

Name: CLORINDA MCBURNEY
 Address: [REDACTED]
 City, State: MOORE, ID 83255
 Phone: [REDACTED]

May 30, 2011

Richard Rigby
 Idaho Department of Water Resources
 P.O. Box 83720
 Boise, ID 83720-0098
 Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.


The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely,



5. Delay factors that indicate up to 150 years before benefits may result should warrant a futile call on any petition.
6. The Lost River basins should qualify for the less than 10% impact rule.

Signature: _____



Date: 5-30-11

Name: TED M'BURNEY
 Address: _____
 City, State: _____
 Phone: _____

May 30, 2011

Richard Rigby
 Idaho Department of Water Resources
 P.O. Box 83720
 Boise, ID 83720-0098
 Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.


The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.

The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely, 

Name: Cheri Maynard
Address: [REDACTED]
City, State: moore Id
Phone: [REDACTED]

May 30, 2011

Richard Rigby
Idaho Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.

The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely,



Name:
Address:
City, State:
Phone:

Ralph L. Parkinson
[REDACTED]
Arco, Idaho 83213
[REDACTED]

May 29, 2011

Richard Rigby
Idaho Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.

The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely,

Ralph L. Parkinson

Name: Tamel Kidd
Address: [REDACTED]
City, State: Blackfoot Eden - 83323
Phone: [REDACTED]

May 29, 2011

Richard Rigby
Idaho Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.


The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely,



Name: Kimberly Harry
Address: [REDACTED]
City, State: MOORE Id 83255
Phone: [REDACTED]

May 29, 2011

Richard Rigby
Idaho Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.

The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely,

Kimberly Harry

Name: _____
 Address: _____
 City, State: _____
 Phone: _____

May 29, 2011

Richard Rigby
 Idaho Department of Water Resources
 P.O. Box 83720
 Boise, ID 83720-0098
 Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.

The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely,



Name: Richard C. Henry
Address: [REDACTED]
City, State: Moore, ID
Phone: [REDACTED]

May 29, 2011

Richard Rigby
Idaho Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098
Fax: 208-287-6700

Re: Proposed Change to Conjunctive Management Rule 50

Dear Sir:

Basin 34 has been told numerous times since the Snake River Basin Adjudication that we would never be involved in Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA), the "A-line." As a result, we were unaware that we were even in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Model (ESPAM). Some of the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. People that are on the Modeling Committee have obviously represented and protected the interests of whomever or whatever organization they represented. We were never approached to be on the Modeling Committee. Decisions have been made for our groundwater basins without our knowledge or input. Had we been aware of our inclusion in the ESPAM, we would have certainly had a representative there to protect our interests.

The contribution of the Big and Little Lost Rivers (Basins 33 and 34) to the ESPA is negligible, at best. "Good" water years, (when calls are unlikely) are the only times that these two basins may contribute to the ESPA. "Bad" water years, (when calls are likely) do not allow any water to leave these basins.

The ESPAM was never intended to be used as an administrative tool nor as a boundary. Again, the boundaries of the ESPAM seem arbitrary and political. The Big and Little Wood River Valley's should be included in the ESPAM and are not. Do they have representation on the Modeling Committee?

We are told that there is groundwater that leaves Basins 33 and 34 and flows into the ESPA, but how much and how long it takes to reach the Twin Falls area are unknowns. Estimates are inexact.

The hydrologic basis for the definition of the Area of Common Ground Water Supply is set forth in the Conjunctive Management Rules as: "The Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer supplies water to and receives water from the Snake River" (CMR 050.0 1.a.). The Big and Little Lost River Basins cannot receive water from the Snake River. We do not meet this criterion.

If we do become part of the ESPA and are made subject to calls from the Twin Falls area, do we get to make calls ourselves? How will those be delivered?

Sincerely, 