrigate up to ½ acre of lawn and garden. Arrowhead has a couple of wells for back-up with two 100,000-gallon storage tanks. The wells are high fluoride and Arrowhead has been trying to negotiate an exchange with the City of Salmon, whose Jesse Creek water is low in fluoride, so Arrowhead can begin using the back-up well system.

There are 9 homes and 1 hydrant on Arrowhead's domestic rights. Gary specifically pointed this out because a letter from the current watermaster states there were 10 homes and 1 service. Arrowhead filed a permit within the last year or two to add 4 more homes to their service area without increasing the flow of water under their total domestic rights.

Arrowhead has a 2" pipe from Chipps Creek to serve their domestic rights. Per Gary, other than that 2" pipe, the City of Salmon owns all of the winter water out of Chipps Creek.

Gary said he has an issue with the City of Salmon's use of their water. He said Arrowhead has been shut off and he's gone up to the City's water treatment plant and they're dumping water directly into the river. He sees that as a waste of water and would

like to see Arrowhead's water delivered if the City isn't using their full water right. Apparently the Edwards have also been involved in this because they have been refusing to turn off their diversion from Chipps Creek until the City uses all of their water without dumping into the river. Gary says the City should be required to measure their water at each diversion, not at the water treatment plan. Gary and Bob also state that, until last year, there was a 12" pipe serving the City's treatment plan, but last year a 14" pipe was installed and the City of Salmon is filling that pipe. There is a statement in an IDWR field exam that the 12" pipe will serve all of the City's water rights. Clearly, this was a point of some contention for Gary and Bob.

Arrowhead has water rights for irrigation from both Chipps and Pollard. The irrigation system services the entire POU. The Chipps Creek diversion is used to fill the reservoir. The Pollard (Canyon) Creek diversion comes in by ditch below the reservoir. At that point, the outlet from the reservoir mixes with the Pollard Creek water and it is used for irrigation. All houses use the irrigation water as much as possible. Bob Kramer, who lives at the top of the POU, can not get enough pressure under the current system, so he uses domestic system water to irrigate. However, the domestic system water is better quality because it goes through gravel filtration and is completely piped, so that is primarily uses in the houses.

Gary is also against the City of Salmon claiming water right 75-114. He says it was abandoned for 30 or 40 years and the POD was never verified. Per a 2008 watermaster report that he supplied me with, 75-114 was not listed as a City of Salmon water right and, in fact, was not listed on the report at all.

The big issue, it appeared to me, with Gary and Bob and Arrowhead in general was the question of AF limits on water rights. When Arrowhead filed on its transfers and they were granted for year-round use, AF limits were assigned to keep the water rights from being enlarged. As for the City of Salmon, the water rights that they had filed transfers on had AF limits administratively assigned. The water rights the City of Salmon claimed that did not have transfers of course did not have administrative AF limits. The preliminary recommendations for the SRBA removed some of the City of Salmon AF limits that were existing and failed to assign AF limits for the non-transferred water rights. Arrowhead, with Bob and Gary as representatives, want to see AF limits on all the water rights that have been transferred to year-round use.

Bob and Gary also want to see the City of Salmon measuring their water intake at their PODs and not at the City water treatment plan. If I can interject my own thoughts here, I told them if we assigned AF limits to the City of Salmon water rights, they would really have to measure their intake at the PODs and not at the treatment plan. Per Bob Foster of the IDWR Salmon office, the City has measurement devices installed at the Chipps and Pollard Creek PODs.

As a side note, we did not discuss 75-14465 (Arrowhead's late claim for a storage reservoir) in depth. However, it is clear to me and should be clear from my notes that the reservoir is an important part of the current irrigation system. Also, the 1979 ASCS

photo supplied by Gary during the meeting shows the reservoir site. It is difficult to tell if it was in construction at that time or simply dry.

Arrowhead Water District Field Exam 08/25/2008

Exam conducted by Monica Van Bussum of IDWR

Accompanied by Bob Kramer, Chairman of Arrowhead Water Dist, and Gary Leuzinger, Member of Arrowhead Water Dist



Photo taken at lower elevation below the low end of Arrowhead Water Dist's reservoir. Center of photo shows outlet of reservoir dumping into Arrowhead's Pollard Creek diversion ditch. Arrowhead's Pollard Creek diversion ditch (next picture) comes in from right of where this picture was taken.



Photo showing Arrowhead's Pollard Creek ditch where it enters pipe. Arrowhead's outlet from reservoir (shown previous picture) is just to the left of this picture.



Photo showing Pollard Creek ditch/reservoir water dumping into Arrowhead's piped irrigation system.



This photo was taken with my back to Arrowhead's reservoir, as well as the intersection of Arrowhead's Pollard Creek ditch with the outlet from the reservoir. The green field bisecting the left-right center of the picture is the westernmost field that is and can be irrigated with Arrowhead's irrigation right. Any property above that mark is irrigated in full from Arrowhead's domestic right. Photo taken looking east. City of Salmon can be seen just beyond the irrigated field.



These photos show where Arrowhead measures its irrigation right from Pollard Creek. The headgate is to the right of the picture. The left of the picture shows a culvert used for overflow. The overflow runs back into Pollard Creek.



Photo shows the two intakes for Arrowhead Water Dist's rights. The intake in the background is the intake for Arrowhead's domestic rights. The water goes through a small culvert into a gravel trough where it is filtered, and then travels into Arrowhead's piped domestic system. The foreground diversion is for Arrowhead's irrigation rights, which are then distributed through its reservoir system.



Photo shows Arrowhead Water Dist's gravel filtration for its domestic right. The pipe from the Chipps Creek diversion can be seen in the center background. The pipe dumps water into this gravel "trough," where it is collected in the 2-inch pipe that then goes to serve the homes.



Photo showing Arrowhead's gage for its domestic right from Chipps Creek. Per Gary Lysinger, member of Arrowhead Water Dist, the watermaster told him this usually carries between 30 and 40 gpm. There is a 2-inch pipe going into and coming out of this gage.

75-5, 75-19G, 75-21, 75-22, 75-14465

domestic
storage

line down this road NW

1979

reservoir site

gravel
pit out
9th St

map from ACS supplied by Gary ~~Hyatt~~ from Amador water Dist. 8/20/2005 mgm/19.100.000





State of Idaho

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

900 N. Skyline Dr., Suite A • Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402-1718

Phone: (208) 525-7161 • Fax: (208) 525-7177 • Web Site: www.idwr.idaho.gov

EASTERN REGION

C. L. "BUTCH" OTTER
GovernorDAVID R. TUTHILL, JR.
Director

January 30, 2008

Lemhi County Treasurer/Auditor
206 Courthouse Dr.
Salmon, ID 83467

RE: WATER DISTRICT NO. #75-A

Dear Treasurer/Auditor:

Transmitted herewith is the Watermaster's Report and claim for services along with the Proposed Budget for 2008 for the above mentioned Water Districts.

The various items in this report have been checked and have been found to be proper charges against the water users therein named. Section 42-612, 42-613 and 42-614 of the Idaho Code provides the procedure under which this claim shall be paid from the funds of the above named district.

If you have any questions, please contact us at once.

Sincerely,

Dennis M. Dunn
Senior Water Rights Agent

Enclosure

DMD:jgi

7.4

*MVB received from
Arrowhead Water
Dist. during FE
8/25/2008
re: Arrowhead objections
to City of Salmon
recommendations*

*114 0-10076
NOT CHARGE*

WATERMASTER'S REPORT

From April 15, 2007 To Oct 15, 2007

COPY

Water District No. 75-A
Name of Watermaster Harry Shannfelt
P.O. Address 1310 Taft St. Salmon Id 83467

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2007

AFFIDAVIT OF WATERMASTER

STATE OF IDAHO)
COUNTY OF Lemhi) ss.

Department of Water Resources
Eastern Region

Harry Shannfelt, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Watermaster of Water District 75-A, having been lawfully appointed by David R. Tutthill, Director, Idaho Department of Water Resources, and that the volumes of water, as stated in this report and prorated by him to the water right holders of the district are correct.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 1st day of November, 19 2007

(Deputy) Watermaster District No. 75-A

Mary Benton
Notary Public

(SEAL)



My Commission expires 4/19/11

I HEREBY CERTIFY, that Harry Shannfelt was lawfully appointed by me as Water Master of Water District No. 75-A, and that the information contained in this report, as herein sworn to, is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, correct.

Salmon
Boise, Idaho, 18 January, 19 2008

David R. Tutthill, Jr.
Director, Department of Water Resources

By Dennis M. Lewis

Total Delivery in 24 Hour Sec Feet	Total Cost		Adopted Budget		Credits		Debits		Cost Per 24-Hr Sec. Ft. \$
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	
1617.48	566	79	532	36			34	43	350.4
459.04	160	87	157	19			3	68	
922.40	323	23	265	53			57	70	Total No. Days of Watermaster
37.20	13	05	14	87	1	82			
131.50	46	40	53	79	7	69			days at \$ per day \$
841.70	294	95	204	79			90	16	Total No. Days of Asst. Watermaster
23.60	8	29	9	35	1	06			days at \$ per day \$
109.20	38	28	41	90	3	62			Other expenses charged pro rata \$
129.60	45	43	39	62			5	81	TOTAL COST 1500.00
8.56	3	01	3	81		80			Total No. 24 Hour Sec. Feet Delivered 4,280.28
.00		00	176	79	176	79	1		Cost per 24-Hour Sec. Feet Delivered \$.3504
4,280.28	1500	00	1500	00	191	78	191	78	
									Water Master - 500.00
									Water Master Expenses 250.00
									Sec & Treas 200.00
									FICA 55.00
									Miscell. Expenses 200.00
									1205.00
City	350	00	350	00					
70%									
Arriahand	150	00	150	00					
30%									
	2000	00	2000	00					Winter Water Master 150.00
									Sec & Treas 100.00
									FICA 20.00
									Miscell. Exp. 50.00
									320.00
									Total Salaries 1525.00
									Contingency 475.00
									2000.00

COPY

COPY

ARROW Head Meter

4-15-07 Beginning Meter Read - 48743200
10-15-07 Ending Meter Read - 55853700
7,110,500

gals used - 7,110,500 in 187 days

$$187 \overline{) 7,110,500} \quad 38,024 \text{ gal/day}$$

$$1440 \text{ min/day} \overline{) 38,024} \quad 26 \text{ gpm}$$

1 gal = 0.00223 CFS

$$26 \text{ gpm} \times 0.00223 = \boxed{0.058 \text{ CFS}}$$

$$0.058 \times 187 = 10.846 \text{ } \frac{24 \text{ HR}}{\text{Sec Ft.}}$$

Arrowhead's
note: This
is WM's
calculation of
what they
used, well
below 0.3 cfs.
MVB 8/25/08

Watermaster's Proposed Budget

FOR 2008

COPY

Water District No. 75 A

Stream Jesse Creek

Name of Watermaster Harry Shanafelt

Post Office Address 1310 Taft St.

Name of Secretary Amy Fielko

Post Office Address _____

SECTION 42-615, IDAHO CODE

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR SUCCEEDING YEAR. Each watermaster shall, at least thirty (30) days prior to the annual meeting of the water users of the water district, also prepare and file with the department of water resources a proposed budget for the succeeding year, together with a distribution of the amount of said budget to the respective water users, using the actual deliveries for the past irrigation season or seasons, as the basis for said distribution as hereinabove provided, which said proposed budget and distribution shall be submitted to the water users for consideration and approval at the next annual meeting.

In conformity with the above statute, I hereby submit a Proposed Budget for the season of 2008

Harry J. Shanafelt
Watermaster

(This report must be made in duplicate, one copy to be forwarded to the appropriate regional office of the Idaho Department of Water Resources, and one copy to the Secretary of the last Annual Water User's Meeting of your District.)

WATER RIGHT OWNER

IDWR
WATER RIGHT
IDENT No.

DIVERSION NAME / REMARK

COPY

City of Salmon

75-00018

"

75-00016

"

75-00017A

"

75-00017B

"

75-00019B

"

75-00019C

"

75-00007

"

75-00026A

City of Salmon

75-07563

Blackader

75-00019A

"

75-00113

Arrow Head

75-00019D

"

75-00021

"

75-00023

"

Arrow Head

75-00005

Cliff Cummings

75-10778

"

75-10779

"

75-10780

"

Cliff Cummings

75-10777

Gaven

75-00024

Gaven

75-00020

Peters Haddock

75-00001

"

75-00013

"

Edwards

75-00002

"

75-00010

"

75-00012

"

75-00011

Edwards

75-02162

Skunberg

75-00026B

Austin

75-00003

Prosch

75-00014

Arrowhead's note:

75-114 not listed as
City of Salmon water
right.

Edgar Edwards

75-10097 11-12/61

Dir to stop 10.4C.

Chis & Galey

1938 River

[illegible]

	DAYS	SALARY	TOTAL	DAYS	SALARY	TOTAL	EXPENSES	TOTAL
2003		500.00			450.00		1150.00	2000.00
2004		500.00			450.00		1150.00	2000.00
2005		500.00			450.00		1150.00	2000.00
2006		500.00			450.00		1150.00	2000.00
2007		500.00			450.00		1150.00	2000.00
AVERAGE								
WATERMASTER'S PROPOSED BUDGET								
NEXT YEAR	500.00				450.00		1150.00	2000.00

Complete this proposed budget report form as follows:

- 1) Enter water right holder name, corresponding IDWR water right number or numbers, and corresponding diversion name and/or remarks on page 3.
- 2) If you wish to estimate next season's assessments based on the average delivery of past seasons, then enter the actual water deliveries to each user for the past one to five seasons on page 3. You have the option of using at least the past two seasons or up to five seasons for averaging. You also have the option of using 1 year's delivery or one year's delivery as a basis of determining assessments for the next season. Enter deliveries as total 24-hour second feet. Total 24-hour second feet is a flow rate expressed in terms of one day or 24 hours. For example, a continuous diversion of 2 cfs over 20 days would equal 40 24-hour second feet.
- 3) If using the averaging method, enter the average delivery for past seasons in column 6 of page 3. If you are not averaging, then enter each user's delivery from 1 year in column 5 and skip column 6.
- 4) In the work space provided at the top of this page, enter next years proposed watermaster salary, secretary and/or staff salaries, and expenses. You may use the past season costs and expenses, or average past seasons' costs and expenses as an aid in determining next years budget. A more detailed listing or itemization of expenses and salaries can be attached to this form.
- 5) Divide the total proposed budget amount for next year by the total past season delivery (total of column 5, page 3) or average past seasons delivery (total of column 6, page 3) to obtain a unit cost factor.
- 6) Under column 7, page 3, multiply the unit cost factor by each user's past season or average past seasons deliveries to obtain the estimated billing for the next year.
- 7) Use column 8, page 3, to enter the adjusted billing amount if the district wishes to carry over debits and credits from the previous season. (Refer to the past watermaster report. If a user had a credit, subtract that credit from his or her estimated billing in column 7 of this report, and enter the difference or adjusted amount in column 8. If a user had a debit, then add that debit to his or her billing amount shown in column 7 and show as adjusted billing in column 8.)
- 8) Sign the report and submit the original to the appropriate regional office of the Department of Water Resources. Retain one copy for the Water District.

COPY

given to M. van Duzum or IDWR by
Gary Lysinger of Arrowhead Water
Dist. during field exam 8/25/2008

75-10076 (was 75-00004 and 75-00114)

75-00114 provides an excellent example of how the City of Salmon enhanced their water rights at the expense of other Jessie Creek water users. The claim filed under 75-10076 states "*this right was purchased by the city and converted to municipal use. No record of the transaction is available. Past Watermasters have recognized this transfer in nature of use.*". This water right was not purchased. It was an abandoned water right that the City was allowed to use by the Water Master without the knowledge of Arrowhead and other water users. 75-10076 or 75-00114 did not appear on the list when the Basin 75A Watermaster was asked for a list of all water rights in Jessie Creek during the irrigation season of 2006. Use of these rights do not appear on any annual 75A Watermaster Report we examined. This water right appears to have been abandoned for at least 20-30 years before the city started using it. The City in effect submitted a claim for a right that was abandoned and a right they did not own. IDWR allowed the original .5cfs without any justification from the City even though this exceeded the state limits/allowed per irrigated acre based on tax records. In addition according to the IDWR back files there was never proof that the land was irrigated from Jessie Creek. Arrowheads 75-19D right was partly reduced because of very similar circumstances.

The 75A Watermaster included a statement in the application for transfer form stating "*I don't see where a 0.50 cfs 1894 priority will hurt any of the 1894 priorities.*" Adding another right in an over appropriated drainage obviously damages other 1894 rights. Priorities lower than 1894 were not considered at all and will result in their receiving less or no water at all. Arrowhead rights were damaged by the approval of this right but the right being extended to 12 months and then removing the 70AFY limitation originally imposed by IDWR when the right was authorized as a municipal right seriously dilutes the ~~very limited~~ AFY limitations imposed on other rights. These actions by IDWR are clearly unfair and further reinforce our belief that there has been an aggressive program of expansion of City Rights aided and possibly guided at times by individuals in IDWR. Again, when Arrowhead changed water right use and season of use they have had severe AFY limitations applied. IDWR provides no basis for removing the 70 AFY that was applied during the "accomplished transfer" that Arrowhead and Edwards have objected to. Is the SRBA Process removing AFY limitations on all 12 month rights except Arrowhead Rights. It should also be noted here that the same AFY limitation applied to a 12 month right would restrict the diversion rate more than it would an irrigation season right. This right if allowed should be limited to the irrigation season or afy limitations should be applied to all City rights with similar expansions.

IDWR granted an accomplished transfer" on this right from an irrigation 6 month right to a 12 month right even though other affected water users did not know this right had been abandoned and this would have clearly have been an enlargement of the original right and this right seems to have been used w/o the consent or knowledge of other water users. The advertisement for the accomplished claim did not divulge the information that this was an abandoned right. We can find ^{no} public process where other water users were notified or had reasonable opportunity to know how this right was being acquired by the City. We can find no information where Watermasters notified other users that they were

providing water from an abandoned right to the City. To the best of our knowledge any information divulging this fact was available only to the City, IDWR and the Watermasters which normally worked for the City.

or was chosen by

An August 31 1992 written by Eric Verner states "Carter looked at Water District 75 records and found that the Water Master Records delivering this right to the City in the year 1979. This record was not made part of the backfile for this right and apparently is not available to the public. We have found that many District 75A records after this date contain no record of use of this right. The current information in the IDWR records falsely state that the right was "purchased" (see SRBA Claim for 75-10076). The 75-10076 Claim Verification Field Exam Sheet signed off 4-19-06 falsely states that "a 14" 1.5 mile pipe line carries Chipps and Pollard Creek Water to Jessie Creek." This line was not installed at the time of this verification. The misleading, missing and inaccurate information in this water right and other City rights makes it hard to understand and verify the validity of City Rights.

*- city maps
use --
- Full xi
pollard
- Added by
WMS*

*2007 annual report does not
list 75-10076 or 114*

given to M. Van Bussum of IDWR
by Gary Lysinger of Arrowhead
Water Dist. during field exam
8/25/2008.

March 12, 2008

Department of Water Resources

Arrowhead's note:
This is incorrect.
There were 9 homes + 1 service.

Enclosed is the 1996 Department of Water Resources Agreement with Arrowhead Water District allowing 10 homes on Arrowhead's water system. Currently, to my knowledge, Arrowhead water already has 10 homes plus one service, making 11 service hook-ups. N^o

The City of Salmon has priority year around water rights from Chips and Pollard Creek. In past years, there have been times of the year when the City has not been able to receive their full water right. Being a good neighbor, the City has chosen to run their Salmon River pumps to keep up with the City's water demand, rather than to take all of their entitled water rights.

With more and more annexations coming into the City, there is no guarantee that the City won't use all their current water rights entitled to them.

The 0.02CFS of water Arrowhead is requesting equates to 9 gpm of water. I believe in the future 4 additional homes on Arrowhead's Water District could become a real hindrance on Arrowhead's existing 10 homes they are allowed on their system.

Nary J. Shanafelt
Paul Stokes

Water District 75A
Water Master, Harry J. Shanafelt
Assistant Water Master, Paul Stokes

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2008

Department of Water Resources
Eastern Region

given to M. van Dusen by
author of this spreadsheet, Gary Lysinger of
Arrowhead Water Dist., during field exam
8/25/2008

ARROWHEAD DOMESTIC WATER USAGE

0.1cfs=44.8gpm

	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July
g/m 21	44.8	0	0	20	15	15	15	15	30	40	44.8	44.8
g/m 19D	10	50	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
tot gpm	54.8	50	20	20	15	15	15	15	30	40	44.8	54.8
g/h 21	2688	0	0	1200	900	900	900	900	1800	2400	2688	2688
g/d 21	64512	0	0	28800	21600	21600	21600	21600	43200	57600	64512	64512
g/mo 21	1935360	0	0	864000	648000	648000	648000	648000	1296000	1728000	1935360	1935360
cum gal 21	1935360	1935360	1935360	2799360	3447360	4095360	4743360	5391360	6687360	8415360	10350720	12286080
AF 21	6	6	6	9	11	13	15	17	21	26	32	38
% 42.17 af	14.1%	14.1%	14.1%	20.4%	25.1%	29.8%	34.5%	39.2%	48.7%	61.2%	75.3%	89.4%
g/h 19D	600	3000	1200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
g/d 19D	14400	72000	28800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14400
g/mo 19D	432000	2160000	864000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432000
cum gal 19D	432000	2592000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3456000	3888000
AF 19D	1.33	7.95	10.61	10.61	10.61	10.61	10.61	10.61	10.61	10.61	10.61	11.93
%12 af	11.05%	66.29%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	88.38%	99.43%

Assumptions

- 75-00021 is usable in all months in a normal water year except September and October

Notes

- 75-00021 should always be used when available before using 75-00019D
- 75-00021 water not programmed above would be used in September and October if possible
- The above tot gpm is a "planned maximum Arrowhead use" and is the volume at which the Water Resource valve below the Arrowhead meter should be set.
Any changes to these settings by would be made only if water is not available under the water right (arrowhead would be notified) or by Arrowhead at their valve if water is not being used for a period of time
- Use of any unused water above the maximums above would be negotiated with the Water Resources Water Master and would be provided only if available.

given to M. Van Bussum of IDWR by
Gary Lysinger of Arrowhead Water
Dist, author of document, during
field exam 8/25/2008.

July 15 IDWR Field Review w/Moica P. Van Bussum

1. Monia Issues

- A. Chipps Diversion Point - 14" pipe
B. Where Arrowhead uses water rights claim is approved?

2. Reservoirs

- A. Dixie Pond - on hold for Monica Review waste water - 75-14481
B. Arrowhead Reservoir-Late Claim Filing rejected by IDWR 75-14465 Div'd to State
In State

3. Edwards Objections against Arrowhead (2)

A. 75-22 Diversion points-should not divert all water in Chipps Creek (WM shuts off
75-22 at same time as all 75-05 priorities)

C. 75-05 Should not have Chipps Diversion and do not irrigate hardened acres.

4. Arrowhead Objections against City Issues

A. Enlargements-Changes in "Period of Use" and "Nature of Use"

-Irrigation to Municipal and Change from Irrigation Season to 12 Mo w/no afy
limits

-Two types 1. Original irrigation w/no sou and 2. Afy limits applied by IDWR and
then removed by SRBA Recommendations

-Serious damage to Arrowhead Domestic rights and Arrowhead and other Jessie
Creek irrigation water users - unnecessary - 2 in - City owns Creek

B. Diversion Point Issues

-Allow diversion w/o measurement at POD - pod changed w/ measurement request
-Rights transferred to Chipps/Pollard and then determined to be either/or for all
rights w/ Chipps/Pollard Diversion

-Allows the City to run water around Arrowhead Pollard Creek Diversion and
waste to river or to provide water to lower priorities(including City)

No resolution makes settlement w/ Edwards Harder

C. Other Issues

-IDWR non public processes i.e. enlargements w/o any notification of affected users(remove afy limitations, extend season of use ect.

-inaccurate, incomplete and misleading information on City water right information. ie "no records exist for this transaction", pipe from Pollard Creek to Jessie Creek 14 in dia when it was 12 in, etc . . No record ex 19th for this transaction

-Arrowhead and other water rights owners not treated same as City, ie afy limitations, IDWR rejecting late claim for reservoir calling it an enlargement when repeatedly granting enlargements to the City, Providing City guidance and support on enhancing their rights w/o same level of support for other users, Allowing Watermaster to work for the City and not provide an impartial service.