

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Water Resources Division
Surface Water Branch
P. O. Box 413
Logan, Utah
Sept. 12, 1951

Mr. E. O. Larson, Chairman,
Bear River Compact Commission
P. O. Box 360
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dear Mr. Larson:

The following is a report on the Bear River Compact Engineering Committee meeting held at Salt Lake City on August 23, 1951. The meeting was informal and minutes were not taken of all proceedings and discussions.

Meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Governor's Board Room at State Capitol Building. Members of Engineering Committee, Compact Commissioners, and Advisors present were as follows:

Engineering Committee:

W. V. Iorns, Chairman
E. K. Thomas, Representing Bureau of Reclamation
C. O. Roskelley, Representing State of Utah
Lynn Crandall, Representing State of Idaho
H. T. Person, Representing State of Wyoming

Compact Commissioners:

Mark R. Kulp - Idaho
L. C. Bishop - Wyoming
Joseph Tracy - Utah

State Advisors and others present:

E. G. Thorum - Utah Power & Light Company, Salt Lake City
A. V. Smoot - Corinne, Utah
J. L. Weidman - Tremonton, Utah
E. J. Baird - Soda Springs, Idaho
Fred M. Cooper - Grace, Idaho
E. C. Gradert - Fort Bridger, Wyoming
J. W. Sirrine - Montpelier, Idaho
E. M. Van Orden - Lewiston, Idaho
Judge Howell - Ogden, Utah
A. B. Harris - Logan, Utah
W. N. Gibson - Logan, Utah

A number of people, whose names were not obtained, were in the audience at intervals throughout the proceedings of the meeting.

Although the meeting had been planned for two days, it was limited to one day because the Wyoming representatives announced that due to other engagements they could only be present on the first day. The several points discussed and the recommendations of the Committee are as follows:

1. Practicability of operating the river system as set forth in Article IV, Paragraph A of the Proposed Compact Draft, dated August 1, 1951.

Wyoming representatives objected to principle that three aggrieved users could cause river regulation to be initiated. They contended that regulation under these stipulations would be eternal, that regulations should only be in effect in low water years, that upstream regulation would seldom supply more water to downstream users and that this compact would result in a large administrative force operating continuously.

Idaho representatives pointed out that the Commission merely acts as a court, that any upstream storage would have to be governed by regulation, and they could see nothing wrong in the general principle of the Article.

The Committee recommended that the Drafting Committee give Paragraph A of Article IV further study.

2. Paragraph B, Article IV

Mr. Crandall did not like the depletion method in that the studies were based on a few years of plentiful water supply, that dry years may have percentage flows in considerable variance with those derived, and that too many indeterminate factors are involved. He recommended that the divertible flow method was a more dependable method of division.

Mr. Person agreed that there was less theory in divertible flow method of division and stated that Wyoming would not agree to a compact which would place Wyoming under regulation in years like 1944, 1946 and 1947, during which time he contended no Idaho user was injured. He believed the water should be divided between Wyoming and Idaho on the basis of irrigated acreage. Also it would be agreeable with Wyoming to divide divertible flow on basis of irrigated acreage, as the general public understands divertible flows. Also, he contended if the water was to be divided by the courts, that division would be on the basis of irrigated acreage.

Mr. Kulp questioned as to how tributaries would be regulated under the various methods, but there was no comment nor subsequent discussion on the subject.

Members of the committee appeared to be more favorable to water division by the divertible flow method. Mr. Person would define the divertible flow as all diversions in Wyoming plus Idaho diversions plus that passing the lowest point of diversion. There was considerable discussion on whether the lowest point should be Border, Stewart Dam, Alexander, or Cutler Dam. The committee recommended that studies be made in general as follows:

- a. Segregation of natural flow and storage waters of main stem from Stewart Dam to Cutler Dam.
- b. Deliveries by divertible flow method in Central division.
- c. Deliveries by divertible flow method using Alexander or some other downstream point as lowest point of diversion and irrigated lands above said point as basis for division.

3. Existing upstream reservoirs.

A tabulation of minor upstream reservoirs as recorded in adjudications and decrees was presented and it was pointed out that this list may not be complete and also that some of the reservoirs may not exist or may have been greatly enlarged.

The committee recommended that each State Engineer furnish the Chairman with a complete tabulation of all recorded permits, certificates and adjudications of storage reservoirs. Further, the Logan Office should investigate these in the field and determine whether correct or not. It was suggested that reservoirs below 20 acre-feet be eliminated from final listings, but that they should be included in the investigation.

4. Consideration of reports on available storage supplies and storage requirements above Bear Lake.

Mr. Thorum and Mr. Grandall pointed out that upstream storage would be practically 100 percent loss to Bear Lake storage and that any storage left over after hay crop harvest would be consumed in pasture irrigation. All agreed that no limit could be placed on time for emptying upstream reservoirs. There was additional discussion on upstream storage, but time did not permit a full exploration of the subject and no recommendations were made.

5. Article IX Chapman Canal rights.

A short report on irrigated lands under Chapman Canal in Utah, capacity of Canal and Neponset Reservoir was presented to the Committee. The Committee recommended that

the Logan Office complete any surveys necessary to show acreage of irrigated lands and present all data to the Compact Commission for its decision in defining the Chapman Canal rights.

It was the general opinion of the Engineering Committee that they were not prepared at this time to make definite recommendations to the Drafting Committee or Compact Commission and that the Engineering Committee would need hold additional meetings to work out its recommendations to the Drafting Committee and Compact Commission.

Respectfully,

W.V. Iorns
W. V. Iorns, Chairman,
BEAR RIVER COMPACT ENGINEERING COMMITTEE