

Graves, Lori

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2006 10:54 AM
To: Neely, Ken; Graves, Lori
Cc: Skaggs, Pam; Peppersack, Jeff
Subject: RE: Water measurement question

Ken,

First of all, I did learn that Edwards withdrew its protest of the Tertling transfer application (as of April 10), which I assume is the reason Ed Squires called and wants to move on making changes. My advice to Ed would be that what he is proposing seems to have merit and is probably reasonable, but neither you as watermaster nor anyone at IDWR should give any verbal approval on making any changes until after the water right transfer is approved.

Despite what Ed and Tertling have told you about transferring water away from these three wells and leaving only a small amount at the 36th and Hill site, the actual transfer application does not seem to support that statement even though they may intend to do so. The transfer instead appears to add a well and combine rate of flow and volume of rights 63 12, 13, & 15 under these and other wells. The protest withdrawal from Edwards includes an affidavit from Norm Young that raises what seem to be a number of valid points about combining wells under the rights and creating a potential for enlargement. Valid points are also made about the need for additional monitoring. IDWR may include some stringent measuring and monitoring requirements under the approved transfer, including installation of data loggers for both rate of flow and volume on all wells. I notice from review of the files that flow meters are already installed on the three wells near Hill & 36th. We should still be administering these rights in accordance with the last transfer or how the rights are currently recorded with the Department. Therefore, I think any changes that Squires & Tertling do before the transfer is approved is premature. Purchase and installation of a single expensive meter now may cost Tertling more if we condition the transfer differently or require monitoring equipment (i.e, data loggers) that won't work with the meter they install now.

Again, my advice is to tell Ed not to do anything now until after the transfer is approved and we've all had a chance to review the conditions. Neither you as watermaster nor IDWR should give any recommendation or verbal approval of anything until that transfer is approved. Anything he does now is at his own risk. You can ask Pam Skaggs how long it might be before the transfer might be approved. If Ed or Tertling has concerns with this advice, then tell them to call me directly if they wish.

Tim

-----Original Message-----

From: Neely, Ken
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 11:41 AM
To: Graves, Lori; Luke, Tim
Subject: Water measurement question

I got a call from Ed Squires. Terteling is making changes to the property on 36th and Hill, and Ed is proposing that all three geothermal wells be plumbed so that only one flow meter is necessary. This will make the monitoring easier, and more accurate, since Ed is proposing that Terteling purchase an expensive flow meter in order to get good recordings on low flows. The other option would be to go with a flow meter on each well, and Ed indicated that Terteling might go with cheaper flow meters if he had to purchase three, and these meters would probably not be as accurate for low flows.

The shed (Silkey) well will be used as the primary production well, the triangle (Tiegs) well will be used as a backup in the case of a problem with the Shed well, and the house well will be the primary shut-in monitoring well. Ed would like to know if I (as Water Master) and the Department will agree to this. Also, since the Boise Front Stipulated Agreement calls for monitoring of individual wells, he wonders how the other parties can be informed of this plan (assuming that we agree to it), and thus get their buy-in.

I would appreciate your opinions on this proposal. Thank you.

ken

Kenneth W. Neely, Technical Hydrogeologist
Idaho Department of Water Resources

fyi e 635 Terteling issue

Lester, Steve

From: Lester, Steve
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 4:16 PM
To: Neely, Ken
Cc: Graves, Lori
Subject: RE: Water measurement question

Ken:

I talked to John Westra and Lori Graves about this. This is where we landed:

Lots of complexities, mostly legal/administrative rather than technical. Terteling should do the following if wants to proceed with this idea:

Present a written proposal to IDWR. The plan should include technical aspects from a qualified party (Ed). It should also cover legal issues from a qualified party (attorney). Legal issues should show how the plan is compatible with water district orders about well monitoring/measuring equipment etc. Legal factors should also address any relevant orders/policies for the Boise Front, including but necessarily limited to the stipulated agreement you referred to (assume that is the one about City developing more heating use under its water permits, the process coordinated by Norm Young a few years ago). Additionally, the legal aspect of the plan should show how water district parties and Boise Front parties have had a chance to review and comment on the plan. For example, the plan should include documentation showing how Terteling provided a reasonable amount of time for parties to provide written comments. All comments received under that scenario would be appended to the plan.

This would provide IDWR with a complete picture for our review and would limit our time/effort in chasing the information. This is particularly critical during this period when we are trying to complete the SRBA and have little time for too many other things like this. Obviously, Western Region would like to be included in any department review of the plan.

Please let us know if you need more comments from this end. Thanks.

Steve

-----Original Message-----

From: Graves, Lori
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 11:44 AM
To: Lester, Steve
Subject: FW: Water measurement question

FYI and comment.

-----Original Message-----

From: Neely, Ken
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 11:41 AM
To: Graves, Lori; Luke, Tim
Subject: Water measurement question

I got a call from Ed Squires. Terteling is making changes to the property on 36th and Hill, and Ed is proposing that all three geothermal wells be plumbed so that only one flow meter is necessary. This will make the monitoring easier, and more accurate, since Ed is proposing that Terteling purchase an expensive flow meter in order to get good recordings on low flows. The other option would be to go with a flow meter on each well, and Ed indicated that Terteling might go with cheaper flow meters if he had to purchase three, and these meters would probably not be as accurate for low flows.

The shed (Silkey) well will be used as the primary production well, the triangle (Tiegs) well will be used as a backup in the case of a problem with the Shed well, and the house well will be the primary shut-in monitoring well. Ed would like to know if I (as Water Master) and the Department will agree to this. Also, since the Boise Front Stipulated Agreement calls for monitoring of individual wells, he wonders how the other parties can be informed of this plan (assuming that we agree to it), and thus get their buy-in.

I would appreciate your opinions on this proposal. Thank you.

Graves, Lori

From: Neely, Ken
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 10:09 AM
To: Vincent, Sean; Luke, Tim; Graves, Lori
Subject: Water Master hours

Here is the invoice that is being sent to the Chairman of Water District 63S.

Sean...in the future, Debbie Allen would like me to bill my hours to 58413 on my regular time sheet, as opposed to an annual billing. Generally, I will bill about 4 hours a month, except for two times a year when I measure the wells weekly for 6 weeks (Feb-Mar, and Sept-Oct).

ken



Water Master Bill
Feb 2006.pdf...

Kenneth W. Neely, Technical Hydrogeologist
Idaho Department of Water Resources
Technical Services Bureau
322 East Front Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
208-287-4852 (phone)
208-287-6700 (fax)
<http://www.idwr.state.id.us/hydrologic/>

Graves, Lori

From: Neely, Ken
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2006 3:08 PM
To: Graves, Lori
Subject: RE: water rights questions

Thanks Lori. The issue is that yesterday, the two wells at 36th and State were producing a total of 51 GPM. It appeared that the only use at the time was for the office/house on the corner, since most of the greenhouses are gone, and those remaining are not in use, nor is the Terra Vita company in operation. So, I am going to give Tom T. a call and ask him why the use was that high for just the one house. ken

-----Original Message-----

From: Graves, Lori
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2006 2:52 PM
To: Neely, Ken
Subject: RE: water rights questions

Tertling currently has a permissible place of use for .86 cfs and 400 afa for heating, irrigation and domestic uses diverted from 4 wells (Windsock and Flora). Transfer 71690 was filed to add additional hot wells in case Windsock failed and to expand the heating p/u. This transfer has not been approved and is currently protested. Aesthetic use is not authorized on the Tertling rights. The fish in the canals have benefited in the past from Flora's wastewater. Less water is being used at Flora because the greenhouse operation has shifted north, which means less wastewater for the fish. Hope this helps. lg