

COPY
RECEIVED

APR 06 2016

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

Norman M. Semanko, ISB No. 4761
MOFFATT, THOMAS, BARRETT, ROCK &
FIELDS, CHARTERED
101 S. Capitol Blvd., 10th Floor
Post Office Box 829
Boise, Idaho 83701
Telephone (208) 345-2000
Facsimile (208) 385-5384
nms@moffatt.com
26002.0001

Attorneys for Claimants Dean C. Gentry
and Glenda Gentry

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS

In re CSRBA

Case No. 49576

Subcase No. 91-7121

**CLAIMANTS DEAN C. GENTRY AND
GLENDA GENTRY'S AMENDED
RESPONSES TO OBJECTOR'S FIRST
REQUESTS FOR DISCOVERY**

Dean C. Gentry and Glenda Gentry,

Claimants,

vs.

Coeur d'Alene Tribe, a federally-recognized
Indian tribe,

Objector.

**CLAIMANTS DEAN C. GENTRY AND GLENDA GENTRY'S AMENDED
RESPONSES TO OBJECTOR'S FIRST REQUESTS FOR DISCOVERY - 1**

Client:4111343.1

COME NOW Claimants Dean C. Gentry and Glenda Gentry, by and through undersigned counsel of record, and provide amended responses to Objector's First Requests for Discovery, which replace in total Claimants' previous Responses to Objector's First Requests for Discovery, dated March 7, 2016, as follows:

REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1: Please admit that the United States of America is the legal owner, and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe is the beneficial owner of the submerged bed and banks of Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River within the exterior boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 1 on the grounds that the term "exterior boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation" is vague. Responding Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 1 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding who owns "the submerged bed and banks of Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River within the exterior boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation." Without waiving these objections, Claimants admit that in *United States v. Idaho*, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1094, 1117 (1998), the court stated the following: "[t]itle is quieted in favor of the United States, as trustee, and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho, as the beneficially interested party of the trusteeship, to the bed and banks of the Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River lying within the current boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation." However, Claimants deny that the United States and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe own any submerged bed and banks at Claimants' point of diversion.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2: Please admit that the United States of America, as the trustee, and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, as the beneficially interested party of the

trusteeship, is entitled to the exclusive use, occupancy, and right to the quiet enjoyment of the bed and banks of the Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River within the current boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 2 on the grounds that it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding who owns “the bed and banks of the Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River within the current boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.” Without waiving this objection, Claimants admit that in *United States v. Idaho*, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1094, 1117 (1998), the court stated the following: “[t]he United States, as trustee, and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho, as the beneficially interested party of the trusteeship, are entitled to the exclusive use, occupancy and right to the quiet enjoyment of the bed and banks of the Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River lying within the current boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.” However, Claimants deny that the United States and the Coeur d'Alene Tribe are entitled to the exclusive use, occupancy, and right to the quiet enjoyment of the bed and banks at Claimants' point of diversion.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3: Please admit that the State if [sic] Idaho is permanently enjoined from asserting any right, title or otherwise interest in or to the bed and banks of the Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River within the current boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3: Objection is made to this Request for Admission No. 3 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding the State of Idaho's right, title or interest “in or to the bed and banks of the Coeur d'Alene Lake and the St. Joe River within the current boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.” Without

waiving this objection, Claimants admit that in *United States v. Idaho*, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1094, 1117 (1998), the court stated the following: “[t]he State of Idaho is permanently enjoined from asserting any right, title or otherwise interest in or to the bed and banks of the Coeur d’Alene Lake and the St. Joe River lying within the current boundaries of the Coeur d’Alene Indian Reservation.” However, Claimants deny that the State of Idaho is permanently enjoined from asserting a right, title or interest in or to the bed and banks at Claimants’ point of diversion.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4: Please admit that the Coeur d’Alene Tribe has the inherent right to exclude non-members of the Coeur d’Alene Tribe from tribally owned lands within the Coeur d’Alene Reservation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 4 on the grounds that the terms “inherent right,” “non-members,” and “tribally owned lands within the Coeur d’Alene Reservation” are vague and that this Request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of any admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Claimants admit that in *United States v. Idaho*, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1094, 1117 (1998), the court stated the following: “[t]he Coeur d’Alene Tribe of Idaho, as the beneficially interested party of the trusteeship, [is] entitled to the exclusive use, occupancy and right to the quiet enjoyment of the bed and banks of the Coeur d’Alene Lake and the St. Joe River lying within the current boundaries of the Coeur d’Alene Indian Reservation.” However, Claimants deny that the Coeur d’Alene Tribe has any right to exclude Claimants from the lands at Claimants’ point of diversion.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5: Please admit that the point of diversion for this claim is located within the exterior boundary of the Coeur d’Alene Indian Reservation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 5 on the grounds that the term “exterior boundary of the Coeur d’Alene Indian Reservation” is vague. Without waiving this objection, Claimants admit that the point of diversion for this claim is located within the current boundary of the Coeur d’Alene Indian Reservation. However, Claimants deny that the United States and the Coeur d’Alene Tribe own the lands at Claimants’ point of diversion.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6: Please admit that the presumed OHWM for Coeur d’Alene Lake and the St. Joe River is 2128 feet above sea level.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 6 on the grounds that the term “presumed OHWM” is vague and without temporal context. Without waiving this objection, Claimants admit that in *City of Coeur d’Alene v. Mackin (In re Ownership of Sanders Beach)*, the court stated the following: “[t]he current OHWM of the Lake is 2128 feet” and “the OHWM of Lake Coeur d’Alene has been 2128 feet since 1907.” 143 Idaho 443, 447, 147 P.3d 75, 79 (2006) (citing *Erickson v. State*, 132 Idaho 208, 211, 970 P.2d 1, 4 (1998)); *Id.* at 451, 83. However, Claimants deny that the historic OHWM or the natural high water mark for Coeur d’Alene Lake and the St. Joe River is or has always been 2128 feet.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7: Please admit that the point of diversion and/or some or all of the diversion works at issue in the above-encaptioned matter is below the presumed OHWM of the St. Joe River.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 7 on the grounds that the term “presumed OHWM” is vague and without temporal context. Without waiving this objection, Claimants admit that in *City of Coeur*

d'Alene v. Mackin (In re Ownership of Sanders Beach), the court stated the following: “[t]he current OHWM of the Lake is 2128 feet” and “the OHWM of Lake Coeur d’Alene has been 2128 feet since 1907.” 143 Idaho 443, 447, 147 P.3d 75, 79 (2006) (citing *Erickson v. State*, 132 Idaho 208, 211, 970 P.2d 1, 4 (1998)); *Id.* at 451, 83. However, Claimants deny that the historic OHWM or the natural high water mark for Coeur d’Alene Lake and the St. Joe River is or has always been 2128 feet and further deny that the point of diversion and/or some or all of the diversion works at issue in this claim are below the applicable natural or ordinary high water mark.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8: Please admit that the waters overlying the bed and banks at the location of Claimant(s)[’] water diversion point are navigable.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 8 on the grounds that the term “navigable” is vague. Responding Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 8 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding whether “the waters overlying the bed and banks at the location of Claimants’ water diversion point are navigable.” Without waiving these objections, Claimants admit that said waters are “navigable” according to Claimants’ understanding of the definition in Idaho Code Section 36-1601 and the definition in 33 U.S.C. § 1362.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9: Please admit that under Idaho law the point of diversion for a water right is the point at which water is diverted from a natural water channel and put to beneficial use.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 9 on the grounds that it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion on what constitutes “the point of diversion for a water right” under Idaho law and is not reasonably

calculated to lead to the discovery of any admissible evidence because it seeks a legal conclusion. Without waiving the objection, Claimants therefore deny the same.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10: Please admit that Claimant(s) did not have permission to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River from either the United States or the Coeur d'Alene Tribe at the time the diversion works were constructed for this claim.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 10 on the grounds that the term "permission to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River" is vague. Responding Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 10 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding who owns the "submerged lands of the St. Joe River." Without waiving these objections, Claimants admit that they did not have a permit from either the United States or the Coeur d'Alene Tribe to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River at the time the diversion works were constructed for this claim. However, Claimants deny that the United States or the Coeur d'Alene Tribe owns the land upon which the diversion works may have been constructed and further deny that any such permission was needed.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11: Please admit that since the time Claimant(s) began diverting water from the St. Joe River he/she has never received permission to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River from either the United States or the Coeur d'Alene Tribe for Claimant(s)[] diversionary works.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 11 on the grounds that the term "permission to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River" is vague and the Request is vague as to time. Responding

Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 11 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding who owns the “submerged lands of the St. Joe River.” Without waiving these objections, Claimants admit that they have never received a permit from either the United States or the Coeur d’Alene Tribe to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River for Claimants’ diversion works. However, Claimants deny that the United States or the Coeur d’Alene Tribe owns the land upon which the diversionary works may have been constructed and further deny that any such permission was needed.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12: Please admit that under Idaho law a water right may not be initiated or maintained in trespass.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 12 on the grounds that it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion on initiating a water right and trespass under Idaho law and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of any admissible evidence because it seeks a legal conclusion. Without waiving the objection, Claimants therefore deny the same.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13: Please admit that the Claimant(s) does not have the right to enter the lands of the Coeur d’Alene Tribe for the purposes of maintaining his/her diversion works.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 13 on the grounds that the terms “right” and “purposes of maintaining” are vague. Responding Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 13 on the grounds that it seeks a legal conclusion regarding who owns the lands at Claimants’ point of diversion and the rights of Claimants to their diversion works. Without waiving these

objections, Claimants deny the Request for Admission No. 13, including any assertion that the Coeur d'Alene Tribe owns the lands at Claimants' point of diversion.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14: Please admit that a decreed water right and/or an IDWR water permit or license does not authorize the holder of said right, permit, or license to trespass on the land of another for any purpose.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 14 on the grounds that the terms "IDWR water permit or license" and "for any purpose" are vague. Responding Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 14 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion on the rights of a water right holder and trespass under Idaho law and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of any admissible evidence because it seeks a legal conclusion. Without waiving these objections, Claimants therefore deny the same, including any assertion that Claimants have trespassed or are trespassing on the land of another.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15: Please admit that under Idaho law riparian rights are limited to the right to maintain adjacency to navigable waters and to build or use aids to navigation but does not provide for any right to make any consumptive use of water or right of access for the appropriation of water.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15: Objection is made to Request for Admission No. 15 on the grounds that the term "right to maintain adjacency to navigable waters" is vague. Responding Claimants also object to this Request for Admission No. 15 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion on riparian rights under Idaho law and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of any admissible evidence because it seeks a legal conclusion. Without waiving the objection, Claimants therefore deny the same, including

any assertion that Claimants have no right to make any consumptive use of water or right of access for the appropriation of water.

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: If you deny any of the Requests for Admissions 1-15 above, please state the legal and/or factual basis of each denial, if any.

ANSWER NO. 1: See Responses to Request for Admission Nos. 1-15.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Please identify the legal basis which you intend to rely upon for support of your statements in your response to the Tribe's objection:

"The U.S. did not reserve any other littoral or riparian rights in regard to the subject lands which are ordinarily attendant to waterfront property, including the right to access water, to wharfage, or to use the adjacent water. These rights are therefore appurtenant to and including [sic] with those waterfront lands sold by the U.S. and are subject only to State law regulation as provided by the Acts of Congress enabling the alienation of those lands."

ANSWER NO. 2: Objection is made to Interrogatory No. 2 on the grounds that the Claimants did not file the above-mentioned response to the Tribe's objection.

Notwithstanding the objection, the response to the Tribe's objection speaks for itself.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Does the Claimant(s) hold an encroachment permit from the Coeur d'Alene Tribe for any purpose? If so, what is the encroachment type and Tribal permit number?

ANSWER NO. 3: Claimants' encroachment permits from the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, if any, are available to and held by the Tribe.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: Before installing the diversionary works in the St. Joe River, did Claimant(s), or Claimant(s)[] predecessors in title request the permission of either the United States or Tribe to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River?

ANSWER NO. 4: Objection is made to Interrogatory No. 4 on the grounds that the term “permission...to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River” is vague and the Interrogatory is vague as to time. Responding Claimants also object to this Interrogatory No. 4 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding who owns the “submerged lands of the St. Joe River.” Without waiving these objections, Claimants did not request permission of either the United States or the Coeur d’Alene Tribe to encroach upon the submerged lands of the St. Joe River for the installation of their diversionary works. However, Claimants did not need such permission because the United States and the Coeur d’Alene Tribe do not own the land upon which the diversionary works may have been installed.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: Please state the name, address, telephone number, and type of testimony, lay or expert, for any witnesses you may call at trial of this matter.

ANSWER NO. 5: Claimants are unsure, at this time, whom they may call as witnesses at the time of hearing. Claimants reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner prior to hearing and pursuant to any trial schedule produced by the court. Claimants may call any and all of the individuals identified during discovery, to include, but not be limited to the following individuals:

a) Claimants, Dean C. Gentry and Glenda Gentry, c/o Norman Semanko, Attorney at Law, 101 S. Capitol Blvd., 10th Floor, P.O. Box 829, Boise, Idaho 83701-0829.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: For each person listed as an expert witness above, please:

(a) State the subject matter on which the expert is expected to testify;

(b) Provide a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed and the basis and reasons therefore;

(c) Provide the facts, data or other information considered by the witness in forming his or her opinions;

(d) Note any exhibits to be used by the expert witness as a summary of or support for the opinions; and,

(e) Provide the qualifications of the witness, including a list of all publications (co)authored by the witness within the preceding ten (10) years, the compensation to be paid for the testimony, and a list of other cases in which the witness has testified as an expert at trial or by deposition within the four preceding years.

ANSWER NO. 6: Claimants are unsure, at this time, whom they may call as witnesses at the time of hearing. Claimants reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner prior to hearing and pursuant to any trial schedule produced by the court.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Please describe the Claimant(s)[] diversion works and water system from the point of diversion to the place of use, including but not limited to, a description of all materials located in the water, the pump capacity (in gallons per minute), the conduit diameter(s) (in inches), any storage facilities on the property (and storage volume in gallons), and a description of the water conveyance on the property.

ANSWER NO. 7: Objection is made to Interrogatory No. 7 on the grounds that the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, documents containing the information requested in Interrogatory No. 7 are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx>. Claimants do not have possession, custody or control of any additional description of their

diversion works and water system, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: If the Claimant(s) assert anyone other than the Coeur d'Alene Tribe owns the submerged lands underlying the claimant's point of diversion please list the name and contact information of such person or entity.

ANSWER NO. 8: Objection is made to Interrogatory No. 8 on the grounds that the Interrogatory is vague as to time. Responding Claimants also object to this Interrogatory No. 8 because it seeks a legal conclusion or opinion regarding who owns the "submerged lands underlying the claimant's point of diversion." Notwithstanding the objection, Claimants or the State of Idaho own the submerged lands underlying the Claimants' point of diversion. The name and contact information are as follows: Dean C. Gentry and Glenda Gentry, c/o Norman Semanko, Attorney at Law, 101 S. Capitol Blvd., 10th Floor, P.O. Box 829, Boise, Idaho 83701-0829; State of Idaho, c/o Attorney General's Office, P.O. Box 83720, Boise, ID 83720-0010.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: Please produce any documents you assert support your factual and/or legal basis in answering Requests for Admission Nos. 1-15 and Interrogatories Nos. 1-8.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 1 on the grounds that it is vague and overly broad. Notwithstanding the objection, Claimants respond as follows: See documents previously produced or referenced and documents produced herewith.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of the deed, or other document, by which you acquired title to your

property. If you acquired your property by operation of law, please produce any documents which evidence the factual basis of your acquisition.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2: See Exhibit A attached hereto.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of any title insurance policy (with declarations page) covering the real property to which the water right claim at issue in this matter is appurtenant.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3: Claimants do not have documents responsive to this request, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of any available engineering/draftsman drawings, reports, or other documents related to your property's water-system.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 4 on the grounds that the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, documents requested in Request for Production No. 4 are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx>. Claimants do not have possession, custody or control of any additional engineering/draftsman drawings, reports, or other documents related to Claimants' water-system, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of a scaled elevation-view (side-cut view) diagram of the diversion works at

issue in this case. On the diagram, please draw the OHWM and the ordinary low water mark. Please provide the elevation of the pump, the elevation of the high/low point of the water line, the length of the water line (in feet), and depth of pump (in feet below OHWM). Please provide the lowest elevation of the entire diversion works.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 5 on the grounds that it is overly burdensome and the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, the documented information requested in Request for Production No. 5, if any, is available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx>.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of a scaled plan-view (top view) diagram of the property and diversion works at issue in this case. On the diagram, please include all property boundaries, structures, pasture, yard, gardens, and other locations where water use is occurring. Please include the location of the St. Joe River, the location of all components of the diversion works, pump, and water line, and the location of all water conveyance systems on the property.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 6 on the grounds that it is overly burdensome and the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, the documented information requested in Request for Production No. 6, if any, is available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx>.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of photos showing the diversion works and water-system, including but not limited to the pump, water lines and/or piping, pump house, and irrigation system.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7: Documents requested in Request for Production No. 7, if any, are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx> and the Idaho Department of Water Resources' Coeur d'Alene Spokane River Basin Adjudication claims database at <http://www.srba.state.id.us/SREPT.HTM>. Claimants do not have possession, custody or control of any additional photos showing the diversion works and water-system, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of any deeds, surveys, plats, or other document which relates to the property at the location of your point of diversion. In this request the term "property" means land appurtenant to your point of diversion.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8: Documents requested in Request for Production No. 8 are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx> and the Idaho Department of Water Resources' Coeur d'Alene Spokane River Basin Adjudication claims database at <http://www.srba.state.id.us/SREPT.HTM>. Claimants do not have possession, custody or control of any additional deeds, surveys, plats, or other documents that relate to the property at the location of the Claimants'

point of diversion, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner. See also Response to Request for Production No. 2.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9: Please produce a true, accurate, correct, and admissible copy of any water withdrawal permit(s) and license(s) and/or encroachment permit(s) you may hold from the Idaho Department of Water Resources and/or the Idaho Department of Lands.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 9 on the grounds that the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, documents requested in Request for Production No. 9, if any, are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx> and by public records request to the Idaho Department of Lands.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10: Please produce all I.R.C.P. Rule 26 material for any witness listed or noted as an expert witness in your answer to Interrogatories Nos. 5 and 6 above.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10: Claimants are unsure, at this time, whom they may call as witnesses at the time of hearing. Claimants reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner prior to hearing and pursuant to any trial schedule produced by the court.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Please produce documents related to available water use data for the diversion works and/or the property.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 11 on the grounds that the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, documents requested in Request for Production No. 11 are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx>. Claimants do not have possession, custody or control of any additional documents related to available water use data for the diversion works and/or the property, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12: Please produce any documents related to other sources of water used by the Claimant(s) on the property and/or other claims made in the CSRBA by the Claimant(s) for other water rights appurtenant to the property and/or any additional water use permits or licenses acquired by the claimant since the commencement of the CSRBA for water use appurtenant to the property at issue.


RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 12 on the grounds that the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, documents requested in Request for Production No. 12 are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx> and the Coeur d'Alene Spokane River Basin Adjudication claims database at <http://www.srba.state.id.us/SREPT.HTM>.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13: Please produce any other documents which may be relevant to, or support, Claimant(s)' water right claim, Objector's objection, and/or any responses to the objection which have been filed in this matter.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13: Objection is made to Request for Production No. 13 on the grounds that it is overly broad and the information requested is equally available to the Tribe as to the Claimants. Notwithstanding the objection, documents requested in Request for Production No. 13 are available in the Claimants' licensing file online on the Idaho Department of Water Resources' website at <http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/apps/ExtSearch/WRAJSearch/WRADJSearch.aspx> and the Coeur d'Alene Spokane River Basin Adjudication claims database at <http://www.srba.state.id.us/SREPT.HTM>. Claimants do not have possession, custody or control of any additional documents which may be relevant to, or support, Claimants' water right claim, Objector's objection, and/or any responses to the objection which have been filed in this matter, but reserve the right to supplement this answer in a timely manner.

DATED this 1st day of April, 2016.


MOFFATT, THOMAS, BARRETT, ROCK &
FIELDS, CHARTERED

By 
Norman M. Semanko – Of the Firm
Attorneys for Claimants Dean C. Gentry
and Glenda Gentry

STATE OF IDAHO)
) ss.
County of Ada)


NORMAN M. SEMANKO, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:


He is the attorney for the Claimants Dean C., Gentry and Glenda Gentry, in the above-entitled cause and makes this verification for and on behalf of said Claimants; that he has read the foregoing **CLAIMANTS DEAN C. GENTRY AND GLENDA GENTRY'S AMENDED RESPONSES TO OBJECTOR'S FIRST REQUESTS FOR DISCOVERY**, knows the contents thereof, and that the same are true to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.



Norman M. Semanko

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 1st day of April, 2016.





NOTARY PUBLIC FOR IDAHO
Residing at Mendota, ID
My Commission Expires 01/09/18

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 1st day of April, 2016, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **CLAIMANTS DEAN C. GENTRY AND GLENDA GENTRY'S AMENDED RESPONSES TO OBJECTOR'S FIRST REQUESTS FOR DISCOVERY** to be served by the method indicated below, and addressed to the following:

Howard A. Funke
Kinzo H. Mihara
Dylan Hedden-Nicely
HOWARD FUNKE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
424 Sherman Avenue, Suite 308
P.O. Box 969
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83816-0969
Facsimile (208) 667-4695


☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
() Hand Delivered
() Overnight Mail
() Facsimile

Chief, Natural Resources Division
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF IDAHO
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0010

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
() Hand Delivered
() Overnight Mail
() Facsimile

Director
IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0098

☒ U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
() Hand Delivered
() Overnight Mail
() Facsimile



Norman M. Semanko

EXHIBIT A

COPY

WARRANTY DEED

WARRANTY DEED, made this 22nd day of January, 1992, between HARLAN KIELING, an unmarried man, of 26692 Grossbeck Highway, City of Warren, County of Macomb, State of Michigan 48089, herein referred to as "Grantor"; and DEAN C. GENTRY and GLENDA GENTRY, husband and wife, of P.O. Box 321, City of St. Maries, County of Benewah, State of Idaho 83861, herein referred to as "Grantees".

WITNESSETH:


That Grantor, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, has granted, bargained, and sold, and does, by these presents grant, bargain, sell, convey, and confirm unto Grantees and their heirs and assigns forever, all the following described real estate situated in Benewah County, State of Idaho, to-wit:

Lot Thirty-four A (34A), Cottonwood Point
First Addition, according to the recorded
plat thereof.

TOGETHER, with all tenements, easements, hereditaments and appurtenances thereunto belonging.

Grantor, for himself, his heirs and assigns, does hereby covenants, warrants and shall defend the quiet and peaceable possession of said premises by the Grantees, their heirs and assigns forever against the lawful claims of all persons.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has hereunto set his hand
and seal on the day and year first above written.


HARLAN KIELING


Grantors

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
 : ss.
County of Macomb)

On this 22 day of January, 1992, before me the
undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the said State,
personally appeared HARLAN KIELING, known to me to be the
person whose name is subscribed to the above and foregoing
WARRANTY DEED, and acknowledged to me that he executed the
same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
affixed my official seal the date last above written.

SANDRA A. McMASTERS
NOTARY PUBLIC - MACOMB COUNTY, MICH.
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 9-13-93


Notary Public, State of Michigan
Residing at: Macomb County.
Commission expires: 9-13-93

RECEIVED

188284


92 FEB 6 P12:33

McFadden Law Offices
BENJ. ...
KAY SATHER, CLERK $\frac{1}{2}$ =

WARRANTY DEED

-2-

