

Retelle, Erin

From: Olenichak, Tony
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2005 10:49 AM
To: Retelle, Erin
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7304

Erin,
I signed copy is in the mail to you this morning.

Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: Retelle, Erin
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2005 9:12 AM
To: Olenichak, Tony
Subject: RE: Permit 22-7304

Dear Tony,

Thanks so much for your help on this! I was wondering if you could please send a signed hard copy of this correspondence to me at the state office (we need to have signed documents for the files)? I'll get started on the Order to remove that requirement from the permit.

Thanks again,
Erin

Erin Retelle
Water Resource Agent

322 E. Front St.
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098

(208) 287-4949

-----Original Message-----

From: Olenichak, Tony
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2005 3:50 PM
To: Retelle, Erin
Cc: 'rsmith@tetontel.com'
Subject: Permit 22-7304

Erin,

You sent a letter to Galloway Hills Assn. Inc., dated September 21, 2004, concerning the requirement to have a measuring device installed at the point where water is returned to the creek from the pond diversion described in Permit 22-7304. The options described in your correspondence to Galloway Hills Assn. was to either install the measuring device or to request removal of the requirement from their permit.

Richard Smith, representing Galloway Hills Assn., visited with me at the Idaho Falls Regional Office on June 16, 2005 to inquire as to what type of measuring device would be required, if any, by Water District #1. I told him that I would field inspect the diversion described in the permit, and either inform him of the type of device that would be necessary to install, or I would send a letter to the IDWR (and a copy to him) notifying the Department that a measuring device wasn't necessary and wouldn't interfere with the delivery of surface water by the Watermaster.

I inspected the diversion described in Permit 22-7304 on July 28, 2005. There's a relatively short distance between the diversion on North Leigh Creek and the return from the pond to the creek. Without any other diversions between the two points, it's obvious there wouldn't be any interference to the delivery of surface water

to any other North Leigh Creek diversions. A measuring device on the outflow structure wouldn't serve any purpose since there isn't anywhere else for the water to go after it has been diverted from the creek to the pond. Once the pond is full, all the water diverted into the pond flows back to North Leigh Creek. Therefore, the requirement of an outflow measuring device on Permit 22-7304 isn't needed and could be removed.

Tony Olenichak
Deputy Watermaster
Water District #1