

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO

IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION)
)
FOR PERMIT NO. 63-11791 IN THE)
)
NAME OF MEADOW CREEK HOMEOWNERS)
)

NOTICE OF CONFERENCE

On April 21, 1992, Meadow Creek Homeowners filed with the Department of Water Resources an application for permit to appropriate the public waters of the State of Idaho. The application was protested by Drainage District #2 and The New Dry Creek Ditch Co..

The Department has set the matter of protest for a conference to be held on Tuesday, July 28, 1992, at 10:30 a.m., in the Second Floor Conference Room, Department of Water Resources, 1301 N. Orchard St., Boise, Idaho 83706. The conference will be held in accordance with provisions of Chapters 2 and 17, Title 42, and Chapter 52, Title 67, of the Idaho Code, the adopted Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Department of Water Resources, and Rules 4 and 5 of the adopted Rules and Regulations of Water Appropriation of the Department of Water Resources. Opportunity shall be afforded all parties to respond and present information and argument on all issues involved.

Dated this 16th day of July, 1992.

David R. Tuthill, Jr.
DAVID R. TUTHILL, JR., P. E.
Manager, Western Regional Office

I hereby certify that on the 21st day of July, 1992, I mailed a true and correct copy, postage prepaid, of this document to the applicant(s) and protestant(s) listed:

Sue Taylor
Sue Taylor
Secretary

Certified Mail

MEADOW CREEK HOMEOWNERS
C/O O'NEILL ENTERPRISES ASSOC.
871 PARKCENTER BLVD
BOISE ID 83706

DRAINAGE DISTRICT #2
C/O GASS LAW OFFICES
MAIN STREET PLAZA, SUITE 204
BOISE ID 83702

THE NEW DRY CREEK DITCH CO.
1200 HEREFORD DR
EAGLE ID 83616

CONFERENCE AND HEARING PROCEDURE

IN THE MATTER OF A PROTESTED APPLICATION FOR PERMIT

In accordance with IDAHO CODE, Section 42-203, the following issues are involved in the consideration of the application and protest(s):

- 1) Will the proposed use reduce the quantity of water under existing rights?
- 2) Is the proposed water supply insufficient for the purposes intended?
- 3) Is the application made in good faith or for delay or speculative purposes?
- 4) Has the applicant sufficient financial resources with which to complete the proposed project?
- 5) Will the proposed use conflict with the local public interest?
- 6) Is the proposed use contrary to conservation of water resources within the state of Idaho?

BURDEN OF PROOF

The Applicant has the initial burden of proof on issues 1,2,3,4,& 6 above, that is, the applicant has the burden of coming forward with evidence for evaluation of those criteria.

The initial burden of proof on issue 5, local public interest, lies with the both the applicant and protestant as to factors which they are most knowledgable and cognizant of. The applicant has the ultimate burden of persuasion with respect to this issue.

PROCEDURE

The procedure normally followed by the department in arriving at a decision on the issues which must be considered is to first hold a conference in the matter and then, if necessary, hold a hearing. If a hearing is held a written decision is issued based on the hearing record.

CONFERENCE

Preliminary to holding a hearing, a pre-hearing conference is held to to familiarize the department and the parties with the matter and to determine if a resolution of the protest(s) is possible without the need for a hearing.

At the conference the department may formulate and simplify the issues, obtain admissions of fact and of documents which will avoid unnecessary proof, arrange for the exchange of proposed exhibits or prepared expert testimony prior to the hearing, limit the number of witnesses, consolidate the examination of witnesses, and advise the parties of the procedure which will be followed at any subsequent hearing.

HEARING

Any party may request in writing five (5) days before any hearing that the oral proceedings thereof be taken in the form of stenographic notes at the expense of the requesting party. Any party may have such stenographic notes of the oral proceedings, or part thereof, transcribed at his own expense. A taped record of the proceedings will be maintained for the appeal period.

If the hearing is conducted by a hearing officer appointed by the Director, rather than the Director himself, a proposed decision will be issued and the parties will be afforded the opportunity to file exceptions to the proposed decision and present briefs and oral arguments to the Director prior to the issuance of a final decision by the Director. This procedure is required by IDAHO CODE, Section 42-1701A.

The parties by written stipulation, may waive their right to a proposed decision, however, the failure of either party to waive a proposed decision will not predjudice the director's review of a party's evidence and arguments. However, such a waiver will shorten the decision making process and may expedite substantially the issuance of a final decision. Whether compliance with Section 42-1701A is waived will not affect a party's right to petition for a rehearing of the final decision pursuant to rule 11 of the Department's Rules of Practice and Procedure or affect a party's right to appeal the final decision to the District Court.

Under the provisions of the IDAHO CODE, Sections 42-1701A and 67-5215, any court review of the department's decision on appeal shall be confined to the record created before the department.

EXHIBITS

If any party at a hearing intends to present an exhibit to augment the hearing record, such party shall in advance of the hearing, prepare sufficient copies of the exhibit for distribution to all parties at the hearing.