

RECEIVED
MAY 24 2007
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 37-1151D

(Insert water right number)

STANDARD FORM 1
OBJECTION

Please fill in the following information:

B. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PERSON OBJECTING

Name: Harry S. Rinker

Address: P.O. Box 7250

Newport Beach, CA 92658

Daytime Phone: (714) 979-8300

Name & Address of Attorney, if any:

C. CLAIMANT OF WATER RIGHT AS LISTED IN DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Name: Harry S. Rinker

Address: P.O. Box 7250

Newport Beach, CA 92658

D. I object to the following elements as recommended in the Director's Report. (Please check the appropriate box(es)). See Attached Narrative

1. ☒ **Name and Address**
Should be: Harry S. Rinker at address above
2. ☐ **Source**
Should be: _____
3. ☒ **Quantity**
Should be: As decreed (combined rights - entire flow of stream)
4. ☐ **Priority Date**
Should be: _____
5. ☐ **Point of Diversion**
Should be: _____
6. ☐ **Instream Flow Beginning and Ending Point**
Should be: _____
7. ☐ **Purpose(s) of Use**
Should be: _____
8. ☐ **Period of Year**
Should be: _____
9. ☒ **Place of Use**
Should be: 361.2 acres (see narrative for justification)
10. ☐ **I object because:**
☐ This water right Should not exist.

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

E. REASONS SUPPORTING OBJECTIONS(S): Please see attached narrative.

F. VERIFICATION (must be completed)

State of California)
)ss.
County of Orange)

Harry S. Rinker, duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:
(Name of person filing objection)

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

[Signature]
(Signature of person filing objection)

(Attorney signing in representative capacity)

Subscribed and sworn to before me on:

May 21, 2007

[Signature]

Notary Public for California

Residing at: Orange County

My Commission Expires: April 9, 2008



INSTRUCTIONS FOR MAILING

You must mail the objection, to the Clerk of the court. **FAX filings will not be accepted.** You must also send a copy to all the parties listed below in the Certificate of Mailing.

G. CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that on May 21, 2007, I mailed the original and copies of this objection, including all attachments, to the following persons:

1. Original to:

Clerk of the District court
Snake River Basin Adjudication
253 Third Avenue North
PO Box 2707
Twin Falls, ID 83303-2707

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

Name: Harry S. Rinker

Address: P.O. Box 7250


Newport Beach, CA 92658

3. Copies to:

IDWR Document Depository
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098

United States Department of Justice
Environment & Nat'l Resources Div
550 W Fort Street, MSC 033
Boise, ID 83724

Chief, Natural Resources Division
Office of Attorney General
PO Box 44449
Boise, ID 83711-4449


Signature of objector or attorney
mailing on Objector's behalf

**NARRATIVE IN SUPPORT OF SF-1 OBJECTION
SNAKE RIVER BASIN ADJUDICATION**

Subcases: 37-627, 37-1150, 37-1151B, 37-1151D, 37-1152, 37-1212, 37-4192

Claimant: Harry S. Rinker

Prepared by Brockway Engineering, PLLC

Right No. 37-627

This right was originally decreed in Frost (1909), but recommended for disallowal by IDWR on the assumption that it was superseded by 37-1152 as decreed in Brown vs. Reardon (1925). Brown re-decreed all rights on Rock Creek and Guy Creek, but omitted any reference to 37-627 which was originally decreed from Smith Creek (aka Smidt Creek).

First, mere lack of mention of a water right in a particular decree does not automatically imply that the right was intended to be superseded.

Second, 37-1152 was not decreed to the identical place of use as 37-627, as indicated by IDWR staff in making the recommendation. Brown established 37-1152 from Rock Creek on two parcels of land, one owned by Christina Eastwood and one owned by W. W. Wallace, with an undivided one-half interest to each party. However, the Smith Creek right was originally decreed in Frost only to the land owned by Eastwood. In other words, Brown did not decree 37-1152 to the same place of use as 37-627.

Third, Smith Creek is a separate source from Rock Creek which could only have been utilized on the Eastwood property (the Wallace property is to the north and Smith Creek cannot reach it by gravity). A small impoundment just west of the road is still apparent. Smith Creek flows very sporadically, but lack of physical water supply is not a grounds for forfeiture and the current land owner should be allowed to continue to utilize Smith Creek water, when available, as it has been used historically.

For these reasons, it appears likely that 37-627 was established in Frost and it is incorrect to assume that it was superseded by Brown. It appears more likely that the omission of reference to Smith Creek in Brown has the effect of leaving the Smith Creek right unchanged. That is apparently how IDWR interpreted Brown prior to the SRBA, as 37-627 has been carried on the IDWR database to this day, while Rock Creek rights that were obviously superseded by Brown were not carried on the database.

Right No. 37-1150

IDWR limited the acreage under this right to 200 acres, on the belief that the decree lists the place of use as five (5) quarter-quarters and therefore the recommendation must be limited to 200 acres. This right was decreed in Brown vs. Reardon to land owned by Daniel Reardon. On page 2 of the decree, the land to which it is decreed is listed as

SE1/4 SE1/4 Section 1, N1/2 and the SE1/4 of Section 12, and the N1/2 of the NE1/4 of Section 13, all in T. 1 S., R. 17 E.

First, the decreed place of use covers 15 quarter-quarters, not 5. Second, a GIS analysis of the 1987 aerial photo by Brockway Engineering indicates that within the above place of use there are 240.4 acres irrigated, tabulated by 40-acre tract as follows:

Section	Qtr-Qtr	Acres
12	NENE	1.3
12	NWNE	10.8
12	SWNE	35.5
12	SENE	19.5
12	NENW	33.2
12	NWNW	15.5
12	SENE	12.5
12	NESE	10.6
12	NWSE	18.4
12	SWSE	20.4
12	SESE	16.5
13	NENE	19.2
13	NWNE	27.0
	Total	240.4

Therefore, right 37-1150 should be recommended for 240.4 acres. The ArcView shape file corresponding to the above acreage can be supplied by Brockway Engineering if needed.

Right No. 37-1151D

IDWR limited this right to irrigation of 350 acres, based on a GIS calculation of the acreage from the 1987 aerial photo. Brockway Engineering's independent evaluation of the acreage indicated 361.2 acres, tabulated by 40-acre tract as follows:

Section	Qtr-Qtr	Acres
14	NWNE	9.1
14	SWNE	2.0
14	NENW	10.9
14	SENE	18.9
14	NESW	15.4
14	SESW	2.6
14	NWSE	2.3
14	SWSE	22.4
23	NENE	15.0
23	NWNE	11.0
23	SENE	17.6

23	NESE	26.1
23	NWSE	0.4
23	SWSE	7.4
23	SESE	25.7
26	NENE	18.8
26	NWNE	6.0
26	SWNE	14.6
26	SENE	11.6
26	NESW	0.5
26	SESW	13.3
26	NESE	0.2
26	NWSE	34.5
26	SWSE	21.4
35	NWNE	6.6
35	SWNE	0.6
35	NENW	23.0
35	SENE	23.3
Total		361.2

Therefore, this right should be recommended for 361.2 acres. Brockway Engineering can provide the ArcView shape file corresponding to the above acreage if needed.

Right No. 37-4192

This claim was based on a statutory claim filed in 1981 by Marguerite E. Tews, the owner of the Rock Creek property at that time. In the remarks section of the statutory claim, Tews indicates that the filing was necessary to codify irrigation usage just below (south) of the southernmost area decreed in Brown vs. Reardon. That decree established water right 37-1150 on Reardon's land which extended south to the N1/2 of the NE1/4 Section 13. Tews asserts in 37-4192 prior to her acquisition of the land in 1943, irrigation water had continued southward using the same ditch system, and irrigated land within the S1/2 of the NE1/4 Section 13. Analysis by Brockway Engineering of the 1987 aerial photo indicates 32.2 acres irrigated within the S1/2 of the NE1/3 Section 13.

Because IDWR staff had no evidence of priority, the right was recommended for disallowal. Water has been used on the S1/2 of the NE1/4 Section 13 prior to 1971, and therefore a surface water right has been established by beneficial use. To disallow the entire claim for lack of priority evidence is unwarranted. The claimant is willing to attempt to justify pre-1971 usage via aerial photos and/or affidavits from prior owners if possible.

General objection pertaining to all water rights

The rights were decreed in Brown vs. Reardon for the entire flow of Rock Creek. Currently and historically, the water has been distributed via earthen ditches and the land

has been irrigated by gravity methods. Based on the NRCS soil survey, the predominant soil is loam or silt loam with moderate available water holding capacity, and the potential for gravel or sand layers at depth. Historic cropping has been pasture and alfalfa. The duty of water is undoubtedly greater than 0.02 cfs per acre; however, IDWR did not perform an analysis to determine the historic duty of water, even though the claimant is entitled to the maximum diversion rate that has historically been put to beneficial use. Instead, perhaps as a matter of expediency, IDWR assumed 0.02 cfs/acre for every portion of the property. This is contrary to IDWR's practice for rights in the Big Wood River and other streams in Basin 37-Part 3, for which the flow rate listed in the Watermaster's decree book was used for the recommendations.

The ramifications of the 0.02 cfs/acre assumption are as follows:

- 1) 37-1151D was incorrectly limited to 7.0 cfs (0.02 cfs/acre on 350 acres)
- 2) 37-1152 was incorrectly disallowed because it covers the same POU as 37-1151D and would therefore result in greater than 0.02 cfs/acre on the land.
- 3) 37-1150 was incorrectly limited to 4.0 cfs (0.02 cfs/acre on 200 acres; acreage problem discussed above).
- 4) 37-1151B and 37-1212 combined were incorrectly limited to 0.86 cfs (0.02 cfs/acre on 43 acres).