

10-25-2011

Notes of: S. Keen

Pre-hearing Conf. RE: I-84/Mayfield Area
Ground Water Applicants

Shekinah - Prepared to move the water + use it
Cramer ASAP. Not water supply, but
injury, is the issue here.

Nevid - Nevid has already drilled a productive
Semanko well under its existing permit.
- Wants all technical info submitted
by deadline. This should apply to
all parties and to IDWR.
- Who is properly involved is key, and
under what circumstances.

Orchard Ranch - Irrigation app.
Semanko ★ Ready to go. Willing to collect
+ share data. Can help model.
- Not sure why they're involved when
they're not protested.
- Could ~~be~~ prejudice the process
if all protesters can speak to
all the applications.

SUPPORT DATA

IN FILE # 61-12095

Mayfield Townsite
Arch Properties
Smith

Difference between
well interference
+ sufficiency of
supply.

- ~~App at~~ Planned community already approved by Elmore County.
- Not sure the rules contemplate what we're doing.
- Wants an independent hearing officer for his two applicants.
- Wants participation from IDWR in data collection because otherwise IDWR will nitpick the results.
- Thinks there is some existing data.

Intermountain Sewer + Water
McHugh

- Has one permit also.
- Has a business interest in a speedy process. And orderly + transparent.

PROTESTANTS

Lori Atkins - Look at the "whole pie"

Mary Frisch - Ability of aquifer ~~to~~ to handle the proposals. Wants opportunity to speak.

Tanya Bolshaw - What have other states done. Have they done consolidated hearings?

Driff Herven - Cautious approach would be prudent.

Hofstetter rep. Van Groner - Wants mitigation for new depletion or import water
- Consolidation a good idea to prevent juniors going first and finding themselves short down the road.

Could IDWR allow all parties to intervene? }
Would likely be unfair to make one applicant bear the issue }
- most senior could be a test case with all parties participating.

IPCo
Simpson

- 2 interests -

- A. Gas turbine right
- B. Snake River water

- Seeking knowledge of water supply.
- Are GWMA's and CGWMA's the appropriate designations.
- Develop a record, then evaluate all applications against the record.
- Overall IPCo can bring technical information to the table re: the connection of GW to the Snake River.

Creamer

- What did the Mtn. Home Ground Water advisory committee develop + advise?
Does it have a role.

City of Wayne Shepherd
Mtn. Home

- Did some modeling (Brookway),
but only the south part of town.
- Wants to see the science.

D. Bateman

- Wants independent science. So far has only seen paid consultants, who ~~have~~ may have an agenda.

City of Pocatello
J. Beeman

- Cities are uniquely qualified to provide water to communities.
(Tragedy of the Commons. i.e. one owner has incentive to conserve, whereas multiple owners don't.)

Sort of like B. Smith's point regarding the City of Engle's land use planning. i.e. + trust the city to look after the public interests.

- Could we have pre-filed testimony, and hearing is only for X-Exam, like PUC?

Quinney - Likes consolidation. All straws into the same sponge.
- Also consider availability - reasonable pumping level.
- Contingency planning for mitigation.
If, then....

? - May already be over-appropriated.

Trippets - Agree that it should be consolidated.

Gary - 1. If IDWR ~~was~~ resources were committed to coordinate things, would everyone share data.
(Erickson says it should go both ways.)

Simpson { Could IDWR be the clearinghouse for initial disclosure?

- A. Scans make available everything submitted ~~to~~ in all apps. so far
B. Get more info to be submitted.

Gary

2. What about the issue of who shouldn't be involved? Should IDWR approve an unprotected application out of order.

3. Should Gary put out a "straw man" proposal?

↑

IDWR will send the straw man proposal out.

Comments to IDWR only, then IDWR will post them all on the website.

↑ For efficiency.