

1-19

Dana L. Hofstetter, ISB #3867
 HOFSTETTER LAW OFFICE, LLC
 608 West Franklin Street
 Boise, Idaho 83702
 Telephone (208) 424-7800
 Facsimile: (208) 424-8774
 Email: Dana@IdahoWaterLaw.com

Michael B. Schwarzkopf, ISB #2861
 ATTORNEY AT LAW
 1809 Graham Street
 Yakima, Washington 98902
 Telephone: (208) 841-8227
 Email: mbschwarzkopf@yahoo.com

Attorneys for
 Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc.

**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. 37-296A, 37-717, 37-1216
	)	and 37-7854
	)	
Case 39576	)	INDIAN CREEK RANCH OWNERS
	)	ASSOCIATION, INC.'S RENEWED
	)	MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY
_____	)	

The Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc. ("ICROA") renews its November 4, 2009 Motion to this Court for an Order, pursuant to Rule 37 of the Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure, compelling the Claimant in the above-referenced subcases to answer ICROA's First Set of Interrogatories and respond to its First Requests for Production of Documents ("Discovery Requests") in each of the above-listed subcases.

This Motion is supported by, and incorporates, the Affidavits of Dana L. Hofstetter filed on November 4, 2009 (in support of ICROA's original Motion to Compel this discovery) and on December 30, 2009 (in support of ICROA's Motion to Extend Deadlines and Renewed Motion for Fees and Costs). This Motion is also supported by, and incorporates, the Affidavit of Michael B. Schwarzkopf filed on December 30, 2009 (in support of ICROA's Motion to Extend Deadlines and Renewed Motion for Fees and Costs). It is further supported by, and incorporates, the Affidavit of Michael B. Schwarzkopf and the Memorandum of Fees and Costs filed contemporaneously herewith.

As the Court is aware, the Discovery Requests at issue were served by facsimile on September 15, 2009. *Affidavit of Dana L. Hofstetter in Support of the Original Motion to Compel filed November 4, 2009*. Answers and Responses were due on October 15, 2009. *Id.* No Answers or Responses were received in the time required by the Rules of Civil Procedure, and Claimant's counsel never made a request for an extension of the discovery response time. *Id.* Moreover, Claimant's counsel refused to give ICROA any definite date assurance as to when Claimant would answer ICROA's Discovery Requests. *Id.* And, he avoided ICROA's efforts to meet and confer about these matters. *Id.*

Because the original Trial Scheduling Order required that discovery be completed by January 4, 2010, ICROA was forced to file the original Motion to Compel this discovery on November 4, 2009. It also asked for its costs and fees. It filed the Motion so that it could complete discovery and prepare for trial, particularly given the scheduling constraints of the holiday season.

At the Motion to Compel hearing, on November 18, 2009, the Court received City of Hailey's firm assurance that it would be able to Answer and Respond to ICROA's Discovery Requests by December 11, 2009, and the Court so ordered. The Court also vacated the January 4, 2010 discovery completion deadline at that time. The Court held in abeyance its decision on ICROA's requests for attorney fees and costs.

City of Hailey did not Answer and Respond to ICROA's Discovery Requests by the Court-ordered date of December 11, 2009. *Affidavits of Dana L. Hofstetter and Michael B. Schwarzkopf in Support of ICROA's Motion to Extend Deadlines and Renewed Motion for Fees and Costs filed December 30, 2009*. Nor did it alert ICROA or the Court in advance that it would not be able to do so. *Id.* Nor did it initiate any communication with ICROA about the status of its Answers and Responses *after* the Court-ordered date passed. *Id.* Indeed, it was only after counsel for ICROA made inquiry by email to counsel for City of Hailey on December 15, 2009 (*Id.*, *Ex. 1*), and then followed it up by phone message the following day, that counsel for City of Hailey, on December 17, 2009, finally undertook a communication about the two month overdue Answers and Responses. *Id.* In the course of that phone call, counsel for City of Hailey gave no explanation for the continuing delay and refused to give ICROA his availability for an effort to address the discovery and scheduling issues with the Court by telephone, before the Christmas holiday (as it had encouraged the parties to do during the Motion to Compel hearing). *Id.*

ICROA followed this conversation up with a letter later that same day, December 17, 2009, confirming that City of Hailey counsel had committed in the phone

call to serve the Answers and Responses on Monday, December 21, 2009 (*Id.*, *Ex.2*).

The letter also asked that he serve them by courier to avoid further delay, and asked that he communicate if courier was not possible, so that counsel for ICROA could try again to arrange an informal conference call with the Court about discovery and scheduling matters before the Christmas holiday. *Id.* City of Hailey did not serve ICROA by U.S. mail until Wednesday, December 23, 2009 (the result of which was that ICROA didn't receive the Answers and Responses until late in the afternoon of Christmas Eve - *Affidavit of Dana L. Hofstetter, filed December 30, 2009*); and, did not give ICROA the courtesy of the call it asked for if the Answers and Responses weren't actually going to be in ICROA's hands three days earlier, as requested. *Affidavits of Dana L. Hofstetter and Michael B. Schwarzkopf, filed December 30, 2009*. This, coupled with the intervening holiday season and the impending January 11, 2010 summary judgment deadline, made it nearly impossible for ICROA to treat the rescheduling of deadlines issue informally, and brought on the necessity of filing that part of the Motion. *Id.*

ICROA was also concerned that the earlier Order of the Court compelling discovery by December 11, 2009, had been disregarded, and that, on first blush, claimant's discovery answers and responses appeared underdone. For these reasons, ICROA renewed its Motion for Fees and Costs. Because ICROA only received City of Hailey's Answers and Responses late in the afternoon of Christmas Eve, ICROA had been able to do only a very cursory review of the contents of the discovery response by the required motion cutoff date of December 30, 2009. Because of that, ICROA reserved

the right to seek additional attorney fees and costs, and sanctions, for deficiencies in those Answers and Responses.

ICROA raised these discovery response deficiency concerns at the January 13, 2010 hearing on its Motion to Extend Deadlines and Renewed Motion for Fees and Costs. The Court addressed the extension of deadlines portion of the motion by issuing a new Trial Scheduling Order, continued the fees and costs portion of the motion to January 20, 2010 and granted ICROA an expedited hearing on January 20, 2010 to address any discovery deficiencies identified by it in claimant's discovery responses.

ICROA has identified seven (7) specific deficiencies in claimant's discovery responses at this time. Those deficiencies are exhaustively detailed in Mr. Schwarzkopf's email to Mr. Brown of 6:40 p.m. on Monday, January 18, 2010 (attached as part of Exhibit A to Mr. Schwarzkopf's Affidavit filed contemporaneously herewith). They are also detailed in Mr. Schwarzkopf's two (2) Friday, January 15, 2010 emails to Mr. Brown, one at 1:02 p.m. and the other at 1:34 p.m. (also attached as part of Exhibit A to Mr. Schwarzkopf's Affidavit filed contemporaneously herewith).

These deficiencies, including failures to provide critical flow data from the collection/diversion works and from Indian Creek itself, and failure to provide any construction or facilities drawings of the collection/diversion works, and failure to provide information about the measuring devices used by claimant to measure flow, and incomplete minutes of city meetings about the water use, do not comport with the Court's Order on ICROA's Motion to Compel. They continue to significantly hamper ICROA's

discovery efforts and its prosecution of this case within Court-ordered scheduling constraints.


City of Hailey's failures are the continuation of a lack of respect by it for ICROA, for the Rules of Civil Procedure and for this Court. ICROA is now and again struck by the feeling that City of Hailey's continuing failures to meet Court-ordered deadlines and its promises to ICROA counsel, to communicate in good faith, and to make a good faith effort at answering the propounded discovery, unmask its underlying and widespread disrespect.

ICROA cannot abide, the extra costs and fees it has been put to by City of Hailey's failures, particularly since the December 11, 2009 Court-ordered discovery deadline. Thus, it asks for its fees and costs for its efforts to acquire the Court-ordered information, including the efforts now to obtain that which was ignored by claimant in its first, underdone, answers and responses to ICROA's discovery requests.

ICROA also respectfully requests an Order directing Claimant to answer, completely and in good faith, the Discovery Requests forthwith.

ICROA requests oral argument on this renewed Motion on January 20, 2010. as anticipated by the Court in the January 13, 2010 hearing.

DATED this 19th day of January, 2010.


Dana L. Hofstetter
Attorney for ICROA


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused to be served a copy of the foregoing document (including any attachments) this 19th day of January, 2010, by the pre-paid method(s) indicated below to:

IDWR
Document Depository
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0098
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax

Craig Hobdey
P.O. Box 176
Gooding, Idaho 83330
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax

Patrick D. Brown
Hutchinson & Brown
104 Lincoln Street
P.O. Box 207
Twin Falls, Idaho 83303
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax


Dana L. Hofstetter

Dana L. Hofstetter, ISB #3867
HOFSTETTER LAW OFFICE, LLC
608 West Franklin Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
Telephone (208) 424-7800
Facsimile: (208) 424-8774
Email: Dana@IdahoWaterLaw.com

Michael B. Schwarzkopf, ISB #2861
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1809 Graham Street
Yakima, Washington 98902
Telephone: (208) 841-8227
Email: mbschwarzkopf@yahoo.com

Attorneys for
Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc.

**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. 37-296A, 37-717, 37-1216
	)	and 37-7854
Case 39576	)	
	)	
	)	AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL B.
	)	SCHWARZKOPF
	)	

STATE OF WASHINGTON	)	
	)	ss.
COUNTY OF YAKIMA	)	

Michael B. Schwarzkopf, being first being duly sworn upon oath, deposes and
says:

AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL B. SCHWARZKOPF -- 1

(1) I am Michael B. Schwarzkopf, counsel of record in this matter for Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc. ("ICROA");

(2) I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein;

(3) I have attached, as Exhibit "A" hereto, a record of all of the communication I have had with counsel for City of Hailey in a good faith effort to identify the deficiencies in his client's discovery answers and responses and to meet and confer with him about the deficiencies in his client's answers and responses to ICROA's Discovery Requests since our last hearing in this matter on January 13, 2010. I certify that I made my part of these communications in an attempt to identify discovery deficiencies, to resolve the discovery disputes and to avoid the need for additional court action;

(4) The seven (7) deficiencies that I noted for Mr. Brown, contained in my emails that make up a part of Exhibit "A" hereto, accurately reflect the results of my review thus far of ICROA's Discovery Requests and City of Hailey's discovery Answers and Responses thereto;


(5) These deficiencies include failures to provide critical flow data from the collection/diversion works and from Indian Creek itself, failure to provide any construction or facilities drawings of the collection/diversion works, failure to provide information about the measuring devices used by claimant to measure flow, and incomplete minutes of city meetings about the collection/diversion works;

(6) I have attached, as Exhibit "B" hereto, a copy of relevant pages 11 through 14 of Claimant's 1st Answers and Responses to Objector's 1st Set of Interrogatories and

Requests for Production, in subcase 37-00296A. ICROA's other subcase Discovery Requests have analogous subject matter, and Claimant's other subcase Answers and Responses are analogous to its Answers and Responses in subcase 37-00296A as to this subject matter.

FURTHER YOUR AFFLIANT SAYETH NOT.


DATED this 19th day of January, 2010.



Michael B. Schwarzkopf

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 19th day of January, 2010.

Elizabeth A W Mareld
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington
Residing at: Yakima
My Commission Expires: Feb. 20, 2012




CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused to be served a copy of the foregoing document (including any attachments) this 19th day of January, 2010, by the pre-paid method(s) indicated below to:

IDWR
Document Depository
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0098
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax

Craig Hobdey
P.O. Box 176
Gooding, Idaho 83330
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax

Patrick D. Brown
Hutchinson & Brown
104 Lincoln Street
P.O. Box 207
Twin Falls, Idaho 83303
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax


Dana L. Hofstetter

RE: Indian Creek Ranch Owners' Discovery

Monday, January 18, 2010 6:40 PM
From:

"Mike Schwabach" <mischwabach@yahoo.com>
Add sender to Contacts

To: "Patrick Brown" <patbrown@chblaw.com>
BCC: Dana@IndianCreekRanch.com

Mr. Brown:

Because you don't indicate in the email below (dated January 18 2010, 11:52 a.m.) whether you also received the first of my two emails of last Friday, let me say again that while your answers and responses to our interrogatories and requests for production did provide some of the Indian Creek Spring and Creek flow data we requested, you did not provide any indication of the location(s) in the collection/diversion works at which the flow data you provided was taken. We assume that the limited data you provided pertained to flow somewhere other than in the creek because you referenced the flow data documents you provided in your response to our Request for Production No. 13 and our Interrogatory No. 18, both of which had a municipal water supply, not a creek, orientation. If we're misreading the limited data you provided in this regard, please let us know. We think this information is requested in Request for Production No. 15, Interrogatory No. 16 and Request for Production No. 11 as well.

As an aside, please be aware that, for purposes of this email, the numbered Interrogatories and Requests for Production to which I refer are those contained in the discovery we propounded in subcase 296A. We would note that the three other sets of interrogatories and requests for production that we propounded for the three other subcases could have analogous requests with different numbers as to the omissions listed both above and below.

To continue, then, you have told us that, historically, there have been at least two locations where measurement could take place once the spring water enters the municipal collection/diversion works. We would like all the flow data from each measuring point, and an indication of which data applies to which point, and the time periods involved.

As for the discovery answers and responses deficiencies referenced in the second of my two emails of last Friday, I did point out to you explicitly that you have not provided us any

construction or facilities drawings as requested in Request for Production No. 10.

Your failure to provide us any Indian Creek flow measurement records, even though the City has been contractually required since 1983-ish to maintain measurement at two points on the creek, is implicated by Request for Production No. 15.

Your failure to provide us any documents that would describe your past or present measuring equipment, even though we saw that such equipment recently existed at two point in your collection and conveyance system, is implicated by Interrogatory No. 16 and Request for Production No. 11.

Your failure to provide the underlying measurement data (turbine flow SCADA data at 15-minute intervals) utilized to analyze system demands in the Municipal Water System Demand and Supply Analysis (Page 4, Paragraph 2), referenced in the SFF study, is implicated by Interrogatory No. 18 and Request for Production No. 13. We think this information is requested in Request for Production No. 15, Interrogatory No. 16 and Request for Production No. 11 as well.

Our indication that we received a number of duplicate documents in response to our Requests for Production (and our question whether they were supposed to be something else) is based on the fact that the documents you provided, described in your index as numbers 7-28, are completely duplicated by documents numbered 36-57. Should we have been provided different documents as document numbers 36 to 57, instead of the same documents?

Further, there are apparent gaps in the relevant minutes of the Council Meetings you provided. For example, the produced minutes for February 22, 1982 reference a planned City Council meeting on March 8, 1982 on the same subject but the minutes for the March 8, 1982 meeting are not provided.

Please note that these are the omissions we have identified based on an immediate review of the answers and responses to our Interrogatories and Requests for Production. It is not necessarily a comprehensive list of omissions. We reserve the right to identify further omissions as discovery proceeds.

which you believe triggers the need to produce information itemized below. In the meantime, I am forwarding this e-mail to my client, so they may check again about whether some of the information requested below is information we possess. I do not, however, expect to be able to talk to my client until Tuesday morning, as today is a holiday.

I also have a message for my receptionist from Friday afternoon indicating you called demanding that I communicate to you on Friday that I personally had received e-mail from you. I would appreciate it if you would not make such demands on my staff. I was not available as I was in court on other business. And I don't need my receptionist running to the courthouse because someone on the phone demands to hear from me immediately.

I would also appreciate it if you would do what you promised to do in

December: namely let me know when and where your client will be available so I can conduct the 30(b)(6) deposition. It will include the following topics:

1. The negotiation, drafting, execution, and implementation of the 1983 agreement;
2. The surface water rights, and water right usage in the last 20 years, of the Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association;
3. The surface water rights, and water right usage in the last 20 years, by each member of the Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association;
4. The Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association's knowledge about the City's use of water since 1980;
5. The Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association's knowledge about the City's water rights;
6. All information provided to any person who may testify as an expert for Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association in any of the subcases;

I will continue to be available to respond to any further communications you may undertake on these subjects. After noon on Tuesday, however, I will likely also be focused on drafting the documents I will need to file with the court to update it on the status of any continuing discovery response inadequacies. Please give me your thoughts as early as possible so the court may have the most up to date information possible.

As for your assertion that I demanded anything from your receptionist on Friday afternoon (or at any other time), much less what you claim I demanded, it is patently false. But I'm confident you know that. Moreover, when I spoke with her and left the message asking that you call me (wanting to confirm with you that you had in fact received my emails because of the difficulties you have claimed in the past), she told me affirmatively that you were on the phone in your office. There was no indication that you were in court or anywhere else.

Finally, as for your assertions that you have asked me for, and that I promised you, dates for a 30(b)6 deposition of ICROA, that is also patently false. I'm confident that you know that as well. I will be glad to speak more about the subject of scheduling the depositions we all need in the near future. As we did discuss in December, ICROA has been waiting a long time to schedule depositions due to your inability to answer and respond to its written discovery. In any event, I couldn't make out the meaning of the last few lines of your email on that subject. Perhaps you could fill in the blanks for me before we have any further discussion of that subject.

Mike Schwarzkopf

RE: Indian Creek Ranch Owners' Discovery

Monday, January 18, 2010 11:52 AM
From:

"Patrick Boon" <patrickboon@calnet.net>
Add sender to contacts

Mr. Schwarzkopf <mbschwarzko@tycho.com>
Mr. Schwarzkopf:

I have received the below e-mail. You could significantly expedite the review process if you would identify, for each item listed, what particular request for production, or interrogatory, you're referring to

7. The sources of information relating to each of the above items.

I need to hear from you soon on this, as I anticipate I will be taking depositions of any experts may utilize, once we have completed and I just that the information likely to be forthcoming from the deposition.

Thanks. Pat

Indian Creek Ranch Owners' Discovery

Friday, January 15, 2010 1:34 PM
From:

"Mike Schwarzkopf" <mbschwarzkopf@yahoo.com>
Add sender to Contacts

patbrown@cableone.net

centle@cableone.net

Dana@IdahoWaterLaw.com

Mr. Brown:

Apparently, I just inadvertently sent you only a partial email dealing with what we believe are the deficiencies in your answers and responses to our Interrogatories and Requests for Production of documents. I have set forth below other of those deficiencies (although analysis is ongoing):

2. You have not provided us any construction or facilities drawings as requested in Request for Production No. 10 of the 206A Requests (repeated in the other three claims' Requests as well).

3. You have not given us any Indian Creek flow measurement records even though the City has been contractually required since 1983-ish to maintain measurement at two points on the creek.

4. You have not given us any documents that would describe your past or present measuring equipment even though we saw that such equipment recently existed at two point in your collection and conveyance system.

5. Apparently, SPF utilized turbine flow SCADA data at 15-minute intervals to analyze system demands (Municipal Water System Demand and Supply Analysis Page 4, Paragraph 2), and yet you

have provided none of their underlying measurement data.

6. We received a number of duplicate documents in response to our Request for Production. Were they supposed to be something else?

7. We note gaps in the chronology of the minutes of the Council Meetings you provided.

Please provide me a responsive email by noon Tuesday so that we can meet our meet and confer obligations under the IRCP before the continuation hearing set for next Wednesday. I will be available all weekend and on Monday and Tuesday (till noon) to respond to any response you may make. I will continue to analyze your responses and answers so that we can get to the bottom of these information needs.

Thank you.

Mike Schwarzkopf

Indian Creek Ranch Owners' Discovery

Friday, January 15, 2010 1:02 PM
From:

"Mike Schwarzkopf" <mbschwarzkopf@yahoo.com>
Add sender to Contacts

patbrown@cableone.net

centle@cableone.net

Dana@IdahoWaterLaw.com

Mr. Brown:

I have initially identified what I believe are the following gaps in your discovery responses to our interrogatories and requests for production in this case:

1. While you have provided some of the Indian Creek Spring and Creek flow data we requested, you have not provided any indication of the location in the collection/diversion works at which this flow data was taken. You have told us that historically there have been at least locations where measurement could take place. We would like all the flow data from each measuring point, and an indication of which data applies to which point.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Please describe the equipment you use for diverting water under your portion of the Water Right from the source and conveying it to the place of use, including in your response, without limitation, descriptions of all pumps, pipelines, tanks, conduits and other facilities employed in such diversion and distribution systems.

ANSWER NO. 15: Please see Answer No. 13. Claimant has allowed the proponents to inspect the collection and distribution system which is comprised of underground drain pipe collecting water at the source. The water then passes through a well into underground, which runs down to the hydropower generator and water storage reservoir at the lower end of the valley. From there the water is piped underground to the City of Halley, where it is distributed to its users.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10: Please produce all documents relating to your answer to Interrogatory No. 15.

RESPONSE NO. 10: Please see the Answer No. 15.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: Please describe any and all measurement equipment used for measuring your diversions of water under the Water Right from the source.

ANSWER NO. 16: Measurement occurs through a fixed well and through an ultrasonic measurement system at the collection point, where the water enters the reservoir, and at various points where individual users within the City have their water metered. Pursuant to the proponent's inspection of the facilities, they were

CLAMANT'S 14 ANSWERS & RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT'S 14 SET OF INTERROGATORIES & REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - 11

shown the well and allowed to measure it. They and their engineers were also allowed to photograph and document the measurement systems and question the City officials about the particulars of each of the measurement systems.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Please produce all documents relating to your answer to Interrogatory No. 16.

RESPONSE NO. 11: Respondent does not possess responsive documents at this time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: In your Claim, you contend that your portion of the Water Right is for "Municipal Purpose". Please describe all the facts that support this contention.

ANSWER NO. 17: Claimant objects to the extent the Interrogatory purports to compel the description of "all facts" as such is beyond scope of what may be required by and Interrogatory. Without waiving the objection, the respondent submits the water from Indian Creek has been used to supply the municipal needs of the City of Halley for as long as any one presently at the City can remember and such uses have been recognized since at least the time of the Frost decree.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12: Please produce all documents relating to your answer to Interrogatory No. 17.

RESPONSE NO. 12: See attached documents.

CLAMANT'S 14 ANSWERS & RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT'S 14 SET OF INTERROGATORIES & REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - 12

EXHIBIT

B

INTERROGATORY NO. 18: In your Claim, you contend that your portion of the Water Right has a season of use of "1-1 to 12-31". Please describe all the facts that support this contention.

ANSWER NO. 18: Municipal water supply has an inherent use year-round as most people use it for culinary purposes daily, and in this case, as set forth in the above answers, the water has been used for those purposes for more than a century without any cessation.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13: Please produce all documents relating to your answer to Interrogatory No. 18.

RESPONSE NO. 13: Flow records of the flows from the springs are attached.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: In your Claim, you contend that your portion of the Water Right is for 2,620 cubic feet per second "cfs". Please describe all the facts that support this contention.

ANSWER NO. 12: Please see Frost Decree and DWR's claim file.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14: Please produce all documents relating to your answer to Interrogatory No. 19.

RESPONSE NO. 14: See Answer No. 19.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15: Please produce all documents that contain any measurement records of Indian Creek and/or Indian Springs flows or diversion quantities.

CLAIMANT'S 14 ANSWERS & RESPONSES TO
OBJECTION'S 14 SET OF INTERROGATORIES & REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - 13

RESPONSE NO. 15: Please see attached flow records.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16: Please produce all documents referenced in, relating to or supporting any of your answers to the Interrogatories above that are not otherwise being produced in response to another Request for Production herein.

RESPONSE NO. 16: All responsive documents are being produced, except as noted above.

Dated this 28 day of December, 2009.

HUTCHINSON & BROWN, LLP

By: 

Patrick D. Brown
Attorneys for Claimant

CLAIMANT'S 14 ANSWERS & RESPONSES TO
OBJECTION'S 14 SET OF INTERROGATORIES & REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION - 14

Dana L. Hofstetter, ISB #3867
HOFSTETTER LAW OFFICE, LLC
608 West Franklin Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
Telephone (208) 424-7800
Facsimile: (208) 424-8774
Email: Dana@IdahoWaterLaw.com

Michael B. Schwarzkopf, ISB #2861
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1809 Graham Street
Yakima, Washington 98902
Telephone: (208) 841-8227
Email: mbschwarzkopf@yahoo.com

Attorneys for
Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc.

**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. 37-296A, 37-717, 37-1216
	)	and 37-7854
	)	
Case 39576	)	MEMORANDUM OF COSTS AND
	)	ATTORNEY FEES AND AFFIDAVIT OF
	)	DANA L. HOFSTETTER
	)	

COMES NOW the Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc. ("ICROA"), by and through its attorney of record, Dana L. Hofstetter, and hereby states that the fees and costs set forth in the table of fees and costs (attached hereto as Exhibit A) have been, or will be, reasonably, necessarily and actually incurred in prosecuting discovery-related motions in the above-captioned subcases since December 11, 2009. This Motion is based

MEMORANDUM OF COSTS AND ATTORNEY FEES AND AFFIDAVIT OF DANA L. HOFSTETTER -- 1

upon I.R.C.P. Rules 37 and 54. It is also based upon ICROA's Renewed Motions for Fees and Costs and to Compel Discovery (and supporting Affidavits), the latter renewed motion's related documents filed contemporaneously herewith.

AFFIDAVIT OF COUNSEL

STATE OF IDAHO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF ADA)

Dana L. Hofstetter, being first being duly sworn upon oath, deposes and says:

(1) I am Dana L. Hofstetter, counsel of record in this matter for Indian Creek Ranch Owners Association, Inc. ("ICROA");

(2) I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein;

(3) My firm has been engaged as counsel by ICROA on an hourly fee plus costs basis in this matter, and I am familiar with the records and method of timekeeping utilized by my firm and Mr. Schwarzkopf in this case;

(4) The table of costs and fees, attached hereto as Exhibit "A", is a true and correct copy of the billing entries for attorney fees and costs incurred by ICROA after December 11, 2009 for the purpose of obtaining good faith compliance by City of Hailey with the Court's December 7, 2009 Order concerning ICROA's Discovery Requests;


(5) To the best of my knowledge and belief, the attorney fees and costs charged, incurred, and projected in Exhibit "A", were or will be necessarily and reasonably incurred in prosecuting these efforts, and they are in compliance with IRCP

Rule 54(d);


(6) Additionally, the rates charged are consistent with comparable service and rates for attorneys with my and Mr. Schwarzkopf's experience in trial work in the State of Idaho.

FURTHER YOUR AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

DATED this 19th day of January, 2010.


Dana L. Hofstetter

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 19th day of January, 2010.




Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho
Residing at: BOISE, ID
My Commission Expires: 7/18/2014

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused to be served a copy of the foregoing document (including any attachments) this 19th day of January, 2010, by the pre-paid method(s) indicated below to:

IDWR
Document Depository
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0098
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax

Craig Hobdey
P.O. Box 176
Gooding, Idaho 83330
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax

Patrick D. Brown
Hutchinson & Brown
104 Lincoln Street
P.O. Box 207
Twin Falls, Idaho 83303
☐ U.S. Mail ☐ Fed Ex ☐ Hand ☒ Fax



Dana L. Hofstetter

EXHIBIT A
TABLE OF FEES¹

12/17/09	MBS	Telephone conference with Patrick Brown regarding late discovery responses. Draft letter to Mr. Brown regarding late discovery responses.	1.00@ \$185/hr.	185.00
12/17/09	DLH	Telephone conference with Mike Schwarzkopf regarding his telephone conversation with Pat Brown about overdue discovery responses. Review and revise draft letter to Pat Brown regarding same.	0.50@ \$185/hr.	92.50
12/22/09	MBS	Review trial scheduling and sanctions options in view of continued recalcitrance of Mr. Brown in providing discovery responses. Telephone conferences with SRBA Court clerk and counsel. Draft e-mail to Mr. Brown regarding Requests for Admissions.	2.00@ \$185/hr.	370.00
12/22/09	DLH	Telephone conference with Mike Schwarzkopf regarding drafting Motions to address overdue discovery responses.	0.20@ \$185/hr.	37.00
12/29/09	MBS	Draft Motion to Extend Deadlines and second Motion for Fees and Costs regarding Mr. Brown's additional discovery failures.	4.50@ \$185/hr.	832.50
12/30/09	MBS	Review and revise Motion to Extend Deadlines and Motion for Fees and Costs	0.70@ \$185/hr.	129.50
12/30/09	DLH	Review, revise and finalize Motion to Extend Deadlines and Renewed Motion for Fees and Costs and associated documents. Arrange for filing and service of same.	2.00@ \$185/hr.	370.00
1/13/10	MBS	Prepare for and attend hearing on Motion to Extend Deadlines.	1.6@ \$185/hr.	296.00
1/13/10	DLH	Telephonically attend hearing on Motion to Extend Deadlines	0.5@ \$185/hr.	92.50
1/15/10	MBS	Review City of Hailey's Discovery Responses. Draft e-mails to Mr. Brown regarding same.	3.2@ \$185	592.00

¹ This table does not include fees and costs incurred prior to December 11, 2009 due to overdue discovery.

1/18/10	MBS	Draft response to Mr. Brown's e-mail requesting further detail about Discovery Response inadequacies in effort to meet and confer.	3.5@ \$185	647.50
1/19/10	MBS	Draft Renewed Motion to Compel, Memorandum and Affidavit for January 20, 2010 hearing.	5.0@ \$185	925.00
1/19/10	DLH	Review, revise and finalize Renewed Motion to Compel, Memorandum of Fees and Costs and arrange for filing and service of same	2.0@ \$185	370.00
1/20/10	MBS	Prepare for and telephonically attend Hearing on discovery responses.	1.0@ \$185	185.00
			Est.	
1/20/10	DLH	Roundtrip travel to Twin Falls for hearing. Attend hearing on discovery responses.	6.0@ \$185	1,110.00
			Est.	
	Total		33.7@ \$185/hr.	\$6,234.50

Costs:

1/20/10 - Mileage RT Twin Falls Boise 250 miles @ \$0.50/mile IRS rate =125.00

TOTAL (FEES AND COSTS)

\$6,359.50

HOFSTETTER LAW OFFICE, LLC

608 West Franklin Street

Boise, Idaho 83702

Phone: (208) 424-7800

Fax: (208) 424-8774

E-Mail: Dana@IdahoWaterLaw.com

FAX COVER SHEET

RECEIVED

JAN 20 2010

Department of Water Resources

DATE: January 19, 2010

TO: IDWR

FAX: 287-6700

FROM: Dana Hofstetter

The information contained in this facsimile may be confidential information or attorney work product or both and is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient listed above. Any reading, disclosure, use or reproduction of this communication other than by the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by collect telephone call immediately and return the communication to us by U. S. Mail.

NUMBER OF PAGES BEING TRANSMITTED (INCLUDING THIS PAGE) 23

IF ALL PAGES ARE NOT RECEIVED, PLEASE CALL (208) 424-7800.

ORIGINAL BY MAIL: YES ☐ NO ☒