

**BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

IN THE MATTER OF BASIN 37
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

Docket No. AA-WRA-2021-001

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO
DISMISS, FOR CONTINUANCE OR
POSTPONEMENT, AND FOR
CLARIFICATION OR MORE
DEFINITE STATEMENT**

BACKGROUND

On May 4, 2021, the Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources (“Department”) issued a *Notice of Administrative Proceeding, Pre-Hearing Conference, and Hearing* (“Notice”). The Director commenced the administrative proceeding in response to predicted drought in Basin 37 for the 2021 irrigation season and in response to ground water modeling showing that curtailment of ground water rights during the 2021 irrigation season would result in increased surface water flows for certain holders of senior surface water rights. *Notice* at 1. The purpose of the hearing is for the Director to decide whether “the withdrawal of water from ground water wells in the Wood River Valley south of Bellevue (commonly referred to as the Bellevue Triangle) would affect the use of senior surface water rights on Silver Creek and its tributaries during the 2021 irrigation season.” *Id.* at 1; *see also id.*, Attachment A (depicting the “Potential Area of Curtailment”). The Director, acting as presiding officer, set a prehearing conference for May 24, 2021, and set the hearing for June 7-11, 2021. *Id.* at 1-2.

On May 13, 2021, South Valley Ground Water District (“South Valley”) filed *South Valley Ground Water District’s Motion to Dismiss/Supporting Points & Authorities/Motion to Shorten Time for Response/Request for Oral Argument* (“SVGWD MTD”) and *South Valley Ground Water District’s Motion for Continuance of Hearing* (“SVGWD MFC”). On the next day, Sun Valley Company (“Sun Valley”) filed a *Motion to Dismiss* (“SVC MTD”) and the City of Bellevue (“Bellevue”) filed a *Motion for More Definite Statement, Motion for Clarification, and Motion to Postpone Hearing* (“Bellevue Motion”). On May 19, 2021, attorney James P. Speck filed a *Joinder in and Support of Motions* on behalf of numerous clients¹ that joined in and

¹ Specifically: Griffin Ranch Homeowners Ass’n, Griffin Ranch PUD Subdivision Homeowners Ass’n, Inc., Robert P. Dreyer, River Rock Ranch LP, Margo Peck, Edward M. Blair Jr Personal Residence Trust, Marion R. and Robert M. Rosenthal, CW & RH Gardner Family Limited Partnership and Robert & Kathryn Gardner Family Trust, Rego 2008 Revocable Trust, Team Flowers Bench LLC, Parks Family 2006 Trust, Thomas W. Weisel, Tom Weisel

supported the motions filed by South Valley, Sun Valley, and Bellevue. On the same day, Galena Ground Water District filed *Galena Ground Water District's Joinder in and Support of South Valley Ground Water District's Motions*. On May 20, 2021 three joinder filings were made. Dean R. Rogers, III and Dean R. Rogers, Inc., filed a *Joinder in and Support of Motions* that joined and supported South Valley and Bellevue's motions; Sun Valley Water and Sewer District joined in the same motions in its *Joinder in, and Support of, Previously Filed Motions*; and the City of Pocatello filed *City of Pocatello's Joinder in and Support of Motions* joining in the motions filed by South Valley, Sun Valley and Bellevue. On May 21, 2021, the City of Hailey filed *City of Hailey's Joinder in and Support of Motions* joining in the motions filed by South Valley, Sun Valley and Bellevue. In addition, on May 21, 2021, the Big Wood and Little Wood Water Users Association filed *Joint Response to Motions*. For the reasons discussed below, the Director denies the above-referenced motions filed by South Valley, Sun Valley, and Bellevue.²

ANALYSIS

The above-referenced motions filed by South Valley, Sun Valley, and Bellevue seek several different forms of relief, sometimes in the alternative, and raise a number of different arguments. Some of the arguments presented in support of the relief requested overlap. The various arguments are addressed in the discussion below.

I. MOTIONS TO DISMISS

The motions to dismiss filed by South Valley and Sun Valley argue that Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. does not create authority for the Director to initiate this proceeding, and the Director has used an improper procedure to address the question of whether ground water rights diverting in the Bellevue Triangle should be curtailed during 2021 in favor of senior water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries. *SVGWD MTD* at 1-2, 9-20; *SVC MTD* at 2-12. South Valley and Sun Valley argue that the Ground Water Act³ does not authorize this proceeding, and that, in the absence of the filing of a delivery call under the *Rules for Conjunctive Management of Surface and Ground Water Resources* ("CM Rules"),⁴ the Director lacks authority to regulate or curtail diversions by holders of junior-priority ground water rights to protect diversions by holders of senior-priority surface water rights. *Id.* South Valley and Sun Valley further argue that the Notice and the administrative proceeding it initiated violate due process requirements.

Partners, Justin Power Separate Property Revocable Trust, Ridgeview Smith Properties LLC, Linda D. Woodcock, Redcliff Homeowners Ass'n, and The Jones Trust.

² South Valley and Sun Valley moved the Director to shorten time regarding their motions to dismiss, and also requested oral argument, pursuant to Rules 260, 270, and 565 of the Department's Rules of Procedure. *SVGWD MTD* at 28; *SVC MTD* at 14-15. Bellevue requested an expedited decision on its motion. *Bellevue Motion* at 7. The motions to shorten time are mooted by the issuance of this order, and the requests for oral argument on the motions are denied. IDAPA 37.01.01.260, .270 and .565.

³ Idaho Code §§ 42-226—42-239.

⁴ IDAPA 37.03.11.000—050.

SVGWD MTD at 2, 9-10, 20-27; *SVC MTD* at 1-6, 12-14. The Director disagrees, for reasons discussed below.

a. IDAHO CODE § 42-237a.g. AUTHORIZED THE INITIATION OF THIS ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING.

The Director has the authority to initiate this administrative proceeding under the plain language of Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. Section 42-237a.g. authorizes the Director “[t]o “supervise and control the exercise and administration of all rights to the use of ground water.” Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. This code section states that “in the exercise of this discretionary power,” the Director “may initiate administrative proceedings to prohibit or limit the withdrawal of water from any well” during any period the Director determines “that water to fill any water right in said well is not there available.” *Id.* “Water in a well shall not be deemed available to fill a water right therein,” in turn, “if withdrawal of the amount called for by such right” would affect, contrary to the policy of the Ground Water Act, “the present or future use of any prior surface or ground water right” *Id.* (underlining added). Nothing in Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. requires the filing of a delivery call or request for administration of ground water rights prior to the Director initiating an administrative proceeding. Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. expressly authorized the Director to initiate this proceeding even in the absence of a delivery call or a request for administration. Further, Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. expressly commits the determination of whether to initiate this proceeding to the Director’s discretion.⁵

Sun Valley argues, however, that Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. “requires a ‘call’ for administration of water rights,” because the statute refers to “the amount called for” by a ground water right that is potentially subject to curtailment in favor of a “prior surface or ground water right.” *SVC MTD* at 2 (quoting Idaho Code § 42-237a.g.). This argument incorrectly equates “the amount called for” by a junior ground water right with a “delivery call” filed by a senior surface water right holder against the junior ground water right. The “amount called for” by a ground water right is simply the licensed or decreed quantity of the ground water right. Idaho Code §§ 42-219(1), 42-1411(2)(c), 42-1412(6). This meaning is clear in the cited passage of Idaho Code § 42-237a.g., which in speaking of “the amount called for by such right” is referring to a ground water right for which water “shall not be deemed available” because continued withdrawals would affect “prior” surface or ground water rights. Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. (underlining added). A “delivery call,” in contrast, is a request made by the holder of a senior priority water right for administration of junior priority water rights. IDAPA 37.03.11.010.04. Sun Valley’s argument that Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. requires the filing of a “delivery call” is contrary to the natural reading of the statutory language and “counter to Idaho water law.” *North Snake Ground Water Dist. v. IDWR*, 160 Idaho 518, 523, 376 P.3d 722, 727 (2016).

⁵ The Director’s exercise of this discretionary authority is subject to judicial review under applicable legal standards. *See, e.g., Rangen, Inc. v. IDWR*, 160 Idaho 251, 255, 371 P.3d 305, 309 (2016) (discussing the standards for reviewing “[d]iscretionary determinations of an agency”).

Sun Valley further argues that a different section of the Ground Water Act—Idaho Code § 42-237b⁶—requires the filing of a delivery call. Sun Valley argues Section 42-237b “requires an ‘adverse claim’ – or put another way a ‘call’ – to initiate the proceeding.” *SVC MTD* at 7, 9. This argument is incorrect because this proceeding was not initiated under Idaho Code § 42-237b, but rather under Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. Section 42-237a.g. expressly authorizes the Director to initiate this administrative proceeding even in the absence of a delivery call or “adverse claim.” Nothing in Idaho Code § 42-237b or in Idaho Code § 42-237a.g mandates that an “adverse claim” be filed prior to initiation of an administrative proceeding pursuant to Idaho Code § 42-237a.g.

Idaho Code §§ 42-237a.g. and 42-237b deal with distinctly different questions. Idaho Code § 42-237a defines the “Powers of the Director of the Department of Water Resources,” while Idaho Code § 42-237b deals with “Administrative Determination of Adverse Claims” between individual water users. The Ground Water Act grants the Director broad “discretionary power” to “supervise and control the exercise and administration of all rights to the use of ground water . . .” Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. The Ground Water Act also includes a separate provision authorizing individual water right holders to pursue claims of injury against other water right holders. *See* Idaho Code § 42-237b (“Whenever any person owning or claiming the right to the use of any surface or ground water rights believes that the use of such right is being adversely affected by one or more user[s] of ground water rights of later priority . . .”). There is no basis in the language or structure of the Ground Water Act for interpreting Idaho Code § 42-237b’s authorization for individual water users to pursue “adverse claims” against other water users as a limitation on the Director’s broad discretionary authority under Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. to supervise and control the exercise of ground water rights that may be affecting senior surface water rights.

This conclusion is also supported in the recent repeal of some sections of the Ground Water Act. The Legislature repealed Idaho Code § 42-237b, but it did not repeal or amend Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. *SVGWD MTD* at 11-12, 15; *SVC MTD* at 7-10. Consequently, while the Ground Water Act will no longer authorize the administrative determination of “adverse claims” by “local ground water boards” after July 1, 2021, the Ground Water Act will still expressly authorize the Director to “initiate administrative proceedings to prohibit or limit” the withdrawal of water under junior ground water rights that “would affect” the present or future exercise of “any prior surface or ground water right.” Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. Had these separate authorities been deemed inextricably linked or interconnected, as argued by South Valley and Sun Valley, then both would have been repealed. This is not what happened.

South Valley and Sun Valley also argue that, before initiating an administrative proceeding pursuant to Idaho Code § 42-237a.g, the Ground Water Act requires the Director to determine “an area of common ground water supply,” a “reasonable pumping level,” or a “reasonably anticipated rate of future natural recharge.” *SVGWD MTD* at 2, 9, 12-14, 18-20, 23-

⁶ The 2021 Idaho Legislature repealed Idaho Code § 42-237b, effective July 1, 2021.

24; *SVC MTD* at 3, 5, 11.⁷ Under the plain language of Idaho Code § 42-237a.g., however, the Director is allowed, not required, to make these determinations when exercising “discretionary power” to initiate and conduct administrative proceedings regarding supervision and control of ground water withdrawals. *See* Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. (“in making determinations upon which said orders shall be based, he may establish a ground water pumping level or levels in an area or areas having a common ground water supply as determined by him . . .”). The Director is also specifically authorized to allow ground water withdrawals “at a rate exceeding the reasonably anticipated rate of future natural recharge . . .” *Id.* The language of Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. expressly states that these determinations are not preconditions to the Director’s exercise of the “discretionary power” to initiate administrative proceedings under Idaho Code § 42-237a.g., but rather are permissible exercises of the Director’s authority to “supervise and control the exercise and administration” of ground water rights. *Id.*

South Valley argues, however, that in the *Clear Springs* decision,⁸ the Idaho Supreme Court conclusively determined that Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. allows the Director to prohibit ground water pumping “in only two scenarios: 1) where pumping is found to cause material injury; or 2) to prevent aquifer mining.” *SVGWD MTD* at 13-14. The *Clear Springs* decision does not support this conclusion. The *Clear Springs* Court did not comprehensively interpret Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. To the contrary, the Court only referenced Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. to consider the ground water users’ argument that under this provision “they are protected from delivery call as long as they are maintaining reasonable pumping levels.” 150 Idaho at 803, 252 P.3d at 84. The distinctly different question of whether the Director must establish a “reasonable pumping level” or “reasonably anticipated rate of future natural recharge” prior to initiating an administrative proceeding under Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. was not raised or decided in the *Clear Springs* case.

b. THE CM RULES DO NOT APPLY TO OR GOVERN THIS PROCEEDING.

South Valley and Sun Valley also argue that this administrative proceeding must be dismissed because the CM Rules provide the sole and exclusive procedural pathway for addressing the question of whether ground water rights diverting in the Bellevue Triangle should be curtailed during the 2021 irrigation season in favor of senior surface water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries. *SVGWD MTD* at 10-16; *SVC MTD* at 10-12. The Director disagrees, for reasons discussed below.

The CM Rules provide procedures for responding to delivery calls. As CM Rule 1 states: “The rules prescribe procedures for responding to a delivery call made by the holder of a senior-priority surface or ground water right against the holder of a junior-priority ground water right . . .” IDAPA 37.03.11.001. In contrast, this administrative proceeding is not a response to a delivery call. Rather, as South Valley and Sun Valley admit, this administrative proceeding was initiated in the absence of a delivery call. *See, e.g., SVGWD MTD* at 8 (“the Association

⁷ South Valley and Sun Valley also make a related argument that CM Rule 30 required the Director to determine “an area of common ground water supply” before initiating this administrative proceeding. This argument is addressed below.

⁸ *Clear Springs Foods, Inc. v. Spackman*, 150 Idaho 790, 252 P.3d 71 (2011).

members did not file a delivery call that satisfied the requirements of CM Rule 30”);⁹ *SVC MTD* at 1-2 (“in the absence of a call for delivery of water”). The plain language of the CM Rules contradicts assertions that the CM Rules govern this administrative proceeding. *See also Memorandum Decision and Order, Basin 33 Water Users, et al., v. IDWR*, Ada County Case No. CV01-20-8069, at 8-9 (Nov. 6, 2020) (“the CM Rules are limited in scope to prescribing the basis and procedure for responding to delivery calls No such delivery call has been made in this case.”).

The plain language of the CM Rules also contradicts assertions that the CM Rules provide the sole and exclusive procedure for dealing with questions of administration between surface water rights and ground water rights. This case is an example. As previously discussed, Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. explicitly recognizes the Director’s broad “discretionary power” to initiate administrative proceedings to address the question of whether to prohibit or limit diversions under junior ground water rights that are affecting senior surface water rights, even in the absence of a delivery call or “adverse claim.” *See also Memorandum Decision and Order, Basin 33 Water Users, et al., v. IDWR*, supra, at 8-12 (rejecting the argument that “the CM Rules preclude the Director from exercising his authority under the [Ground Water] Act”).

South Valley and Sun Valley argue, however, that the District Court for the Fifth Judicial District, Twin Falls County, has already conclusively determined that the CM Rules apply to and govern the issues raised in this administrative proceeding. In support of this argument, South Valley and Sun Valley repeatedly cite to and quote from the Court’s *Memorandum Decision and Order* issued on April 22, 2016, in the judicial review proceeding under Ada County Case No. CV-WA-2015-14500 (“*Mem. Decision & Order*”). *SVGWD MTD* at 6, 12, 16-19, 23; *SVC MTD* at 4-6, 10-11. That case, however, involved “a demand for the priority administration of water” that “the Director treated “as delivery calls under the CM Rules” *Mem. Decision & Order* at 3. The findings, analysis, and holdings therefore focused on the question of whether the “delivery calls” were governed by CM Rule 40 or CM Rule 30. *Id.* at 5-15. The question of whether the Director is authorized to initiate an administrative proceeding under Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. was never raised or decided. Nor did the Court hold that the CM Rules are the sole or exclusive procedural pathway for addressing the question of whether ground water rights authorizing diversion in the Bellevue Triangle may be subject to curtailment in favor of senior water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries. Moreover, four years later the same Court held that the CM Rules apply only when senior water right holders have filed delivery calls. *Memorandum Decision and Order, Basin 33 Water Users, et al., v. IDWR*, supra, at 8-12.

For the same reasons, South Valley and Sun Valley have misplaced their reliance on decisions of the Idaho Supreme Court regarding the validity or interpretation of the CM Rules, such as *AFRD2 v. IDWR*, 143 Idaho 862 (2007), *A&B Irr. Dist. v. IDWR*, 153 Idaho 500 (2012), and *A&B Irr. Dist. v. Spackman*, 155 Idaho 640 (2013). *SVGWD MTD* at 10, 14-15; *SVC MTD* at 2-3, 7. None of these cases raised or decided the question of whether the Director is

⁹ *SVGWD* asserts that the *Notice* was issued “in direct response to claims of material injury made by senior water users in the Advisory Committee meetings held in mid-April.” *SVGWD MTD* at 19. Even assuming this assertion is correct (which it is not), verbal assertions made at the Advisory Committee meetings are not “delivery calls” within the meaning and requirements of CM Rule 30.

authorized to initiate an administrative proceeding under Idaho Code § 42-237a.g., and none of these decisions held that the CM Rules are the sole or exclusive procedure for addressing the question of whether ground water rights can or should be curtailed to prevent injury to senior surface water rights. These types of questions never arose in these cases because conjunctive management delivery calls had been filed, the issues hinged upon whether the Department had properly responded to the delivery calls, and it was undisputed that the CM Rules governed the questions presented for resolution. That does not also mean, however, that the CM Rules are the sole or exclusive procedure for addressing questions of priority administration between interconnected ground water rights and surface water rights, especially when there is express statutory authority to the contrary—in this case, Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. *See Mead v. Arnell*, 117 Idaho 660, 666, 791 P.2d 410, 416 (1990) (“rules do not supplant statutory law nor do they preempt judicial statutory interpretation”) (citation omitted); *Memorandum Decision and Order, Basin 33 Water Users, et al., v. IDWR*, supra, at 8-12 (rejecting arguments that the CM Rules bar application of the Ground Water Act).

c. THIS ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING SATISFIES DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENTS.

South Valley and Sun Valley argue that this proceeding must be dismissed because it violates their due process rights. *SVGWD MTD* at 20-27; *SVC MTD* at 4-7, 12-14. South Valley and Sun Valley assert that the *Notice* deprives them of a full and fair opportunity to be heard and protect their water rights, because the schedule established in the *Notice* does not grant sufficient time for South Valley and Sun Valley to conduct discovery, arrange for expert analyses, and otherwise prepare for the hearing. *Id.* These assertions rest primarily on contentions that this case involves a delivery call under the CM Rules, and on attempts to analogize this case to conjunctive management cases involving the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (“ESPA”). *See, e.g. SVGWD MTD* at 20 (“the schedule for this case is unprecedented and is contrary to any other conjunctive administration case that the agency has ever considered”); *SVC MTD* at 14 (“In each of those cases, meaningful discovery was allowed to take place over the course of months and years, not mere days”).

South Valley’s and Sun Valley’s due process arguments rely in large part on their contention that this case is, or should be treated as, a response to a delivery call filed under the CM Rules, and therefore the *Mem. Decision & Order* establishes due process requirements for this case. *SVGWD MTD* at 22-23; *SVC MTD* at 4-5. As previously discussed, however, this case is not a response to a delivery call under the CM Rules, and the *Mem. Decision & Order* only applies to delivery calls under the CM Rules. The *Mem. Decision & Order* did not establish due process standards for administrative proceedings pursuant to Idaho Code § 42-237a.g. *See Memorandum Decision and Order, Basin 33 Water Users, et al., v. IDWR*, supra, at 8-12 (distinguishing the CM Rules and the Ground Water Act). For these reasons, there is no merit in South Valley’s argument that an “area of common ground water supply” had to be determined prior to initiating this administrative proceeding in order to satisfy due process. *SVGWD MTD* at 20, 24. For the same reasons, there is no merit in contentions of South Valley and Sun Valley that the Director improperly relieved senior water rights holders of the burden of identifying and serving junior water rights holders with notice of a conjunctive management delivery call. *SVGWD MTD* at 22-24; *SVC MTD* at 4-5.

Moreover, it is incorrect to analogize this case to the cases that addressed conjunctive management delivery calls involving the ESPA. *SVGWD MTD* at 25; *SVC MTD* at 14. This case only addresses in-season administration of ground water rights diverting in the Bellevue Triangle during the 2021 irrigation season, and time is of the essence. A drought is predicted for 2021, and information and data currently available to the Director suggests that ground water pumping in the Bellevue Triangle during the 2021 irrigation season will have an immediate, measurable impact on surface flows in Silver Creek and its tributaries, and may injure senior surface water rights diverting from those sources.

The ESPA cases were very different. They involved many more ground water diversions and a far larger area than this case. The vast majority of the ESPA diversions were much farther away from the Snake River than ground water diversions in the Bellevue Triangle are from Silver Creek and its tributaries. The impacts of the ESPA diversions on surface flows of the Snake River are far more diffuse, delayed, and attenuated than the impacts of ground water diversions in the Bellevue Triangle are on the surface flows of Silver Creek and its tributaries. Resolving the ESPA cases often required long-term, multiple-season curtailments and/or mitigation plans.¹⁰ This case, in contrast, involves a smaller number of ground water rights pumping from a more limited area that is immediately adjacent to Silver Creek and its tributaries. These ground water diversions appear to have direct, largely un-attenuated impacts on the surface flows in Silver Creek and its tributaries. Further, this case only addresses potential shortages during the 2021 irrigation season, which likely will be a time of drought.

The Director has an affirmative duty to distribute water in accordance with the prior appropriation doctrine. *In Re SRBA*, 157 Idaho 385, 393, 336 P.3d 792, 800 (2014). Protecting the water rights of senior appropriators diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries during the upcoming irrigation season may require prompt administration of ground water rights in the Bellevue Triangle. While South Valley and Sun Valley are correct in arguing that junior ground water rights are real property rights, *SVGWD MTD* at 21; *SVC MTD* at 4, senior surface water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries are also real property rights, and in times of shortage have priority over the water rights of junior ground water appropriators. Idaho Const. Art. XV § 3; Idaho Code §§ 42-106, 42-226, 42-237a.g., 42-602, 42-607.

Further, “[d]ue process is not a rigid concept to be mechanically applied to every adversary confrontation; rather, due process is ‘flexible and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands.’” *Bowler v. Bd. of Trustees of Sch. Dist. No. 392, Shoshone Cty., Mullan*, 101 Idaho 537, 542, 617 P.2d 841, 846 (1980) (quoting *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 481 (1972)). South Valley and Sun Valley ignore this settled principle by arguing that this case must follow the procedural requirements of the CM Rules and the ESPA cases, and by focusing only on the water rights of junior appropriators. This case does not involve an ESPA conjunctive management delivery call, however, and the information presently available to the Director indicates that ground water diversions in the Bellevue Triangle may have a direct and

¹⁰ See, e.g., *AFRD2 v. IDWR*, 143 Idaho 862 (2007); *A&B Irr. Dist. v. IDWR*, 153 Idaho 500, 284 P.3d 225 (2012); *In the Matter of Distribution to Various Water Rights held by and for the Benefit of A&B Irr. Dist.*, 155 Idaho 640, 315 P.3d 828 (2012); *IGWA v. IDWR*, 160 Idaho 119, 369 P.3d 897 (2016); *Rangen, Inc. v. IDWR*, 160 Idaho 251, 371 P.3d 305 (2016); *North Snake Ground Water Dist. v. IDWR*, 160 Idaho 518, 376 P.3d 722 (2016).

immediate effect on the flows of Silver Creek and its tributaries during the 2021 irrigation season. *Notice* at 1. Timely and effective priority administration of water rights is integral to due process, and often necessary if the Director is to “equally guard all the various interests involved.” Idaho Code § 42-101. Providing a full and fair opportunity for all potentially interested parties to be heard on a question of administration during the current irrigation season, while also protecting the water rights of all potentially interested parties, precludes the type of protracted, time-consuming proceedings contemplated by South Valley and Sun Valley. South Valley and Sun Valley seek procedural protection far in excess of what “the particular situation demands.” *Bowler*, 101 Idaho at 542, 617 P.2d at 846.

The schedule established by the Notice, in contrast, allows for timely, in-season administration of water rights in accordance with the prior appropriation doctrine. Further, the schedule guarantees that, before any order for curtailment is issued, there will be pre-hearing conference and a hearing on the merits. At the hearing, the parties will have an opportunity to submit exhibits, call and examine their own witnesses, cross-examine other parties’ witnesses, and cross-examine IDWR staff members who prepared the staff memoranda. This schedule provides notice to the parties and grants a “full and fair” opportunity to be heard before any curtailment order is issued. *Coeur d’Alene Tribe v. Johnson*, 162 Idaho 754, 762, 405 P.3d 13, 21 (2017).

Sun Valley also argues that the Notice violates due process because the subsequently-issued *Request for Staff Memorandum* (May 11, 2021) (“Request”) allegedly enlarged the boundary of the “Potential Area of Curtailment” identified in the Notice. *SVC MTD* at 5-6. This assertion is incorrect. The Notice is the legally operative document that establishes the potential area of curtailment for purposes of this administrative proceeding. The Request did not purport to modify the Notice, and the “Potential Area of Curtailment” depicted in the map attached to the Notice has not been changed or enlarged by the Request. The Request simply calls for staff to prepare a memorandum that contains “[f]acts and technical information” that may be pertinent to the issues to be addressed in this proceeding. *Request* at 1. The staff memorandum was posted on the IDWR website on May 17, 2021, and is available to all potentially interested parties.¹¹ The staff members that prepared the memorandum will testify at the hearing and be subject to cross-examination. *Request* at 1. The Director’s request that staff prepare the memorandum did not violate any due process requirement or prejudice any party.

II. MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT

The *Bellevue Motion* includes a request for a clarification of the Notice, or a more definite statement regarding certain aspects of the Notice. *Bellevue Motion* at 1-3. Specifically, Bellevue asks for clarification or a more definite statement as to the boundaries or extent of the physical area within which ground water diversions are potentially subject to curtailment, whether

¹¹ The staff memorandum is posted on the IDWR website in multiple parts. *Jennifer Sukow Response to Request for Staff Memo* (May 17, 2021), *Phil Blankenau Response to Request for Staff Memo* (May 17, 2021), *Sean Vincent Response to Request for Staff Memo* (May 17, 2021), and *Tim Luke Response to Request for Staff Memo* (May 17, 2021). The “Supporting Files of Jennifer Sukow” were also posted on the same day. <https://idwr.idaho.gov/legal-actions/administrative-actions/basin-37.html>.

curtailment of ground water diversions in this area would extend beyond the 2021 irrigation season, and the “relevance” of certain information identified in the Request. *Id.* at 2-3. Bellevue argues that clarification or a more definite statement regarding these matters is necessary because the Request “asks for several items that are much broader than what is set forth in the Notice,” and “it is impossible to know at this point whether the Director will need to broaden or modify the Notice.” *Id.* Bellevue does not assert, however, that the Notice by itself is vague, ambiguous, or confusing. Rather, Bellevue argues that the Request can or will enlarge the Potential Area of Curtailment identified in the Notice, and that the Request creates the potential for curtailment to extend beyond the 2021 irrigation season. For the reasons discussed below, the Director disagrees and denies the *Bellevue Motion*’s request for clarification or a more definite statement.

The Notice is the legally operative document that establishes the potential area of curtailment for purposes of this administrative proceeding, and also the timeframe during which curtailment could potentially occur. Under the Notice, the “Potential Area of Curtailment” is limited to the area depicted in the map attached to the Notice, and the timeframe for potential curtailment of ground water rights within this area is limited to the 2021 irrigation season. *Notice* at 1 & Attachment A. The Request does not purport to modify the Notice, enlarge the “Potential Area of Curtailment” depicted in the map attached to the Notice, or enlarge the period of potential curtailment beyond the 2021 irrigation season. The Request is only an instruction to IDWR staff to prepare a memorandum setting forth facts and technical information that may be pertinent to the issues to be addressed at the administrative proceeding hearing. *Request* at 1. The fact that the Request calls for the memorandum to include information regarding surface water and ground water uses outside the Bellevue Triangle and during years other than 2021 does not enlarge the area potentially subject to curtailment as a result of any order issued in this administrative proceeding, nor does it enlarge the period of potential curtailment beyond the 2021 irrigation season.

Further, and contrary to the apparent understanding of the *Bellevue Motion*, the Request does not assume or establish the ultimate “relevance” of the information requested to the outcome of this administrative proceeding. *Bellevue Motion* at 3. Rather, the Request calls for facts and technical information that is potentially relevant to the issues to be addressed in this proceeding. *Request* at 1. The Request does not assume that all the requested facts and technical information ultimately are, or will be, relevant to the determination of whether ground water users within the Bellevue Triangle must be curtailed during the 2021 irrigation season in order to protect senior surface water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries. Rather, it is intended to ensure the record includes the facts and technical information that water users and IDWR staff have identified as potentially relevant. This approach promotes efficiency and fairness in the administrative proceeding.

III. MOTIONS FOR POSTPONEMENT OR CONTINUANCE.

Bellevue requests postponement of the hearing scheduled for June 7-11, 2021, *Bellevue Motion* at 3-6, and South Valley requests that the hearing be continued. *SVGWD MFC* at 1-4.¹²

¹² South Valley’s motion for continuance was filed “in the alternative” to South Valley’s motion to dismiss. *SVGWD MFC* at 1.

The primary argument asserted in support of these motions is that the hearing schedule established by the Notice does not allow sufficient time to address the issues presented in this proceeding, and to prepare a defense to potential curtailment of their water rights. *See Bellevue Motion* at 4 (“This rushed schedule certainly seems to give lip service to a full and fair opportunity for parties to defend their water rights and use”); *SVGWD MFC* at 3 (“grossly inadequate to prepare for the complex issues involved”). Both Bellevue and South Valley also argue that their attorneys have prior obligations (including an out-of-country trip) which will interfere with their attorneys’ ability to fully prepare for the hearing. *Bellevue Motion* at 6; *SVGWD MFC* at 4.

The arguments of Bellevue and South Valley that the hearing schedule fails to allow sufficient time to prepare for the hearing are essentially the same due process arguments made in the motions to dismiss, and lack merit for the same reasons. In brief, this case does not involve a conjunctive management delivery call on the ESPA, and the curtailment question presented is simply whether ground water uses in the Bellevue Triangle during the 2021 irrigation season will have adverse effects on the exercise of senior surface water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries. In other words, this case is not governed by the procedural requirements of the CM Rules, and is not analogous to the ESPA cases. Moreover, adopting the protracted and time-consuming schedule contemplated by Bellevue and South Valley would effectively preclude any possibility of protecting senior surface water rights diverting from Silver Creek and its tributaries from junior ground water uses in the Bellevue Triangle during the upcoming irrigation season. This would be contrary to the prior appropriation as established by Idaho law. Idaho Const. Art. XV § 3; Idaho Code §§ 42-106, 42-226, 42-237a.g. These legal considerations, and the circumstances of this case, also preclude the Director from granting an essentially indefinite postponement or continuance on grounds that some parties’ attorney have prior obligations or travel plans. The Director therefore denies the motions for postponement or continuance of the hearing scheduled for June 7-11, 2021.

DATED this 22nd day of May, 2021.



GARY SPACKMAN
Director

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 22nd day of May, 2021, the above and foregoing was served on the following by the method(s) indicated below:

James R. Laski Heather E. O'Leary Lawson Laski Clark, PLLC 675 Sun Valley Rd., Ste. A P.O. Box 3310 jrl@lawsonlaski.com heo@lawsonlaski.com efiling@lawsonlaski.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Matthew A. Johnson Brian T. O'Bannon White, Peterson, Gigray & Nichols, P.A. 5700 East Franklin Road, Suite 200 Nampa, Idaho 83687-7901 mjohnson@whitepeterson.com bobannon@whitepeterson.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Laird B. Stone Stephan, Kvanvig, Stone, & Trainor P.O. Box 83 Twin Falls, Idaho 83303-0083 sks&t@idaho-law.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Jerry R. Rigby Rigby, Andrus & Rigby, Chartered 25 North Second East Rexburg, ID 83440 irigbv@rex-law.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Joseph F. James James Law Office, PLLC 125 5th Ave. West Gooding, ID 83330 joe@jamesmvlaw.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Robert L. Harris Holden, Kidwell, Hahn & Crapo, P.L.L.C. P.O. Box 50130 1000 Riverwalk Drive, Suite 200 Idaho Falls, ID 83405 rharris@holdenlegal.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email

Rusty Kramer, Secretary PO Box 507 Fairfield, ID 83327 waterdistrict37b@outlook.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Brendan L. Ash James Law Office, PLLC 125 5th Ave. West Gooding, ID 83330 efile@jamesmylaw.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Alton Huyser 72 North, Hwy 75 Shoshone, ID 83352 bigwoodfarmllc@gmail.com cooper.brossy@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Richard T. Roats Lincoln County Prosecuting Attorney P.O. Box 860 Shoshone, ID 83352 rtr@roatslaw.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Paul Bennett 114 Calypso Lane Bellevue, ID 83313 info@swiftsureranch.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Carl Legg 1430 Poplar Avenue Twin Falls, ID 83301	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
J. Evan Robertson Robertson & Slette, PLLC P.O. Box 1906 Twin Falls, Idaho 83303-1906 erobertson@rsidaholaw.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email


Ann Y. Vonde P.O. Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0010 ann.vonde@ag.idaho.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
James P. Speck Speck & Aanestad P.O. Box 987 Ketchum, ID 83340 jim@speckandaanestad.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
John K. Simpson Barker Rosholt & Simpson LLP 1010 Jefferson St., Ste. 102 P.O. Box 2139 Boise Idaho 83701-2139 jks@idahowaters.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Rod and Kaysi Hubsmith 208-316-7087 Kaysi10@live.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Lawrence Schoen Napuisunaih 18351 U.S. Highway 20 Bellevue, ID 83313 lschoen@naramail.net	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Barbara Farms LLC Fred Brossy P.O. Box 424 Shoshone, ID 83352	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
Sabala Farms, Inc. Mark Sabala 1819 E. 1550 S. Gooding, ID 83330	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email

Idaho Ranch Hands Property Management 218 Meadowbrook Hailey, ID 83333 idahoranchhands@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
David & Nicole Hults 1572 E. 1700 S. Gooding, ID 83330	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
Bill & Karen Arkoosh 2005 US Hwy 26 Gooding, ID 83330	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
Charles E Newell P.O. Box 584 Shoshone, ID 83352	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
Nick & Jennifer Westendorf 439 N. 700 W. Shoshone, ID 83352	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
Southern Comfort Homeowner's Association P.O. Box 2739 Ketchum, ID 83340	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
Joe & Melissa Matheney P.O. Box 54 Richfield, ID 83349	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email
John & Carrie Arkoosh 2368 E. 1775 S. Gooding, ID 83330	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input type="checkbox"/> Email

W. Kent Fletcher Fletcher Law Office P.O. Box 248 Burley, Idaho 83318 wkf@pmt.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Albert P. Barker Travis L. Thompson Barker Rosholt & Simpson LLP 1010 W. Jefferson St., Ste. 102 PO Box 2139 Boise, ID 83701-2139 apb@idahowaters.com tlr@idahowaters.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Candice McHugh McHugh Bromley, PLLC 380 S. 4 th St., Ste. 103 Boise, ID 83702 cmchugh@mchughbromley.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Chris M. Bromley McHugh Bromley, PLLC 380 S. 4 th St., Ste. 103 Boise, ID 83702 cbromley@mchughbromley.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Norman M. Semanko Parsons Behle & Latimer 800 West Main Street, Ste 1300 Boise, ID 83702 NSemanko@parsonsbehle.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Sarah A. Klahn Somach Simmons & Dunn 2033 11th St., Suite 5 Boulder, CO 80302 sklahn@somachlaw.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email
Randall C. Budge Thomas J. Budge Racine Olson, PLLP 201 E. Center St. P.O. Box 1391 Pocatello, Idaho 83204 randy@racineolson.com tj@racineolson.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Overnight Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email

Michael C. Creamer
Michael P. Lawrence
Charlie S. Baser
Givens Pursley LLP
601 W. Bannock St.
P.O. Box 2720
Boise, Idaho 83701-2720
mpl@givenspursley.com
mcc@givenspursley.com
charliebaser@givenspursley.com

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U.S. Mail, postage prepaid
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hand Delivery
<input type="checkbox"/>	Overnight Mail
<input type="checkbox"/>	Facsimile
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email



REBECCA WILLS