

<p>SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, Colorado 80203</p>	<p>DATE FILED: January 10, 2017 10:54 AM</p>
<p>Appeal from District Court, Water Division No. 1 Case No. 15CW3018 The Honorable Judge James F. Hartmann</p>	
<p>Appellant: The Jim Hutton Educational Foundation, a Colorado non-profit corporation,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Appellee: Dick Wolfe, in his capacity as the Colorado State Engineer; David Nettles, in his capacity as Division Engineer in and for Water Division No. 1, State of Colorado; Colorado Division of Water Resources; and Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife.</p> <p>Defendant-Intervenors: Yuma County Water Authority Public Improvement District; Colorado Ground Water Commission; Marks Butte, East Cheyenne, Frenchman, Sandhills, Central Yuma, Plains, W-Y, and Arikaree Ground Water Management Districts.</p> <p>Defendant – Well Owners: Republican River Water Conservation District; City of Wray; City of Holyoke; Harvey Colglazier; Lazier, Inc.; Marjorie Colglazier Trust; Mariane U. Ortner; Timothy E. Ortner; Protect Our Local Community’s Water, LLC; Saving Our Local Economy, LLC; the “North Well Owners”; Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.; Dirks Farms Ltd; Julie Dirks; David L Dirks; Don Andrews; Myrna Andrews; Nathan Andrews; Happy Creek, Inc.; J&D Cattle, LLC; 4M Feeders, Inc.; May Brothers, Inc.; May Family Farms; 4M Feeders, LLC; May Acres, Inc.; Thomas R. May; James J. May; Steven D. Kramer; Kent E. Ficken; Carlyle James as Trustee of the Chester James Trust; Colorado Agriculture Preservation Association; Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners; and the City of Burlington.</p>	<p>▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</p>
<p><u>Attorneys for Appellants:</u> Porzak Browning & Bushong LLP Steven J. Bushong (#21782) Karen L. Henderson (#39137) 2120 13th Street Boulder, CO 80302 Tel: 303-443-6800 Fax: 303-443-6864 Email: sjbushong@pbblaw.com, khenderson@pbblaw.com</p>	<p>Supreme Court Case Number:</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">NOTICE OF APPEAL</p>	

Appellant the Jim Hutton Educational Foundation (“Foundation”), submits the following

Notice of Appeal pursuant to C.A.R. 3 and 4(a):

I. Description of Nature of Case and Disposition in Trial Court

A. General Statement of the Nature of the Controversy

This case involves senior surface water rights in the Northern High Plains Designated Groundwater Basin (“NHP Basin”). The United States Supreme Court ruled that surface water depletions caused by wells in the NHP Basin are subject to the Republican River Compact (“Compact”). The magnitude of depletions caused by wells created Compact compliance problems for Colorado. The State and Division Engineers responded by curtailing surface water rights, not wells, and draining the on-channel Bonny Reservoir. The Foundation owns water rights that are being curtailed and water rights that cannot obtain available water through the now drained Bonny Reservoir. Further, the statutory provision in place when the NHP Basin was created that allowed surface water right owners to protect their rights by challenging whether previously designated groundwater was properly designated was taken away by Senate Bill 52 (2010).

The Foundation’s Complaint in this matter raised three claims. Claim 1 seeks a declaration that administration of surface water in the Republican River Basin is unlawful; Claim 2 seeks a declaration that Senate Bill 52 is unconstitutional when applied retrospectively to the existing NHP Basin; and Claim 3 seeks a declaration that the Colorado Ground Water Management Act is unconstitutional if there is no relief to Claim 1 and/or Claim 2. All Claims were extensively briefed by the parties in competing Motions for Summary Judgment. The Foundation’s Second Claim was also the subject of a Motion to Dismiss filed by the Colorado Ground Water Commission.

On August 29, 2016, the Water Court issued an Order dismissing Plaintiff’s Second Claim for Relief and Part of Plaintiff’s Third Claim for Relief (the “Dismissal Order”). On December 7, 2016, the Water Court certified its dismissal of the Foundation’s Second Claim for Relief as final pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b) (the “Certification Order”). This appeal ensued.

B. Judgment and Order being Appealed and Basis for Supreme Court's Jurisdiction

The Foundation is appealing the Water Court's dismissal of the Foundation's Second Claim for Relief regarding Senate Bill 52 (2010) as set forth in the Dismissal Order. The Colorado Supreme Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Colo. Const. Art VI, § 2(2), C.A.R. 1(a)(1), 1(a)(2) and 4(a), and C.R.S. § 13-4-102(1)(d).

C. Whether the judgment or order resolved all of the issues including attorney's fees and costs.

The Dismissal Order did not resolve all of the issues in Case No. 15CW3018. It wholly dismissed the Foundation's Second Claim for relief and partially dismissed the Foundation's Third Claim. Only the Second Claim is the subject of this appeal. No request for an award of attorney's fees and costs has been made.

D. Whether the judgment was made final for purposes of Appeal pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b).

In its Certification Order, the Water Court certified the Dismissal Order as final in regards to the Foundation's Second Claim pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b). Specifically, the Foundation moved the Water Court to certify its Dismissal Order as a final judgment for the purpose of appealing the dismissal of the Second Claim for relief. The Court found that the "first two prerequisites for certifying a final judgment have been satisfied" because the Dismissal Order encompassed the Foundation's Second Claim in its entirety and precluded the Foundation from relitigating the constitutionality of Senate Bill 52 in the present case. (*Certification Order*, p. 4). After being presented with the equities and interests of judicial administration by the parties, the Court also found that the third prerequisite for certification pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b) was satisfied, noting

that the parties had “presented no justifiable reasons why the court should delay entering final judgment on claim two.” *Id.* at p. 5.

E. Date the Order or Decree was entered and the date provided to counsel.

The Dismissal Order was entered on August 29, 2016 and served on the parties the same day. The Certification Order was entered on December 7, 2016, and served on the parties the same day.

F. Whether an Extension of Time was Granted to File Post-Trial Relief.

No such motions have been filed or granted.

G. Date and Motion for Post-Trial Relief was Filed.

None was filed. A Motion for Clarification was filed on December 19, 2016, but it did not pertain to the Dismissal Order being appealed, and nor did it go to the merits of the Water Court’s decision to certify Claim 2 under C.R.C.P. 54(b). Instead, it sought clarification regarding what the Water Court meant by part of a background sentence in the Certification Order. The Motion for Clarification was orally denied during a telephone Status Conference on January 9, 2017.

H. Date any Motion for Post-Trial Relief Was Denied.

No motion for post-trial relief regarding the Dismissal Order was filed.

I. Whether Extension was Granted to File any Notice of Appeal.

No extensions to file a notice of appeal were requested or granted.

II. Advisory Listing of Issues to be Raised on Appeal

A. Whether the Water Court erred in dismissing the Foundation’s Second Claim regarding Senate Bill 52 (2010).

B. Whether the Water Court erred in concluding, as a matter of law, that the Foundation’s Second Claim regarding Senate Bill 52 (2010) was not ripe because the

Foundation had not already successfully challenged the status of the designated groundwater in the NHP Basin before the Ground Water Commission.

C. Whether Senate Bill 52 (2010) is unconstitutional when applied to an existing designated ground water basin such as the NHP Basin, which at the time of designation, was subject to a statute that allowed surface water right owners to subsequently challenge the status of designated groundwater and redraw the designated ground water basin boundaries as new information became available, without any cutoff date. *See Gallegos v. Colo. Ground Water Comm'n*, 147 P.3d 20 (Colo. 2006). Senate Bill 52 took away those rights and remedies. Senate Bill 52 was adopted after new information became available regarding the NHP Basin, including the Compact litigation before the United States Supreme Court and resulting groundwater model.

D. Whether Senate Bill 52 (2010) violates the prohibition against retrospective legislation in Art. II, § 11 of the Colorado Constitution, and whether it is a taking without just compensation, a violation of due process, and contrary to the prior appropriation doctrine.

III. Whether a Transcript of Evidence is Necessary

No such transcript is necessary, and none exists. Evidence in the record consists of pleadings and exhibits filed with the Water Court in this matter and related information.

IV. Counsel for the Parties

Attorneys for Appellant the Jim Hutton Educational Foundation:

Porzak Browning & Bushong LLP
Steven J. Bushong (#21782)
Karen L. Henderson (#39137)
2120 13th Street
Boulder, CO 80302
Telephone: 303-443-6800
Email: sjbushong@pbblaw.com, khenderson@pbblaw.com

Attorneys for Appellees Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife:

Cynthia H. Coffman, Attorney General
Timothy J. Monahan (16971)*
First Assistant Attorney General
Katie L. Wiktor (38025)*
Assistant Attorney General
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 720-508-6310 (Mr. Monahan); 720-508-6761 (Ms. Wiktor)
tim.monahan@state.co.us; katie.wiktor@state.co.us
*Counsel of Record

Attorneys for Appellees Dick Wolfe, State Engineer; David Nettles, Division Engineer for Water Division No. 1; Colorado Department of Natural Resources; and Colorado Division of Water Resources:

Cynthia H. Coffman, Attorney General
Ema I. G. Schultz (#40117)*
Assistant Attorney General
Preston V. Hartman (# 41466)*
Daniel E. Steuer (#35086)*
Assistant Attorney General
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Tel: 720-508-6307 (Ms. Schultz); 720-508-6260 (Mr. Hartman); 720-508-6262 (Mr. Steuer)
ema.schultz@state.co.us; preston.hartman@state.co.us; daniel.steuer@coag.gov
*Counsel of Record

Attorneys for Appellees 4m Feeders Inc; 4m Feeders LLC; Carlyle James as Trustee of the Chester James Trust; Happy Creek Inc; J and D Cattle LLC; James J. May; Kent E. Ficken; May Acres Inc; May Brothers Inc; May Family Farms; Steven D. Kramer; and Thomas R. May:

Carlson, Hammond & Paddock
Johanna Hamburger, (#45052)
William Arthur Paddock (#9478)
1900 Grant St., Suite 1200
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: (303) 861-9000
jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com

Attorneys for Appellees City of Burlington:

Burns Figa & Will PC
Alix L. Joseph (#33345)
Michael Y. Ley (#43733)
6400 South Fiddlers Green Circle, Suite 1000
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
Telephone: 303-796-2626
ajoseph@bflaw.com; mley@bflaw.com

Attorneys for Appellees Arikaree Ground Water Management District; Central Yuma Ground Water Management District; Frenchman Ground Water Management District; Marks Butte Ground Water Management District; Plains Ground Water Management District; Sandhills Ground Water Management District; and Wy Ground Water Management District:

Vranesh and Raisch
Eugene J. Riordan (#11605)
Leila Christine Behnampour (#42754)
1720 14th Street, Suite 200
Boulder, CO 80302
Telephone: 303-443-6151
ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com

Attorney for Appellees City of Holyoke; City of Wray, Colorado; David R. Dirks; Dirks Farm Ltd; Harvey Colglazier; Julie Dirks; Lazier Inc; Mariane U. Ortner; Marjorie Colglazier Trust; and Timothy E. Ortner:

Alvin Raymond Wall (#5953)
120 E. Denver St.
Holyoke, CO 80734-0305
Telephone: 970-854-2376
arw@pctelcom.cnet

Attorneys for Appellees Colorado Agriculture Preservation Association:

Lawrence Jones Custer Grasmick LLP
Bradley C. Grasmick (#35055)
Curran A. Trick (#44914)
5245 Ronald Reagan Blvd., Suite 1
Johnstown, CO 80534
Telephone: (970) 622-8181
brad@lmcglaw.com; curran@lmcglaw.com

Attorneys for Appellees Colorado Ground Water Commission:

Cynthia H. Coffman, Attorney General
Chad M. Wallace (30022)*
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Patrick E. Kowaleski (9598)*
Senior Assistant Attorney
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 720-508-6281 (Mr. Wallace); 720-508-6297 (Mr. Kowaleski)
chad.wallace@coag.gov; patrick.kowaleski@coag.gov
*Counsel of Record

Attorney for Appellees Colorado State Board Land Commissioners:

Cynthia H. Coffman, Attorney General
Virginia Sciabbarrasi (39753)*
Assistant Attorney General
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 720-508-6253
ginny.sciabbarrasi@coag.gov
*Counsel of Record

Attorneys for Appellees Don Andrews; Myrna Andrews; and Nathan Andrews:

Vranesh and Raisch
Stuart B. Corbridge (#33355)
Geoffrey M. Williamson (#35891)
1720 14th Street, Suite 200
Boulder, CO 80302
Telephone: 303-443-6151
sbc@vrlaw.com; gmw@vrlaw.com

Attorneys for Appellees East Cheyenne Ground Water Management District; Protect Our Local Community's Water LLC; and Saving Our Local Economy LLC:

Buchanan Sperling & Holleman PC
Timothy R. Buchanan (#12185)
John D. Buchanan (#45191)
7703 Ralston Road
Arvada, CO 80002

Telephone: (303)431-9141
trb@tbvs.net; jbuchanan@tbvs.net

Attorneys for Appellees Republican River Water Conservation District:

Hill & Robbins
David W. Robbins (#6112)
Peter J. Ampe (#23452)
1441 18th Street, Suite 100
Denver, CO 80202
Telephone: 303-296-8100
davidrobbins@hillandrobbins.com; peterampe@hillandrobbins.com

Attorneys for Appellees North Well Owners:

Colver Killin & Sprague, LLP
Russell J. Sprague (#40558)
Kimbra L. Killin (#24636)
216 S. Interocean
Holyoke, CO 80734
Telephone: 970-854-2264
rsprague@ckslp.com; kkillin@ckslp.com

Attorneys for Appellees Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc:

Vranesh and Raisch
Aaron S. Ladd (#41165)
Justine C. Shepherd (#45310)
1720 14th Street, Suite 200
Boulder, CO 80302
Telephone: 303-443-6151
asl@vrlaw.com; jcs@vrlaw.com

Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.
Roger T. Williams (#6302)
1100 West 116th Avenue
Westminster, CO 80234
Telephone: 303-254-3218
rwilliams@tristategt.or

Attorneys for Appellees Yuma County Water Authority Public Improvement District:

Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP
Steven O. Sims (#9961)
John A. Helfrich (#34539)

Dulcinea Z. Hanuschak (#44342)
Telephone: 303-223-1100
ssims@bhfs.com; jhelfrich@bhfs.com; dhanuschak@bhfs.com

V. Appendices

Appendix 1 – *Order Granting the Colorado Ground Water Commission’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Second Claim for Relief and a Portion of Plaintiff’s Third Claim for Relief*, entered August 29, 2016 in Case No. 15CW3018 (referred to as the “Dismissal Order” herein).

Appendix 2 – *Certification of Claim Two as a Final Judgment Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b), and Order Granting Certain Defendants’ Motion to Stay the Proceedings on Plaintiff’s First and Third Claims for Relief Pending Resolution of the Appeal on Claim Two*, entered December 7, 2016 in Case No. 15CW3018 (referred to as the “Certification Order” herein).

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of January, 2017.

PORZAK BROWNING & BUSHONG LLP



Steven J. Bushong (#21782)
Karen L. Henderson (#39137)
Attorneys for the Jim Hutton Educational Foundation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 10th day of January, 2017, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NOTICE OF APPEAL** was filed and served by the Colorado Courts E-Filing system or via email and addressed to the District Court, Water Division 1 and counsel for each of the parties Water Court Case No. 15CW3018, pursuant to C.A.R. 3(d)(8), as follows:

Party Name	Party Type	Attorney Name	E-mail Address
District Court, Water Division 1	Non-Party	N/A	
Colorado Division of Water Resources	Defendant	Daniel E Steuer (CO Attorney General) Ema I.G. Schultz (CO Attorney General) Preston Vincent Hartman (CO Attorney General)	ema.schultz@state.co.us; preston.hartman@state.co.us; daniel.steuer@coag.gov
Colorado Parks and Wildlife	Defendant	Katie Laurette Wiktor (CO Attorney General) Timothy John Monahan (CO Attorney General)	tim.monahan@state.co.us; katie.wiktor@state.co.us
David Nettles	Defendant	Daniel E Steuer (CO Attorney General) Ema I.G. Schultz (CO Attorney General) Preston Vincent Hartman (CO Attorney General)	ema.schultz@state.co.us; preston.hartman@state.co.us; daniel.steuer@coag.gov
Dick Wolfe	Defendant	Daniel E Steuer (CO Attorney General) Ema I.G. Schultz (CO Attorney General) Preston Vincent Hartman (CO Attorney General)	ema.schultz@state.co.us; preston.hartman@state.co.us; daniel.steuer@coag.gov
4m Feeders Inc	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
4m Feeders LLC	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
Carlyle James as Trustee of the Chester James Trust	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
City of Burlington	Defendant-Well Owner	Alix L Joseph (Burns Figa and Will P C) Steven M. Nagy (Burns Figa and Will P C)	ajoseph@bflaw.com; mley@bflaw.com

Party Name	Party Type	Attorney Name	E-mail Address
City of Holyoke	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
City of Wray Colorado	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Colorado Agriculture Preservation Assoc	Defendant-Well Owner	Bradley Charles Grasmick (Lawrence Jones Custer Grasmick LLP)	brad@ljcglaw.com; curran@ljcglaw.com
Colorado State Board Land Commissioners	Defendant-Well Owner	Virginia Marie Sciabbarrasi (CO Attorney General)	ginny.sciabbarrasi@coag.gov
David L Dirks	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Dirks Farms Ltd	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Don Myrna and Nathan Andrews	Defendant-Well Owner	Geoffrey M Williamson (Vranesh and Raisch) Stuart B Corbridge (Vranesh and Raisch)	sbc@vrlaw.com; gmw@vrlaw.com
Happy Creek Inc	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
Harvey Colglazier	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
J and D Cattle LLC	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
James J May	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
Julie Dirks	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Kent E Ficken	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
Lazier Inc	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Mariane U Ortner	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Marjorie Colglazier Trust	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet

Party Name	Party Type	Attorney Name	E-mail Address
May Acres Inc	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
May Brothers Inc	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
May Family Farms	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
North Well Owners	Defendant-Well Owner	Kimbra L. Killin (Colver Killin and Sprague LLP) Russell Jennings Sprague (Colver Killin and Sprague LLP)	rsprague@cksllp.com; kkillin@cksllp.com
Protect Our Local Community's Water LLC	Defendant-Well Owner	John David Buchanan (Buchanan and Sperling, P.C.) Timothy Ray Buchanan (Buchanan and Sperling, P.C.)	trb@tbvs.net; jbuchanan@tbvs.net
Republican River Water Conservation Dist	Defendant-Well Owner	David W Robbins (Hill and Robbins PC) Peter J Ampe (Hill and Robbins PC)	davidrobbins@hillandrobbins.com; peterampe@hillandrobbins.com
Saving Our Local Economy LLC	Defendant-Well Owner	John David Buchanan (Buchanan and Sperling, P.C.) Timothy Ray Buchanan (Buchanan and Sperling, P.C.)	trb@tbvs.net; jbuchanan@tbvs.net
Steven D Kramer	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
Thomas R May	Defendant-Well Owner	Johanna Hamburger (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.) William Arthur Paddock (Carlson, Hammond & Paddock, L.L.C.)	jhamburger@chp-law.com; bpaddock@chp-law.com
Timothy E Ortner	Defendant-Well Owner	Alvin Raymond Wall (Alvin R Wall Attorney at Law)	arw@pctelcom.cnet
Tri State Generation and Transmission Assn.	Defendant-Well Owner	Aaron S. Ladd (Vranesh and Raisch) Justine Catherine Shepherd (Vranesh and Raisch)	asl@vrlaw.com; jcs@vrlaw.com

Party Name	Party Type	Attorney Name	E-mail Address
Yuma Cnty Water Authority Public Improv	Defendant-Intervenor	Dulcinea Zdunska Hanuschak (Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP) John A Helfrich (Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP) Steven Owen Sims (Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP)	ssims@bhfs.com; jhelfrich@bhfs.com; dhanuschak@bhfs.com
Colorado Ground Water Commission	Defendant-Intervenor	Chad Matthew Wallace (CO Attorney General) Patrick E Kowaleski (CO Attorney General)	chad.wallace@coag.gov; patrick.kowaleski@coag.gov
Arikaree Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
Central Yuma Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
Frenchman Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
Marks Butte Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
Plains Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
Sandhills Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
Wy Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	Eugene J Riordan (Vranesh and Raisch) Leila Christine Behnampour (Vranesh and Raisch)	ejr@vrlaw.com; lcb@vrlaw.com
East Cheyenne Ground Water Mgmt Dist	Defendant-Intervenor	John David Buchanan (Buchanan and Sperling, P.C.) Timothy Ray Buchanan (Buchanan and Sperling, P.C.)	trb@tbvs.net; jbuchanan@tbvs.net


Amy Peters

Appendix 1

<p>DISTRICT COURT, WATER DIVISION NO. 1, STATE OF COLORADO</p> <p>Weld County Courthouse 901 9th Avenue P.O. Box 2038 Greeley, Colorado 80631 (970) 475-2400</p>	<p>DATE FILED: August 09, 2016 10:34 AM CASE NUMBER: 2015CW3018</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> COURT USE ONLY <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Plaintiff: The Jim Hutton Educational Foundation, a Colorado non-profit corporation,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Defendants: Dick Wolfe, in his capacity as the Colorado State Engineer; David Nettles, in his capacity as Division Engineer in and for Water Division No. 1, State of Colorado; Colorado Division of Water Resources; and Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife.</p> <p>Defendant-Intervenors: Yuma County Water Authority Public Improvement District; Colorado Ground Water Commission; and the Marks Butte, Frenchman, Sandhills, Central Yuma, Plains, W-Y, and Arikaree Ground Water Management Districts.</p> <p>Defendant – Well Owners: Republican River Water Conservation District; City of Wray; City of Holyoke; Harvey Colglazier; Lazier, Inc.; Marjorie Colglazier Trust; Mariane U. Ortner; Timothy E. Ortner; Protect Our Local Community’s Water, LLC; Saving Our Local Economy, LLC; the “North Well Owners”; Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.; Dirks Farms Ltd; Julie Dirks; David L Dirks; Don Andrews; Myrna Andrews; Nathan Andrews; Happy Creek, Inc.; J&D Cattle, LLC; 4M Feeders, Inc.; May Brothers, Inc.; May Family Farms; 4M Feeders, LLC; May Acres, Inc.; Thomas R. May; James J. May; Steven D. Kramer; Kent E. Ficken; Carlyle James as Trustee of the Chester James Trust; Colorado Agriculture Preservation Association; Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners; and the City of Burlington.</p>	<p>Case Number: 15CW3018</p> <p>Div. No. 1</p>
<p>ORDER GRANTING THE COLORADO GROUND WATER COMMISSION’S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF’S SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF AND A PORTION OF PLAINTIFF’S THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF</p>	

This matter comes before the court for ruling on the Colorado Ground Water Commission's (Commission) motion to dismiss claims two and three of Jim Hutton Educational Foundation's (Plaintiff) complaint for declaratory relief for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff filed a response and the Commission filed a reply.

Plaintiff's second claim for relief seeks a ruling from this court that a portion of C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a), as amended by the General Assembly in 2010 through enactment of Senate Bill 10-52 (SB-52), is unconstitutional as applied to Plaintiff's surface water rights. Plaintiff's constitutional challenge focuses on a provision found in the current version of the statute that prohibits the Commission from removing permitted wells from the boundaries of a designated ground water basin, even when a surface water right holder establishes that the ground water within the basin is tributary to surface water. This provision, according to Plaintiff, unconstitutionally removes a statutory remedy, i.e. the authority of the Commission to remove wells from a basin proven to be pumping tributary ground water, which was previously available to surface water users to protect their decreed rights.

Plaintiff's third claim for relief involves the interaction between the Colorado Groundwater Management Act of 1965 (Management Act) and Colorado's obligations under the Republican River Compact (Compact). Plaintiff asserts that the Management Act is unconstitutional if the State and Division Engineers (Engineers) decide, during the litigation of Plaintiff's first claim for relief, that the Engineers are prevented by the Management Act from administering designated

ground water to satisfy Colorado's obligations under the Compact. In addition, Plaintiff contends the Management Act is unconstitutional if the Commission later determines that it lacks authority to redraw the boundaries of a designated ground water basin to exclude wells depleting tributary ground water, which Plaintiff believes would cause Colorado to be non-compliant with its responsibilities under the Compact.

The court finds that Plaintiff's second claim is not ripe for ruling because Plaintiff's claim of injury is speculative. Plaintiff seeks to have the boundaries of the Northern High Plains Designated Ground Water Basin (NHP Basin) redrawn to exclude permitted wells operating within the Basin, which would then require those wells to operate within the priority system in place for surface water rights. However, Plaintiff has yet to prove that the water at issue is not designated ground water. To meet this burden, Plaintiff must prove to the satisfaction of the Commission, not this court, that water presently classified as designated ground water is hydraulically connected to surface water and that well pumping within the NHP Basin is having more than a *de minimis* impact on Plaintiff's surface water rights. See *Gallegos v. Colo. Ground Water Comm'n*, 147 P.3d 20, 31–32 (Colo. 2006). Under the Management Act, the Commission is vested with exclusive jurisdiction to decide whether the water involved in this controversy is designated ground water. *Meridian Serv. Metro. Dist. v. Colo. Ground Water Comm'n*, 361 P.3d 392, 396 (Colo. 2015). If the Commission determines that the water at issue is not designated ground water, but instead is ground water tributary to surface water,

then jurisdiction over the water would transfer to the water court. *Id.* If, however, the Commission concludes that the water is designated ground water, which it is currently presumed to be, Plaintiff's claim that C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a) is unconstitutional is moot.

The court also concludes that the portion of Plaintiff's third claim relating to the Commission's lack of statutory authority to redraw the boundaries of the Basin, if Plaintiff subsequently proves that the ground water is hydraulically connected to surface water and that well pumping is causing injury, involves speculative injury to Plaintiff, too, for the same reasons articulated in the previous paragraph. The court finds that Plaintiff must first petition the Commission for a determination as to whether the water at issue is designated ground water before it may litigate this component of the third claim for relief in the district court.

As to Plaintiff's assertion that the Management Act is unconstitutional if the Engineers are precluded under the Act from administering ground water to meet Colorado's Compact obligations, the court concludes that this part of claim three is entwined with Plaintiff's first claim for relief and it does not require a determination by the Commission as to whether the water is designated ground water. Therefore, that portion of claim three is properly before this court and will remain part of this action.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a non-profit corporation, owns the Hutton Ranch, a sprawling four thousand acre ranch located in close proximity to the South Fork of the Republican

River in Yuma County, Colorado. Plaintiff holds decrees to four water rights to divert surface flow from the South Fork of the Republican River for irrigation use on the ranch:

- (1) Two cubic feet per second (cfs) of water to the Tip Jack Ditch with an appropriation date of February 8, 1889, and a decree date of December 28, 1893;
- (2) Twenty-three cfs diverted to the Hale Ditch with an appropriation date of January 17, 1908, and a decree date of September 8, 1939; and
- (3) The Hutton No. 1 Ditch for 12.9 cfs and the Hutton No. 2 Ditch for 4.92 cfs of water with an appropriation date of July 5, 1954, and a decree date of May 24, 1978.

The water rights described above were historically used to flood irrigate native pasture grasses for cattle grazing on the ranch. Plaintiff presently leases its land and corresponding water rights to generate revenue to provide low interest loans to students pursuing nursing degrees.

In 1942,¹ the states of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska entered into the Compact to create mechanisms for the most efficient use of the waters in the Republican River basin and to establish an equitable division of said waters between the three states. C.R.S. §§ 37-67-101, -102. Pursuant to Article IV of the Compact, Colorado is allotted a total of 54,100 acre-feet of water annually from the

¹ The Republican River Compact became effective in 1943 when its provisions were consented to by the United States Congress. *See* C.R.S. § 37-67-102.

following four sources: (1) the North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin (10,000 acre-feet); (2) the Arikaree River drainage basin (15,400 acre-feet); (3) the South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin (25,400 acre-feet); and (4) the Beaver Creek drainage basin (3,300 acre-feet). C.R.S. § 37-67-101. In addition, Colorado is entitled to use the entire water supply of the portions of the Frenchman Creek and Red Willow Creek drainage basins located within Colorado. *Id.*

Very few ground water wells operated in the area surrounding the Hutton Ranch prior to 1965, and those then in existence involved withdrawals of relatively small quantities of water. In an attempt to maximize development and beneficial use of Colorado's water resources, and in recognition of the availability of potentially non-tributary ground water in certain areas of the state, the General Assembly enacted the Management Act in 1965.² The Management Act provides the mechanism for designating ground water basins, as well as establishing the policies and procedures for the use and permitting of wells and the preservation of ground water. C.R.S. §§ 37-90-102 to -111. The legislature created the Commission to facilitate the provisions of the Management Act. C.R.S. §§ 37-90-103(8), -104. The Commission consists of twelve members, comprised of ten voting members—nine persons appointed by the Governor, consisting of a mix of agriculturalists and persons representing municipal or industrial interests, and the Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources—and the State Engineer and the

² The Management Act was originally found in article 18 of chapter 148, C.R.S., but is now located at C.R.S. §§ 37-90-101 to -143.

Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board as two non-voting members. C.R.S. § 37-90-104(1), -(3), -(4).

In 1966, a petition was filed with the Commission to establish the NHP Basin. Notice of the petition was published in several newspapers serving the counties encompassing the area of the proposed basin, and a single entity—Pioneer Irrigation District—filed a protest. Eight individuals filed written statements in support of the petition. A hearing was held before the Commission on April 14, 1966, in Wray, Colorado, after which the Commission issued written findings of fact, conclusions of law, and a final order designating the NHP Basin. In its findings, the Commission determined that six geological formations holding water existed within the proposed boundaries of the NHP Basin: (1) the Ogallala-Alluvium formation; (2) the Chadron formation; (3) the Niobrara formation; (4) the Benton formation; (5) the Dakota formation; and (6) the Morrison formation. At the time of the designation hearing, the Commission estimated that 96,688,000 acre-feet of water was stored in the Ogallala-Alluvium formation. No estimates were made for the other five geological formations because the Commission determined that those formations did not produce sufficient quantities of water to be significant sources of ground water. The Commission concluded that the water in the Ogallala-Alluvium formation was ground water that in its natural course would not be available to and required for the fulfillment of decreed surface water rights, and therefore the water met the definition of designated ground water under C.R.S. §

148-18-2(3) (1963). The Commission established the NHP Basin boundaries to correspond with the boundaries of the six underlying geological formations.

As required by C.R.S. § 148-18-5(1)(g), the Commission projected the yearly ground water usage in the NHP Basin for the fifty-year period following designation using ten-year increments. The Commission projected that water use in the NHP Basin would steadily increase over time, with 1,035,000 acre-feet of water usage estimated for year ten (1975) and 3,706,000 acre-feet for year fifty (2015).

Plaintiff estimates that there are now more than four thousand wells removing ground water within the boundaries of the NHP Basin, which Plaintiff asserts has caused surface flows in the South Fork of the Republican River to decline considerably over time. This, in turn, has resulted in the State Engineer curtailing surface water usage in the Basin, including Plaintiff's water rights, to ensure that Colorado does not exceed the annual amount of water it is allocated under the Compact. Although the State Engineer curtails surface water use to meet Compact obligations, Plaintiff contends that no such restrictions are placed on designated ground water use within the NHP Basin.

Plaintiff filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief in this action on the premise that certain actions and inactions by the named defendants have caused injury to Plaintiff's surface water rights. Within the complaint are three claims for declaratory relief: (1) a request for a finding by this court that the administration of water in the Republican River basin by the defendants, in electing to curtail only surface water use and not designated ground water withdrawals by

NHP Basin well users to meet Colorado's Compact obligations, is improper; (2) that SB-52 is unconstitutional as applied to the NHP Basin because surface water users no longer have the ability to petition the Commission to redraw the NHP Basin boundaries to exclude permitted well users from the NHP Basin upon a showing that ground water was improperly designated when the Basin was designated; and (3) the Management Act is unconstitutional if designated ground water cannot be administered by the State Engineer under the same framework as surface water to ensure Colorado's compliance with the Compact or, in the alternative, if the Commission is precluded by statute from redrawing the NHP Basin boundaries to remove well users that are withdrawing tributary ground water and injuring surface water rights.

II. ANALYSIS

In its motion to dismiss Plaintiff's second and third claims, the Commission argues that this court lacks subject matter jurisdiction because this court cannot grant the relief Plaintiff requests until the Commission first decides whether designated ground water is involved in this controversy. With regard to its second claim, Plaintiff counters that it is not seeking a determination from this court regarding the legal character of the water involved, i.e. whether the water removed by well operators within the NHP Basin is or is not designated ground water; instead, Plaintiff asserts that it is merely requesting a finding that if Plaintiff later pursues an action with the Commission to de-designate portions of the NHP Basin and establishes that the ground water is hydraulically connected to surface water

and well pumping is causing injury to Plaintiff's surface water rights, then the Commission must apply the pre-SB-52 statutory language and exclude any well found to be withdrawing tributary ground water from the boundaries of the NHP Basin. Plaintiff further argues that the Commission, as an administrative agency, lacks authority to decide constitutional challenges to SB-52 and the Management Act; therefore, jurisdiction over these claims is vested with the water court under either its exclusive jurisdiction or ancillary jurisdiction over water matters.

To resolve the subject matter jurisdiction question raised by the Commission, the court must decide whether Plaintiff's constitutional challenges are ripe for ruling in this declaratory judgment action. This analysis necessarily includes consideration of the statutory authority delegated to the Commission under the Management Act and that which is assigned to the water courts under the Water Right Determination and Administrative Act of 1969 (1969 Act).

Plaintiff acknowledges that the Commission determined in 1966 that the water within the boundaries of the NHP Basin is designated ground water. Plaintiff also concedes that the decision as to whether the water in question continues to meet the definition of designated ground water must be made by the Commission, based on factual data obtained after designation of the Basin, and not the water court. *See* C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a). Nevertheless, Plaintiff believes its claim that SB-52 is unconstitutional is a "water matter" under the 1969 Act, regardless of whether the water at issue is designated ground water, and thus falls under the water court's jurisdiction. The court disagrees.

The General Assembly, in the 1969 Act, assigned to the water court exclusive jurisdiction over water matters arising within its division. C.R.S. § 37-92-203(1). A “water matter” under the 1969 Act includes not only all water in or tributary to a natural stream, C.R.S. § 37-92-102(1)(b), but also all non-tributary ground water located outside of a designated ground water basin. C.R.S. § 37-92-203(1). Designated ground water, however, is excluded from the definition of “waters of the state” in the 1969 Act, C.R.S. § 37-92-103(13), and therefore must be administered through the Management Act. The General Assembly, when enacting the Management Act, conferred exclusive authority to the Commission to “supervise and control the exercise and administration of all rights acquired to the use of designated groundwater.” C.R.S. § 37-90-111(1)(a). Thus, the legislature has clearly established one procedural framework for the appropriation and administration of designated ground water under the Management Act, with authority delegated to the Commission, while creating a separate system in the water courts for the appropriation and administration of all other types of waters of the state under the 1969 Act. *State ex rel. Danielson v. Vickroy*, 627 P.2d 752, 757–58 (Colo. 1981).

Pursuant to the Management Act, the Commission, and not the water court, is tasked with the authority to make the initial determination as to whether the controversy involves designated ground water. *Meridian*, 361 P.3d at 396; *Pioneer Irrigation Dists. v. Danielson*, 658 P.2d 842, 846 (Colo. 1983) (interpreting *Vickroy* to hold that the Commission must make the initial factual determination whether wells operating within the boundaries of a designated ground water basin are

pumping designated ground water or waters of the state). Jurisdiction only shifts to the water court if the Commission determines that designated ground water is not involved in the controversy. *Id.* Because the Commission established the NHP Basin in 1966, a presumption exists that the ground water within the boundaries of the Basin is designated ground water, and Plaintiff has the burden of overcoming this presumption. *See Vickroy*, 627 P.2d at 759 (“[A]fter creation of a designated ground water basin[,] the proponent of the proposition that certain ground water within the basin is not designated ground water has the burden of proving that proposition.”).

With the clear understanding in place that the Commission, and not this court, must decide whether the water at issue is designated ground water or water subject to the 1969 Act, the court now turns to the question of whether Plaintiff’s constitutional challenges to SB-52 are ripe for ruling.

As the backdrop to Plaintiff’s claims, prior to the passage of SB-52 in 2010, C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a) provided that the boundaries of a designated ground water basin could be altered, after initial designation, “as future conditions require and factual data justify.” The Colorado Supreme Court, when interpreting the pre-SB-52 version of C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a), determined that the General Assembly “anticipated that a designated ground water basin could include ground water that does not properly fall within the definition of designated ground water.” *Gallegos*, 147 P.3d at 31. The Supreme Court further held that to obtain relief from the Commission, the surface water right holder “must prove that the pumping of then-

designated ground water has more than a *de minimis* impact on their surface water rights and is causing injury to those rights.” *Id.* If the surface water user made such a showing, the Supreme Court ruled that the Commission was required to redraw the basin boundaries to exclude the surface water rights and wells removing designated ground water that was shown to more properly fall within the definition of ground water under the 1969 Act. *Id.* The Court stressed, however, that it was improper for the Commission and the plaintiff in *Gallegos* to “jump[] straight to the issue of what the relief would be if the asserted injury were true” prior to the plaintiff making a factual showing to the Commission that ground water within the designated basin was hydrologically connected and causing injury to the plaintiff’s surface rights. *Id.* at 32.

In response to the *Gallegos* decision, the General Assembly enacted SB-52 and, when doing so, stated that the legislature was merely clarifying and reaffirming the General Assembly’s original intent that the boundaries of a designated ground water basin may only be altered upon a showing of sufficient factual data justifying the redrawing of the basin’s boundaries, but that the boundaries may not be altered in such a way as to exclude any existing permitted well operating within the basin. Plaintiff argues that the 2010 revisions to the statute, whereby surface water users no longer have the ability to seek exclusion of permitted wells from the designated basin boundaries, is unconstitutional when applied to designated ground water basins created prior to the enactment of SB-52.

The constitutionality of legislation may be challenged in two ways. A plaintiff may make an “as-applied” challenge, as raised by Plaintiff here, which alleges the statute is unconstitutional under specific circumstances in which the plaintiff has acted or proposes to act in the future, but does not render the statute completely inoperable, or a plaintiff may raise a facial challenge to the statute, meaning that there are no circumstances under which the statute can be applied constitutionally. *Sanger v. Dennis*, 148 P.3d 404, 410–11 (Colo. App. 2006). A statute found to be facially unconstitutional renders the statute utterly inoperable.

A complaint for declaratory judgment is remedial in nature and by design is intended to “settle and to afford relief from uncertainty and insecurity with respect to rights, status, and other legal relations” C.R.S. § 13-51-102; *see also* C.R.C.P. 57(a) (District courts have the power to declare rights, status, and other legal relations.). Although courts are to liberally construe the provisions of the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Law, C.R.S. § 13-51-102, a plaintiff must nevertheless assert “present and cognizable rights” to satisfy the ripeness doctrine. *Cacioppo v. Eagle Cnty. Sch. Dist. Re-50J*, 92 P.3d 453, 467 (Colo. 2004). The existence of cognizable rights is necessary because a declaratory judgment action “calls, not for an advisory opinion upon a hypothetical basis, but for an adjudication of present right upon established facts.” *Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Dist. Court*, 862 P.2d 944, 947 (Colo. 1993) (quoting *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 242, 57 S. Ct. 461, 465, 81 L. Ed. 617 (1937)). A complaint for declaratory relief asserting a constitutional challenge to a statute must present a justiciable issue and be ripe for

ruling. *Cacioppo*, 92 P.3d at 467; *see also Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Ass'n*, 485 U.S. 439, 445, 108 S. Ct. 1319, 1323, 99 L. Ed 2d 534 (1988) (“A fundamental and longstanding principle of judicial restraint requires that courts avoid reaching constitutional questions in advance of the necessity of deciding them.”).

Plaintiff discusses extensively in its response to the motion to dismiss the reasons why it believes the constitutionality of SB-52 must be decided by the water court before Plaintiff files a petition to de-designate the NHP Basin with the Commission. However, all of Plaintiff’s arguments are premised on its supposition that when it eventually files a petition for de-designation of portions of the Basin with the Commission, it will successfully prove that the water withdrawn by well users in the NHP Basin is not designated ground water and that the withdrawals are causing injury to Plaintiff’s surface water rights. The possibility of a future claim does not suffice. *Metro Wastewater Reclamation Dist. v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 105 P.3d 653, 656 (Colo. 2005) (“The mere possibility of a future claim is not an appropriate predicate for the exercise of judicial power.”). Even if this court were to assume that the question will be presented to the Commission at a later time, it is not appropriate for this court to enter declaratory judgment on what presently is a non-existent issue. *Am. Civil Liberties Union of Colo. v. Whitman*, 159 P.3d 707, 709 (Colo. App. 2006) (“Declaratory judgment proceedings may not be invoked to obtain advisory opinions or resolve nonexistent questions, even where it may be assumed that the question may arise at some future time.”).

Plaintiff, through its second claim for relief, attempts to jump to the question of what relief it would be entitled to receive from the Commission before it makes a factual showing to the Commission of hydrological connection and injury to its surface water rights. This is the same procedural path attempted by the parties in *Gallegos*, and it was made clear by the Supreme Court that the question of whether designated ground water is involved in the controversy must be decided prior to litigating the form of relief.

The court concludes that Plaintiff's constitutional challenge to SB-52 is not presently ripe for ruling and will only present an actual controversy in this action if Plaintiff successfully proves to the Commission that water within the NHP Basin is not designated ground water. If Plaintiff fails to carry its burden before the Commission, the legal character of the water remains as designated ground water, which this court has no jurisdiction over, and Plaintiff's constitutional challenge to SB-52 is moot.

Plaintiff's third claim for relief raises, in part, a constitutional challenge to the provisions of the Management Act prohibiting the Commission from redrawing the boundaries of the designated ground water basin to exclude permitted well users from the boundaries of the basin should it later be proven that the well operators are withdrawing tributary ground water and causing injury to surface water users. Once again, Plaintiff's standing to raise this constitutionality claim arises only if the Commission first determines that designated ground water is not involved in this controversy.


III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER OF THE COURT

The Commission, and not the water court, has exclusive jurisdiction over the question of whether designated ground water is involved in this controversy. Thus, Plaintiff's ability to challenge the constitutionality of the current version of C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a), as amended by SB-52, depends entirely on a decision by the Commission that water removed by permitted well owners in the NHP Basin is not designated ground water and that the withdrawals are injuring Plaintiff's water rights. If the Commission finds that the water within the boundaries of the Basin continues to meet the definition of designated ground water, Plaintiff's constitutional challenges to SB-52 become moot. The same rationale applies to the portion of Plaintiff's third claim for relief raising a constitutional challenge to the provisions of the Management Act that prevent the Commission from redrawing the NHP Basin boundaries.

Based on the forgoing, the court grants the Commission's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's second claim for relief raising a constitutional challenge to SB-52. The court also dismisses the portion of Plaintiff's third claim for relief asserting a constitutional challenge to the provisions of the Management Act that prohibit the Commission from redrawing the boundaries of a designated ground water basin to exclude permitted wells.

Dated: August 29, 2016.

BY THE COURT:


James F. Hartmann
Water Judge, Water Division 1

Appendix 2

<p>DISTRICT COURT, WATER DIVISION NO. 1, STATE OF COLORADO</p> <p>Weld County Courthouse 901 9th Avenue P.O. Box 2038 Greeley, Colorado 80631 (970) 475-2400</p>	<p>DATE FILED: January 10, 2016 10:54 AM CASE NUMBER: 2015CW3018</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> COURT USE ONLY <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Plaintiff: The Jim Hutton Educational Foundation, a Colorado non-profit corporation,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Defendants: Dick Wolfe, in his capacity as the Colorado State Engineer; David Nettles, in his capacity as Division Engineer in and for Water Division No. 1, State of Colorado; Colorado Division of Water Resources; and Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife.</p> <p>Defendant-Intervenors: Yuma County Water Authority Public Improvement District; Colorado Ground Water Commission; Marks Butte, East Cheyenne, Frenchman, Sandhills, Central Yuma, Plains, W-Y, and Arikaree Ground Water Management Districts.</p> <p>Defendant – Well Owners: Republican River Water Conservation District; City of Wray; City of Holyoke; Harvey Colglazier; Lazier, Inc.; Marjorie Colglazier Trust; Mariane U. Ortner; Timothy E. Ortner; Protect Our Local Community’s Water, LLC; Saving Our Local Economy, LLC; the “North Well Owners”; Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.; Dirks Farms Ltd; Julie Dirks; David L Dirks; Don Andrews; Myrna Andrews; Nathan Andrews; Happy Creek, Inc.; J&D Cattle, LLC; 4M Feeders, Inc.; May Brothers, Inc.; May Family Farms; 4M Feeders, LLC; May Acres, Inc.; Thomas R. May; James J. May; Steven D. Kramer; Kent E. Ficken; Carlyle James as Trustee of the Chester James Trust; Colorado Agriculture Preservation Association; Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners; and the City of Burlington.</p>	<p>Case Number: 15CW3018</p> <p>Div. No. 1</p>
<p>CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM TWO AS A FINAL JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO C.R.C.P. 54(b), AND ORDER GRANTING CERTAIN DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO STAY THE PROCEEDINGS ON PLAINTIFF’S FIRST AND THIRD CLAIMS FOR RELIEF PENDING RESOLUTION OF THE APPEAL ON CLAIM TWO</p>	

This matter comes before the court on the motion of the Jim Hutton Educational Foundation (Plaintiff) for certification of the court's order dismissing claim two of Plaintiff's complaint as a final judgment under C.R.C.P. 54(b). Several defendants filed a response opposing Plaintiff's request for final certification, arguing that there is no just reason for certifying the order dismissing claim two as a final judgment. The Yuma County Water Authority Public Improvement District, on behalf of itself and numerous other defendants, filed a motion to stay the proceedings on claims one and three, should the court grant Plaintiff's motion to certify claim two as a final judgment. Many other defendants filed notices of joinder to the motion to stay the proceedings pending resolution of an appeal on claim two. The court will refer to the defendants requesting a stay of the proceedings collectively as "Defendants" in this order.

After considering the relief requested by Plaintiff and Defendants in their respective motions, and the contents of the file, the court enters the following findings and conclusions.

Plaintiff owns four surface water rights in the Republican River basin which it uses to irrigate a large ranch in eastern Colorado. Plaintiff's ranch is situated over the Northern High Plains Designated Groundwater Basin (NHP Basin). Plaintiff estimates that there are approximately four thousand wells in the NHP Basin withdrawing vast quantities of ground water, which, according to Plaintiff, has significantly diminished the amount of surface water because the ground water and surface water are hydraulically connected in this area. Plaintiff asserts that many of the ground water appropriators' wells were permitted and began operating after Plaintiff received its water rights decrees. Although Plaintiff's water rights are senior to these ground water appropriators' rights, Plaintiff contends the state and division engineers have been curtailing only the senior surface water rights to meet Colorado's Republican River Compact obligations to deliver water to Nebraska and Kansas, rather than first curbing the junior rights of the ground water appropriators.

Plaintiff filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief in this action on the premise that certain actions and inactions by the named defendants have caused

injury to Plaintiff's water rights. The complaint contains three claims for relief, which can be summarized as: (1) the administration of water in the Republican River basin by the defendants is unlawful; (2) Senate Bill 52 ("SB-52") is unconstitutional as applied to the NHP Basin; and (3) the Colorado Groundwater Act is unconstitutional if designated ground water cannot be administered by the state and division engineers under the same framework as surface water to ensure compliance with the Republican River Compact.

With regard to its second claim, Plaintiff is requesting a ruling from this court that SB-52 is unconstitutional because the Colorado Groundwater Commission no longer has the authority, under C.R.S. § 37-90-106(1)(a), to adjust the boundaries of the NHP Basin to exclude wells that are removing tributary ground water from the Basin. On August 29, 2016, this court entered an order granting the Colorado Ground Water Commission's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's second claim for relief. The court held that Plaintiff's constitutional challenge to SB-52 was not ripe for ruling by the water court because, under the Colorado Groundwater Act, Plaintiff must first seek a determination by the Colorado Groundwater Commission that the water in the NHP Basin no longer meets the definition of designated ground water. Plaintiff now seeks an order from this court certifying the order dismissing its second claim as a final judgment, pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b), to allow Plaintiff to pursue an appeal of that ruling to the Colorado Supreme Court.

As the parties correctly note in their pleadings, three requirements must met before the trial court is authorized to certify as a final judgment an order resolving less than all of the claims filed in a case. First, the decision must consist of a ruling upon the entire claim for relief. *Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation Dist. v. Greeley Irrigation Co.*, 348 P.3d 434, 439 (Colo. 2015). Second, the decision must be final in the sense of an ultimate disposition of the claim. *Id.* And finally, the trial court must find that there is no just reason to delay entry of final judgment on the claim. *Id.*

Here, the court dismissed Plaintiff's second claim for relief in its entirety—not based on the merits of Plaintiff's constitutional challenge, but instead because the court found Plaintiff's constitutionality claim was not ripe for ruling. Plaintiff has not yet proven to the Colorado Groundwater Commission that the water at issue no longer meets the criteria for designated ground water; therefore, Plaintiff's contention that it will be harmed if the Groundwater Commission cannot, pursuant to the provisions of SB-52, alter the NHP Basin boundaries to remove wells that are withdrawing tributary groundwater is premature.

Plaintiff seeks to resolve these issues in a different fashion by first litigating the constitutionality of SB-52 before this court, and thereafter it plans to file a petition with the Colorado Groundwater Commission to de-designate portions of the NHP Basin, in an attempt to remove wells operating in the Basin. The court's order dismissing Plaintiff's second claim is a ruling encompassing Plaintiff's second claim entirely and precludes Plaintiff from litigating the constitutionality of SB-52 in the present case, and therefore the first two prerequisites for certifying a final judgment have been satisfied.

There are times when certifying a ruling that resolves less than all of the claims filed in the case will result in "piecemeal" litigation of the claims, and thus, to avoid such a result, the court may elect to not certify the ruling as a final judgment. Plaintiff's claims differ significantly from most cases, however, because Plaintiff concedes that at some point in time it will be required to petition the Colorado Groundwater Commission if it seeks to have the boundaries of the NHP Basin redrawn. The parties also recognize that this court, and not the Groundwater Commission, has jurisdiction over those of Plaintiff's claims pertaining to the state and division engineers' administration of surface water rights. Thus, it is very possible, perhaps even likely, that certain of Plaintiff's claims will be litigated before this court and others will be decided by the Colorado Groundwater Commission, due to jurisdictional requirements and limitations. Therefore, certifying the order dismissing Plaintiff's claim two will not result in piecemeal litigation that would otherwise be avoided if the court opted not to certify the order

as a final judgment. The parties have presented no justifiable reasons why the court should delay entering final judgment on claim two.


Although Plaintiff's claims will likely be litigated in two forums, the court nevertheless finds good cause exists to stay the proceedings on claims one and three in the present case. Based on the opinion of the Colorado Supreme Court on the appeal of Plaintiff's second claim for relief, the parties may decide to litigate the claims simultaneously or in one forum before the other.

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's motion to certify the August 29, 2016 Order dismissing Plaintiff's second claim for relief as a final judgment, pursuant to C.R.C.P. 54(b), is granted.
2. Defendant's motion to stay the proceedings on Plaintiff's first and third claims for relief until the Colorado Supreme Court issues a mandate on the appeal of the order dismissing Plaintiff's second claim for relief, is granted.
3. The court is not vacating the telephone status conference scheduled for January 9, 2017 at 8:30 a.m. The court will discuss with the parties during that status conference whether the trial should be vacated, as well as scheduling other future events.

Dated this 7th day of December, 2016.

BY THE COURT:


James F. Hartmann
Water Judge, Water Division One