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

In Re: SRBA) Subcase Nos.
) 1-2064, et al.
Case No. 39576) (American Falls subcases)
) Subcase Nos.
) 1-2068, et al.
) (Palisades subcases)

DEPOSITION OF ANTHONY OLENICHAK FEBRUARY 9, 2012

REPORTED BY:

JEFF LaMAR, C.S.R. No. 640

Notary Public

```
THE DEPOSITION OF ANTHONY OLENICHAK was taken
1
   on behalf of the Ground Water Districts and American
2
   Falls Spaceholders at the offices of Idaho Department
   of Water Resources Southern Regional Office,
4
   1341 Fillmore Street, Suite 200, Twin Falls, Idaho,
5
   commencing at 10:01 a.m. on February 9, 2012, before
   Jeff LaMar, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary
   Public within and for the State of Idaho, in the
8
   above-entitled matter.
10
                         APPEARANCES:
11
   For Ground Water Districts:
12
        RACINE, OLSON, NYE, BUDGE & BAILEY, CHARTERED
13
        BY MS. CANDICE McHUGH
14
        101 South Capitol Boulevard, Suite 300
15
        Boise, Idaho 83702
16
   For American Falls Spaceholders:
17
        RIGBY, ANDRUS & RIGBY, CHARTERED
18
        BY MR. JERRY R. RIGBY
19
        25 North Second East
2.0
        Post Office Box 250
21
        Rexburg, Idaho 83440
22
   ///
23
   ///
24
   ///
25
```

```
APPEARANCES (Continued):
1
2
   For State of Idaho:
3
        OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
4
        BY MR. MICHAEL C. ORR
5
        700 West Jefferson, Statehouse Room 207
6
        Post Office Box 83720
        Boise, Idaho 83720-0010
8
   For Surface Water Coalition:
9
        BARKER, ROSHOLT & SIMPSON LLP
10
        BY MR. JOHN K. SIMPSON
11
        1010 West Jefferson, Suite 102
12
        Post Office Box 2139
13
        Boise, Idaho 83701-2139
14
   For Idaho Power Company:
15
        IDAHO POWER COMPANY
16
        BY MR. JAMES C. TUCKER
17
        Post Office Box 70
18
        Boise, Idaho 83707
19
   For Idaho Department of Water Resources:
20
        OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
21
        BY MR. CHRISTOPHER M. BROMLEY
22
        322 East Front Street, 6th Floor
23
        Post Office Box 83720
24
        Boise, Idaho 83720-0098
25
```

```
APPEARANCES (Continued):
 1
 2
    Also Present:
 3
          Ray Williams
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	I N D E X		
2			
3	TESTIMONY OF ANTHONY OLENICHAK PAGE		
4	Examination by Ms. McHugh 6,64,103,130		
5	Examination by Mr. Rigby 32,107		
6	Examination by Mr. Orr 55,114,134		
7	Examination by Mr. Simpson 66,120,136		
8	Examination by Mr. Tucker 98,124,137		
9	Examination by Mr. Bromley 127		
10			
11	EXHIBITS		
12	1 - Joint Notice of Deposition of Tony Olenichak 7		
13	2 - Idaho Department of Water Resources 13		
14	Recommended Water Rights Acquired Under State		
15	Law, Right No. 1-2064, dated 12/16/2006		
16	3 - Idaho Department of Water Resources 13		
17	Recommended Water Rights Acquired Under State		
18	Law, Right No. 1-2068, dated 12/16/2006		
19	4 - State of Idaho's Motion for Partial Summary 26		
20	Judgment		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

```
ANTHONY OLENICHAK,
1
   first duly sworn to tell the truth relating to said
2
   cause, testified as follows:
4
                          EXAMINATION
5
   BY MS. McHUGH:
                Good morning, Tony. I'm Candice McHugh,
          O.
   and I represent the Ground Water Districts in this
8
   matter.
                Is it fine if I call you "Tony"?
10
          Α.
                Yes, please.
11
                Okay. Can you please state your name and
          Q.
12
   spell your full name for the record.
13
                Anthony Olenichak, A-n-t-h-o-n-y,
          Α.
14
   O-l-e-n-i-c-h-a-k.
15
                You understand you're here today to talk
16
   about water-right claims in the SRBA for American Falls
17
   and Palisades Reservoir? Is that your understanding?
18
          Α.
                As it pertains to the refill issue?
19
          Ο.
                Yes.
2.0
          Α.
                Yes.
21
                Okay. And the water rights at issue
22
   specifically is water right 1-2064, and that's for
23
   American Falls.
24
                Do you understand that?
25
```

Α. Yes. 1 And 1-2068 for Palisades? 2 Yes. Α. MS. McHUGH: And I'll have you mark this, Jeff. 4 (Exhibit 1 marked.) 5 (BY MS. McHUGH): I'm handing you what's 0. 6 been marked as Exhibit 1. 7 Have you seen this document before? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Ο. And can you tell me what it is. 10 Α. It's the request for the deposition. 11 And for which you're here today? Q. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Okay. Have you had your deposition taken 0. 14 before? 15 Α. Yes. 16 And when was that? 17 I can't remember the exact dates, but I 18 think I've had one each year for the past three years. 19 And there was one back in 2005. 20 Okay. And can you generally tell me what Ο. 21 matters they were in. 22 The last one was over water right 1-6, the Α. 23 AFRD No. 2 right. One was concerning the Minidoka 24

25

power rights. The other was over the high-water right

```
issue. I can't remember what the fourth one was. The earliest one was the A & B/Falls Irrigation issue.
```

- Q. And just so I can understand that, so the 1-6 AFRD 2 water right, I think I attended that deposition.
- And was it taken by Tom Arkoosh?
 - A. Yes.

5

8

9

10

11

- Q. Okay. On the Minidoka power rights, could you elaborate who took that deposition?
- A. That was at the Valley Bank in Twin Falls, if I remember correctly.
- Q. And do you recall --
- A. I don't recall who it was that asked for the deposition.
- Q. Do you remember who asked the questions?
 - A. The common group. Jim Tucker was there.
- 17 Q. Okay.
- A. John Simpson.
- Q. Was that in an SRBA matter? Do you know?
- A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. Okay. And the high-water right deposition?
- A. Yes. That took place in the Idaho Falls
 IDWR office.
- Q. And if I'm remembering, was Randy Budge in attendance or --

- 1 A. I think so.
- Q. -- Rob Harris?
 - A. I can't remember if Rob was there or not.
 - Q. Okay. And then in 2005 the A & B and Falls Irrigation District matter, was that an SRBA matter?
 - A. No, it wasn't.
 - Q. Okay. I probably should have gone over the ground rules to begin with, but you understand you're under oath and that this transcript can be used in court?
- 11 A. Yes.

5

6

8

10

22

- Q. And to answer the questions audibly so that the court reporter can record them?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And if you need a break, you can just ask me, and we can take a break.
- Okay. When I refer to "the Director"

 today, I'll be referring to Interim Director Gary

 Spackman or his predecessors, but it means the Director

 of the Department of Water Resources.
- 21 A. Okay.
 - Q. Can I have a brief background of your education.
- A. I have a bachelor of science degree in watershed science from Utah State University. I

1 graduated in 1983.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Have you had any subsequent training, educational training?
 - A. Not educational, no.
 - Q. Any training within IDWR?
- A. Well, through my experience there's several miscellaneous trainings, but mostly it's through my experience dealing with water rights and hydrology.
- Q. Okay. And what is your current position with IDWR?
 - A. Program manager for Water District No. 1.
 - Q. And since when have you held that position?
- A. 2005. From 200- -- or I should say 1990 to 2005 I was a hydrologist for Water District 1. Prior to that from 1988 to 1990 I was a senior water right agent for the Department of Water Resources. From 19- -- 198- -- did I say 1988?
 - O. Yeah.
- A. From 1985 to 1988 I worked for the State of Montana Water Rights Bureau as a water rights specialist. From 1984 -- you want to go back?
 - Q. No, that's probably fine. Thank you.
- A. Okay.
- Q. Can you tell me, you're employed by Water
 District 1. Can you explain the relationships between

```
Water District 1 and the Department of Water Resources, as you understand it.
```

A. Water District 1 has a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Water Resources. We share their vehicles, their office equipment. We are State employees. We get paid through their payroll system, participate in their benefits, retirement, health insurance.

We do that by collecting our assessments from the water users, the water district does, and then paying at least a portion of those assessments to the Department of Water Resources for the use of their equipment and also to reimburse our salaries.

- Q. And the Attorney General's office represents Water District 1, or is your attorney for this deposition? Is that your understanding?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Does Water District 1 have any other attorneys that represent it? Do you know?
- A. Water District 1 has attorneys that represent the Committee of Nine.
- Q. In your current position as program manager, can you briefly explain what your responsibilities include.
 - A. My responsibilities are to see that the

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
daily accounting of water delivery is done properly,
that water measurements are -- are taken in a timely
manner and accurately.
```

So my responsibility extends to supervising three positions in the Idaho Falls office and the 12 hydrographer-engaged reader positions that are spread out over the district.

- Q. What have you done to prepare for this deposition?
- A. I read my previous depositions. That's the only preparation that I've done.
 - Q. Did you consult with any attorneys?
- A. Yes. I -- Chris Bromley I met with briefly two days ago, and he had some questions concerning the refill issue.
 - Q. Did you review any documents besides your depositions?
 - A. Yes. I reviewed the -- I'm not sure whether you would call it an order or what type of document it was from Judge Wildman concerning the binding effect of the Eagle decree.
 - Q. Any other documents?
 - A. None that I can think of.
- Q. Getting specifically to water right
 No. 1-2064 and 1-2068, what work have you been asked to

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

```
do for those water rights?
```

- A. Well, I've reviewed -- and I've explained
 how those water rights are delivered in the Water

 District 1 water right accounting. I've also reviewed
 how the language in the Eagle decree has been used in
 that delivery.
 - Q. Did you make the recommendations for those water rights?
 - A. No, I did not.

- MS. McHUGH: Jeff, if I could have this document marked as No. 2 and this document marked as No. 3.
- (Exhibits 2 and 3 marked.)
- Q. (BY MS. McHUGH): I've handed you a document that's been marked as Exhibit No. 2.
- Could you identify that document.
- A. Exhibit No. 2 is the recommended water right from the Idaho Department of Water Resources for right No. 1-2064, which is the 1921 water right for American Falls Reservoir.
- Q. Is it accurate to say that that's the Director's Report?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Were you involved in preparing any portion of this Director's Report?
- 25 A. No.

- Q. Are you aware of whether this recommendation in the Director's Report has been altered or amended since it was issued?
 - A. I'm not sure if it's been amended, but I know we were talking about separating out the portion of winter-water-savings water out of this right that's for the entire reservoir.
 - Q. And is that pursuant to a stipulation between the parties? Are you aware?
 - A. I am not.

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And can you identify what's been marked as Exhibit No. 3.
- A. Exhibit No. 3 is the Department's recommendation for 1-2068 for Palisades Reservoir.
- Q. Were you involved in preparing any portion of this Director's Report?
 - A. No.
- Q. And do you know whether this recommendation has been altered or amended since it was issued?
- A. I think this right also may have been amended to separate out the winter-water-savings water from the total quantity of the right.
- Q. Before I go into more depth on those two water rights, I want you to keep those in mind when I ask you some questions about Water District 1

```
operations. Now I want to talk to you a little bit
about Water District 1 operation regarding the issue of
refill.
```

Could you tell me what you understand "refill" to mean as it pertains to these two water rights.

A. Water District 1 accounts for the gains that accrue to this priority date up to the amount of the capacity of the right. Once that capacity is reached, it's common for the physical contents not to match the water that we've accrued on paper.

What that means is the storage that accrued to the right was used either by an irrigation canal downstream or the water was released for flood control or any other type of usage.

When surplus water comes into the reservoir after that time, that evacuated space can sometimes refill physically. That's my definition of the refill.

Q. I'm going to break down a few of the terms that you used. First of all, you said "the capacity of the right."

Can you explain to me what you mean by "the capacity of the right."

A. Well, the total amount of water we can store into the American Falls storage right is the

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
1 | 1,672,590 acre-feet.
```

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And that refers on Exhibit 2 specifically to the quantity element?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And so the capacity of the water right for 1-2068 for Exhibit No. 3 would be 1.2 million acre-feet?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. You also used the term "physical capacity."

 Can you explain to me what you mean by

 "physical capacity" as it relates to the capacity on

 the water right.
 - A. Well, the active physical capacity should be equal to the capacity on the water right.
 - Q. Is it fair to say that the physical capacity is how big the reservoir is, how much water the reservoir will hold?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. You also used the term "surplus water."

 Could you explain to me what you meant by
 "surplus water."
 - A. After the water right has accrued its volume of storage, the physical contents sometimes are not the same as what we've accounted for on paper that's accrued to the right because of the operations

undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation, whether it be to release the water for irrigation needs or for flow 2 augmentation or for flood control, whatever the purpose, that would cause the physical contents not to equal the amount that we've stored under the right.

- In other words, the physical contents would Ο. be less than the actual content as recorded under the right?
 - Or the same.
- So am I accurate in saying that what you understand refill to be in these cases is to refill the water right after there has been some releases from storage?
- The water right would remain filled, regardless of whether or not we had refill.
- So you're using the term "refill" as a Ο. physical refill of the reservoir, and the water rights, the amount of water that is stored under the water right or accounted for for the water right doesn't change?
 - Correct. Α.
- I also understand that "refill" can be used as to refill the storage account.
- Could you explain to me what you understand that might mean if someone were to say that "Our

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

storage account was refilled."

A. Yes. Common situation is that the irrigation season begins, we're -- let's assume that the reservoirs are full physically and we've also filled the water right on paper. There's some storage use by a canal that occurs. And so the reservoirs are physically drawn down because of that storage use.

And then we have a burst of runoff from snowmelt or rain that exceeds the demand, the irrigation demand. There's no water spilling out the end of the system, so physically the contents of the reservoir increase. That's an example of refill.

What that -- the effect of that is is that it allows us to cancel some of the previous storage that has -- storage usage that has occurred. In other words, we started with a full reservoir, there were some storage used, and then that physical space that was evacuated subsequently refilled, so we now have a full system again, which allows us to cancel the previous storage use.

- Q. When does the cancelling of the previous storage use occur?
- A. It occurs on the day of allocation, when the watermaster allocates the amount of storage or the amount of fill available to the spaceholders.

- Q. So when we were discussing a refill of a water right earlier -- and I understood your answer to be that the right would remain the same, even if the physical contents of the reservoir refilled -- explain to me how that is consistent with what you just told me about refilling a storage account.
- A. We don't refill the storage account. We refill the reservoir physically. The storage account would -- would be 100 percent full under this assumption. And then space is physically evacuated and then subsequently refills. That's a physical change, but the amount accrued in the storage right doesn't change.
 - Q. If the storage water right was not 100 percent filled, could you explain what would happen if there was a surge of water prior to the day of allocation -- or after the day of allocation, what would happen to a storage account that was not 100 percent full?
 - A. The storage account that's not 100 percent full would then fill under priority. If natural flow was sufficient to fill that priority, then it would continue to accrue water under that storage account.
 - Q. And when would that occur?
 - A. It can occur any time during the season.

- Q. In the answer to one of my questions, you also said something about "the refill of the system."

 Could you explain to me what you meant by that.
 - A. We generally look at the reservoir -- the reservoirs collectively as a system, because water that may accrue to a storage account such as American Falls might be physically held in Palisades.

The net system contents are -- would be equivalent to the refill, where the refill is occurring, whether it's credited towards storage that had previously been used out of American Falls or previously been used out of Palisades. The refill may not occur in the reservoir where the storage use came from.

- Q. Could you list the reservoirs that are included in your term "system."
- A. Yes. Jackson Lake, Palisades Reservoir,
 American Falls, Lake Walcott, Ririe, Henry's Lake,
 Island Park, Grassy Lake. I think that's all of them.
- Q. Does Water District 1 recognize refill of storage water rights in priority?
 - A. No, it does not.
 - Q. Can you explain that.
 - A. Assuming the reservoir rights have filled

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- to 100 percent and then some refill occurs, that refill does not occur in priority to the reservoirs. In other words, a reservoir -- let's say the most senior reservoir wouldn't have first right to refill.
 - Q. The senior reservoir would not have the first right to refill?
 - A. Correct.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. What reservoir is the senior reservoir?
- A. I don't remember the priority dates of every reservoir exactly, but certainly Lake Walcott would be with their 1909, and then Jackson I believe has a 1906 water right for a portion of its storage. Those would be the senior reservoirs.
- Q. And I know I'm belaboring the issue on refill, but now we've introduced that Water District 1 does not refill storage water rights in priority. And the explanation was that the senior reservoir would not have first right to.
- Refill. And I apologize if you've already answered this question, but can you explain to me how does Water District 1 recognize refill.
- A. Refill is not identified per individual reservoir. It's systemwide refill. I guess that's a better explanation as to why it's not done under

priority. It's just surplus water that's physically stored in the reservoir system that wasn't assigned to a specific storage right.

Q. Can you look at Exhibit No. 2, which is the water right for American Falls Reservoir. And could you walk me through an example of where systemwide -- there would be refill and how you would treat this water right or how this water right would -- do you understand my question?

A. I think so.

Assuming this water right was filled on paper -- in other words, upstream from American Falls there was enough water, natural flow, available to fill the entire 1,672,590 acre-feet, and some of that water was used, that American Falls storage, there was some spaceholder in the system that diverted their storage, that would be subtracted from their allocation from this full storage account.

While that's happening, they're evacuating space. It may not be physically from American Falls Reservoir. It may be from some other reservoir. And then we have a burst of snowmelt or rain refills that space. It may not refill the space physically in American Falls; it could refill the space anywhere physically in the system, wherever that empty space

could be. If there's sufficient refill to cancel out the storage use, then that refill, in a sense, is credited towards the spaceholder of American Falls.

- Q. Towards the spaceholder of American Falls who already used their water?
 - A. Correct.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And when that is credited to their storage account, that could occur before the day of allocation?
- A. No. It generally happens on the day of allocation.
- Q. On the day of allocation. And can you explain to me why Water District 1 allows for or accounts for the systemwide refill. Do you know the reason?
- A. Yes. There is no injury to any other water user. Refill occurs when there's surplus water in the system in excess to the amount of the demand by water rights.
- Q. Is there an interest in keeping the reservoirs as full as possible throughout the season?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And do you know why?
- A. It maximizes the amount of water available above Milner Dam.
- Q. And why is that important? Do you know?

- A. The water users in Water District 1 depend on the quantities above Milner Dam. If there weren't any shortages, there wouldn't be any need for the watermaster to curtail or regulate any water user. The more water you hold upstream, the less people get curtailed.
 - Q. I understand that refill can occur after there's been a burst of late spring runoff, for instance. I think that's what you've explained.

Can refill occur any time during the irrigation season?

- A. Typically, it doesn't happen after the day of allocation until you get all the way towards the end of the season, usually in the month of October.
 - Q. And why is that?
- A. At that time the irrigation demand greatly exceeds the amount of natural flow that's flowing down through the system, and there are rights generally senior to the reservoir rights.
- Q. And when it occurs later in the season in October, can you explain that process.
- A. Yes. At that point any new fill -- or I should say any additional reservoir fill that occurs in October isn't considered refill of the storage that had been used prior to that time, but it accounts as

1

2

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

accrual towards the next irrigation season.

- Q. Okay. If I understand your answer, what you're saying is when you answered earlier that there can be a cancelling of storage use prior to the day of allocation or on the day of allocation because there's been a physical refill of the reservoir, any cancellation of storage used from a storage account would not occur based on late-season refill or refill that occurs in October?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. And why is that?
- A. The irrigation season runs until
 October 31st. We get some new accrual in the reservoir
 accounts, both physically and on paper, in October
 because irrigation demand is decreased to a point where
 the natural flow coming into the system exceeds the
 irrigation demand and is captured in the reservoirs.
 And the storage practice was always to apply that
 accrual in October, one month prior to the start of the
 new irrigation season, to apply that new accrual
 towards the capture of storage and the storage rights,
 storage accounts for the following season.
- Q. So to all the storage accounts and storage rights equally?
 - A. According to priority.

0. And how long has that been the practice? 1 Do you know? 2 I -- I'm sure it's always been the practice Α. since 1978 when computerized accounting was formalized. 4 I think the practice also occurred prior to that time. 5 And the practice of refilling a storage Ο. 6 account on the day of allocation, do you know how long that practice has occurred? Could you ask the question again? 9 0. Yes. The refilling of a storage account on 10 the day of allocation that we talked about a little 11 while ago, I understood that the storage accounts could 12 be refilled if there had been an evacuation prior to 13 the day of allocation and then there had been like a 14 late spring runoff. 15 How long has that practice occurred? 16 I think that's always been the practice. 17 I'd like to mark this document, MS. McHUGH: 18 please. 19 (Exhibit 4 marked.) 20 (BY MS. McHUGH): You've been handed a Ο. 21 document marked Exhibit 4. 22 Have you seen this document before? 23 Α. Yes, I have. 24 Can you tell me what it is? 25

- A. I think it is a petition to the Court to make a judgment on three issues.
 - Q. And when did you see this document before?
 - A. Oh, I think it was a few weeks ago. Maybe as much as a month ago.
 - Q. Do you recognize this document as being the State of Idaho's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And what's your understanding of who filed the document, on behalf of what party?
- A. My understanding is Michael Orr filed it on behalf of the State of Idaho.
- Q. Okay. And I'll have you turn to page 2 in that document. And if we could look at issue No. 3.

And just for completeness of the record, could you read into the record the entirety of issue No. 3.

A. "The following 'refill' remark should be included in the partial decrees for storage water rights Nos. 1-2064 (American Falls Reservoir) and 1-2068 (Palisades Reservoir) because it is necessary to define and/or efficiently administer the rights. This right is filled for a given irrigation season when the total quantity of water that has accumulated to storage under this right equals the decreed quantity.

```
Additional water may be stored under this right but such additional storage is incidental and subordinate to all existing and future water rights."
```

- Q. Thank you.
- Have you seen the proposed remark in item
 No. 3 before?
- A. Prior to the issuance of this request? No, li haven't.
 - Q. Okay. Did you help prepare this document?
 - A. I've talked to Michael Orr concerning the refill issue and how it's been accounted for in Water District 1.
 - Q. Okay. And on this remark, either in this document or in any other document, have you seen this remark before?
 - A. No.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Did you help prepare this remark?
- A. I helped prepare it in giving the background information as to how the water's been historically administered.
- Q. So your understanding is that this remark came from the document itself, from the Attorney General's office in preparing the document?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Does this remark capture how refill

```
has been done in Water District 1 under these two water rights?
```

- A. Certainly since 1978. And prior to that there's been a few exceptions.
- Q. Would the inclusion of this remark on water right 1-2064 or 1-2068 alter Water District 1 practices?
 - A. No, it wouldn't.

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. How would this remark affect other water rights in Water District 1?
- A. Well, it wouldn't have any effect, because we would continue the practice of how we've been filling the storage right.
 - Q. Can you explain why this remark would be -- do you think this remark would be helpful on water right 1-2064 and 1-2068?
 - A. Yes, I think it would.
 - Q. Can you explain.
 - A. There are some people that would argue that the refill should occur under priority, which in some cases would make the refill senior to existing rights.

 And that's the change of what we've done historically.

 This remark would help to clarify that issue.
- Q. Under this remark, can you explain when refill would occur?

- A. Yes. As I've explained previously, refill occurs after the reservoir rights have accrued their volume limitation, but physically there's additional storage captured in the system that hasn't been assigned to any particular storage account.
- Q. And I want to draw your attention specifically to the second sentence in this remark. And it reads, "Additional water may be stored under this right but such additional storage is incidental and subordinate to all existing and future water rights."

Can you explain to me your understanding of that sentence.

- A. Yes. What that means is once the Water District 1 records show that the storage right has been full, that any additional water is allowed to be stored under this right. However, the storage of that water shall not come at the expense of any water right holder.
 - Q. Any current water right holder?
 - A. Any current or future.
- Q. And is that consistent with how refill occurs currently in Water District 1?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you explain what the implication would

1

2

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

```
be if the additional stored water would not be
   subordinate to future water uses.
2
                There are several things that would change.
          Α.
   I'm not sure I have a handle on everything that would
4
5
   occur.
                The first thing you would have to do is
6
   identify which space from which reservoir under which
   priority is the evacuated space being filled under.
   should say refilled under.
                If you did that, then potentially we would
10
   be refilling the 1921 priority or the 1939 priority
11
   throughout the entire peek runoff period, which could
12
   prevent any water rights junior to those priorities
13
   from diverting water for as long as we're refilling
14
   previous evacuated space.
15
                        That's all the questions I have,
          MS. McHUGH:
16
   actually, at this time. I'm going to turn it over to
17
   Jerry to continue.
18
                Or do we want to take a quick break?
19
          MR. RIGBY:
                       Let me just chew my lozenge. Sorry.
20
          MS. McHUGH:
                        Okay.
21
          MR. RIGBY:
                       Okay.
22
   ///
23
   ///
24
   ///
25
```

EXAMINATION

BY MR. RIGBY:

1

2

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Tony my name is Jerry Rigby of Rigby,
Anderson & Rigby in Rexburg. And my firm represents
what is commonly known as the Upper Valley storage
holders in this particular action, which is basically
just, I guess, a few of the spaceholders that we
represent. Because we represent so many, we've always
classified ourselves as just naming a few as basically
the typical spaceholders.

Do you understand that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And I will tell you my purpose in deposing you today is to attempt to discover exactly how the refill works. And that's strictly my focus. Secondly, my focus is to determine what, if any, changes were to occur, the impact that would cause to my clients or even the seniors.

And generally speaking, my clients, for the record, are the juniors. Not in every case, but let's just assume that I'm, in essence, representing a junior spaceholder.

Is that okay?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So I just want to make certain you

understood where I'm coming from, because we are obviously in discussions at the moment of attempting to find some language that will work. And in doing so, we need to totally understand how this actual refill has worked and how it would work if changes were made.

Is that clear?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So with that preface, then, let me go back over -- and Candice did a good job of, I think, addressing the particulars themselves. I want to go over some scenarios and some changes that perhaps might impact either seniors or juniors, and at least what your understanding would be if those changes occurred.

But before I do that, let me make certain to go back and address some of the actual mechanisms that you use now and how it really does occur under certain scenarios.

So with that, let's start with, as you indicated, my understanding is that the fill on paper is -- once that's done, your program or your computerized model that has run since 1978 is done; is that correct?

A. That's correct. After the storage rights have filled, the natural flow that's coming down through the system is not allocated to any of those

- priorities, because they've met their maximum volume accrual, and it would go to fill perhaps a junior priority after that point.
 - Q. And just to be certain, so for this particular record, although it's been discussed ad nauseam in other depositions as to the program itself, what are we talking about? What do you call the program, the storage program?
 - A. Well, it's the daily water right accounting program is one component.
 - Q. Okay.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. And then the second component that the watermaster uses when he makes his allocation on the day of allocation is the storage report.
- Q. Okay. So are those the programs when you say these are used to determine when the full allocation occurs?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Is there any other tweaking that is done by the watermaster?
- A. When there's water being spilled past
 Milner Dam, the computerized water right accounting
 program doesn't know the reason as to why that water's
 being spilled past Milner Dam.
- So there is some decision process by the

watermaster that has to essentially be input into the water right accounting program so it knows whether that water was being spilled for flood control or whether it was being spilled for flow augmentation, Idaho Power rental, whatever the purpose may be.

- Q. Flow augmentation for fish?
- A. Yes. The computerized accounting, it just sees the storage going past Milner and doesn't understand, you know, what storage that should be charged to or which account.
- Q. So is it fair to say that the tweaking that would occur manually would be the watermaster determining -- and we'll talk about how that determination is actually made in a moment, but determination of where that water came from, from whose account or for what purpose?
- A. We usually don't identify, except for flood control, as to which storage account that it came from. But it does also play a role in determining at what point can we cancel irrigation storage that we -- was used upstream from Milner.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. So those are the two things that I can think of.
 - Q. That's what I was just going to ask.

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Those are the two major things; right?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. There may be others, but they're incidental or nominal?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So let's talk about, then, first of all flood control, because if we had a perfect system it would store during the season of storage, and once it's filled, then obviously any drawdowns we wouldn't even have to worry about this particular issue.

But because every single year is unique, then we have to deal with scenarios of flood control happening during the same time as storage, happening after the full storage, and even happening after the refill; correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. So I'm going to ask a few scenarios on that, then. Suppose for a moment under the present situation or the present modeling that you run that on paper the system is full, but before the date of allocation there is flood control, which evacuates, as a result of certain reservoirs under the flood control rule curves.
- And those particular reservoirs are generally which reservoirs?

- A. Jackson and Palisades are typically the ones that get drawn down for flood control.
 - Q. Correct. And how does that impact -- I know I'm getting off the question. But how does that impact American Falls, then, by their evacuation of flood control?
 - A. It shouldn't affect American Falls at all.
 - Q. Because it's a pass-through?
 - A. Well, not that it's a pass-through. But any reduction to the allocation due to flood control would not be deducted from the American Falls allocation. It would only be deducted from Jackson and Palisades.
 - Q. So American Falls still could be filled on paper, but not physically filled, and the evacuation of those two storages could actually be captured in American Falls; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So now, that evacuation occurs and it's missed the mark. By that I'm saying by missing the mark is that the anticipated runoff doesn't quite refill the evacuation.
 - Isn't it the intent of the evacuation theoretically to still end up with a full reservoir, just not the excess?

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

A. Yes.

2

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So it doesn't miss -- under this scenario -- and isn't it true that that happens quite often because it's impossible to make a perfect calculation?
- A. I don't know what the statistics are, but yes, it's common to refill the evacuated flood-control space.
 - Q. But does it always get filled?
- A. No. There are some years where the evacuated space does not get filled if it were spilled past Milner.
- Q. Okay. So now assuming that to be the case, that scenario, how do you make an accounting for that, as far as the evacuation is concerned, because your model itself said the system's full; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And now the system isn't physically filled.

 Who gets the deduction, if you will? From whose water right does that come?
- A. If we never spilled any water past Milner

 Dam, the physical contents in the system would be equal

 to the physical accrual in our accounting. The problem

 occurs is when storage that was credited towards the

 storage account on the water right accounting flows

| past Milner.

2

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the case of flood control, when it comes to the day of allocation, we look at the physical contents, compare that to the amount that was accrued on paper, and the physical contents are less, then we go to the Bureau of Reclamation and ask them to identify which reservoirs that the water that spilled past Milner came from.

Generally, in a flood control situation, it's 75 percent of the shortage goes to Palisades, 25 percent goes to Jackson, because I believe that's the way it's written into the contracts or that's the Bureau of Reclamation's policy for flood control.

- Q. And you would need to do that any year that it doesn't physically refill; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And you've done that in the past?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So now, with that scenario, is it fair to say that the system could be full in the end on date of allocation with the deductions made for Jackson and Palisades, therefore they wouldn't be full?
 - A. I don't understand your question.
- Q. Okay. Physical fill versus fill on paper. We've already said that even under the present

accounting that the system is full, and so therefore your accounting models are done. Now, because of the 2 evacuation, even whatever that comes out, if it actually spills past Milner, then we are actually less 4 in the system, and you're telling me you then contact 5 BOR to determine from whose space that comes, and assuming it to be typical, 75 percent from Palisades and 25 percent from Jackson, then in the end before any diversions or other diversions -- and I'm only limiting this to the evacuation for flood control, then they 10 would be that much less in their actual physical fill; 11 correct? 12

- When we'd go to make the storage allocations to the spaceholders, the Palisades spaceholders would share in the shortage. That's 75 percent of that shortage.
- And when does that actual storage allocation occur, again?
- Α. There are three things that have to happen before the day of allocation occurs: One, we have to stop spilling water past Milner. Two, we have to reach our maximum day of storage accrual on paper; in other words, we no longer -- we drop below the point below the most senior priority of unfilled space. And three, we've reached our maximum physical reservoir contents

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in the system.

2

5

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Once we're sure all three things -- all three of those things have happened, at that point we can make our day of allocation because we know at that point what our shortage is between the amount of accrual we have on paper to the storage accounts and the amount that we have physically in the system above Milner.

- Q. Okay. So that storage allocation, then, conceivably could end up with all other reservoirs filled except for Jackson and Palisades?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And therefore that's -- and that's the current system; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Again, I'm going to ask this several times:
 But the proposed refill remark given by or proposed by
 the State of Idaho, would that be inconsistent with
 that practice?
 - A. No, it wouldn't.
 - Q. Okay. Would it give you any additional help in that practice?
- A. Yes, it would. It would get rid of the argument from others that the refill should occur under priority.

- Q. Okay. Now, let's continue with that scenario, because we haven't talked about now what happens afterwards when you get a hot, early summer and you get the fresh shed coming down. Now that starts to refill.
- Where is it refilling, as far as what you do presently?
- A. It would be refilling in the system. I assume that the scenario you're describing is we initially think we're past the point of allocation, but for some unexpected reason we get additional rain, the diversions all shut off, we store some water physically in the system, that's refill that's occurred in the system, and it's credited towards either the spaceholders of unfilled rights or it's credited towards storage use that has occurred up to that point in time.
- Q. Okay. Is there any priority between those two?
- A. No. Only the unfilled rights would accrue under priority. But assuming all the storage rights had been filled, then the watermaster sits down and decides whether that additional refill should be credited towards cancelling previous irrigation storage used by diversions or if it should be used by water

```
spilled for flow augmentation -- I shouldn't use the
word "spill." I should say delivered for flow
augmentation below Milner, or delivered as storage
rental from Idaho Power.
```

Q. But how is that actually done? By that I'm saying you said the watermaster makes that determination.

Is there any priority given to any of those three? And you've just given three examples there.

- A. I don't think there's any written policy as to what the priority of those different examples would be.
 - Q. In actuality, does he give any priority?
- A. Probably the best thing to do is for me to use an example. I think it was in 2010, we thought we were past the point of any additional capture of surplus water in the reservoir system. We were prepared to make our day of allocation.

The Bureau started running water for flow augmentation. They had some quantity available from the rental pool. Let's say it was 150,000 acre-feet. They started running that volume of water.

And then either towards the end of them running that volume of water or after they had finished, we got this unexpected runoff and surplus to

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the water rights that were currently diverting water,
we gained some additional storage or refill in the
system, and so that enabled us to write off or cancel
all the storage used by irrigation diversions and all
but a small quantity of the water that had been
released for flow augmentation.

So in effect, the watermaster made the decision then to cancel the irrigation storage used ahead of the flow augmentation. And the Bureau was okay with that decision, and that's what was done in 2010. But I suppose --

- Q. But that's by policy, then?
- A. Well, that was the watermaster and the Bureau of Reclamation getting together and agreeing to that procedure. But I suppose it could have been done differently.
- Q. Okay. So let's ask that same question as to instead of BOR's diversions or releases, let's use that same example for the scenario we use with Jackson and Palisades, so flood control versus actual irrigation diversions. Now you get that additional fresh shed.

Does it go back in equally, priority with flood control first, or priority with irrigation? Or is there even a policy on that?

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Well, there isn't a policy. The refill would occur after some storage usage.
 - Q. That's my scenario, that you've used some storage for irrigation and you've also had some flood control diversion or releases. So you're literally down on two different accounts.

Now you have an additional fresh shed come in that allows the system to store water while all other water rights are being filled, after all other water rights are being filled, the question is, is there a policy or is there anything that would sort those by priority, or is it just fill them all proportionately? Or do you know?

A. Well, it's really difficult because there's so many different scenarios. What it comes down to is when we get to the day of allocation, we look at the balance between what storage has accrued on paper, and we allocate to that first.

If there's additional water physically in the system, at that point then you make your decision as to which storage use you want to cancel.

Q. But again, I'm trying to get to the decision. If you don't know, I understand. I'm just asking you, you just said you make your decision. I'm trying to get to how that decision is made.

- A. Yeah, I -- I don't know what scenarios could possibly happen. The ones in the past I understand prior to flow augmentation it was a pretty simple process. We would just simply cancel the storage usage, wherever it may be. We didn't have to decide whether it was flow augmentation, storage diversion, through canals.
 - O. Flood control?
- A. Well, with flood control, the only time we have to deduct for flood control is when the water is going out past the system. At that point we'd be spilling water past Milner. And so any irrigation diversion that was diverting water at that time while we were spilling, we automatically cancel that.

If you carry that through, you can say by the cancelling of that it actually increases the burden of refilling the flood-control space, but that's the way it's worked.

- Q. And again, just for clarity in the record, flood control in those reservoirs are pursuant to their contracts, is that not?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So in essence, it comes with the water right? I mean you could say priority dates, flood-control curves, that all comes with each

particular contract; is that correct?

- A. I think so. The contracts I've seen it's written in there that the Bureau would try to maximize the storage captured in the reservoirs. However, because of flood control or whatever operations they have, if that causes a shortage, then the spaceholders share in that shortage.
- Q. Okay. Now, I don't want to belabor it, and I just have one more line of questions on this one and then I'll move off of it.

The actual refilling, if you will, recapturing in the system, is it -- and I used the word even before when I had discussions with you -- share and share alike? Is it based at all upon the source, for example, American Falls perhaps has a different source of recapturing some of the fresh shed versus some of the other reservoirs, such as Ririe, that has a very, you know, small area for a source? Or do you just put it all on paper and then it goes equally out to all the space users pursuant to their percentages? Because physically it's going to be in a different location, as you capture it.

A. Yes. Again, because water is held in different reservoirs, we go back to the day of allocation. When we know how much storage is filled on

paper, accrued on paper according to the water rights, we know how much water is physically in the system, if there's a difference, if there's a shortage of water physically in the system, we try to identify what was the cause of that shortage.

If it was flood control -- generally it's Jackson and Palisades -- that shortage would be shared by all spaceholders in Palisades. The way it's done in the water right accounting and in the allocation is that let's say due to flood control, even though that the Palisades storage right filled to 100 percent on paper, because of the evacuation of flood-control space that didn't refill, let's say the -- we were able to allocate 95 percent to Palisades spaceholders, then each Palisades spaceholder gets allocated 95 percent. Doesn't matter how much water they had carried over from the previous year.

We've had a situation in one year where someone carried over their full allocation in Palisades from the previous year and were actually allocated less water the following year because of a flood-control operation that didn't refill completely.

Q. Okay. So now moving off then of this line of questioning into if a change occurred, especially the issue of priority given on the refill, because your

```
accounting system right now does not address the
1
   evacuation, either for flood control, irrigation, or
2
   fish flow augmentation, then if the priority system
   continued and always was in effect, assume for a moment
   the scenario that a flood control occurred prior to the
5
   actual fill on paper -- so in other words, your model
   is still up and running -- and your model is now
   tweaked to say that it would have filled and your model
   would have been done, but because of flood control it
   hasn't filled, and therefore the priority date
10
               And let's say that as a result of an error
   continues.
11
   in calculation the evacuation was such that there never
12
   is a refill of that space.
13
14
```

What would that do to the junior users and their storage rights that would otherwise have occurred under the present situation? Is that clear enough?

- A. Yes. If we identified the storage that was spilled out the end of the system and refilled that under priority, and in the situation you described is they've missed --
 - Q. Missed the mark.
- A. -- the amount that they thought they could refill.
- So whatever that time period was between the time that they cease -- or I should say they were

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

evacuating the space up until the time you reach your
maximum accrual, the priority date that we were
delivering would never jump above that priority date
for the space we were refilling.

- Q. I.e., a 1921?
- A. 1921.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So potentially if you were dumping water out of American Falls Reservoir for whatever reason and we were to refill that under the 1921 priority, you could get yourself into a situation where if you knew that we had a well above average snowpack and you wouldn't have to refill American Falls Reservoir until June, they could wait all the way until the month of June to fill that.

And the net effect of that is we would only be delivering the 1921 priority during the peak runoff in a much -- much above average water year. During that time period they were refilling the reservoir in June.

- Q. And so therefore, the obvious question for the juniors is, is that a substantial impact to them, or could it be?
- A. Well, if you had a right that was junior to 1921 and where historically you had diverted water in June during the peak runoff, if we changed the way we

```
did things and that situation occurred, then those
junior rights would be curtailed until the American
Falls Reservoir refilled completely under their
priority.
```

- Q. And even if there was the snowpack that substantiated the original evacuation for flood control, even if it was there and it came off so late, they would not be able to have diverted stored water until the 1921 was completely filled again; is that correct?
- A. Well, they wouldn't be able to divert natural flow under their junior priority --
 - Q. I'm sorry.
- A. -- until American Falls Reservoir was filled.
- Q. That's right. So in addressing the issue of priority on the second fill, do you know of any scenario where a priority system would not -- I mean would not injure the junior spaceholders from the way it's being conducted pursuant to your modeling?
 - A. Can you ask the question again?
- Q. Do you know of any way a priority system that would continue or be used in a refill that would not impact the juniors substantially?
 - A. Yes. In the situation -- let's assume that

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

we did allow refill under priority for water that was dumped for whatever reason, flood control, whatever reason, and the reservoir system did refill completely 100 percent, anyone that -- any junior user that used storage instead of natural flow that otherwise would have been available to them would have gotten cancelled under that situation.

Q. Okay. So that's the case when it fills completely.

But if it does not fill completely, would they be impacted differently and substantially differently than they are now?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, you indicated that although you didn't write the actual proposed remark that you at least were interviewed or discussed this with the State of Idaho.

Is there anything in here that doesn't go far enough to address your particular concerns, like you say you've heard comments of others that said they would rather have the priority on the refill and this would help to keep the present system in place, is there anything in here that does not go far enough to protect your present system, or do you have questions in your present system that need to be answered still and perhaps a remark could help there?

```
None that I can think of. I -- I don't
          Α.
1
   think I can improve this remark at all.
2
                And as asked by her, but I'll ask again, is
          0.
3
   this necessary?
4
          MR. BROMLEY:
                         Excuse me, Tony, just for
5
   clarification, did you say "approve" or "improve"?
          THE WITNESS:
                         "Improve."
          MR. BROMLEY:
                         Thank you.
          MR. RIGBY:
                       Thanks.
9
                And therefore, again, the question is, do
          Ο.
10
   you think this is necessary and should be included
11
   within the remarks and the water right of both the
12
   water right No. 2064 and 2068?
13
                Well, I don't think it's necessary, because
          Α.
14
   that's the way we've always done it under the existing
15
   right, even without this remark.
16
                But if that present system that you've been
17
   administering and managing is challenged, would this
18
   help you in continuing to manage it the way you're
19
   doing it now?
20
```

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. I just need a minute.
- MS. McHUGH: I was just going to say we need a break.
- Q. (BY MR. RIGBY): If the language were taken

2.2

```
out at the very end of the remark, the proposed remark,
quote, "and future water rights," end quote, what would
that do to change your present system? By that I'm
saying what would that do to any future water rights,
in your opinion?
```

- A. Well, as long as the reservoir system wasn't full, there would be the potential there that we would always be filling the unfilled reservoir storage rights ahead of any junior water rights.
- Q. And as far as the storage itself is concerned, you indicated that for the most part most of the time the storage doesn't occur after the date of allocation until the October season. Why? Because of the high demand. But isn't that the real issue: It's because of the high demand. Not because they couldn't fill, but it's because they generally don't fill because of the high demand for natural flow that has priority?
- A. That's correct. Even in the driest of years, if the canals didn't divert any water through July, we could still fill the reservoir system.
- MR. RIGBY: Okay. I don't think I have any further questions.
- MS. McHUGH: Can we take a break?
- MR. ORR: It's okay with me.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

```
MR. BROMLEY:
                         It's 11:15.
1
          MS. McHUGH:
                        Keep going?
2
          MR. BROMLEY: Tony, is that okay?
3
          THE WITNESS:
                        Yeah.
4
                        That's fine.
          MS. McHUGH:
5
          MR. ORR: I just have some clarification
6
   questions to ask. I didn't want to open up anything
   new here.
9
                          EXAMINATION
10
   BY MR. ORR:
11
                So, Tony, just for the record, I'll state
          0.
12
        I'm Michael Orr, the Attorney General's office.
13
   represent the State of Idaho in this subcase.
14
                And looking at my notes here going back
15
   over some of your answers, I believe you were asked if
16
   the Attorney General represented you in this deposition
17
   and in this matter. And I just want to clarify a point
18
   there that I represent the State.
19
                Do you understand I do not represent you or
20
   Water District 1 in this matter; correct?
21
          Α.
                Yes.
22
               A little earlier I believe you said, "When
          Ο.
23
   surplus water comes into the reservoir the evacuated
24
   space can sometimes refill physically.
                                             That's my
25
```

definition of refill."

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So if I understand you correctly, when you use the term "refill" you're talking about physically refilling reservoir space?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And then also in response to some earlier questions, I believe you referred to the "capacity," quote, of the water right. So what I'd like you to do is look at Exhibits 2 and 3. I believe those are recommended partial decrees for the two water rights at issue here. I don't see an entry on these water rights for capacity.

Can you clarify for me what you're talking about when you use the term "capacity."

- A. Well, rather than use the term "capacity," I should have said "quantity." But the quantity is generally the active capacity of the reservoir.
- Q. So when you referred to the capacity of the water right earlier, what you really meant was the quantity element of the water right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And with that answer you just gave me, would that also apply to your references to the volume or maximum volume of a water right? When you made reference to the maximum volume of these water rights,

were you referring to the quantity element of these water rights?

A. Yes.

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

Q. One of the questions asked you was, quote,

"Does Water District 1 recognize refill of storage
water rights in priority?"

And your answer to that, I believe, per my notes was "No, it does not."

So do I understand that to mean that you do not allow reservoirs to refill ahead of the first fill of junior water rights? If you don't understand how I put it, I'll try it again.

- A. Please.
- Q. Okay. In Water District 1 you say you do not recognize refill of storage water rights in priority.

So if a storage water right has filled, does Water District 1 allow any further accumulation under that right before the fill of junior water rights?

- A. No.
- Q. Another point of clarification. A couple times earlier you referred to the, quote, "senior reservoir," unquote.

My understanding of seniority is that it

applies to the water right, and granted water rights
often identify reservoirs. But when you refer to
senior reservoir, did you actually mean the reservoir
had a senior water right?

A. Yes.

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. There was some discussion of your familiarity with the remark that is identified in Exhibit 1, the Notice of Deposition, and in Exhibit 4, State's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, the refill remark.

Do you recall speaking to me regarding what might be an appropriate refill remark I believe several months ago? I believe we had some telephone calls.

- A. Yes.
- Q. And do you recall me proposing language to you for a refill remark and asking you whether it would be consistent with how the system is currently administered and your understanding of the storage water rights?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And this remark in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 4, does that appear to you to be the same remark, the same language, based on your memory, that we discussed in those telephone calls?
- A. Yes. I can't remember if it was word for

1 | word, but yes.

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. In response to one question I believe you said there are some people that would argue that refill should occur under priority, which in some cases would make the refill seem to existing rights.

Given that, if this remark in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 4 were included on the storage water rights, would that remark facilitate administration for purposes of resolving the argument some people had that refill should occur under priority?

- A. Yes.
- Q. You also referred to spills past Milner Dam and that the computerized water right accounting program doesn't know the reason why that water is being spilled past Milner.

Why is that important or why is the fact that the computer program doesn't know why it's spilling past Milner important?

A. Well, I don't think it's important to the accounting program itself. It's important to the administration and the ultimate allocation of how much water is allocated to the storage rights and how much water is cancelled by the storage usage that was occurring during the time that storage is passing Milner.

- Q. So would I be correct in saying that the reason it's important that the program doesn't know why the water is being spilled past Milner Dam, what that means is that the program doesn't allocate spills to any given account or right --
 - A. That's --
 - Q. -- the watermaster has to do that himself?
 - A. Yes.

2

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Now, Tony, my understanding is -going back to that same question -- the ultimate reason
 that's important is that Water District 1 strives to or
 has to account for all water in the system as either
 natural flow or storage; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I believe Mr. Rigby asked you that in the scenario where all storage water rights had been filled and you have refill in the reservoir system due to some evacuation, I believe he asked you how does the watermaster determine whether the cancelling should be allocated to irrigation use or flow augmentation or whatever.

And in that discussion Mr. Rigby asked is there any priority given to those three, and the three examples you've just given me, referring to flow augmentation, prior irrigation use, et cetera. The use

```
of the word "priority" in that sense I understood to
mean preference or basis for a decision, not a priority
date.
```

- Do you recall that discussion? Can you enlighten me any on that?
- A. Yes. It's -- I understood the question as being the sequence at which we distribute the refill.
- Q. In other words, the criteria for that distribution?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. But not a reference to the priority date element of a water right?
- 13 A. Yes.

5

6

8

9

10

20

21

- Q. And there was another point that I think

 Mr. Bromley clarified, but I just want to touch on it

 again. My notes say that at one point, "I don't think

 I can approve this remark at all," that you made that

 statement in regards to the remark in Exhibit 1 and

 Exhibit 4.
 - So I'll just ask you, can you approve of the remark proposed in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 4, the refill remark?
- A. Yes, I think I -- if someone misunderstood,

 I said -- used the word "improve," not "approve." But

 yes, I would approve the remarks.

Q. Sure. And I understand that. It's just an important point. I want to make sure the record's clear on that.

And I believe you also said that you don't think this remark is necessary in the water rights, but then Mr. Rigby asked you if the present system management and administration is challenged, would this remark help you in continuing to manage it the way you do now. And I believe you answered yes.

The question I had was, although you don't think this remark is necessary in one sense to allow you to continue past administration, what is your understanding of the legal authority for storing water when the storage rights had already been filled previously? And I'll try to rephrase that question if it came out funny.

A. Yes. And that's probably another reason for the remark that I haven't discussed in the other questioning is that there are some people that believe that once we have filled the storage right on paper that perhaps the reservoirs above Milner don't have a right to capture this surplus storage or refill or whatever words that you tack onto it.

So that would be the other purpose of this remark, to clarify that we would have the right to

store water in addition to the amount that we previously stored.

Q. I believe Mr. Rigby asked you that if the remark language that was proposed here in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 4, if the second sentence was taken out, the sentence that says, "Additional water may be stored under this right, but such additional storage is incidental and subordinate to existing and future water rights," if that sentence was taken out, I believe Mr. Rigby asked you, "What would that do to change your present system?"

Now, my notes say that your answer to that was, "As long as the reservoir system wasn't full, there would be the potential that we'd always be filling the unfilled reservoir storage rights ahead of any junior water rights."

Now, just to be clear on this, a senior reservoir storage right should be filled ahead of the junior water right, should it not?

- A. Yes.
- Q. So if we took this second sentence out, as Mr. Rigby postulated, would I be correct in thinking that what would be the potential was that you would be refilling the reservoir or the storage rights ahead of junior water rights rather than filling?

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Α.
                Yes.
1
                     That's all I have at the moment.
          MR. ORR:
2
   Thank you.
3
          MS. McHUGH:
                        I do have some questions, and I
4
   don't know if it makes sense for me to do it because I
5
   can imagine me getting different things than maybe you
   would want, and have those of us that are on board with
   the condition go first and you go second, or I can wait
8
   until the very end.
                         It doesn't matter.
          MR. SIMPSON:
                         So I'm not on board with the
10
   condition; is that what you're saying?
11
          MS. McHUGH:
                       Well, anyway, there you go. Those
12
   of us that called for the deposition today and the
13
   person on there. So I guess what I'm asking is --
14
          MR. SIMPSON:
                         Sure, if you'd like to go again,
15
   that's fine.
16
                        I just had a couple.
          MS. McHUGH:
17
18
                      FURTHER EXAMINATION
19
   BY MS. McHUGH:
20
                Tony, this is Candice again. And I think
          Ο.
21
```

after hearing the different questions, I think I have four scenarios that I need to clarify in order to understand the refill. And hopefully this will help clarify my understanding.

22

23

24

And the first scenario is when we refill after the day of allocation and there had not been a full system prior to the day of allocation, so some water rights had gone unfilled.

Do you understand that scenario so far?

Are you following my example?

- A. I might stop you before you go any further because --
 - Q. Okay.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. -- there wouldn't be any refill after the day of allocation because the definition of the "day of allocation" is that it happens after all refill has already happened.
- Q. Good point of clarification. So I understood that there were times when there could be refill of the reservoir physically after the day of allocation had occurred.
- A. Well, when that's happened, we've -- we've underestimated how much water was going to come down. And the decision we made, we thought that it was the day of allocation, but it turned out that it was some point later in time after an additional amount of water came down through the system.
 - Q. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

 And is it fair to say that the only refill

after the day of allocation would be in late October?

A. No. I wouldn't characterize it as refill in October. I would characterize it as new fill for the next irrigation season.

MS. McHUGH: Okay. That's the clarification I wanted. Thank you.

MR. RIGBY: John, do you want to come up here?

MR. SIMPSON: No. I think I'm okay from way

back here. That way I won't impart the cold that I got from someone.

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

5

8

EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. SIMPSON:

Q. Good morning, Tony. My name is John Simpson, and I represent a number of entities which have, as you know, American Falls space, Palisades space, and Jackson space. So I'll try to be brief, but I don't know if I can after what I'm enduring.

You made a comment or testified that generally the intent is to maximize the amount of water above Milner to make it available for the water users within Water District 1.

Do you recall that comment? Is that a fair statement of your testimony?

A. Yes.

- Q. And likewise, would it be then the intent of the water district to maximize the amount of storage that occurs within the reservoirs in any one season and in order to make that available to the spaceholders?
 - A. Could you repeat that question?
- Q. Likewise, in continuing your statement regarding maximizing the amount of water available for the water users above Milner, is it also the intent to maximize the amount of storage that is retained in the reservoirs above Milner in any one irrigation season?
- A. Yeah, that's not Water District 1's goal. I always assumed that was the Bureau of Reclamation's goal.
- Q. Okay. And so Water District 1's goal is to then what, with respect to the storing of water within the reservoirs?
- A. Yes. We're responsible for accounting for the accrual into those reservoirs.
- Q. Okay. And so the more water we can store in the reservoirs above Milner, then the more water we have available for the spaceholders; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And would it be fair to say that in your view that's one reason that refill needs to be recognized?

2

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes, that's a benefit to the water users above Milner Dam.
 - Q. And so if water is -- we've used the concept of evacuating space, and you may not have identified the different types of evacuation that have occurred and distinguished between those. And I think we've talked about flood control and we've talked about irrigation use and we've talked about water that's delivered for flow augmentation. And I guess in addition we've talked about water that's rented for other uses below Milner as well.

Are there any other uses of water that would be included in your definition of "evacuation of space"?

- A. For the release of water past Milner, I think those are the only reasons I can think of.
- Q. Okay. And so if water's released for flood control, would it be fair to say that that water was not available to the spaceholder?
- A. No, it's available to the spaceholder until that water passes Milner Dam.
- Q. So it's available to them as storage or as natural flow?
 - A. As storage.
 - Q. And so if that water is released at

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

American Falls, would it be available to a spaceholder above American Falls?

- A. As long as it doesn't pass Milner Dam, yes.
- Q. So they could call for it as it's being released out of American Falls? Or I guess are you describing the occurrence where if a diversion above American Falls needed water, even though there was a flood-control release occurring, they could call for that water?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And it would be delivered to them in the form of storage?
- A. Well, it depends on the water right of the person calling for the water. If they were in priority, it would be natural flow. If they were out of priority, then it would be storage water.
- Q. Okay. And so if in the event that there wasn't demand for water at the time of the flood control event, then it wouldn't be charged as natural flow to anyone because they didn't call for it, but it would still be charged as storage to certain accounts because of it being called storage and allocated storage?
 - A. And what's your question?
 - Q. Is that right?

- A. Yes. Under the assumption that you don't have any irrigation diversions going on and there's natural flow coming down the system and there's no release past Milner, all of that water would be accrued to an unfilled storage account.
 - Q. Okay. And at the time that flood control event occurs, you have no way of knowing what account it's being charged to because the date of allocation hasn't occurred?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And so likewise, if there's a diversion above Milner, they don't know if at that particular point in time of a flood-control release, they don't know if that's their water that's being charged to them that's being released or not?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So with respect to after a flood-control event has occurred, then there's space available to receive additional water for storage; correct?
 - A. Only if the water left the system.
- Q. If it wasn't stored in a lower reservoir from which it was released?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And if it left the system, then there would be space available; correct?

2

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A. Correct.

2

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And if it left the system, then under what priority would that space refill?
- A. It doesn't refill under a priority. What it does is that it reduces the difference between the paper storage that was stored into the storage accounts and the physical storage in the system at the time.
- Q. Understand. Are there any conditions to that water then being -- then additional water being stored in the space that was previously evacuated?
 - A. No.
- Q. So if the water's in the river, it can be stored?
- A. Well, we allocate to whichever water rights are diverting water. And if the natural-flow supply exceeds the amount of demand by the water rights, the net effect is the physical storage in the reservoir increases.
- Q. And is that a written policy that the water district has?
- A. No. It's a physical occurrence. It's just -- it's what happens. You receive additional storage, but under the scenario where all the storage accounts have been filled, there's nowhere for that additional storage to have accrued to any storage

- account. It simply offsets the amount that has been spilled out the end of the system.
 - Q. I understand. Again, when you say "accrual" in that answer, you're talking about paper accrual?
 - A. Correct.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Okay. Does the water district have a manual or any written policy on how water is accounted for or how refill occurs?
- A. There's the FORTRAN code in the accounting program itself. And there are different various memos, manuals that have been written over time. But I don't believe there's a one manual that describes every policy and procedure contained in the water right accounting program.
- Q. Okay. And those manuals or procedures that you just described, do you have copies of those?
- A. Most of those were compiled by Bob Sutter, who was the main author of the computerized accounting program. And I have some of those. I'm not sure if I have all of them.
- Q. If you didn't have copies of all those, who would?
- A. They would be in the Department of Water
 Resources stored in the -- probably the hydrology

```
section in the State office in Boise.
          MR. SIMPSON:
                         Chris, do you have copies of
2
   those, or do you have that storage box?
          MR. BROMLEY:
                         Storage in storage box?
4
                        Yeah. What Tony's describing, do
5
          MR. SIMPSON:
   you have those?
          MR. BROMLEY: John, I don't know. And Tony
7
   wasn't asked to bring documents.
8
          MR. SIMPSON:
                        I know. I understand.
9
          MR. BROMLEY: John, I haven't --
10
          MR. SIMPSON: But you can make those available
11
   if we requested, though?
12
          MR. BROMLEY:
                        If you're interested, John, we can
13
   certainly look around and see what we got.
14
          Ο.
                (BY MR. SIMPSON): And otherwise, Tony, you
15
   do have some of those at your office in Idaho Falls?
16
          Α.
                Yes.
17
                Okay. Tony, with respect to flood control,
18
   you made a couple statements that flood control
19
   typically occurs at Palisades and Jackson; correct?
20
          Α.
                Correct.
21
               Under those priorities; correct?
          Q.
2.2
                I don't understand the question.
          Α.
23
                Well, those reservoirs have a priority for
          Q.
24
   storage; correct?
25
```

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Okay. And flood control is authorized at Palisades; correct?
 - A. I think flood control is a requirement that the Bureau of Reclamation has.
 - Q. Okay. At Palisades?
 - A. At Palisades.
 - O. And at Jackson?
 - A. And at Jackson.
 - Q. Does American Falls Reservoir have a flood control rule curve?
- A. No, I don't believe it does.
 - Q. So to the best of your understanding, is American Falls operated for flood control?
 - A. It depends on how you define "flood control." Not in the same way that it's regulated for flood control in Palisades and Jackson. But for example, this year the Bureau's releasing water out of American Falls in order to keep the level of the reservoir below the new riprap work.
 - Q. Right.
- A. And whether you consider that a flood control or reservoir operation, I don't know what definition it would fall under.
 - Q. Okay. But to the best of your

understanding, that flood control, the water that's
being released out of American Falls, that's not being
done pursuant to a flood control rule curve at American
Falls; is that correct?

A. Correct.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. And so under typical operations

American Falls wouldn't by itself be operated for flood control.

Would it be fair to say that it's operated as a part of the entire system above Milner?

- A. Yes.
- Q. So if Jackson or Palisades dictated a flood-control operation or release, there may be circumstances where that water is released out of American Falls instead of releasing it out of Palisades or Jackson?
- A. Physically, no. The purpose of a flood-control operation at Palisades and Jackson is to physically draw down the contents to a certain level based on the snowpack that's above it.
- Q. Okay. So water that on paper is allocated to American Falls spaceholders may be contained in Palisades or Jackson and then may be released because of a flood control rule curve at either Palisades or Jackson?

- Anthony Olenichak 2/9/2012 Α. Yes. 1 In response to some questions by Q. Okay. 2 Mr. Rigby, he was, I believe, working through a scenario that referenced a refill priority of 1921. 4 That would be the priority from American 5 Falls; correct? Α. Yes. Do you recall that line of questioning by Q. 8 Mr. Rigby? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Okay. Do you recall that, again, that was Q. 11 following a flood-control release scenario that 12 Mr. Rigby was talking to you about? 13 If I remember correctly, I was Α. No. 14 thinking that it could be a release for any reason. 15 O. "For any reason" being flow augmentation or 16 irrigation use or flood control? 17 Best example I can use is the current 18 situation where there's currently 3,000 cfs going past 19 Milner, but there's currently no flood-control 20 operation going on in either Jackson or Palisades. 21
- so I suppose someone could identify that storage going
 past Milner as coming out of American Falls.

 And if we allowed for the refill of that
 - And if we allowed for the refill of that evacuated space under priority, then the refill would

come under the 1921 priority, which is the example that
I was addressing with Mr. Rigby's question.

- Q. Even if on paper there's American Falls space has filled in Palisades or Jackson?
- A. Well, he was -- he was asking me if we allowed refill under priority. We're assuming that for some reason the storage in American Falls has been released and we're refilling under the 1921 priority.
- Q. Except for an irrigation use at American Falls, can you identify for me how a refill would occur under a 1921 priority?
- A. Yes. Apparently, again using the current situation that we have, we're on paper -- if you looked at paper, we're -- every -- all the natural flow that arises above American Falls under the 1921 priority is accruing or adding to the American Falls storage account in our paper accounting.

Physically however, the Bureau has decided to keep the level at American Falls Reservoir at a constant rate, so essentially they're passing through that water and it's going out the end of the system that currently is accruing to our 1921 space in American Falls.

Mr. Rigby's question, I thought, was what if we were to refill that space that's being currently

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
evacuated under the 1921 priority, what would be the effect of that.
```

- Q. I guess I'm a little confused, Tony, because right now is the '21 right filled on paper?
- A. I don't -- I don't know. I don't think so.

 We don't start running our computerized accounting

 until around the 1st of April.
 - Q. I mean if you added up the priorities prior to '21 and included the '21 priority at American Falls, is there, on paper, fill in excess to that number, just roughly speaking?
 - A. No. I would say potentially there's a good chance that American Falls' storage right is full 100 percent on paper at this time or in the near future.
 - Q. Okay. So then I'll add to Mr. Rigby's scenario, because I'm just trying to understand.

If today on paper the '21 right is filled, even though water is being released out of American Falls and there's no flood control, you said, so then under what priority date would American Falls be filling?

- A. If the storage right were full --
- Q. On paper.
- A. -- on paper. And you're asking under what

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 | right would the physical water in American Falls --

Q. Be retained.

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. -- be retained?
 - Q. Uh-huh.
- A. It would either be retained by some other unfilled storage account --
 - Q. 1939, for example.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. The Palisades right.
- A. Yes. But the natural flow that arises below Palisades and Island Park can't go to fill those rights on paper. And so what you would have, I think, in the scenario you're describing is that American Falls' contents increase. That is what we call unallocated or unaccounted-for storage physically captured in the system but not under any priority.
- Q. Okay. And so unallocated storage that is captured is temporarily given the priority of the reservoir that it's captured in; is that fair?
 - A. No. It's not getting any priority.
- Q. Well, it's got to be stored under some priority, though. Maybe I'm making this too complicated. But I understand what you just said with respect to unallocated storage. It's called unallocated storage because American Falls storage is

already filled on paper, so you can't give that storage a home.

But would it be fair to say you're still storing it under some priority?

- A. No. And that's -- that's the purpose of the second sentence in this refill remark. It allows you to refill that storage above and beyond what the amount was described in the water right.
- Q. So under that second remark when it says "Additional water may be stored under this right," so it's being stored under the '21 right? If this remark were to attach to 2064, it would be being stored under the '21 priority?
- A. My take on it is it would be stored in

 American Falls Reservoir, but not necessarily under the
 1921 priority.
- Q. Well, again, you're using this remark, the second sentence, as the basis for storing unallocated storage?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. Right. And so when it says under this right, whatever this remark attaches to, it will be attached to a right with a priority date, correct, as one of the elements of the water right?
 - A. I think the purpose of the remark was to

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- allow for the additional storage of water beyond the
 quantity described in the right. What you described as
 far as priority, I don't -- I don't think that was
 taken into consideration.
 - Q. By you as looking at this, or by the State in your discussions with them?
 - A. I was under the impression that this remark described the additional storage that was captured physically in the reservoir system beyond the quantity that was previously stored under the right.
 - Q. So in this remark where it says "Additional water may be stored under this right," are you then saying that this right has a different priority under a first fill than a second fill, in your view?
 - A. Yes. The priority would be subordinate to all other existing and future rights.
 - Q. And if that's the case, would that maximize the fill of the reservoir system?
 - A. No. The effect would be it would maximize the total amount of water available to water users, not just storage users above Milner.
 - Q. And is it correct to say that it's your view that that's how it's been done since 1978, since the accounting program identified this as the protocol for storing additional water?

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

- Q. Okay. And prior to 1978, is it your testimony that that was not always the case?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So prior to 1978, prior to the accounting program making that change, the protocol that we just described, refill did occur in the system; correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And how did refill occur in the system prior to 1978?
- A. I think it occurred very similar to how we currently account for the water. It's difficult to tell because I don't think the watermaster began his administration until they had reached the point of maximum reservoir contents in many of the years, so it would be difficult to tell.

The one main difference is that both Lynn Crandall and Henry Eagle --

- Q. And they're the watermasters prior to --
- A. They were the watermasters prior to around 1969, 1968.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. They allowed -- when Palisades was built, they allowed for the refill of American Falls storage

```
ahead of the initial fill of the Palisades storage right. I think that's the only exception.
```

And then that practice was stopped by Art

Larsen, the watermaster after Henry Eagle, prior to the

time the water right accounting was developed.

- Q. So at that time, to the best of your understanding, was the fill of space following a flood-control release handled differently than the refill of space following an irrigation use?
 - A. Which time period are you talking about?
 - O. Prior to '78.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. And what was the question?
- Q. Was the fill of space previously evacuated for flood control handled differently than the refill of space following an irrigation use?
 - A. I don't think so.
- Q. That is, prior to '78 there were times where it was just done by priority?
- A. Prior to 1978, I -- it appears to me that most of the time they would wait until they reached the day of maximum reservoir contents and would simply allocate based on that. How they distributed the flood control, I'm not sure.
- But as they were spilling water past Milner for flood control or whatever reason, storage usage was

1 | cancelled, just as it is today.

2

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And the irrigation use as it is today?
- A. And the irrigation use also.
- Q. Tony, in your view, is there a difference between flood control and the availability of water to the spaceholder as opposed to an irrigation use and the water being available to the spaceholder? Let me rephrase that.

I mean if a spaceholder needs water and makes a demand or calls for that water for irrigation, that water is then made available to them if that water's in their space; correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. If you have a flood-control event occur and it occurs at a time of the year when it's not needed, then the spaceholder arguably wouldn't call for it; correct? If it's not needed, they're not going to call for the water; is that common sense or is that agreed?
- A. Water District 1 doesn't require the water users to call for their water. We do an after-the-fact accounting. So we look at what's been diverted this past day, then we calculate the natural flow available, we look at the water rights for the diversion that's diverting water.

If there's sufficient natural flow to fill their water right, then they're using natural flow. If there isn't sufficient natural flow to fill their water right, then it's charged as storage.

- Q. All right. So in terms of then a flood-control event, if a spaceholder, a diverter, diverts the water, if there's natural flow going over Milner, sufficient natural flow going over Milner, is that diverter charged with natural flow if they have a natural-flow right?
- A. I think I see what you're getting to. We account for whether the diversion is diverting natural flow or storage. If there's water spilling out past Milner because of a flood-control operation, that storage diversion is cancelled.

If there isn't water spilling past Milner, the storage diversion is not cancelled, even though they may be releasing flood-control water out of Jackson or Palisades, if it's physically being caught in a downstream reservoir, there's no loss to the system; and therefore, we would charge for the storage diverted by the irrigation diversion.

Q. I understand that. I guess the point I'm trying to get to is a question for you that if a spaceholder's space is eventually at the date of

```
allocation short because of a flood-control release
that has occurred, in your view, is that a different
circumstance than if that spaceholder had diverted
water for storage use for irrigation?
```

- A. The shortage from flood control dictates how much storage we can allocate to each of the spaceholders. And the spaceholders can use that amount of allocated storage regardless of what time of the year. They can divert it whenever they want to divert it.
- Q. All right. And so if a flood-control event occurs and an individual entity's space doesn't fill because of that event, that water that was released may not have ever been available to them at the time of the year they needed it; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Whereas if that entity had called for storage or had diverted storage, they had the ability to utilize that storage; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Two different circumstances; correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. But the accounting program, as it's set up now, doesn't distinguish between the filling of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

that space?

2

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I don't understand the question.
- Q. Well, if you have a flood-control event and an entity had used storage, at the time of that flood-control event the slate is wiped clean in terms of that irrigation diversion that had occurred?
- A. If the flood-control storage released went past Milner.
- Q. Okay. I guess with all my questions that's what I'm presuming, is that if you have that circumstance occurring, it's not captured, because in most cases the Bureau in recent years releases water -- well, strike that last part.

But in that event do you understand what I'm saying, is that would you agree that the circumstances are different for that individual entity in terms of the availability of water and the differences between a flood-control event and an irrigation use and the availability of that water?

A. Well, you're describing two different scenarios. The first scenario, I think, is that there's not a flood-control event so the reservoir would fill. The diversion -- the spaceholder then would be allocated 100 percent allocation.

If a flood-control event occurred and they

```
didn't refill that evacuated space, you would be allocated less than 100 percent. It has no bearing on what he's diverted up until that time.
```

- Q. But the difference between that individual entity and someone who hadn't diverted storage, they would take the same hit if they're in the same reservoir?
- A. They would both have the same storage allocation. One would have used storage and one would not.
 - Q. Right. With respect to the allocation of unfilled space following a flood-control event, I think you said it's 75 percent is allocated to Palisades and 25 to Jackson.

Do you recall that?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And with respect to Palisades, it's apportioned equally across all the spaceholders in Palisades?
- A. The best way to describe it, when there's a shortage due to flood control, everyone's carryover gets wiped out and every spaceholder in that reservoir gets the same percentage allocation.
- Q. And is that the same methodology that's utilized at Jackson?

4

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. Yes.

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So for example, if you're 100,000 acre-feet short of a full reservoir on the date of allocation, 75,000 of that unfilled space would be allocated to Palisades, 25,000 would be allocated to Jackson?
- A. If the failure to fill was due to flood control, yes.
- Q. And then that 75,000 acre-feet that would be allocated to the Palisades spaceholders would be proportioned out to them without reference to priority date of their space?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And the 25,000 allocated to Jackson would be allocated out without referencing their priority date in Jackson?
- A. Correct.
- Q. If you know, Tony, why was refill not given the same priority as the original storage in that reservoir? You referenced earlier that Henry Eagle and Lynn Crandall did it a certain way, and then when Mr. Larsen came on it was your perspective that the way refill was handled was changed. Do you have an understanding of why that occurred?
- A. When I was reviewing the records over the past year reading through the annual books and how the

```
accounting was done, I noticed during the time that Art
  Larsen was watermaster, most of those years the
2
  reservoir system filled completely. They were good
  water years. It wasn't an issue, except there was one
4
  particular year -- and I don't remember what year it
5
  was, but under those conditions I noticed that Art
  Larsen didn't give credit of refill to the American
  Falls spaceholders as Henry Eagle and Lynn Crandall
  would have under the same conditions.
```

I've been told that there was some correspondence with the Director as to whether or not the refill should occur ahead of the initial fill of junior rights. And the answer to that was no, it shouldn't.

- Ο. And do you recall what correspondence that was? 16
 - I think it was between the watermaster and the Director of the Department at the time.
 - And by "junior rights," are you referring Ο. to junior storage rights, the first fill of Palisades, or are you talking about junior storage and natural-flow rights?
 - Α. I'm not sure what the question was geared to, whether or not it was just storage or pertained to everybody.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. But what you recall in the documents you reviewed, do you recall if that refill was then secondary or junior to the first fill of all storage space, or was it junior to all storage and natural flow within the water district?
- A. When the watermaster made his allocations, he credited the refill to American Falls spaceholders, only that it used storage up until that time. During the time or prior to the time new accrual occurred in -- I should say new physical contents increased in Palisades as the American Falls Reservoir contents were dropping.
- Q. So it was relative to the junior/senior spaceholders in the system above Milner when you talk about allocation?
- A. Well, no, it wasn't done for everyone. It was done for only the American Falls spaceholders and only ahead of Palisades. Or the way it was calculated was the new accrual in Palisades went towards the refill of spaceholders in American Falls that had used storage.
- Q. Yeah. I was talking more in that circumstance that you mentioned about with Mr. Larsen the year in which Mr. Larsen sought input from the Director of Water Resources and whether or not from

```
your understanding that discussion pertained to junior
1
   storage rights and senior storage rights in the system
2
   above Milner or all storage and natural-flow rights
   above Milner.
          Α.
                I don't know. I haven't seen the
5
   correspondence.
6
          O.
                Okay.
          MR. BROMLEY:
                         John, it's about 20 after noon.
8
          MR. SIMPSON:
                        Do you want to break?
9
   break for lunch.
10
          MR. BROMLEY: Maybe we can just go off the
11
   record real fast.
12
                (Lunch recess.)
13
                (BY MR. SIMPSON): Tony, I just have a few
          Ο.
14
   more questions.
15
                And one question would be I think you
16
   identified that the provision that is contained in the
17
   Notice of Deposition, Exhibit 1, and in the State's
18
   motion for summary judgment is a fair representation of
19
   the status quo of basically how refill is considered
20
   today --
21
          Α.
                Yes.
22
                -- is that fair?
          Ο.
23
                Would it also be fair to say that there is
24
   at least the potential that if this recommendation or
25
```

- this remark were included that the ability to refill
 may be substantially less in the future if new rights
 are licensed or decreed?
 - A. The potential there is to reduce the refill with future allocations, yes.
 - Q. Okay. So every new right that is decreed within the system above Milner has the direct potential to reduce the refill of storage rights in Water District 1?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

- Q. So for example, any right that was licensed after or permitted after 1979, for example, would have the ability to take water that otherwise might be available for refill of storage above Milner?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And in those circumstances, if those were to occur, then we wouldn't necessarily be maximizing the fill in the system?
- MR. BROMLEY: Objection. Calls for speculation.
- Q. (BY MR. SIMPSON): You can answer if you can.
 - A. No, I would disagree with that, because if there's, let's say, a 1970 priority and they divert as a result of taking water away from refill, that water we can say was definitely used for that 1970 water

1 | right.

2

5

10

11

21

22

23

24

But there's the chance that if it hadn't been allowed to divert the water and instead went to refill, there's no guarantee that that refilled quantity would be used above Milner because you could get into the situation where there's water that came down later in excess of what was needed to physically fill the reservoir, and as a result the water went out into the system, and you've curtailed that 1970 from diverting water when it otherwise could have.

- Q. Because of the timing of the flows?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. But if that water came down later, then the 1970 could still divert it; correct?
- A. Only after the senior water rights were filled.
- Q. And if the senior water rights were filled, then the 1970 right under your speculation could divert it?
- 20 A. Yes.
 - Q. In your testimony this morning you referenced that you had some communications with Mr. Orr from the Attorney General's office; is that correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Regarding a refill remark or how refill occurred; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And I think you referenced that there were some telephone conversations?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Were there any e-mails or written correspondence?
- A. Specifically to this issue, I don't recall any e-mails.
 - Q. Any other written documents?
- 12 A. None that I can recall.
- Q. Tony, let me just ask you a couple questions on your perspective regarding fill versus refill.
 - That is, if water is filled in space and has not been utilized by the spaceholder, is that a different circumstance than if water has filled in space, is available for the spaceholder, and is utilized and then that space refills?
 - A. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Well, I'm trying to identify whether or not, in your view, there's a difference between fill and refill. That is, when space has filled and is subsequently evacuated, is that a different

circumstance than if the space is filled and at that point is available for the spaceholder?

A. Well, the difference between fill and refill is mostly just timing. Fill is that water that fills the reservoir that goes also towards filling the storage account in the water right accounting program.

Refill is the same thing where water could accrue to a reservoir, but it doesn't necessarily go to any storage right.

- Q. So let me ask this hypothetical: If you were creating an accounting program for accounting for the fill of a reservoir, in your view, should there be any consideration about whether or not that water that filled space was actually available for a spaceholder to utilize in identifying it either as fill or refill?
- A. Well, the way the accounting program works is as long as you don't spill water out the end of the system, everything that accrues to the storage account is available.

After that storage account fills completely and you get additional storage, that's also available, but what the unknown is who it's available to.

Q. And so that helps me. And so then do you think it would be wise to consider not only that it's available, whether it's needed?

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. The water district doesn't make the determination of need. We simply account for the water and distribute it to the appropriate water rights or storage rights.
- Q. Understand. Then how about in determining whether or not that water was available, whether it was actually used by that spaceholder or by a spaceholder in the district, do you think it would be wise to consider that fact?
 - A. You'll have to repeat that.
- Q. Well, we've talked about water being available. And you said that the water district doesn't consider whether it's needed, just accounting for it and whether it's available.

And my question goes to when you consider whether it's available to the spaceholder, do you think it would be prudent to consider whether it was actually used by a spaceholder within the district?

- A. No. The water district doesn't make that determination. We simply allocate what's available. And whether or not they choose to use it or not, it's not our decision. They can choose to carry it over to the next irrigation season, or they can choose to use it all in the current irrigation season.
 - Q. Okay. But if that water was evacuated from

```
space and then subsequently that space didn't fill
1
   after the evacuation, was that water available then to
2
   that spaceholder?
               No, it would be deducted from the
4
   allocation.
5
          MR. SIMPSON: Right. Okay.
                                        That's all the
6
   questions I have.
          MR. TUCKER:
                        Tony, I've got a couple questions.
8
   I don't really have a big interest in this. I'll set
9
   that forth right off the bat. But I am confused.
10
   Okay. And I've got just a couple questions that you
11
   might be able to help me with my confusion. And if you
12
   can't, I'll go to lunch with these guys again and ask
13
   them sometime.
14
          MR. SIMPSON: Not to the same place.
15
16
                          EXAMINATION
17
   BY MR. TUCKER:
18
               For the record, my name is Jim Tucker.
          Ο.
                                                         I'm
19
   with Idaho Power Company.
20
                You testified that when you refill the
21
   reservoirs you don't do it in any particular priority,
22
   but I took that as in one way you were saying you
23
   didn't take a preference, in other words, you didn't
24
```

fill one reservoir over another; is that right?

didn't refill the reservoir over another?

- A. The refill is just a matter of physical storage -- additional physical storage occurring in the reservoir system after the rights have been filled.
 - Q. So it's just somewhat opportunistic, then?
- A. Yes.

2

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. That refill -- what I'm a little confused about, that refill that occurs, is that then reallocated back to storage accounts?
 - A. Not necessarily.
- Q. All right. When would it be and when wouldn't it be? That's what I'm confused about.
- A. There are lots of different scenarios. And I'll throw out just a few, and I may be excluding some.

Let's assume we had 50,000 acre-feet of unallocated storage that we captured in the reservoir system as refill, it's in the system, hasn't been allocated to anyone. What do we do with that? If it was a year in which we released water, storage water for flood control, and we failed to refill that -- I should say, let's say that space that was evacuated and went past Milner is less than this unallocated storage that we refilled with, we first refill that water that was released for flood control. Now we have a chunk of water that still doesn't belong to anybody.

Then what we can do at that time is we can credit it with the storage use that had already occurred. It allows us to allocate to everyone 100 percent, but we still have some extra water. And we take the storage usage from canals from the beginning of the irrigation season and just work our way forward until we run out of water. And that way we allocate every acre-foot of water in the system. We don't have any left over that we don't allocate.

So the answer is sometimes it goes to offset the flood-control release, sometimes it will go to cancel storage that was diverted early in the irrigation season, and sometimes it will go to unfilled storage accounts. And that's the last option that I haven't talked about.

And that's the situation of where American Falls Reservoir, the storage right is filled to 100 percent, but we've captured the water physically up high in the system in Palisades, or even Island Park, and that allows for any surplus gains that come in below those reservoirs to physically accrue and are captured in American Falls Reservoir. But since their right is 100 percent full, there's no way to allocate that storage.

And one of the things we've done in the

past, depending on the circumstances, we take that additional storage and we add it to the unfilled junior storage accounts when we make their allocation.

- Q. Which are higher in the system?
- A. Which are higher in the system.
- Q. Okay.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. And the basis for that is that the only reason that additional storage occurred in American Falls was because of the benefit of the upper reservoirs that held the water up higher, you've maximized your water capture.
- Q. Okay. So are those processes or procedures that you just went through, are they memorialized anyplace, are they written down anyplace where you would know how to follow that? Say if you were sick one day, somebody else would know how to follow that situation?
- A. No. It's always been at the watermaster's discretion.
- Q. Okay. So it's something that you learned and I suspect Lyle learned just from kind of being on the job and seeing how the system worked and learning that as you go?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, I was a little confused. This

also confused me: You said when flood-control releases are made, if they don't leave the system, if they don't go past Milner, and then you made -- excuse me if I've got this wrong, but then you made a statement that in those situations there's no space available for refill if you had -- I took it if the storage accounts were full -- do you recall saying that or --

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Can you explain what you mean by that?
- 11 A. Yes.

2

5

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Okay.
 - A. The way the water right accounting works is that it keeps track of every water, distributes it to natural flow, storage accounts. If we never spilled a drop of water past Milner, the physical contents in the system would always equal the physical fill in the storage water rights.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. And so if we're not spilling water past
 Milner and they release water for flood control out of
 Jackson and Palisades and it's physically caught in
 American Falls, we still have the same amount of water
 that we can allocate to what we've accrued on paper.
 - So what that means, since we haven't

```
spilled water out the end of the system, there's some unfilled account in the system. And so there wouldn't be any refill.
```

- Q. Okay. So if you captured water in a higher reservoir, then, that would go to fill that account, it wouldn't be refill, it would be filling that account, that unfilled account?
- A. It would be the initial fill instead of the refill.

MR. TUCKER: Okay. I got you. All right. All right. That makes sense. Okay. All right. Well, maybe that answers my other questions I've got here.
Okay. That may be all I have. Thanks. Appreciate it.

MS. McHUGH: I think I just have a couple clarifying questions.

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

FURTHER EXAMINATION

18 BY MS. McHUGH:

Q. And I think this was John's question, but I think he asked if every new right -- when looking under the remark, every new right has the potential to reduce storage rights in Water District 1 under this remark.

And I think you agreed with that statement.

Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

- Q. Do you mean that every new right has the potential to reduce storage rights or every new right would have the potential to reduce physical fill or refill?
 - A. We're talking potentially. It doesn't necessarily mean it could happen. But potentially if you allow a junior appropriator future right to divert water that otherwise would have been captured in the reservoir, the potential there is to effect a spaceholder from additional storage he otherwise would have received.
 - Q. And the reason a junior future right could do that is because the -- is why? Explain how that would happen. I don't follow.
 - A. The filling under priority is limited to the quantity described in the right. American Falls, it's this 1.67 million acre-feet. Once we've stored that amount --
 - Q. Maybe I need to stop you right there.

 Once you've stored the full quantity under the American Falls water right 1-2064, once that full quantity's been stored, can a junior future right impact the amount of water stored under that water right?
 - A. It could only impact the refill --

Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. -- of that right.
- Q. That's what my question was. So just to recap, then.

Once water under 1-2064, once that water right has been totally filled up to the quantity on the water right, a future junior use could not impact that water right storage?

- A. Not the initial fill of 1.67 million.
- Q. Okay. That was my question. John also asked you one other question relating to water right 1-2064. And I wasn't sure I understood your answer.

And it was along the lines of if a 1921 right is filled but the physical fill is unallocated storage, not under any priority, what happens. And I didn't understand your answer. So could you repeat your answer.

A. Well, that scenario, I think, was when American Falls isn't physically full but their water right is filled to the 1.67 million, but we have additional storage that's captured in the reservoir that's surplus water that wasn't distributed to any senior water right, that becomes available to someone.

And as I described to Mr. Tucker, several things can happen. At that point the watermaster can

```
decide to offset any reductions to flood-control
releases by that additional storage, or you can use it
to cancel storage that had been previously used by a
canal, or you can add it to unfilled storage accounts.
```

Q. Thank you. That helped me.

I think that in the first answer to that question you referred to storing water rather than capturing water.

And do you see a difference in those two words?

A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And could you explain the difference between those two words to me.
 - A. Yeah. Storing the water would be assuming to store it under the water right.
 - O. Uh-huh.
 - A. Capturing the water would be physically capturing the water in the reservoir that doesn't necessarily -- is assigned to any water right.
 - Q. Okay. And one more clarifying question.

 And I may have misunderstood the answer or the question.

But there was something along the lines of if a storage water right or a storage reservoir is physically refilled after the day of allocation and

there were previously unfilled storage rights, can you tell me what would happen?

- A. Refill can't occur after the day of allocation.
- Q. Okay. Physical refill cannot occur. I'm not talking about physical refill of the reservoir.
 - A. That would be correct.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And I should say physical refill of the reservoir system. The way they operate the reservoirs, you may see an increase in contents in one reservoir, but it would be offset by the decrease in contents by another reservoir. So after the day of allocation, the net system contents are always going down. They're never going up.
- MS. McHUGH: That helps me. Thank you. Okay.
 That's all. Thank you.

18

19

21

22

23

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

FURTHER EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. RIGBY:

- Q. Even if they have to adjust the date of allocation because they incorrectly described it?

 Isn't that what you said earlier?
- A. Correct. The final day, after you get to the end of the year and you look back at the day of

allocation, it comes after the last day of physical increases.

- Q. And that's why your statement that it cannot occur will always be a fact because that's what you'll look back to and say once it started going down, that's the date of allocation?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. It's more complicated than that, but that's why you can make that bold statement, is it not?
- A. Yeah. We have had years where we thought we were at the day of allocation, and then -- that's in realtime, and then eventually we found out that we had this unexpected supply of water that came through the system, and so the day of allocation moved to that date. But we never have two days of allocation in any one year.
- Q. Right. Okay. Just a couple other clarifications that were raised as a result of counsel's questions.

First of all, assume for a moment -- and of course, I represent a group called Mitigation, Inc., owning interest in Ririe Reservoir. And quite candidly, it's the toughest reservoir to fill for one main reason, and that's source of water in the sense that not only is it low on the priority table, its

source itself is difficult some years to actually fill that reservoir.

The question I would have is assume for a moment, then, that all these reservoirs have filled to their capacity, the two that we're talking about particularly here that they filled on paper to those capacities, isn't it a fact that Ririe, generally speaking, will hold some of that water that made that fill possible for American Falls?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And in fact, that's the intent, keep it in Ririe if you can; right?
- A. Yes.

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Okay. So getting to Mr. Tucker's question, where we're not completely full in the system, because let's say everything's filled but Ririe -- and that can happen; correct?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Because of its bad source and low priority.

 Until it is filled the priority for Ririe still is on; correct?
- A. If American Falls is filled and there's sufficient natural flow, yes.
- Q. Yes. And so in this conversion of water that occurs, so to speak, we've always viewed it and

```
treated it like for every acre-foot, once it's filled
like that, American Falls is filled, for every
acre-foot of water that is then captured in American
Falls beyond its paper fill puts one more acre-foot of
water conversion that was owed to Ririe -- excuse me,
owed to American Falls by Ririe, now not owed? Does
that make sense?

A. Yes.
```

- Q. Is that correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. I'm using the scenario where there's no others that -- all the others are filled.
- 13 A. Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TUCKER: Yeah, you're kind of testifying too.

THE WITNESS: It's the situation I described to Mr. Tucker where Ririe is physically holding American Falls storage, and because of that there's some empty space in American Falls, even though it's filled on paper, and we have this surplus water come down that we're able to physically capture in American Falls Reservoir.

And at that time we look to Ririe

Reservoir. And that American Falls water held is no
longer needed. That unallocated-for storage, in a

sense, replaces the water that was held upstream. And therefore, American Falls can get full allocation allocated to it, and Ririe then gets the physical contents allocated to it.

- Q. (BY MR. RIGBY): Very good. Now, but is that a different scenario than what you've been testifying as to the refill?
- A. Yeah, the potential is there. If we -- if we assigned a priority date to the refill of that water coming into American Falls, you may find yourself in a situation where you're not able to do that swap of unallocated-for storage with Ririe Reservoir, and they're stuck with only the amount that they accrue on paper, which is usually a smaller amount than they hold physically in the reservoir.
- Q. So that would be if the change occurred as to a priority refill?
- A. Yes. The potential there is reduce the benefit that Ririe gets from holding American Falls water in it on those years where the system nearly fills.
- Q. As to the discretion of allocation of the captured water in the refill, I guess I'm still a little unclear, then, as a result of your answer of a moment ago.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And that is, if it's the discretion of the 1 watermaster, then when I was talking about -- and I 2 shouldn't have said "priority," because someone pointed that out. I used the wrong word. And it wasn't a priority in the sense of water priority. I think 5 that's what was asked. It's not a priority issue. It's you've captured this extra water, and the reason you're able to capture it, even though the system filled on paper or completely filled, you've had releases. And we've talked about them. Releases as a 10 result of flood control, releases as a result of 11 diversions for irrigation, and releases for fish 12 augmentation. 13

There could be others, but basically those are the big three; is that correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So are you saying, then, that the capturing, wherever it's captured in the system thereafter, goes first to flood control, or is that still part of this discretion of the watermaster?
- A. In my experience, assuming you have all three situations, you have a situation where the amount of water physically available in the system is less than the amount that we've accrued on paper, and people have already been diverting storage water after Milner

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
spill ceases, we have this surplus of storage water in
the system that we have to allocate to someone,
generally the first thing it does -- or the watermaster
has done is apply that unallocated storage to fill the
flood-control evacuated space so that the paper
contents will match the physical contents, so we're
able to allocate what's on paper.
```

If we're able to do that entirely, we still have a surplus of this storage water in the system.

Then we can use it to offset either previous storage diversions or we can use it to fill unfilled storage rights or add to their fill.

- Q. But let me stop you right there. The reason they're unfilled is for what reason? Is it because of like Ririe, it just didn't fill from its source, or is it because of diversions for irrigation as you've talked about in the other two scenarios?
- A. It depends on the timing and the location of the runoff. The reason they didn't fill is for whatever reason. The physical contents don't match the amount that we've stored on paper.
- Q. Okay. But again, then I'll ask you the question, as others have asked.

That's just discretionary, according to your testimony? You don't have anything else that you

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
know of that would give the watermaster that right
to -- and I don't want to say prioritize, but to
allocate according to the way you've just described?
```

- A. Yes. The unallocated-for storage for this refill doesn't belong to anyone, according to the water rights. And so it's at the watermaster's discretion as to how he should distribute that water. And that's the way it's been operated in the past.
- Q. Do you know why? Why would refilling of the flood control be first as opposed to third?
- A. I think that's just how it's been done in most years. But I suppose a watermaster with a different philosophy could do it differently.

MR. RIGBY: Okay. I have nothing more.

MR. ORR: I do have a few more, again, just clarifications.

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

FURTHER EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. ORR:

Q. Tony, I think a bit earlier -- I think before lunch -- Mr. Simpson asked you if this remark in Exhibits 4 and 1, which authorizes or seeks to authorize storage of additional water even after a right fills, if it was included as a remark in the decree, I think Mr. Simpson asked you "Wouldn't the

priority of the remark also attach to storing the additional water?"

And the reason I'm asking for clarification on this is I think there might have been some confusion over the distinction between a water right and a priority date. Sometimes they're used interchangeably.

Is your understanding that a priority date is simply one element of a water right?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And this remark to which I referred in Exhibits 1 and 4, particularly the second sentence, making the storage of additional water subordinate to existing and future rights, do you understand that as -- I'm searching for the word, but I'm going to try this one -- negating the priority element as to the storage of additional water?
- A. Yes. And I thought that was clarified in one of John's last questions when he was asking about this issue, is that in the initial fill we store under the 1921 priority. And then once we've reached the quantity of that right under that priority, then the priority becomes junior to all existing and future rights.
- Q. So under this remark, although the refill storage of additional water would be authorized by the

remark under this water right, it doesn't mean that priority attaches to it?

A. Correct.

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Bear with me for just a moment here, please.

Now, I believe you've testified here that this remark to which I referred would be consistent with how refill, quote, "is done in Water District 1 now."

Does that mean that storage of additional water beyond the first fill or refill is done using excess or surplus water?

- A. Can you ask the question again?
- Q. I think you've testified -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- that the remark in Exhibits 1 and 4, if it was included in the water rights in question here, would recognize and authorize the type of refill that Water District 1 has been doing while you've been there, and it's consistent with how Water District 1 has operated, quote, "refill"?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So am I correct in concluding that that means the way Water District 1 has operated refill in your experience has been that refill is done using excess or surplus water?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
 - Q. Can you define for me what "excess or surplus water" means in that context?
 - A. Excess or surplus water would be any amount of water in the system each day that's in excess to the demand by water right users.
 - Q. So under the remark in Exhibits 1 and 4, specifically the provision subordinating refill to future water rights, the only thing we'd be talking about reducing is the supply of excess or surplus water in the future, potentially?
- 12 A. Yes.

4

5

7

8

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. It would not diminish the priority of any existing right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. I think in response to the question by Mr. Rigby or Ms. McHugh you said something to the effect of physical reefer -- refill cannot occur --
 - A. Reefer madness.
 - MR. BROMLEY: Never thought you'd see that in a transcript.
- MR. ORR: With my name on it.
- Q. Let me start over.
- After the date of allocation, I believe
 that you said or agreed to the statement that physical

```
reefer -- refill -- there it is again -- cannot occur.
1
               Do you remember saying something like that?
2
               Yes.
          Α.
               So when water accumulates to the system
4
   after the date of allocation, is that the, quote,
5
   "first fill" of the next year's supply?
          Α.
               Yes. And October is the exception.
                                                     There
   is increase to the system after the day of allocation.
8
   But prior to that time, the day of allocation, there
   isn't any additional increase in the net reservoir
10
   system contents until you reach that time period,
11
   usually in October, when the demand drops and we're
12
   able to capture additional water under priority towards
13
   the initial fill the following irrigation season.
14
               Okay. And related to that -- just because
          0.
15
   I'm struggling with understanding the statement you
16
   made there -- I have read in some documents where
17
   people or where the document refers to the first fill
18
   of a reservoir during a given season or water year as a
19
   refill. Usually that's in the sense of power
20
   operations or fish flow augmentations.
                                            I've seen
21
   documents documenting, well, this reservoir will be
22
   able to refill every year.
23
               Why I'm leading into that is, would you
24
```

agree that sometimes the term "refill" is applied to

what is not the type of in-season refill we're referring to here?

A. Yes.

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And all I'm getting at here is, in my opinion "refill" is a little bit of an ambiguous term, you have to be careful how you're using it.

Would you agree with that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And I think this is my last question: The watermaster's exercise of discretion in connection with some of the decisions you've referred to here -- and I think you also referred to watermaster philosophy regarding exercise of that discretion.

And sometimes the word "discretion" is understood to mean arbitrary or capricious, for instance, the watermaster's exercise of discretion is being arbitrary or capricious.

Is that what you mean, or is it discretion within some parameters or guidelines or policy objectives?

A. The goal distributing this unaccounted-for storage is to try to match the physical contents to what has been accrued on paper. That's the primary goal. Because of that, that's generally the order as to which we credit that unaccounted-for storage where

```
it goes first to refilling that evacuated space for
   flood control to match what we have on paper accrued to
2
   the storage accounts.
                Secondly, the other two possibilities are
4
   filling unfilled storage accounts or cancelling
5
   previously used storage.
                Where the watermaster's discretion comes in
7
   between those two choices is generally where the
8
   unaccounted-for storage occurred. And I think if you
9
   have two different watermasters, they may make two
10
   different decisions. And I'm not sure which would be
11
   correct.
12
                     I think that's all I have.
          MR. ORR:
13
          MR. SIMPSON: Okay. I got a few follow-up,
14
   then.
15
16
                      FURTHER EXAMINATION
17
   BY MR. SIMPSON:
18
                Tony, just in reference to your last
          Ο.
19
   testimony about where you have two different
20
   watermasters making two different decisions and the
21
   discretion.
22
                Do you recall that testimony just now?
23
          Α.
                Yes.
24
                And that being discretionary, in your view,
25
```

```
1 is that --
2 A.
```

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Yes.

- Q. Would that be similar to how a refill occurred and under what priority in terms of how Mr. Crandall handled it versus Mr. Larsen, in those terms it was discretionary on their part as well; correct?
- A. Well, that's the decision they made. And the Director determined that that was the incorrect way of doing things. And so the watermaster no longer had discretion to do that.
- Q. So it became the Director's discretion to make that decision?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You know, right after lunch I asked you a couple questions about the potential if this remark were implemented on the effect of refilling storage.

 And the remark I'm referring to is the remark in the Exhibit 1 and in the State's motion.

Do you recall that testimony?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Could the implementation of this remark also affect a spaceholder's water supply?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Because if fill didn't occur after a

```
flood-control release, that would affect the allocation, then, to a particular spaceholder?
```

A. Correct.

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. And so we just talked about the potential to affect the water supply with respect to future rights.

Would it also be the case that rights issued say after 1978 also would have the potential to affect the water supply of a spaceholder?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Based upon the implementation of this remark; correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And, Tony, just if you could refer back to that remark.

Since we've had a lot of time to discuss it today, what does "incidental," as it's identified in the second sentence of the remark, mean to you? And what does it mean to you, and how has the word "incidental" been utilized in how you've allocated or accounted for water to date in Water District 1?

A. Well, I suppose the best way would be to look up the definition of "incidental" in the dictionary, but what that means to me is is that --

MR. SIMPSON: The lights are out.

```
MS. McHUGH:
                        Can you continue, Jeff?
1
          THE COURT REPORTER: I can run on battery for a
2
   little while.
          O.
                (BY MR. SIMPSON): Go ahead and finish your
4
5
   sentence.
                Incidental and subordinate, what that means
          Α.
6
   to me is that the storage rights can't make a call
   against any other existing or future water rights to
   refill that space.
          Ο.
                So the word "incidental" and the word
10
   "subordinate" have the same meaning to you in the
11
   context of that remark?
12
                Well, if you took out the word
13
   "incidental," I don't see any problem with that. I
14
   think it would be just fine if it said, "This right --
15
   under this right with such additional storage is
16
   subordinate to all existing future rights," that would
17
   be fine also.
18
               But as you look at that remark and in terms
          Ο.
19
   of how you've, in your duties in Water District 1 have
20
   accounted for water, the word "incidental" has no
21
   meaning to you?
22
          Α.
                Yes.
23
                         That better be all the questions I
          MR. SIMPSON:
24
```

have, based on battery life.

```
Well --
          MS. McHUGH:
1
          MR. TUCKER:
                        I have just a couple more.
2
          MS. McHUGH:
                        That's fine.
3
          MR. TUCKER:
                        Can I do that?
4
5
          MR. SIMPSON:
                         Hurry.
6
                      FURTHER EXAMINATION
   BY MR. TUCKER:
8
                This kind of traffic's off some of
9
   Candice's questions.
10
                Can you give me an example of when you
11
   store water and when you capture water, the difference
12
           I'm not clear on that difference.
13
                Storing -- the accounting program, it keeps
          Α.
14
   track of the reach gains in every reach of the Snake
15
   River. And then we distribute those gains based on the
16
   priorities of the water rights for diversions in those
17
   reaches or in downstream reaches.
18
                Every drop of water, assuming we're not
19
   spilling water past Milner, is distributed to those
20
   storage accounts according to priority, according to
21
   the amount of natural flow in the river each day.
22
                But the physical reservoir contents, the
23
   actual capturing of storage, may be different than
24
```

what's showing as accruing on paper.

One of the reasons could be that you have storage users, canals, using storage at the same time we're accruing new storage to a senior reservoir priority.

So what you would see physically is reservoir contents could be remaining steady. We aren't really capturing any water, but we're accruing water on paper at the same time it's being used by the canal diversion.

So the difference being capturing and accruing water in the paper accounting is that accruing paper -- accruing water in the paper accounting is what's accruing to the water right itself. Capturing is the determination of the increase in reservoir contents.

Q. Okay. Okay. All right. Just let me see if I can simplify it for me, then.

So when you're refilling, are you capturing water or storing water or both?

- A. In refilling we're only capturing water, we're not storing water, because the assumption is is that the only time you can refill is when the storage right is 100 percent full.
- Q. So when you're refilling, you're not storing water under any water right? You're capturing

1

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
water, but not under a water right --
1
          Α.
                Correct.
2
          0.
                -- or are you; correct?
3
                Correct.
          Α.
4
          MS. McHUGH: Oh, good.
5
          THE WITNESS: I thought I was going home.
6
          O.
                (BY MR. TUCKER): So let me again express
   my ignorance some more.
8
                So in this remark where it says "Additional
9
   water may be stored under this water right, " that's not
10
   applicable to when you're capturing water under refill?
11
          Α.
                Yeah, I suppose the word "storage" would
12
   apply on the day of allocation when we actually
13
   allocate the storage. But it's based on the water that
14
   was captured up until that time.
15
                Okay. I'm really confused now. Probably
          Q.
16
   mixing apples and oranges.
17
                        Maybe I can help.
          MS. McHUGH:
18
          MR. TUCKER:
                        Anyway.
19
          0.
                Okay.
                       I guess I know as much about that as
20
   I'm going to learn from it.
21
                Mr. Orr asked you a couple questions
22
   about -- and this again gets back to the discretionary
23
   decisions or the decisions the watermaster makes about
```

25

how to assign or allocate unallocated storage that you

went through before. And you said there were 1 certain -- you mentioned certain goals that you believe 2 or you testified the watermaster might have in mind. But again, I guess my question goes back 4 to, is there anyplace that those goals or guidelines 5 are memorialized where they're either in a Departmental memorandum or a guideline or something like that, or again, is it simply historical knowledge that that 8 watermaster has on how the system works? 9 Α. I think it's mostly based on historical 10 There may be some documentation out there practice. 11 somewhere that has documented what was historically 12 done. But I don't know where that would be or what 13 that would be. 14 MR. TUCKER: Okay. Okay. That's all I have. 15 Thanks. 16 MR. BROMLEY: Candice, I've got three, since 17 we're going to come back around, and you'll start 18 again. 19 MS. McHUGH: Okay. 20 21 **EXAMINATION** 22 BY MR. BROMLEY: 23 Tony, John was asking you some questions Ο. 24 about speculative issues of injury based on future

| appropriations.

1

2

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I guess my question is, any new appropriation would have to be applied for, a permit issued, and then ultimately, I suppose, a license issued by the Director.

There are administrative remedies for any water user that believes they're going to be injured by a new appropriation, aren't there?

- A. Yes.
- Q. So they could file a protest?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Jim was asking you some questions about refill and capture. Right now it's a historic practice, is my understanding, that the water district even allows refill or capture of water in a reservoir once the contents have gone down.

There isn't a water right that authorizes it, is there?

- A. Yes, it's -- it's just something that's happened. The water district doesn't make the decision as to whether the Bureau should hold the water or not. It's just what has happened in the past. We have this chunk of water that we allocate, and that's that refill or unallocated water.
 - Q. So this remark would actually authorize the

```
ability to store water after the water right has been
1
   fully satisfied?
2
           Α.
                Yes.
                And that would be consistent with
4
   historical practice?
5
           Α.
                Correct.
6
                But then there would actually be a right
           Q.
   that would authorize the ability to do it?
8
           Α.
                Yes.
9
           Ο.
                And then lastly on this issue of
10
   watermaster discretion, you talked about the
11
   Crandall-Eagle method maybe in a couple select years
12
   where only American Falls was filled ahead of
13
   Palisades, and then when Mr. Larsen became the
14
   watermaster -- what was that, around 1970?
15
           Α.
                Yes.
16
                -- there was a change in that practice.
17
                This remark would limit discretionary
18
   practice changes by the watermaster; is that correct?
19
           Α.
                That's correct.
20
           MR. BROMLEY:
                         Thank you.
21
           MS. McHUGH:
                        Thank you.
22
   ///
23
   ///
24
   ///
25
```

FURTHER EXAMINATION

BY MS. McHUGH:

1

2

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. And, Tony, I'm sorry to have to go back and ask some questions, but I think it's important for me to understand how this remark works in relationship to how the Water District 1 storage system has operated. And I at one point thought I was clear, and I'm now sure I'm clear now so I have to do some follow-up questions.

And I understand your answer to be that there is no net increase to storage after the day of allocation.

Is that right? Is that what you said?

- A. With the exception of late in the year towards October.
- Q. Okay. And that the no net increase to storage after the day of allocation is due to the accounting program, there's no net increase to storage in the accounting program?
- A. Both the accounting and physically, because what's happening is is that water rights senior to the reservoirs are using all the natural flow.
- Q. Okay. That brings me to my question. I need to make a couple of assumptions so I can get this clear in my mind.

Water District 1 and the watermaster have determined that their estimated day of allocation is May 28th. As of that date, though, the entire system is not filled. On June 20th there's a lot of rain that happens, and canals stop demanding natural flow, they stop taking water because they don't need it because it's raining.

Are you with me?

A. Yes.

1

2

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Does refill happen in reservoirs physically under that scenario? Can it?
 - A. Both new fill and refill could both occur.
- Q. Okay. And the new fill -- explain to me who gets the new fill.
- A. The new fill would have been the unfilled water rights at the time of the first attempted allocation.
- Q. Right. Okay. So we now have the initial day of allocation was May 28th.

After that initial allocation date, a bunch of rain happened, demand went down, but the system hadn't filled before and the system hadn't filled on paper or physically before the May 28th estimated day of allocation, and what you're telling me is when you have that rain event and demand drops, the reservoirs

```
actually are -- refilling is occurring, and now those
folks who didn't have any storage in their system prior
to May 28th could now suddenly have storage accounts
that get bigger on paper?
```

- A. The way I would describe it is fill continues --
 - Q. Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A. -- in June. It's not a refill. Still the fill, because we really haven't reached the actual day of allocation. Our first attempt in May was incorrect. And the day of allocation would move until after you got past that period of rain and the reservoir system again began to drop.
- Q. Okay. How do you decide which fill continues?
- A. It's based on the daily accounting. We measure the natural flow available in the system, and we distribute that to the earliest right first.
 - Q. Stop there. The earliest --
- A. The earliest right, the earliest right that's diverting water.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Regardless of whether it's natural-flow right for irrigation or it's a storage right.
- 25 According to the priority, you fill those in sequence

until we've exhausted the total amount of natural flow on that day. And that determines whether or not or which account that natural flow goes into.

- Q. And if you use all of that to do the first fill in sequence of those water rights and rain is still happening and there's low demand, then what happens?
- A. At that point we show all the storage accounts being full, we show some canals that have used storage, but because of the rain we see the reservoirs are all physically 100 percent full, so what that means is now we have that unallocated-for storage or refill storage physically in the system, and it needs to be allocated to someone on the day of allocation.
- Q. And so then you move the day of allocation now from the May 28th original one to a different date?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And then you're going to now adjust people's storage accounts and essentially credit them back storage that they may have used prior to May 28th?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And it still rains. What would happen next?
- A. Same situation. If the rain was sufficient to fill all water rights, the reservoir started

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

increasing in storage, now the day of allocation gets moved further forward.

MS. McHUGH: Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.
That's all for me. I think I'm now more clear.

MR. RIGBY: Good. I won't ask any questions that create any more confusion, so...

MR. ORR: I have only one question I'd like to ask you, Tony.

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

FURTHER EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. ORR:

Q. I believe earlier Mr. Simpson asked you if the remark we've been referring to were implemented or included in the decrees would it potentially have effect on the water supply for a spaceholder.

Do you recall that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. I think you said yes. I was wondering if you could explain to me what you meant by "yes." What kind of effect? What were you referring to?
- A. I was assuming the water supply meant the total amount of water that would be available to the spaceholder during the irrigation season. If the spaceholder is limited to simply 100 percent of the space that he owns in the reservoir, he would be

```
allocated that amount, and he would be limited to using
   that amount.
2
                If we allow refill to occur, potentially
   that spaceholder would have not only his 100 percent
4
   allocated space to use, assuming he had already used
5
   that, he would have additional water to use under the
   additional refill.
                And when John Simpson used the word
   "potential," potentially that could happen.
9
          Ο.
                So I'm still not sure I got to the point I
10
               Let me try this again.
   wanted to.
11
                If this remark is implemented or put in the
12
   decrees, would it prevent a spaceholder's storage
13
   account from filling under the applicable storage right
14
   or reduce the chances of their filling of their space
15
   under the storage right?
16
                It would only reduce the chances of the
17
   amount of water they got under refill.
18
                So it would only reduce the excess or
          O.
19
   surplus that might be available to them in the future?
20
          Α.
                Correct.
21
               And that's all?
          Q.
22
          Α.
               Correct.
23
                     Okay.
                            That was the only point I had.
          MR. ORR:
24
```

///

FURTHER EXAMINATION

BY MR. SIMPSON:

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Well, Tony, when we talk about refill, we're talking about not only filling that could occur after you have 100 percent of your space filled and available to you, but also a refill, as it's been used in this deposition, that occurs after a flood-control release; correct? So it could be an amount that is not in addition to the 100 percent of what you're entitled to, but also up to 100 percent?
- A. The refill in that situation would just be used to offset the storage that had previously filled but was released by the Bureau of Reclamation for flood control.
- Q. That's right. Correct. And if the spaceholder did not utilize that water when it was released for flood control, then if the refill, as it's been used in this context, did not fill that space back up, it would affect the water supply available to them after the date of allocation -- or it could potentially? Excuse me.
 - A. Yes.
- MR. SIMPSON: That's all I have.
- MR. TUCKER: Could I ask one more question?
- MR. SIMPSON: No. Get that on the record.

FURTHER EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. TUCKER:

- Q. Is there anyplace where the day of allocation is defined?
- A. It's difficult to determine. There's not a common procedure the watermaster uses to publish that, other than through our weekly water reports that we distribute to water users.
 - Q. So if I Googled it, I probably wouldn't find it?
 - A. Probably not.

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. All right. Thanks.
- A. But I could look back in any year and determine that for you if you called the office.
- MR. TUCKER: Yeah. Okay.
- MS. McHUGH: Is there any more questions?

 Okay. And, Jim, I do believe there might
 be, but I can help you on that.
- 19 THE COURT REPORTER: Are we off?
- MS. McHUGH: But before we go off the record, I do just want to mention a couple things.
- Are we concluding today's deposition for
 the purposes of what the notice was for, with the
 understanding that you can notice other depositions?
 Or did you want it, John, to be a continuing

deposition? MR. SIMPSON: Well, I think it has to be 2 continuing, because I don't know what Kent or others 3 may have wanted to ask. MS. McHUGH: 5 Okay. So I guess we're going to continue the deposition. And I think, Tony, Chris will make an 7 arrangement with whoever may need to do some follow-up 8 questions or additional questions on that. 9 As to what you've said here today, the 10 procedure, I quess, I would expect that you'd want to 11 review the transcript up to this point and make any 12 corrections to that? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. 14 MS. McHUGH: Because the other continuing 15 deposition may not occur for a while. 16 So is there a way to arrange that on a 17 continuing deposition, Jeff? 18 19

THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah. He can review this volume.

MS. McHUGH: Okay. And then we can just sign this volume. So we'll have that sent to you guys to do that, then. All right.

MR. BROMLEY: Thanks.

MS. McHUGH: Nothing further. Thanks.

20

21

22

23

24

Anthony Olenichak 2/9/2012

```
MR. BROMLEY:
                             Thanks.
1
                   (Deposition adjourned at 2:22 p.m.)
2
                   (Signature requested.)
3
                                  -000-
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF ANTHONY OLENICHAK
2	
3	I, ANTHONY OLENICHAK, being first duly sworn,
4	depose and say:
5	That I am the witness named in the foregoing
6	deposition; that I have read said deposition and know
7	the contents thereof; that the questions contained
8	therein were propounded to me; and that the answers
9	contained therein are true and correct, except for any
10	changes that I may have listed on the Errata Sheet
11	attached hereto.
12	DATED this day of 20
13	
14	CHANGES ON ERRATA SHEET YES NO
15	
16	ANTHONY OLENICHAK
17	
18	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this
19	day of 20
20	
21	
22	
23	NAME OF NOTARY PUBLIC
24	RESIDING AT
25	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES

1	ERRATA SHEET FOR ANTHONY OLENICHAK
2	PageLineReason for Change
3	Reads
4	Should Read
5	PageLineReason for Change
6	Reads
7	Should Read
8	PageLineReason for Change
9	Reads
10	Should Read
11	PageLineReason for Change
12	Reads
13	Should Read
14	PageLineReason for Change
15	Reads
16	Should Read
17	PageLineReason for Change
18	Reads
19	Should Read
20	PageLineReason for Change
21	Reads
22	Should Read
23	
24	
25	SIGNATURE:

2

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place therein set forth, at which time the witness was put under oath by me.

That the testimony and all objections made were recorded stenographically by me and transcribed by me or under my direction.

That the foregoing is a true and correct record of all testimony given, to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 17th day of February, 2012.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JEFF LaMAR, CSR NO. 640 Notary Public

Eagle, Idaho 83616

My commission expires December 30, 2017