

## MEMORANDUM TO FILE

FROM: Monica Van Bussum

DATE: October 9, 2008

RE: Gary Leuzinger of Arrowhead Water District's e-mail dated 10/8/2008

FILES: 75-5, 75-19G, 75-21, 75-22, 74-14465

Gary has mentioned he is concerned about a note on page 6 of my notes from meeting re: Arrowhead Water District SRBA claims (scanned; document date 8/25/2008, received date 9/3/2008). Per Gary's request and accompanied by him, I looked at the land again on October 3, 2008. The remark is accompanied by a picture of a field and some horses and reads:

"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."

Gary is concerned that my remark means IDWR will remove this small part of the POU from Arrowhead's SRBA recommendations, and is concerned about the intent of my remark. This memo is to clarify my view of irrigation on that land and also relay some additional information about that land.

During my October 3 visit to the land, Gary pointed out an old ditch that runs along the east side of the road in front of Bob Kramer's house. The ditch is no longer used. Per Gary's e-mail and communication at that time, Bob had to quit watering this land in the early 1990s because he was flooding his crawl space. The land has not been irrigated since that time. There is some land to the south that may have been irrigated since then (the Dixie Graves land mentioned in Gary's e-mail). Some tree stumps can be seen along the ditch. Per Gary, these were cut down because the water was no longer flowing down the ditch and they died. It is possible the land was irrigated from this ditch in 1987 and the ditch was still being used, which is why it is currently included in Arrowhead's POU for its SRBA claims. However, this land is currently not being irrigated and it is not Arrowhead's intention to irrigate it, which is what my note on page 6 says. Property above the fence line in that picture is irrigated from Arrowhead's domestic rights or not at all. Again, there may be some exception for Dixie Graves' property.

Field exams done in 2008, although very helpful in determining the extent of SRBA claims, ultimately reflect what is being done in 2008 with, hopefully, a focus on what was happening in 1987 when the SRBA commenced. It is not currently my intention to remove this small acreage from Arrowhead's recommended POU because there is evidence of historic irrigation which was probably still occurring around 1987 and a system is in place that could once again allow this property to be irrigated.

**Van Bussum, Monica**

---

**From:** Van Bussum, Monica  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2008 10:51 AM  
**To:** 'gbgv16a@yahoo.com'  
**Cc:** Foster, Bob  
**Subject:** RE: note in field review  
**Attachments:** 75-5 et al Arrowhead memo re Gary Leuzinger (10-9-2008).doc

Hi Gary,

I have written and scanned a memo to the file. That should be available online by early next week, but here is a copy for you. I want to emphasize there is a difference between "could not" and "do not." During my last visit to Arrowhead's place of use with you on October 3, you showed me a ditch that Arrowhead currently does not use and has not used since the early 1990s. My statement in the field exam says you do not irrigate the field in question with the irrigation system, but with the domestic system. The place of use in question is still recommended as part of Arrowhead's water rights and is not currently at stake in the objection process. A field exam completed in 2008 naturally reflects what is happening in 2008, but most SRBA recommendations should reflect what was happening in 1987 based on the best available evidence. I hope this e-mail and the memo attached clarify things for you, but please let me know if there is anything else I can do for you.

Monica

Monica Van Bussum  
 Sr. Water Resource Agent  
 Idaho Department of Water Resources  
 322 East Front Street  
 PO Box 83720  
 Boise, ID 83720-0098

208.287.4907

---

**From:** GARY LEUZINGER [mailto:gbgv16a@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 08, 2008 9:47 PM  
**To:** Van Bussum, Monica  
**Cc:** railrider@centurytel.net  
**Subject:** note in field review

Monica, I hate to bother you again about this note but it clearly says that we do not have irrigation rights for land to the west of the fence. The note clearly states that there are not "irrigation rights" and that the land is watered by domestic water. As we observed last week the ditches clearly indicate the land was watered with irrigation water. Bob Kramer as we discussed had to quit watering land west of his house in the 90s because he was flooding his crawl space.

Dixie Graves flooded land from her sprinkler pipe as late as this summer. In 1987 this land was farmed by the lessor was recommended.

You indicated the note did not say we could not irrigate this land but when I reread it clearly does. Appreciate it if you could help us clear this up.

10/9/2008

Thanks

Gary Leuzinger

10/9/2008