## UIdaho Law Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law

Confederate Colville Tribes v. Walton (Colville Tribes)

Hedden-Nicely

6-22-1979

## Response by the United States to findings and conclusions and order proposed by the State of Washington

Robert M. Sweeny Assistant United States Attorney

James J. Gillespie United States Attorney

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/walton

## **Recommended** Citation

Sweeny, Robert M. and Gillespie, James J., "Response by the United States to findings and conclusions and order proposed by the State of Washington" (1979). *Confederate Colville Tribes v. Walton (Colville Tribes)*. 48. https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/walton/48

This Brief is brought to you for free and open access by the Hedden-Nicely at Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Confederate Colville Tribes v. Walton (Colville Tribes) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. For more information, please contact annablaine@uidaho.edu.

1				
2				
3	FILED IN THE			
4	U & DISTRICT COURT			
5	Eastern District of Washington			
6	JUN 22 1979 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON J. R. FALLOUIST, Clerk			
8	COLVILLE CONFEDERATED TRIBES, )			
	Plaintiff, )			
9	Civil No. 3421			
10	-vs- ) Civii No. 5421			
11	BOYD WALTON, JR., and KENNA ) JEANNE WALTON, his wife; and			
12	WILSON WALTON and MARGARET ) WALTON, his wife,			
13	) RESPONSE BY THE UNITED Defendants, STATES TO FINDINGS AND			
14	) CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER STATE OF WASHINGTON, PROPOSED BY THE STATE			
15	) OF WASHINGTON Defendant-Intervenor.			
16	)			
17	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )			
18	Plaintiff, )			
19	-vs- ) Civil No. 3831			
20	WILLIAM BOYD WALTON and KENNA )			
21	JEANNE WALTON, his wife; and the STATE OF WASHINGTON, )			
22	Defendants. )			
23				
23 24	Comes now the United States of America, plaintiff in Civil			
	No. C-3831, and in response to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions			
25	of Law and Order proposed for entry by the State of Washington,			
26	states as follows:			
27	l. The pleading proposed by the State of Washington, in			
28	general, follows the Court's oral decision of June 4, 1979.			

2. However, the United States objects to the finding that limits the Colville Tribes reserved water right to 428.8 acre feet of water this year calculated upon the acreage presently irrigated by the Colville Tribes for the reason that this improperly 1. - RESPONSE BY THE U.S.

FORM OBD-93 SEP 77

29

30

31

32

DOJ

uses irrigated acreage as a limit upon the Tribe's reserved water right rather than a method of measurement of such reserved water right, and since the Court has recognized the right of the Tribes to use waters reserved to the Tribes for purposes other than irrigation (i.e., a fishery), that in order to be consistent the Court should recognize the Tribe's reserved right to 666.4 acre feet of water as quantified by Judge Neill.

3. The United States objects to the State's proposed Finding No. 1(c), upon the following grounds:

(a) The Judgment of February 9, 1979, did not confirm any rights to water in the defendants Walton that were not subject to the paramount reserved water right of the Colville Tribes.

(b) As stated above, the waters reserved to the Colville Tribes should be calculated as 666.4 acre feet rather than 428.8 acre feet.

(c) Defendants Walton certificate of water right from the State of Washington is for irrigation of 65 acres by diversion from No-Name Creek; defendants Walton have no state-sanctioned right to withdraw ground waters within the No-Name Creek Basin for irrigation purposes;

(d) The proposed Findings intimates that the Colville Tribes must obtain approval from the State of Washington to utilize waters on trust lands within No Name Creek Valley where the water use exceeds 428.8 acre feet, and such a finding is not sanctioned in law nor is such finding necessary to this order under the facts presently before the Court.

4. With respect to the language proposed by the State in paragraph 3 of the Order, it is respectfully suggested that in view of the water situation in No Name Creek Valley that the parties 2. - RESPONSE BY THE U.S.

DOJ

FORM OBD-93 SEP 77

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

	per yes	3	0
-	é	<u> </u>	
1	be directed	to submit weekly ra	ther than monthly reports to the
2	U.S.G.S. of	the amount of water	withdrawn or diverted by the
3	parties.		
4			Respectfully Submitted,
5			JAMES J. GILLESPIE
6	4		United States Attorney
7			16150-
8			ROBERT M. SWEENEY Assistant United States Attorney
9			P. O. Box 1494
10			Spokane, Wa. 99210
11	5		(509) 456-3811
12	-		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32	3 RESPONS	E BY THE U.S.	

Ũ

FORM OBD-93 SEP 77

I DOJ