

When a delegate is selected by the board to perform a task the board puts its trust in that delegate and the delegate's expertise to carry out that task (or obtain the expertise required) and report back to the board. The reports are submitted to the board during board meetings. Members of the board have the opportunity to ask questions or request information for further clarification. When the board members are satisfied with the report (including recommendations), the board will votes to accept the report. This board has the good fortune of having members with professional back grounds to produce expert opinions on water matters.

The subject of the Hydrology Peer Review for the K2 site has been the topic of discussion as of late. The following facts need to be considered in relation to recent comments:

- This peer review was an evaluation of the hydrogeologic study preformed by HWR, (Hyland Water Recourses) owned by Mike Ploughe. The scope of the study requested and paid for by PSWID included locations in east Strawberry, all in the general area of the K2 site. In this study Mike Ploughe gave the K2 site a positive evaluation.
- In addition to the information requested, Mike Ploughe commented that a site in Pine might be considered. His comment was generic with no specific location recommended, making it impossible to evaluate his recommendation. Normally, a hydrogeologist alone cannot adequately evaluate all the factors that make a site productive for drilling a well. It requires other expertise for a complete site analysis which should include a study of the infrastructure required to deliver the water and an economic evaluation with a business plan of costs and demands.
- The three reviewing hydrologists' reports were technical reviews of Mike Ploughe's study, using their technical knowledge of the hydrogeology in the area. We are not aware that the peers visited the K2 site to complete their review. Finding comments about Pine in the HWR report, they felt compelled to comment on that alternative.
- These Peer reviews were requested and paid for by the PWCo, and were the sole property of PWCo. No tax money was involved. Although marked confidential, the delegates in charge of negotiations. (Jim Richey and Wes Suhr) were given the opportunity to review them and report their findings to the board.
- At the November 16th PSWID Public Board Meeting, Mr. Suhr gave his and Jim Richey's professional summary of the peer reviews which included the impact on Fossil Creek Springs, resulting in a summary rating of "neutral to positive". Questions from board members were answered and the delegate report was approved by the board. No member of the board requested an individual review of these documents.

Now that the peer reports have been made public, I have read through them. I have also reviewed the delegates' detailed evaluations of the peer reports and conclude these delegate evaluations were comprehensive and agree with their general assessment of "neutral to positive" for the hydrogeology of the K2 Site.

The K2 Site well is about getting needed water into the system quickly and economically, ending water shortages and hauling charges for the immediate future.