

RECEIVED
MAY 08 2006
DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

**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)
)

)

A. Subcase No. 29-7375

**STANDARD FORM 2
RESPONSE TO OBJECTION**

B. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PERSON RESPONDING:

Name: Twin Falls Canal Company Milner Irrigation District
Address: P.O. Box 326 5294 E 3610 N
 Twin Falls, Idaho 83303-0326 Murtaugh, Idaho 83344

North Side Canal Company
921 N. Lincoln Ave.
Jerome, Idaho 83338

Name and Address of Attorney:

Attorney Name: John K. Simpson / Travis L. Thompson
Attorney Address Barker Rosholt & Simpson LLP
 113 Main Ave W., Suite 303
 P.O. Box 485
 Twin Falls, Idaho 83303-0485
Attorney Phone: (208) 733-0700

C. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PERSON WHO FILED OBJECTION TO WHICH YOU
ARE RESPONDING:

Name: City of Pocatello
Address: P.O. Box 4169
 Pocatello, ID 83205

D. I am responding to the objection(s) to the following elements:

1. ☐ Name and Address
2. ☒ Source
3. ☒ Quantity
4. ☒ Priority Date
5. ☒ Point(s) of Diversion
6. ☐ Instream Flow Description
7. ☒ Purpose(s) of Use
8. ☐ Period of Year
9. ☒ Place of Use
10. ☒ Claimant's Proposed General Provisions
11. Recommendation:

☐ This water right should not exist

☐ This water right was not recommended, but should be recommended with the elements described above.

BRIEF EXPLANATION FOR RESPONSE.

In its Amended Objection filed on or about November 19, 2003, claimant City of Pocatello alleged that the claim "includes accomplished change in point of diversion" including 23 points of diversion. Respondent is unaware of any basis for including other points of diversion under this right, or for including such a remark stating the same, and therefore opposes the same.

In its Amended Objection filed on or about November 19, 2003, claimant City of Pocatello alleged that the "place of uses is within the service area of the City of Pocatello municipal water supply system as provided for under Idaho law, including all lands necessary to complete the beneficial use of this municipal water right." Respondent is unaware of any basis for changing the place of use under this water right to the vague and undescribed place of use alleged by Pocatello, or for including such a remark stating the same, and therefore Respondent opposes the same.

In its Amended Objection filed on or about November 19, 2003, claimant City of Pocatello

requested the inclusion of a general provisions regarding "source, quantity, priority date and purpose of use" that relates to Pocatello's reservoir and tank storage facilities. Respondent is unaware of any basis for the inclusion of such general provision and therefore opposes it as unnecessary to define or administer the water right.

In its Amended Objection filed on or about November 19, 2003, claimant City of Pocatello requested the inclusion of a general provisions regarding "source, quantity, priority date and purpose of use" that relate to "separate streams" and "separate administration". Respondent is unaware of any basis for the inclusion of such general provisions and therefore opposes them as unnecessary to define or administer the water right.

In its Amended Objection filed on or about November 19, 2003, claimant City of Pocatello objects to the statement in "Other Provisions Necessary for Definition or Administration of this Water Right" relating to administration and when water was first appropriated or used. Respondent is unaware of any basis for Pocatello's objection to the statement and therefore opposes the same. Respondent is further unaware of any basis regarding Pocatello's objection that the water right should include 23 points of diversion and therefore opposes the same.


With respect to Pocatello's objection regarding a "Swan Falls" general provision, Respondent understands that this objection has been separated from Basin 29 and consolidated with similar objections as Consolidated Subcase 92-37. Accordingly, Respondent understands that this issue will not be addressed in this subcase and hereby reserves the right to participate in Consolidated Subcase 92-37.

VERIFICATION

State of IDAHO)
) ss.
County of Twin Falls)

TRAVIS L. THOMPSON, duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:



That I am the party/claimant filing this response, as defined by I.C. §§ 42-1401A(1) and (6) or that I am the attorney for the party/claimant responding, and that I have read this response, know its contents and believe that the statements are true to the best of my knowledge.



Travis L. Thompson
Barker Rosholt & Simpson LLP

Attorneys for Respondents

Subscribed and sworn to before me on: May 4, 2006



Notary Public for: Idaho
Residing at: *Twin Falls*
My Commission Expires: *08-17-2011*

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that on May 4, 2006, I mailed the original and copies of this response, including all attachments, to the following persons:

1. Original to:

Clerk of the District Court
Snake River Basin Adjudication
P.O. Box 2707
Twin Falls, ID 83303-2707

2. One copy to the claimant of the water right at the following address:

City of Pocatello
P.O. Box 4169
Pocatello, ID 83205

3. One copy to the party who filed the objection at the following address:

Josephine P. Beeman
409 W. Jefferson St.
Boise, ID 83702

4. Copies to:

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

Chief, Natural Resources Division
Office of the Attorney General
State of Idaho
P.O. Box 44449
Boise, ID 83711-4449

Tom Arkoosh
P.O. Box 32
Gooding, Idaho 83330

United States Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
550 West Fort Street, MSC 033
Boise, ID 83724

Roger Ling
P.O. Box 396
Rupert, Idaho 83350

Kent Fletcher
P.O. Box 248
Burley, Idaho 83318


Travis L. Thompson