

Yenter, Cindy

From: Merritt, Allen
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2012 12:57 PM
To: Luke, Tim
Cc: Skinner, Corey; Yenter, Cindy; Cooper, Jeff
Subject: Phone call from Stan Lloyd

This morning I received a phone call from Stan Lloyd (208-638-5543) who is involved in the new Irrigation District (ID) on Cassia Creek (I forget the formal name) and the Cassia Creek Water District (43-C). He was complaining about your recent letter to Mr. Darrington. He was particularly upset about being told they may not know the difference between an ID and WD. He seemed offended that you would inform them of this in a letter and not set up a meeting to go over the differences. He indicated they (I don't know exactly who from the ID) are having a meeting with the Cassia County Commissioners next Monday. He was also somehow connecting this problem with the complaint of Grush altering/building ponds on Blacksmith Creek. Somehow Stan was under the impression that IDWR has told someone there was nothing IDWR can do regarding the Grush issue and since you've undermined or put into question the ID that these guys are helpless. He was calling for a meeting before the 1/28 43-C annual meeting to get things clarified.

About halfway thru the conversation I called Corey and Cindy into my office so they could hear and participate.

I told him Mr. Lloyd that I understood your letter was responding to Mr. Darrington's letter that was responding to a request for dates and place so IDWR could send out notices to the 43-C annual meeting. I told him I thought your letter was spot on and that there likely is confusion about the authority between the ID and 43-C. I also informed him that if he were asking that IDWR attend a meeting next Monday with the county commissioners it would likely not happen since it is a holiday. He indicated he may not know for sure if there would be a meeting since it was a holiday. I asked if there was going to be a meeting that he let me know. I emphasized several times that the WD responsibilities of 43-C could not be overtaken by the ID.

Regarding the Grush issue. Corey explained that him and Jeff had visited the site and we were not finished with matter. Corey explained that at the time of the visit no water was impounded so no water right violation had occurred and that the alteration of the creek may not be jurisdictional for IDWR but our office was waiting on discussing the matter with Aaron Golart. (Since the phone call Corey discussed the matter with Aaron and I understand it is not jurisdictional and Corey will provide his field examination to the COE for their review since there may be wetland issues) Corey explained that he was in contact with Mr. Grush and the water right issue is being monitored and not yet resolved.

Mr. Lloyd was informed that staff from our office plans attend the 43-C district.

I'm not sure if you wish to call Mr. Lloyd or whether or not it would do any good. If I here of a meeting they have scheduled with the county commissioners I will let you know.

If I've totally confused you please call.

Allen