

Edl, Michele

From: Walker, Kay
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2009 8:53 AM
To: Edl, Michele
Subject: RE: Simplot 63-10034

Vic told me they only operate the plant 330 days a year. They have to shut it down periodically for maintenance. I looked through the file and only thing I have to document that is my memo regarding conversation with Vic on July 17, 2008. If you want something for file documentation you should contact Vic.

From: Edl, Michele
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2009 6:27 PM
To: Walker, Kay
Subject: FW: Simplot 63-10034

Kay,
 Shelley and I had a lengthy discussion about this right this afternoon.
 I believe that as a result we will give Simplot industrial use and then, sort of, take it away with careful conditioning.
 We're thinking inch per acre for wastewater land application and looking at the total industrial rate that Simplot has available. Your Nov 2008 spreadsheet (attached) shows an industrial use volume limitation based on 330 days. Could you explain that limitation a bit more for me?
 Thanks
 Michele

From: Walker, Kay
Sent: Monday, November 24, 2008 9:27 AM
To: Edl, Michele
Cc: Walker, Kay
Subject: Simplot 63-10034

Michele: I have made my recommendations on the rights that will overlap with License 63-10034. I have scanned in a copy of my "Simplot" review sheet that may help you in finalizing their license on Permit 63-10034. The way I see it you could go a couple of ways on that one. The system capacity is 9.96 cfs. I have recommended 1" per acre to all the claims they had filed within a 933 acre ppu. The ppu is based upon the shape file you had created and then I removed a portion of it in Sec. 19 (NENE & NENW) because it had been sold and I added some land in Sec. 12 (E1/2SE) that was included on Carter's exam recommendation. I also rounded the acres recommended to whole numbers rather than have some 10th's in there. I have made recommendations on 401 acres of the 933 acre ppu. Because I did not have documentation to show exactly how many acres were developed under each priority date I felt I needed to limit the rights to an inch per acre. The surface rights that are older than the groundwater rights made it impossible to determine when each piece of land was added to the groundwater system.

The way I have made recommendations there is no need to allow more industrial water for their waste water from plant. I have covered the water used in the SRBA.

You could either:
 License for 97 acres within the 933 acre ppu at 1.94 cfs
 Or
 License for 532 acres within the 933 acre ppu at 1.94 cfs.

Seeing how they have lots of surface water on this property, along with all the wastewater from their plant, they won't be hurting for water no matter how we license the permit. Hopefully the spread sheet will assist you in seeing what I have done. Also – the recommendations (for all but the permit and 63-21537) are out there on workflow so you can print them out if you want to.

If you have any questions or concerns about my recommendations, please let me know real soon. I am planning on working through their stock water claims the first of next week and then requesting a meeting with Vic so we can discuss what I have done and try to resolve the objections submitted in SRBA.

Thanks!!

9/6/2009