## DEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

IN THE MATTER OF REVISING THE	١
BOUNDARIES OF WATER DISTRICT	١
No. 130, IN THE AMERICAN FALLS	,
AREA	١
	,

## TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

Conducted December 17, 2003, Pocatello, Idaho Before Presiding Officer Karl J. Dreher Director, Idaho Department of Water Resources

> Transcribed by Patsy McGourty Administrative Assistant Department of water Resources

Proceedings transcribed from electronic sound recording.

Karl Dreher: Good afternoon. As I indicated prior to the start of this hearing, I am Karl Dreher, Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and I'll be serving as the presiding officer in this matter. This matter concerns the proposed expansion of Water District 120 for a portion of the area overlying the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer within the Department's Administrative Basin 29. The provisions of § 42-604, *Idaho Code* require this hearing to be held prior to the creation of, or prior to making changes to the boundaries of the water district by the Director of the Department of Water Resources.

This hearing is being conducted on December 17, 2003, commencing at about 2:20 in the afternoon. The notice was for a hearing commencing at one but we've spent the past hour or so providing general background information and discussing what the need and purpose is for this particular matter. We're at the Ramada Inn which is located at 133 West Burnside in Pocatello, Idaho.

Again, the purpose of this hearing is to provide affected water right holders or their representatives an opportunity to make an oral statement on the record stating their position, views, or any concerns they have regarding the proposed expansion of Water District 120. For the purposes of this hearing, persons that make statements do not need to be sworn in nor will they be subject to any cross-examination. All persons that have signed up to speak will be heard, but then at the end we'll give an opportunity for any others that wish to be heard as well. And if for some reason you wish to be heard a second time, that will be possible as well once everyone who wishes to be heard is heard at least once.

Notice of this hearing was mailed to each affected water right holder in the proposed Water District 120 as required under the provisions of § 42-604, *Idaho Code*. In addition notice was published in several newspapers of general circulation within the area of the proposed district. Now as I indicated prior to going on the record in this matter, I reviewed the reasons for the proposed expansion of Water District 120 and described the duties that the watermaster of the district would be expected to carry out under my supervision. Now, if there are no further questions, we're at the point where we can begin to take statements and comments from those persons who desire to be heard and I'll just use the list that I've been provided. The first individual that's indicated a desire to make a statement is LaVerne Jim or Bim. Jim. Mr. Jim if you would come forward.

Laverne Jim: I'm Laverne Jim, from the Fort Hall Water Resource Commission and I'm here on behalf of the Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and this is the verbal testimony I'll give. In 1990 Sho-Ban tribes entered an agreement between the tribes, the State of Idaho, and the United States to quantify rights of the tribes in the Upper Snake River Basin. The agreement is a congressional mandated agreement and was later entered into decree by the Snake River Adjudication District Court. The agreement respects the solidarity to the entities that are a party to the agreement. Within the agreement all parties agreed to cooperate in the administration of water resources. The tribes are to administer all tribal water rights within the reservation, the United States administers the distribution of the Fort Hall Indian

Irrigation Project water rights and the state administers the distribution of the water rights acquired under state law that are not part of the Fort Hall tribal agency or Fort Hall Irrigation Project water rights. It is critical that the previous boundary region of the Water District 120 does not interfere with the tribes' ability to develop and manage future points of ground water diversion or utilization on any Indian land pursuant to the agreement. The agreement provides the tribes, State and the United States will work cooperatively to coordinate and monitor water use to the same extent that they require other users in Idaho. The tribes are willing to work cooperatively with the other parties provided any party benefits equally and protect each party's interest. The tribe believes the inclusion of a portion of the Basin 29 must not interfere with provisions, nature, scope or spirit of the 1990 Fort Hall Water Rights Agreement and the rights decreed under the agreement. The tribes maintain jurisdiction to implement and master water rights on the reservation that will be potentially impacted by this change. The Fort Hall, I mean the Shoshone-Bannock tribes reminds the state and the water users that the tribes have a unique status with the United States government since the Fort Bridger Decree of 1868, a congressional ratified treaty that currently entrusts responsibility to the tribes. The tribes further assert that civil regulatory authority is vested with the Sho-Ban tribes within the exterior boundaries of the Fort Hall Reservation. All monitoring activities will be in cooperation with the tribes and the state relating to non-Indian lands. In closing the tribes request that the state implement enforcement measures on both non-Indian surface water and non-Indian ground water use to ensure that the tribe's ground water rights are

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

preserved. The tribes made a request to the state regarding enforcement issues which have not yet been resolved. That's all I have.

- 71 Karl Dreher: Mr. Jim, could you state your position with the tribe?
- 12 Laverne Jim: I'm Chairman of the Fort Hall Water Commission.
- 73 <u>Karl Dreher</u>: And can you provide an address for the record?
- 74 Laverne Jim: Box 306, Fort Hall.

69

- 75 <u>Karl Dreher</u> Thank you very much. Next we have Timothy Deeg.
- Timothy Deeg: I am Timothy P. Deeg. I reside at 2957 Deeg Road, American Falls, 76 77 Idaho, 83211. I am a member of the Aberdeen-American Falls Ground Water 78 District and served as past secretary, president, and I am currently a board member. I'm also serving as President of the Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, 79 80 Incorporated, and I am Chairman of Water District 120. The Aberdeen-American Falls Ground Water District adopted the following resolutions at the December 81 82 Board Meeting. Be it resolved that we hereby support the inclusion of ground 83 water rights in a portion of Basin 29 overlying the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer. Be it further resolved that we pray that the Director will consider the revision of 84 such southern Water District 120 boundary as to extend the water district 85 boundary to include all of Basin 29 within Power County. Be it further resolved 86 87 that such action by the Director will allow for consistent, efficient water rights administration within Water District 120 as well as the Aberdeen-American Falls 88 Ground Water District. We believe that the southern Eastern Snake Plain 89 boundary is arbitrary in Basin 29 in that particular area. Be it further resolved 90 91 that the social and economic benefits derived from inclusion of all of Basin 29

within Power County provides continuity and participation. Be it further resolved that such proposed expansion of the Water District 120 be all of Basin 29 within Power County and said expansion is consistent with water rights administration under title 42, Chapter 6. In conclusion I would like to thank Mr. Director for allowing us the opportunity to express our views as water right holders and as the constituents that will come under regulation by the adoption of this order.

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

<u>Karl Dreher</u>: Okay, thank you. Then the last individual that's on the sign up sheet that's indicated they want to speak is Dean Tramer.

Dean Tramer: My name is A. Dean Tramer. I'm the city attorney for the City of Pocatello and I'm here representing the municipal corporation known as the City of Pocatello and speaking on behalf of the mayor and the city council for the City of Pocatello. The new boundaries for Water District 120 will include ground water rights which the City of Pocatello uses at the airport. The City of Pocatello has an interesting mix of water rights including surface water rights, ground water rights and also 50,000 acre feet of storage water right in the Palisades Reservoir so we're involved on a lot of fronts in regards to distribution and regulation of water rights. The City of Pocatello did not oppose the State's Motion for Interim Administration in the SRBA Court and does not oppose the revision of the boundaries of Water District 120 to include ground water rights which divert from the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer in Basin 29. Pocatello believes there are four issues that need to be understood and addressed regarding the administration of water rights in Water District 120. First, the SRBA proceeding did not determine injury to senior priority water rights. The SRBA Court's Order allows the Idaho

Department of Water Resources to proceed with interim administration of ground water rights because it's reasonably necessary to protect senior water rights in Water District 120. Again, that doesn't determine injury or the extent of injury. Idaho Department of Water Resources can protect senior water rights we believe in Water District 120 from injury in accordance with IDWR's obligations within the water district's statutes, namely, Chapter 6, Title 42 of the Idaho Code. That requires the Director of IDWR to make a finding of injury in an administrative proceeding consistent with the mandates of the prior appropriation doctrine of Idaho. At present, there is no determination of injury in the record of the SRBA Court or in Water District 120. Second the SRBA Court's Order is directed to administration of ground water rights within a water district. This interim administration limits the Idaho Department of Water Resources to its distribution authorities under the water district statutes. Again, Chapter 6, Title 42 of the Idaho Code. That means until the entry of a final decree in the SRBA for those ground water rights, for these ground water rights, IDWR may only administer these ground water rights through the normal administrative mechanism provided by the water district statutes. Again, Chapter 6, Title 42, Idaho Code. In these water districts, the Idaho Department of Water Resources has the authority to shut and fasten and I'm quoting, or cause to be shut or fastened the head gates of the ditches or other facilities for diversion of water from such streams or water supplies when in times of scarcity of water it's necessary to do so in order to supply the prior rights of others in such stream or water supply. Again, I'm quoting Idaho Code 42-607. Since Water District 120 and the Aberdeen-

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

American Falls Ground Water management area overlap, Pocatello has additional comments about the legal differences between water districts and ground water management areas. Pocatello has supported the formation of water districts in Basins 35, 36, 37, 41 and now 29 to facilitate conjunctive administration of ground water and surface water rights. Administration of existing ground water rights to protect senior surface water rights is not addressed in the critical ground water area statute, Idaho Code 42-233A or the ground water management area statute, Idaho Code 42-233D. Statutes addressing administration among ground water users are not the appropriate vehicle for conjunctive administration of existing ground water and surface water rights. Further, the mechanisms by which critical ground water areas and ground water management areas are formed do not fit the conjunctive administration paradigms. Both designations have been used historically by IDWR as establishing de facto moratoriums on the processing of new ground water right permits. Review of Idaho Department of Water Resource records indicates IDWR designated eight critical ground water areas prior to the passage of the ground water management area statute in 1982. Since 1982, at least 9 ground water management areas have been established. Although a few of the ground water management areas have been designated based on depletion of surface water caused by ground water, the primary impact of those designations was to control additional ground water development and gather data. Since recent extensive ground water level measurements of the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer indicate that the aquifer is not being mined completely and that, in general,

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

ground water levels are stable throughout the aquifer. The criteria for establishing a critical ground water area, an area not having sufficient ground water to provide a reasonably safe supply for irrigation, or a ground water management area, an area approaching the conditions of critical ground water area, are not present. Third, the administration of the water within Water District 120 must accord with the legal force and effect of the October, 1984 Swan Falls Agreement, the October, 1985 Swan Falls Contract and the Consent Judgments in the cases of Idaho Power v. State of Idaho in the Fourth District and Idaho Power v. State of Idaho in the March, 1990 case. They are collectively called the Swan Falls Agreement. The SRBA Court is presently considering the appropriate mechanism to guarantee the SRBA proceedings do not supercede, pre-empt, modify, terminate, extend or otherwise affect the legal force and effect of the Swan Falls Agreement in the Snake River Basin drainage upstream from the Idaho Power Company plant at Swan Falls. The court has not made this a basin-wide issue although the Swan Falls drainage encompasses all of 21 water right basins and portions of three water right basins including all the existing and currently proposed geographic area in Water District 120. The City of Pocatello did file Swan Falls objections in Basin 29 and the SRBA Court has included those objections in the ongoing Swan Falls case. Again, Pocatello's concern is that the SRBA proceedings don't supercede, pre-empt, modify, terminate, extend or otherwise affect the legal force and effect of the Swan Falls Agreement throughout the Swan Falls drainage. Finally, the Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources proposes that the watermaster of the revised

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

Water District 120 continue the same duties outlined when Water District 120 184 was created in February, 2002. Those duties performed under the direction and 185 supervision of the Director include: curtailment of illegal diversions, 186 measurement and reporting of diversions under water rights, enforcement of 187 provisions of stipulated agreements between the holders of senior priority surface 188 water rights and junior priority ground water rights and curtailment of out of 189 priority diversions that are not included in a stipulated agreement or mitigation 190 plan approved by the director and are determined by the director to be causing 191 injury to senior priority water rights. Pocatello wants to comment in more detail 192 about this curtailment of out of priority diversions that are not included in a 193 stipulated agreement or mitigation plan approved by the director and are 194 determined to be causing injury to senior priority water rights. We believe it 195 would be of assistance to the Idaho Department of Water Resources and the 196 public if information relating to the implementation or clarification of this duty to 197 determine injury, were entered into the record. Specifically, Pocatello believes 198 IDWR's instructions to the watermaster must be based on facts from the best 199 evidence available. This includes information on the type of use, priority date, 200 measured diversion rate and measured diverted volume for individual ground 201 water and surface water rights. This in turn allows summary of the cumulative 202 decreed rate versus priority date for ground and surface water rights. These 203 summaries will demonstrate and illustrate the complex inter-relationship of 204 ground and surface water rights in Water District 120. I appreciate the 205 opportunity to provide these comments here today. We will also be providing 206

some formal written comments prior to December 29, 2003, at 5:00 p.m. We believe that the comment process is vital not only to the economy of the State of Idaho, but also to the vitality of the cities of this state. Thank you.

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

Karl Dreher: Thank you. Okay, that's all the people that had signed up in advance to speak. Is there anyone else that didn't sign up that wishes to speak at this point? Okay. Any of the three that did speak, do they have any thing further that they would like to offer? All right. That will conclude the record of oral statements in this proceeding. Thank you for your participation and as I indicated earlier, the hearing record will remain open for 12 days through December 29<sup>th</sup> to allow time for the submittal of additional written comments as provided in the notice of this proceeding and as required by § 42-604, Idaho Code. I will issue a final order following the close of the comment period. A copy of the final order will be sent by regular mail to all holders of water rights affected by this order. Any party may file a petition for reconsideration with the Director of the department within 14 days of the service of the final order. Any party feeling aggrieved by the final order may also seek judicial review before the district court within 28 days of the issuance of the final order or within 28 days of the action taken on any petition for reconsideration. Thank you for attending. The record is now closed except for the taking of additional written comments.

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

## **CERTIFICATION**

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

Hac. 19, 2003

Patsy McGourty

Transcriber