



## State of Idaho

# DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Southern Region, 1341 Fillmore Street, Suite 200 • Twin Falls, Idaho 83301-3380

Phone: (208) 736-3033 • Fax: (208) 736-3037 • Web Site: [www.idwr.idaho.gov](http://www.idwr.idaho.gov)

---

C. L. "BUTCH" OTTER  
Governor

DAVID R. TUTHILL, JR.  
Director

February 15, 2008

Buddy Ward  
PO Box 186  
Almo, ID 83312

RE: Water District 43-D, Almo Creek

Mr. Ward;

Enclosed is a copy of your 2007 adopted budget. I assumed that you had one, but apparently this is not the case. The problem with your 2007 watermaster's report is that Column 3 (Adopted Budget) does not have the dollar amounts agreed upon at last year's water meeting. If your district has agreed to pay you more for last year's deliveries, the increase should be reflected in Column 2 (Total Cost). How the forms are filled out after that is between you and your district. The Credit and Debit columns are there for those districts that use that accounting method, but apparently 43-D does not. I noticed that your Column 3 figures are the same as those used in 2006, and they did agree with the 2006 adopted budget.

Regards,

James E. Stanton  
Sr. Water Resource Agent



## State of Idaho

# DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Southern Region, 1341 Fillmore Street, Suite 200 • Twin Falls, Idaho 83301-3380

Phone: (208) 736-3033 • Fax: (208) 736-3037 • Web Site: [www.idwr.idaho.gov](http://www.idwr.idaho.gov)

C. L. "BUTCH" OTTER  
Governor

DAVID R. TUTHILL, JR.  
Director

February 4, 2008

Bud Ward  
PO Box 186  
Almo, ID 83312

RE: Water District 43-D, Almo Creek

Dear Mr. Ward;

We have received your 2007 watermaster's report and 3 daily-record books, and your 2008 proposed budget. The figures do not make any sense to me, however, so I am returning the report and budget for possible correction. On the watermaster's report, the Adopted Budget amounts are twice what is shown on your 2007 adopted budget; this is obviously incorrect. These incorrect amounts then appear on the 2008 proposed budget as the Estimated Billing, but they do not reflect the actual 2007 costs; so that does not make sense either. You used these same figures on the 2007 proposed budget, which makes all this even more confusing. The normal way of doing things, if there is such a thing, is for the adopted budget to have some relationship to the proposed budget, but there does not appear to be any connection between the two in your district.

Regards,

James E. Stanton  
Sr. Water Resource Agent