

RECEIVED

MAR 08 1995

Department of Water Resources
Southern Region

5
1994 Finance Report
Water District 37U Fish Creek

Biginning Balance	\$2,374.44
Income Water Master Tax	\$13,110.94
Total	\$15,485.38

5
1994 Expenditures

Water Master Wages	\$12,024.81
Sec & Treas. Wage	\$300.00
1/2 Soc. SEc. & Medicare	\$919.98
Telephone	\$26.49
Total	\$13,271.23

Remaining Balance	\$2,214.15
-------------------	------------

TO: Tim Luke

DATE: April 10, 1995

FROM: Jim Stanton

RECEIVED

SUBJECT: Watermaster's Reports, District 37-U

APR 12 1995

Department of Water Resources

I spoke today with the District treasurer and also with the assistant watermaster concerning the WM report. Apparently this district does the report in manner that is different from every other district. Their adopted budget is actually a billing for the water that was delivered last year. The WM report shows how much water was delivered to each user, and shows the adopted budget; no delivery cost, credits or debits are shown. The cost per 24-hour second foot shown on the report has nothing to do with the adopted budget amounts, since they are for two different years. They used to use the normal financial methods, but apparently changed to this system some years ago by vote of the district. Is this method legal? I guess it evens out the bills more than the conventional method, but it makes the WM report impossible to check.

Spoke w/ Jim Stanton on 4/18 regarding this matter. I advised Jim that after-the-fact billing is legal & acceptable to IDWR, if that is in fact what the district is doing. As Jim explained the report and calculations though, it appears that they are assessing in some other manner, and that the watermaster report is confusing.

I advised Jim to contact the district & seek clarification on methodology, then correct or direct them to more suitable method if needed.

Tim Luke
TJL
4-18-95

37-2479

2581

2599

2609

2616

A37-14285

14286

418

36 70

823-4440

Kathy Peck

431-5381

36-7080

8089

7731

RK 3 Box 1