

Opinions of the Colorado Supreme Court are available to the public and can be accessed through the Court's homepage at <http://www.courts.state.co.us/supct/supctcaseannctsindex.htm> Opinions are also posted on the Colorado Bar Association homepage at www.cobar.org.

ADVANCE SHEET HEADNOTE
June 12, 2006

**No. 05SA205, Harmony Ditch Company v. Ground Water Management:
Water Law**

The Harmony Ditch Company and various other opposers appealed directly to the supreme court for review of the water court's decree approving an application for an augmentation plan for approximately 1,000 wells in the South Platte River Basin, filed by the Ground Water Management Subdistrict of the Central Colorado Water Conservancy District. The water court approved the application and in its decree imposed a duty of curtailment on the state engineer in the language of section 37-92-305(8). Harmony assigned error to the water court's failure to construe the language of the statute and include in the decree that curtailment of out-of-priority diversions is authorized only when the augmentation plan is not being operated in compliance with the other terms and conditions of the decree.

The supreme court affirmed, holding that section 37-92-305(8) specifies what a water court decree must demand of the state engineer and that the water court complied with the

statute's mandate by imposing a duty of curtailment on the state engineer in the precise terms of the statute.

<p>SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Two East 14th Avenue Denver, Colorado 80203</p> <p>Appeal from the District Court, Water Division 1, Case No. 02CW335 Honorable Roger A. Klein, Judge</p>	<p>Case No. 05SA205</p>
--	-------------------------

CONCERNING THE APPLICATION FOR WATER RIGHTS OF THE GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT SUBDISTRICT OF THE CENTRAL COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT IN ADAMS, LARIMER, MORGAN AND WELD COUNTIES.

Opposers/Appellants:

THE HARMONY DITCH COMPANY; THE LOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, THE ILIFF IRRIGATION DISTRICT, AND THE MORGAN-PREWITT RESERVOIR COMPANY, acting by and through the Prewitt Operating Committee; IRRIGATIONISTS' ASSOCIATION, WATER DISTRICT 1; NORTH STERLING IRRIGATION DISTRICT; PAWNEE WELL USERS, INC., CENTENNIAL WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT; CITY OF BOULDER; CITY OF ENGLEWOOD; CITY OF STERLING, CITY OF WESTMINSTER; AND SOUTH ADAMS COUNTY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT,

v.

Applicant/Appellee:

THE GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT SUBDISTRICT OF THE CENTRAL COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT,

and

Opposers/Appellees:

HAROLD (HAL) D. SIMPSON, State Engineer, JAMES (JIM) R. HALL, Division Engineer for Water Division No. 1; THE CITY OF AURORA; CITY OF LAKEWOOD; BRIGHTON DITCH COMPANY; LOWER PLATTE & BEAVER CANAL COMPANY; THE CITY OF LONGMONT; CHERRY CREEK WATER USERS ASSOCIATION; RURAL DITCH COMPANY; GODDING DITCH COMPANY; THE CITY OF LOVELAND; NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT; GREELEY IRRIGATION COMPANY; RIVERSIDE RESERVOIR AND LAND COMPANY; RIVERSIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT; THE FARMERS RESERVOIR AND IRRIGATION COMPANY; PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY; THE CITY AND COUNTY OF BROOMFIELD; ST. VRAIN & LEFT HAND WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT; THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER; THE HENRYLYN IRRIGATION DISTRICT; CACHE LA POUFRE WATER USERS ASSOCIATION; THE GREELEY AND LOVELAND

IRRIGATION COMPANY; SEVEN LAKES RESERVOIR COMPANY; WATER USERS ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT NO. 6; THE CITY OF THORNTON; VARRA COMPANIES, INC.; THOMPSON WATER USERS ASSOCIATION; LOWER LATHAM RESERVOIR COMPANY; BIJOU IRRIGATION COMPANY; BIJOU IRRIGATION DISTRICT; THE CITY OF BLACK HAWK; THE CITY OF GREELEY, acting by and through its Water & Sanitation Board; FORT MORGAN RESERVOIR & IRRIGATION COMPANY; and RANGEVIEW METROPOLITAN DISTRICT.

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED
EN BANC
June 12, 2006

Timothy R. Buchanan, P.C.
Timothy R. Buchanan
Arvada, Colorado

Attorneys for Harmony Ditch Company and North Sterling
Irrigation Dist.

John W. Suthers, Attorney General
Paul L. Benington, Assistant Attorney General
Alexandra L. Davis, Assistant Attorney General
Natural Resources and Environment Section
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for State and Division Engineers

White & Jankowski, L.L.P.
David F. Jankowski
Bradford R. Benning
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for City of Sterling

Moses, Wittemyer, Harrison and Woodruff
Veronica A. Sperling
Brian A. Knutsen
Boulder, Colorado

Attorneys for Centennial Water & Sanitation District, City
of Boulder, and Pawnee Well Users

Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.
Mary Mead Hammond
Lee H. Johnson

Beth Ann Parson
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for Iliff Irrigation District, Logan Irrigation
and Morgan Prewitt Reservoir, Irrigationists' Assoc., Water
District 1, and City of Westminster

Berghill, Greenleaf, & Ruscitti LLP
David G. Hill
Melissa M. Heidman
Boulder, Colorado

Attorneys for City of Englewood

Moses, Wittemyer, Harrison and Woodruff, P.C.
David L. Harrison
Richard J. Mehren
Boulder, Colorado

Attorneys for South Adams County Water and Sanitation
District

Casey S. Funk
Daniel J. Arnold
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for City and County of Denver

Trout, Raley, Montañó, Witwer & Freeman, P.C.
Robert V. Trout
James S. Witwer
Douglas M. Sinor
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District
and the City of Greeley

Vranesh & Raisch, L.L.P.
Michael D. Shimmin
Stuart B. Corbridge
Boulder, Colorado

Attorneys for Bijou Irrigation Company and Bijou Irrigation
District

Lind, Lawrence & Ottenhoff, L.L.P.
Kim R. Lawrence

Kelly J. Custer
Greeley, Colorado
Attorneys for the Ground Water Management Subdistrict of
the Central Colorado Water Conservancy District

William R. Fisher
Brent A. Bartlett
Fort Collins, Colorado

Attorneys for the Cache La Poudre Water Users Assoc.,
Thompson Water Users Assoc., and Lower Latham Reservoir
Company

Harvey W. Curtis & Associates
Harvey W. Curtis
David L. Kueter
Patricia A. Madsen
Sheela S. Stack
Englewood, Colorado

Attorneys for the City of Black Hawk

Krassa & Miller, LLC
Robert F. T. Krassa
Boulder, Colorado 80301

Attorneys for Brighton Ditch Company

Bernard Lyons Gaddis & Kahn, P.C.
Jeffrey J. Kahn
Wendy E. Slee
Longmont, Colorado

Attorneys for Waters Users Association of District 6 St.
Vrain & Left Hand Water Conservancy District, Greeley and
Loveland Irrigation Company, Seven Lakes Reservoir Company

Peter C. Fleming
Glenwood Springs, Colorado

Attorney for Amicus Curiae Colorado River Water
Conservation District

Porzak Browning & Bushong LLP
Michael F. Browning
Boulder, Colorado

Attorney for the City of Longmont

Petrock & Fendal, P.C.
Frederick A. Fendel III
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for Rangeview Metropolitan District

Greeley Irrigation Company
Greeley, Colorado

Bratton & McClow, LLC
John H. McClow
Gunnison, Colorado

Amicus Curiae for Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy
District

Porzak, Browning, Bushong, LLP
Glenn E. Porzak
Kevin J. Kinnear
Boulder, Colorado

Amicus Curiae for City of Golden, Upper Eagle Regional
Water Authority, Eagle River Water Sanitation District,
Eagle Park Reservoir Company, Vail Assoc., Inc., and
Clinton Ditch & Reservoir Company

Balcomb & Green, P.C.
David C. Hallford
Christopher L. Geiger
Scott A. Grosscup
Glenwood Springs, Colorado

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Basalt Water Conservancy
District

Patrick, Miller & Kropf, P.C.
Kevin L. Patrick
Ramsey L. Kropf
Aspen, Colorado

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae for the Town of Gypsum and
Cornerstone Winter Park Holdings, LLC

Brownstein Hyatt & Farber, P.C.
Steven O. Sims
John A. Helfrich
Denver, Colorado

Attorneys for the City of Aurora

No appearance by or on behalf of Henrylynn Irrigation District

PER CURIAM
JUSTICE EID does not participate

The Ground Water Management Subdistrict of the Central Colorado Water Conservancy District filed an application for approval of a plan for augmentation for approximately 1,000 wells in the South Platte River basin, in Water Division No. 1, on December 23, 2002. The plan for augmentation proposed to allow out-of-priority well pumping by replacing the resulting out-of-priority depletions. Approximately 50 entities and individuals, including the state engineer, filed statements of opposition to the application.

On June 3, 2005, the water court entered a decree approving the plan for augmentation, which provides, in pertinent part: "Pursuant to § 37-92-305(8), C.R.S., the State Engineer shall curtail all out-of-priority diversions, the depletions from which are not so replaced as to prevent injury to vested water rights." The Harmony Ditch Company and various other opposers appealed directly to this court, assigning error to the decree's description of the state engineer's duty of curtailment in the language of the statute itself. Harmony contends that section 37-92-305(8) compels such decrees to "require that the state engineer curtail all out-of-priority diversions, the depletions from which are not so replaced as to prevent injury to vested water rights," and that this mandate remains unfulfilled unless the statutory language is construed to mean, and the decree also specifies, that the state engineer is authorized to curtail out-

of-priority diversions only when the augmentation plan is not being operated in compliance with the other terms and conditions of the decree.

The mandate of section 37-92-305(8) - that decrees approving plans for augmentation impose a duty of curtailment, under certain circumstances, on the state engineer - is entirely a creature of statute, and the statute itself specifies what the decree must demand of the state engineer. By imposing a duty of curtailment on the state engineer in terms of the precise formula required by statute, the water court has complied with the mandate of the statute. Should a party suffer injury as a result of the state engineer's attempt to comply with his obligation, avenues exist to challenge the scope of his authority, as intended by the legislature and decreed by the water court, in the context of the particular circumstances.

The judgment of the water court is therefore affirmed.