

DISTRICT COURT-SRBA Fifth Judicial District County of Twin Falls - State of Idaho	
JUN 17 2003	
By _____	 Deputy Clerk

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS**

In Re SRBA	)	SPECIAL MASTER'S REPORT
	)	
Case No. 39576	)	FINDINGS OF FACT AND
	)	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
_____	)	FOR WATER RIGHT 61-00293C

I. FINDINGS OF FACT


A notice of claim was filed for this water right pursuant to I.C. § 42-1409. The Director of the State of Idaho Department of Water Resources examined the water system for this reporting area. The *Director's Report* contained a recommendation or abstract for the elements of this water right.

Water right 61-00293C is an uncontested overlapping water right to 61-00308. On September 23, 2002, the parties filed a *Stipulation to Resolve Objections* in this subcase. Although the Idaho Department of Water Resources was not a signature to the *Stipulation*, the *Stipulation* did not include subcase 61-00293C. On October 29, 2002, IDWR filed a *Notice of IDWR Non-Concurrence in Basin 61 Subcase Settlements Submitted Without IDWR Signature*. The attachment to the *Notice* made changes to water right 61-00293C (see attachment to this master's report.) Those changes are as follows: "priority date" changes from January 1, 1898 to August 1, 1898; add an additional "point of diversion"; and reduces the acres from 40 acres to 39.2 acres.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW


Therefore, based on the file and record herein and pursuant to the *Notice of IDWR Non-Concurrence*, IT IS RECOMMENDED that the elements for water right 61-00293C be decreed as set forth in the *Attached Recommendation for Partial Decree pursuant to I.R.C.P. 54(b)*.

DATED: June 17, 2003.



 THOMAS R. CUSHMAN
 Special Master
 Snake River Basin Adjudication

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS



In Re SRBA)
) PARTIAL DECREE PURSUANT TO
) I.R.C.P. 54(b) FOR
Case No. 39576)
)
) Water Right 61-00293C

NAME AND ADDRESS: IDAHO FRESH PAK INC
P O BOX 130
LEWISVILLE, ID 83431-0130

SOURCE: SAND SPRINGS GULCH TRIBUTARY: LITTLE CANYON CREEK

QUANTITY: 0.395 CFS

PRIORITY DATE: 08/01/1898

POINT OF DIVERSION: T05S R10E S18 NWSESE (Injection) Within Elmore County
NWSESE (Rediversion)
NWSESE

PURPOSE AND PERIOD OF USE:	PURPOSE OF USE	PERIOD OF USE	QUANTITY
	Irrigation	03-15 TO 11-15	0.395 CFS

PLACE OF USE: Irrigation Within Elmore County
T05S R10E S19 NENW 39.2
39.2 Acres Total


OTHER PROVISIONS NECESSARY FOR DEFINITION OR ADMINISTRATION OF THIS WATER RIGHT:

THIS PARTIAL DECREE IS SUBJECT TO SUCH GENERAL PROVISIONS NECESSARY FOR THE DEFINITION OF THE RIGHTS OR FOR THE EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION OF THE WATER RIGHTS AS MAY BE ULTIMATELY DETERMINED BY THE COURT AT A POINT IN TIME NO LATER THAN THE ENTRY OF A FINAL UNIFIED DECREE. I.C. SECTION 42-1412(6).

RULE 54(b) CERTIFICATE

With respect to the issues determined by the above judgment or order, it is hereby CERTIFIED, in accordance with Rule 54(b), I.R.C.P., that the court has determined that there is no just reason for delay of the entry of a final judgment and that the court has and does hereby direct that the above judgment or order shall be a final judgment upon which execution may issue and an appeal may be taken as provided by the Idaho Appellate Rules.

Roger Burdick
Presiding Judge of the
Snake River Basin Adjudication



IDWR REPORT REGARDING
NON-CONCURRENCE WITH THE PARTIES' STIPULATIONS

IDWR submits this report as an explanation to the Court and the parties of its non-concurrence with the stipulations filed in the following Smith/Batrue subcases:

61-293B – IDWR cannot concur with the parties' stipulation since it does not resolve the BLM's objection to the place of use element. However, it is IDWR's understanding that there is a Stipulation to Resolve the United States' objections to this water right that has yet to be finalized. It is further IDWR's understanding that this stipulation allows certain public lands to remain on this water right. Once the stipulation with the United States has been filed, IDWR will be able to concur with the place of use element as agreed upon by the parties.

Further, IDWR disagrees with the priority date. The priority date originally recommended by IDWR was a typographical error. The appropriate priority date as agreed upon by the parties and IDWR is August 1, 1898; this priority date is identified on the revised recommendation attached hereto and incorporated herein.

61-293C – See explanation concerning priority date for 61-293B above. In addition, the ownership of this water right has changed. Filed contemporaneously herewith is a Notice of Completed Administrative Proceeding that changes the ownership and revises the priority date to August 1, 1898. Although this subcase is an uncontested overlapping water right, correcting the priority date that is based upon a typographical error is appropriate.


61-293D - See explanation concerning priority date for 61-293B above.

61-2000B - IDWR cannot concur with the quantity as specified under the purpose and period of use on the amended recommendation attached to the parties' stipulation. The quantity element under the purpose and period of use should be 2.056 cfs; the same quantity as listed under the quantity element of this water right. Also, a necessary remark was not included in "Other Provisions Necessary for Definition or Administration of This Water Right" pertaining to the lockable device. Attached hereto is a revised recommendation which is incorporated herein that properly lists these elements.

61-11921 – IDWR cannot concur with the parties' stipulation since it does not resolve the BLM's objection to the place of use element. However, as discussed above in water right number 61-293B, once the United States' stipulation is filed, IDWR will be able to concur with the place of use element as agreed upon by the parties.

IDWR further disagrees with the quantity element and the priority date. The quantity element should be 1.16 cfs based upon the agreed capacity of the ditch not 1.24 cfs. The attached recommendation properly lists the quantity element for this water right. The quantity element under the purpose and period of use should remain as reflected in the parties' stipulation with stockwater and domestic use being non-cumulative.

The appropriate priority date as agreed upon by the parties for this water right is July 31, 1898, and is identified on the revised recommendation attached hereto and incorporated herein.



IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS

In Re SRBA)
)
Case No. 39576)
_____)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Water Right(s) : 61-00293C

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING


I certify that a true and correct copy of the SPECIAL MASTER'S REPORT, SPECIAL MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PARTIAL DECREE and NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL MASTER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION were mailed on June 17, 2003, with sufficient first-class postage prepaid to the following:


DIRECTOR OF IDWR
PO BOX 83720
BOISE, ID 83720-0098

IDAHO FRESH PAK INC
Represented by:
CHESTNUT, AMY D
205 N 10TH ST, STE 520
PO BOX 2139
BOISE, ID 83701-2139
Phone: 208-336-0700

IDAHO FRESH PAK INC
Represented by:
NORMAN M. SEMANKO
ATTORNEY AT LAW
205 N 10TH ST, STE 530
BOISE, ID 83702
Phone: 208-344-6690

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING


PAGE 1
06/17/03
DEBBIE LASH
Deputy Clerk



IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS

In Re SRBA)
Case No. 39576)
_____)

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF
SPECIAL MASTER'S
RECOMMENDATION


Water Right(s): 61-00293C

On June 17, 2003, Special Master THOMAS R CUSHMAN issued a SPECIAL MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION for the above subcase(s) pursuant to SRBA Administrative Order 1 (AO1), Section 13a.

Pursuant to SRBA Administrative Order 1, Section 13a, any party to the adjudication including parties to the subcase, may file a Motion to Alter or Amend on or before the 28th day of the next month.

Failure of any party in the adjudication to pursue or participate in a Motion to Alter or Amend the SPECIAL MASTER'S RECOMMENDATION shall constitute a waiver of the right to challenge it before the Presiding Judge.

DATED June 17, 2003.


DEBBIE LASH
Deputy Clerk