

October 27, 2005

W. Roger Warner
Water Rights Supervisor
900 N. Skyline Drive
Ste. A
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402

RECEIVED

OCT 28 2005

Department of Water Resources
Eastern Region

Dear Roger,

75-7052 & 75-7589

This letter is to protest the Williams Lake Recreational Water and Sewer District's applications to change to municipal status. I am protesting both applications and have enclosed a check for \$50.00.

I have been in contact with Shelley Keen of your Boise office for several months. The only explanation he has given me for the impetus for the Board to seek municipal status is "... is to give the water delivery organization latitude to provide water to a greater variety of uses than may have been established." (6/25/05 email) In another email Shelley mentions "increased flexibility with regard to allocating the water from permits 75-7589 and 90."

The original water rights are quite specific regarding the responsibility of the Water District to provide water to a certain number of homes, Williams Lake Resort etc. The District was limited to those hook-ups only and the water was for in-house use only. This specificity was a determining factor in designing the new system. Our system was designed to handle those who were eligible by the end of the development period. Our pumps, storage tanks and distribution lines are not designed to handle unlimited hook-ups.

According to the Water Board News of January, 2002, "In the event that the alarm on the tanks goes off, there is a three day supply of water in the tanks." What has changed since 2002 if, when the system failed this summer, the tanks were dry in under 24 hours? In fact Williams Lake Resort and the Forest Service are not yet on line, and we ran out of water that quickly. Could it be that all the outside use of our water, as evidenced by lush lawns and landscaping, is consuming the water that rightfully belongs in the homes at the lake?

Since there is now no information flow from the District Board to the taxpayers, one can only wonder what purpose moves the Board to seek a change of status that allows them flexibility. In two of their Board meetings since May, Board members have named property owners to whom they say they "owe" water. If the Board were acting in compliance with Gary Spackman's decision, there would be no way they could "owe" water to anyone new. As a matter of fact, in the late '90s, there was a challenge by a property owner demanding water and he lost based on the Spackman decision.

Receipt
E031413

There is also the implied "guarantee" of water to those persons who paid \$20,000.00 each for sewer hookups to properties without homes, sewer or water. In fact, at the May 20, 2005 sewer sub district meeting, when the Board was asked "... How can you do a sewer and no water ... without guaranteeing water?", the answer was "Well, after we get changed to municipal they can get water." Is this not the speculation that Gary Spackman spoke against so strongly in his ruling?

I am also interested in the Board plans for the surface water under permit 75-7052. Since the old lake water system no longer exists, are we taxpayers going to be asked to build a second system and what will be its beneficial use? I also find it curious that this permit is for 66 homes when only 64 homes exist.

I feel that all of the above endangers our water system, my property values and the enjoyment of my home at Williams Lake. As a non-resident, I may not be able to serve on the Water Board or vote for the Water Board but I am definitely required to fund that Board with a hefty portion of my taxes. As such, I believe that I also have the right to know what is being planned by the Board. Their actions could well result in less water for each home – or, as happened this summer, no water for each home.

I feel that, as a taxpayer within the District, I have the right to an honest explanation of Board plans. I would like to hear how they plan to add hook-ups under the proposed new flexibility. Have they set a new limit for hook-ups and, if so, where did they get the authority to do so – or are they simply planning on adding hook-ups until our system fails? Are they planning on expanding the current water system since it wasn't designed for the new flexibility? If they plan to change the system, I would like an explanation of how they plan to do that when none of them understands how the system works. It would also seem important to find out how they plan to fund all of this. I would imagine that the current bond holders would be as interested and skittish as I am.

Please, hold a hearing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kathleen Gliksman".

Kathleen Gliksman
87 Dapplegray Lane
Rolling Hills Estates
CA 90274