



BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

106 West 500 South, Suite 101
Bountiful, UT 84010
(801) 524-6320
FTS 588-6320

MINUTES

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION ANNUAL MEETING

Utah Department of Natural Resources Building
Salt Lake City, Utah
April 16, 1991

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Federal Members

Kenneth T. Wright

Idaho Members

R. Keith Higginson
Rodney Wallentine
Floyd J. Jensen

Utah Members

D. Larry Anderson
Blair Francis
Calvin Funk

Wyoming Members

Gordon W. Fassett
J. W. Myers
S. Reed Dayton

ENGINEER-MANAGER

Jack A. Barnett
106 West 500 South
Suite 101
Bountiful, UT 84010

Wally Jibson
880 River Heights Blvd.
Logan, UT 84321

ATTORNEY

E. J. Skeen
Attorney At Law
536 East 400 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

The annual meeting of the Bear River Commission was called to order by Chairman Ken Wright at 1:30 p.m. on April 16, 1991, in the First Floor Conference Room of the Utah Department of Natural Resources Building in Salt Lake City, Utah. A copy of the attendance roster is attached as Appendix A. The agenda was approved without change (see Appendix B).

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the last Commission meeting held November 27, 1990, in Salt Lake City, Utah. After a few minor editorial changes, the minutes were approved.

The Commission voted to have Rod Wallentine continue to serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission for the second year of his two-year term. Larry Anderson was also re-elected as Secretary/Treasurer of the Commission.

Bert Page reported on the Commission's income and expenditures from July 1, 1990, to April 1, 1991 (see Appendix C). Page indicated that at the beginning of that time period, cash on hand was \$129,479.40. Collectively, the states paid assessments of \$75,000 and the Commission earned \$9,279.65 in interest, yielding \$213,759.05 in total revenue. Total expenses during that time period were \$73,396.76, bringing the cash balance as of April 1, 1991, to \$140,362.29. The financial report was approved as presented by Page.

Larry Anderson discussed the Commission budgets for FY 91, 92, and 93 (see Appendix D). Anderson indicated that in FY 91, the Commission had approved

a budget of \$159,390. It was projected that through the end of FY 91 (June 30, 1991) total expenditures would be \$108,414. Anderson indicated that in the FY 91 budget, \$66,725 had been allocated for depletion studies, but only about \$22,725 of that would be spent in FY 91. The remaining allocation for depletion studies would be carried over into FY 92.

Anderson indicated the proposed budget for FY 92 was \$135,235. It included state assessments of \$25,000 each. In FY 92, \$49,210 would be spent for USGS stream gaging. The FY 92 budget also included a 4 percent increase in the personal services contract for the Engineer-Manager and his technicians. It was anticipated that at the end of FY 92, total carry-over funds would be about \$56,830.

Anderson indicated that with projected expenditures reducing the amount of carry-over available, in FY 93 he believed the Commission should increase the dues to each of the states from \$25,000 to \$30,000. Blair Francis indicated the Records Committee was proposing that \$600 be allocated in FY 92 for the printing of 200 copies of the history prepared by Wally Jibson. The Commission approved the projected \$30,000 state assessments for FY 93 and FY 94 and also increased the FY 92 printing line item to include an additional \$600, bringing the total printing line item to \$800.

Reed Dayton reported on the activities of the Operations Committee. He indicated that the Operations Committee was facing many of the same challenges with respect to limited water supplies as in the previous year, but with the experience gained over the last year, they felt better prepared to face the coming year.

Dayton asked Jack Barnett to report on streamflow forecasts. Barnett indicated that because of the long drought, above average snowpack would be needed to obtain average streamflow. So far this year, however, snowpack was below average, so streamflows were projected to be below normal. Barnett indicated that as of April 12, the Soil Conservation Service was anticipating the following streamflows:

<u>Gage</u>	<u>Percent of Normal Streamflow</u>
Utah-Wyoming state line	62
Hare	56
Big Creek	57
Woodruff Creek	51
Thomas Fork	59
Smiths Fork	59

Barnett indicated that the preceding numbers did not reflect recent storms, but added that an above-average April would be required to even have a water year as good as last year.

Carly Burton discussed current conditions at Bear Lake and projected Bear Lake levels (see Appendix E). Burton indicated that as of April 1, Bear Lake elevation was at 5,910.40, which was equivalent to 518,000 acre-feet of storage. Burton reminded the Commission that the low elevation which occurred in November of 1990 was 5,909.8. In five months the Lake had only risen 0.6 foot. On April 1 of 1990, the Lake was considerably higher at 5,913.9, with a capacity of 747,000 acre-feet. As of April 1, 1991, the lake was at about 30 percent of its 1.4 million acre-foot storage capacity.

Basinwide snowpack conditions for Bear Lake on April 1, 1991, were 71 percent of normal. Burton had received an updated Snotel report as of April 15 which showed basinwide snowpack at 68 percent of normal. The Upper Section in the Uintas was at about 75 percent of normal; Little Bear Station showed only 9 percent of normal; Montecristo showed 86 percent of normal. As of April of 1990, the basinwide snowpack was at 60 percent of normal; however, base flows of the river are lower than last year.

Burton indicated the projected runoff at Stewart Dam was at 52 percent of normal for the April through September period. The projected runoff a year ago was at 36 percent of normal. The actual flow which occurred was at 6 percent of normal.

Burton indicated that the Utah Power and Light (UP&L) model was projecting about 73,000 acre-feet of runoff for the April through July period, equal to about a 1-foot rise on the Lake. UP&L anticipated releases would begin about May 15.

UP&L had developed some operating constraints this year based on the limited water supply in Bear Lake and the relatively dismal forecasts. First, there would be no release of Bear Lake storage water outside of the decreed irrigation season dates in Idaho and Utah. Second, irrigation companies and individuals who had contracts for Bear Lake storage water would be encouraged to only use 75 percent of their contracted amounts of Bear Lake storage water. UP&L would not try to deliver storage water by contract date, but try to have everyone conserve so that everyone would survive. Burton also indicated that UP&L had determined they would not sign contracts for new uses of water. Burton also mentioned that many of the contracts signed in more recent years have a stipulation that if in any given year Bear Lake is below 5,910, they have no guarantee that any storage water will be available for their use.

Burton went on to indicate that UP&L had determined that as a part of their operating constraints, maximum diversion rates could be

curtailed during the season. Last year during the early part of July, with the releases which were being made at Bear Lake, UP&L could not meet all of the irrigation demands downstream. This caused UP&L to draw storage out of Cutler, Oneida, and Soda in an effort to try to keep up with all of the demands. UP&L contacted all of the major companies and asked them to cut 25 percent on their rate of diversion. Burton indicated that might occur again this year. Because there is such a large elevation difference between Bear Lake and Mud Lake, the ability of the pumps to lift the water from Bear Lake into Mud Lake is continually diminishing.

Burton indicated that the 1991 charges for Bear Lake storage water as shown on page 2 of Appendix E are based on the costs of the coal which is burned in the steam electric plant to replace the lost energy through the hydro system on the Bear River from the diverted water.

Burton stated that UP&L will strongly discourage the irrigation of farmlands after crops have been harvested in the fall. UP&L will not provide storage water for that purpose.

Burton also indicated that UP&L was projecting that the low Bear Lake elevation for 1991 would be 5,907.5.

Barnett explained that in an attempt to understand all of the storage which is authorized and is occurring in the Bear River, he had placed the storage facilities he was aware of into three categories: (1) pre-compact storage, (2) Original Compact storage, and (3) Amended Compact storage. Barnett indicated he had sent four memoranda to the Operations Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee summarizing total storage allowed under these three categories. Barnett identified that there are three reservoirs which are storing water under pre-amended Compact storage rights: Sulphur Creek, Woodruff Narrows, and Broadbent. He distributed a handout showing storage available in the reservoirs for the 1991 season (see Appendix F), and indicated that if storage in Sulphur Creek and Woodruff Narrows were not restricted, the reservoirs could fill to a point where they would exceed their storage allocation. Barnett said he would revise the memoranda he had sent to the Operations Committee and the TAC and send them to the full Commission so Commission members would have a breakdown of storage allowed in the reservoirs on Bear River.

Blair Francis asked Jeff Fassett what Wyoming planned to do with the Smiths Fork allocation since there was no reservoir built. Fassett indicated Wyoming would most likely reallocate that storage to Woodruff Narrows.

Jeff Fassett reemphasized the concern that all states, and particularly Wyoming, felt over the drop in Bear Lake elevation recorded by Utah Power and Light at the end of the 1990 pumping season. Fassett pointed out that after Bear Lake reaches 5,911 this year and

storage under the 1958 Compact has been fulfilled, there may be opportunities to store 1980 Compact allocations. He believed it was very important that the Commission monitor the Bear Lake level and the flows on the River to ensure the Upper Basin takes advantage of their legal opportunities in the 1991 irrigation season. Carly Burton indicated within the next ten days they would be conducting tests to determine the accuracy of Bear Lake measuring devices, and that UP&L would advise Jack Barnett so he could notify the Commission.

Blair Francis reported on the activities of the Records Committee. He indicated the Committee had met earlier that morning and discussed three items. First, Francis indicated the biennial report is being completed. It was anticipated that the report would be printed in a 8½" x 11" format, and a paragraph would be added to explain how the Engineer-Manager calculates his adjudications during the irrigation season. Further, Francis indicated the report would show the reservoir water versus the natural flow water during the irrigation season on the main stem only.

Second, Francis stated that the amended Compact and Bylaws had been published and multiple copies were available for distribution. Francis indicated that the main reason the Compact and Bylaws were reprinted was that the states were running out of copies of the booklet. It was determined that since more needed to be printed, the Bylaws would be updated and the names of current Commission members reflected on the back cover, but no change was made to the text of the Compact.

Third, Francis summarized the status of the History of the Bear River Compact being prepared by Wally Jibson. Francis indicated that the Records Committee felt that rather than having a formal legal document prepared, the history should be as remembered by Jibson with comments from important players in the history. Francis explained that a fourth draft would soon be prepared, and the Records Committee recommended that the following items be included: (1) Alan Robertson's recollections as to why and how the Amended Compact came about; (2) comments on the document by important players in the history (Ed Skeen, Reed Dayton, etc.); (3) a hydrograph of Bear Lake showing historic elevations; (4) a list of those people who served during the original deliberations, plus on the Bear River Commission, up until the present; and (5) potentially a section giving credit to those who assisted in the preparation and editing of the history. Francis reminded Commission members that the Commission budget had been revised to include \$600 for printing of 200 copies of the history. It was anticipated that the final version of this history would be completed and the remaining dollars disbursed to Jibson in advance of the next Commission meeting.

Jack Barnett reported on the efforts of the TAC. Barnett indicated that all three states were proceeding on schedule with

efforts to determine the accuracy of the base map. All states believed they would be prepared to input their data into a digital format by the fall or early winter. It was anticipated that revised maps would be prepared early in 1992 for the Commission's review and the maps would be presented for adoption at the April 1992 Commission meeting.

Barnett reported that the states were also finalizing their contracts with the Commission for compensation in connection with their efforts to verify the base map. Upon receipt of those contracts, Barnett indicated each of the states would be free to submit a report to him describing the first 1/3 of their efforts and requesting payment for those efforts.

With respect to each state's efforts to estimate current depletions, Barnett reported that TAC members from each state will be in the field looking at what has occurred to date and estimating depletions based on changes which have occurred since the base map. Barnett indicated that as the TAC moved forward to verify base maps and estimate current depletions, efforts in the field led to the TAC proposing some changes in boundaries between the three divisions as outlined in the Compact.

Hal Anderson reported that as the TAC was doing their field efforts, they also looked at the boundaries which were established to define the various divisions within the Compact. Anderson indicated that the Compact uses dams along the main stem of the Bear River as being division boundaries. The Compact does not distinguish between surface and ground water, but simply looks at all water which is tributary to the River. Anderson indicated that the TAC had run into difficulties trying to use Stewart Dam as a division boundary because surface-water and ground-water issues required the consideration of separate boundaries. Anderson said the State of Idaho will need to establish surface and ground-water divides to accurately portray the lands which are served by the canals which divert upstream of Stewart Dam and determine whether they are in the Central or the Lower Division for Compact purposes.

Sue Lowry also reported on Pixley Dam being the boundary between the Central and the Upper Division. Lowry indicated the depletions were made based on a state line division, rather than a Compact division, so Wyoming and Utah both have 13,000 acre-feet. Therefore, the TAC has chosen to follow the hydrologic boundary upstream on each side of the state line as was initially done on the base map.

Barnett reported that the TAC had discussed recent weather modification efforts. Barnett indicated that Utah had held meetings with meteorologists and local residents to discuss Utah's weather modification programs, but those meetings were poorly attended. With respect to stream gaging, Barnett indicated the TAC had an ongoing assignment to constantly monitor the effectiveness of the stream gaging

program which is supported by Commission funds. Further, the TAC has been following with great interest the stream gaging effort which is supported by Utah Power and Light, where they have recently automated several of their gages. Barnett indicated he felt it was essential for the Commission to acquaint the USGS with the justification for some of the stream gages so that they can be responsive to the Commission's needs.

Barnett also indicated that last summer there were some questions surrounding about a three-day downtime at the USGS's Utah-Idaho state line gage. Barnett said he would be visiting the state line gage with the USGS in the near future, and all who wanted to attend would be invited. Barnett also indicated that with instructions from the TAC, he would continue to pursue the best way to gage the inflow-outflow and stage at Woodruff Narrows.

Chairman Wright turned the Commission's attention to agenda item VIII, and asked the Management Committee members from each state to report on their state's efforts to use Compact-apportioned water. Larry Anderson indicated that Utah's Bear River Task Force intended to prepare a final report by October of 1991 to outline a procedure and discuss the needs for development of the Bear River to meet Utah's future water needs. With support from the Task Force, the Utah Legislature had appropriated \$2 million for construction of Bear River dams. They authorized the construction of four reservoirs on the Bear River: Honeyville, Barrons, Avon, and the raising of Hyrum Reservoir. Since Avon and the raising of Hyrum would not both be done on the same drainage, the Task Force was instructed to come back with a recommendation. From the \$2 million the Legislature set aside, they appropriated \$350,000 back to the Utah Division of Water Resources to continue its investigations of Bear River projects.

Anderson indicated that the Hyrum Reservoir is owned by the Bureau of Reclamation. The State of Utah is entering into a joint study with Reclamation to look at the possibility of raising Hyrum Reservoir. The Task Force hoped to include the results of the study in its final report. Anderson indicated he anticipated that a year from now the Task Force would be looking at the possibility of environmental impact statements and applying for federal permits to move ahead with construction of the reservoirs. The Utah Legislature had placed an additional stipulation on the Task Force that before they moved ahead with construction of the reservoirs, they must have in place contracts for 70 percent of the water.

Keith Higginson reminded the Commission that Idaho's Bear River Task Force was terminated on December 31, 1990. The Task Force had prepared a final report to summarize its two-year efforts to investigate opportunities for Bear River development in Idaho, and that report was filed with the Governor of Idaho at the end of 1990. That report contained five recommendations:

1. The Task Force effort should be continued for at least two more years. (A draft piece of legislation was included in the report to do so.)

That did not occur, so all future activities relating to Bear River Development will be handled through the responsibilities of the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) and the Idaho Water Resource Board.

2. The State of Idaho should get serious about contributing to water resource development. There should be an annual appropriation of \$2-3 million to aid in water development in Idaho.

The Legislature appropriated \$300,000 to the Revolving Development Fund.

3. The State should develop a market strategy for use of its entitlement in the Bear River. This strategy should encourage the Idaho Department of Commerce to attract business and industry to the area which would use Bear River water.

4. The State should become seriously involved in weather modification. The Task Force drafted a bill to instruct the Director of the IDWR to coordinate weather modification activities and accept funds from various sources for these efforts.

This bill passed the House, but after a Senator made a very restrictive, six-page amendment to the one-paragraph bill, the House refused to pass the amended bill.

5. The Board should initiate discussions with Utah Power and Light Co. and other energy companies to determine and evaluate their interest in participating in potential reservoir projects at Rocky Point and at Soda Springs.

Jeff Fassett reported that in the State of Wyoming the Cokeville Meadows National Wildlife Bird Refuge was moving forward. They were still struggling with environmental compliance issues, as well with establishing the boundary of the refuge, which includes most of the area in Wyoming around Cokeville. Fassett indicated he would keep the Commission apprised as to whether that proceeds to refuge status.

On the weather modification front, Fassett indicated that the Wyoming Legislature appropriated \$70,000 to the State Engineer's office this past session. They were currently looking to work with the State of Utah to do some joint research efforts. The focus of Wyoming's legislative initiatives was not to make snow, but to look scientifically at whether or not there were some downwind effects from those who were making snow in Utah.

Fassett indicated that adequate funding was not the problem when it came to Wyoming using compact water in the Bear River Drainage, rather the federal environmental permitting process restricts projects from being built. Wyoming has water development funds available in excess of \$20 million a year, but they are unable almost anywhere in the State of Wyoming to get past the federal permitting process to get a single major project off the ground.

The big effort for Wyoming in the Bear River drainage is reallocating what they have. After five years of drought, Wyoming is getting serious requests from people who are interested in expanding agricultural operations. Major projects are not feasible in the near term, but they are looking at more minor projects and reallocating their minor amounts of compact water, as well as the banking concept, to satisfy those new demands and new interest in water development in the Bear River drainage within Wyoming.

Chairman Wright then asked the Management Committee members to report on agenda item IX. Jeff Fassett indicated he felt that the Commission, and certainly Wyoming, was very concerned that the Upper Division had been "under the microscope" for a long time. Wyoming felt it was time to turn some of that microscope to the Lower Division and look at interaction in the Lower Basin, the use and management of Bear Lake water, and interstate obligations and contractual relationships.

Higginson explained that the reason why a microscope was applied to new uses of water above Bear Lake was that for the first part of the century, Bear Lake had a priority for storage of all of the water that came down the river to that point of diversion (except during flood periods). That water was for the benefit of the Lower Basin. That was shared by Compact redistribution with the Upper Basin. Higginson conceded, however, that if the dry period continues, the Lower Basin will need to be more critical of itself in the distribution of water below Bear Lake. The Commission could reach a point fairly soon where they would need to adopt an interstate delivery scheduled for the Lower Division.

Anderson emphasized that the Commission needed to manage its resources efficiently to maximize the use of the water resources both above and below Bear Lake.

Barnett indicated that as Chairman of the TAC, he would put on the agenda of the next TAC meeting a discussion as to how to prepare for an interstate delivery schedule under the auspices of the Compact. Barnett further indicated that he had overlooked putting on the TAC's agenda a discussion of how the model operates in Idaho to distribute water for direct flows. Mr. Funk had told Barnett, that users were concerned that Idaho's model was not programmed to deliver water across

the state line according to any priorities, rather it only recognized Idaho priorities.

Lee Case reassured the Commission that the USGS welcomed the opportunity to meet and discuss the Commission's needs. He recognized that the Commission relied heavily upon USGS data to allocate water, a very scarce commodity. He indicated the USGS was servicing the gages on a regular basis and if any gages went down, the USGS would have them fixed within 48 hours--and normally sooner than that. Case emphasized the importance of timely and accurate data collection. Jeff Fassett expressed his support of open dialogue between the USGS and the Commission.

It was determined that the next regular Commission meeting would be held on Tuesday, November 26, in Salt Lake City. Pre-commission meetings, if deemed necessary, would be held on Monday, November 25. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
ANNUAL MEETING
Salt Lake City, Utah
April 16, 1991

IDAHO COMMISSIONERS

R. Keith Higginson
Rodney Wallentine
Floyd Jensen

UTAH COMMISSIONERS

D. Larry Anderson
Blair R. Francis
Calvin Funk
J. Glen Nelson (Alternate)
Dean Stuart (Alternate)

CHAIRMAN

Kenneth T. Wright

WYOMING COMMISSIONERS

Gordon W. Fassett
S. Reed Dayton
J. W. Myers
John Teichert (Alternate)

ENGINEER-MANAGER

Jack A. Barnett

ATTORNEY

E. J. Skeen

SECRETARY

Heidi S. Marciniak

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

IDAHO

Hal Anderson, Department of Water Resources
Pete Peterson, River Commissioner - Dist. #11

UTAH

Robert Fotheringham, Division of Water Rights
Lloyd Austin, Division of Water Resources
Carly Burton, Utah Power & Light
Jody Williams, Utah Power & Light
Norman Stauffer, Division of Water Resources
Lee Case, U.S. Geological Survey
Robert Morgan, State Engineer, Division of Water Rights
Bert Page, Division of Water Resources
Barry Saunders, Division of Water Resources
Don Barnett, Bear River Commission
Claire Allen, Board of Water Resources
Terri Jackson, Division of Water Resources
Ben Lindsay, Bear River Water Conservancy District
Les Dunn, Bear River Water Conservancy District

WYOMING

Sue Lowry, State Engineer's Office
John Yarbrough, State Engineer's Office

- IV. Report of Secretary-Treasurer (including future budgets and assessments) Anderson
- V. Report of Operations Committee
 - A. Stream flow forecasts - 1991 Dayton
 - B. Bear Lake operations - 1991 Barnett
 - Burton
 - 1. Lake levels
 - 2. UP&L contracts
 - C. Reservoir operations - 1991 Barnett
 - 1. List of reservoirs and storage rights
 - 2. Current and anticipated storage
 - D. Recommendations and other items Dayton
- VI. Report of Records Committee Francis
 - A. Biennial report
 - B. Printing of Compact and Bylaws
 - C. Jibson's Commission history
- VII. Report from Technical Advisory Committee Barnett
 - A. Efforts to verify base map (and contracts with each state)
 - B. Efforts to estimate current depletions
 - C. Weather modification
 - D. Stream gaging
- VIII. Efforts in each state to use Compact-apportioned water
 - A. Utah Anderson
 - B. Idaho Higginson
 - C. Wyoming Fassett
- IX. Other items from Commission members
 - A. Items from the Management Committee
 - B. Items from other Commission members
- X. Next Commission meeting Wright
 - A. Date: November 25, 1991 (regular meeting - fourth Monday in November)
 - B. Location

Anticipated adjournment: 4:30 p.m.

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES

FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 1990 TO APRIL 1, 1991

INCOME	CASH ON HAND	INTEREST INCOME	FROM STATES	TOTAL REVENUE
Cash Balance 07-1-90	\$129,479.40			\$129,479.40
State of Idaho			\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
State of Utah			\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
State of Wyoming			\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
Interest on Savings and other income		\$9,279.65		\$9,279.65
TOTAL INCOME TO APRIL 1, 1991	\$129,479.40	\$9,279.65	\$75,000.00	\$213,759.05

DEDUCT OPERATING EXPENSES

EXPENDED THROUGH U. S. G. S.

	APPROVED BUDGET	UNEXPENDED BALANCE	EXPENDITURES TO DATE
Stream Gaging	\$48,710.00	\$5,680.00	\$43,030.00
SUBTOTAL	\$48,710.00	\$5,680.00	\$43,030.00

EXPENDED THROUGH COMMISSION

Personal Services	Jack	\$26,380.00	\$6,595.03	\$19,784.97
	Technician	\$3,200.00	\$1,615.33	\$1,584.67
Travel (Eng-Mgr)		\$1,800.00	\$765.80	\$1,034.20
Office Expenses		\$2,100.00	\$1,432.08	\$667.92
Printng Biennial Report		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Treasurer Bond & Audit		\$1,000.00	\$40.00	\$960.00
Printing		\$700.00	\$700.00	\$0.00
Legal Consultant		\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00
Commission History		\$5,000.00	\$2,440.00	\$2,560.00
Special Studies				
a. 1976 Base Map		\$3,275.00	\$0.00	\$3,275.00
b. 1976 Depletion Study		\$66,725.00	\$66,725.00	\$0.00
SUBTOTAL		\$110,680.00	\$80,313.24	\$30,366.76

TOTAL \$159,390.00 \$85,993.24 \$73,396.76

CASH BALANCE AS OF 4-1-91 \$140,362.29

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

DETAILS OF EXPENDITURES

FOR PERIOD ENDING APRIL 1, 1991

232	JACK BARNETT	\$2,198.33
233	JACK BARNETT	\$2,904.80
234	E.J. SKEEN	\$500.00
235	JACK BARNETT	\$2,503.86
236	D I T S	\$3,000.00
237	D I T S	\$275.00
238	JACK BARNETT	\$2,298.31
239	U S G S	\$43,030.00
240	GILCHRIST, SADLER, & HARDER, CPAS	\$860.00
241	JACK BARNETT	\$2,228.13
242	JACK BARNETT	\$3,013.49
243	WALLY JIBSON	\$2,560.00
XXX	BANK CHARGE	\$12.83
244	V O I D	\$0.00
245	V O I D	\$0.00
246	V O I D	\$0.00
247	V O I D	\$0.00
248	FENTON INSURANCE	\$100.00
249	JACK BARNETT	\$5,611.08
250	JACK BARNETT	\$2,300.93
	TOTAL EXPENSE	\$73,396.76

BANK RECONCILIATION

APRIL 1, 1991

Cash in Bank per Statement 4-1-91	\$5,229.13
Less: Outstanding Checks	\$2,300.93
Net Cash in Bank	\$2,928.20
Plus: Savings Account-Utah State Treasurer	\$137,434.09
TOTAL CASH IN SAVINGS AND IN CHECKING ACCOUNT	\$140,362.29

BRC BEAR RIVER COMMISSION / EXPENDITURE FORECAST THRU FY 91 & PROPOSED FY 92 AND FY 93 BUDGET

DESCRIPTION	FY 91 BUDGET	FY 91 AS OF 03-31	FY 91 THRU JUNE 30	FY 92 BUDGET	FY 93 PROPOSED
INCOME					
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$108,762.68	\$129,479.40	\$129,479.40	\$107,065.40	\$56,830.40
IDAHO	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$30,000.00
UTAH	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$30,000.00
WYOMING	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$30,000.00
INTEREST ON SAVINGS	\$5,000.00	\$8,685.61	\$11,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$7,000.00
TOTAL INCOME	\$188,762.68	\$213,165.01	\$215,479.40	\$192,065.40	\$153,830.40
EXPENDITURES					
	BUDGET	Y-T-D	PROJECTED 6-30-91	BUDGET	BUDGET
STREAM GAGING-U.S.G.S.	\$48,710.00	\$43,030.00	\$43,030.00	\$49,210.00	\$49,510.00
PERSONAL SERVICES JACK TECHNICIAN	\$26,380.00	\$19,784.97	\$26,380.00	\$27,435.00	\$28,532.00
	\$3,200.00	\$1,584.67	\$3,200.00	\$3,330.00	\$3,460.00
TRAVEL	\$1,800.00	\$1,034.20	\$1,310.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,600.00
OFFICE EXPENSES	\$2,100.00	\$667.92	\$1,540.00	\$1,600.00	\$1,700.00
PRINTING BIENNIAL REPORT	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,500.00	\$0.00
TREASURE'S BOND & AUDIT	\$1,000.00	\$960.00	\$960.00	\$960.00	\$960.00
PRINTING	\$700.00	\$0.00	\$494.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
LEGAL CONSULTANT	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
COMMISSION HISTORY (WALLY)	\$5,000.00	\$2,560.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SPECIAL STUDIES					
1976 BASE MAPS	\$3,275.00	\$3,275.00	\$3,275.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
1976 DEPLETION STUDY	\$66,725.00	\$0.00	\$22,725.00	\$44,000.00	\$0.00
REPRINTING BASE MAPS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$159,390.00	\$73,396.76	\$108,414.00	\$135,235.00	\$86,462.00
UNEXPENDED CASH BALANCE	\$29,372.68	\$139,768.25	\$107,065.40	\$56,830.40	\$67,368.40

NOTE: USGS '93 FIGURE IS PRELIMINARY AND MAY CHANGE BEFORE CONTRACT IS SIGNED.

**SUMMARY - BEAR LAKE/BEAR RIVER OPERATION
APRIL 1, 1991**

I. CURRENT CONDITIONS

A. Bear Lake Elevation -	5,910.40 - 518,000 AF			
1990 -	5,913.90 - 747,000 AF			
B. Snowpack Conditions -	4/1/91	71%		
	3/4/91	65%		
	4/2/90	60%		
C. Projected Runoff -	4/1/91	155,000	52%	(April-Sept.)
Projected -	4/1/90	108,000	36%	
Actual -	90	18,000	6%	

D. UP&L Bear Lake Model Forecast:

Projected April-July Runoff	73,000
Projected Lake Release Begin	May 15
Projected July 31, 1991 Elevation	5,910.64
Actual July 31, 1990 Elevation	5,912.34

II. 1991 OPERATION

A. Irrigation Season (Decreed Dates)

Idaho - April 20-September 30
Utah - April 1-September 30

B. Bear Lake Releases (Est.)

May 15 to September 15

C. Operating Constraints

1. No release of Bear Lake storage outside of decreed irrigation season dates in Idaho and Utah.
2. Irrigation companies and individuals will be restricted to 75% of the contracted amounts of Bear Lake storage water.

3. Maximum diversion rates will likely be curtailed during the season depending on conditions.
4. The 1991 charge for Bear Lake storage water will be as follows:

Above Soda	\$10.10/acre foot
Above Grace	\$9.24/acre foot
Above Cove	\$3.74/acre foot
Above Oneida	\$2.82/acre foot
Above Cutler	\$1.36/acre foot
5. Irrigation of farmground next fall after crops have been harvested is strongly discouraged, and UP&L *will not* provide Bear Lake storage water for that purpose.
6. Projected 1991 low Bear Lake elevation is 5,907.5.

CBB3/123:cms

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

PRE-AMENDED COMPACT STORAGE ALLOCATIONS
AS RESTRICTED BY 5,911 BEAR LAKE ELEVATION

APRIL 16, 1991

Reservoir*	Sulphur Creek	Woodruff Narrows	Broadbent
Reservoir capacity	19,775	57,300	500**
Carryover storage, October 1, 1990	12,400	4,420	?
Current storage allocation by state for storage rights prior to Amended Compact	5,714	18,490	0
Storage allowed this season while Bear Lake is below 5,911	18,114	22,910***	only carryover storage
Current storage in reservoir	16,740	14,385	?
Space available for storage yet this season	1,374	8,525	?
Storage accomplished in 1990 from April 16 to maximum	4-5-90 storage 14,480	13,425	?

* All reservoirs are in the State of Wyoming. These reservoirs have the right to store under Amended Compact storage rights, but will be restricted this season until Bear Lake reaches 5,911.

** Preliminary number, subject to additional research.

*** This number must be reduced by amount of pumping from reservoir by Chevron.