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We've officially made it to autumn, which means two things – first, the weather is getting cooler and we can finally take out those sweaters, and second, it’s time to start thinking about what needs to be done to finish out this year strong. Before jumping into content from the October issue sponsor, Associate Director Maureen Ryan Braley has provided a brief update on MCLE Compliance for those reporting their CLE credits this year. You’ll want to catch the important information on page 8!

This issue is sponsored by the Water Law Section and begins with an overview of recent water legislation from author Paul Arrington, Director of the Idaho Water Users Association. Next, co-authoring team Meghan Carter and Jennifer Wendel penned two articles with piggy-backing topics – the statewide impacts of water rights adjudications in Idaho and ownership of water rights. Following these two complementary pieces is an article by Rebecca Moon on the option to rent your water right as opposed to transferring it. Finally, Norman Semanko provides a case review of the Ninth Circuit’s amended opinion in *PCFFA v. Glaser*.

In addition to the water law content, this issue also contains a handful of articles of interest to the general practitioner. Larry Hunter penned his final report from the ABA House of Delegates as he steps down and hands the reigns to his successor. Following Larry Hunter’s report, University of Idaho College of Law students Hayden Cottle and Quindaro Frieder provide a guide for the usage of service animals by handlers and best practices for businesses. Next is attorney Stephanie Guyon’s article on the Idaho Charitable Assets Protection Act. And last but certainly not least, the Professionalism & Ethics Section with the former Concordia University School of Law congratulate Newal Squyres on receiving the 2020 Richard C. Fields Civility Award.

We hope you enjoy these articles and are proactive in preparing for the end of the year!

Best,

Lindsey M. Welfley
Communications Director
Idaho State Bar & Idaho Law Foundation, Inc.

The Right to Vote: Is It a Privilege or An Obligation

Donald F. Carey
Idaho State Bar President
Sixth and Seventh Districts

Some years ago, I was a sailor on a nuclear submarine. On one long control room watch, while underway, I was engaged in a conversation with a shipmate concerning politics. The discussion concerned the lack of political awareness of our electorate. My friend made a bet. After our watch concluded we would go to the crew’s mess for a meal, and while there he would ask other shipmates who the Vice President of the United States was.

He suggested that half of those asked would not know the correct answer. Now mind you, the VP is second in succession as Commander in Chief. You would think people in the military would know the correct answer. I lost the bet! Eight of the 10 asked did not know the correct answer. I was appalled. How is it possible that anyone would not know who the VP is at any given moment? Good thing we did not ask who was the Speaker of the House, or the majority leader of the Senate.

I have always been a political news junkie. Even as a young child, I have a present sense recollection of President Kennedy’s assassination and that of Martin Luther King, Jr., and other major political events that have occurred over the past 50+ years. It amazes me that many who are given this right to vote fail to exercise their franchise. Many embrace a cavalier attitude that it does not matter, that all politicians are corrupt and dishonorable, so why bother? When I hear someone make these types of statements, I think that they have lost hope and have surrendered their opportunity to participate in government by the people.

The voting statistics collected over the years demonstrate that general election turnout is slightly higher nationally than is the turnout for the midterm elections. Still, the turnout of general elections is rarely over 60% of the electorate. Local and state election voter turnouts are dismal, which is unfortunate. Local elections often affect our lives more immediately than other elections, yet we ignore the opportunity to weigh in on the discussion. City Council elections, County Commissioner elections, and School Board elections affect taxes, street repairs, education of our children – yet those elections are largely ignored.

As lawyers, I believe we have a heightened obligation to participate in government, including an obligation to be informed and to vote. The authority for that position is found in our oath of office. The opening statement of the oath states that we will defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Idaho. It is unclear to me how we
We have been gifted the privilege of living in this country. We enjoy the opportunities and freedoms it provides.

can honor our oath and at the same time disengage from the political discourse.

If this November you find yourself thinking "why bother?", let me encourage you to reconsider your position, gently of course. I know, without a doubt that votes matter and elections have consequences. We have been gifted the privilege of living in this country. We enjoy the opportunities and freedoms it provides. We have been educated in the law and we have taken an oath. We should all be willing to engage in our body politic, if for no other reason than to cast a vote.

In many respects, we are the loyal opposition. We must do our job, individually, collectively, and respectfully. We the people are responsible for our government and for those we elect to do our business. It is our business to hold our leaders accountable for their actions in office. Our vote is but one tool available for that purpose. Let us not shirk our responsibility.

Regards.

Donald F. Carey

is a 1991 graduate of the University of Wyoming College of Law. He is a founding partner in the Idaho Falls-based law firm of Carey Romankiw. He is a certified mediator. His practice includes general litigation and alternative dispute resolution. When he is not in the office you may find him running ridiculous distances in the mountains of eastern Idaho and western Wyoming.
You have put away your sandals and bathing suits and pulled out your sweaters and jackets. You are grilling less and using the oven more. Pumpkin spice-flavored items are showing up on the counters. Leaves are changing from green to yellow and orange. Fall is in the air! And for the 1,717 Idaho attorneys due to report Mandatory Continuing Legal Education compliance at the end of 2020, this means you have only a few months left to complete your CLE credits!

Idaho lawyers must complete 30.0 CLE credits every three years, including 3.0 Ethics credits. Of the 30.0 CLE credits, at least 15.0 credits must be “live.” Fortunately, live webcasts and live teleconferences qualify for live CLE credit! You do not need to attend an in-person event to complete your live CLE credit requirement. Search for upcoming live courses on our website by looking for notices such as “Online-Live,” “Live Webcast,” or “Live Audio Streaming.”

You must complete your MCLE requirements by December 31, 2020. Or, you can pay the $100 MCLE extension fee and have until March 1, 2021 to complete your CLEs. Check your CLE attendance records on our website, isb.idaho.gov, by navigating to Licensing & MCLE –> MCLE Information –> MCLE Attendance. Questions regarding MCLE compliance can be sent to mcle@isb.idaho.gov.

Maureen Ryan Braley is the Associate Director of the Idaho State Bar. She oversees Admissions and Mandatory Continuing Legal Education and assists with the general administration of the Idaho State Bar. She was the Director of Admissions of the Idaho State Bar from 2011 – 2019 and was promoted to Associate Director in February 2019.
Keely Duke and Josh Evett are excited to announce the formation of their new firm.

Both partners are recognized as highly skilled, tenacious defenders of Idaho’s medical, business, and insured community. Keely and Josh have joined forces to create Idaho’s premier trial team.
LEILA L. HALE
(Public Reprimand)

The Professional Conduct Board has issued a Public Reprimand to Nevada lawyer, Leila L. Hale, based on professional misconduct.


Pursuant to an office policy, Ms. Hale sent a non-attorney employee to conduct home visits to two personal injury clients. During those visits, the firm employee presented the potential clients with retainer agreements and various other legal documents. The firm employee read through those documents with the clients and advised one of the clients about potential attorney’s liens that may be filed by her already retained counsel if she were to switch counsel. The Nevada Board found those home visits constituted the unauthorized practice of law and that Ms. Hale violated her responsibilities under Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 5.3 regarding supervising non-lawyer assistants.

In addition, the retainer agreements presented to those clients provided that in the event of withdrawal by Hale Law or early discharge of Hale Law, the client would be responsible for, at minimum, a combined firm rate of $1,000 per hour for all attorney and staff time. The Nevada Board found such an agreement was an unreasonable fee and violated Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 1.5.

The Public Reprimand does not limit Ms. Hale’s eligibility to practice law.

Inquiries about this matter may be directed to: Bar Counsel, Idaho State Bar, P.O. Box 895, Boise, Idaho 83701, (208) 334-4500.

JAMES M. McMILLAN
(Interim Suspension)

On August 24, 2020, the Idaho Supreme Court issued an Order Granting Petition for Interim Suspension of License to Practice Law of Wallace attorney James M. McMillan.

Inquiries about this matter may be directed to: Bar Counsel, Idaho State Bar, P.O. Box 895, Boise, Idaho 83701, (208) 334-4500.
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Like many areas of the law, Idaho’s water law continues to evolve as issues arise and disputes are settled. In recent years, Idaho’s Legislature passed several pieces of legislation affecting Idaho’s water code. Many of these amendments are fodder for water cooler conversations amongst water law nerds, like myself! However, there are several bills that warrant some level of understanding regardless of your practice area. The following covers six pieces of legislation enacted during the 2018, 2019, and 2020 legislative sessions.

**Water delivery and local planning**

There has long been a tension between land development and water delivery rights of way for canals, laterals, drains, etc. Historically, these facilities ran through farms and along roads delivering water to Idaho’s thriving agricultural communities. Yet, as more and more of these farms are developed, these facilities now cross through or near neighborhoods, shopping centers, parks, and schools. Unfortunately, historically Idaho’s irrigation delivery entities have not been involved in the land use planning and approval processes with local communities. At times, this has resulted in development that impedes the ability to deliver water safely and efficiently. Further, disputes regularly arise as landowners and developers work to understand the rights and obligations associated within these rights of way.

Senate Bill 1306a (2018) amended Idaho Code § 67-5919, by adding a new subpart (4) to provide notice of “a proposed subdivision or any other site-specific land development application” to local irrigation water delivery organizations. To receive notice, the irrigation water delivery organization must notify the city and/or county. By including the irrigation organizations in the planning process, all parties – including developers, communities, and those receiving water – can work to ensure that development does not interfere with safe and efficient water delivery.

**Investing in Idaho’s water future**

In general, Idaho does a great job managing its water resources. Throughout its history, Idaho’s water users have worked hard to develop available water supplies for various uses. Although Idaho has seen its share of water shortages, particularly during those hot, dry summer months, it still fares much better than many other western states. And yet, as we look to the future, more water is needed. Studies indicate that in the Treasure Valley...
(Ada and Canyon Counties) as much as 188,000 acre-feet of additional water will be needed by 2065. That’s over 61 billion additional gallons of water (1 acre-foot = 325,851 gallons)! In other areas of the State, like Mountain Home and Moscow, declining aquifers may require alternate sources of water.

In 2019, Idaho’s Legislature passed House Bill 285, which appropriated $20 million for large water infrastructure projects. This money could be used, for example, to offset the cost of raising Anderson Ranch Dam on the South Fork of the Boise River – a project that would provide up to 29,000 additional acre-feet of water. Or, it could be used to construct a pump house and pipeline to deliver water from the Snake River to the Mountain Home Air Force Base to shore up its future water supplies.

There are many ways to spend this money to ensure Idaho’s water future is bright. More money (much more) will be needed to continue this process. These appropriated funds are a great start and demonstrate the Legislature’s ongoing commitment to ensuring that Idaho’s water supplies meet the demands of its citizens.

Ensuring the success of a monumental water settlement

Water users have worked hard over the years to resolve disputes involving the administration of Idaho’s water supplies. In 2015, surface and ground water users along Idaho’s Eastern Snake River Plain entered into a monumental settlement agreement to restore aquifer levels and river flows. The agreement requires sacrifice. Mitigation plans have been approved to outline recharge efforts and reductions in water use. Over the years, significant money has been spent to ensure success.

Modeling shows that, through these sacrifices, aquifer levels can be restored, stream flows can increase, and all will benefit. To be successful, however, all stakeholders must participate.

In 2019, Idaho’s legislature amended several code sections to help ensure that all water users are working together. Senate Bill 1041 provides ground water districts with the authority to levy special assessments to ground water users who refuse to comply with approved mitigation plans. Senate Bill 1056a provides the Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) with the authority to curtail (i.e., shut off) water users that have failed to comply with their mitigation plan obligations. These provisions provide the necessary enforcement authority to ensure that all participants in the success contemplated by the settlement agreement.

Removing vegetation from canals, laterals, and drains

Water delivery facilities, such as canals, laterals, and drains, crisscross the Idaho landscape. To ensure the effective, efficient, and safe delivery of water, the operating entities must have access to the facilities. Access is gained via roadways that run along either side of the facilities. These facilities and their associated roadways must be clear of buildings, vegetation, fences, etc. Idaho law has long recognized and protected the right of operating entities to remove encroachments on their rights of way. Whether it be fences, buildings, or vegetation, if encroaches on the right of way it is subject to removal at the landowner’s expense.

Although the right to remove trees, bushes, and other vegetation from a right of way has long been recognized by Idaho’s courts, it has not been included in the Idaho Code. Senate Bill 1086 (2019) amended several provisions of the Idaho Code to codify the long-standing right of operating entities to remove vegetation from rights of way.

Bear River Adjudication

Idaho is a leader in water right adjudications. Over the last 30+ years, Idaho’s Snake River Basin Adjudication (SRBA) has worked to catalogue and decree water rights through Idaho’s Snake River Basin (comprising much of the State) as well as the Coeur d’Alene-Spokane River, Palouse River, and Clark Fork-Pend Oreille River Basins in North Idaho. An adjudication benefits all water users, whether they be agricultural, commercial, municipal, or otherwise. Prior to 2020, there were only two basins in Idaho that did not yet have legislative approval for an adjudication – the Kootenai River Basin in Idaho’s panhandle and the Bear River Basin in Southeast Idaho.

House Bill 382 authorized an adjudication of the Bear River Basin. Expected to commence in the coming years, this adjudication will allow the Basin’s water users to obtain decrees and confirm their valuable water rights.

Addressing water needs of Idaho’s municipalities

Idaho’s water code dates to the infancy of the Gem State. At times, provisions in the code appear to conflict with each other and create confusion among practitioners. Such is the case with the statutes involving a municipality’s ability to develop water rights. The general rule for water right development is that an applicant must construct any diversion infrastructure and begin using that water within five years in order to obtain a new water right. This
“development period” ensures that Idaho’s water resources are developed in a timely manner.

Idaho’s water law has long recognized, however, that municipalities do not plan in five-year increments. Rather, municipal planning horizons regularly extend 10, 15, even 25 years as planners anticipate future growth and infrastructure needs. Municipal water rights, therefore, could seek sufficient water to meet “Reasonably Anticipated Future Needs” (or “RAFN”) based on those planning efforts.

Although the law allows municipalities to look many years into the future when seeking new water rights, it still required that any infrastructure associated with that new water user be constructed within five years. This proved to be an ineffective and inefficient process. Many circumstances can change over a municipality’s planning horizon.

For example, water use habits may change as water efficiencies are increased, resulting in a need for less water or different infrastructure. Likewise, population growth forecasts may prove wrong, again impacting water and infrastructure needs.

Senate Bill 1316 amends these statutes to align the code with the realities of the RAFN development process by extending the timeframe for constructing infrastructure and diverting water to align with the municipality’s planning horizon. This will significantly reduce the risk of overdevelopment of water and infrastructure.

Idaho is fortunate to have a legislature that recognizes the value of water to the state. The Legislature’s focus on water law over the last few sessions has improved the water code and ensured that Idaho’s water resources continue to be protected. These changes to the Idaho Code will help Idaho and Idahoans manage water rights better, both now and into the future.

And there you have it! Six pieces of water legislation. If you made it to the end, then perhaps you too are a water nerd.

Paul L. Arrington is Executive Director and General Counsel for the Idaho Water Users Association. Arrington graduated from Boise State University in 2002. He then graduated in 2005 from Gonzaga University School of Law and joined Barker Ros Holt & Simpson LLP later that year, where his law practice focused largely on water and natural resource issues in Idaho and throughout the United States. In May 2017, Arrington took over as the IWUA director.

When not working, Mr. Arrington enjoys spending time with his wife, Michelle, and their four children. He enjoys running and cycling to clear his mind.

---

Endnotes
1. For an example of legislation that digs into the minutia of Idaho’s water code, check out Senate Bill 1289 (2020). https://legislature.idaho.gov/session-info/2020/legislation/S1289/
4. See Elmore County Water Supply Alternatives Study – SPF Water Engineering, 2017 (Terry Scanlan). Ground water levels in Elmore County have declined 100–200 feet since the 1960’s. In some areas, the current decline is 5 feet per year, with an annual pumping deficit of 43,000 acre-feet per year.
5. The Palouse Aquifer will see increased demand of nearly 5,000 acre-feet per year by 2065. Over 2,200 acre-feet of additional water is needed per year to stabilize that aquifer.
7. Importantly, these efforts are working! Since 2015, the volume of water stored in the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer has increased by 2.2 million acre-feet or 717 billion gallons of water. While this is great news, water users recognize they must remain vigilant to accomplish the ultimate goals of the settlement agreement.
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In 528 AD, the Roman Emperor Justinian issued the edict, "By the law of nature these things are common to mankind – the air, running water, the sea, and consequently the shores of the sea." With these words, Justinian codified the modern-day public trust doctrine, and began an era of public management of natural resources. Though Justinian’s Rome was marred by drought, earthquakes, and a pandemic, it survived where other civilizations did not; Ancient Rome mastered water resource planning.

Idaho is facing all the same challenges and more, including population growth and weather variations caused by climate change. To safeguard its water resources, Idaho has become a leader in western water adjudications, taking stock of its water uses and planning for an uncertain future.

In the 1800’s, western states advanced the idea of efficient use of water resources through the doctrine of “beneficial use.” The “prior appropriation” doctrine holds that the first person to put water to a beneficial use has the first right to that water. With limited water resources available, water is allocated by priority date, or the date the water right was established, until there is no water left to distribute. States eventually codified the prior appropriation and beneficial use doctrines. Idaho created a mandatory permit structure for groundwater rights in 1963 and surface water rights in 1971.

An adjudication is a snapshot of all water rights existing in a particular area on one date and incorporates both the beneficial use rights and the statutory rights. In a general stream adjudication, one type of adjudication, all water rights established under beneficial use or the permit statutes must be claimed and the federal government is required to waive its sovereign immunity under the McCarran Amendment and claim its water uses through state courts. Without a general stream adjudication, the rights established through beneficial use are not recorded and administration of water rights in priority is impossible. When all water uses are accounted for, the state is better able to manage its water resources.

The Idaho Water Adjudications Court, part of the Fifth Judicial District Court that specializes in water right adjudications, presides over all of the general stream adjudications in Idaho. The Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) acts as a neutral technical advisor to the court. IDWR investigates adjudication claims and issues Director’s Reports, or recommendations with all of the essential elements of a water right, to the court. The court hears objections from claim-
ants, and ultimately issues partial decrees documenting the water right. When an adjudication is closed, the court issues a Final Unified Decree, incorporating all of the partial decrees.

As of the summer of 2020, Idaho has general stream adjudications completed, ongoing, or pending in almost every basin in the state. When Idaho can take full stock of its water use, it will be in the best position to manage and maintain its water resources.
istrative proceedings, an Idaho Supreme Court appeal, and legislation. Reclamation's original late claims were disallowed and two different water rights were decreed. The larger of the two water rights, with the earlier priority date, was subordinated to all water rights in IDWR Administrative Basin 63, except water rights to store more than 1,000 acre feet, managed groundwater recharge after April 15, 2019, or power. The smaller junior right requires Reclamation to inform the watermaster of the date it intends to store water pursuant to the right. With the refill issue resolved, irrigators and Reclamation have certainty in how water rights interact with flood control releases.

Northern Idaho Adjudication

The Northern Idaho Adjudication (NIA) is the current, ongoing adjudication in Idaho. The NIA is made up of three individual adjudications: the Coeur d'Alene-Spokane River Basin Adjudication (CSRBA), the Palouse River Basin Adjudication (PRBA), and the Clark Fork-Pend Oreille River Basin Adjudication (CFPRBA).

The CSRBA commenced on November 12, 2008, and currently encompasses over 12,000 state based claims in basins 91 through 95. Claims in basins 91 through 94 have all been resolved, and IDWR and the Court are currently working through Basin 95 which was split into Part 1 and Part 2. There remain just over 40 contested state based water rights in Part 1 and just over 30 contested cases in Part 2.

Federal reserved water rights, including rights of federally recognized Indian tribes, must be adjudicated in a general stream adjudication. In the CSRBA, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe filed 353 water rights claims. When evaluating Tribal federal reserved claims, a court must first determine what water use a Tribe is entitled to, determined by the purpose of the reservation and the treaty between the Tribe and the United States. Secondly, the court must quantify the amount of water allotted to those uses.

The Idaho Supreme Court determined that the Coeur d'Alene Tribe had reserved water rights for agriculture, fishing and hunting, domestic purposes, and instream flows on the Reservation. The Court also established the priority dates of these uses: 1) for non-consumptive uses, time immemorial and 2) for consumptive uses, the date-of-Reservation, or the date of reacquisition by the Tribe if the land was previously allotted to a non-Indian owner. Currently the parties are working with IDWR and the CSRBA Court to prepare for the quantification phase of the litigation. This second phase will take a significant amount of time and current quantification phase deadlines with the CSRBA Court extend through 2024.

The PRBA commenced on March 1, 2017 to adjudicate basin 87 covering the Palouse River which flows into Washington north of Moscow. The deadline to file a claim in the PRBA was August 31, 2020. To date, IDWR has received over 1,900 claims. Once IDWR completes claims review, it will issue Director’s Reports, or recommendations, for the claims to the PRBA Court.

The CFPRBA will adjudicate basins 96 and 97 around Lake Pend Oreille and Priest Lake. The Idaho Legislature authorized all three NIA adjudications under one bill, but required each adjudication to seek funding at the time of commencement. The Idaho Legislature funded the CFPRBA in July of 2020. IDWR will submit the commencement petition to the court this fall.

Bear River Basin Adjudication

On March 9, 2020, Governor Little signed House Bill 382 into law, authorizing IDWR to commence the Bear River Basin Adjudication (BRBA). House Bill 382 did not appropriate funding for the adjudication. IDWR will file the commencement petition with the court by the end of 2020 and will subsequently seek funding from the legislature to commence the BRBA.

Instream stockwater rights on federal grazing allotments

Instream stockwater rights based on federal grazing allotments appear in every adjudication in the state and are undergoing major changes in the wake of an Idaho Supreme Court decision and recent legislation. Federal grazing allotments offer low cost, subsidized permits for livestock grazing on public, federal land – land that is held in trust for the citizens of the United States. The cattle grazing on the land are owned by private individuals. Which party owns the instream stockwater rights?

In Joyce Livestock Co. v. U.S. both Joyce Livestock Company and the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM) claimed the same instream stockwater rights. The Idaho Supreme Court found that the determining question is: who put the water to beneficial use? The court determined that the predecessors to Joyce Livestock Company established a beneficial use water right by grazing cattle on public land.

Though BLM issued the grazing permit and held the land in trust, BLM did not establish a stockwater water right because it did not own the cattle grazing on the lands. The court stated, “[u]nder Idaho law, a landowner does not own a water right obtained by an appropriator using the land with the landowner’s permission unless the appropriator was acting as agent of the owner in obtaining that water right.”

Joyce Livestock was decided in 2007, 20 years after the SRBA commenced. By 2007, the SRBA court had already decreed the United States thousands of instream stockwater water rights across Idaho. Because those decrees were final, those decrees remain in effect. In response to Joyce Livestock, the Idaho Legislature enacted legislation to spur the forfeiture of de minimis stockwater water rights held by the United States and others who do not own livestock.

On March 27, 2018, Governor Little signed House Bill 718 into law, which amended Idaho Code § 42-501, and stated that “…in order to comply with the Joyce decision, it is the intent of the Legislature that stockwater rights acquired in a manner contrary to the Joyce decision are subject to forfeiture.” On March 24, 2020, Governor Little signed House Bill 592 into law, further amending Idaho Code § 42-501 to provide a process for the Director of IDWR to declare de minimis stockwater water rights not put to beneficial use for a term of five years or more as forfeited.

To date, no in stream stockwater rights held by the United States on federal graz-
ing allotments have been declared forfeit-ed through the statutory process.

**Conclusion**

Idaho is making great strides in cata-logging all of its water rights. Once all water rights have been adjudicated, the state will have a full picture of water use throughout Idaho. This picture will be key in planning for future water use, admin-istering water rights, and resolving water related conflicts.

---

**Endnotes**

1. Idaho Code § 42-229 (methods of appropriation).
2. Idaho Code § 42-103 (right acquired by appropriation).
3. Idaho Code § 42-1405 (general adjudication); § 42-1405 (notice of a claim); 43 U.S.C. § 666 (McCarran Amendment).
8. Subcase Nos. 01-00219 et al., Order Regarding Sub-cases Pending Upon Entry of Final Unified Decree, In Re SRBA Case No. 39576 (August 26, 2014).
10. Subcase Nos. 01-02064 et al. (American Falls Sub-cases), Subcase Nos. 01-02066 et al. (Paisides Sub-cases), State of Idaho’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, In re SRBA Case No. 39576 (January 25, 2012).
11. BWIs are issues that affect a large portion of the SRBA and not just a single administrative basin.
16. Subcase Nos. 01-219 et al. (Lake Walcott), Subcase Nos. 01-02064 et al. (American Falls). Subcase Nos. 01-02068 et al. (Paisides), Subcase Nos. 01-4055 et al. (Jackson Lake), Subcase Nos. 21-2156 et al. (Island Park), Subcase Nos. 21-4155 (Grassy Lake) Subcase Nos. 25-7004 (Ririe), Subcase Nos. 01-10614, 01-10615, 01-10616, 01-10617, 01-10618, Motion for Order Decreeing Water Rights, In re SRBA Case No. 39576 (January 13, 2013).
18. Order Granting Motion to Alter or Amend Partial Decree, Order of Amended Partial Decree, In re SRBA Case No. 39576 (Feb 28, 2020).
19. Id.
26. Id.
31. Id.; HB01, 2019 Legislature.
32. Subcase Nos. 63-33732, 63-33733, 63-33734, 63-33734A, 63-33734B, 63-33737 and 63-33738, Order Granting Motion to Disallow Final Order Disallowing Water Right Claims, In re SRBA Case No. 39576 (July 19, 2019).
33. IDWR has divided the state into over 50 adminis-trative basins that closely track natural water basins.
34. Water Right Nos. 63-33734A.
35. Water Right Nos. 63-33734B.
36. See Commencement Order for the Coeur d’Alene-Spokane River Basin Adjudication, Case No. 49576 (Nov. 12, 2008).
37. In re CSRBA Case No. 49576 Subcase No. 91-7755, 165 Idaho 517, 448 P.3d 322 (2019), reh’g denied (Nov. 4, 2019).
40. Id.
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Do You Actually Own Those Water Rights?

Meghan M. Carter
Jennifer R. Wendel

Last year the Idaho Supreme Court issued two decisions that changed some of the basic assumptions of water right transactions. That change will leave some landowners without title to the water rights associated with their properties. These decisions remind us to be diligent when it comes to water right ownership.

McInturff v. Shippy

Idaho Code §42-248(1) requires any person who owns a water right to inform the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) of any change in ownership. Idaho Code §42-1409(6) requires any person with a water right in a general adjudication to notify IDWR of any change in ownership. Until recently, IDWR did not view those statutes as providing IDWR the authority to determine ownership; IDWR believed it simply maintained records of ownership. That changed with McInturff v. Shippy.¹

The water right at issue in this case has a complicated history. Bruner started St. Maries Wild Rice Growers near St. Maries, Idaho in the 1980s.² Bruner did not own the land he was using but instead leased it from Shippy’s predecessor in interest. Shortly after forming the company Bruner applied for a water right permit. When the license was issued, St. Maries Wild Rice Growers was listed as owner. Bruner sold his wild rice company to McInturff in 2001, the sales agreement specifically transferred the water right. McInturff submitted a change of ownership to IDWR in 2005 and IDWR updated its records to show McInturff as owner.

McInturff subsequently filed a claim in the Coeur d’Alene–Spokane River Basin Adjudication (CSRBA)³ for the water right.⁴ Shippy filed a competing claim based on ownership of the land. Due to the complicated back story and limited information, IDWR did not know who the rightful owner was and didn’t believe it had the authority to make the decision. Therefore, the Director’s Report listed both McInturff and Shippy as owners of the water right. Both parties filed an objection.

The CSRBA Court held that Shippy had failed to timely assert his claim of sole ownership. Shippy did not contest the license being issued to St. Maries Wild Rice Growers, he did not file a change of ownership, and he did not contest McInturff’s open use of the water from 2001-2014. Highlighting Shippy’s failure to exhaust his administrative remedies, the CSRBA Court held Shippy’s claim was a collateral attack on the license.⁷
The CSRBA Court went further, "[w]hen the Director acts to transfer the ownership of a water right he alters one of the defining elements of that right. Such an alteration is of legal consequence." The CSRBA Court pointed to Idaho Code §42-249(5) and stated that if IDWR does not have sufficient evidence to support a change of water right ownership, it has the authority to refuse to process the change.7

Shippy appealed the CSRBA Court's decision. The Idaho Supreme Court affirmed the CSRBA Court in a 3-2 decision. The Supreme Court highlighted that Idaho Code §42-1401D deprived the CSRBA Court of "jurisdiction to review an agency decision of the IDWR that was subject to judicial review under the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act" and that "the claim should have been brought in front of the Director during the change in ownership determinations."8

The language used by the CSRBA Court and the Supreme Court changed how IDWR's ownership records are viewed. The ownership records are not just a recording of information provided to IDWR, they determine legal ownership of water rights. IDWR's determination of ownership cannot be reviewed for the first time in a water rights adjudication. Any challenges to IDWR's determination of ownership must proceed through the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act.

**First Security v. Belle Ranch**

In *Belle Ranch,*9 the Idaho Supreme Court explored how a partial decree and the Snake River Basin Adjudication (SRBA) Final Unified Decree interact with the principle of res judicata. South County acquired the Property in 2003 along with the appurtenant water rights.10 From 2005 to 2008, South County executed three mortgages with Mountain West Bank (MWB). South County, during the pendency of the SRBA, made seven conveyances of fractional portions of the water rights to multiple parties which we will refer to as First Security.

In 2010, South County defaulted on its mortgages and MWB executed a deed in lieu of foreclosure on the Property which specifically included the water rights. MWB filed a change of ownership with IDWR in June of 2010. IDWR acknowledged the change and updated its records Sept. 11, 2011. The Property and its appurtenant water rights were then conveyed to Belle Ranch. Belle Ranch filed a change of ownership with IDWR in 2012.

South County's predecessor in interest filed claims in the SRBA in 1988.11 South County filed a change of ownership with IDWR after it acquired the Property. IDWR issued recommendations to the water rights in 2007, listing South County as the claimant. On August 31, 2010, partial decrees were issued for the water rights in the name of South County. The partial decrees contained a Rule 54(b) certificate, certifying the partial decrees as final, making them appealable decisions.

The SRBA Final Unified Decree was issued in August of 2014. The Supreme Court noted that the Final Unified Decree does not supersede any administrative changes to an element of a water right completed after entry of a partial decree but before the entry of the Final Unified Decree.12

First Security did not assert its interest in the water right until October 2014, when it submitted an ownership change to IDWR. IDWR processed First Security’s change of ownership splitting the rights between First Security and Belle Ranch. Belle Ranch challenged the change of ownership. IDWR informed the parties they needed to pursue a quiet title action, and this suit commenced.

First Security argued that ownership was not litigated in the SRBA and that being a claimant is not the same as being an owner.13 The Supreme Court held the partial decrees “were final adjudications of all the claims, except for those properly claimed under a subsequent administrative procedure.”14 The Supreme Court went on to say that ownership of the water right was litigated in the SRBA because “[w]hen a court issues a decree in the name of a claimant, it is deciding whether that claimant’s assertion of ownership is valid.”15

First Security was “obligated by Idaho Code section 42-248(1) to notify the Department of the change of ownership,” but it did not. The Supreme Court then held “because the actions could have been brought in the SRBA and were not, First Security’s claims are barred.”16

In those areas of the state that have already been adjudicated (such as those parts within the Snake River Basin Adjudication17) this decision will have a significant impact for land owners that purchased property with water rights during the pendency of the adjudication and failed to file a change of ownership with IDWR before the water right was decreed. Prior to the *Belle Ranch* decision, IDWR would process post-decree changes of ownership filings in instances where transfer of ownership occurred prior to the issuance of partial decrees. Now, IDWR is no longer able to process an ownership change based on pre-decree transfers.

Where the water right was decreed in the name of the previous owner, the decree is a determination of ownership and IDWR cannot look to pre-decree transfers to change ownership. In those areas of the
state that are either currently being adjudicated (the Northern Idaho Adjudications) or those areas of the state that will be adjudicated in the future (Bear River Basin Adjudication) this case emphasizes the importance of timely filing a change of ownership with IDWR.

**Conclusion**

As a best practice when working with water rights or real estate transactions that have appurtenant water rights, always check who is on record with IDWR as the owner. And, at the same time you record a real estate transaction, also file a change of water rights ownership with IDWR.

Meghan M. Carter is a Deputy Attorney General representing the Idaho Dept. of Water Resources. She has been in that position for seven years. The views expressed in this article are that of the author’s only and do not reflect those of the Attorney General’s Office or the Idaho Dept. of Water Resources.

Jennifer R. Wendel is a Deputy Attorney General representing the Idaho Dept. of Water Resources.

**Endnotes**

4. Id.
5. Subcase No. 91-7094, Memorandum Decision and Order, In re CSRBA Case No. 49576 at 6 (Aug. 17, 2017).
6. Id. at 8.
7. Id. at 9.
8. McInturff, 165 Idaho at 498, 447 P.3d at 946.
10. Id. at 733,449.
11. Id. at 738, 451.
12. Id. at 739, 452.
13. Id. at 742, 451.
14. Id.
15. Id. at 743, 456.
16. Id. at 744, 457.
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Don’t Transfer Your Water — Rent It!

Rebecca E. Moon

Rather than secure your right to water with a permanent transfer, why not rent it for the short-term to maintain an inexpensive and flexible use? Better yet, why not rent it from yourself? The Water Supply Bank and local rental pools effectively operate as an open exchange market to match water right holders with surplus water to water users needing additional water. Idaho Code section 42-1764(1) specifically allows water right holders to use the Water Supply Bank as a substitute for transfer proceedings.

This allows a water right holder to rent its own appropriated water through the Water Supply Bank with the flexibility to change the point of diversion, place of use, or nature of use. This opportunity provides water right holders with short-term flexibility for changing the use of their existing appropriated water without risking forfeiture that may otherwise accumulate through non-use. Water right transfers are a permanent, but often time-consuming, process that allows the otherwise fixed elements of a water right to be changed. The Water Supply Bank allows for leases and rentals of water rights to and from the bank by any water user. A water right holder is allowed to lease water to the Water Supply Bank and then rent that same water from itself (referred to here as a “Directed Rental”) to temporarily change certain elements of the water right. This article will address some of the benefits of renting water from yourself, rather than permanently transferring a water right.

Simplot case study

Earlier this year, two of Simplot’s locations each had their water rights curtailed due to a delivery call by a senior water right holder. To make-up for the lost water, Simplot submitted applications to the Water Supply Bank to rent a total of 74.8 acre-feet of water to substitute for the curtailed rights at the two locations. Simplot requested a Directed Rental of water from a different Simplot water right which had previously been leased to the Water Supply Bank. Approximately two months later, the Water Supply Bank approved both rental applications.

When renting private water from the Water Supply Bank, lessors and renters are allowed to negotiate the rental price for the water. Since this was a Directed Rental of private water, the rental fee Simplot owed to itself was $0 and Simplot paid an administrative fee to the Water Supply Bank of $149.60. The administrative fee is 10% of the cost of the rental or the current published rate for renting water, which for 2020 is $20 per acre-foot.

Simplot could have applied for a transfer of the existing leased water to make up the lost supply, however, the process would have been more costly, would likely...
A transfer proceeding is a process that allows a water right holder to permanently change one or more elements of its water right.

A transfer proceeding is a process that allows a water right holder to permanently change one or more elements of its water right. This could include a change to the point of diversion, place of use, period of use, or nature of use.

A water right holder can initiate a transfer proceeding through a written application and the payment of a fee to the Idaho Department of Water Resources. The Director of the Department can approve a transfer in whole, in part, or with conditions. When deciding whether to approve a transfer, the Director considers whether the modified right (1) will injure other water rights, (2) will constitute an enlargement of the original right, (3) is consistent with the conservation of water resources and in the public interest, (4) will adversely affect the local economy of the watershed, and (5) is a beneficial use.

The Director cannot approve a transfer unless the watermaster for the appropriate district has also recommended approval of the transfer.

With limited exceptions for specific types of transfers, the application undergoes advertisement for public notice and comment. Anyone who believes the change in water rights may result in their aggrievement may protest the application. If the applicant for the transfer cannot resolve the protest informally, the Director then investigates the protest and holds a hearing to determine whether the transfer meets the factors above.

Generally, a transfer proceeding can take anywhere from six months to a year to complete. Once the transfer is complete, the elements of the water right become permanently fixed again, unless another transfer is completed.

What is the water supply bank?

The Water Supply Bank and local rental pools facilitate the exchange of previously appropriated natural flow water rights and privately held storage water rights. Local rental pools each have their own rules which may vary slightly from one another or the Water Supply Bank. This article will focus on the Water Supply Bank, which is statutorily created and operated by the Idaho Water Resource Board through the Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources.

The Water Supply Bank may lease, purchase, or otherwise obtain, any decreed, permitted, or licensed water rights. Through the Water Supply Bank, a water right holder can lease its surplus of water for others to use and a water user can rent additional water for its use.

Although the Water Supply Bank was formalized in 1979, there were informal rental pools in the state as early as 1932. At that time, water could be rented for $0.17 per acre-foot. Today, the current published rate set by the Water Supply Bank is $20 per acre-foot.

To lease water to the Water Supply Bank, a water right holder applies with the Water Supply Bank and pays an application fee of $250 per water right. The water right holder can attach conditions to the Lease, such as duration or rental price, by specifying such conditions in the application. While not subject to public notice or advertisement, the applications are considered at public meetings of the Board. The Director and the Board review an application and either approve or deny it based on factors, including rental price, likelihood to be rented, and whether it is in the local public interest. If approved, the water right holder’s leased water is placed into the Water Supply Bank for a rental by other water users and the water right holder must cease use of that portion so leased.

Although it is within the Board’s discretion, the owner of the leased water generally does not receive any money unless and until the leased water is rented from the Water Supply Bank. Once the leased water is in the Water Supply Bank’s control, any forfeiture proceedings under Idaho Code section 42-222(2) are stayed, regardless of whether the water is ever rented or not. In the case of leasing stored water, the largest risk to the water right holder is that if there is a dry winter, the storage may not completely refill by the end of the term of the lease, in which case the water right holder may not have use of its water until such storage refilled.

To rent water from the Water Supply Bank, a water user applies to the Water Supply Bank. There is no fee to apply to rent water. The Director then reviews the application, including place and type of use, and approves or denies based on whether (1) injury to other rights would occur, (2) it would constitute an enlargement, (3) the rented water will be put to beneficial use, (4) there is sufficient supply within the Water Supply Bank for the intended use, and (5) it will conflict with the local public interest.
Unlike a transfer application, unless the rental application is for a period greater than five years, the Director has discretion whether to require public notice through advertisement.\(^{20}\) The Director can approve rental applications with terms of up to five years. A term beyond five years requires review by the Board.\(^ {21}\) Once approved, the water user pays the rental fee to the Water Supply Bank, which then pays the water right holder, less a 10% administrative charge held by the Water Supply Bank.\(^ {22}\)

**Benefits of directed rentals**

Idaho Code section 42-1764(1) specifically allows a water right holder to use a Directed Rental in lieu of the transfer proceedings prescribed by Idaho Code section 42-222. In doing so, the water right holder can temporarily change the elements of its water right. Here are some of the benefits that may be achieved through the use of Directed Rentals:

**Flexible and Temporary.** A Directed Rental allows a water right holder to change the place or type of use of its water for a **limited duration** (1–5 years), which provides temporary and flexible uses for the previously appropriated water. At the end of the Directed Rental, the water reverts to the Water Supply Bank and ultimately back to the original elements of the water right (and owner) at the end of the lease term. This can be especially useful for water users leasing property for the short term where no water right exists or pursuing experimental crops where a permanent need for water is unknown.

**Inexpensive.** Although there is generally a flat fee per acre-foot of water rented when renting water from the Water Supply Bank, the water user can negotiate the rental fee with the water right holder.\(^ {23}\) If the water right holder of the leased water is also the user of the rented water, the rental amount can be waived so that the amount owed is $0. In such circumstances, the water right holder/user is still required to pay the administrative fees to the Water Supply Bank, which is 10% of the rental fee or published rental rate.\(^ {24}\)

**Approval Occurs Quickly.** For water leased or rented through the Water Supply Bank, any public notice of the use or change requested is within the discretion of the Board but is not statutorily required as with transfer proceedings. Generally, the Board does not advertise the leases or rentals and approves or denies on its own based on the criteria discussed previously. Because there is no advertisement, there is also no objection period or protests. Although an individual could file an objection or protest with the Board, the discretion to approve or deny rests wholly with the Board. Generally, once a rental application for a Directed Rental is submitted, it is completed and approved within a few weeks.

If the elements of that same water right were changed using transfer proceedings, it could potentially take a few months to even years. If a water right holder has water available for a Directed Rental, it is a much faster process to change the elements of the water and begin using the changed water right more quickly.

**No Dedication to Land.** Generally, once transferred water is put to beneficial use on land, it becomes dedicated for use on that land only. However, when water is rented from the Water Supply Bank it does not become affixed to the property where it is used.\(^ {25}\) This means if a Directed Rental (or any rental) occurs, the owner of the right does not risk permanent loss of the water and the water right will revert to its original elements (including place of use) once the rental is complete.

This is especially important when water users are leasing land that does not have appurtenant water rights. If a transfer was used, the water right would become permanently affixed to the leased land and the owner of the land could become the owner of the water right. However, if a water user or lessee of land was able to use a Directed Rental, they maintain all benefits of using the water on the leased land, but also ensure continued ownership of the water right.

**No Forfeiture.** Since forfeiture is stayed while water is leased to the Water Supply Bank—even if the water is not rented by anyone—if a water right holder does not have use for its water for the next few seasons at one location, it can temporarily transfer the water to a different location through the Water Supply Bank without risking forfeiture of the otherwise unused water.

**Interim Rentals.** A Directed Rental can also be utilized while a water right holder is in the process of permanently transferring the water right. When using the two in tandem, a water right holder can realize the benefits of a Directed Rental while pursuing a formal transfer proceeding.

Although a transfer of a water right is useful and necessary when the elements of the water right need to be permanently changed, through the use of Directed Rentals, a water user can achieve the same means temporarily. Whether using a Directed Rental alone or in tandem with a formal transfer proceeding, a Directed Rental gives the water user an inexpensive and flexible alternative, without the risk of forfeiting their unused water.

---

**Endnotes**

1. Idaho Code §§ 42-1764(1), -222(1).
2. Although “beneficial use” has never been statutorily defined, water rights must be put to some useful purpose, which includes domestic use, irrigation stock-watering, manufacturing, mining, hydropower, municipal, aquaculture, recreation, and fish and wildlife.
3. Under Idaho Code section 42-605(3) each water district has a watermaster appointed by the Director of the Department to oversee water distribution.
5. IDAPA 37.02.03.010.02.
6. Idaho Code § 42-1761; IDAPA 37.02.03.001.02.
7. Idaho Code § 42-1762(2); IDAPA 37.02.03.025.02.a.
8. IDAPA 37.02.03.010.05, .08.
11. IDAPA 37.02.03.025.02.
12. IDAPA 37.02.03.025.01.
13. IDAPA 37.02.03.025.05.
14. IDAPA 37.02.03.025.06.
15. Idaho Code § 42-1762(2); IDAPA 37.02.03.025.08.b.
16. IDAPA 37.02.03.025.06.n.
17. Idaho Code §§ 42-223(5), -1764(2); IDAPA 37.02.03.025.08.e.
19. Idaho Code § 42-1763; IDAPA 37.02.03.030.01.
20. IDAPA 37.02.03.030.02.
21. IDAPA 37.02.03.030.05.
22. IDAPA 37.02.03.035.
24. IDAPA 37.02.03.035.

Rebecca E. Moon is Real Estate Counsel at J. R. Simplot Company where she oversees real estate and water transactions and negotiates various commercial contracts for the company. Prior to working at Simplot, she worked in private practice. She is also the vice chairperson of the Water Law Section.
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Norman M. Semanko

Last year, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued an amended opinion in PCFFA v. Glaser¹, providing clarification – and raising some questions – regarding the irrigation return flow exemption contained in the Clean Water Act². The case itself is currently on remand to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California. In the meantime, the Ninth Circuit Court’s decision has western irrigation interests, legal practitioners, and regulators all weighing the future of the exemption.

This article will provide an overview of the exemption for irrigation return flows, an examination of the Glaser case, and offer some guidance as to how these issues may be addressed in the future.

History of the irrigation return flow exemption

Under the Clean Water Act, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required to discharge a pollutant into navigable waters from a point source.³ This requirement applies to government agencies.⁴ However, the Act contains a permit exemption “for discharges composed entirely of return flows from irrigated agriculture.”⁵ In addition, while a “point source” is defined as “any discernible, confined and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to any pipe, ditch [or] channel. . .” it does not include “return flows from irrigated agriculture.”⁶ It hasn’t always been so.

The Clean Water Act, as originally enacted in 1972, did not contain any exceptions to its NPDES permitting requirement.⁷ It wasn’t until five years later, during 1977, that Congress added an exception for discharges composed entirely of return flows from irrigated agriculture.⁸ In doing so, Congress limited the irrigation return flow exemption “to only those flows which did not contain additional discharges from activities unrelated to crop production.”⁹

The legislative history for the 1977 amendments to the Clean Water Act includes a Congressman’s statement that an NPDES permit would not be required for “a vast irrigation basin that collects all of the waste resident of irrigation water in the Central Valley and places it in [the San Luis Drain] and transport[s] it . . .[to] the San Joaquin River.”¹⁰ Ironically, this is the very irrigation and drainage project that would become the subject of the Glaser case some 40 years later.

The Glaser Case: Addressing the meaning and application of the exemption

In Glaser, selenium and other pollutants were discharged to the San Joaquin River and the Bay-Delta Estuary from the San Luis Drain, which was built by the
Outside of the district court, irrigators west-wide – particularly in the Ninth Circuit – are also asking the question: What activities are related to crop production?

Addressed three alleged errors committed by the district court in its interpretation of the irrigation return flow exemption. First, the Ninth Circuit Court concluded that the burden of proving that the exemption applies falls on the Defendants. The district court had found that the burden rests with the Plaintiffs. In reversing the lower court, the Ninth Circuit observed that once the plaintiffs in a case prove the existence of a discharge of a pollutant to navigable waters from a point source, the defendant carries the burden of demonstrating that an applicable statutory exemption applies. With the Plaintiffs having made their initial showing, the burden shifts and the Defendants in Glaser must now establish that the Project’s discharges were “composed entirely of return flows from irrigated agriculture.”

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals next upheld the district court’s determination that the irrigation return flow exemption applies to discharges that are related to crop production. While noting that the district court should have begun its analysis with the statutory text, the Court of Appeals nonetheless concluded that the district court’s reliance on legislative history to construe the statutory exemption was not erroneous.

In construing the plain language of the statute, the Ninth Circuit concluded that the dictionary definition of “agriculture” confirms that it has a broad meaning that encompasses crop production. The Court reviewed the legislative history and confirmed that Congress intended for “irrigated agriculture” as used in the Act’s exemption to be defined broadly and to include discharges from “all activities related to crop production,” including drainage from retired and fallow lands.

Finally, the Ninth Circuit Court held that the discharges must be composed “entirely” of return flows from irrigated agriculture to qualify for the exemption. The district court had construed the irrigation return flow exemption as applying unless a “majority of the total commingled discharge” is unrelated to crop production. The Ninth Circuit found that the dictionary definition of “entirely” is “wholly, completely, fully.” That definition differs significantly from the “majority” standard used by the district court.

In confirming a literal interpretation of “entirely,” the Ninth Circuit observed: “Given the many activities related to crop production that fall under the definition of ‘irrigated agriculture,’ Congress’s use of ‘entirely’ to limit the scope of the statutory exception makes perfect sense. The text demonstrates that Congress intended for discharges that include return flows from activities unrelated to crop production to be excluded from the statutory exception, thus requiring an NPDES permit for such discharges.” On remand, the district court was therefore ordered to consider the Plaintiffs’ claims regarding alleged runoff entering the San Luis Drain from “non-irrigated land,” including the solar project and “highways, residences, seepage...and sediment” from other locations.

The future of the exemption: More litigation and potential guidance

Significant questions face the district court on remand in Glaser. Perhaps most consequential will be the court’s determination of what broad set of activities are “related to crop production” within the Project. One of the Plaintiffs’ main claims – drainage from retired and fallow lands – seems to clearly fall within the irrigation return flow exemption. Other allegations in the complaint are not so easy to characterize as “related to crop production.” Whatever the result, the district court’s decision will be subject to appeal and perhaps additional clarification. Lawsuits in other jurisdictions are certainly possible, as well.

Outside of the district court, irrigators west-wide – particularly in the Ninth Circuit – are also asking the question: What activities are related to crop production? Given that the answer is not set forth in the Clean Water Act itself, the irrigation community may look to the regulators to provide answers, either through guidance or rulemaking. Whether that comes from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or the State agencies that have been delegated authority to administer the NPDES program, the pressure will grow as additional citizen suits are pursued.

Previous EPA guidance provides that the irrigation return flow exemption includes maintenance of irrigation conveyances through the use of aquatic herbicides. The Bureau of Reclamation has also issued guidance regarding discharges to its irrigation and drainage facilities. The need to expand on this guidance or to issue additional guidance interpreting the irrigation return flow exemption seems apparent in the wake of Glaser. Whether that will eventually lead to agency rulemaking, or even additional action by Con-
gress to clarify the meaning and scope of the current exemption within the Clean Water Act, is something that only time will tell.

Norman M. Semanko is a shareholder with Parsons Behle & Latimer in Boise. Semanko previously served as Executive Director & General Counsel for the Idaho Water Users Association. He spent time as a Legislative Assistant in the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives while obtaining his law degree from Georgetown University. These days, Semanko splits his professional time representing clients in southern Idaho and North Idaho.
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"All creation is a mine and every man, a miner"
- Abraham Lincoln
The August 2020 meeting of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association (ABA) was unique, as, of course, much of our lives is unique during the pandemic. The meeting was a virtual meeting in which members of the House and others listened and watched via a Zoom webinar. The voting on the various resolutions was done on a separate platform called SYNC. To their credit, the ABA technical staff handled the logistics almost without flaw (I almost wrote “virtually without flaw”, but that would have been too cheesy). While I missed seeing my colleagues in the Idaho delegation, as well as friends from other states, the business of the House was carried on in an orderly fashion.

In all, approximately 60 resolutions were adopted and another four failed or were withdrawn. Many of the resolutions were revised before passage. The results of the voting and the subject matter of the resolutions, as well as the content of the speeches given by incoming and outgoing officers of the association are available on the ABA website, but I will give a summary of some of the highlights for me.

Because of the societal environment in which the meeting was held, there were a number of resolutions that touched on the COVID-19 pandemic, civil rights, and racism. It was only fitting, and in fact quite moving, that for the invocation, with which the House always begins its proceedings, a video was played of the invocation which recently deceased civil rights icon, Representative John Lewis, offered at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the House of Delegates. He called upon God to bless all of us to work in harmony, stating “we are all one house”.

He alluded not just to the House of Delegates, but to the nation as being “one house”, a timely reminder for all of us. Consistent with the feelings expressed by Representative Lewis and the tenor of the times, one of the last resolutions that the House passed called for state and federal governments to recognize June 19th (Juneteenth) as a paid federal holiday to mark the end of slavery.

Two of the resolutions dealt with police reform. Both are resolutions which urge state and local governments to take action. The first is to include instruction of implicit bias as a part of law enforcement training. The second is to legislate the abrogation of the substantial curtailment of qualified immunity in civil actions against law enforcement officials.

A hotly contested resolution, albeit one that is seemingly arcane to non-House members, dealt with the procedure of bringing resolutions before the House. It was proposed by a select committee head-
ed by former ABA President Bob Carlson of Montana. Its purpose was to clarify that a resolution dealt with one of the four purposes of the ABA. It was felt that it would make it easier for states with integrated bars, like Idaho, to deal with resolutions without appearing to take up controversial, politically-tinged issues. The measure was defeated principally because it was felt that the added obligation of including the purpose would restrict the introduction of important measures that arose at the last moment.

The Resolution that was the longest-debated and most divisive dealt with bar exams. The proponents of the Resolution argued that while the timing of the Resolution was problematic (it was submitted after 24 states had already given an in-person bar exam in late July), it was also unavoidable due to the rapid rise of the pandemic since the mid-year meeting in February and the immediacy of the various states’ bar exams.

The point of the Resolution was to encourage, really to force, States not to administer a traditional bar exam this year in order to avoid possibly exposing recent law school graduates to the COVID-19 virus. The Resolution included a number of suggestions for alternatives to bar admission during the pandemic. Those alternatives included: (1) administering the exam online; (2) offering limited admission to recent graduates until they could take the bar exam later, possibly in the Spring; and (3) allowing admission to the Bar by diploma privilege (i.e., by merely graduating from law school).

The position of the supporters of the Resolution was that it was impossible to guarantee isolation from the virus in a traditional bar exam setting, even if social distancing, wearing masks, and antiseptic measures were practiced. The opponents argued that the Resolution was flawed because among other things, it did not specify that the graduates for a diploma admission had to graduate from a licensed and accredited law school. The Resolution passed after a lengthy debate.

A number of States, including Idaho, had already administered the bar exam, while others had cancelled or postponed theirs, assuring a patchwork of admission policies this year. Just a word about how Idaho administered the bar exam this year.

The format of the bar exam, while administered by the Idaho State Bar, is approved by the Idaho Supreme Court. This year in particular there was cooperation to assure as safe a proceeding as possible while maintaining the integrity of bar admissions. The Court authorized the Idaho State Bar to also administer an online bar exam in October 2020. Applicants for the July in-person bar exam were given a choice of taking the exam in-person or online. The vast majority took the exam in-person. The test was administered to small groups at various locales and social distancing, masks, and proper sanitization were practiced. No positive COVID-19 cases were traced to the Idaho bar exam.

In addition to the Resolution process, the House heard from present and incoming leaders. Judy Perry Martinez (LA), the then current President of the ABA, Patricia Refoe, (AZ), the incoming and now current President, Reginald Turner (MI), the President-Elect, and William Neukom, this year’s recipient of the ABA Medal and a former President of the Association all spoke eloquently of the role of the ABA. Two topics that were common for the speakers were preserving the right to vote (especially timely because of this being the 100 year anniversary of the adoption of the 19th Amendment) and upholding the independence of the Judiciary. For the full remarks, one can check the Annual Meeting notes on the ABA website.

Finally, on a note of personal privilege, this was my last meeting as the Idaho State Bar Delegate and my last as a member of the House of Delegates. I am sure that my successor, Judge Oths, will do a great job. I have enjoyed the opportunity to serve the bar in the capacity of State Delegate and State Bar Delegate for the past 16 years and thank all of those who have given me their support, counsel, and encouragement.

I am particularly mindful of the support of the Idaho State Bar commissioners and staff, especially Diane Minnich. I have enjoyed working with the various other Idaho Delegates over the years, including Deborah Ferguson, Jennifer Jensen, Michelle Points, Tim Hopkins, and the late Allyn Dingel. It’s been a great experience.
service animals have become a common part of our surroundings. Though pets have long been an enrichment to our families, service animals occupy a different and specific role to many of our citizens. Citizens with disabilities often employ the skills of service animals to assist them through the world. Veterans have the ability to have an animal prescribed to them as a part of their treatment and rehabilitation.

This article will explain the following topics for clear, concise guidance to navigate the world of service animals: definition of a service animal, rights of handlers, rights of businesses, and available resources for issues regarding service animals.

What is a service animal?

According to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)\(^1\) and Idaho Statute\(^2\) a “Service animal means any dog that is individually trained to do work or perform tasks for the benefit of an individual with a disability, including a physical, sensory, psychiatric, intellectual, or other mental disability.” Other species of animals, whether wild or domestic, trained or untrained, are not service animals for the purpose of this definition.

The work or tasks performed by a service animal must be directly related to the individual’s disability. Examples of work or tasks include, but are not limited to: assisting individuals who are blind or have low vision with navigation and other tasks; alerting individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing to the presence of people or sounds; providing non-violent protection or rescue work; pulling a wheelchair; assisting an individual during a seizure; alerting individuals to the presence of allergens; retrieving items such as medicine or the telephone; providing physical support and assistance with balance and stability to individuals with mobility disabilities; and helping persons with psychiatric and neurological disabilities by preventing or interrupting impulsive or destructive behaviors. The crime deterrent effects of an animal’s presence and the provision of emotional support, well-being, comfort, or companionship do not constitute work or tasks for the purposes of this definition.

Animals that can be designated as service animals are dogs and miniature horses. Under the Veterans Affairs (VA)
benefit however, only dogs may be designated as a service animal.

Do I qualify?

Veterans may qualify through the VA for the benefit of a service animal. To qualify, a veteran must meet with their VA health provider. Veterans who have been diagnosed as having: a visual, hearing, or substantial mobility impairment, spinal cord injury, traumatic brain injury (TBI), or seizure disorders; or certain mental health issues may qualify for a service dog. Veterans must have successfully completed a training program by Assistance Dog International (ADI) or the International Guide Dog Federation (IGDF) and provide a certificate. Veterans seeking to use a service dog as a VA health benefit must have their dog certified by ADI or IGDF. Applying for the VA benefit of a service dog is normally a two-stage process. The first stage will be to qualify through Veterans Affairs and the second stage through a coordinating organization to assist in training and financial assistance.

If the veteran qualifies for the VA benefit, the VA will provide financial coverage for several of the associated expenses. Coverage will be provided for one service dog at any given time. The VA, not the veteran, will be billed for a commercially available insurance policy. The VA will also be billed for any premiums, copayments, and deductibles associated with the policy.

The VA will cover all treatment associated with the service dog, including prescription medications and veterinary care. Dogs with preexisting conditions will not be excluded. Hardware or replacements for use with the dog can be obtained through the Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service at the veteran’s local VA medical facility. Travel expenses associated with obtaining a dog or replacement dog are covered.

Items associated with the service dog that are not covered by the federal regulation include: “license tags, non-prescription food, grooming, insurance for a personal injury policy, non-sedated dental cleanings, nail trimming, boarding, pet sitting or dog walking services, over the counter medications, or other routine expenses associated with owning a dog.”

Veterans can also obtain a service animal without applying for or using VA benefits or services. They can do so by obtaining and training an animal themselves or through a non-ADI or non-IGDF approved organization. However, it is important to note that Idaho does not have a recognized organization. However, it is important to note that Idaho does not have any ADI or IGDF approved organizations for service animals.

Additional assistance may be available through non-profit organizations. Always use legitimate organizations and avoid those that require payment for the organization’s services. Do your research to find the best fit for your needs.

Rights of handlers

A service animal must be under the control of its handler. Under the ADA, service animals must be harnessed, leashed, or tethered, unless the individual’s disability prevents the use of these devices or they interfere with the service animal’s safe, effective performance of tasks. In that case, the individual must maintain control of the animal through voice, signal, or other effective controls.

A person with a disability cannot be asked to remove their service animal from any governmental, commercial, or public premises unless: (1) the animal is acting poorly (barking, growling, or invading the space of others) and the handler does not take effective action to control or correct the animal or (2) the animal is not housebroken. When there is a legitimate reason to ask that a service animal be removed, staff must offer the person with the disability the opportunity to obtain goods or services without the animal’s presence.

Service animals and housing rights

Under the Fair Housing Act (FHA), handlers of service animals are to be allowed reasonable accommodations by housing providers. The FHA makes it unlawful for a housing provider to refuse to make a reasonable accommodation that a person with a disability may need in order to “have equal opportunity to enjoy and use a dwelling.”

While some disabilities are readily visible or apparent, others are not. Housing providers are permitted to request information regarding the task the service animal provides and related need for a service animal. However, housing providers are not entitled to ask, or demand answers related to the individual’s diagnosis.

Housing providers are entitled to request documentation of a disability in order to make a determination regarding a reasonable accommodation such as exceptions to no-animal policies, deposits, or fees that are typically charged for animals. However, the handler does not have to comply with requests that are related to their personal health. Some types of short-term temporary shelters are not covered by the FHA.

Inquiries, exclusions, charges, and other specific rules related to service animals

Individuals can ask the handlers two questions: (1) Is the animal a service ani-
A service animal is out in public. Businesses that sell or provide care or food for a service animal are not, however, required to provide a special location for it to relieve itself. Violators of the provisions of the ADA can be required to pay money damages and penalties.

Removing a service animal

In these cases, the business should give the person with the disability the option to obtain goods or services without having the animal on the premises.

People with disabilities who use service animals cannot be charged extra fees, isolated from other patrons, or treated less favorably than other patrons. However, if a business such as a hotel normally charges guests for damage that they cause, a customer with a disability may be charged for damage caused by his or her service animal.

Conclusion

Service animals are a growing trend in Idaho and can be found in the form of service dogs or miniature horses. It is important that handlers and businesses are both aware of their rights when dealing with or handling service animals. Handlers have the right to be accompanied by their service animal in any place of public accommodation. Businesses have the right to ask the two-questions stated previously.

Finally, the removal of a service animal can only happen if the animal is acting poorly and the handler does not take effective actions to correct the animal or the animal is not housebroken. If all parties are aware of their rights and responsibilities when interacting with service animals, these interactions can be smooth and positive for all.

Rights of businesses

Under the ADA, places of public accommodation must allow people with disabilities to bring their service animals into all areas of the facility where the public is allowed to go. This federal law applies to all businesses open to the public, including restaurants, hotels, taxis and shuttles, grocery and department stores, hospitals and medical offices, theaters, health clubs, parks, and zoos.

Service animals are not required to wear a vest or identification when they are out in public. Businesses that sell or prepare food must allow service animals in public areas even if state or local health codes prohibit animals on the premises. Businesses are not, however, required to provide care or food for a service animal or provide a special location for it to relieve itself. Violators of the provisions of the ADA can be required to pay money damages and penalties.

Endnotes

1. (28 C.F.R. §36.104)
2. (§56-701A)
3. (38 CFR §74.148)
4. (42 USC §3604(t)(3)(B); 24 CFR § 100.24).
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The Idaho Charitable Assets Protection Act: Better Protection of Idaho’s Charitable Assets and Donor Intent

Stephanie N. Guyon

Idaho is home to over 4,500 charitable organizations that hold over $9 billion in charitable assets. Each year, Idahoans donate over $900 million in charitable contributions. Yet, Idaho had no comprehensive charitable assets law until July 1, 2020 when the Idaho Charitable Assets Protection Act (ICAPA), the state’s first comprehensive charitable assets law, became effective.

ICAPA articulates and confirms the Attorney General’s role in protecting Idaho’s charitable assets and preserving donor intent. Importantly, ICAPA includes two significant provisions that will better protect charitable assets in Idaho.

The first provision prohibits the misuse of charitable assets. The second provision requires charitable organizations to notify the Attorney General in writing before they dissolve, convert to a noncharitable entity, or terminate and dispose of all or substantially all of the organization’s assets.

This article discusses the history of regulating charitable assets and those two provisions, including the Attorney General’s related enforcement duties and authorities.

A brief history of charitable asset regulation

The history of the state attorney general’s authority to supervise charitable trusts dates back to the development of English common law in Fifteenth Century England. The king’s chancellor, on behalf of the Crown, began enforcing trusts that benefitted the people and the community. The English Parliament enacted the Statute of Elizabeth in 1601 to further control abuses of charitable donations, but the law was unsuccessful and gradually fell into disuse. Other charity supervision laws followed, but the task of enforcing charitable trusts always fell back on attorneys general.

In 1938, the Idaho Attorney General’s common law authority over charitable trusts was called into question. In Hedin v. Westdala Lutheran Church, the Idaho Supreme Court invalidated a provision in a will that left the residue of the testator’s estate to his trustee to use for charitable and religious purposes. The Idaho Supreme Court expressed concern that if the provision was upheld no one would have standing to ensure the trustee properly distributed the funds. The court rejected the attorney general’s common law authority to enforce charitable trusts, writing:

Apparent...
and maintain suits to protect public charities where property intended for their use is not being properly applied. In this state, such is not one of the duties of that official.10

In 1963, the Idaho Legislature restored the Attorney General’s authority over charitable trusts. The Legislature documented the purpose of adding subparagraph (4) to the Attorney General’s general duties in Idaho Code § 67-1401, writing, (4) [now (5)] gives the Attorney General authority over charitable trust assets “in conformity with the common law.”11

**Attorney General’s limited authority under Idaho Code § 67-1401(5)**

Before ICAPA, Idaho Code § 67-1401(5) constituted the primary source of the Attorney General’s authority over charitable trust assets. Broadly phrased, paragraph 5 imposed a duty on the Attorney General to “supervise” entities and persons holding property subject to a charitable trust.12

The law authorized the Attorney General to examine charitable trusts, but failed to provide the tools (e.g., subpoenas or investigative demands) to conduct such examinations. Also, while the Attorney General could file suit to enforce compliance with a charitable trust’s purpose, he could not recover lost assets or hold persons accountable for misusing charitable assets.

Court decisions implicating Idaho Code § 67-1401(5) are scarce. Since 1963, the Idaho Supreme Court has issued only four opinions addressing the statute.14 Unfortunately, none of the opinions helped to interpret or clarify the statute’s language.

**Idaho Charitable Asset Protection Act**

The Attorney General began drafting a comprehensive charitable asset law in 2015. With input from Idaho’s nonprofit community and experienced charitable trust attorneys, ICAPA emerged five years later. The law covers “charitable organizations” and their “accountable persons” holding “charitable assets,” for a “charitable purpose”—each being a defined term.

**Misuse of Charitable Assets.** ICAPA prohibits a charitable organization or an accountable person from knowingly misusing charitable assets.15

A charitable organization or an accountable person misuses charitable assets by knowingly using charitable assets or allowing charitable assets to be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the law applicable to the charitable asset, the restrictions contained in a gift instrument regarding the charitable assets, or the charitable purpose of the charitable organization that holds the charitable asset.

An accountable person is not liable under ICAPA, however, if the accountable person does not knowingly misuse charitable assets. They also are not liable in four other situations. First, if his or her duties are discharged in compliance with the standards found in Idaho’s Nonprofit Corporations Act;16 second, if he or she acts in compliance with the applicable trust instrument and the instrument complies with Idaho law; third, if he or she qualifies for immunity under Idaho Code § 6-1605; and fourth, if he or she acts in compliance with a court order of which the Attorney General received timely notice, such that the Attorney General had an opportunity to object.17

ICAPA’s enforcement provisions parallel those granted to the Attorney General in the Idaho Consumer Protection Act.20 When the Attorney General has a reason to believe that a charitable organization or an accountable person has knowingly misused charitable assets or is knowingly misusing charitable assets, the Attorney General has authority under ICAPA to initiate an investigation of the charitable organization or the accountable person.

Before filing a lawsuit against a charitable organization or an accountable person, the Attorney General must offer the charitable organization or accountable person an opportunity to sign an assurance of voluntary compliance or a consent judgment.21 If settlement is not possible, the Attorney General may proceed with a lawsuit to obtain injunctive and financial relief.22

**Notice to Attorney General.** If a charitable organization intends to dissolve, convert to a noncharitable entity, or terminate and sell or transfer all or substantially all of its charitable assets, the charitable organization, at least 30 days before dissolution, conversion, or termination, must provide written notice to the Attorney General.24

The charitable organization’s written notice must include the following: (1) the legal names and mailing addresses of the charitable organization’s directors and officers; (2) a description of the charitable organization’s charitable assets and the charitable purpose of the charitable organization’s charitable assets; and (3) a copy or summary of the charitable organization’s plan of dissolution, conversion to a noncharitable organization, or termination and disposal of all or substantially all of the charitable organization’s charitable assets.25

The Attorney General has 30 days after receiving the charitable organization’s notice to inform the charitable organization in writing that the Attorney General consents to or opposes the organization’s proposed plan to dissolve, convert, or terminate.26 If a charitable organization receives a letter of opposition from the Attorney General, the charitable organization must refrain from implementing its proposed plan for 14 days receiving the notice.27

---

**Defined Terms**

- **Charitable Organizations:** persons who hold charitable assets. I.C. 48-1903(4).
- **Accountable Persons:** The directors, officers, executives, managers, trustees, agents, and employees of Charitable Organizations. I.C. 48-1903(3).
- **Charitable Asset:** Any interest in real or personal property and any other article, commodity, or thing of value that is impressed with a charitable purpose. I.C. 48-1903(3).
- **Charitable Purpose:** the relief of poverty, the advancement of knowledge, education, or religion, or the promotion of health, the environment, civic or patriotic matters, or any other purpose, the achievement of which is beneficial to the community. I.C. 48-1903(5).
During that 14-day period, the Attorney General will work with the charitable organization to resolve the Attorney General’s opposition to the charitable organization’s proposed plan. If a resolution is not possible during the 14-day period, the Attorney General has discretion to file a lawsuit seeking to block the charitable organization’s proposed plan.28

The Attorney General may investigate instances where a charitable organization fails to give proper notice.29 ICAPA also gives the Attorney General authority to enter into assurances of voluntary compliance or consent judgments, and, if necessary, to file civil lawsuits against charitable organizations and their accountable persons.30

In addition to the 30-day notice requirement, a charitable organization must provide certain information to the Attorney General within 90 days of dissolving, converting to a noncharitable organization, or terminating and disposing of all or substantially all of its charitable assets.31 The Attorney General must receive a list from the charitable organization that includes, at a minimum, (1) the name and address of each person who received the charitable organization’s charitable assets, and (2) a description of which charitable assets the person received.32

For More Information. The Attorney General’s FAQs regarding ICAPA are available on the Attorney General’s website. The FAQs cover all of ICAPA’s requirements and provide information about how the Attorney General intends to interpret and apply the law.

Attorneys who represent charitable organizations should advise their clients about ICAPA and refer them to the Attorney General’s FAQs. Attorneys and charitable organization leaders may direct their questions about ICAPA to the deputy attorneys general with the Attorney General’s Consumer Protection Division.

Endnotes
1. Title 48, chapter 19, Idaho Code.
3. See Idaho Code § 48-1907. The notice requirement applies to charitable organizations with charitable assets of more than $10,000.
5. Patton, supra note 4, at 136-37.
6. Id. at 138-39.
8. Id. at 243-44, 81 P.2d at 742.
9. Id. at 250-51, 81 P.2d at 745-46. The court found the charitable trust invalid because the will’s provision failed to (1) identify a reasonably ascertainable class or group of beneficiaries, (2) limit the trustee’s ability to choose the beneficiaries, or (3) identify a person who could enforce the trust.
10. Id.
12. The Attorney General also has enforcement authority over charitable trusts and private foundations pursuant to Idaho Code §§ 68-1204 and 33-1505 and Idaho’s Probate Code, title 15. Idaho Code.
16. Under Idaho law, “the word ‘knowingly’ imports only a knowledge that the facts exist which bring the act or omission within the provisions of the law. It does not require any knowledge of the unlawfulness of such act or omission.” Idaho Code § 18-101(5).
17. ICAPA does not prevent a person from seeking a release or modifying the charitable purposes or restrictions within a gift instrument as Idaho law allows. See Idaho Code § 48-1906(3)(b).
20. The Idaho Consumer Protection Act is codified at title 48, chapter 6, Idaho Code.
22. Assurances of voluntary compliance and consent judgments serve as settlement agreements between the Attorney General, on behalf of the State of Idaho, and charitable organizations or accountable persons. The district court must approve the terms within an assurance or consent judgment. See Idaho Code § 48-1909.
23. The Attorney General may request and a court has authority to (a) issue a temporary restraining order or preliminary or permanent injunction to enjoin the alleged violator’s unlawful activities; (b) appoint a master, receiver, or escrow agent to gather, account for, and oversee the charitable assets of the alleged violator and prevent further dissolution of any charitable assets; (c) remove the alleged violator from his or her position as an accountable person of the charitable organization; (d) terminate a charitable organization and liquidate its charitable assets in accordance with the charitable organization’s governing instrument(s) or applicable law; (e) require the alleged violator to pay damages or restitution of any charitable assets mis-appropriated, lost, or diverted; (f) require the alleged violator to pay civil penalties of up to $50,000; (g) order the alleged violator to perform a specific action; and (h) require the alleged violator to pay the attorney general’s fees, reasonable expenses, and investigative costs. See Idaho Code § 48-1910(1).
24. See Idaho Code § 48-1907. ICAPA does not require charitable organizations to notify the Attorney General every time they sell or transfer a charitable asset. The notice requirement only applies when charitable organizations terminate operations or convert to a noncharitable entity and intend to distribute all or substantially all of their charitable assets.
26. See Idaho Code § 48-1907(4). The Attorney General may consent in writing to charitable organization’s plan. If the charitable organization does not receive a notice of consent or opposition from the Attorney General opposing its proposed plan, the charitable organization may proceed with its plan. See Idaho Code § 48-1907(6).
27. See Idaho Code § 48-1907(8).
28. See Idaho Code § 48-1907(8). If 14 days pass from when the charitable organization received the Attorney General’s written opposition and the Attorney General does not file suit seeking to block the charitable organization’s proposed plan, the charitable organization may proceed with its plan. See Idaho Code § 48-1907(8).
30. See Idaho Code § 48-1901(2). The Attorney General may request the court enter an order that: (a) prevents the charitable organization from proceeding with its proposed plan to dissolve, convert to a noncharitable organization, or terminate and dispose of all or substantially all of its charitable assets; (b) appoints a master, receiver, or escrow agent to gather, account for, and oversee charitable assets if it appears the charitable organization’s charitable assets may be dissolved, converted, terminated, or disposed of during the Attorney General’s lawsuit; (c) terminates a charitable organization and liquidates its charitable assets in accordance with its governing instrument(s) or applicable law; and (d) requires the charitable organization’s accountable person(s) to pay civil penalties of up to $5,000 if the charitable organization’s accountable person(s) knew of and intended to violate the notice provisions of Idaho Code § 48-1907.
32. See Idaho Code § 48-1907(7).

Conclusion
Idaho has a large number of charitable organizations holding a significant amount of charitable assets. ICAPA is Idaho’s first comprehensive act regulating the use of charitable assets, and it articulates and confirms the Attorney General’s role in protecting Idaho’s charitable assets and preserving donor intent.

Stephanie N. Guyon is a deputy attorney general in the Attorney General’s Consumer Protection Division. She handles a variety of consumer matters, including charitable assets and solicitations, auto advertising, Internet sales, and telemarketing. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not reflect the opinions or position of the Attorney General’s Office or the State of Idaho.
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The Richard C. Fields Civility Award recognizes an attorney who demonstrates a strong commitment to professionalism and civility in the practice of law. The award was created in 2014 to honor the memory of the late Richard Fields. Mr. Fields received the Idaho State Bar’s Distinguished Lawyer Award in 2000 and chaired the Dean’s Advisory Council at Concordia University School of Law from 2009 to 2014. Additionally, Mr. Fields demonstrated a commitment to professionalism and civility in his practice of law.

In honor of Mr. Fields’ memory and legacy, this year’s award is presented by the Idaho State Bar Professionalism & Ethics Section and the former Concordia University School of Law. We are pleased to announce the 2020 recipient of the Richard C. Fields Civility Award is Newal Squyres, practicing at Holland & Hart, in Boise, Idaho.

Mr. Squyres’ passion for the law was ignited during his clerkship for Judge Joe Ingraham on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The principles of civility and professionalism have guided Mr. Squyres’ approach to practicing law throughout his career, which spans more than 45 years. Mr. Squyres also served in the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) on the personal staff of U.S. Attorney General Griffin Bell from 1977-1979. During his tenure in the OLC, he focused on national security and counterintelligence issues, including passage and implementation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA).

Mr. Squyres is a Fellow in the American College of Trial Lawyers, a preeminent organization of trial lawyers in North America, for which fellowship is extended only by invitation to those experienced trial lawyers whose professional careers have been marked by the highest standards of ethical conduct, professionalism, civility, and collegiality.

In 2015, Mr. Squyres was honored with the Idaho State Bar's Distinguished Lawyer Award. He has served as an Idaho State Bar Commissioner, including one term as president. While Idaho State Bar president, he wrote about civility and professionalism. Mr. Squyres insightfully wrote:

Definitions of “kindness” include compassion, generosity, a helping act, and service. Each of these is an attribute to which good lawyers should aspire. Synonyms that seem particularly appropriate to what we do are courtesy, humanity, indulgence, patience, thoughtfulness, tolerance, and understanding. Each
In recent years, Mr. Squyres has added the role of mediator to his distinguished career.
Court Information

OFFICIAL NOTICE
SUPREME COURT OF IDAHO

Chief Justice
Roger S. Burdick

Justices
Robyn M. Brody
G. Richard Bevan
John R. Stegner
Gregory W. Moeller

Regular Fall Term for 2020
1st Amended May 20, 2020

Boise & Coeur d’Alene via Zoom .................. August 17, 19, and 21
Pocatello ........................................................ September 9 and 10
Twin Falls ............................................................. September 11
Boise ............................................................. September 14 and 16
Boise ............................................................. November 2, 4, 6, 9, and 12
Boise ............................................................. December 7, 9 and 11

By Order of the Court
Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk

NOTE: The above is the official notice of the 2020 Fall Term for the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and should be preserved. A formal notice of the setting of oral argument in each case will be sent to counsel prior to each term.

OFFICIAL NOTICE
COURT OF APPEALS OF IDAHO

Chief Judge
Molly J. Huskey

Judges
David W. Gratton
Jessica M. Lorello
Amanda K. Brailsford

Regular Fall Term for 2020
5/19/20

Boise ............................................................. August 11, 13, 18, and 20
Boise ............................................................. September 1, 3, 15, and 17
Boise ............................................................. October 13, 15, 20, and 22
Boise ............................................................. November 5, 10, 17, and 19
Boise ............................................................. December 8

By Order of the Court
Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk

NOTE: The above is the official notice of the 2020 Fall Term for the Court of Appeals of the State of Idaho, and should be preserved. A formal notice of the setting of oral argument in each case will be sent to counsel prior to each term.

Idaho Supreme Court
Oral Arguments for November 2020
9/17/20

Monday, November 2, 2020 – BOISE
8:50 a.m. State v. Rebo ...................................... #46451
10:00 a.m. Rouwenhorst v. Gem County ............. #47668
11:10 a.m. Asher v. McMillian .......................... #47684

Wednesday, November 4, 2020 – BOISE
8:50 a.m. State v. Orozco ............................. #47263
10:00 a.m. Chernobieff v. Smith ....................... #47337
11:10 a.m. Frizzell v. DeYoung ......................... #47543

Friday, November 6, 2020 – BOISE
8:50 a.m. State v. Gorrin .............................. #46554
10:00 a.m. Weitz v. Weitz ................................ #47483
11:10 a.m. Tucker v. State ................................. #46882

Monday, November 9, 2020 – BOISE
8:50 a.m. Choice Feed v. Montierth ............. #46544
10:00 a.m. State v. Huckabay ......................... #48109
11:10 a.m. Hilton v. Hilton ......................... #47487

Thursday, November 12, 2020 – BOISE
8:50 a.m. State v. Howard ............................. #47367
10:00 a.m. Bromund v. Bromund .................. #47602
11:10 a.m. Abdullah v. State ...................... #46497

Idaho Supreme Court Calendar

Oral arguments held in Boise are now available to watch live streaming via Idaho Public Television’s Idaho Live at: http://idahoptv.org/in sesión/courts.cfm
Please note, playback quality will depend on your Internet connection speed.
Press releases and schedules are posted as they are made available at https://isc.idaho.gov/.

Idaho Appeals Court
Oral Arguments for October 2020
9/17/20

October, 2020 via Zoom

Thursday, October 22, 2020 – BOISE
9:00 a.m. State v. Frakes .............................. #46887/46928
10:30 a.m. State v. Ochoa .............................. #47796

Idaho Supreme Court Calendar

Oral arguments held in Boise are now available to watch live streaming via Idaho Public Television’s Idaho Live at: http://idahoptv.org/in sesión/courts.cfm
Please note, playback quality will depend on your Internet connection speed.
Press releases and schedules are posted as they are made available at https://isc.idaho.gov/.


**Brian Donesley**

**LIQUOR LAW**

- Former Idaho Liquor Chief
- Former Idaho State Senator
- 30+ years experience in liquor law
  - Retail/Wholesale
  - Revocations/Suspensions/Criminal
  - Hearings/Appeals/Trials
  - Lobbying/Governmental Affairs
  - State, Local, Federal, Multi-State
  - National Association of Alcohol Beverage Attorneys (NAABLA)
  - Licensed in Idaho and Washington

Brian Donesley, Attorney at Law
ISB No. 2313
P.O. Box 419, – Boise, ID 83701
Telephone: (208) 343-3851
bdonesley @bdidlaw.com
www.Idaholiquorlaw.com

---

**Grant T. Burgoyne**

**MEDIATOR AND ARBITRATOR**

Certified Professional Mediator
On State and Federal Court Mediator Rosters
Arbitrator
Hearing Officer
AV Rated Attorney

Serving Idaho Attorneys and their Clients

- Employment • Contracts • Torts • Commercial
  - Personal Injury • Civil Rights

(208) 859-8828 | Grant@ADRIIdaho.com
www.ADRIdaho.com

---

**SAGE**

**SETTLEMENT CONSULTING**

**INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS AND THEIR CLIENTS**

Sage’s Comprehensive Services:

- Structured Settlement Annuities
- Market-Based Structured Settlements
- Non-Qualified Structured Settlements
- Attorney Fee Deferral Strategies
- Trust Services
- Qualified Settlement Funds (468B Trusts)
- Government Benefit Preservation
- Mass Tort Settlement Resolution
- Lien Resolution
- Medicare Set-Asides
- Probate Coordination
- Law Firm Financing

www.sagesettlements.com

---

**Audrey Kenney, CSSC**

Sage Settlement Consulting
Senior Settlement Consultant
Phone: (208) 631-7298
akenney@sagesettlements.com
Cases Pending (August 2020)

**Criminal Appeals**

**Denial of counsel**
1. Whether the district court erred by ruling the state could not use the defendant's prior misdemeanor DUI conviction to enhance his current DUI charge to a felony because the record was silent as to whether the defendant waived his right to counsel in the prior DUI case.

   State v. Price  
   Docket No. 47608  
   Court of Appeals

**Double jeopardy**
1. Whether the district court erred by denying defendant's motion to dismiss and finding defendant's retrial was not barred by double jeopardy where his original trial prematurely ended in a mistrial due to circumstances beyond the parties' control, and pursuant to the stipulation of the state and defense counsel.

   State v. Bowman  
   Docket No. 47333  
   Court of Appeals

**Due process**
1. Whether the mid-trial amendment of the charging document to add an alternative means by which the defendant was alleged to have committed the crime violated the defendant's rights to due process and to prepare and present a defense.

   State v. Larsen  
   Docket No. 47148  
   Court of Appeals

**Evidence**
1. Whether the district court erred by excluding the breath testing instrument verification logs and testimony regarding the standard operating procedures governing the certification and measure of uncertainty for breathalyzer devices from evidence at the defendant's trial for felony driving under the influence of alcohol.

   State v. Keys  
   Docket No. 47587  
   Court of Appeals

2. Whether the district court abused its discretion by denying defendant's pretrial motion for the admission of alternate perpetrator evidence on the basis that the evidence was hearsay and did not meet the trustworthiness requirement of I.R.E. § 804(b)(3).

   State v. Blake  
   Docket No. 47157  
   Court of Appeals

**Procedural**
1. Whether the defendant waived his right to confront adverse witnesses and allowing the state to introduce hearsay evidence to prove its allegations that defendant violated the conditions of his probation.

   State v. Gray  
   Docket No. 47203  
   Court of Appeals

2. Whether the district court erred by failing to conduct the analysis required by I.C.R. 14 when addressing the state's motion for joinder of the drug possession charge with other charges.

   State v. Chacon  
   Docket No. 47009  
   Court of Appeals

3. Whether the district court erred by ruling on defendant's motion to seal the criminal case record without first conducting the hearing required by I.C.A.R. § 32(1)(1).

   State v. Clapp  
   Docket No. 47446  
   Court of Appeals

**Search and seizure – suppression of evidence**
1. Whether the district court erred by denying the motion to suppress and finding that the warrantless search of defendant's vehicle was a valid inventory search conducted pursuant to established police procedures.

   State v. Weliever  
   Docket No. 47332  
   Court of Appeals

**Civil Appeals**

**Damages**
1. Whether the trial court erred by concluding plaintiff failed to prove it was damaged by defendant's breach of the parties' trademark settlement agreement.

   Gem State Roofing v. United Components  
   Docket No. 47484  
   Supreme Court

**Post-conviction relief**
1. Whether the district court erred by granting the state's motion for summary dismissal and ruling that petitioner's amended post-conviction petition took the place of, and did not incorporate, his original post-conviction petition and supporting declaration.

   Davis v. State  
   Docket No. 47638  
   Court of Appeals

**Standing**
1. Whether plaintiffs had standing to bring a suit for property damage when plaintiffs did not own the property at the time the damage occurred and pursued their claim based on an assignment from the previous property owner.

   Radford v. Van Orden  
   Docket No. 47364  
   Supreme Court

**Statute of limitations**
1. Whether the district court erred by ruling defendants reinitiated the statute of limitations on plaintiffs' breach of contract claim by acknowledging the existence of the debt in writing.

   Fuentes v. Williams  
   Docket No. 47021  
   Court of Appeals

**Double jeopardy**
1. Whether the district court erred by denying defendant's motion to dismiss and finding defendant's retrial was not barred by double jeopardy where his original trial prematurely ended in a mistrial due to circumstances beyond the parties' control, and pursuant to the stipulation of the state and defense counsel.

   State v. Bowman  
   Docket No. 47333  
   Court of Appeals

**Due process**
1. Whether the mid-trial amendment of the charging document to add an alternative means by which the defendant was alleged to have committed the crime violated the defendant's rights to due process and to prepare and present a defense.

   State v. Larsen  
   Docket No. 47148  
   Court of Appeals

**Evidence**
1. Whether the district court erred by excluding the breath testing instrument verification logs and testimony regarding the standard operating procedures governing the certification and measure of uncertainty for breathalyzer devices from evidence at the defendant's trial for felony driving under the influence of alcohol.

   State v. Keys  
   Docket No. 47587  
   Court of Appeals

2. Whether the district court abused its discretion by denying defendant's pretrial motion for the admission of alternate perpetrator evidence on the basis that the evidence was hearsay and did not meet the trustworthiness requirement of I.R.E. § 804(b)(3).

   State v. Blake  
   Docket No. 47157  
   Court of Appeals

**Procedural**
1. Whether the defendant waived his right to confront adverse witnesses and allowing the state to introduce hearsay evidence to prove its allegations that defendant violated the conditions of his probation.

   State v. Gray  
   Docket No. 47203  
   Court of Appeals

2. Whether the district court erred by failing to conduct the analysis required by I.C.R. 14 when addressing the state's motion for joinder of the drug possession charge with other charges.

   State v. Chacon  
   Docket No. 47009  
   Court of Appeals

3. Whether the district court erred by ruling on defendant's motion to seal the criminal case record without first conducting the hearing required by I.C.A.R. § 32(1)(1).

   State v. Clapp  
   Docket No. 47446  
   Court of Appeals

**Search and seizure – suppression of evidence**
1. Whether the district court erred by denying the motion to suppress and finding that the warrantless search of defendant's vehicle was a valid inventory search conducted pursuant to established police procedures.

   State v. Weliever  
   Docket No. 47332  
   Court of Appeals
2. Whether the officer’s actions of taking defendant into protective custody to transport him to a hospital for mental health treatment and searching him before placing him in the police car were constitutionally reasonable under the community caretaking function.

   State v. Towner
   Docket No. 47396
   Court of Appeals

3. Whether the district court erred by granting the motion to suppress and finding that the officer unlawfully extended the traffic stop by deviating from writing the citation to engage in a conversation with other officers who arrived on scene.

   State v. Riley
   Docket No. 47372
   Court of Appeals

---

**Sentence review**

1. Whether the district court erred by affirming the magistrate’s judgment ordering the defendant to serve consecutive periods of probation for two counts of driving without privileges.

   State v. Magsamen
   Docket No. 47716
   Court of Appeals

2. Whether the district court abused its discretion by suggesting that a 10-year fixed term of confinement could never be appropriate in a homicide case, even though such sentence is permitted under the law.

   State v. Ruff
   Docket No. 47028
   Court of Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarized by:</th>
<th>Lori Fleming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supreme Court Staff Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(208) 334-2246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Martelle, Gordon & Associates, p.a.**

WE CAN HELP WITH DEBT PROBLEMS FROM STUDENT LOANS, IRS OR STATE TAXES, CREDIT CARDS, AND OTHER DEBTS.

**TAX PROBLEMS**
- Offer in Compromise
- Installment Plans
- Innocent Spouse Relief
- Penalty Abatement
- Bankruptcy Discharge
- Tax Court Representation
- Lawsuits in Federal Court

**STUDENT LOAN NEGOTIATIONS**
- Payment Plans
- Forgiveness
- Deferment/Forbearance

**BANKRUPTCY**
- Chapter 7
- Chapter 11
- Chapter 13
- Business & Personal
Anthony P. De Giulio 1939 – 2020

Anthony Paul De Giulio, 80, of Pingree, passed away, Monday, August 24, 2020 at Bingham Memorial Hospital.

Tony was born December 25, 1939 in Pingree, Idaho to Suzio L. and Mary Busico De Giulio.

Tony attended Idaho State University where he joined ROTC. Following ISU, he received his legal degree from Willamette University in Salem, OR. Tony served his country in the United States Army during the Vietnam War and received many medals and awards. He was awarded the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Star, Vietnam Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal. He put together and monitored the first US Army trial defense service.

Tony married Barbara Marie Whiting, together they had four children. They later divorced. On February 4, 1983 he married Nadine Eileen Semler in Colorado Springs, CO.

Upon his honorable discharge in September of 1993 he continued to live in Virginia for a couple of years before moving home to Pingree. Tony then opened up the De Giulio Law Office in Blackfoot in March of 1996. He fully retired in 2005.

Tony is survived by his wife, Nadine of Pingree; children, Nicolas Anthony De Giulio, Leslie Ann De Giulio, Toni Jeanne Andrews, and Gionina Piccolina De Giulio; sister, Anna Kesterson; eight grandchildren; and 11 great grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his parents; daughter, Lynn Marie; and brothers, Eugene and Ernie De Giulio.

Edward J. Anson 1951 – 2020

Beloved husband, father, grandfather, and friend, Edward “Ed” Joseph Anson, 69, of Pinehurst, Idaho, passed away Aug. 11, 2020, at St. Patrick’s Hospital in Missoula, MT. He was born Jan. 9, 1951, in Philadelphia, PA; Ed was the son of Edward and Theresa (Whelan) Anson.

Ed attended Washington College of Maryland, where he studied English and political science. During his undergrad time, Ed took a year off to travel and work across Europe. He then moved west, where he attended and graduated from Gonzaga University with a law degree. After graduation, Ed moved to Wallace, Idaho, where he began practicing law. He practiced at Anson & Sweney for a few years before opening up the Coeur d’Alene branch of Witherspoon Kelly in the late 1980s, where he worked until he retired in April 2017.

On Oct. 13, 1990, Ed was united in marriage to Marla, in Paris, France. Ed had many passions in life. He enjoyed golf, skiing, old movies, photography, and listening to music, especially the Rolling Stones. Ed was a world traveler, with a particular affinity for France, Italy, and Mexico. He was also known as a “foodies,” enjoying all types of cuisines and cooking for the family. At the end of the day, Ed loved nothing more than putting his nose in a good book.

Ed is survived by his beloved wife of 30 years, Marla Anson; four children, Ryan (Ashley) Bailey, James (Eryka) Anson, Stephen Anson, and Rachelle Evans; and six grandchildren, Kyncie, Mason, Lexi, Brooklyn, Olivia, and Violet. Ed was preceded in death by his parents.

John A. Doerr 1933 – 2020

John Doerr of Twin Falls, Idaho, 87, died of complications from acute aging on August 22, 2020. He was born in Bismarck, North Dakota to Mary Heisler Doerr and August Doerr, on May 24, 1933. John was a loving husband, father, son, brother, and friend. He had many passions in his life, among them the practice of law, hunting and fishing, gathering the bounty of the wild, gardening, travel and adventure, visiting with family and friends, the study of philosophy and classic literature, music and dance, and lifting a glass of good drink. He celebrated life and lived it
to the fullest, knowing it was a blessed gift, not to be taken for granted.

John finished his education at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, in 1958 when he received his J.D. During his time in school, in the summers he traveled to northern Idaho, where he worked for the forest service and developed his love of the mountains, adventure, and the State of Idaho.

John started his practice of law with his father, August, in Napoleon, ND, for the first five years, then made the decision to pursue an opportunity to work for a law firm in Twin Falls, Idaho, where he practiced law until a week before his death. John had a long honorable career as a lawyer.

John married Rosemarie Hansen shortly after they met in 1954 and spent the next 60 years together, until Rosemarie’s death in 2016. John’s second love, Joan Davies, blossomed late in his life.

John is survived by his second love, Joan Davies; sisters, Lori and Trish; children, Kathleen Willard, Thomas Doerr, Michele Harris, and Mark Doerr; 12 grandchildren; and 11 great-grandchildren.

Thomas R. Cushman
1946 – 2020


Thomas loved his wife Gail; his children, Elizabeth Hume (Chris) and Cole Cushman (Pam). His love of his grandchildren was endless. Nathanial and Tommy Cushman, and Roe and Maggie Hume are his proudest legacy.

His work life always centered around the law with time spent as a judge in Gooding, Idaho. He served in the Idaho Legislature, and was a special master for the Snake River Basin Adjudication. He was a Boise County Prosecuting Attorney and Public Defender in Orofino, Idaho.

His interests spanned a wide spectrum. He loved to cook, read, dance, sing, ski, golf, and travel. The love of travel was shared with his lifelong companion and adventurer, Gail, and together they visited all 50 states, 30ish countries, and all seven continents.

He was particularly proud of his service to his country in the United States Marine Corps. Tom and Gail were married for 53 years and never looked back.

Keeping track

Despite our best efforts, there are times when a member’s death remains undocumented. Upon learning of a fellow attorney’s death, please feel free to contact Lindsey Welfley with the information at lwelfley@isb.idaho.gov. This will allow us to honor the individual with details “In Memoriam.”

WE ARE COMMERCIAL LITIGATION EXPERTS

It’s who we are. It’s all we do.
We’ve handled some of the toughest, most complex business cases in the Northwest. And because we represent both defendants and plaintiffs, we understand your opponents’ motivations and strategies — and what it takes to win.

Andersen Schwartzman Woodard Dempsey PLLC • 208.342.4411
101 S Capitol Blvd, Suite 1600, Boise • aswdpllc.com
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Appoints New Bankruptcy Judge for District of Idaho

SAN FRANCISCO, CA — Judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit have appointed Noah G. Hillen as the next bankruptcy judge on the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Idaho. His 14-year term began on August 31, 2020, when he took his oath of office administered by Chief Bankruptcy Judge Joseph Meier of the District of Idaho. Mr. Hillen will maintain chambers in Boise.

Mr. Hillen, 38, engaged in private practice as a Chapter 7 trustee and attorney in Boise since 2014, primarily in bankruptcy and commercial law. Previously, he worked as an associate attorney from 2010 to 2013 at Moffatt, Thomas, Barrett, Rock & Fields Chtd. in Boise. From 2009 to 2010, Mr. Hillen was an associate attorney at Hall, Farley, Oberrecht, and Blanton P.A., in Boise.

Mr. Hillen received his Bachelor of Arts from the College of Idaho and his juris doctorate from the University of Idaho College of Law. Following law school, Mr. Hillen clerked at Idaho’s Fourth Judicial District Court for Judge Joel D. Horton, who was then elevated to the Idaho Supreme Court, where Mr. Hillen continued his clerkship with Justice Horton until 2009.

The U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Idaho received 3,665 bankruptcy filings in 2019. The court is authorized two permanent judgeships.

Judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit have statutory responsibility for selecting and appointing bankruptcy judges in the nine western states that comprise the Ninth Circuit. The court uses a comprehensive merit selection process for the initial appointment and for reappointments. Bankruptcy judges serve a 14-year renewable term and handle all bankruptcy-related matters under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

Promotion of Captain Anil Kimball, Idaho Army National Guard

FORT IRWIN, CA – On August 14, 2020, Anil Kimball was promoted to the rank of Captain. Captain Kimball is a Judge Advocate in the Idaho Army National Guard. He is currently serving a one-year mobilization in the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Fort Irwin, California, where he is focusing in the Army legal functional area of administrative law. Upon his return to Idaho, Captain Kimball will resume his duties as the National Security Law advisor in the Brigade Legal Section, 116th Cavalry Brigade Combat Team, Idaho Army National Guard, where he will continue to advise commanders on the Law of Armed Conflict. Captain Kimball has served in the Idaho Army National Guard since October 2018 and has been a member of the Idaho State Bar since January 2018.

Thank you, Tom

After over three years of working with Tom Walker at Generations Law Group, I am joining the law firm of Ludwig Shoufler Miller Johnson, LLP. Tom gave me my first job out of law school, and I wanted to take this time to express my appreciation for his mentorship and friendship for these past three years.

Despite our 40-year age and nearly 10,000 Bar number difference, when Tom started his new firm, he hired me as his associate. Through his encouragement and guidance, I have been able to be extremely active in the Bar, getting elected as an officer of the 4th District Bar Association, providing pro bono service to veterans, and being elected Chair of the Idaho Military Legal Alliance.

I will forever be grateful to Tom. Tom is an expert in complex litigation, especially in the areas of Business Law and Trusts and Estates. I would recommend him to any attorney or client that has questions in these areas. My family and I look forward to our continued friendship. Thank you again, Tom.

~ T. Matthew Wolfe II
Idaho Academy of Leadership for Lawyers Class of 2020-2021 Announced

STATEWIDE – The Idaho Academy of Leadership for Lawyers proudly announces their 2020-2021 class. The participants will be the Academy’s ninth class. The diverse makeup of the class features attorneys from four judicial districts who encompass an array of practice areas.

Participants have pursued legal careers in the fields of criminal law, health care, real estate, local government, business, family law and estate planning as in-house counsel, in solo, small and large firms and for local government. Participants will meet in Boise over five sessions for this interactive leadership training program designed specifically for lawyers. The first session will take place September 25th and 26th with Graduation set for May 7, 2021.

Special thanks to the Fourth District Bar Association and the Fifth District Bar Association for their generous financial support of the Academy. For more information please contact Teresa Baker, Idaho State Bar Program and Legal Education Director at (208) 334-4500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idaho Academy of Leadership for Lawyers Class of 2020-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah M. Brekke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke’s Health System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer R. Chadband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zasio Enterprises, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill S. Holinka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holinka Law, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit A. Kreimeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnel, Wagner, Sykes + Stacey, PLLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler J. Rands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RandLaw, PLLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth D. Sonnichsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Evett, PLLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>CLE Credits</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ethics in Trust and Estate Planning</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Live Audio Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COVID-19’s Impact on Idaho’s Healthcare Providers</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Live Webcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Family Law Fall Conference</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Live Webcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Idaho Pro Bono Week CLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Live Webcast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>CLE Credits</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mobile Monday CLE Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professionalism and Ethics Section Annual CLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Monday CLE Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Division of Government Responsibilities in the COVID-19 Era</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics of Beginning and Ending Client Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethics and Changing Law Firm Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Monday CLE Series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information and to register, visit [www.isb.idaho.gov/CLE](http://www.isb.idaho.gov/CLE).
**Statement of Ownership**

**Statement of Ownership, Management, and Circulation (All Periodlic Publications Except Requester Publications)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Title of Publication</td>
<td>The Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Date of Filing</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of Issues Published per Year</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Frequency of Issue</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Full Name and Complete Mailing Address of Publisher, Editor, and Owner</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Idaho State Bar Building, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Complete Mailing Address of Headquarters</td>
<td>701 W. Jefferson Blvd., Suite 1800, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Owner or Party with Other than 10% Interest</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Nature and Address of Each Person Who Owns 10% or More of the Outstanding Voting Securities</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Total Circulation</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Full Name and Complete Mailing Address of Immediate Executive Official</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Circulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Statement of Circulation Date</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Total Number of Copies Published during the 12 Months Prior to the Date of Filing (11/2019)</td>
<td>4,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total Number of Copies Distributed for Public Distribution During the 12 Months Prior to the Date of Filing (11/2019)</td>
<td>4,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Copies Sent to Home Delivery Subscribers During the 12 Months Prior to the Date of Filing (11/2019)</td>
<td>4,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Copies Sent to Nonprofit Organizations During the 12 Months Prior to the Date of Filing (11/2019)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Total Paid Circulation (Add columns c, d, and e)</td>
<td>4,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Total Distribution (Subtract c from f)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Copies Not Distributed (Add columns d and e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Distribution (Subtract c from f)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Full Name and Address of Owner, Editor, and Publisher</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Full Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Total Circulation</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Full Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Outstanding Voting Securities</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Financial Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Full Name and Address of Publisher, Editor, and Owner</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Full Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Outstanding Voting Securities</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Full Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Total Circulation</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Full Name and Address of Owner, Editor, and Publisher</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Full Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Outstanding Voting Securities</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Full Name and Address of Each Nonprofit Organization Which Owns 10% or More of Total Circulation</td>
<td>Idaho State Bar, Boise, ID 83702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32% of all lawyers under 31 and 21% of all lawyers have a DRINKING PROBLEM

28% of lawyers struggle with DEPRESSION

19% of lawyers have symptoms of ANXIETY DISORDER

11% of lawyers have experienced SUICIDAL THOUGHTS

- These statistics mean there’s a chance it will be you and certainly it will be someone you know. Care for your colleagues and yourself.

- When you see something, do something. These issues can destroy lives and damage lawyers' reputations.

- Getting help for a friend or asking for help ourselves saves lives, futures, families, and practices. Ignoring or doing nothing can be consequential.

SAVE A LIFE! CALL US!  
Idaho Lawyer Assistance Program Saves Lives Absolutely 100% Confidential

24 Hour Hotline
866.460.9014 | 208.891.4726
www.SouthworthAssociates.net
UBS provides a powerful integration of **structured settlements** and **wealth planning** for you and your clients.

By integrating structured settlements with one of the world’s leading wealth management firms, your clients can now receive unbiased advice and long-term planning to help secure their financial needs now and in the future. With over 7,000 Financial Advisors in 350 offices across the country, we stand ready to serve you.

**Extensive capabilities for a range of settlement solutions**

- Structured settlements
- Structured attorney fees
- Traditional wealth planning
- Special needs trusts
- Medicare set-aside trusts
- Qualified settlement funds (468b trusts)
- Revocable and irrevocable trusts
- Guardian and conservatorship accounts
- Court controlled accounts
- Fiduciary bonding
- Trust and estate planning
- Life insurance and long-term care
- Banking services

For more information on the capabilities of Vasconcellos Investment Consulting at UBS, or for a second opinion on your current wealth management strategy, please contact:

**Vasconcellos Investment Consulting**
William L. Vasconcellos, CIMA®, CRPC®
Senior Vice President–Wealth Management
1161 West River Street, Suite 340, Boise, ID 83702
208-947-2006 888-844-7452 william.vasconcellos@ubs.com
www.ubs.com/fa/williamvasconcellos

We will not rest  UBS
The ability to accept payments online has become vital for all firms. When you need to get it right, trust LawPay’s proven solution.

As the industry standard in legal payments, LawPay is the only payment solution vetted and approved by all 50 state bar associations, 60+ local and specialty bars, the ABA, and the ALA.

Developed specifically for the legal industry to ensure trust account compliance and deliver the most secure, PCI-compliant technology, LawPay is proud to be the preferred, long-term payment partner for more than 50,000 law firms.