

Merritt, Allen

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2008 10:31 AM
To: Merritt, Allen
Cc: Homan, John
Subject: FW: From " 208 788 0214"(Fax Message NO.8514)

Attachments: 20080210112301872.tif



2008021011230187
2.tif (362 KB)...

Allen,

Didn't know if you already got this. I spoke with Kevin this morning and he said it is not the intent of the districts to spend the \$90,000 on the same 12 items that he sent to us already, and that the contractor would not work on investigation of those items. However, the attached letter makes it appear that way. He still intends to send us a letter providing clarification about the independent contract which will probably be the items or descriptions on the last page of the attached document. Kevin did say they were intending to send assessments out by the end of this week or first of next week. I advised that we should have the opportunity to see his letter and respond before he sends assessments. He also advised that the district also intends to do some sort of RFP. He was home sick today so I limited my conversation with him.

We probably should discuss any concerns and if/how to respond to Purdy's second letter. If the contractor does not work directly on the 12 items that Kevin forwarded to us, then Purdy's issue of the contract not being relevant to WD37-M is probably mute.

Tim

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

From: Mitchell, Camille On Behalf Of IDWR Fax
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2008 8:23 AM
To: Luke, Tim; Gibson, Deborah
Subject: FW: From " 208 788 0214"(Fax Message NO.8514)

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

From: idwrfax@idwr.idaho.gov [mailto:dwrfax@idwr.idaho.gov]
Sent: Sunday, February 10, 2008 9:23 AM
To: IDWR Fax
Subject: From " 208 788 0214"(Fax Message NO.8514)

This E-mail was sent from "State_507_BW" (Aficio 2045e).

Queries to: webmaster@idwr.idaho.gov

PICABO LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

Box 688

PICABO, IDAHO 83348

Tel 208-788-3530

fax 208-788-0214

npurdy@earthlink.net

February 9, 2008

Mr. Tim Luke
Water District Specialist
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0098
Ph: 208-287-4800

Re: Criteria of Resolution #14 as adopted and approved by Board 37 & 37M

Dear Mr. Luke:

Enclosed is a copy of the District 37 & 37M recently adopted CRITERIA AND EXPLANATIONS FOR RESOLUTION #14 to meet your recommendations that the Water Advisory Board provide specific details for the expenditure of the water user's assessment for \$90,000. As a substantial water user in District 37M I have several objections to this action:

1. The list of the twelve action items attached have nothing to do with District 37M nor do I see any benefits to District 37M. I think the cost should be borne by District 37 since they instituted the resolution and will be the benefactor of it. Individual payment by Districts has been the policy over the years if they solely benefit.
2. The twelve issues listed and the other issues listed on page 5 of the criteria such as *"abuse of domestic well exemption, shallow surface wells with no licenses and improved policing of water right transfers"* have little to do with the delivery of water and fall under the IDWR's authority and I feel the water user cannot be legally assessed for their investigation.
3. Many of the issues raised are currently being adjudicated by the SRBA and action by the Districts under Resolution #14 will be duplication.
4. Many of the issues being raised are problems that the IDWR has responsibility to answer or investigate and fall outside of the authority of the Districts 37 & 37M.
5. I object to a private contractor who will answer to the Advisory Board and not be under the direction of the District's Watermaster or the IDWR.

I feel since the issues raised by Resolution #14 are so vague and contentious, the Department should intervene and assign an officer to the District and direct the officer to institute Resolution #14 in accordance with existing IDWR policies and licenses and use the resources of the Department to implement the Resolution. I am afraid if the Department does not intervene there will be long range negative consequences to the Department and the Districts 37 & 37M.

Thank you for your consideration to date and your interest in this matter and please advise me of your opinion of the new Criteria and Explanations of Resolution #14 and my comments.

Sincerely,


Nick Purdy

**CRITERIA AND EXPLANATIONS
FOR RESOLUTION #14
AS ADOPTED AT THE 2008 ANNUAL MEETING
FOR WATER DISTRICTS 37 & 37M**

Up until the 2006 water season, Water District 37 did not concern itself with diversions not directly tied to the Big Wood River and its tributaries. The district took a "look the other way" approach to any other diversions. Beginning in 2005, concern developed about improving enforcement of water rights within the district. With that concern as a motivation, Water District 37 hired a full time employee to investigate potential water use abuses in the district. From those investigations as well as additional concerns brought forth from the finalization of the Snake River Basin Adjudication (SRBA), water districts 37 & 37 M realized that some of their water delivery as well as ownership records might be incomplete. In order to update district records, districts 37 & 37 M adopted Resolution #14. Resolution #14 as accepted at the January 14, 2008 annual meeting authorizes the collection and expenditure of \$90,000.00 to update district records for the proper administration and enforcement of water rights in Basin 37. Water Districts 37 & 37M will allocate the additional \$90,000.00 as authorized in Resolution #14 to update records as well as address issues listed below:

1.) Lane Ranch

- The back file explaining how to administer this diversion contains 333 pages. There are two surface water rights out of two different streams (Big Wood River and Elkhorn Creek). There are also ground water rights but how many is not exactly known. The uses listed on the IDWR public website include: asthetic, irrigation, recreation, and wildlife. There are also issues of water storage in multiple ponds. The district needs help sifting though all of this data to determine how to administer these rights.

2.) Golden Eagle Subdivision.

- There are 8 different water rights tied to this property that the district is aware of. On one right specifically (37-154C), the district's records show a diversion rate of 2.85 cfs. The state's records show an additional 6 cfs is allowed for asthetic use on this right. Why the discrepancy exists is unknown at this time. The groundwater rights although tied to surface asthetic (non-consumptive) rights are not regulated at this time. Recent transfers from Homeowner's Associations to individual ownership further complicate this diversion. The district needs help administering all of these rights.

3.) Comstock Ditch

- There are multiple non-consumptive permits along with irrigation rights in this ditch. The Big Wood River feeds the upper part of this system. The middle section of the original system has been abandoned, but the lower end of this system is fed by spring water. One diversion from the lower section of this ditch owns a piece of the "Rockwell Bypass Saved Water" that is tied to the Big Wood River, but the Big Wood River water does not make it to this particular diversion. Also, the lower end of this system feeds the upper part of the Golden Eagle Subdivision referred to in #2. The Comstock ditch water that is delivered to the Golden Eagle Subdivision is not regulated. How to administer this extra water to Golden Eagle is not understood at this time. The District needs help understanding how to administer this system.

4.) Purdum Slough

- Harry Rinker Company owns water rights in this system that can also be delivered to the Hiawatha Canal. The district has never been contacted by the Rinker Company to say when and/or where the water is to be delivered. The district is concerned that double delivery could take place, but we are unsure of what water still exists in this system, because multiple transfers to multiple locations took place. In times past this system used to return to the river, but because of development and/or poor maintenance that is no longer the case. Consequently, the district is not sure whether to administer this system as a natural stream or a canal. The District needs help understanding how to administer this system.

5.) Fuld Estate (Old KOA Campground)

- No Surface water rights exist at this location, but irrigation in excess of 10 acres has taken place in the past. This location is also served by the Ketchum City Municipal place of use. The district is not sure what water rights are used at this location and/or how to administer them.

6.) Demi Moore/Bruce Willis/Aspen Lakes Canal Co./Aspen Lakes Homeowners/Perry Thomas

- There are multiple owners of multiple water rights with multiple uses delivered from one pump. How to enforce consumptive vs. non-consumptive rights to respective owners is problematic at best. The Willis property also owns non-consumptive rights out of spring-fed sources that are tied to irrigation rights of other individuals who claimed their source as the Big Wood River. How to establish priority of delivery on this system is an ongoing struggle. The District will need to devote more resources to solve the problems of this system.

7.) East Fork of the Big Wood River

- Some of the issues on the East Fork are slowly being solved, but there is still a lot of work to do. In the past, water rights on this tributary were administered as a separate stream from the Big Wood River. The district has never found documentation to explain why this happened. Water right owners on this system became accustomed to never having their water shut off, so it is taking considerable time to educate owners of how the system will be administered in the future. There may be "futile call" issues raised on this tributary if surface water does not make it to the Big Wood River, but those issues will also have to be governed by conjunctive management policy if it is enforced in this basin. Multiple water rights with multiple uses are also an issue on most of the diversions out of the East Fork. Also, some ponds exist with no rights attached to them, but they may be exempt under the 24-hour storage rule. As said earlier, much research still has to be done on the East Fork.

8.) Hiawatha Canal

- The Hiawatha Canal raises multiple concerns. First and foremost, the district is unsure whether it is delivering the proper totals to the river headgate. Because of multiple transfers, splits, sales, name changes, and mitigation losses, the Watermaster is not sure if the decree book reflects the proper delivery totals to the Hiawatha Canal. There are also ponds attached to the Hiawatha Canal that are not supported by a water right. There are also issues of how to administer the Indian Creek water that enters the Hiawatha Canal. All of these issues raise concerns about whether the Watermaster is/can be given authority to administer and enforce water rights on the Hiawatha Canal. Regardless, the Water District will use considerable resources in solving these issues.

9.) Cove Canal

- Delivery totals to the Cove Canal are also a question that needs to be answered. There are some spring sources claimed in the Cove Canal area that are not listed in the district decree book and consequently are not administered. The district needs help clarifying these rights.

10.) Partial Decrees for Areas 1 and 2

- When Partial Decrees for Areas 1 and 2 were issued, the district received the information on 2 discs. The discs contain information on groundwater as well as surface water and disallowed water rights as well as recommended water rights. The problem is that the information on the discs is not in a format that the district can use to adapt the old decree books. Many hours of paper work lay ahead to rewrite the decree books for areas 1 and 2, but the IDWR has offered little if any help in organizing the information. It is imperative that the decrees books for areas 1 and 2 be somewhat finished before the partial decrees for area 3 are issued, but the manpower requirements to finish such a task are beyond the resources of Water Districts 37 & 37M.

11.) Ground Water Sources with Surface Water priorities

- In the past, these sources were issued curtailment notice by mail, but no personal contact was made between the District and the water right owner. The District is concerned that many of the notices were disregarded and diversion of ground water continued without interruption. The Watermaster is personally developing a daily enforcement route to administer these rights. With this added enforcement, the Watermaster will be less available to address other issues listed above and the district will be forced to seek additional resources to make up for the added time requirements.

12.) Rinker 11 & 11A Canals and Gimlet #9 Canal

- Changes in the river channel have caused all of these systems to undergo major changes in headgate construction. Return flow measuring devices are being installed this year in conjunction with take out measuring devices at the newly installed headgates. Water right owners in these systems have also become accustomed to never having their water shut off because their rights are largely non-consumptive with small irrigation rights attached. Extremely dry years like 2007 prove that these systems do consume water when the water table drops low enough to prevent gaining reaches within the systems. Considerable time and resources will be dedicated to these systems in educating the water right owners of how the system will be managed in the future. The district will likely use support from the Idaho Department of Water Resources in this education process.

2

As the above issues are addressed and hopefully solved, other issues such as abuse of the domestic well exemption, shallow surface wells with no licenses and improved policing of water right transfers will need to be addressed.

In addressing all of the issues listed above, it becomes apparent that Water Districts 37 & 37 M may need to consider hiring additional personnel.

Duties that additional personnel would be responsible for could include the following:

- Update district files with corrected recommendations from the IDWR and SRBA
- Assist the districts in developing their GIS capabilities
- Assist the districts in rewriting district decree books using IDWR direction
- Assist the districts in identifying additional diversions that may require improved enforcement
- Assist the districts in compiling a contact list for all diversions
- Assist the districts in developing formal requests of the IDWR for enforcement direction on questionable water rights

Activities not allowed for district personnel would include the following:

- Interpreting decrees and recommending enforcement guidelines to the Watermaster
- Being party to any objection in the SRBA while representing Water Districts 37 & 37M

When considering hiring additional personnel, the districts have considered hiring an independent consultant versus hiring additional district employees. Hiring an independent consultant instead of a full time employee would offer at least three advantages:

- 1.) The districts would avoid paying employer income tax, health insurance benefits, and retirement benefits.
- 2.) The districts would not be obligated to employ the individuals(s) after research is complete.
- 3.) Finding an employee in the Blaine County area with knowledge of the local watershed as well as the professional, technical and communication skills required to fill this position while also willing to work for a typical water district salary would be extremely difficult.

Concerns have been voiced as to the vague language of Resolution #14 as written and adopted at the 2008 annual meeting. It is the hope of Water Districts 37 & 37M that this document helps remove some of those concerns.