

Graves, Lori

From: Neely, Ken
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2006 8:16 AM
To: Luke, Tim
Cc: Graves, Lori
Subject: RE: WD63-S 2005 Report

Tim,
I will work on the tables. As for the breakdown of the total cost, I am guessing that we need Debbie's help with that, correct?
ken

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

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 11:12 AM
To: Neely, Ken
Cc: Graves, Lori
Subject: WD63-S 2005 Report

Ken,

Just a reminder, I assume you will make some corrections to the 2005 report you handed out at the annual meeting, specifically for the incorrect dates referenced in the tables on page 8 of the report? That should be done so we get a correct copy for the file. Also, I suggest that Table 3 on page 8 be revised to show the total cfs and volume used per diversion, the owner of each diversion in addition to the Diversion Name, and the total cfs and volume used in the district. I think we also need to show a little more detail in IDWR's cost - the hourly rate, benefits and indirect charge that arrives at the total cost of \$2,850.89. In accordance with the code, that figure should be divided by the total cfs used, and the resulting ratio then applied against each user's use to arrive at the individual assessments. This method should come out the same as your percentage based billing.

Sorry to be picky - but we probably should try to be consistent with code as much as possible. I can help with this if you wish.

Tim Luke
Idaho Department of Water Resources
322 E Front St
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
208-2874959
tim.luke@idwr.idaho.gov

Graves, Lori

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006 9:48 AM
To: Neely, Ken
Cc: Graves, Lori
Subject: RE: WD63-S 2005 Report

Ken,

My thought was to show total cfs by dividing the ac-ft volume by 1.9835, which really converts the volume to units of cfs per day. This makes the reporting only more consistent with the annual watermaster report form provided by the department for many years to surface water districts. My review of the code indicates that there is no specific requirement for reporting water use/deliveries in the so-called 24-hour cfs as prescribed by our reports. Therefore, reporting the use in volume and basing the assessments on volume is acceptable. In fact, this is the way we are doing it for gw diversions in water districts on the ESPA, I just wasn't thinking correctly.

So, I think the table you have in the updated report is fine, except that I did not know how the percentages were calculated. I arrive at different percentages. Your footnote indicates that the percentages were determined at the 2004 annual meeting. Is this further explained in the minutes of the 2004 meeting and was it adopted as a resolution? Was this same resolution adopted again at the 2005 meeting? Your footnote may need further clarification. Normally, this table of use and costs should show each users total seasonal or annual use and the total use in the district as you have already done. Then you divide the total expenses by the total use (volume ac-ft in this case) and apply that cost factor against each individual user.

It is really the same approach as percentages, or a proportionment of expenses. The key point is you should show this cost factor (\$/ac-ft). Minimum users, or users charged a minimum fee should be subtracted out of the total that is used for the cost factor and proportionment of expenses.

It may not matter for this year - the revised tables you have are probably acceptable other than some additional clarification of the percentages. In subsequent years however, I would suggest using the method above. I would caution against using fixed percentages as determined at a prior annual meeting.

Also, meeting minutes need to be signed and dated by whoever takes those and submitted to IDWR shortly after the annual meeting. The minutes should not be folded into the text of an-email message as I've seen over the past couple of years.

Give me a call if any of this does not make sense.

Tim

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

From: Neely, Ken
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2006 4:25 PM
To: Luke, Tim
Subject: RE: WD63-S 2005 Report

Hi Tim

The corrected version is on my PCCCommon. I fixed it as you requested, except I am not sure what you mean by total cfs.

ken

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

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 11:12 AM
To: Neely, Ken
Cc: Graves, Lori
Subject: WD63-S 2005 Report

Ken,

Just a reminder, I assume you will make some corrections to the 2005 report you handed out at the annual meeting, specifically for the incorrect dates referenced in the tables on page 8 of the report? That should be done so we get a correct copy for the file. Also, I suggest that Table 3 on page 8 be revised to show the total cfs and volume used per diversion, the owner of each diversion in addition to the Diversion Name, and the total cfs and volume used in the district. I think we also need to show a little more detail in IDWR's cost - the hourly rate, benefits and indirect charge that arrives at the total cost of \$2,850.89. In accordance with the code, that figure should be divided by the total cfs used, and the resulting ratio then applied against each user's use to arrive at the individual assessments. This method should come out the same as your percentage based billing.

Sorry to be picky - but we probably should try to be consistent with code as much as possible. I can help with this if you wish.

Tim Luke
Idaho Department of Water Resources
322 E Front St
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
208-2874959
tim.luke@idwr.idaho.gov