

WALLACE N. JIBSON
355 SOUTH 6 EAST
LOGAN, UTAH

MINUTES OF
BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
ANNUAL MEETING
April 28, 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Those in Attendance	1, 2
Approval of the Minutes of the Nov. 26, 1963 meeting	2
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	2
Report of the Assistant Secretary	3 (insert)
Report of the Budget Committee	4
Election of Officers	5
Address by Mr. F. M. Clinton, Regional Director, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation	5 (insert)
Statement for Utah on Bear River Project, by Com. Jay R. Bingham . . .	6
Statement for Wyoming on Bear River Project, by E. J. Van Camp . . .	7
Statement for Idaho on Bear River Project, by Dr. Evan M. Kackley . .	7 (insert)
Report of State Engineer's Committee on Stock-Watering Ponds, by Wayne D. Criddle, Utah State Engineer	8

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

Minutes of Annual Meeting held in the Water Conference Room
Utah State Capitol
April 28, 1964

The Annual meeting of the Bear River Commission convened in the Water Conference Room of the Utah State Capitol Building, Salt Lake City, Utah on Tuesday, April 28, 1964 at 9:30 a.m. Chairman E. O. Larson presided over the meeting.

Voting Commissioners present:

IDAHO

Carl E. Tappan, Boise
Melvir Lauridsen, Montpelier

UTAH

Jay R. Bingham, Bountiful
L. B. Johnson, Vice Chairman, Randolph
A. V. Smoot, Corinne

WYOMING

Floyd A. Bishop, Cheyenne
S. Reed Dayton, Cokeville

UNITED STATES

E. O. Larson, Chairman and U. S. Representative

Alternate Commissioners and Advisers present:

IDAHO

Stephen W. Boller, Idaho Attorney-General's Office, Boise
Russell D. Stoker, Soda Springs (Adviser)
J. Warren Serrine, Montpelier (Alternate)

UTAH

Wayne D. Criddle, Salt Lake City (Adviser)
Dallin W. Jensen, Ass't. Attorney General, Salt Lake City (Adviser)
Ross Plant, Richmond (Adviser)
Glenn McKinnon, Randolph (Alternate)
Robert B. Porter, Salt Lake City (Adviser)
Robert J. Potter, Garland (Alternate)

WYOMING

Earl Lloyd, Cheyenne
John Teichert, Cokeville
David P. Miller, Rock Springs
E. J. Van Camp, Cheyenne
Marvin Bollschweiler, Evanston, Water Commissioner

LEGAL ADVISER TO THE BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

E. J. Skeen, Attorney, Salt Lake City, Utah

Others present:

Wallace N. Jibson, Ass't. Secretary, Bear River Commission, Logan, Utah
Robert D. Berrett, Controller, Utah Water & Power Board, Salt Lake City
Janice M. Hammond, Secretary, Utah Water & Power Board, Salt Lake City
Donald C. Norseth, Utah State Engineer's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah
F. M. Clinton, Regional Director, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake
E. K. Thomas, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City, Utah
Dean Bischoff, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Logan, Utah
Reed Budge, Caribou County Commissioner, Soda Springs, Idaho
R. J. Cranney, Preston, Idaho
Dr. Evan M. Kackley, Bear River Protective Committee, Wayan, Idaho
M. C. Grover, Extension Service, Malad, Idaho
Leonard Clark, Bear River Coordinating Committee, Malad, Idaho
Morgan Harris, Oneida County Coordinating Committee, Malad, Idaho
Frank O. Reeder, Box Elder County Commissioner, Brigham, Utah
Ray Finch, Bear River Coordinating Committee, Tremonton, Utah
L. D. Bodily, Bear River Coordinating Committee, Lewiston, Utah
Lamont E. Tueller, Bear River Coordinating Committee, Logan, Utah
William D. Burton, Box Elder County Commissioner, Tremonton, Utah
Grover R. Harper, Box Elder County Commissioner, Corinne, Utah
Andy Walquist, KCPX TV News, Salt Lake City, Utah
Harry Fuller, Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah
Fullmer Allred, Bear River Coordinating Committee, Brigham City, Utah
Marion Olsen, Paradise, Utah

CHAIRMAN LARSON: We will declare a quorum present. Our first item of business this morning will be the consideration of the minutes of our November meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

COM. SMOOT: I move that the Commission approve the minutes of our regular meeting held November 26 as published.

COM. BINGHAM: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried.

The next item of business is the report of the Chairman. I do not have a report this morning. The next item of business will be the report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Before we get started with the Secretary's report, I would like to introduce Mr. F. M. Clinton, Regional Director of Region IV, Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Dean Bischoff from the Logan Bureau office, and Mr. E. K. Thomas, who is also with the Bureau of Reclamation.

MR. BERRETT: I will give you the Financial Report from July 1, 1963 to March 31, 1964. We have had a total expenditure of \$21,938.65. We have an unexpended cash balance of \$20,550.30. You will find a complete breakdown of our expenditures in the report that I have passed to you. Are there any questions?

COM. JOHNSON: I move that the Commission accept the report of the Secretary-Treasurer as presented.

COM. TAPPAN: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried.

We will now have the report of the Assistant Secretary.

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

MR. JIBSON: Gentlemen, in the interest of time, I will read my report to you and questions will be discussed as we proceed.

(see insert for report of Assistant Secretary)

REPORT TO BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
ANNUAL MEETING

April 28, 1964

Wallace N. Jibson
Assistant Secretary

Water Supply Forecast and Streamflow

Adequate water supplies are expected over most of Bear River basin during this irrigation season. April snow surveys are not completed, but because of cool weather with later snowmelt at intermediate elevations, any change over the April 1 forecast is most likely to be upward.

Comparison of expected seasonal runoff with last year and a longtime average is shown in the following table:

	Runoff in Acre-feet April - September		Forecast	Percent
	<u>Average</u> <u>1943-63</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>This Year</u>	<u>of Average</u>
Bear River nr Utah-Wyo State line	116,100	89,900	95,000	82%*
Smiths Fork above diversions	111,700	95,100	112,000	100%*
Total	227,800	185,000	207,000	91%

* Differs from published Water Supply Outlook because of period of average.

Bear Lake is now (April 22) storing 782,000 acre-feet at elevation 5,914.42 feet which is 0.27 foot above the present irrigation reserve; however, there have been no releases for power generation.

Woodruff Narrows Reservoir began spilling April 17 or about two weeks ahead of last year. Irrigation holdover storage of 4,260 acre-feet remained in the reservoir October 1, 1963, also the full holdover of fishery water in the amount of 4,000 acre-feet for release during the winter period. Storage of 18,240 acre-feet is permitted for irrigation each year, but as the total reservoir content was about 11,000 acre-feet on October 1, the spillway crest was reached with the addition of 17,000 acre-feet.

Moderate releases from Sulphur Creek Reservoir are being made in order to avoid extensive spilling at a later date.

Stream-Gaging Program

Last month the Bureau of Reclamation requested installation and operation of five gaging stations in the lower basin to be operated for a period of two or more years. Financing is to be by transfer of funds from Reclamation to the Geological Survey on a quarterly repay basis.

We have proceeded with installation because only Federal funds are involved, and the gages are now in operation at the following sites:

Bear River near Smithfield, Utah

Logan River below Blacksmith Fork near Logan, Utah

Malad River near Plymouth, Utah

Malad River near Bear River City, Utah

Duckville Canal (from Malad River) near Bear River City, Utah

A gaging station was installed and placed in operation as of October 1, 1963 on East Fork Little Bear River above Porcupine Reservoir. This will be a long-term, water management class of station. Also, a discontinued station on Bear River near Corinne has been reactivated for data needed in studies of Great Salt Lake which are now being conducted by the Quality of Water Branch of the Survey at Salt Lake City.

A permanent station was installed last fall below the Whitney dam site on West Fork Bear River. The Forest Service has concurred on its location as an operational station for the contemplated Whitney Reservoir. A small Parshall flume with overflow section will be added upon completion of the dam.

The Public Health Service terminated its program of streamflow records on Cub River Canal and Worm Creek as of June 30, 1963. The records were continued at our expense through September 30, 1963 to complete the water year and have been computed for publication.

Budget Estimates for 1966-67 Biennium

Proposed budgets for the next biennium will be required by State agencies during the next few months and prior to the fall meeting of this Commission. The following estimates will have been presented to the Budget Committee before the Commission meeting for committee action and recommendations.

An increasing work load on Logan office personnel, brought about in part by the new gaging stations, will necessitate an extra engineer or engineering technician working full time or part time, depending on availability. Operational funds from the Bureau of Reclamation will be on a year to year basis but at this time are believed to be firm through 1966 fiscal year. These funds will finance the larger part of the additional personnel requirement.

It is suggested that each State budget to provide for a part of the added personnel needs and for periodic increases in salary due about January 1, 1966. If the two-year amount per State were raised from the present budget of \$20,500 to \$21,500, matching funds would be requested from the Geological Survey which would result in a \$6,000 increase for the biennium.

Annual Report, 1963

We regret that pressure for earlier completion of 1963 streamflow records and the urgency of difficult gaging-station construction this spring have delayed the 1963 Annual Report of the Commission beyond April 1.

Publication of regular streamflow records will be earlier this year than ever before, thus we are making progress in reducing the long period between collection and publication of records. Meanwhile, we are aiming at May 20 for completion and printing of the 1963 Commission report.

Applications for Appropriation

Relatively few applications were submitted to the State Engineers since our last meeting. These have been summarized on the following pages for examination by the Commission.

Applic Number	Date of Filing	Name	Source	Use	Location	Amount
			<u>STATE OF UTAH</u>			
35719	11-13-63	Joseph H. Anderson	Waste Water	Irrigation	S33 T13N R1W Cache	1.5 cfs
35732	11-20-63	Jennie P. Reese	Underground	Stock Water	S6 T12N R1E Cache	0.01 cfs
35760	12- 4-63	Joseph B. White	Cold Water Spring	Fish Culture	S9 T10N R2E Cache	4.0 cfs
35762	12- 5-63	College Irrig. Co.	Underground	Irrigation	S21 T11N R1E Cache	4.50 cfs
35780	12-17-63	Frank Moeller et al	Underground	Domestic	S19 T13N R6E Rich	0.015 cfs
35809	1- 9-64	River Heights Town	Underground	Municipal	S3 T11N R1E Cache	2.0 cfs
35823	1-13-64	Howard H. Johnson	Drain	Irrigation	S14 T12N R1W Cache	0.10 cfs
35831	1-16-64	Utah State Univ.	Underground	Hydraulic Laboratory	S36 T12N R1E Cache	10.0 cfs
35832	1-16-64	Utah State Univ.	Underground	Hydraulic Laboratory	S36 T12N R1E Cache	10.0 cfs
35833	1-16-64	Utah State Univ.	Underground	Hydraulic Laboratory	S35 T12N R1E Cache	10.0 cfs
35841	1-20-64	Robert Thalman	Underground	Stock Water	S12 T11N R1W Cache	0.05 cfs
35842	1-20-64	Vivian M. Allen	Cub River	Irrigation	S3 T14N R1E Cache	2.00 cfs
35847	1-21-64	Leon Rogers	Birch Creek Spring	Irrigation	S13 T9N R1E Cache	0.022 cfs
35867	1-31-64	G. E. Pyle	Underground	Irrigation, Stock	S28 T12N R1E Cache	0.015 cfs
35870	2- 4-64	William V. Davis	Springs	Irrigation, Stock	S35 T8N R2W Box Elder	0.1 cfs
35873	2- 6-64	State Land Board	Stump Hollow Spring	Irrigation, Domestic	S17 T14N R4E Cache	0.033 cfs
35894	2-14-64	Melvin C. Maughan	Underground	Irrig., Dom., Stock	S22 T10N R2W Box Elder	1.0 cfs
35927	2-28-64	Nettie Anderson	Spring	Irrigation, Stock	S35 T12N R1E Cache	0.1 cfs
35938	3- 5-64	William J. Francis	Underground	Irrigation, Stock	S35 T9N R2W Box Elder	0.5 cfs
35970	3-12-64	Ernest Olsen	Underground	Irrigation, Stock	S16 T12N R1E Cache	1.0 cfs
35985	3-24-64	Woodruff L.D.S. Ward	Underground	Irrigation	S8 T9N R7E Rich	0.5 cfs
35995	3-27-64	John A. Hansen	Underground	Irrigation, Domestic	S19 T12N R1E Cache	0.1 cfs
36031	4- 7-64	Charles W. Ames	Underground	Irrig., Dom., Stock	S22 T11N R1E Cache	0.1 cfs
36035	4- 8-64	Kanichi Horiye	Unnamed Stream	Irrigation, Stock	S17 T11N R2W Box Elder	2.0 cfs

19.645
Cons. Use
applic.

Applic Number	Date of Filing	Name	Source	Use	Location	Amount
			<u>STATE OF WYOMING</u>			
19 4/170	2- 7-64	Roger F. Pierce	Sims Draw trib. Bear	Stock	S35 T16N R121W Uinta	0.6 ac-ft
19 5/170	2- 7-64	Roger F. Pierce	Faddis Draw trib. Bear	Stock	S26 T16N R121W Uinta	0.5 ac-ft
19 1/175	2-18-64	Everett Dayton	Smiths Fork	Irrigation	Tr69 T25N R118W Lincoln	0.442 cfs
UW 2-1-152	3-11-64	John J. Gastanago	Bear River	Irrig. Dom. Stock	S5 T24N R119W Lincoln	1350 GPM
			<u>STATE OF IDAHO</u>			
			None			
						300
						f.
						4,542
						Total

Additional comments by Mr. Jibson on his report:

Mr. Teichert informed me this morning that above-normal water content has been recorded on the Smiths Fork snow survey. Our early peak has passed for the small streams, but medium and high elevation snow is still there. We will have a supply at or above normal from all indications.

With regard to the new applications for appropriations in the three States, these have been very minimal this time. Most of the applications are from Utah in the Cache Valley area and are for underground development. Wyoming had four applications also for relatively small amounts. Two of these Wyoming applications are for stock water. Idaho indicated that they have not received any applications in the Bear River drainage.

COM. JOHNSON: Has the Rich County well application been approved?

MR. JIBSON: I don't know whether or not it has been approved. We receive only the record of applications filed.

COM. JOHNSON: I would like to go back to the Health Department's pulling off the Cub River (gaging stations). Are they completely off the Bear River now?

MR. JIBSON: Yes, they are through now. The Public Health Service was interested in checking pollution from the sugar factories (and other industry) in the area. They discontinued their participation as of June 30, 1963.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Are there any questions on Mr. Jibson's report?

We will have Mr. Smoot, Chairman of the Budget Committee, give us a report on their meeting now.

REPORT OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

(Mr. Smoot requested a detailed report on budget estimates from Mr. Jibson)

MR. JIBSON: The present budget for 1964-65 biennium is \$99,000.00 for the two-year period. What we are proposing here today for the 1966-67 biennium is as follows:

<u>Allocation of Budget</u>	<u>Approved Budget 1964-65 Biennium</u>	<u>Proposed Budget 1966-67 Biennium</u>		
U. S. Geological Survey	\$37,500	45,800 \$ 40,500	} 64,500	2 yr 1 yr 32,250 - 1450 30,800 Coop agreement
Idaho	20,500	21,500		
Utah	20,500	21,500		
Wyoming	<u>20,500</u>	<u>21,500</u>		
Total	\$99,000	110,300 \$105,000		
<u>Allocation by Program</u>				
Stream-gaging Program	\$75,000	91,600 \$ 81,000	} 18,700	24,000
Compact Administration	<u>24,000</u>	<u>24,000</u>		
Total	\$99,000	110,300 \$105,000		

Revised: Nov 23, 1964
Commission Budget not changed

MR. JIBSON: Essentially, this increase is in the stream-gaging portion of our program. This is now a more realistic allocation of the budget; Geological Survey will stand 50 percent of the increase.

COM. SMOOT: The Budget Committee met this morning and two members were present at the meeting. We examined the details of this proposed budget compared with the present budget as approved by the Commission. The Budget Committee has determined that this increase that is being asked now from the States of \$1,000 each is a reasonable request. The U. S. Geological Survey will be asked for half of the overall increase or \$3,000. We would like to get an increase in contribution from each State in the amount of \$1,000. We would like to have Mr. Jibson's recommendations on this amount approved.

I move that the Bear River Commission approve the report of the Assistant Secretary as presented including the provision that the contribution from each Compact State be increased from \$20,500 to \$21,500 for the 1966-67 period.

COM. LAURIDSEN: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried.

We will now go to the matter of the election of officers for the Bear River Commission for this year. What are the desires of the Commission?

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

COM. SMOOT: Inasmuch as it has been the custom of the Commission:

I move that the present officers be elected for another year. These officers are: Jay R. Bingham, Secretary-Treasurer; Wallace N. Jibson, Assistant Secretary; and Mr. L. B. Johnson, Vice Chairman.

COM. BISHOP: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried. Our standing committees are appointed by the Chairman, and they will remain the same.

Budget

A. V. Smoot
Melvin Lauridsen

J. W. Myers

Operations

Cleo L. Swenson
S. Reed Dayton

Lawrence B. Johnson

State Engineer's

Wayne D. Criddle
Floyd A. Bishop

Carl E. Tappan

I think that we will call upon our guest speaker, Regional Director, Mr. F. M. Clinton, to address us now.

(See insert for address by Mr. Clinton)

REVISION OF BEAR RIVER PROJECT REPORT

Address by Mr. F. M. Clinton
Regional Director, U.S.B.R., Region 4

Presented at

Bear River Commission Meeting
April 28, 1964

Salt Lake City, Utah

REVISION OF BEAR RIVER PROJECT REPORT

It is a pleasure to be here this morning to tell you of our work on the Bear River Project. This is my first Bear River Commission Meeting, and I feel it an honor to meet here with you.

Our investigations have been going on for a long time in the Bear River area. I moved here to Salt Lake City in 1960, and since I have been here we have finished the preliminary work on the Bear River Project and distributed our preliminary report on this project in the local area for comments.

The Bureau proceeded after the Compact was signed by the states, to prepare the most economical plan to develop the Bear River below Bear Lake to its full potential. These investigations by the Bureau involved investigating alternate plans of developing main stream storage, what lands to put water on, soil conditions, etc.

In the beginning, we recognized the need for water for both full and supplemental supplies was mainly on the west side of the River. The east side was more nearly developed to its full capacity. The big job was to get main stem Bear River waters out on the lands on the west side. Our original plan was put together and completed in 1960-61. This report was released in 1962. This report has been circularized and commented on since then. I would like, first, to go through this plan very briefly.

This plan was made up primarily of a main stem development, and an added portion of tributary development. We will take up the tributaries first. The Cub and Worm Rivers are included in our development. We selected the Glendale Reservoir on Worm Creek as a potential development. This would be an enlargement of the existing reservoir and

would develop supplemental water mostly. We investigated the Mapleton site on that stream system also. We haven't given up on the Mapleton site completely yet. We will look at this site more closely before construction plans are finalized.

To develop the volume of water that is on the main stem that flows over Cutler Dam every year will involve a large storage reservoir with a 300,000 acre-foot capacity or more. This must be done on the main stem. We looked at the Oneida Narrows site, and we considered enlarging the Cutler Reservoir. We finally selected the Oneida Narrows site as the best potential development. In the preliminary plan, this site had a 225,000 acre-foot active storage capacity. We would not have to pump the water onto the land, because we would take out at 255 feet above stream level and gravity would do the rest for us.

We investigated power development at the Oneida Narrows site also. We decided that this was not feasible. In dry years the entire flow would have to be stored and none would be left over for power development. Under this plan, 109,000 acres were to be developed and divided between both states.

We investigated sites on the lower river below Cutler Dam also. We finally selected the Honeyville site. This site has a potential capacity of 120,000 acre-feet, including 115,000 active. This reservoir would regulate the river for the bird refuge and furnish water for Willard Bay Reservoir and to the Ogden area for future use. We could also deliver water to Brigham City if it should be needed in the future.

We have received many comments on this original plan. Our planning people went to work on this job with the idea of getting the most feasible and economical project possible. We did not show any favoritism

towards any one area of any one state. When we got through, the Project cost-ratio was 2.4 to 1. This is an exceptionally good cost-ratio; in fact, it is almost unheard of these days. This Bear River Project is primarily an irrigation project, however, and the estimated cost of the project was still in excess of what the water users could pay in 60 years. The reason that we considered 60 years is that we wanted to get the maximum repayment from the water users. We thought the only way to obtain revenues to repay the irrigation allocated costs in excess of repayment ability of the irrigation was through a water conservancy district approach. For this reason, in the preliminary report we proposed that conservancy districts in both states be organized to collect ad valorem taxes to cover the irrigation subsidy.

In Utah, we received no adverse comments. They did suggest that we take another look at the Mapleton and Glendale sites however. We have agreed that we will take another look at these two sites. Idaho commented as follows on the report:

1. Idaho feared interference with operation of Bear Lake. They were afraid of the low levels that might possibly occur on Bear Lake, such as those that occurred in 1934 and 1935. We had considered using Bear Lake as a storage reservoir at one time, but we abandoned this idea.

2. Another criticism that Idaho had was that the Bureau did not provide for any municipal and industrial water in Idaho as we did in Utah. We did feel that this was a valid criticism.

3. Another criticism that Idaho had was that the plan used all the upper river's flow at the Oneida Narrows Dam, precluding private reclamation developments above the dam.

In the original plan, the Bureau had not set any water aside for this purpose. Idaho's Governor said that Idaho wasn't getting enough water from the project.

4. Another major objection to the plan was that of building the high Oneida Dam and reservoir. It was felt that this large reservoir would take too much valuable land off the tax rolls and it would adversely affect the individuals who depended upon this land for grazing purposes as it would be submerged.

5. Idaho said that they did not want the conservancy district in their state. Idaho has no laws for conservancy districts on their law books and the people feel quite hostile towards a conservancy district operation coming into their state to subsidize the project through ad valorem taxes.

In 1963, the Last Chance Canal water users and others got together and proposed a reservoir that they would build themselves, known as the Caribou Reservoir. They proposed a 40,000 acre-foot reservoir be built.

We will cut the area that will be served by the Caribou Reservoir out of our project plan.

I have met with both governors, the Idaho State Reclamation Engineer, the Utah Water and Power Board, and various other organizations that have been opposing or supporting the project. I have met with the Coordinating Committee and the Upper Bear River Protective Committee in an effort to get this project in an acceptable form to the majority of the people in both states. I feel that if we don't get the support for the project here we don't stand a chance of getting

it authorized by the Congress. In the course of these meetings and further studies, an effort was made to meet the requirements of Idaho. I told the Idaho interests that I would go as far as I could to make it acceptable and still keep the project feasible.

I will run through Idaho's objections again and tell you what the Bureau has proposed doing to solve these problems.

1. Idaho feared interference with operation of Bear Lake at sometime in the future. I felt that the holders of rights in Bear River are fully protected by Idaho water law. The water master would see that their rights were fully protected. To remove that fear even further, I am willing that when the State Engineer of Idaho does approve the Bureau's filing for the Oneida Project, that he put in a stipulation in that approval that states that the application cannot adversely affect prior rights in Bear Lake. We will even go a step further and put this same stipulation in the revised report to the Congress which will recommend restrictive language in the project bill preventing adverse affect by the project on Bear Lake.

2. Concerning providing M and I water in the upper reaches and water for private development, we have gone over recent studies of this problem and have concluded that we can reserve about 20,000 acre-feet in the Oneida Narrows Reservoir for future consumers in the area.

3. We have looked at the tributary development and there are quite a few tributaries that could be developed. Montpelier Creek and Soda Creek could be developed quite easily. We have decided to reserve about 18,000 acre-feet for tributary development. Since the Last Chance and Grace area have decided to build the Caribou Reservoir, we will not deliver project water into this area. These reserves will have to be taken out of the water supply at Oneida and this means that

we will serve less land. We will take this land out of the project at the end of the ditch. We will stop the canal in Box Elder County at the end of the Plymouth Siphon and delete 13,000 acres originally planned in the project as 'new land' in the Garland-Bothwell area. We will try to do a little more for Oneida County than we had originally planned. We are extending the Portage Canal a few miles and this will bring in about 5,000 more acres of land. This is being done to divide the water equally between the two states. Utah people, of course, were hurt and disappointed about this change in plans, but we are trying to make the project acceptable to Idaho too.

There is water on the main stem that can be developed in the future. We have found when you start looking for land, the east side has been pretty well taken care of. Whatever development of the lower tributaries is made, the water will have to be used mainly on the west side. In the revised report, in order to protect plans for future development, we will ask the Congress to let us build the Oneida Canal to its full original capacity so that we can use it to convey additional water that could be developed through further storage developments and water exchanges. The principle of exchange is a very good one, and we feel that the Congress will go along with us on this proposal. The amount that can be developed through storage and exchanges is about 70 to 80,000 acre-feet. We want to build deferred capacity into the Oneida Canal for this future use. The Congress has given us this authority on other projects in the past. This would give us a lot more flexibility with the project.

One other thing we are doing in revising this report is trying to lessen the impact of these reserves we are making for the upper river on the lower river. We will plan to convert the surcharge

capacity originally planned for Oneida Narrows Reservoir to active capacity. By putting gates on the spillway we can convert 80,000 acre feet of surcharge capacity to active capacity usable for irrigation purposes. The reservoir can be operated for flood control purposes just as well with a gated spillway as an ungated one.

As to the high Oneida Narrows Dam, we have to include this in the development in order to get full development of the river. We can't accomplish full development without this high dam. We can never find a reservoir site, it seems, that doesn't hurt somebody.

As for the objection that Idaho had concerning the conservancy district, I have told them that the irrigation subsidy has to be provided to permit repayment of reimbursable project costs as required by law. Reclamation projects must be paid for. I have told the Idaho people that there is some chance that a subsidy could be provided from Columbia River power revenues. I will try to work something out along these lines. That would relieve Idaho of organizing a conservancy district. As far as the conservancy district situation is concerned in Utah, Utah has this principle long established. Utah has several projects being built now under the conservancy district system. The tax limit for conservancy districts in Utah is 1 mill. In the case of the Dixie Project, special legislation has raised this to 5 mills, however. I have asked about the possibility of Utah participating in Columbia River power revenues. If the power revenue available to Utah should be in proportion to water contributed by the state to the Columbia River, then Utah would not get very much. This project would have a 50 year pay out period as we now intend to report it. The subsidy requirement will be 33 - 34 million dollars; this is besides what the water users could pay. The benefit cost-ratio for

the revised project plan will be about 1.9 dropping from 2.4. However, we feel that this is still a very good project economically. In making these changes, we have reduced the benefit cost-ratio considerably, but as I stated previously, I think that the 1.9 cost-ratio is still a very good project.

We have a fairly large job ahead of us in our Logan and Salt Lake offices to redo this project, and it will be near the end of the year before we get the revised report ready to send to the Commissioner. After he reviews it he will send it to the Secretary who will send it out and get comments on it from the various interests concerned with the project. At the time the Secretary sends it out, the states will be called upon for official comments. I think, gentlemen, that gives you the schedule of events and brings you up to date on where we are and where we are going on this project.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Clinton. We have appreciated your frank and clear-cut statement.

We will now have a ten-minute recess.

(Chairman Larson reconvened the meeting at 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LARSON: The Bureau of Reclamation had this Bear River Project explained to the Commission when the report was first put out. This Commission is not taking any action on this project at all. The main purpose of this Commission is to carry out the provisions of the Bear River Compact. I am sure we have a lot of people here with us this morning who would like to discuss this proposed project further, and perhaps it would be best in order to conserve time if we allow ten minutes to each State to have a representative speak on this project.

COM. TAPPAN: I don't believe that Idaho is in any position to express any views on this subject at this meeting. I don't think that it is the purpose of this Commission to hear views for or against the project at this time.

COM. SMOOT: I have no comments to make on the project at this time. Utah shall certainly be interested in seeing the revised report when it is available.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: What is your feeling on this matter, Mr. Skeen?

MR. SKEEN: It seems to me that if the States represented want to have ten minutes to speak, we should perhaps hear them.

COM. SMOOT: I move that the Commission allow each State to have a representative present their views in a ten-minute period.

COM. BINGHAM: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried.

COM. LAURELSEN: I would like to introduce Dr. Evan M. Kackley. He will make a statement for us.

(Statement attached)

CHAIRMAN LARSON: We will hear from the Utah delegation now.

STATEMENT FOR UTAH ON BEAR RIVER PROJECT

COM. BINGHAM: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Commission, I would like to refer to Article VI of the Bear River Compact. It reads:

It is the policy of the signatory States to encourage additional projects for the development of the water resources of the Bear River to obtain the maximum beneficial use of water with a minimum of waste, and in furtherance of such policy, authority is granted within the limitations provided by this Compact, to investigate, plan, construct, and operate such projects without regard to State boundaries, provided that water rights for each such project shall, except as provided in Article V, Paragraph A thereof, be subject to rights theretofore initiated and in good standing.

I think in general that expresses what we are all concerned with. In the spirit that brought this Compact into being, the prime purpose and intent was the full utilization of the waters of the Bear River to the benefit of all the States concerned. There is much good that comes out of a critical look at these far-reaching projects. I would again point out that the report that was issued earlier and covered by Mr. Clinton's comments today was compiled and planned without regard to division of water between the States but was done to get the most feasible project possible. In the best interests of all, the States should be willing to have a report prepared to equalize the division of the water to be developed. We think that such a report should be prepared. There are certain parts of the plan that will be omitted in the revised report, and I think that we can carry out the interests of the local areas and get the cooperation that is needed to get this project workable and on the road to becoming a reality.

I would like to commend Mr. Clinton and his staff for their dedicated effort in this regard. I think that I voice the sentiments of the entire Utah group by stating that we recommend the completion of the revised report and the taking into account as many of these changes that have been proposed as possible.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Bingham, for your comments. We will now hear from Wyoming.

STATEMENT FOR WYOMING ON BEAR RIVER PROJECT

MR. VAN CAMP (Alternate Commissioner representing Com. Myers): We appreciated the remarks of Mr. Clinton here today also. Wyoming expressed its concern over this project at the hearings held as to the adequacy of this project under feasibility requirements. Our concern lies not within any of the project features, but it does relate to the post-operations that could be involved in Bear Lake, which we consider the key to the entire project.

I am appreciative of hearing Mr. Clinton's remarks here this morning. I believe that we would certainly have to get a good look at the plan as finally submitted by the Bureau before we make any statement. We certainly want to be good neighbors with our sister States and work with them. There are certainly a lot of problems to be resolved in this regard, and it is going to take a lot of real hard work to get this project in a form that we can all support. Some of these problems are the Conservancy District as the contracting agency and the M and I water, and these problems are going to be very tough ones to solve. It is unfortunate that this project got off to the bad start that it did. This project divides the water of two States, and it is going to take some pretty good leadership to get everything resolved.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: To re-state the Bureau's present plan--they are considering the suggestions and recommendations of all concerned, and they are now working on a revised report that will be distributed towards the end of the year.

COM. JOHNSON: I would like to add my support to Mr. Bingham's statement in regard to this project.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: There have been other requests to speak on this subject, but I think that we should go on now. Mr. Clinton has asked to be excused now.

MR. CLINTON: We have appreciated your consideration here this morning and the opportunity to give you an account of our stewardship on Bear River.

Statement of Evan M. Kackley to Bear River Commission, April 28, 1964. (As submitted later by Dr. Kackley)

"The Bear River Protective Committee appreciates the opportunity afforded it to present their viewpoint on the proposed Bear River Projects. The Bear River Protective Committee at one time held membership in the Bear River Coordinating Committee, but their viewpoints became divergent and their members separated from the same.

All the members have, or at one time have had, official appointments from the three main-stem counties on the Bear in Idaho.

The Committee has been castigated as blackguards and tools of the Utah Power & Light Company by those who favor the proposed projects of Region 4. This is not true, for the Committee is interested in the development of Bear River and its members have no connection whatsoever with the Utah Power & Light Company, having at times testified individually against Utah Power & Light in Washington hearings, and been in the usual conflict off and on incident to water operations on Bear River.

The Bear River Protective Committee has always felt that Mr. Clinton has inherited a project to put over which he had no opportunity to direct during its organization and planning detail. It has been felt by the Committee that if he had, he would have understood the feelings and working principles of the Idaho people, and reclamation projects in Idaho, as he was long associated with Region 1, Bureau of Reclamation, Boise, Idaho.

The bone of contention of the proposed Bear River projects has been the high Oneida Narrows Dam. At all times the high Oneida Narrows Dam has been designed to control Bear Lake and to make use of it, as stated in the Proposed Feasibility Report, and as is set forth in future engineering after its construction in which a canal would be increased from 1,200 to 1,500 second feet to cover the eventual taking over of approximately 70,000 acre-feet of storage in Bear Lake via exchanges from dams constructed in Utah.

The dam has always been held high with a dead storage of 150,000 acre-feet in order that a canal could be taken out 242 feet above the natural stream flow to convey this water into Utah.

The Oneida Narrows project is extremely destructive of resources, flooding out many acres and wrecking the tax structure of two of the main-stem counties, as well as affecting the other.

A very distinguished former member, and an architect of the Bear River Compact, Senator Fred Cooper, had this to say of the high Oneida Narrows Project on January 5, 1961 in the Caribou County Sun of Soda Springs, Idaho:

Before an attempt is made by the Bureau of Reclamation to sell this plan to the public a full disclosure of all the facts should be made so that interested parties may see all the bad features as well as the good, and determine whether it is the best interest of the citizens in the area.

This statement was the death knell of that proposed project that would have lowered the shores of Bear Lake to an all-time low in its operation. As has been pointed out, at no time has the Bear River Compact been given full consideration as to the framework by Region 4 in their proposed project, and the dam itself is still constructed for the entrance some way or other into Bear Lake.

It is a poor yardstick to cite acres of irrigation benefited by the proposed project. Region 4 has included as receiving supplemental irrigation all the acres below any canal or lateral. It does not take into consideration the need, or not the need, for irrigation of these acres. Neither have the figures been always consistent. In the Grace area, 8,000 acres were included on their maps as new land being brought under irrigation, but at the Boise Hearings in protest to their filings, it was brought out that these were supplemental acreages. The only fair qualification or yardstick is the amount of water designated to each State, and the method and practicability of use.

It must be stated and remembered that every last drop of this water, no matter to which State it goes, arises in its origin from the State of Idaho, and is commingled with upstream water points of origin in the State of Wyoming, and the State of Utah east of the Wasatch Range, and the filing is upon the water rights of the Utah Power & Light, and involves management of Bear Lake in those rights, and affects the only non-consumptive use of water rights up-state from the Utah-Idaho boundary south of Preston, Idaho.

In Modified Plan II, Idaho was to receive 61,500 acre-feet and Utah 77,500 acre-feet for irrigation purposes. This is a total of 139,000 acre-feet of water to be stored at Oneida Narrows Dam, with a filing upon 325,000 acre-feet of so-called runoff water and 1,500 second feet of natural or active stream flow.

To this 139,000 acre-feet must be added 12,000 acre-feet for replacement of destruction to fish and wildlife resources. This is necessitated by the destruction of 23 miles of fine bird habitat, with open water all winter, fine fly trout fishing, and winter range. This makes a total of Idaho waters stored of 152,000 acre-feet.

The actual reconstruction of fish and wildlife losses necessitates a storage at Coulam of 27,700 acre-feet of water, leaving a deficit from the 12,000 of 15,700 acre-feet which would eventually have to be supplied from Idaho stored waters.

Further, the reservoir would flood out at least 7,000 acres of irrigated lands (actually more), amounting to, at the rate of 4 acre-feet per acre, 28,000 acre-feet of water. This cannot be regarded as conserved water. It is merely transferred water.

The amount of shrink in the Idaho portion of irrigation water at 22% over 105 miles of canal amounts to 13,500 acre-feet of loss of Idaho waters.

These figures total a 10,000 acre-feet net loss, including the bird refuge plans, shrink, and loss of irrigated lands. Add the 77,500 acre-feet of water that goes to Utah to this, and Idaho suffers a net loss of 87,500 acre-feet.

Municipal and Industrial waters of the Oneida Narrows project are not realistic. In the Oneida project, the cost per 1,000 acre-feet of stored water, either to be paid for by those using the water or by a conservancy district or some method of financing the deficit, amounts to \$900,000 including the interest.

Either under a conservancy district or payment by a power basin revenue, the cost for M & I water must be guaranteed by those guaranteeing the construction of the project, namely the taxpayers, and if the water is not used for the same, under the plans of Region 4, the contracting agency must pay this amount.

Without the M & I water the financial feasibility of the Oneida project is impossible.

One thousand acre-feet of water is equivalent to a flow of 1.37 second feet annually, or 617 gallons per minute.

Industry on the main-stem in Idaho has, in one case, developed by well and pumping, at a cost of \$25,000, 2,000 gallons or 3.2 second feet. This would cost under Region 4, \$2,880,000 at the point of storage, not at the plant site. Under proposed expansion of this company, the cost would be \$5,760,000.

The City of Soda Springs recently purchased, including a fine ranch, 5 second feet of potable water for \$100,000.

Comparable cost of development of 1,000 acre-feet of water in the Salt Lake-Ogden area has been between \$99,000 and \$201,000.

Even in the proposed conservancy district, it is stated the cost has been \$900,000 on the Oneida project, but on the proposed Blacksmith Fork Dam the cost would be \$350,000—figures difficult to reconcile to the taxpayer and to industry.

The weighted acre water requirement has been set at 3.48 on the Oneida Narrows project. This is not delivery at the lateral headgates, but is only storage space in the dam with a canal 105 miles long, 93 miles of laterals and 166 miles of drainage. The average percentage of loss for transportation is 22% which is very much in conflict with that on the new Teton project in Idaho which allows 35% shrinkage over much shorter canals and shorter laterals. The average weighted per acre need on this project is set at 4.5 for delivery at the laterals, not just storage space 105 miles away.

The weighted average per acre at Grace is 4.1 acre-feet at the head of short canals, and at the head of canals on the Palisades project it varies between 4 and 10 acre-feet.

It is an acknowledged fact that Bear River is one of the most overly appropriated, if not the most, streams in the State.

Water rights in the original project were to be obtained by cutting of irrigation water rights, either adjudicated, proscriptive or riparian, along the entire project from Grace, Idaho south. This was admitted under oath at the Boise Hearings. The degree of this cutting may be seen in the Glendale Project in which water dedicated in increased amounts in that project came to 14,300 acre-feet but actually 18,600 acre-feet were set forth in the operation of the project, or a 30% cut in water rights.

Repeatedly it was stated that Region 4 would only take the water originating below Bear Lake, but under oath also at Boise they admitted that there was no unappropriated water on Bear River and that they were filing upon the water rights of Utah Power & Light for their project. Furthermore, it was stated there that Region 4 did not know the amount of riparian or proscriptive rights, or the early rights on Bear River and its tributaries, and that they did not know the status of rented water, which belonged to the storer, in this case Utah Power & Light, but rented to many irrigators.

At Boise it was further brought out under questioning of Region 4 that the simulated operation and method of operation of this project, to overcome the very low weighted acre factor, Region 4 would insist upon a high degree of efficiency of farming and irrigation operations, limiting the water to a stated annual amount, and with the premise that farmers and irrigators with more water have a tendency to waste water.

With this built-in drouth factor, and the fact that there is no floor in Bear Lake, and the fact that the only water rights in Bear Lake are those guaranteed to the U & I Sugar Company, a demand would be made by the irrigators for a pump down of the reserve water for the ever recurring drouths which would be greatly increased and accelerated by the proposed project of Region 4 on a river already overly appropriated.

The Federal government, under the Colorado Decision has the power to do this on Bear River as it is a navigable stream, without any regard to date of origin of water rights. At present the power to do this is contained in the provisions of the Bear River Compact, within that body and not the sole provision of the Federal government. Furthermore, as in the Glen Canyon case, the Federal government can and does exercise water jurisdiction to protect investment in a project.

The State of Utah has many dam sites, approximately a half million acre-feet of water arising within that State, with over 800,000 acre-feet comprising the site of the proposed Honeyville. Furthermore, in Cache County alone the State of Utah, since 1927, has unrestricted rights to make use of 150,000 acre-feet of water, of which only 14,000 acre-feet at Porcupine has been used. With the advent of pumping in Idaho now, raising as much as 740 feet in a profitable operation by private enterprise, water could be lifted from the Cutler Dam project 450 feet and supply the same acreages as now in the proposed Oneida Narrows Dam and without the excessive costs of construction in Idaho.

The following provisions of the Bear River Compact are brought to the attention of the Bear River Commission, and our attorneys advise us that the filing by Region 4 for the Bear River waters is directly in conflict with these:

1. "New projects must be subject to rights theretofore initiated and in good standing;
2. "Application for appropriation, change of point of diversion, pledged place and nature of use," provides that "no such application shall be approved if the effect thereof will be to deprive any water user in another State of water to which he is entitled."
3. Water users are defined in the Bear River Compact as those who put water to beneficial use. Electric power is among those of beneficial uses.

Again the Bear River Protective Committee thanks the Bear River Compact Commission for the time and privilege of speaking to them."

CHAIRMAN LARSON: We will now have the report of the State Engineer's Committee on stock-watering ponds.

REPORT OF THE STATE ENGINEER'S COMMITTEE

MR. CRIDDLE: This stock pond problem has a different amount of importance to different people. Just to show you how big a problem this situation might lead to, in the State of Texas they have better than 1/3 million stock-watering ponds. 600,000 acre-feet of water is lost annually through evaporation from these ponds. A study has been made by the U. S. G. S. which shows a marked decrease in the flow of rivers and streams in this area.

I believe that we must devise some means of getting a better control over this situation. In 1962, the Pacific Southwest Inter-Agency Committee, consisting of all the States represented here today and all of the Federal agencies dealing with water and land, put together a "Stock Water Facilities Guide." I would like to read a part of the foreword in this booklet:

To assure optimum utilization of the range resources requires adequate stock water. Where live streams and springs do not occur and productive wells are difficult to obtain and expensive to maintain, the impounding of flood water in surface reservoirs is often the most practical solution. However, because of the improved machinery and physical ability of man to construct impoundments of such size and number as to seriously decrease surface runoff for many of the watersheds in the Pacific Southwest, it is becoming increasingly evident that such construction can interfere with existing rights.

In most States storage in stock ponds requires right by appropriation obtained through established legal channels. If the surface supply is available, the appropriation will generally be granted; if not available, it may be necessary to secure it by purchase of existing rights. In either event, conservation practices must include the exercise of the proper effort to see that all recognized rights are respected and that land and water resources are developed within this vital requirement.

This "Guide" was consequently objected to very strenuously by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior when we started working on it. Eventually, this "Guide" was accepted by all of the agencies and was produced as an Inter-Agency report.

This "Guide" tells about setting up the Committee to develop it and the:

Instructions to the task force were to develop guides for the location, spacing, and engineering design of stock ponds, which would incorporate information on the volume, surface area, and depth relationship of ponds in relation to climate, topography, land cover, live-stock and/or wildlife use. Consideration was to be given to alternative methods of meeting livestock needs, including development of runoff areas, wells, springs, and other methods appropriate for any particular locality. Suggestions for improving the uniformity of State requirements for stock pond filings and their construction were also requested.

It is recognized that the information in this first report may not be complete and fully accurate. With experience, refinements will be desirable and, in some cases, necessary. Changes should be made as knowledge and understanding of the area's hydrology is increased.

I would like to briefly run through the contents of this report. First, it discusses various "Methods of Supplying Range Stock Water", then it takes up "Stock Pond Hydrology", "Losses of Water —Evaporation and Seepage", "Losses of Capacity", "Stock Pond Design Criteria", "Regional Stock Pond Hydrology", "Legal Aspects," and "State's Requirements".

This summary will tell you the differences in the laws in each State and the importance that each State apparently attaches to the stock pond problem.

In Utah, we are attempting to limit stock pond construction to the very minimum. We want to develop the resource, but we have found that many people abuse this privilege and put in a reservoir instead of a pond.

(Mr. Criddle distributed five copies of this report to each State)

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Mr. Bishop, does Wyoming have anything to add to Mr. Criddle's statement?

COM. BISHOP: I don't have anything further. Wyoming doesn't feel that we have any real problem in this area. The only problem we feel that we have in regards to stock ponds is in Utah, particularly on Yellow Creek.

COM. TAPPAN: In Idaho, we have 10 or 12 stock-watering ponds in the Bear River area. Only one of these ponds has more than 1/2 acre-foot capacity. The Compact allows as much as 20 acre-feet per stock pond. Occasionally, the water in these ponds is used by irrigators, and Idaho laws don't help that situation very much.

I hope that the present Governor's water study group will come up with something that will let us line up a little better in respect to law with the other States in connection with the stock-watering pond situation.

COM. JOHNSON: I move that the Commission accept the State Engineer's Committee Report and make it a part of the minutes of this meeting.

COM. BINGHAM: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried.

COM. BINGHAM: I might add that we do have very able State Engineers here on this Commission. I think that perhaps what we have in this Pacific Southwest Inter-Agency Committee report is something that we could use for a starting point for ourselves in facing this stock-watering pond problem. I think that we should study this report and perhaps the State Engineers could formulate a plan as to what we can do to get some uniform legislation and action among the Compact States.

COM. JOHNSON: I think that we made a dreadful mistake when we wrote the 20 acre-foot capacity limitation into the Compact on these stock-watering ponds. It would take an amendment to the Compact to get this changed now. I think that 20 acre-feet is way out of bounds. In these Western States, one acre-foot is ample.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Is there any new business that the Commission should take up today?

COM. DAYTON: In regard to the Bear River Project, any action that this body makes should be with a view to conforming to the terms of the Compact and making sure that the adjudicated water rights are preserved.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: I think that this Commission tries to operate that way.

COM. BINGHAM: I move that this meeting of the Bear River Commission be adjourned.

COM. BISHOP: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: This annual meeting of the Commission is now adjourned. (The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.)

JTB50N

MINUTES OF THE
BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
November 23, 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Those in Attendance	1
Consideration of the Minutes of April 28, 1964	2
Report of the Chairman	4
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	4
Letter from the Governor of Idaho appointing Alternate Commissioner	5
Resolution recognizing the contribution of the late Melvin Lauridsen	6
Proposed Amendment to Bylaws of the Bear River Commission	6
Report of the Assistant Secretary	7
Additional comments on the Report of the Assistant Secretary	8

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

Minutes of Regular Meeting held in the Water Conference Room
Utah State Capitol
November 23, 1964

The Regular Meeting of the Bear River Commission convened in the Water Conference Room of the Utah State Capitol Building, Salt Lake City, Utah on Monday, November 23, 1964 at 9:40 a.m. Chairman E. O. Larson presided.

Voting Commissioners present:

IDAHO

(Tappan)
Cleo L. Swenson, Preston
Stephen W. Boller, Idaho Assistant Attorney General, Alternate Commissioner appointed by Governor Smylie for this meeting only.

UTAH

Jay R. Bingham, Bountiful
L. B. Johnson, Vice Chairman, Randolph
A. V. Smoot, Corinne

WYOMING

(Myers)
Floyd A. Bishop, Cheyenne
S. Reed Dayton, Cokeville

UNITED STATES

E. O. Larson, Chairman and U. S. Representative

Alternate Commissioners and Advisers present:

IDAHO

J. Warren Serrine, Montpelier (Alternate)
Russell D. Stoker, Soda Springs (Adviser)

UTAH

Glen McKinnon, Randolph (Alternate)
Robert J. Potter, Garland (Alternate)
Ross H. Plant, Richmond (Alternate)
Wayne D. Criddle, Salt Lake City (Adviser)
Dallin W. Jensen, Assistant Attorney General, Salt Lake City (Adviser)
Robert B. Porter, Salt Lake City (Adviser)

WYOMING

John Teichert, Cokeville (Adviser)
David P. Miller, Rock Springs (Adviser)
E. J. Van Camp, Cheyenne (Adviser)

LEGAL ADVISER TO THE BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

E. J. Skeen, Attorney, Salt Lake City, Utah

Others Present:

Wallace N. Jibson, Assistant Secretary, Bear River Commission, Logan
Robert D. Berrett, Controller, Utah Water & Power Board, Salt Lake City
Janice M. Hammond, Secretary, Utah Water & Power Board, Salt Lake City
Donald C. Norseth, Utah State Engineer's Office, Salt Lake City

CHAIRMAN LARSON: If you will come to order, we will go ahead with the meeting. This meeting today is the Regular Meeting of the Bear River Commission. Are all of the States represented?

COM. BINGHAM: We only have one Commissioner from Wyoming present. Perhaps we had better wait a few more minutes.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: In order to save time, our attorney has suggested that we go ahead and proceed with the meeting, and any action that we take will have to be approved by Wyoming when their representatives arrive. We will take up the matter of the minutes first.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 1964

COM. JOHNSON: I move, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Jibson give us a resume of the highlights of the last meeting rather than read them all.

COM. DAYTON: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: Motion carried.

MR. JIBSON: Gentlemen, we distributed the minutes to those on the regular mailing list. We do have a few extra copies here this morning if you would care to refer to them.

In our last meeting, we approved the previous minutes as they were published. We then had a report of the Secretary-Treasurer who introduced Mr. F. M. Clinton, Regional Director of the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Dean Bischoff, and Mr. E. K. Thomas. Mr. Berrett gave the financial report for the period covering July 1963 - March 31, 1964 showing an unexpended balance of \$20,550.30. His report was accepted.

The Assistant Secretary's report was then given which dealt mainly with the forecast of expected streamflow runoff. At that time, it looked like between 82 percent and 100 percent of normal runoff. Actually, the runoff turned out to be a little better than that.

We mentioned that five development-type stream-gaging stations had been installed. These stations are now in operation. We mentioned also that the 1963 Annual Report was running behind schedule. The applications for appropriation were presented to the Commission; these were primarily for small appropriations confined largely to underground withdrawal in Cache Valley.

The Commission checked and approved budget estimates for the 1966-67 biennium, and this budget is summarized in the minutes on page 4. Following our discussion on the proposed budget, Mr. Smoot proposed that we approve the budget as presented. This was done.

We then turned to the matter of election of officers. At this time it was moved by Commissioner Smoot that Jay R. Bingham be elected Secretary-Treasurer, Wallace N. Jibson, Assistant Secretary, and L. B. Johnson, Vice Chairman of the Commission. Members of the Standing Committees were re-appointed at this time.

The balance of the meeting was turned to a discussion of the proposed Oneida Project in Idaho by the Regional Director of the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. F. M. Clinton. After he finished, each of the States was called upon for brief comments. Commissioner Tappan said that he did not think Idaho was in a position to express any views on the subject at that time. Commissioner Bingham spoke for the State of Utah and expressed Utah's approval and support of the project. Mr. Van Camp, representing Wyoming, spoke briefly on the project, saying it was a little bit out of their territory and they were not particularly concerned except as it might affect the entire river system and the Compact. Dr. Kackley submitted a rather lengthy statement at the request of Commissioner Lauridsen. The statement that he mailed to us (for inclusion in the minutes) was a little different than the one given at the meeting but essentially covered the same points. He was very much opposed to the project.

COM. JOHNSON: Dr. Kackley did not speak for the entire State of Idaho, did he? I was under the impression that he spoke representing a group of water users.

MR. JIBSON: On page 6 of the minutes we note that Chairman Larson allowed each of the States ten minutes, and Commissioner Lauridsen requested that Dr. Kackley be allowed to present a statement. (Mr. Jibson read from page 6.)

MR. BOLLER: It was my interpretation that Dr. Kackley's statement was not an official comment for the State of Idaho.

COM. SMOOT: When Commissioner Lauridsen requested that Dr. Kackley be allowed to present a statement for "us," it seems to me that "us" would mean the Idaho delegation.

COM. JOHNSON: I think at this time that it is best to keep the position of all of the States clear on this matter.

MR. SKEEN: I think that the minutes are rather clear on this point. On page 1 of Dr. Kackley's statement he says he is talking for the Bear River Protective Association.

MR. BOLLER: I did not think that he spoke representing any group but merely himself.

CHAIRMAN LARSON: I might say that before I called upon the States for comments, I talked to Mr. Tappan; and he said that if they were allowed ten minutes, that would be all right; it was my understanding that Dr. Kackley was speaking for only one group and not the entire State of Idaho.

MR. JIBSON: I don't know that there is anything else of importance in the minutes.