

RECEIVED

MAR - 7 2003

Department of Water Resources

Roger D. Ling, ISB No. 1018
Jason D. Walker, ISB No. 5790
LING & ROBINSON
P. O. Box 396
Rupert, Idaho 83350
Telephone (208) 436-4717
Facsimile (208) 436-6804

Attorneys for Claimant/Objector,
A & B Irrigation District

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	)	Subcases 36-02080, 36-15127 (36-15127A
	)	and <u>36-15127B</u>), 36-15192, 36-15193
Case No. 39576,	)	(36-15193A and <u>36-15193B</u>), 36-15194
	)	(36-15194A and <u>36-15194B</u>), 36-15195
	)	(36-15195A and <u>36-15195B</u>), 36-15196
	)	(36-15196A and <u>36-15196B</u>) (US/BOR)

REPLY BRIEF OF A & B IRRIGATION DISTRICT

COMES NOW the Claimant/Objector, A & B Irrigation District ("District"), by and through its attorneys of record, and respectfully submits this Reply Brief to the Ground Water Users Response to A & B Irrigation District's Opening Brief.

I. FACTS

As indicated in District's Opening Brief, Unit B of the District's project was designed as a gravity irrigation system utilizing ground water pumped from the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer into a distribution system of canals and laterals and delivered to landowners of the District. The District then collects surface water, drain water, irrigation waste and return flows (drain water) in a drainage system consisting of a series of

1
2
3 ditches, drains and ponds operated and maintained by the District.
4 (Affidavit of Brockway) Historically, the District utilized
5 injection wells to dispose of excess drain water. In addition, the
6 District used some of the excess drain water to irrigate some 2,363
7 additional acres within the District. (Affidavit of Brockway)

8 On or about November 23, 1984, the Bureau of Reclamation
9 ("BOR") filed for a permit with the Idaho Department of Water
10 Resources ("IDWR") to appropriate water for these expanded acres in
11 "Unit B" and other acres of the North Side Pumping Division of the
12 Minidoka Project. (Affidavit of Walton.) However, before the
13 permits could be approved, the Idaho Legislature passed House Bill
14 71, later codified as Idaho Code §42-1416. This law was enacted on
15 March 1, 1985. As has been indicated, this statute provided in
16 part that the expansion of a valid, unadjudicated water right in
17 violation of the permit requirements of the State would be presumed
18 valid and to have created a water right with a priority date
19 corresponding with the completion of the expansion, provided,
20 however, no other appropriators were injured. (*Idaho Session Laws*,
21 1985 Chapter 19, p.31)

22 Relying upon that statute, the District acting through
23 BOR withdrew its permit applications and, on or about November 19,
24 1987 the District filed claims in the Snake River Basin Adjudica-
25 tion ("SRBA") for water rights consistent with its expanded use.
26 IDWR recommended each of the enlarged uses of water rights on or

1
2
3 about November 2, 1992. it is significant that no objections to
4 the recommendations made by IDWR were filed.

5 Two years later, on January 4, 1994, SRBA District Judge
6 Daniel C. Hurlbutt found I.C. §42-1416(2) void for vagueness.
7 Judge Hurlbutt's decision was appealed to the Idaho Supreme Court.
8 However, before the Supreme Court could hear the appeal, the Idaho
9 Legislature repealed I.C. §§42-1416 and 42-1416A and simultaneously
10 re-enacted I.C. §42-1426, which also were found by Judge Hurlbutt
11 to be invalid. This decision was also appealed.

12 In October of 1996, the Idaho Supreme Court determined
13 that §42-1426 is constitutional in Fremont-Madison v. Idaho Ground
14 Water Appropriators, 129 Idaho 454, 926 P.2d 1301 (1996). As a
15 result of that decision, in August of 1998, IDWR filed an Amended
16 Director's Report on all enlargement claims in Basin 36 with the
17 subordination remark included, which is one of the issues in this
18 matter. Further, the Report stated, contrary to the District's
19 claims, that the source of all water used on the enlarged acres is
20 ground water. Objections were filed by the District as to the
21 source, quantity, priority date, and the subordination remark. In
22 due course, the Special Master ruled against the District, and the
23 District filed a Motion to Alter or Amend which was also denied.
24 The present challenge was filed by the District to have included in
25 any decree on these claims the source of the water utilized by the
26 District on its expanded acres, and to further establish that the
27 subordination remark is not applicable where drain water, waste

1
2
3 water and surface return flows are the source of the water utilized
4 on the expanded acres. Furthermore, the District has maintained
5 that, to the extent the subordination remark is applicable to its
6 claims, the District's water rights should only be subordinate to
7 those water rights obtained by permit prior to the adoption of I.C.
8 §42-1416(2).

9 II. ARGUMENT

10 The District has challenged the Special Master's Report
11 and Recommendation claiming that certain findings of the Special
12 Master were clearly erroneous. The Ground Water Users have
13 responded to the District's Opening Brief and attempted to cloud or
14 minimize the issues. They claim that the Special Master was
15 correct both in law and in fact in his findings. The District
16 maintains that the Special Master's Report should have made the
17 following findings:

18 1. The source of the water in the "B" claims includes
19 drain water, waste water, diffused surface water, and return flows
20 (hereinafter referred to collectively as "drain water") in addition
21 to ground water.

22 2. To the extent that drain water is the source used by
23 the District on its "B" claims, the drain water is private water
24 captured by the District within the project and is not subject to
25 appropriation by others and therefore inappropriately subordinated
26 to other ground water rights.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

3. Use of drain water for irrigation is the most effective way to return water to the aquifer and actually provides a benefit to the Ground Water Users, eliminating their claim of injury and the need to subordinate.

4. Even if it is determined that the drain water used by the District is subordinated to the subsequent appropriation of ground water by others, Claim Nos. 36-15193B and 36-15194B are constitutional appropriations of surface water not covered by I.C. §42-1426 or I.C. §42-1416, and therefore may not be subordinated to junior water rights.

5. To the extent ground water is utilized by the District on enlarged acres, and to the extent subordination is appropriate, if at all, the District's water rights should only be subordinated to water rights established prior to March 1, 1985.

6. Respondents are barred from having the District's rights subordinated to junior rights acquired by permit after March 1, 1985 by the doctrine of waiver and estoppel.

Each of these proposed findings is discussed below.

A. The source of drain water in the "B" claims should include drain water, waste water, diffused surface water, and return flows in addition to ground water.

The first issue before the Court is the correct identification of the source of water for these rights. The Special Master incorrectly concluded that ground water is the sole source for the rights claimed by the District, and that drain water is ground water. In support of the Special Master's decision, respondents'

Memorandum ignores the undisputed facts which clearly establish additional sources of water utilized by the District. These additional sources are the drain water discussed herein.

The Idaho Supreme Court has recognized waste water or drain water as a source that can be put to a beneficial use. Sebern v. Moore, 44 Idaho 410, 416-418, 258 P. 176, 178 (1927); Hidden Springs Trout Ranch, Inc. v. Hagerman Water Users, Inc., 101 Idaho 677, 680, 619 P.2d 1130, 1133 (1980) reh'g denied; and Jensen v. Boise-Kuna Irrigation District, 75 Idaho 133, 269 P.2d 755 (1954). The undisputed report of Dr. Charles Brockway and the undisputed facts have clearly establish that, in addition to ground water, the District is utilizing drain water as a source for the expanded acres. It should be noted that the only evidence before the Special Master were the Affidavits submitted on behalf of the District. No challenge was ever made to those Affidavits.

The District agrees with the respondents's statement that the reality of the source must be reflected in the decrees. While the respondents' reality defines the source exclusively as ground water, it ignores the fact that the nature of the ground water is changed by its use by landowners and subsequent recovery by the District. Furthermore, the respondents' reality ignores the fact that diffused surface water from storms and other sources is collected in the District's drains, ponds and ditches. The District, however, seeks to have these sources acknowledged in the decrees as part of the source utilized on the District's expanded

1
2
3 acres. To do otherwise would perpetuate a fallacy which would
4 serve neither the District, the Ground Water Users, nor the State.
5 The undisputed facts in this case, as well as the uncontested
6 report of Dr. Brockway, cannot be ignored. Drain water must be
7 acknowledged as a separate and distinct source from ground water in
8 the decrees sought by the District.

9 B. To the extent that drain water is the source used by
10 the District on its "B" claims, the drain water is private water
11 captured by the District within the project and is not subject to
12 appropriation by others and therefore inappropriately subordinated
13 to other ground water rights.

14 Idaho Code §42-1426 provides in pertinent part as
15 follows:

16 [T]he legislature finds that prior to the
17 commencement of the Snake River Basin Adjudi-
18 cation . . . persons entitled to the use of
19 water or owning any land to which water has
20 been made appurtenant by decree license or
21 constitutional appropriation have through
22 water conservation and other means, enlarged
23 the use of said water without increasing the
24 rate of diversion and without complying with
25 the mandatory permit system adopted by the
26 legislature. . . . Thus, the legislature fur-
27 ther finds and declares that it is in the
28 public interest to waive the mandatory permit
requirements for these enlargements in use
prior to the commencement of the general
adjudication so long as the enlargements in
use did not increase the rate of diversion of
the original water right or exceed the rate of
diversion for irrigation provided in section
42-202 Idaho Code after the enlargement of
use, and the enlargement of use did not reduce
the quantity of water available to other water
rights existing on the date of the enlargement
in use.

1
2
3 Similarly I.C. §42-1416, which has been repealed, stated in a
4 pertinent part that:

5 Extension of use after acquisition of a valid
6 unadjudicated water right in violation of the
7 mandatory permit requirement shall be presumed
8 to be valid and to have created a water right
with a priority date as of the completion of
the expansion, in the absence of injury to
other appropriators.

9 Certainly neither of these statutes limits the source of the water
10 to be used in the enlarged place of use. Idaho Code § 42-1426 only
11 refers to waters made available through conservation and other
12 means. The recapture of drain water as accomplished by the
13 district qualifies as "other means." Therefore, the respondents'
14 argument that the District's right to recapture drain water or
15 return flow does not allow them to put it to beneficial use on
16 other lands is contrary to the enlargement statute cited above.

17 This inconsistency is made clear by the respondents' own
18 argument. In one sentence the Ground Water Users contend that
19 while a right to recapture and reuse drain water exists, the reuse
20 cannot be on additional lands. However in the next sentence they
21 cite Colthrop v. Mountain Home Irrigation District, 66 Idaho 181
22 157 P.2d 1008 (1945), stating that "any change in place of use of
23 the right creating the waste water (such as attempting to add
24 additional irrigated acres) 'could not be made' if the change
25 injured other water rights (which it would if an enlargement were
26 allowed)." If this proposition is correct, the reverse must be
27 true: adding additional acres is possible as long as the addition

1
2
3 does not injure other water rights. In fact this is consistent
4 with the language of both I.C. §42-1426 and repealed I.C. §42-1416.
5 Furthermore, it is precisely on point with the case at hand.

6 The drain water collected by the District is private
7 water and not subject to appropriation by others. Sebern v. Moore,
8 44 Idaho 410, 258 P. 176 (1927). I.C. §42-212. Under I.C.
9 §42-212, the IDWR is prohibited from issuing or granting permits to
10 appropriate private water to anyone other than the person or
11 corporation owning the land upon which the water is located,
12 collected or impounded, without the consent of the owner. Because
13 no appropriation can be made by anyone other than the District, no
14 injury can result to any other individuals. The drain water is
15 water available by "other means" and can be and was put to
16 beneficial use on enlarged acres. Thus, contrary to the assertion
17 of the respondents, the District's right to recapture drain or
18 return flow water does in fact allow for enlargement under the
19 plain language of the statute.

20 C. The District's use of drain water on enlargement
21 acres is the most effective way to return water to the aquifer and
22 will actually provide a benefit to the Ground Water Users, thus
23 eliminating their claim of injury and the need to subordinate.

24 The respondents argue that the District's enlargements
25 reduce return flows to the aquifer, increase consumptive use in the
26 basin, and will injure existing rights. (Ground Water Users'
27 Response to A&B's Opening Brief, p.12) There is no evidence in the
28 record to support this factual claim and it appears to be an

1
2
3 attempt to justify subordination by creating an injury where none
4 exists. The statement made by respondents blatantly ignores the
5 facts in this case and further disregards the undisputed report of
6 Dr. Brockway.¹

7 The District diverts approximately 1,110 cubic feet per
8 second of ground water from the aquifer. This water is delivered
9 through its system of ditches to lands within the District. A
10 portion of the water is lost through transpiration and evaporation.
11 Another part of the water is utilized for irrigation by the water
12 users. A certain amount, which we will call "carriage water," is
13 unused and is collected in the District's drains and ponds. This
14 carriage water is limited to the amount of water necessary for
15 delivery of water within the system. There is also a certain
16 amount of runoff from irrigation, seepage and diffused surface
17 water that is collected in the drainage system of the District.

18 Historically, once all this water was collected, the
19 District then injected a portion of it back into the aquifer
20 through its injection wells. It should be noted that, while the
21 District has historically utilized injection wells, there is no

22
23 ¹ It should be noted that the respondents have attempted to make their
24 own jaded interpretation of the District's position appear as if it was a quote
25 from the District's Opening Brief. (Ground Water Users' Response to A&B's
26 Opening Brief, p.12) The indented language referred to is not a quote, nor does
27 it accurately represent the District's position. The use of drain water for
28 irrigation actually enhances the return of water to the aquifer and cuts down on
evaporation loss. While the District has maintained that the project is a closed
system with respect to surface water, it has never disputed that water can and
does eventually percolate back to the aquifer. The real issue is whether
utilizing irrigation as a method to dispose of the waste water creates an injury
to the respondents or other junior right holders.

1
2
3 requirement that they continue that practice. Furthermore, the
4 District is in the process of closing its injections wells out of
5 concern over water quality issues.

6 Therefore, the question remains, what should the District
7 do with the collected drain water? One option is to leave the
8 water in the ditches and ponds where it is collected. According to
9 Dr. Brockway, this is the least favorable approach from the
10 standpoint of aquifer recharge. The rate of evaporation far
11 exceeds the very slow rate of percolation. In addition, sedimenta-
12 tion and settling also reduce the rate of percolation further as
13 time goes on. Simply allowing the water to sit in ponds and drains
14 to eventually evaporate and/or percolate would be a waste of a
15 resource. The District is entitled to utilize this method, and the
16 Ground Water Users could not complain of injury because of the
17 drain water's non-use.

18 The most efficient option for use of the drain water is
19 irrigation. (Affidavit of Brockway) According to Dr. Brockway,
20 irrigation maximizes the return of water to the aquifer and limits
21 the amount lost to evaporation. In other words, the use of the
22 drain water for irrigation does not increase consumptive, does not
23 reduce return flows to the aquifer, and does not injure junior
24 right holders. Furthermore, utilization of drain water for irriga-
25 tion complies with the State's policy of putting water to a
26 beneficial use and avoiding unnecessary waste.

1
2
3 It is ironic that the very approach which will most
4 benefit the Ground Water Users is the very use to which they appear
5 to be opposed. Perhaps the Ground Water Users recognize that
6 without an injury, there can be no subordination? Certainly there
7 can be no injury to the Ground Water Users where the District's
8 utilization actually provides a greater amount of return to the
9 aquifer and cuts down on the amount of evaporation loss. Under
10 these circumstances, there is no justification for the subordina-
11 tion language contained in the Special Master's Report and
12 Recommendation.

13 D. Even if it is determined that the drain water used
14 by the District is subordinated to the subsequent appropriation of
15 ground water by others, Claim Nos. 36-15193B and 36-15194B are
16 constitutional appropriations of surface water not covered by I.C.
17 \$42-1426 or I.C. \$42-1416, and therefore may not be subordinated to
18 junior water rights.

19 This issue is addressed in part above in the discussion
20 characterizing the source of the water utilized. Despite the
21 efforts of the Ground Water Users, it is clear that drain water is
22 a source which must be recognized in the District's claims. If the
23 proper sources are recognized, Claim Nos. 36-15193B and 36-15194B
24 are constitutional appropriations of surface water prior to 1971
25 and are not subject to subordination. They instead would maintain
26 the priority date established by putting those waters to beneficial
27 use. It appears that the respondents' Response Brief is silent on
28 this issue and only argues the characterization of the source of

1
2
3 the water. It is presumed that the silence is acquiescence to the
4 conclusion stated hereinabove.

5 E. To the extent ground water is utilized by the
6 District on enlargement acres, and to the extent subordination is
7 appropriate, if at all, the District's water rights should only be
8 subordinated to water rights established prior to March 1, 1985.

9 The issue here is whether or not the District should be
10 given the benefit of the earlier enactment date based on its
11 reliance on the statute and the Legislature's repeal of I.C.
12 §42-1416 and simultaneous re-enactment of I.C. §42-1426. The
13 respondents argue that the District did not acquire vested rights
14 under I.C. §42-1416 despite their obvious reliance on the statute.
15 Specifically, respondents state that "[b]y enacting section 42-1416
16 the Legislature never purported to create a new water right or any
17 other kind of right." This is a ridiculous assertion and an
18 inaccurate interpretation of the law.

19 A plain reading of I.C. §42-1416 suggests that in fact
20 the Legislature did intend to allow the creation of a new water
21 right by presumption. The statute reads, in pertinent part:

22 "Expansion of use after acquisition of a valid
23 unadjudicated water right in violation of the
24 mandatory permit requirements shall be pre-
25 sumed to be valid and to have created a water
26 right with a priority date as of the comple-
27 tion date of the expansion, in the absence of
28 injury to other appropriators. (Emphasis
added.)

29 A water right under this definition is clearly a property right.

30 In addition, the District did rely upon the statute. Its
31 acts were clear and unambiguous. The claims of the District were

1
2
3 filed with IDWR, and Notice of the Director's recommendations of
4 the District's claims was given as provided by statute. No
5 objections were ever filed opposing the recommendations in the
6 District's expanded water rights under I.C. §42-1416. Despite the
7 Ground Water Users' involvement in other litigation, the specific
8 requirement of filing an objection to the Director's recommenda-
9 tions on these water rights was not addressed by the Ground Water
10 Users. As such, the District did in fact acquire a vested right
11 under I.C. §42-1416.

12 Even if the District does not have vested rights as set
13 forth above, the enactment of the new statute by operation of law
14 relates back to the enactment date of the old statute. The U. S.
15 Supreme Court has held that where a statute is replaced by a new
16 statute which relates to the same subject matter and which
17 re-enacts substantially the provisions of the earlier statute, and
18 the repeal and re-enactment occur simultaneously, all rights and
19 interests arising under the original statute are preserved. Bear
20 Lake and River Water Works and Irrigation Co. v. Garland, 164 U.S.
21 1 (1896); Allied Veterans Council v. Klamath County, 544 P.2d 190
22 (Or. App. 1979); King v. Uhlmann, 437 P.2d 928 (Ariz. 1968); State
23 v. Webb, 76 Idaho 162, 279 P.2d 634 (1955). Similarly, the repeal
24 of a statute does not operate to impair or otherwise affect rights
25 which have been vested or accrued while a statute was in force.
26 King, 437 P.2d at 931 citing 82 C.G.S. Stat. Section 435 at page
27 1010. There should be no dispute that the District established

1
2
3 "vested rights" for expanded acres pursuant to I.C. §42-1416. In
4 adopting I.C. §42-1416, it is clear that the Legislature intended
5 to recognize that a constitutional water right was established by
6 diverting unappropriated waters and putting those waters to
7 beneficial use, notwithstanding the mandatory permit system that
8 had previously been adopted by the State. To advance the enactment
9 date from November 19, 1987 to April 12, 1994 is in direct
10 contradiction of the Legislature's stated policy. I.C. §42-1426
11 (1)(b). To subordinate the District's right to the later enactment
12 date of April 12, 1994 is not only clearly erroneous but fundamen-
13 tally unfair in that it ignores the District's reliance upon the
14 enactment of the statute and deprives it of a priority date it
15 would have otherwise had.

16 **F. Respondents are barred from having the District's**
17 **rights subordinated to junior rights acquired by permit after March**
1, 1985 by the doctrine of waiver and estoppel.

18 The Ground Water Users have voluntarily and intentionally
19 relinquished their right to object to the water right claimed by
20 the District under I.C. §42-1416. In the Ground Water Users'
21 Response to A&B's Opening Brief, the Ground Water Users argue that
22 this case does not involve waiver or estoppel. By making this
23 argument, the Ground Water Users attempt to gloss over the fact
24 that they had a clear and specific opportunity to object to the
25 water rights claimed by the District under I.C. §42-1416.
26 Nevertheless, the respondents were silent and relinquished their
27 right to raise an objection. The Ground Water Users further seek

1
2
3 to excuse themselves from taking such actions by indicating that they
4 steadfastly opposed the application of both the presumption statute
5 and the amnesty statute at every opportunity. However, when faced
6 with this opportunity and required by notice to object to this
7 specific water right, the Ground Water Users failed to capitalize
8 on that opportunity and have thus waived their right to object.

9 Indeed, the facts upon which the Ground Water Users rely
10 in asserting that no waiver or estoppel should apply is as non-
11 existent as the objection which they failed to file when notice was
12 provided regarding the recommendations of District's claims under
13 I.C. §42-1416. No party to the SRBA, including the respondents,
14 claimed injury as a result of the acknowledgment and presumption of
15 the enlarged water right. Furthermore, after the adoption of I.C.
16 §42-1426, Section 34 of chapter 454 of the 1994 Idaho Session Laws,
17 subsection (3)(b) clearly provided that none of the District's
18 claims were subject to further objection in view of the fact that
19 their Notice of Claim was not modified following remand to the
20 Director. By the State of Idaho accepting claims from the District
21 for enlarged water rights pursuant to I.C. §42-1416 and the failure
22 of the respondents to file objections to those claims in the SRBA,
23 a waiver of any subordination of those claims to their rights is
24 clearly established.

25 The doctrine of estoppel is also applicable. By the
26 failure of the respondents to file an objection to the Director's
27 Report in 1992 and by the respondents actually filing claims under

1
2
3 I.C. §42-1416, the respondents are estopped to deny the validity of
4 the claims of the District as originally reported. For the
5 respondents to now assert a right to a subordination clause is
6 inconsistent with their previous position. Furthermore, if that
7 position is affirmed, it is detrimental to the District.

8 The clear weight of legal authority makes it clear that
9 the Ground Water Users have waived any objection they might have
10 had to the claims and should be estopped from disputing the
11 priority of the District's enlargement claims and the rights to
12 which they are subordinated. The fact that the Special Master
13 ignored the clear weight of the legal authority on this issue is
14 clearly erroneous. Therefore, the Report and Recommendation of the
15 Special Master should be altered or amended to be consistent with
16 the law.

17 III. CONCLUSION

18 For the reasons stated herein, the Special Master's
19 Report and Recommendation should be altered and the Court should
20 find as follows:

21 1. The source of the water in the "B" claims includes
22 drain water, waste water, diffused surface water, and return flows
23 (hereinafter referred to collectively as "drain water") in addition
24 to ground water.

25 2. To the extent that drain water is the source used by
26 the District on its "B" claims, the drain water is private water
27 captured by the District within the project and is not subject to

1
2
3 appropriation by others and therefore inappropriately subordinated
4 to other ground water rights.

5 3. Use of drain water for irrigation is the most
6 effective way to return water to the aquifer and actually provides
7 a benefit to the Ground Water Users, eliminating their claim of
8 injury and the need to subordinate.

9 4. In the alternative, even if it is determined that
10 the drain water used by the District is subordinated to the
11 subsequent appropriation of ground water by others, Claim Nos.
12 36-15193B and 36-15194B are constitutional appropriations of
13 surface water not covered by I.C. §42-1426 or I.C. §42-1416, and
14 therefore may not be subordinated to junior water rights.

15 5. To the extent ground water is utilized by the
16 District on enlarged acres, and to the extent subordination is
17 appropriate, if at all, the District's water rights should only be
18 subordinated to water rights established prior to March 1, 1985.

19 6. Respondents are barred from having the District's
20 rights subordinated to junior rights acquired by permit after March
21 1, 1985 by the doctrine of waiver and estoppel.

22 Respectfully submitted this 5th day of March, 2003.

23 LING & ROBINSON

24
25 By: 

26 Jason D. Walker
27 Attorneys for Claimant/Objector
28 A & B Irrigation District

1
2
3 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

4 I hereby certify that on the 5th day of March, 2003, I served
5 a true and correct copy of the *Reply Brief of A & B Irrigation*
6 *District*, upon:

7 IDWR Document Depository
8 P. O. Box 83720
9 Boise, ID 83720-0098

10 Chief, Natural Resources Division
11 Office of the Attorney General
12 State of Idaho
13 P. O. Box 44449
14 Boise, Idaho 83711-4449

15 U. S. Department of Justice
16 Environment & Natural Resource Division
17 550 West Fort Street, MSC 033
18 Boise, Idaho 83724

19 Regional Director
20 Pacific Northwest Region
21 USDI Bureau of Reclamation
22 1150 N. Curtis Rd.
23 Boise, ID 83706-1234

24 Jeffrey C. Fereday, Esq. via fax (208) 388-1300
25 Karl T. Klein, Esq.
26 GIVENS PURSLEY, LLP
27 P. O. Box 2720
28 Boise, ID 83701

Attorneys for: Tim Deeg
Mack Neibaur
Ralph E. Breeding
Aberdeen-American Falls Ground Water District
Bingham Ground Water District
Magic Valley Ground Water District

by depositing copies thereof in the United States mail, postage
prepaid, in envelopes addressed to said parties at the foregoing
addresses.

24
25 
26 Jason D. Walker