

RECEIVED

JUL 09 2007

DEPT. OF WATER RESOURCES
SOUTHERN REGION

Dean Dimond
1454 HWY 25
Jerome Idaho 83338

In Matter of Application For Transfer NO. 72435

Big Sky Farms

First, I want to object to the applicant's motion to extend. The applicant asked more than ten questions so we responded to only ten as the rules requires. After he received the answers to these questions the applicant had every right to ask ten more questions before the deadline. HE DID NOT. After the deadline he made a motion and asked more questions. In a good faith effort to do things right I am enclosing my witness list. Furthermore, I object to the applicant answering of Interrogatory #1 and the request for production #1 and #2. I made an error and typed Camas County but the applicant knew he had property in the Camas Prairie in Elmore County. He needs to respond accordingly. In addition if the applicant wants to play this silly game then we never should have answered any questions as on the first set of Interrogatories the heading at the top said it was pertaining to Twin Falls and Cassia County. Mr. Williams has stated that he is an expert in this field; we as lay people have tried to fairly and accurately do our part, and so the many errors and falsehoods must obviously be a deliberate attempt by Mr. Williams to manipulate and taint this proceeding. As stated in his answers to James Stewart's Interrogatory #1, the applicant has made no effort to compromise on the issue. Given the fact that neither the applicant nor his lawyer can show they have the ability to read minds they have no way of knowing what the protestants had in mind. This shows a huge arrogance of the applicant and his lawyer; their actions have shown they feel no obligation to follow the rules set forth by the Idaho Department of Water Resources.

Based on the facts mentioned above along with the fact that the newspaper notification was inaccurate and that there is false information in the application plus the fact that the applicant wants to change the amount of water to transfer, I would make a motion to dismiss this entire application.

In answer to Interrogatory number 13: Yes, I plan on calling on witnesses.

In answer to Interrogatory number 14: Objection. Interrogatory number 14 seeks production of documents and does not ask a question. Having objected a list of possible witnesses is provided below.

In answer to Interrogatory number 15: Objection. Interrogatory number 15 seeks a production of evidence and does not ask a direct question. Having objected the applicant is free to read the witness list and contact them and ask any questions he may have.

Possible Witnesses

1. Don McFarland
2. Robert Williams
3. Charles Brockway
4. Lee Halper
5. Alma Hasse
6. Carol McFarland
7. Kristi Lucas
8. Lori McFarland
9. Maurisa Willmot
10. Suzanne Vance
11. Marshall Joe McFarland
12. Jack McCall
13. Jerry Theener
14. Bob Naerbout

15. Cindy Yenter
16. Tony Visser

Thank you and we look forward to you granting our motion.

Dean Dimond

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dean Dimond". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the printed name.

P.S. A copy has been sent to the applicant.