

RECEIVED

JUN 27 2008

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

Josephine P. Beeman #1806
Beeman & Associates, P.C.
409 West Jefferson Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 331-0950
(208) 331-0954 (Facsimile)
jo.beeman@beemanlaw.com

Attorneys for City of Pocatello

**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	)	Subcase Nos. 29-271 et al. (see Attachment A)
	)	
Case No. 39576	)	THE CITY OF POCATELLO'S
	)	BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
_____	)	STAY PROCEEDINGS IN THIRTY (30)
		STATE LAW CLAIMS

INTRODUCTION

The City of Pocatello respectfully submits this *Brief in Support of Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims*.¹

The *Motion to Stay* is addressed to the *Notice of Challenge* proceedings arising from SRBA Special Master Bilyeu's May 28, 2008 *Order Denying Motion To Alter Or Amend* for the thirty (30) state law claims. The City of Pocatello's *Notice of Challenge* and *Motion to Stay* were filed June 11, 2008 with SRBA District Judge Melanson.

¹ As governed by SRBA Administrative Order 1, this *Brief* is submitted pursuant to IRCP 7(b)(3)(C) which provides that a brief in support of a motion may be filed within fourteen (14) days of the motion. The City of Pocatello's *Motion to Stay Proceedings In Thirty (30) State Law Claims* was filed and served on June 11, 2008; the 14-day deadline to file the brief is June 25, 2008.

The *Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims* advises the Court that Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609 which was appealed to the Idaho Supreme Court² is now pending proceedings before the United States Supreme Court.³

That appeal may moot the recently concluded proceedings before Special Master Bilyeu for these thirty (30) state law claims or may require the Special Master's Report & Recommendation to be modified to be consistent with the mandate in the appeal. Pocatello requests that this Court stay the proceedings on these thirty (30) state law claims until after the mandate in the appeal. These 30 state law claims are part of the 38 state law claims filed by the City of Pocatello in the SRBA.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF POCATELLO'S FEDERAL LAW CLAIM 29-11609 TO THE CITY'S STATE LAW CLAIMS IS COMMON TO ALL 38 STATE LAW CLAIMS

On December 23, 2004, as part of the proceedings on all 38 state law SRBA claims, Pocatello filed a *Motion and Memorandum to Stay its State Law-Based Claims* pending determination of the City's legal entitlement under its SRBA federal-law claim 29-11609.⁴ Special Master Bilyeu denied Pocatello's motion for stay by order of January 14, 2005.

² Idaho Supreme Court No. 33669: IN RE: SRBA CASE NO. 39576, SUBCASE NO. 29-11609, CITY OF POCATELLO, *Appellants*, vs. STATE OF IDAHO, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and SHOSHONE-BANNOCK TRIBES, *Respondents*. The decision of the Idaho Supreme Court was entered February 19, 2008. A timely petition for rehearing was denied, and a final judgment was entered by the Supreme Court of Idaho on April 3, 2008. The City of Pocatello's time to petition the United States Supreme Court for a Writ of Certiorari to the Idaho Supreme Court expires July 2, 2008.

³ The City of Pocatello has filed with the United States Supreme Court an Application for Extension of Time to File a Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The Application seeks an extension to August 1, 2008 to file the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. A June 3, 2008 service copy of the City's Application was referenced in the June 11 *Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims*, but inadvertently was not attached. Filed this date is an Addendum to the *Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims*, attaching Pocatello's Application to the United States Supreme Court.

⁴ Pocatello's December 2004 *Motion to Stay its State Law-Based Claims* and *Memorandum in Support of Motion to Stay* are attached to this Brief. See footnote 5.

Following denial of the City's *Motion for Stay* in January 2005, and prior to commencement of trial on February 26, 2007, objections were withdrawn or settlements entered for eight of the City's 38 state law subcases. Those resolved subcases did not address or resolve the issue raised in Pocatello's 2004 *Motion for Stay*. When partial decrees were entered for the eight resolved subcases in July 2007, Pocatello filed a *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees*⁵ because of the pending appeal of Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609 to the Idaho Supreme Court.⁶ The *Motion for Reconsideration* was referred to Special Master Bilyeu for hearing on October 10, 2007, and is presently scheduled for continued hearing before Special Master Bilyeu on July 9, 2008.

The *Motion for Reconsideration* explained that the pending appeal "may moot the eight partial decrees or may require the eight partial decrees to be modified to be consistent with the mandate in the appeal." In order to circumvent a later appeal,⁷ the City requested this Court to withdraw the entry of judgment and delay entry of judgment for these eight water rights until after the mandate in the appeal.

In July 2007, when the *Motion for Reconsideration* was filed, the City's remaining 30 state law SRBA claims were pending decision following trial before SRBA Special Master

⁵ The *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees* and *Brief In Support Of Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees* are attached to this brief. The *Brief In Support Of Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees* includes Pocatello's December 2004 *Motion to Stay its State Law-Based Claims* and *Memorandum in Support of Motion to Stay*. This court may take judicial notice of its own records in the case before it. *Larson v. State*, 91 Idaho 908, 909, 435 P.2d 248, 249 (1967).

⁶ At the time the City filed the *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees*, briefing had not yet been completed in the Idaho Supreme Court appeal; Pocatello's Reply brief on appeal was due August 15, 2007. Idaho Supreme Court No. 33669: IN RE: SRBA CASE NO. 39576, SUBCASE NO. 29-11609, CITY OF POCATELLO, *Appellants*, vs. STATE OF IDAHO, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and SHOSHONE-BANNOCK TRIBES, *Respondents*.

⁷ *First Security Bank v. Neibaur*, 98 Idaho 598, 570 P.2d 276 (1977).

Bilyeu. The City of Pocatello's *Notice of Challenge* and *Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims*, filed June 11, 2008, complete the City's requests to this Court to stay the proceedings on all thirty-eight (38) of Pocatello's state law SRBA claims until after the mandate in the appeal of Pocatello's federal law claim 29-11609.

IT IS APPROPRIATE TO STAY THE STATE LAW CLAIMS PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE STANDARD THAT COURTS HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO CORRECT ERRORS OF FACT AND LAW IN ORDER TO CIRCUMVENT A LATER APPEAL

In July 2007, due to the pending appeal of Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609 at the Idaho Supreme Court, Pocatello respectfully requested this court to reconsider the partial decrees for 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222, 29-7431, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and 29-13636. Pocatello specifically asked that this Court withdraw the entry of judgment and delay entry of judgment for these eight water rights until after the mandate in the appeal.

Now, in June 2008, Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609 is pending proceedings before the United States Supreme Court, following entry of decision by the Idaho Supreme Court. Pocatello respectfully requests this court to stay the proceedings on the City's remaining state law claims pending the mandate on appeal.

IRCP 59(e) was the premise for the July 2007 *Motion for Reconsideration*, but its purpose is also served by the present *Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims*.⁸ It is appropriate to allow the court to correct errors of fact and law which have occurred in its proceedings in order to circumvent a later appeal.⁹

⁸ Pocatello's present *Motion for Stay* was filed in advance of any final judgment for the affected 30 state law SRBA claims. IRCP 11(a)(2) (B) provides that a motion for reconsideration of any interlocutory orders of the trial court may be made at any time before the entry of final judgment.

⁹ *First Security Bank v. Neibaur*, 98 Idaho 598, 570 P.2d 276 (1977).


The City has always intended that the denial of its 2004 *Motion for Stay* would be presented to this Court upon review of the Special Master's proceedings as to all 38 state law claims, following conclusion of the proceedings that went to trial.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the City of Pocatello respectfully requests that its *Motion to Stay Proceedings in Thirty (30) State Law Claims* be granted.

Respectfully submitted this 25th day of June 2008.

BEEMAN & ASSOCIATES P.C.
Attorneys for the City of Pocatello

By 
Josephine P. Beeman

Attachment A (30 subcases)

29-00271
29-00272
29-00273
29-02274
29-02338
29-02401
29-02499
29-04221
29-04222
29-04223
29-04224
29-04225
29-04226
29-07106
29-07118
29-07119
29-07322
29-07375
29-07450
29-07770
29-11339
29-11348
29-13558
29-13559
29-13560
29-13561
29-13562
29-13637
29-13638
29-13639

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 25th day of June 2008, I caused a true copy of the foregoing **POCATELLO'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS FOR THIRTY (30) STATE LAW CLAIMS** be served by the method indicated on:

AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR DIST #2

Represented by:
C THOMAS ARKOOSH
DAVID HEIDA
301 MAIN ST
PO BOX 32
GOODING, ID 83330
Phone: 208-934-8872

Via email

STATE OF IDAHO

Represented by:
NATURAL RESOURCES DIV CHIEF
STATE OF IDAHO
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
PO BOX 44449
BOISE, ID 83711-4449

Via U.S. mail

A & B IRRIGATION DISTRICT
BURLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Represented by:
ROGER D LING
PO BOX 396
RUPERT, ID 83350-0396
Phone: 208-436-4717

Via email

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

Via U.S. mail

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Represented by:
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
ENVIRONMENT & NAT'L RESOURCES
550 WEST FORT STREET, MSC 033
BOISE, ID 83724

Via U.S. mail

MINIDOKA IRRIGATION DISTRICT


Represented by:
W KENT FLETCHER
1200 OVERLAND AVE
PO BOX 248
BURLEY, ID 83318
Phone: 208-678-3250

Via email

MILNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT
NORTH SIDE CANAL COMPANY
TWIN FALLS CANAL COMPANY

Represented by:
TRAVIS L THOMPSON
113 MAIN AVE W, STE 303
PO BOX 485
TWIN FALLS, ID 83303-0485
Phone: 207-733-0700

Via email


Josephine P. Beeman

Josephine P. Beeman #1806
Anna R. Trentadue #7519
Beeman & Associates, P.C.
409 West Jefferson Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 331-0950
(208) 331-0954 (Facsimile)
jo.beeman@beemanlaw.com
anna.trentadue@beemanlaw.com

RECEIVED
JUL 31 2007
DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

Attorneys for City of Pocatello

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	)	Subcase Nos. 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222,
	)	29-7341, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and
Case No. 39576	)	29-13636
	)	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF
_____	)	EIGHT (8) PARTIAL DECREES

The City of Pocatello respectfully submits this *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees*: 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222, 29-7341, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and 29-13636. In accordance with SRBA Administrative Order 1¹ and Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), Pocatello's *Motion* must be "served not later than fourteen (14) days after entry of the judgment." These partial decrees for the City of Pocatello were entered July 16, 2007; the service deadline for Rule 59(e) is July 30, 2007.

Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609 is currently on appeal to the Idaho Supreme Court.² That appeal may moot these 8 partial decrees or may require the 8 partial decrees to be modified to be consistent with the mandate in the appeal. Pocatello requests that

¹ Administrative Order 1, Rule 1.a provides: "[t]he litigation of the SRBA will be governed by the Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure (I.R.C.P.), Idaho Rules of Evidence (I.R.E.), and the Idaho Appellate Rules (I.A.R.)."

² Idaho Supreme Court No. 33669: IN RE: SRBA CASE NO. 39576, SUBCASE NO. 29-11609, CITY OF POCATELLO, *Appellants*, vs. STATE OF IDAHO, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and SHOSHONE-BANNOCK TRIBES, *Respondents*.


this Court withdraw the entry of judgment and delay entry of judgment for these 8 water rights until after the mandate in the appeal. The City's basis for this *Motion* will be explained in more detail in a brief to be submitted by Monday, August 13, 2007. IRCP 7(b)(3)(C).

Pocatello requests the court to schedule oral argument on this matter.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of July 2007.

BEEMAN & ASSOCIATES P.C.
Attorneys for the City of Pocatello

By


Josephine P. Beeman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 30th day of July 2007, I caused a true copy of the foregoing **MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF EIGHT (8) PARTIAL DECREES** to be served by U.S. First Class Mail on:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
REPRESENTED BY:
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
ENVIRONMENT & NAT'L RESOURCES
550 WEST FORT STREET, MSC 033
BOISE, ID 83724

STATE OF IDAHO
REPRESENTED BY:
NATURAL RESOURCES DIV CHIEF
STATE OF IDAHO
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
PO BOX 44449
BOISE, ID 83711-4449

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

GARRICK BAXTER
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER
RESOURCES
322 EAST FRONT STREET
PO BOX 83720
BOISE, IDAHO 83720-0098



Josephine P. Beeman

Z2088\8037

Dave

RECEIVED

AUG 14 2007

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

Josephine P. Beeman #1806
Anna R. Trentadue #7519
Beeman & Associates, P.C.
409 West Jefferson Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 331-0950
(208) 331-0954 (Facsimile)
jo.beeman@beemanlaw.com
anna.trentadue@beemanlaw.com

Attorneys for City of Pocatello

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	)	Subcase Nos. 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222,
	)	29-7431, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and
Case No. 39576	)	29-13636
	)	BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
_____	)	RECONSIDERATION OF EIGHT (8)
		PARTIAL DECREES

INTRODUCTION

The City of Pocatello respectfully submits this *Brief in Support of Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees*: 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222, 29-7431, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and 29-13636.

As governed by SRBA Administrative Order 1,¹ this *Brief* is submitted pursuant to IRCP 7(b)(3)(C) which provides that a brief in support of a motion may be filed within fourteen (14) days of the Motion. The City of Pocatello's *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees* was served on July 30, 2007;² the 14-day deadline to file the brief is August 13, 2007.

¹ Administrative Order 1, Rule 1.a provides: "[t]he litigation of the SRBA will be governed by the Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure (I.R.C.P.), Idaho Rules of Evidence (I.R.E.), and the Idaho Appellate Rules (I.A.R.)."

² Pocatello submitted the *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees* pursuant to IRCP 59(e) which requires that the motion be served "not later than fourteen (14) days after entry of the judgment." The partial decrees for 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222, 29-7431, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and 29-13636 were entered on July 16, 2007; the deadline for service of the Motion to Reconsider under IRCP 59(e) was July 30, 2007.

Pocatello filed the *Motion to Reconsider* because the pending appeal of Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609 to the Idaho Supreme Court³ may moot these 8 partial decrees or may require the 8 partial decrees to be modified to be consistent with the mandate in the appeal.

These 8 partial decrees arise from 8 of Pocatello's 38 state-law SRBA claims. On December 27, 2004, as part of the proceedings on all 38 state-law SRBA claims, Pocatello filed a *Motion and Memorandum to Stay its State Law-Based Claims* pending determination of the City's legal entitlement under its SRBA federal-law claim 29-11609.⁴ Special Master Bilyeu denied Pocatello's motion for stay by order of January 14, 2005. The other 30 state law SRBA claims are pending decision following a 2007 trial before SRBA Special Master Bilyeu.

**RULE 59 (e) IS AN APPROPRIATE STANDARD FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF THE EIGHT PARTIAL DECREES**

The purpose of IRCP 59(e) is to allow the court to correct errors of fact and law which have occurred in its proceedings in order to circumvent a later appeal.⁵ Due to the pending appeal of Pocatello's federal law SRBA claim 29-11609, Pocatello respectfully requests this court to reconsider the partial decrees for 29-2354, 29-2382, 29-7222, 29-7431, 29-7502, 29-7782, 29-11344, and 29-13636. Pocatello requests that this Court withdraw the entry of judgment and delay entry of judgment for these 8 water rights until after the mandate in the appeal.

³ Idaho Supreme Court No. 33669: IN RE: SRBA CASE NO. 39576, SUBCASE NO. 29-11609, CITY OF POCATELLO, *Appellants*, vs. STATE OF IDAHO, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and SHOSHONE-BANNOCK TRIBES, *Respondents*. The briefing in this appeal will be completed with the filing of Pocatello's Reply brief, due August 15, 2007.

⁴ Pocatello's *Motion to Stay* and *Memorandum in Support of Motion to Stay* are attached to this *Brief in Support of Motion for Reconsideration*. This court may take judicial notice of its own records in the case before it. *Larson v. State*, 91 Idaho 908, 909, 435 P.2d 248, 249 (1967).

⁵ *First Security Bank v. Neibaur*, 98 Idaho 598, 570 P.2d 276 (1977).

**POCATELLO'S STATE-LAW SRBA PROCEEDINGS
AS RELATED TO THE RULE 59(e) STANDARD**

The issue of the relationship between Pocatello's federal law claim 29-11609 and the City's state-law claims, addressed in the 2004 *Motion for Stay*, is common to all 38 state-law claims. Following denial of the City's *Motion for Stay* in January 2005, and prior to commencement of trial on February 26, 2007, objections were withdrawn or settlements entered for eight of the City's 38 state law subcases. These eight (8) partial decrees arise from those resolved subcases, but those subcases do not address or resolve the issue raised in Pocatello's 2004 *Motion for Stay*. The remaining 30 state-law claims were tried before Special Master Bilyeu.

The City has always intended that the denial of its 2004 *Motion for Stay* would be presented to this Court upon review of the Special Master's proceedings as to all 38 state-law claims, following conclusion of the proceedings that went to trial. If the appeal of Pocatello's federal law claim is still pending at that time, the City anticipates that it will address that issue as appropriate under the circumstances.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the City of Pocatello respectfully requests that its *Motion for Reconsideration of Eight (8) Partial Decrees* be granted.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of August 2007.

BEEMAN & ASSOCIATES P.C.
Attorneys for the City of Pocatello

By 
Josephine P. Beeman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 13TH day of August 2007, I caused a true copy of the foregoing **BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF EIGHT (8) PARTIAL DECREES** be served by U.S. First Class Mail on:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
REPRESENTED BY:
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
ENVIRONMENT & NAT'L RESOURCES
550 WEST FORT STREET, MSC 033
BOISE, ID 83724

STATE OF IDAHO
REPRESENTED BY:
NATURAL RESOURCES DIV CHIEF
STATE OF IDAHO
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
PO BOX 44449
BOISE, ID 83711-4449

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

SARAH A. KLAHN
WHITE & JANKOWSKI, LLP
511 SIXTEENTH STREET, SUITE 500
DENVER, COLORADO 80202


DAVID HEIDA
P O BOX 32
GOODING ID 83330

C. TOM ARKOOSH
ARKOOSH LAW OFFICES, CHTD.
PO BOX 32
GOODING, IDAHO 83330

W. KENT FLETCHER
FLETCHER LAW OFFICE
PO BOX 248
BURLEY, IDAHO 83318

ROGER D. LING
LING ROBINSON & WALKER
PO BOX 396
RUPERT, IDAHO 83350

JOHN A. ROSHOLT
TRAVIS L. THOMPSON
BARKER ROSHOLT & SIMPSON
113 MAIN AVE. WEST, SUITE 303
TWIN FALLS, IDAHO 83301-6167


Josephine P. Beeman

Z2088\8037

Josephine P. Beeman #1806
Beeman & Associates, P.C.
409 West Jefferson Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 331-0950
(208) 331-0954 (Facsimile)
office@beemanlaw.com

RECEIVED

DEC 28 2004

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	)	Subcase Nos. 29-00271, et al. (see attached)
	)	
	)	
Case No. 39576	)	POCATELLO'S MOTION TO STAY ITS
_____	)	STATE LAW-BASED CLAIMS

Pocatello moves to stay its claims in the 38 subcases listed herein. These 38 state law-based claims are "dual-based" claims because the state law-based claims are for water¹ also claimed by Pocatello under federal law in subcase 29-11609. The state law-based claims should be stayed for at least two reasons:

1. The SRBA court in Basin-Wide Issue No. 12 (Subcase No. 91-00012) determined that the claims with the earlier priority date in a dual-claim should proceed first. Pocatello claims a June 14, 1867 priority date for its federal law-based claim, which is earlier than the priority dates named in its state law-based claims.

¹ Note that the federal claim (29-11609) is broader than the state-based claims, because Pocatello has claimed its federal water right consistent with the Act of September 1, 1888, *e.g.*, from "the waters of any river, creek, stream, or spring flowing through the Fort Hall Reservation in the vicinity of said town [of Pocatello]...as may be necessary to provide said town with proper water and sewerage facilities." See ¶4 and Remark #15 of Pocatello's federal claim 29-11609. These sources include, without limitation, the Blackfoot River, Portneuf River, Snake River, Bannock Creek, Jeff Cabin Creek, Mink Creek, Lincoln Creek, Rattlesnake Creek, Ross Fork Creek, Sand Creek, and Toponce Creek.

2. Prosecuting both the state law-based claims and the federal law-based claim at the same time frustrates judicial economy and is unnecessarily costly to the litigants in both cases. Pocatello would prefer to rely on its federally claimed right. Once the federal right decree enters, Pocatello will move to dismiss whatever part of its state-based claims is duplicative of its federal law-based claim.

Pocatello respectfully requests that its motion be granted.

DATED this 23rd day of December 2004.

BEEMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
Attorneys for the City of Pocatello

By Josephine P. Beeman
Josephine P. Beeman

EXHIBIT A

Subcase Numbers

29-00271
29-00272
29-00273
29-02274
29-02338
29-02354
29-02382
29-02401
29-02499
29-04221
29-04222
29-04223
29-04224
29-04225
29-04226
29-07106
29-07118
29-07119
29-07222
29-07322
29-07375
29-07431
29-07450
29-07502
29-07770
29-07782
29-11339
29-11344
29-11348
29-13558
29-13559
29-13560
29-13561
29-13562
29-13636
29-13637
29-13638
29-13639

Josephine P. Beeman #1806
Beeman & Associates, P.C.
409 West Jefferson Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 331-0950
(208) 331-0954 (Facsimile)
office@beemanlaw.com

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	)	Subcase Nos. 29-00271, et al. (see attached)
	)	
	)	
Case No. 39576	)	POCATELLO'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
_____	)	MOTION TO STAY ITS STATE LAW-BASED
		CLAIMS

Pocatello seeks to stay the proceedings in its state law-based claims in the 38 subcases herein. These are "dual-based" claims, which the SRBA court defines as claims to the same water under separate legal theories. *See* Special Master's Amended Recommendation Re: Basin-Wide Issue 12, June 14, 1996 at 3 (hereinafter "Issue 12 Order") (*affirmed in its entirety* by Judge Hurlbutt's Order, April 25, 1997).¹ Here, Pocatello's federal law-based claim seeks entitlement under federal law for the water represented by its 38 state law-based claims. However, the federal law-based claim is also broader² because it claims sources consistent with the Act of September 1, 1888, and also complies with I.C. § 42-1409(1)(c)(ii).

¹ Judge Hurlbutt's Order at page 5 reads: "F. A Single Water Rights Cannot Be Decreed With Both a State and Federal Basis. This recommendation is adopted in its entirety."

² In its federal law-based claim, Pocatello has claimed water rights consistent with the Act of September 1, 1888 (*see* ¶4 and Remark #15 of Pocatello's federal claim), *e.g.*, from "the waters of any river, creek, stream, or spring flowing through the Fort Hall Reservation in the vicinity of said town [of Pocatello]... as may be necessary to provide said town with proper water and sewerage facilities." These sources include, without limitation, the Blackfoot River, Portneuf River, Snake River, Bannock Creek, Jeff Cabin Creek, Mink Creek, Lincoln Creek, Rattlesnake Creek, Ross Fork Creek, Sand Creek, and Toponce Creek.

Although the federal law claim is broader than the state-based claims, where the federal claim and state claims overlap, they differ only by priority date. These are "dual-based" claims. Special Master Haemmerle framed the inquiry before the court when faced with a "dual-based" claim as follows:

(1) whether an implied or express reserved right exists when the same water source already has been appropriated under state grounds or (2) whether a state-based claim exists where the same water has been reserved.... In summary, for both express and implied reservations, the court concludes that a state-based claim for any purpose of use would preclude a federal reservation for the same water where the state-based claim has an earlier priority date. On the other hand, if a federal reservation predates a state-based claim, then the earlier federal reservation precludes the state-based claim....

The court goes on:

If the state-based half of a "dual-based" claim is objected to and has an earlier priority date, then the court should determine the state-based claim first. If the Court finds that a state-based right exists, then the federal reserved claim should be dismissed as a matter of law. On the other hand, if the federal reserved claim has an earlier priority date, then the federal reserved claim should be determined first. If the court finds that a federal reserved right exists, then the subsequent state-based claim should be dismissed as a matter of law.

Pursuant to SRBA court procedures, then, Pocatello's state-based claims should be stayed until its federal law-based claim can be determined by the court. Pocatello intends to rely on its federal law-based right to the extent it is decreed; staying its state-based claims which it will be required to dismiss following the determination of its federal law-based claims promotes judicial economy and preserves the resources of the litigants.

For the reasons stated above, Pocatello respectfully requests that proceedings on state law-based claims be stayed until determination of its federal law-based claim. Such stay should be in force until 60 days following final determination of its federal law-based claim, including the expiration of the parties' rights to appeal, when Pocatello must either file a motion to dismiss its state-based claims or set a status conference for the state-based claims.

DATED this 23rd day of December 2004.

BEEMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
Attorneys for the City of Pocatello

By Josephine P. Beeman
Josephine P. Beeman