

RECEIVED

Feb 12, 2024

DEPARTMENT OF
WATER RESOURCES

Sarah A. Klahn, ISB #7928
Maximilian C. Bricker, ISB #12283
SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN, P.C.
1155 Canyon St., Suite 110
Boulder, CO 80302
303-449-2834
sklahn@somachlaw.com
mbricker@somachlaw.com

Attorneys for American Falls-Aberdeen Ground Water District

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

IN THE MATTER OF DISTRIBUTION OF
WATER TO VARIOUS WATER RIGHTS
HELD BY OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF A&B
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, AMERICAN FALLS
RESERVOIR DISTRICT #2, BURLEY
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MILNER
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MINIDOKA
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NORTH SIDE
CANAL COMPANY, AND TWIN FALLS
CANAL COMPANY

Docket No. CM-MP-2016-001

**AMERICAN FALLS-ABERDEEN
GROUND WATER DISTRICT'S
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
OF MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

IN THE MATTER OF IGWA'S SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT MITIGATION PLAN

COMES NOW American Falls-Aberdeen Ground Water District ("AFAGWD"), by and through its undersigned counsel, pursuant to IDAPA 37.01.01.220.03 and the *Order Authorizing Discovery; Scheduling Order; Order Suspending IDAPA 37.01.01.354; Notice of Prehearing Conference and Hearing* ("Scheduling Order") dated December 29, 2023, to file this *Memorandum in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment* ("Memorandum"). As "there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact," AFAGWD "is entitled to judgment as a matter of law" (Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure ("I.R.C.P.") 56(a)) that IGWA members cannot

cure the 2022 breach of IGWA's *2016 Mitigation Plan* by operating under IGWA's *2009 Mitigation Plan*, and further that operation under any mitigation plan other than the *2016 Mitigation Plan* is not a basis for "safe harbor" from a curtailment order issued pursuant to the Surface Water Coalition ("SWC") delivery call. Filed concurrently herewith is an *Affidavit of Maximilian C. Bricker in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment* ("Bricker Aff."). In support of its *Motion for Partial Summary Judgment* ("Motion"), AFAGWD states as follows:

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 13, 2023, the Surface Water Coalition ("SWC") sent a letter to the Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources ("IDWR" or "Department") asserting that certain members of Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, Inc. ("IGWA") breached the *Surface Water Coalition's and IGWA's Stipulated Mitigation Plan and Request for Order* ("2016 Mitigation Plan")¹ in 2022. On August 2, 2023, the Director issued a *Final Order Regarding IGWA's 2022 Mitigation Plan Compliance* ("2022 Breach Order"), which found that certain Ground Water Districts ("GWDs") that are members of IGWA breached their obligations under the *2016 Mitigation Plan* in 2022² but did not order curtailment of pumping in the breaching GWDs because the Director determined the SWC would not suffer a demand shortfall in 2023. *2022 Breach Order* at 8-9. On August 16, 2023, the SWC filed a *Petition for Reconsideration & Request for Hearing* ("SWC Petition"), which was granted by the Director's *Order Granting Request for Hearing; Notice of Scheduling Conference* dated September 6, 2023.

¹ Attached to *Bricker Aff.* as Exhibit 1.

² The GWDs that "failed to satisfy their proportionate share of the mitigation obligation in 2022," along with their respective share of the 57,637 acre-feet total deficit, were AFAGWD (1,352 acre-feet), Bingham GWD (32,476 acre-feet), Bonneville-Jefferson GWD (5,204 acre-feet), and Jefferson Clark GWD (18,605 acre-feet). *2022 Breach Order* at 8-9.

AFAGWD was one of the breaching GWDs in 2022. *See 2022 Breach Order* at 8-9. As required by the Second Addendum to Settlement Agreement, paragraph 2.b.iv,³ AFAGWD subsequently cured its breach by supplying additional recharge water to cover its share of the deficit under the *2016 Mitigation Plan*.⁴

On December 12, 2023, the Director issued an *Order Appointing Hearing Officer*, and on December 14, 2023, the Hearing Officer issued a *Notice of Second Continued Scheduling Conference; Order Setting Deadlines*. On December 27, 2023, AFAGWD filed a *Petition to Intervene* and a *Proposed Statement of Issues*. At the December 28, 2023, scheduling conference, the Hearing Officer approved AFAGWD's intervention and set a deadline of February 12, 2024, for the parties to file dispositive motions, as well as a hearing for March 11-13, 2024. *See Scheduling Order*. The Hearing Officer identified the following issues for hearing:

- 1) Did the Director error by not issuing an order specifying the actions needed to cure the 2022 breach of the 2016 Mitigation Plan by certain ground water districts?
- 2) Did the Director error by not immediately issuing an order curtailing ground water districts that breached the 2016 Mitigation Plan in 2022?
- 3) Can the 2009 mitigation plan be used to cure the ground water districts' 2022 breach of the 2016 Mitigation Plan?
- 4) What action must be taken by the ground water districts to cure their 2022 breach of the 2016 Mitigation Plan?

Id. at 2-4. The Hearing Officer later shortened and reset the hearing to March 14-15, 2024, but did not alter the preceding deadlines. *Order Granting Unopposed Motion to Amend Hearing Schedule; Amended Notice of Hearing* (Jan. 23, 2024) at 1-2.

³ *See Surface Water Coalition's and IGWA's Stipulated Amended Mitigation Plan and Request for Order* (Feb. 7, 2017) at 8-9 (Ex. A at 2-3). Attached to *Bricker Aff.* as Exhibit 2.

⁴ *See Notice of Filing of Agreement-Satisfaction of AF-A-2022 Mitigation Deficit* (Nov. 3, 2023); *Notice of Satisfaction of American Falls-Aberdeen Ground Water District 2022 Mitigation Obligation* (Nov. 7, 2023).

BACKGROUND

On June 3, 2010, the Director entered an *Order Approving Mitigation Plan* (“2010 Mitigation Order”),⁵ approving *IGWA’s Mitigation Plan for the Surface Water Coalition Delivery Call* dated November 9, 2009 (“2009 Mitigation Plan”).⁶ See IDWR Docket No. CM-MP-2009-007. Under the *2009 Mitigation Plan*, IGWA was to offset its proportionate share of the SWC’s demand shortfall⁷ (i.e., material injury) in a given year with storage water. See *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 3, at 10. If IGWA members failed to supply storage water to mitigate their proportionate share of the demand shortfall, IGWA’s members would face curtailment. *Id.*; *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 4, at 3-4.

In 2015, the SWC and IGWA entered into a comprehensive settlement agreement (“2015 Settlement Agreement”) “for the purpose of *resolving* pending water delivery calls and provide for on-going management of the ESPA to address the current hydrologic conditions” *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 1, at 2, ¶ 5 (emphasis added). On March 9, 2016, the SWC and IGWA jointly sought approval of the *2016 Mitigation Plan* (“March 9, 2016, Request”), specifically asking that 2015 Settlement Agreement be incorporated and approved as a mitigation plan.

The parties stipulate and request that the Director issue the attached Order approving the SWC-IGWA Settlement Agreement and the A&B-IGWA Agreement together as a mitigation plan under CMR 43 (“IGWA’s Settlement Agreement Mitigation Plan”).

Bricker Aff., Ex. 1 at 3, ¶13. The *March 9, 2016, Request* also contained the following statement:

Ground water users who are not presently protected under IGWA’s Mitigation Plan may participate on an equitable basis by joining an IGWA Ground Water District or Irrigation District that entered into the SWC-IGWA Settlement Agreement and the A&B-IGWA Agreement and by complying with such District’s obligations under IGWA’s Settlement Agreement Mitigation Plan; or, secure Director approval of an individual mitigation plan which complies with CMR 43

⁵ Attached to *Bricker Aff.* as Exhibit 3.

⁶ Attached to *Bricker Aff.* as Exhibit 4.

⁷A variable amount determined by the Director each year through implementation of the Methodology Order.

and provides adequate mitigation to help achieve the groundwater level goal and benchmarks set forth in the SWC-IGWA Settlement Agreement.

Id. at 3-4, ¶ 14. The *March 9, 2016 Request* was granted by the Director's *Final Order Approving Stipulated Mitigation Plan* dated May 2, 2016 ("2016 Mitigation Order");⁸ it does not mention or reference the *2009 Mitigation Plan*.

IGWA's obligations under the approved *2016 Mitigation Plan*, are, *inter alia*, to: (1) reduce ground water diversions by 240,000 acre-feet ("AF") each year; (2) deliver 50,000 acre-feet of storage water to the SWC each year; and (3) attain and/or maintain certain "benchmarks," or "ground water level goals," by certain dates. *See Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 1, at 15-16 (Ex. B at 2-3, ¶¶ 3.a., 3.b, 3.e.). IGWA members that satisfy the obligations of the *2016 Mitigation Plan* receive safe harbor from a curtailment order issued pursuant to the SWC delivery call—whether or not satisfaction of the terms of the *2016 Mitigation Plan* redresses any material injury found by the Director through implementation of the Methodology Order. *See id.* at 18 (Ex. B at 5, ¶ 5). The *2016 Mitigation Plan* also provides: "This Agreement sets forth all understandings between the parties with respect to the SWC delivery call." *Id.* (Ex. B. at 5, ¶ 9).⁹

Finally, the *2016 Mitigation Plan* provides:

It is the Parties' intent that the Director will evaluate the breach and, if a breach is found to exist, provide notice of violation and opportunity to cure to the breaching member. If the member fails to cure the breach the Parties will request the Director to issue an order against the breaching member requiring action to cure the breach or be subject to immediate curtailment as provided under CMR 40.05.

⁸ Attached to *Bricker Aff.* as Exhibit 5. The *2016 Mitigation Order* was amended by a February 7, 2017 joint request for a *Stipulated Amended Mitigation Plan* (*Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 2). The Director approved the requested modification in a *Final Order Approving Amendment to Stipulated Mitigation* (May 9, 2017). Throughout this brief, the terminology "2016 Mitigation Plan" and "2016 Mitigation Order" refer to the Plan and Order as modified by the Director's 2017 order as well.

⁹ *See also Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 2, at 10 (Ex. A at 4, ¶ 4).

Bricker Aff., Ex. 2, at 8-9 (Ex. A at 2-3, ¶ 2.b.iv.).

From 2016 to 2020, IGWA's members satisfied their obligations under the *2016 Mitigation Plan*. See *IGWA v. IDWR*, Case No. CV01-23-07893 (4th Dist. Ct., Ada County) at R. 840-44.¹⁰ In 2021 and 2022, however, the Director found that certain GWDs had failed to reduce pumping in accordance with the *2016 Mitigation Plan*. See *Amended Final Order Regarding Compliance with Approved Mitigation Plan*, (Apr. 24, 2023) ("2021 Breach Order") at 16-17; *2022 Breach Order* at 8.

When the Director implemented the Methodology Order in April 2023, he predicted that the SWC would suffer material injury, but offered "safe harbor" from curtailment as follows:

There are seven approved mitigation plans in place responding to the SWC delivery call filed by: 1) A&B Irrigation District, 2) Southwest Irrigation District and Goose Creek Irrigation District (collectively, "SWID"), 3) the Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, Inc. ("IGWA"), 4) certain cities commonly referred to as the "Coalition of Cities", and 5) certain entities commonly referred to as the "Water Mitigation Coalition." A&B Irrigation District's proportionate share of the predicted DS of 75,200 acre-feet is 458 acre-feet. Due to the nature of the mitigation plans for SWID, the Coalition of Cities and the Water Mitigation Coalition, these entities do not need to establish that they can mitigate for their proportionate share of the predicted DS. IGWA has two approved mitigation plans. If IGWA is in compliance with mitigation plan CM-MP-2016-001, IGWA does not need to establish that it can mitigate for its proportionate share of the predicted DS. If IGWA seeks to provide mitigation by delivery of storage water as approved in mitigation plan CM-MP-2009-007, IGWA's proportionate share of the predicted DS of 75,198 acre-feet is 63,645 acre-feet.

Final Order Regarding April 2023 Forecast Supply (Methodology Steps 1-3), IDWR Docket No. CM-DC-2010-001 (Apr. 21, 2023) at 5, ¶ 6, n.5 (emphasis added) (hereinafter "April 2023 Methodology Steps 1-3 Order").

¹⁰ Attached to *Bricker Aff.* as Exhibit 6. IGWA satisfied its obligations in a given year if the sum at the bottom of the column entitled "Total Conservation" equals or exceeds 240,000 AF.

The Director’s footnote frames the core dispute in this case: *can* IGWA’s members cure a breach of the *2016 Mitigation Plan* and continue to receive safe harbor from curtailment by operating under the *2009 Mitigation Plan*?

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Department’s Rules of Procedure authorize the filing of motions for summary judgment in any contested case. IDAPA 37.01.01.220.03. I.R.C.P. 56 applies to motions before the Department with the exception of subsections (b) and (g). *Id.* Under the Rule 56 standard, the Department “must grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” I.R.C.P. 56(a). The moving party has the burden of proving the absence of disputed material facts, and the Department “must liberally construe facts in the existing record in favor of the nonmoving party, and draw all reasonable inferences from the record in favor of the nonmoving party.” *Martin v. Thelma V. Garrett Living Trust*, 170 Idaho 1, 5 (2022) (citation omitted). The Department must deny summary judgment “[i]f there are conflicting inferences contained in the record or if reasonable minds might reach different conclusions.” *Id.*

ARGUMENT

I. IGWA Cannot Use the 2009 Mitigation Plan to Cure the Ground Water Districts’ 2022 Breach of the 2016 Mitigation Plan

a. The Plain Language of the Two Plans Does Not Support the Argument that IGWA Members May Cure a Breach of the 2016 Mitigation Plan by Operating Under the 2009 Mitigation Plan.

As described above, IGWA has two “approved” mitigation plans. Neither plan references the other.

- Under the *2009 Mitigation Plan*, IGWA receives safe harbor from curtailment if IGWA supplies storage water to the SWC in an amount and at a time “as set forth in the Methodology Order.” *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 3, at 10. That means in years when the Director finds there is no material injury to the SWC, IGWA operates without fear of conjunctive administration.
- The *2016 Mitigation Plan*, by contrast, embodies the 2015 Settlement Agreement between IGWA and the SWC, and requires IGWA to undertake certain activities every year (and regardless of the Director’s annual determinations of material injury under the Methodology Order) to redress aquifer levels. It was a stipulated mitigation plan under which the SWC exchanged IGWA’s agreement to conduct annual activities to enhance aquifer health for a guarantee of mitigation water to redress material injury found through implementation of the Methodology Order. Thus, the *2016 Mitigation Plan* provides “other appropriate compensation,” rather than “replacement water supplies,” to the SWC, a valid option under the Conjunctive Management Rules (“CMR”). IDAPA 37.03.11.043.03.c.

Moreover, the *2016 Mitigation Plan* includes provisions related to management of IGWA’s agreed upon aquifer enhancement activities, including a steering committee and a dispute resolution process.¹¹ In the event of a breach, the *2016 Mitigation Plan* provides that the Director take action against “the breaching member [including] requiring action to cure the breach or be subject to immediate curtailment as provided under CMR 40.05.”¹² What the *2016*

¹¹ See *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 1, at 17-18 (Ex. B at 4-5, ¶¶ 3.m., 4); *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 2, at 8-10 (Ex. A at 2-4, ¶ 2).

¹² *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 2, at 8-9 (Ex. A at 2-3, ¶ 2.b.iv.).

Mitigation Plan does **not** include is a term or condition that authorizes IGWA to cure a breach of its obligations by unilaterally deciding to operate under the *2009 Mitigation Plan*.

Nonetheless, IGWA has argued on behalf of the offending GWDs (in various filings)¹³ that language used in footnote 5 of the *April 2023 Methodology Steps 1-3 Order* (mitigation may be carried out by “**an** approved mitigation plan”) and the CMR (Rule 30.07(g), requiring the Director to “take into consideration the existence of **any** approved mitigation plan” before curtailing) authorizes juniors to elect the nature of their mitigation activities. IGWA’s approach is essentially: *Don’t feel like reducing pumping under the 2016 Mitigation Plan? That’s ok, keep your fingers crossed and see if it’s a wet year and then keep pumping; worst case scenario you can “mitigate” under the 2009 Mitigation Plan¹⁴ and avoid curtailment.* This approach has become so popular that, in late 2023 to early 2024, seven of IGWA’s nine GWDs filed petitions for approval of *individual* mitigation plans.¹⁵ Not one of the proposed mitigation plans made any attempt to articulate the relationship between the newly applied-for mitigation plan, the *2016 Mitigation Plan*, and/or the *2009 Mitigation Plan*. From the look of it, some GWDs will continue to ignore their proportionate obligations under the *2016 Mitigation Plan* and administer their own junior pumping in the absence of the Department’s proper exercise of its authority.

¹³ See, e.g., *IGWA’s Response to SWC’s Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification and Request for Enforcement of Orders Approving 2016 Mitigation Plan* (Aug. 3, 2023) at 2.

¹⁴ Or another mitigation plan, see n. 16, *infra*.

¹⁵ See IDWR Docket Nos. CM-MP-2024-001 (Bingham GWD’s *Petition for Approval of Mitigation Plan*); CM-MP-2023-001 (Madison GWD’s & Henry’s Fork GWD’s *Petition for Approval of Mitigation Plan*); CM-MP-2023-002 (Bonneville-Jefferson GWD’s *Petition for Approval of Mitigation Plan*); CM-MP-2023-003 (Jefferson Clark GWD’s *Petition for Approval of Mitigation Plan*); CM-MP-2023-004 (North Snake GWD’s *Petition for Approval of Mitigation Plan*); CM-MP-2023-005 (Magic Valley GWD’s *Petition for Approval of Mitigation Plan*). The only GWDs that have not filed petitions for approval of individual mitigation plans to-date are AFAGWD and Carey GWD.

IGWA's arguments related to the language of the *April 2023 Methodology Steps 1-3 Order* and the CMR are without basis. The fact that these legal authorities contain language acknowledging water users may seek *separate* mitigation plans does not support the idea that a water user may obtain *multiple* mitigation plans and elect—depending on the day of the week, the status of its commercial success in a given irrigation year, or some other intangible—under which mitigation plan it will operate. This is true particularly when the mitigation plan under scrutiny here (the *2016 Mitigation Plan*) provides for “other appropriate compensation” that obligates the water user to perform activities each year regardless of whether there is injury. IGWA's arguments—if adopted—would put conjunctive management into the hands of the offending GWDs and leave entities like AFAGWD who in good faith entered into the 2015 Settlement Agreement and signed onto the *2016 Mitigation Plan*, and are presently in compliance therewith, left holding the bag. If the Department does not reject IGWA's specious arguments in this case, conjunctive management in eastern Idaho is a dead letter.

IGWA's arguments should also be rejected because they are inconsistent with positions it has previously taken before the Department. IGWA previously described the 2015 Settlement Agreement as “historic” and entered into for the “purpose of resolving pending water delivery calls and provide for on-going management of the ESPA to address [current hydrologic conditions].” *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 1, at 2, ¶ 5. Further, IGWA represented that it desired the only means for non-IGWA ground water irrigators to obtain protection from curtailment should be for them to join an IGWA member-district OR to “secure Director approval of an individual mitigation plan *which complies with CMR 43 and provides adequate mitigation to help achieve the ground water level goal and benchmarks set forth in the SWC-IGWA Agreement.*” *Id.* at 3-

4, ¶ 14 (emphasis added). So, while IGWA argues today that its members can operate under the mitigation plan of their choosing to avoid curtailment and cure the breach of the *2016 Mitigation Plan*, in 2016 it asked the Director to *reject non-IGWA mitigation plans that did not assist IGWA in achieving its goals under the 2015 Settlement Agreement*. The Hearing Officer should reject IGWA’s arguments that offending GWDs may cure their *2016 Mitigation Plan* breach through compliance with other, extraneous mitigation plans, including the *2009 Mitigation Plan*.

b. The Department is Required to Take Action When a Ground Water District Breaches the *2016 Mitigation Plan*, Even Though the *Plan* Provides Alternate Mitigation under Rule 43.03.c.

The *2016 Mitigation Plan* provides mitigation in the form of “other appropriate compensation to the senior-priority water right.” IDAPA 37.03.11.043.03.c. The Director’s failure to enforce the *2016 Mitigation Plan* and penalize the offending GWDs is an abuse of discretion, and the Hearing Officer should find that the Director must enter an order that the offending GWDs cannot receive safe harbor from curtailment in 2024, or beyond, by using the *2009 Mitigation Plan*—or any other plan—so long as they remain in breach of the *2016 Mitigation Plan*.¹⁶ The District Court has previously found the Director abused his discretion when he subjected junior ground water users to curtailment because their mitigation plan provided “other appropriate compensation” rather than replacement water, as explained below; here, the Director is abusing discretion by approving the *2016 Mitigation Plan* yet declining to enforce it.

¹⁶ The Director already ordered that the offending GWDs “will not be entitled to the protection of IGWA’s 2016 Mitigation Plan in response to a curtailment order,” *2022 Breach Order* at 9, and should now clarify that the offending GWDs will also not be entitled to the protection of IGWA’s *2009 Mitigation Plan*—or any other plan—in response to a curtailment order until they cure their breaches that occurred in 2022. See *Bricker Aff.*, Ex. 2, at 8-9 (Ex. A at 2-3, ¶ 2.b.iv.).

Following the hearing in the Rangen Delivery Call, the Coalition of Cities (“Cities”) entered into a stipulated mitigation plan with Rangen for “other appropriate compensation.” *See, Order Conditionally Approving Cities’ Second Mitigation Plan*, IDWR Docket No. CM-MP-2014-007 (Feb. 13, 2015).¹⁷ The Director conditionally approved the plan (*see id.* at 9-10), but the Cities remained subject to curtailment because the Director found their alternative form of mitigation was ineffective to replace their depletions in time, location and amount. *See City of Bliss et al. v. Spackman*, Case No. CV-2015-172 (Memorandum Decision and Order, Sep. 8, 2015) at 3-4.¹⁸ On appeal, the District Court found that the Director abused his discretion because parties to a delivery call can stipulate to “other appropriate compensation” in lieu of providing sufficient replacement supplies at the proper time and place; and upon approval of such a mitigation plan, the Director could not ignore the bargain struck between the parties and impose curtailment on the grounds that the mitigation plan would not provide replacement supplies at the time and place required by the senior right. *See id.* at 9-10.

Whereas in the Rangen call the Director improperly imposed curtailment on juniors who were in compliance with an “other appropriate compensation” mitigation plan because the plan did not provide for replacement of water, here the Director has allowed juniors users in GWDs who are *not* in compliance with the *2016 Mitigation Plan* (also an “other appropriate compensation” plan) to *continue* to pump because the orders implementing the Methodology Order did not predict a demand shortfall in 2023. The Director’s inaction disregards the bargain struck between IGWA members and the SWC in the 2015 Settlement Agreement, and the

¹⁷ <https://idwr.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/legal/CM-MP-2014-007/CM-MP-2014-007-20150213-Order-Confirming-Final-Order-Conditionally-Approving-Cities-Second-Mitigation-Plan.pdf> (last visited Feb. 12, 2024).

¹⁸ <https://idwr.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/legal/CV-2015-172/CV-2015-172-20150908-Memorandum-Decision-and-Order.pdf> (last visited Feb. 12, 2024).

Director's incorporation of the 2015 Settlement Agreement into the *2016 Mitigation Plan*. To date, the offending GWDs have avoided any meaningful penalties for their breach of obligations associated with the *2016 Mitigation Plan* in 2022, and appear to believe that they can avoid the most crucial penalty of all—curtailment—by reverting to operating under the *2009 Mitigation Plan*, or their other proposed plans, in 2024. This is a gross inequity and only leads to the erosion of conjunctive management as the rule of law in eastern Idaho.

CONCLUSION

AFAGWD respectfully request that the Hearing Officer enter an order finding that operations under the *2009 Mitigation Plan* will not cure offending GWDs' breach of the *2016 Mitigation Plan*, and that the offending GWDs will not be protected by the *2009 Mitigation Plan*—or any other plan—in response to a curtailment order so long as they are in breach of the *2016 Mitigation Plan*.

Respectfully submitted this 12th day of February 2024.

SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN, P.C.



Sarah A. Klahn, ISB # 7928
Maximilian C. Bricker, ISB #12283
*Attorneys for the American Falls-Aberdeen
Ground Water District*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 12th day of February 2024, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be filed and served on the persons below via email:

Hearing Officer Roger S. Burdick Director Mat Weaver Garrick Baxter Idaho Department of Water Resources 322 E Front St. Boise, ID 83720-0098	Mathew.Weaver@idwr.idaho.gov garrick.baxter@idwr.idaho.gov file@idwr.idaho.gov roburd47@gmail.com
John K. Simpson Marten Law LLP P.O. Box 2139 Boise, ID 83701-2139	jsimpson@martenlaw.com
Travis L. Thompson Marten Law LLP P. O. Box 63 Twin Falls, ID 83303-0063	tthompson@martenlaw.com
W. Kent Fletcher Fletcher Law Office P.O. Box 248 Burley, ID 83318	wkf@pmt.org
Thomas J. Budge Elisheva M. Patterson Racine Olson, PLLP P.O. Box 1391 Pocatello, ID 83204-1391	tj@racineolson.com elisheva@racineolson.com
David W. Gehlert Natural Resources Section Environment and Natural Resources Division U.S. Department of Justice 999 18th St., South Terrace, Suite 370 Denver, CO 80202	david.gehlert@usdoj.gov

<p>Matt Howard U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 1150 N Curtis Road Boise, ID 83706-1234</p>	<p>mhoward@usbr.gov</p>
<p>Rich Diehl City Of Pocatello P.O. Box 4169 Pocatello, ID 83205</p>	<p>rdiehl@pocatello.us</p>
<p>Candice McHugh Chris Bromley Mchugh Bromley, PLLC 380 South 4th Street, Suite 103 Boise, ID 838702</p>	<p>cmchugh@mchughbromley.com cbromley@mchughbromley.com</p>
<p>Robert E. Williams Williams, Meservy & Lothspeich, LLP P.O. Box 168 Jerome, ID 83338</p>	<p>rewilliams@wmlattys.com</p>
<p>Robert L. Harris Holden, Kidwell, Hahn & Crapo, PLLC P. O. Box 50130 Idaho Falls, ID 83405</p>	<p>rharris@holdenlegal.com</p>
<p>Randall D. Fife City Attorney City of Idaho Falls P.O. Box 50220 Idaho Falls, ID 83405</p>	<p>rfife@idahofallsidaho.gov</p>
<p>Corey Skinner IDWR-Southern Region 1341 Fillmore St., Ste. 200 Twin Falls, ID 83301-3033</p>	<p>corey.skinner@idwr.idaho.gov</p>
<p>Tony Olenichak IDWR-Eastern Region 900 N. Skyline Drive, Ste. A Idaho Falls, ID 83402</p>	<p>Tony.Olenichak@idwr.idaho.gov</p>
<p>Skyler C. Johns Nathan M. Olsen Steven L. Taggart</p>	<p>sjohns@olsentaggart.com nolsen@olsentaggart.com staggart@olsentaggart.com</p>

Olsen Taggart PLLC P.O. Box 3005 Idaho Falls, ID 83403	
Dylan Anderson Dylan Anderson Law P. O. Box 35 Rexburg, ID 83440	dylan@dylanandersonlaw.com
<i>COURTESY COPY TO:</i> William A. Parsons Parsons Smith & Stone P.O. Box 910 Burley, ID 83318	wparsons@pmt.org

Sarah A. Klahn, ISB # 7928