

1. Objectors' previous objections questioned whether a private party had the legal authority to hold such water rights for aesthetic, wildlife or recreation uses. Objectors are interested in impacts to the water supply from impounding water in the upper portions of Part 3 of Basin 37 and in particular the reduction in flows on the Big Wood, springs, and groundwater. Objectors' interest is not in debating the authority of the Department to act without legislative or constitutional authorization to permit private parties to hold water rights for private enjoyment of ponds and streamlets.

2. Objectors wish to withdraw their objections to the existence of the water right on those grounds and to amend their objection to object to quantity of water used in the ponds and other aesthetic, wildlife, or recreation amenities which exceed rates of use of the original water rights and which exceed the beneficial use requirements of the aesthetic, wildlife or recreational use.

3. Objectors filed timely objections to this right. By amending the objections at this time, Objectors are providing adequate notice of the entire range of issues they intend to pursue. Objectors are amending their objections in a way that disposes of a significant legal issue. This amendment will focus their objections on the factual circumstances surrounding the beneficial use of water under this right. This amendment narrows the issues in this Subcase by eliminating an overarching legal issue. The amendment turns to a subset of that issue, i.e., the extent of beneficial use, rather than whether the use is "beneficial" in the first place.


4. No prejudice will accrue to any party as no status conferences have been held, no case management schedule has been adopted, and no partial decrees have been entered.

5. Counsel for Objectors has contacted counsel for claimants in the captioned matter, who have not indicated whether they support or oppose said motion.

6. This Court, through Special Master Dolan, recently permitted the City of Pocatello to amend its objections in Subcases 01-209, et al. "Minidoka Credit Remark" even when the amendment there expanded the issues in the Subcase, when the Motion was brought in the earliest stages of the subcase, as is this Motion. Here the amendment narrows the issues in this Subcase.


DATED this 4th day of June, 2008.

BARKER ROSHOLT & SIMPSON LLP



Albert P. Barker
*Attorneys for Tom O'Gara, John F. Stevenson,
Bill Molyneux, Pete Van Der Meulen, Grace Eakin,
Rocky Sherbine, Gerald Bashaw, and Pepin
Corso-Harris*

HOBDEY & HOBDEY



Craig Hobdey
Attorneys for Big Wood Canal Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that on this 4th day of June, 2008, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **MOTION TO AMEND OBJECTION** and **STANDARD FORM ONE OBJECTION, AMENDED** by the method indicated below, and addressed to each of the following:

1. Original hand-delivered to:

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

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

Name: Sun Valley Land and Minerals Inc.
Address: Served c/o counsel below

3. Copies mailed to:

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


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

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

Scott L. Campbell
Moffatt Thomas Barrett Rock & Fields
P.O. Box 829
Boise, ID 83701

James P. Speck
Speck & Aanestad
P.O. Box 987
Ketchum, Id 83340

Edward A. Lawson
Lawson & Laski
P. O. Box 3310
Ketchum, ID 83340



Albert P. Barker

EXHIBIT A

**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	)	A. Subcase No. 37-02446
	)	
Case No. 39576	)	STANDARD FORM 1
	)	OBJECTION
_____	)	AMENDED

Please fill in the following information:

B. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PERSON OBJECTING:

Tom O'Gara	Big Wood Canal Company
John F. Stevenson	112 South Apple Street
Bill Molyneux	Shoshone, ID 83352
Pete Van Der Meulen	
Grace Eakin	
Rocky Sherbine	
Gerald Bashaw	
Pepin Corso-Harris	
c/o Concerned Water Users	
P.O. Box 1200	
Bellevue, ID 83313	

Name and Address of Attorney, if any:

Albert P. Barker	Craig Hobdey
Barker, Rosholt & Simpson, LLP	Hobdey & Hobdey
P.O. Box 2139	P.O. Box 176
Boise, ID 83701	Gooding, ID 83330
Telephone: (208) 336-0700	Telephone: (208) 934-4420
Attorney for O'Gara, Stevenson,	Attorney for Big Wood Canal Company
Molyneux, Van Der Meulen, Eakin,	
Sherbine & Bashaw	

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

Name: Rinker Co.
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 boxes):

1. ☐ **Name and Address**
Should be:
2. ☐ **Source**
Should be:
3. ☒ **Quantity**
Should be: See "E" Below.
4. ☒ **Priority Date**
Should be: date of enlargement of water right
5. ☐ **Point(s) of Diversion**
Should be:
6. ☐ **Instream Flow Beginning and Ending Point**
Should be:
7. ☒ **Purpose(s) of Use**
Should be: See "E" Below.
8. ☐ **Period of Year**
Should be:
9. ☐ **Place of Use**
Should be:
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 OBJECTION(S):

Diversion Rate:

Should be set at the same diversion rate as an irrigation right: one inch per acre for every acre of surface area of the aesthetic, recreation or wildlife use, not to exceed the right from which the aesthetic, recreation or wildlife use is derived, and not to exceed the actual beneficial use. Conveyance loss can not exceed the original right's conveyance loss.

Volume/Consumptive Use:

Should be limited to the irrigation annual total volume of 3.5 feet per acre, not to exceed the right from which the aesthetic, recreation or wildlife use is derived, and not to exceed the actual beneficial use.

Measurement:

A single measuring device is not sufficient to adequately measure the usage by ponds and other aesthetic streamlets. Flow measuring devices specified by the Department and/or water master should be installed at the point of diversion (from stream/or to storage) and the point of discharge back to the natural stream. The measuring devices should provide a means of measurement and lockable controlling works to provide suitable control of diversion.

Administration:


The water right should be regulated by the water master of State Water District No. 37.


Water Quality:

The water used under said right when discharged back to a natural channel should comply with Idaho Water Quality Standards. The monitoring of the standards should be allowable and conducted by the Idaho Department of Water Resources and/or the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.

Tom O'Gara
John F. Stevenson
Bill Molyneux
Pete Van Der Meulen
Grace Eakin
Rocky Sherbine
Gerald Bashaw
Pepin Corso-Harris

Big Wood Canal Company

By: 
Albert P. Barker, Attorney

By: 
Craig Hobdey, Attorney


VERIFICATION

State of IDAHO)
) ss.
County of Ada)


Albert P. Barker, duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:


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 of person filing objection)


(Attorney signing in representative capacity)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 4th day of June, 2008.




NOTARY PUBLIC FOR IDAHO
Residing in: Boise, Idaho
My Commission Expires: 6/1/2012