

MINUTES OF THE
BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING

September 18, 1980

Room 303
State Capitol Building
Salt Lake City, Utah

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
September 18, 1980

THOSE PRESENT:

UNITED STATES

Wallace N. Jibson, Chairman & Federal Representative
Logan, Utah

COMMISSIONERS

IDAHO

Don Gilbert, Grace, Idaho
C. Stephen Allred, (Ex Officio) seated for Daniel Roberts

WYOMING

J. W. Myers Evanston, Wyo.
John Teichert Cokeville, Wyo.
Clem Lord Cheyenne, Wyo. (Seated for Geo. Christopulos)

UTAH

Daniel F. Lawrence (Secretary-Treasurer) Bountiful
Blair Francis, Randolph (Seated for Simeon Weston)
Paul Holmgren, Bear River City

LEGAL ADVISER

None

ALTERNATES AND OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Dee Hansen, State Engineer , Utah Salt Lake City
Norm Stauffer, Dept of Water Resources, Salt Lake City
R. Michael Turnipseed, Area Engineer, Logan

Marvin Bollschweiler, Water Commissioner, Evanston

Ted Arnow, District Chief , USGS Salt Lake City

Jay Haight, UP & L Co. Salt Lake City
Carly Burton " " " " "

Connie Borrowman, Utah Dept of Water Resources, Salt Lake
Secretary

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

Special Meeting

September 18, 1980

Room 303, State Capitol Building

Salt Lake City, Utah

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We'll officially call the meeting to order, gentlemen.

I think before we have introductions, I'd like to mention the passing of another one of our Commission members. Cliff Skinner passed away July 16, at his home in Dingle. He was ailing when he was here to the April meeting. I didn't realize it so much until I noticed in the Minutes that he only made one statement; and that's when he said "Let's get on with the business; we've been here too long." Of course, those kinds of statements can be made when you're not ailing, but I learned later that he had cancer of the liver - and it moved fast with him. The week before he died, Dan Roberts and I drove over and visited with him, and the family later told us that we were about the last ones that he was able to converse with and recognize.

We had a spray prepared by the Preston florist on behalf of the Commission for his services, and Dan and I went to the funeral and expressed to the family the deep esteem and respect we had for Cliff here on the Commission. He was only 60 years old - which was a little surprising to me when I found his age. I thought he at least had me beat.

He was widely known in Southeastern Idaho and Cache Valley, in both states, for his work with the Dairy Commission. He had been Sheriff in Bear Lake County for some time. He had a lot of friends. He did a lot of work here on the Commission - a lot of it in the background. He did a lot of work toward getting legislative approval in the Idaho legislature on the Amended Compact.

We're going to miss him here on the Commission. I don't believe a successor has been appointed yet, has he, Steve?

MR. ALLRED: No.

INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: So, lets quickly have introductions and get on with the meeting.

MRS. BORROWMAN: I'm Connie Borrowman, Secretary to the Commission.

MR. LAWRENCE: I was just thinking, it's kind of a hazardous job to be a Commissioner for that area of Idaho. That is three of them.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: And none too old.

MR. LAWRENCE: You can go back, reading Minutes even way back; and I am embarrassed that I can't remember his name now - one of the old-time Commissioners -

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We had Ferris Kunz.

MR. LAWRENCE: It was before Ferris. One of the originals. Anyway, on behalf of the State of Utah, we certainly did appreciate Cliff's work. I was always impressed with his solidarity and his ideas, and I think we will miss him.

I'm Dan Lawrence.

DR. STAUFFER: Norm Stauffer

MR. TURNIPSEED: Mike Turnipseed

MR. FRANCIS: Blair Francis

MR. HOLMGREN: Paul Holmgren

MR. HANSEN: Dee Hansen

MR. MYERS: Wes Myers

MR. BOLLSCHWEILER: Marvin Bollschweiler

MR. TEICHERT: John Teichert

MR. LORD: Clem Lord

MR. ARNOW: Ted Arnow

MR. HAIGHT: Jay Haight

MR. BURTON: Carly Burton

MR. GILBERT: Don Gilbert

MR. ALLRED: Steve Allred

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I'm Wally Jibson. Dan Roberts called the other day and he somehow has himself affiliated with the Retired Federal Employees Association. He's down to a conference in New Mexico, I believe. Sim Weston and Ed Skeen are in an all-day meeting in Randolph today, with Woodruff Narrows Reservoir Company stockholders; so they couldn't be here. So Blair will be sitting in for Sim. Clem said George got tied up in legislative matters; so we'll have Clem and John and Wes, I guess, officially sitting for Wyoming; and Marv as an advisor. We do, then, have a Quorum if we seat Don and Steve as the two from Idaho.

We don't have a formal agenda written up for today, but following somewhat the agenda in the Bylaws, we'll get the Minutes of the Annual Meeting held April 28 approved. I'm sorry that for most of you here, this morning is the first time you've had a chance to look at these Minutes. We did get a preliminary draft out in June, in preparation for the June 25 Committee meeting. I think George had a copy; Dan and Dee, and probably Steve, of the preliminary draft - and the final draft is the same. We got behind a little bit on the printing, so I didn't get a chance to mail them out; but I'll read them over.

MR. LAWRENCE: Would we be meeting in November?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We want to talk about that today. I discussed it briefly with Steve, and we thought that it might be well if we could make this meeting fill in for the November meeting, because of travel restrictions and so forth.

MR. LAWRENCE: That would be fine; but if we were going to meet, I would move that we just postpone the approval until that meeting.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: If we do decide to postpone the meeting, or cancel the November meeting, about the only thing that we would have then that we don't have today would be the Treasurer's Report that Bert gives, and the listing of applications for appropriations; which, if the States will get them to me, I could mail them out to all those on the mailing list about the time of the November meeting. We can discuss that later, when we're finishing up today, to see if we desire to go ahead with the November meeting. I'll summarize the Minutes, then, and see if you have any questions.

SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES

The Annual Meeting of the Bear River Commission was held in Salt Lake City beginning at 10:55 a.m., on April 28, 1980. All regular Commissioners were in attendance, except J. W. Myers, who was represented by Clem Lord.

Minutes were approved for the regular meeting held November 26, 1979. The Chairman reported that a few hundred copies of the Amended Compact has been printed and were available after the meeting.

Secretary-Treasurer Report showed that all states had paid 1980 fiscal year assessments - \$22,000 per state - leaving a cash balance of \$85,694, of which \$45,300 would be obligated to USGS as of September 30, 1980.

George Christopulos was elected the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, and Dan Lawrence was reelected Secretary-Treasurer.

The report of the Assistant Secretary showed that somewhat above average water supplies are expected for the season. He discussed the budget and the stream gaging program for 1981; but no action was taken, except to set a meeting date of June 25 for the Budget Committee and others from each state.

The balance of the time was spent in discussion of a base map and tabulation of irrigated acreages under the Amended Compact. Ralph Mellin of the State Engineers' Committee led the discussion. It was decided that the Committee would proceed in preparation of a base map. The scale as reported throughout the Minutes is one inch to 100,000 feet, but I believe the scale selected is 1 to 100,000. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: What you should do - any place in the Minutes that you see that '1 inch to 100,000 feet', delete the 'inch' and 'feet'. It's just 1 to 100,000 scale, and it makes quite a difference - about 12 times.

I didn't notice anything else as I reviewed the Minutes as Connie distributed them to me that might be questionable; but if any of you notice significant errors as you review these, if you'd let me know, we can change them on the official copy.

So with that, and recognizing the fact that you haven't had a chance to review them, I think a Motion would still be in order to approve them.

MR. LAWRENCE: I move we approve the Minutes.

MR. MYERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: All in favor? Opposed? Minutes stand approved, pending any corrections that we might find as we read them.

MR. LAWRENCE: Why don't we officially make that change, 1 to 100,000.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. Will you get that in the Minutes, Connie? Reference of '1 inch to 100,000 feet' throughout the Minutes should be '1 to 100,000'. If you would write it just the way you did in the Minutes, Connie, except leave off the inches. You could actually leave the feet on, I guess. It says '1 to 100,000 feet', which we assume is '1 foot to 100,000 feet', but technically you could delete both the 'feet' and the 'inches'.

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The next regular agenda item would be the Report of the Chairman. I might state that the major purpose of the meeting, if not the sole purpose, is to discuss, and act on, a budget for the 1981 fiscal year, beginning this October 1; and also a stream-gaging program, in which the water year also begins October 1. So we need some kind of action today.

As we mentioned, if we can also use this meeting in place of our November meeting, we'll do that. I think rather than give a report on behalf of the Assistant Secretary, I will make my report brief today, and discuss the handout report I have as Chairman; and then, if we have further reports from the Secretary-Treasurer, or the Committees, we could have those at that time.

REPORT OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY

(Chairman Jibson presented the report, a copy of which is attached as a part of these Minutes, with the following comments, where indicated.)

Page 1, para. 1

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I imagine you'll continue to release, of course during the irrigation season and, when possible, into the late fall to bring it down to where you usually have it for the spring. It's amazing how fast, really, the Lake recovered from the 1977 drought. We're already back to having to release water, at least in part, to make a hole for next year's runoff.

Page 1, para. 2

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Walt was aware of our meeting today, but I had forgotten to tell him that we moved our time up to 9 o'clock; so I got panicky this morning about 8:30 and called him from down here. His wife told me he was up on the River, being faithful in his duties. I don't know how you people feel about the work that he has done. From my standpoint, from the records standpoint, I know he has done a terrific job, particularly for being new on the job. I've heard Louis Stuart say that he's done a bang-up job on Woodruff Creek, too.

MR. LAWRENCE: Does he work for Utah and Wyoming? (Yes)

MR. HANSEN: We have been very happy with him.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I would hope that this kind of an arrangement might continue; and as I mentioned about the mosquitoes, he's not new to Bear River mosquitoes, because he worked in our office 30 years ago and he's been over the country.

Page 2, para. 4

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Of course, the canal was taken over by Marv's people for summer operation because it is a regular canal in the upper Wyoming section.

Page 4, para. 2

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: These five stations have been included in past recommendations for discontinuance. The Hyrum Reservoir record is largely a furnished record. I pay the water master over there a small amount each year to make daily readings. We publish daily records during the summer season and about once-a-month records during the winter season on the Hyrum Reservoir. Dee and Mike may have other feelings about the East Fork station. We have another station on Little Bear River we call 'Little Bear River below Davenport Creek' that you might prefer to keep in, if the choice comes between those two. I've recommended previously that Little Bear River near Paradise, which is the station above Hyrum Reservoir would be the least desirable from the general public interest to delete. It still is somewhat of State and local concern, but is a little more broadly used, I believe, than the other stations. With that introduction to the things we should discuss today, I think we could throw this meeting open for discussion now.

MR. TEICHERT: Do I understand that station on Twin Creek has been turned over from the Green River office to your office?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Yes. As of now, to prevent overlapping travel, the Cheyenne office asked if we would take that over, along with some observation wells that they have been hitting, and the quality-water portion of the border gage. Then we would have two of those QW stations in the basin - the one where the River enters Idaho at Border, and the other one at Bear River near Corinne. Ted's office has been handling the Corinne QW record to date; but I think plans are that Bruce Garrett of our office, has the necessary equipment that he could handle both gages.

MR. TEICHERT: But this wouldn't come under the co-op program?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: No; these are federal programs. The Twin Creek gage was operated many years ago by our office, and then we discontinued it; and then, through the Bureau of Land Management, it was picked up again by the Cheyenne office.

MR. TEICHERT: They've had a lot of water. There was 600 second-feet coming out of there.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Yes; I've measured in that range, standing on the edge of a bridge with a 50 pound weight suspended down between my feet, and wondering how quick a little log might jerk me in with it. That was always a 'bugger' to measure. Now it looks real fancy over there. They've got a nice-looking measuring bridge, manometer-type recorder, and they have a beautiful station there now.

MR. HOLMGREN: Wally, could I ask you, what was the purpose of the stations at Collinston and East Side Canal, and the West Side?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: For many years, the Geological Survey operated those gages, somewhat in cooperation with the Power Company, so that we had the total flow at Collinston. By adding the two canals to Bear River near Collinston, we got the total flow of the River at that point. You see, the Collinston gage is one of the oldest in the Nation, actually, it goes clear back to 1889. We wanted to have a measure of that total flow coming through the pass there. Then in more recent years, we wanted to get closer to Great Salt Lake with our gaging and also get below the Malad River, so we installed Bear River near Corinne. Of course, it correlates very well with the Collinston record; and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Power people have extended that record

back by correlation with the Cutler Dam record. I don't know whether it was extended back to 1889, but clear back to the period that we usually use for analysis. So we have kept those two canals in operation; but they're not so important to us any more, because of the Corinne record. So I asked Jay about it. I knew the Power Company or the canal company over there needed those records. He said, 'oh, of course, we would continue them', but there is a little question on how they might be published.

MR. HOLMGREN: Would closing those stations have any significance on our being able to adjudicate the water between the Hammond Canal and the West Canal? Roughly, I guess we have a little over 700 second-feet in the West Canal, and a little less than 200 second-feet in the East Canal.

MR. HAIGHT: We can measure how much is in the canal. We'd have to keep the measurements going. We would keep the records in our offices. If you wanted to publish then, of course we'd make them available.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The Power Company makes a number of measurements there now, anyway. Their hydrographers, and our hydrographers do, and we throw all measurements together when we work up the records. So there is no reason, from your standpoint, why the record would be diminished in quality at all and it would be available to you.

MR. HOLMGREN: I was hoping it wouldn't be any problem administering the water. We have enough problems. We've got to come up with almost another million dollars by October 1 to finalize the purchase of that system.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I guess you've asked yourself the question, from time to time, as to whether you won the lawsuit over there.

MR. HOLMGREN: We're having pretty good luck, though. We have better than 90% of the users that cooperate, and this has to come on a volunteer basis. We think as more people come in it has a tendency to shame the others in, or they feel it's in their best interest to go in. So we're doing pretty good.

MR. TURNIPSEED: Will it be a share-held company?

MR. HOLMGREN: We're asking them to bring in their contracts now, and we'll re-issue stock to all stockholders. It's about time that happened. It was pretty well floundering from dead weight. It was a pretty messy deal the way it had drifted over 80 years. We found that out, with about 6 or 8 years

in litigation. We found that a lot of the interpretations of the contracts were whoever wanted to interpret the way they wanted it in their own minds. We feel it needs a good house-cleaning.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We might turn to page four and take a look at this budget. Basically, it's the same as we presented in April, except that now the Compact assistance would be a direct expenditure. The charges under items 3 and 4 would no longer be chargeable to a direct expenditure item. Those two charges, plus an even \$1,000 was moved up into Item I to try to get back to our previous requirements for the Compact assistance 'personal service' item. In April, we had \$4,310 in that item in budget number 2; and, of course, that was based on the fact that we didn't think we had to budget locally for this 79% that goes into Civil Service Retirement Fund. So actually what we were budgeting for was about 21% compensation to me - and you'll see I didn't raise it in the same proportion of 21% to 100%, when we set that up at \$7,200. I decided that as I get older, I'm not worth as much money as before I retired, anyway. So this, really, is only set up at about a 50% salary situation with what I was getting before retirement. In leaving it at \$7,200 on an average, between this and the time that I would spend as Federal Representative as long as the President hasn't canned me from that, I would probably spend on an average of between two and three days a week, on a year-round basis, on these two items. As you'll notice, this would amount to a net cost to the states of \$20,563 each. We had approved an assessment of \$23,000 per state. I don't believe those assessments would have been paid yet.

MR. LAWRENCE: I signed the bills this morning. Each state would receive the bill in Monday's mail unless I stop them.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I think maybe we should just mention again, as we did in April, that although the fiscal and administrative charge, as listed under item 3, is much higher than previously in our method of budgeting that was used for many years. - It does include such items as rent - which, as we set the budget up was \$6,300 out of the \$18,000, or about a third of it - and another \$2,624 from digital recorder processing, and a certain number of office supplies, and so forth, that we actually do include in that overhead charge. It is a little misleading just to look at the \$18,000 and say, in effect, \$18,000 out of \$102,000 is a tremendous overhead just for administrative work.' That does cover a few other items.

MR. LAWRENCE: In your note on page 2, "Today's proposed budget would require a change in status if my services are to be continued in the assistance program. I would expect to resign from this appointment, effective September 30, 1980." This budget on page 4 is, if we continue, the same way we've been going?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: No. This budget on page 4; the Compact assistance item no longer would be in the cooperative program. It would be a direct expenditure without the overhead charges. But in order for it to be a direct expenditure, if I continue to serve, I couldn't -

MR. LAWRENCE: There's no salary for you under this budget that I can see. It's all tied in the personal services cooperative.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: No, it would be 'personal services' direct under 'compact assistance' that \$7,200.

MR. HANSEN: That would be paid directly to Wally; that wouldn't go through the Geological Survey.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: But it couldn't be paid to me unless I resigned as a part-time employee of the Federal Government.

MR. LAWRENCE: So this is under the plan that you would retire - I mean, you would not be a retired annuitant?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Right.

MR. ALLRED: What's the difference there between the two columns - Compact assistance, and administration allocation?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Nothing. I wanted to show them separately today, so that we could discuss this very thing Dan brings up. In the future, and in future budgeting, if this is the way we go, we would really have two budget items - Stream-gaging item, and direct Compact assistance.

MR. LAWRENCE: What does Compact assistance mean, then?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: It includes, basically, my work in the day-to-day operation of the Compact, working with the hydrographer-Commissioners; supervising, indirectly, their work (they actually work under the direction of the State Engineer's of the three States), setting the quality standards for collection of the records and, a pretty big item has been the preparation of the annual reports in the past. We're on a biennial report basis now, and the first report will be for

1979 and 1980, which will be in this next fiscal year, as far as the work on it. So we'll have a two-year report to get out this winter and spring. Hopefully, we'll try to get it out by the deadline the Compact calls for.

MR. LAWRENCE: The \$64,795 - who performs that service?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The Geological Survey personnel in the Logan office.

MR. TEICHERT: Wally, this \$7,200 - that would be totally paid to you? Is there any other?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: No. There is about an \$800 clerical item that I would have to take out of that, because there is a certain amount of typing. We don't actually have a secretary in the Logan office any more. When you find typographical errors in these things, like this report, you can blame me. I hunt and peck it. We do have to contract out a little typing, and a certain amount of clerical work and preparation of these large plates, and so forth, to go in the annual report. There's a lot of figuring that goes on there. So, work that we've previously had our secretary do, I will have to figure on some contract-out work. Not contract in a sense of getting bids on it, or anything; but just getting a person to work on a contract basis. I assumed about \$800 there; so basically, there would be, then, about \$6,400 that would come to me out of that item.

MR. LORD: Do you have to pay any other additives out of that, like Social Security?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Well, this is one of the things, I think, we may have to resolve today. I don't think that we would have to - maybe in my case, if you handled it more like a contractual obligation rather than just a regular employee. I don't know enough about Social Security to know.

MR. LAWRENCE: Don't you want to get the benefits of Social Security?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Well, I've considered that. I'm probably the only 65-year-old in the country that doesn't have any Social Security time to his credit. I don't remember one single day. I worked for a sugar company up in Idaho, and they might have taken out some Social Security for a few days. I guess, legally, if I worked five years under Social Security, then I could qualify for the minimum. I have a few moral reservations about double-dipping and, really, that is the reason for this law that I quote back here that says I can only draw the difference between what I retire at and what I was making before. That was the

purpose of the law, to prevent double-dipping; and I think it's a good law. But each time I get a raise as an annuitant, which I welcome - I got one September 1 - my hourly rate goes down here. Like a district ranger told me the other day, one of their people now is paying them to work for them. Last time I talked to him, he was making 50 cents an hour, and with this raise in September, he'll have to pay them.

MR. LAWRENCE: Can we avoid paying Social Security?

MR. HANSEN: Wally has to pay it; but we can avoid it by contracting with him. We just contract with you for services and then it's your obligation to pay the taxes.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I did call the Social Security office the other day to find out what the rates were. I wasn't even aware what the rates were, and what they would be January 1. They go up a little bit. One reason I did that was just taking a look at the overall program in case we did go on our own as an office. There may be an item there, 7% or so, that would have to be figured.

DR. STAUFFER: It will cost you about 10% to 12% where you're self-employed.

MR. LAWRENCE: As a self-employer, you pay nearly the combined total of the two - it's a little bit less.

MR. HANSEN: If you go on salary, then we have to set up to take care of that.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Well, really, I hadn't considered those details.

MR. MYERS: That really wouldn't be prohibitive would it?

MR. HANSEN: No. You'd gain the bookkeeping. If you set up as an office and pay him a salary, then you'd have all the bookkeeping to do for federal and state. But if you ever hired a secretary, you'd have to do that anyway, probably.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Technically, on the secretary business, we have had a little secretarial work just paid out for which we contract, and I guess basically that secretary should include that as self-employment.

MR. LAWRENCE: No, that isn't the way it works. They'll require you to collect it from her, unless she's registered as a self-employed person.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: So far, it's been very minimal. I think I've only paid out \$75 or \$80 for secretarial help since I retired.

MR. HANSEN: If he does that under his contract, that's his obligation

MR. LAWRENCE: I think what the Senator was saying is that we ought to crank it in. We're not saying we shouldn't do it; but we need to have it in there, it seems to me, because somebody is going to have to pay it, I'll bet.

MR. LORD: You can get secretarial help the same way, by contract. These organizations that make a business of providing temporary help - then that's their responsibility.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Our former secretary has been willing to come back a lot of times, and then I've had another person. What little we've done so far has just been an informal sort of thing.

MR. TEICHERT: It seems to me that if it's under \$150 or something like that, you don't have to pay.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I think what I'm going to miss more than the typing is the clerical help I've had on preparing the annual report. The tabular work, and a certain amount of that is typing, a certain amount of it is just straight old addition.

I wonder, Ted - Dee has to leave at 10:00 for a short time, but he'll come back - I wonder if you have anything further to add on my assumption that \$51,480 will be available for you for matching.

MR. ARNOW: Yes, I have just one thing to add. When I was here in April, I mentioned that the status of the appropriation bill of the Geological Survey, as it was going through Congress, was such that our cut would only be allocated the same amount as we had last year. I protested about that, requesting increase for Utah; not just specifically for the Bear River Commission, but all cooperative programs. I received a letter, dated August 28, from my boss saying that they've added an additional \$40,374 to Utah's tentative initial allocation. Out of that \$40,374, I've taken enough to bring the amount that we can match with the Bear River Commission up to \$51,480; which would be enough for 33 gaging stations.

The reason that they use the word "tentative" is that the Geological Survey's bill still has not been passed. As you know, the Interior Department bill has not been passed. It's still in Congress. Back in August, Senator Stevens, from one of the Senate committees, came to the Survey and said "What

effect would that be on your budget if you had a 10% cut?" That threw our Washington people into a tizzy. They don't know whether there will be a 10% cut or not; and they're working on the assumption that there won't be, but they can't take the chance. So our Washington office is holding a 7% reserve. As I read here, and you can have copies if you want to, "It is still necessary that Reston (our Washington office) hold a 7% reserve, which reduces your tentative initial allocation of \$54,902. We hope this will become available in the near future." I checked yesterday, and nobody knows anything more than they knew back in August. The bill was someplace there. The Congress has slowed down to a crawl; nobody thinks it is going to be passed until November, maybe December, or January. I'm working under the assumption that there won't be a 7% cut; but it's possible that there will be.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Did you figure out what 7% amounts to in terms of gaging stations?

MR. ARNOW: It amounts to about 1 3/4 gaging stations. I would suggest that we assume that we're not going to have a 7% cut and start the fiscal year on that basis. If we get the 7% cut, we'll have to sit and re-evaluate.

DR. STAUFFER: Could you drop two stations the last month and not be charged for the year?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Actually, it would be about one station; it is about \$3,600.

MR. LAWRENCE: What you should do, as the practical thing - Ted's going to keep his people on, and two weeks from today they're still going to be working in the new fiscal year and he is assuming that he's got the money. I don't think we should operate on any other basis.

MR. ARNOW: I'm assuming that in all the cooperative programs and for some very small cooperators that I have, in which the cooperation is \$3,000, \$4,000, or \$5,000, I've gone ahead to sign the agreements with them. But for the large program, like the Department of Natural Resources, I'm holding on to that agreement. I will start to operate on October 1, on the assumption that there won't be any cut; but I don't think we should sign the agreement. We could sign the agreement; then we'd have to revise it if there were a 7% cut. I really don't think there will be a cut; but as I say, I don't know any more than I've read to you, and I checked Tuesday with my boss and he says he knows

nothing further. That's all I can say on that now. I think we should go ahead, if you want to, on the basis that there will not be a 7% cut.

MR. LAWRENCE: Where are we then? Do we need to revise the figure in column two in this budget that we're looking at, and make a Motion to approve it, or something?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I don't know what to suggest here, Dan. There probably will be some charges, such as we've mentioned on Social Security, that I hadn't considered. I don't know whether I would suggest that we try to revise that upward. We have, in the past, exceeded particular items in the budget without the auditor making too big an issue of it. We've gone over particular items, as I've listed here in items 1 to 11, from time to time. I'm not really suggesting that this is only an estimate, and we don't have to stick with it anyway; but it may not be too serious if we went over that a small amount, if it were agreeable to the Commission, without formally changing the budget. If we could revise it at a later date in the fiscal year, either by letter or at our April meeting, in case we found it necessary. You'll notice from the summary of minutes that I gave, that we're running a rather healthy surplus in our bank account, \$35,000 or \$40,000 as of now. So we would be in no particular trouble there, even if you chose to cut this assessment of \$23,000 back to \$22,000 or \$21,000. Without coming out and suggesting that, I would say that is a possibility if we had to exceed it a little bit - making an adjustment at a later date in the budget.

MR. LAWRENCE: Would this make any difference, Wally, in the way you handle the distribution of the Minutes of the meetings? Has the Survey been reproducing Connie's Minutes for you; or would there need to be any change in the procedure at all?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: For many years I printed the Minutes up and just charged it to the G. S. under our regular cooperative program. For the last 2 or 3 years, I've been getting a direct charge to the Bear River Commission for those. For instance, we had nearly \$100 worth of printing of these Minutes and my report this time. I was going to present that bill to you today and hand to Bert.

MR. LAWRENCE: That would be under that Administrative allocation direct expenditures column, then?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Yes, 'Printing and Reproduction,' \$300. I used to run the Minutes on an old Multilith machine that we had in the office, but if I figured my time was worth anything it was usually very costly to run those Minutes. So I have been having the Water Research Lab do it at their print shop; they do it very fast, but they're not cheap. I figured out on a cost per page, I could have xeroxed this bunch of Minutes cheaper than I could have had them do it. Actually, offset is a little better quality than xeroxing, but their services don't come cheap.

MR. LAWRENCE: I have a suspicion that we probably, Connie and her staff, could do as much, at least 90% of the effort, that if you just added just a little extra effort those Minutes could go directly from Connie, reproduced and so forth.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: That could be done. I'd like to review them before they go out.

MR. LAWRENCE: I think that certainly is assumed. It probably is not a major expense item; it is something that could be just worked out.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: It actually doesn't come under 'Compact assistance'; it comes under the other. In mailing the Minutes, of course postage is a large item; and I have maybe stretched it a point by mailing Minutes in USGS envelopes from time to time, as we do with a lot of other cooperative work. Sometimes there is a fine line when you are doing work with a cooperator and with the Federal Government. When should I use franking privilege, and when should I not? I've discussed this with our Solicitor, Roland Robison. By enclosing a little covering letter on GS letterhead, I've mailed Minutes out. Ted maybe hasn't been aware of this.

MR. LAWRENCE: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to bring this to a head. I certainly think that we have a full consensus on the concept that we should bring you over as a consultant, or employee, or however you want; and get the benefit that accrued both to the Commission and to you, of the money that would not now go to the retirement system. Therefore, I would move that we move ahead with the change and implement it. If it's necessary to adjust the amount, I think that it ought to include the sufficient facilities. What's your title going to be, Assistant Secretary, under that arrangement?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I don't know; I haven't thought that far ahead. It could be. We wouldn't be restricted from any particular title at the time.

MR. LAWRENCE: I think the Commission could employ anybody they want, and call them anything they want. Whatever that is, I don't think we should expect him to 'poor boy'; go around begging. And I think that we would want to set up the kind of a program where supporting services surely would be available on a part-time basis, for doing the adding and clerical work and stuff like that. It was there, and there was no bashfulness about Wally using it, so that he felt that he is not in this as a donation thing. I think that he ought to feel like he is adequately and reasonably compensated for his work, and he'll give it the priority that he should. We're not asking him to finish out his career on some kind of a charity basis.

So that is my proposal; whether we're ready to make it a formal Motion - maybe we need to refine it with some discussion here, and reaction from the other Commissioners from Utah or other states and solidify it. Maybe I'll just ask Steve and the rest of you how you feel about it.

MR. ALLRED: I certainly think it's time to establish an operation for the Commission, independently. I think this is the way it started out. I don't have any problem at all; in fact, I think probably the Minutes ought to include a Motion to employ Wally; show in the Minutes that he is employed on a contractual basis, if that's our desire, by the Commission, for the purposes of administering the activities of the Commission.

MR. LAWRENCE: Do we need to give this job a title" Should we call him the 'Director' or 'Manager'? I am not enough of a charter member to know for sure how we established the 'Assistant Secretary' title in the first place.

MR. MYERS: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad Dan came up with what he just came up with. I'm sure we all agree that this should be done and on a business basis, of course; but also, as a reflection of the value of the past relationship with Wally. If he has preference of title, why I'd let him pick it himself. Maybe he could come up with something fancy. He worked under 'Assistant Secretary' because he wasn't a part of the employees; he was kind of off with a dual-purpose-animal type. So he couldn't be the Secretary, so he was called the 'Assistant Secretary'; it's just that simple.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: This is correct, Wes. I remember almost word-for-word what happened in a meeting like this some 25 years ago, or 23 years ago. The reason I remember it so well, it seemed like my lot in life at that time was to have been an 'Assistant Secretary'. I worked in Idaho for a long time in the Department of Agriculture, and the title I had was 'Assistant Secretary', even though I was doing other kind of work. Anyway, I remember Mark Culp of Idaho saying, "We don't want a Federal employee being called an Interstate River Commissioner", even though this was done on the Upper Snake. So it was Mark who suggested, "let's call him an 'Assistant Secretary.'" That's where the title came from, and it stuck with me. I've been able to live with it. In fact, it didn't have too much meaning, but I could see their point, too. I might say that the USGS did not want a federal employee out here regulating head gates. You can understand that. So had the Commission titled me as an Interstate Commissioner, I'm sure that our chief hydrologist would have said "no". We have Lynn Crandall up there who is called a 'River Commissioner', probably the only one in the country. He's done a wonderful job; but we won't give permission for a federal employee of the GS to be called an 'Interstate Commissioner' because that implies, at least, that he might be out regulating head gates, and we don't want the federal government in that position.

I'm not saying I should be called an 'Interstate Commissioner' here. We have a few complications, as you can see, with the Federal Representative thing, and the Chairman. I think an 'Interstate Commissioner' title might be a little too strong the other way, but there can be other titles. 'Executive Secretary', something like that, might be all right.

MR. LAWRENCE: How does 'General Manager' sound?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I wasn't going to mention this; maybe I should before we actually discuss this any further. I was going to mention it to Steve, because I had done; and I was going to mention it to Dan, because he's Secretary to the Commission. But, if I resign as a reemployed annuitant as of October 1, there may, or may not be, a little change in handling expense money of the Federal Representative. As I mentioned in the report, E. O. Larsen did not come back as a reemployed annuitant. As a matter of fact, he went to work for a consulting firm and went off to Africa while he was still Chairman of the Bear River Commission, and no problem, because he worked as a consultant. But he was reimbursed through the Bureau of Reclamation for his expenses as Chairman and Federal Representative because that had been his former employing agency.

Ted and I have been trying to set up the ground work, whereby we think the Office of Management and Budget would say to the GS, 'Okay, here's a former employee of the GS and, therefore, you take care of the administrative details of paying his expenses as Federal Representative and Chairman of the Commission.' We have some correspondence in the mail at the present time, and it will eventually end up on Secretary Andrus' desk - hopefully before he resigns. I had asked Steve back in June if he would consider, if it were the consensus of the Commission to give me a vote of confidence, that since he was close to the Secretary, if he would consider talking to Secretary Andrus and telling him that the Commission is desirous of my staying on as the Federal Representative and Chairman - in case the White House asked him for his recommendation.

You understand that I was appointed by President Ford, a Republican President. I think Mr. Larsen served under several different Presidents, both Republican and Democratic. But it wouldn't be awfully hard for a Democratic President to put someone else in. So I had in mind, and I did ask Steve in June if he would consider doing that on behalf of Idaho. Just the past few days Ted and I have discussed this and wondered if it would be wise if Dan, as Secretary of the Commission, with the Commission's approval, of course, sent a letter to Secretary Andrus stating that the Commission was desirous of retaining me as Federal Representative. Then, if Andrus gets this other letter in which the GS has given tentative approval to handling my administrative details even though I was not a reemployed annuitant, at least he would have some feedback from us as to what your desires were; whether the Commission itself and the states wanted to keep my status quo as far as Chairman and Federal Representative.

Of course, President Carter can go ahead and make a change if he wanted to without consulting with the Secretary of Interior; but I'm doubtful that he would. In discussing this informally with Senator Church on one occasion, he told me, "Well don't worry about the White House if you get Secretary Andrus' endorsement." So with him resigning some time in the near future, and the alternative of President Carter either going out or remaining for another four years, and this other thing having to come to a head by October 1st, I would make that suggestion, depending on your feelings here.

MR. LAWRENCE: Have you in your own mind thought this through? As far as you know, there's no prohibition in you being Federal Representative and Chairman, and at the same time part-time employee of the Commission on a direct basis? Surely the states, then, would do anything that we need to do to assure the continuation. Would you have to have any kind of new appointment or do you think it's necessary?

MR. ARNOW: Dan, let me read to you or bring you up-to-date on something I've just received. We originally thought that when Wally resigned, if he did finally resign, this information would have to be passed up to the Office of Management and Budget and they would have to simply reappoint him, or seek someone else; and we were informed that that was a very chancey situation at this time. It is a time of emphasis on equal employment opportunity. No additional action may be necessary. In other words, he doesn't think that they have to go to OMB. He said when President Ford appointed Jibson to that post on September 9, 1976, Jibson was appointed as an individual, not as a representative of the Geological Survey; although he was appointed as a result of Bureau and Departmental endorsement, and also with strong support at the state level. A letter is now being sent - it's been drafted for the signature of the Director of the Geological Survey - a letter from the director to Secretary Andrus. I've got a copy of the draft, stating that State Commissioners on the Commission strongly favor Mr. Jibson's continuing service as Federal Representative by virtue of Presidential appointment, because of the importance of competency, experience, and continuity in this position. "You may have already received some word of their wishes in this regard. Mr. Jibson is willing to continue as the Federal Representative," - and then they go on to say, "If you concur in this. I believe the only action necessary would be a letter from you (Andrus) to the Commission, with a copy to OMB, stating that you are directing the Geological Survey to continue to serve the administrative needs of Wally Jibson as a Federal Representative, but that he is no longer a GS employee, per se, but rather a Presidential appointee receiving support from the GS in order to carry out his duties for the Commission."

Now, if the director of the Geological Survey doesn't have any problem with this, and we don't anticipate he will, this will then go on to Secretary Andrus. And it says here, that you may have already received some word of wishes of the Commission.

It would be very helpful, I think, for Andrus to make his decision if he has already received such word, one way or another. Then the only possible 'fly in the ointment', if Andrus would go ahead with this, is that he would probably have to send an information copy to OMB. Now, if they just accept it, fine; if the President decides otherwise, there could be a change. They won't be called upon for an action on just the information copy. So we don't think there will be a problem. The key, I think, is two fold: one, that the Geological Survey send the letter to Andrus; and the other, that you people, if you wish to go this way, get to the Secretary before he receives our letter.

MR. LAWRENCE: When we got Wally appointed in the first place, we either had a single joint letter, or three separate letters from the Governors. I can't remember now for sure. I think maybe we sent that letter around and all three of the Governors signed the same letter. But a telephone call from each of them or something like that, I think, might add a little more weight than just a letter from the Secretary of the Commission. That is certainly easy to do, as far as their writing a letter. We can quote a Motion from this meeting, and so forth. Do you see anything wrong with having Governor Hershler - maybe it isn't necessary?

MR. TEICHERT: It wouldn't hurt. I would Move that the Commission go on record as asking the Secretary of the Commission to submit a letter to Secretary Andrus requesting that Wally Jibson be retained as Federal Representative.

MR. LORD: If I remember correctly, Dan, I believe that they did send out a joint letter requesting Wally's appointment. Probably this would be the better channel to go back through. That went direct to the President.

MR. LAWRENCE: We started with the first one, and kind of accepted E. O.'s tentative offer to resign. He kind of threatened several times over a period of two or three years. So we wrote the President and said that we certainly appreciate his service; he's 87 years old, or whatever he was; and he's served valiantly, and we suggest that you move ahead and appoint someone. That was our first letter. That didn't seem to get a lot of action; it took us quite a while.

MR. ALLRED: I don't think there's any problem with Cece (Andrus). I think that it would be well, though, to create a record for whoever comes next, as to Wally's status. I think it would be important that we as States be on record.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: John, you actually made that a Motion didn't you?

MR. GILBERT: Second.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: If you have any further discussion on that particular Motion, before we vote on it, you could go ahead with that.

What Steve has suggested since your Motion is that we do both - that the Commission go on record writing a letter, and the Governors also be asked to submit a joint letter, or something.

MR. LAWRENCE: Question on the Motion made.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Question on the Motion. All in favor?

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. MYERS: Does that Motion include communications from the Governors?

MR. LAWRENCE: I don't think so. Not the way it was made. We need to make that one now.

CONNIE: The Motion reads, "I would move that the Commission go on record asking the Secretary of the Commission to submit a letter to Secretary Andrus requesting that Wally Jibson be retained as Federal Representative."

MR. HOLMGREN: Then we need a Motion to ask the three Governors to send a letter recommending Wally? I so Move.

MR. FRANCIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: It's been moved and seconded, then, that the Commission request the Governors to file a joint letter.

MR. HOLMGREN: One letter with three signatures, or whatever?

MR. LAWRENCE: What is the time frame that we have to have that letter? It takes a little longer to get three signatures on the same piece of paper. If we have plenty of time it seems to me that that, probably, is preferable. Don't you think, Steve?

MR. ARNOW: I would suggest that the Commission get it's own letter in as soon as possible, and then follow that up, which would be largely for the record, as Steve has said. Perhaps by then, Secretary Andrus would have made his decision, anyway.

MR. ALLRED: I think Secretary Andrus already has the decision; but whatever he does, he'll need to do before early November.

MR. LAWRENCE: I would suggest that the Motion include instructions to the Secretary of the Commission to draft a letter for the Signature of the three Governors and be responsible in getting it to the Commission members in each state, or however, so that he can get the signatures.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Any further discussion on the Motion? All in favor?

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. LAWRENCE: Mr. Chairman, I Move that the Commission make an offer to employ Wallace Jibson to the position to offer Compact assistance, to be called the 'General Manager' or 'Executive Secretary' or whatever appropriate title; that we negotiate with him on a contract basis compensation for that service, which is understood to be part-time, and include whatever supporting personnel that he might need, also on a part-time basis, to fulfill his duties; and it would also include whatever benefits are appropriate - to compensate him for his Social Security expense, travel, and miscellaneous other expenses.

MR. LORD: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Any further discussion on the Motion?

MR. ALLRED: Don reminds me that ought to also include travel?

MR. LAWRENCE: I thought I said travel.

MR. GILBERT: I think it should not include travel. I don't know, I'm wondering -

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I have a travel item in the budget of \$500.

MR. LAWRENCE: You're saying that if we set up any contracts for services, then the contract should provide that we would reimburse him in addition to that for travel? That should be a clarification; that was certainly my intent. That we would compensate him for travel, but on an actual basis, rather than giving him a monthly allowance for travel. I think that would be my Motion.

MR. HOLMGREN: On this Social Security - I'm not clear on that; if he is contracted, then wouldn't he take care of his Social Security?

MR. LAWRENCE: My intent is that - you maybe ought to tell me what the law is - but I think if he contracts with us, that when he files his income tax, he is

for sure going to have to pay a self-employed tax to Social Security. And my intent is that whatever the amount is that we agreed that he should receive has to take into account that there will be an expense to him over and above the amount that he figures he has to take home as pay that he is going to get. In other words, I think there ought to be a consideration in determining the amount that he is paid. I guess that's a little plainer way of saying it.

MR. MYERS: All of these details will show up in a contract. It looks like to me if we agree to contract, that will all work itself out from time-to-time.

MR. LAWRENCE: I just went through kind of an agonizing process of hiring a person on a situation like this. The agony was that I hired him away from an organization that I'm the chairman of. We sat down with him and worked out kind of a negotiated program, and then I wrote him a letter making him the offer, based on the oral agreement. Then his letter came back and said, 'I accept'. I don't know whether that process is applicable here, or not. But it seems that there are some details - either Wally has to initiate a proposed contract, or we have to initiate it.

MR. HOLMGREN: Most contracts I've been a party to, if you contract someone to do something for you, they take care of the Social Security. We hire someone on a day-to-day basis, or a monthly basis, we take care of the Social Security, or half of it, and see that it gets paid.

MR. TURNIPSEED: However, if you make a blanket contractual services contract, and let him pay for his own typing expenses, clerical expenses, postage, all those, and the whole works, Social Security is based on the lesser amount.

MR. LAWRENCE: When we, as a State, contract with someone, we have a paragraph in our standard contracts that says he's an independent contractor and pays all this. I guess, really, the point I was trying to make is, should we receive from Wally a proposed contract and act on it as a Commission, or should we work it out as kind of an informal joint venture and only have to re-do it once, or something?

MR. ALLRED: I would think that the Commission's interest is in the budget - not in the contract with Wally, specifically. The fact that we've authorized the contract with him and that we, in separate action, have set a budget, the details that are in that contract, up to the amount set in the budget. I would hope we could handle somewhat less formally than full Commission approval.

In fact, as far as I'm concerned, I wouldn't mind seeing us authorize the Secretary to enter into that negotiation and to prepare, in conjunction with Wally, the contract.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Could Dan and I get together subsequent to this meeting, probably before the first of October, and try to work something out?

MR. ALLRED: I can't see that it's an item that warrants a separate meeting of this Commission. Once we set the amount, and the fact that it's going to happen. By the time you take all the expenses of this Commission, you can almost pay Wally's salary, for a meeting. I don't know whether that would take a Motion, or whether that could be the understanding; but I would hope something like that could be carried out.

MR. LAWRENCE: That's fine with me. Whether it's appropriate for me to make the Motion, as long as the Commission passes, it doesn't matter whether I make the Motion that the Secretary be authorized to do that. If you amend that Motion to include that, I think it would handle it.

MR. ALLRED: I would so Move to amend the Motion.

MR. MYERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Now, let's have a vote on the Motion, with the amendment.

MR. LAWRENCE: I made an original Motion. I think it's just as clean to have Steve's Motion as an amendment. You voted on that, and now vote on the amended Motion.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Then we'll vote on the amended Motion. All in favor? Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. HAIGHT: We have to leave. In case you were interested, we're releasing this water, running into some difficulty down in the Oneida plant above Cutler, on peoples' land. They've been calling us; I guess you've heard about that. We're doing some bridge construction on the River right now up in the Oneida Narrows. We're having to fluctuate the River somewhat. We'll be releasing this water all winter. We'll have plenty of room for next year.

DISCUSSION OF BUDGET MATTERS

MR. LORD: Have we taken action on the budget?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Not formally. We haven't had a Motion to approve the budget, as presented. We've talked so far about a portion of the budget - the Compact assistance portion of the budget. We actually should take action on the total budget for the Commission, and also our stream-gaging program.

MR. HOLMGREN: Are we acting on an amended budget, on the April 28th budget, that we approved?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We did not approve the budget in April. This is an amended budget; true. But there was no action taken on the budget in April. We can either take action on this budget; approve it, or suggest a change in it, or whatever. We're wide open; that's why we had to call this meeting in September, before the fiscal year begins. The only thing that we've taken action on is the actual assessment to the states.

MR. MYERS: We have already taken action on assessing the states, haven't we?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Yes; and that assessment for 1981, which Dan just billed, is for \$23,000.

MR. MYERS: And our cost in this budget is \$20,566. We have this amount that you were just mentioning - this \$40,000, or whatever - that you have in your account now. Does that take care of the rest of the year - or is that surplus?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: That's surplus.

MR. MYERS: Sooner or later we're going to be able to go for a year or two without raising it.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: A few years ago we jumped three months - when we changed on a fiscal-year basis, without budgeting for it.

MR. MYERS: It looks like we can take a pretty good jump if we've got \$40,000 left, and now we're approving another \$2,000 a state.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: In view of some of these other things that we've been discussing here, primarily Social Security and so forth, I mentioned a little while ago that, as far as the auditing is concerned and so forth, we may want to come back, maybe in the April meeting, and take a look at requesting a little adjustment in this budget. It would be minor, compared to the entire budget,

but it would be in the 'Compact assistance.' I don't know yet; I haven't really considered Social Security and so forth, and maybe we would want to ask for a little adjustment in this 'Compact assistance.' If we wanted to wait until a future meeting in the fiscal year, say our April meeting, to do that, it would be alright with me. If the Commission feels that that possibility might -

MR. MYERS: I don't really think its going to be major enough to change it; but we ought to wait at least until after, as the Motion that was just made, the contract is approved. Then you might want to. It's nice to be ahead instead of behind; but I think we're getting just a little too far ahead.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: If I could just make another statement - I have kind of a backlog on the '79 records. The Cokeville Commissioner, when he quit, was trying to get his records all completed, which he didn't do; so they're dumped on my desk so to speak. This is going to take some time, and it's got to be my effort; it can't be clerical effort, to bring these records up-to-date. So I have a little backlog. Now, to help offset that backlog, with Walt Scott in the picture up there, he will deliver to me a completed record that will require minimal review, just like Stoker does. I have really no occasion, other than to check Stoker in the summertime once or twice, to really review his records. But I have spent considerable time on the Utah and Wyoming records, as we've discussed in the past. So I have a little backlog there; and I wouldn't want to get in a spot this fall and winter of having to spend a lot more time than we've allowed for.

I'm not suggesting that we modify the budget now. I'd sooner go into it, but maybe alert the Commission at this time that possibly in April, as far as the 'Compact assistance' item, it may have to be increased, just to cover what has to be done to get this biennial report out. I'd like to get that on a basis of getting it out when the Compact calls for it, by the 1st of April. There's a lot of work between now and the first of April to get two years' records together, to decide on the format of a two-year report instead of a one-year report, to decide how many gaging station records we're going to include in it, and so forth. For the next 6 months there will be a fairly heavy work load. I don't want to tell the Commission today that everything looks 'hunky (budget) dory' and then have to come back and say, 'Well, we had to run over this a little bit.'

If we could approve it, not conditionally, but just with that understanding here among us that we may have to ask for an adjustment for it so that the auditor doesn't say, 'why prepare a budget when you don't stay within it.'

MR. ALLRED: My comment right now is only with regard to the surplus. One possible use for the surplus that would help, certainly Idaho out, is to use that surplus through the Commission, to pay the expense of the Commissioners. I'm concerned that if we were to reduce the assessment, I'll have an extremely difficult time ever raising it again, or ever getting it up, with the situation we're faced with in Idaho. But certainly, if the Commission were to pick up or defray expenses of some of the Commissioners, that would help Idaho. And that's a potential use for some of that, that really would not reduce the capability in the future; and I think we're going to need that capability in the future to stay in operation.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: This is what I was going to mention also, Steve. We're going to get involved in this implementation of the amended Compact provisions on depletion; and, Wes, you were not here in April, but we had quite a discussion on the base map that we will need and some kind of tabulation of acreages to keep tab on depletion after January 1, 1976. I think we are looking at some expense here that we had not budgeted for, of course. This will be all the more reason to hold a pretty good surplus right now; and as Steve has suggested, we might allay some of these other expenses of the Commission in addition to that.

MR. LAWRENCE: What you're doing - I don't know whether the Senator would agree that this would be following legislative intent or not - you would be really kind of rebating to the states that surplus in the form of relieving Steve's office, and George's office the responsibility of paying travel expense to meetings, etc., which is getting quite acute, I'm sure, in some states.

MR. ALLRED: I'm in a situation where I have to reduce all out-of-state travel to 50%, so we're being careful. Hopefully, that won't continue forever.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Do we have anything further, Steve, on the mechanics of this thing, other than what Dan has said? If it were straight rebates, you probably wouldn't see it.

MR. LAWRENCE: Well, the Commission would just simply authorize the travel expense of the Commissioners to certain meetings, or something; and they'd submit their vouchers to the Secretary-Treasurer and he would pay them. They

would reimburse the State or the individual; probably reimburse the state.

MR. ALLRED: It would be cleaner for us if it were directly to the individual, at some pre-determined rate. We'd have to establish a rate. I don't think that needs necessarily to be done today. It's just a suggestion of how we might utilize some of that, without affecting our future ability to pay those assessments.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: You're suggesting that we not change the assessment to the state, that Dan just billed you for - that we leave that at \$23,000 for 1981?

MR. ALLRED: Yes. We had to take as across-the-board cut. There were a couple of organizations, and a couple of programs, where I did not take any cut. Bear River Compact was one that we left full, as was the U.S.G.S. program. We took those cuts in our own state programs and personnel; and if we were to reduce that assessment at all, then that would show up as a reduction and that would be the basis that we'd have to go from the next year.

MR. MYERS: I wasn't suggesting at all that we reduce that; I wasn't suggesting that we rebate any of it. The only thing I was saying is that we may be able to lower our next assessment because of this. I don't mean below what we're doing, but I mean just moderate it a little. I know what kind of a reaction there'd be in some of the legislative committees if they knew that we had \$30,000 build up. I am not going around mentioning it.

MR. LAWRENCE: I think there's some kind of a reasonable amount, though. Our total annual assessment is \$69,000 - right? So \$30,000 is about half - half of one annual assessment.

MR. MYERS: I'm sure we're justified in carrying some over. There's all the reason in the world. A lot of this has come from interest, too, that we've built up. Our system since we started putting it out at interest, automatically builds up more than we collect.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: For many years - it hasn't been true in the last few years - but for many years, if we had a surplus, it stayed in the bank account. And we had a surplus nearly every year. This started to build-up, and then when we got on the interest train, it added to it.

MR. HANSEN: Another thing, Wally, that you touched on briefly about our discussion in April was the preparation of the base map. There was also discussed

the using of Landsat data to survey the acreage. We could get into a situation there where you could spend \$10,000 or \$20,000 pretty easily.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We mentioned that just before you came in, Dee; that that's one reserve we should keep in mind.

MR. MYERS: The only difference between this system and the old system is, you went ahead and asked for appropriation as you needed it. Probably if all departments were doing what we're doing, you'd get quite an uproar in state government.

MR. HANSEN: I'm sure you would. I know what you're saying is true. I guess the only thing I was saying is that amount of money is really not that much.

MR. MYERS: No; I think its great. Having sat on the other end of the deal, where you're writing all these up, all the various state departments, it gets to be quite an item.

MR. LAWRENCE: Was that all your budget concerns? I was prepared to offer a Motion to accept this budget; but I have some concern over the \$8,000 in that one column. It seems to me that we've almost for sure decided that isn't enough. I'm wondering if we could raise it some amount now, or with a maximum, or something. Otherwise, how can I write a contract for him that would obligate the Commission for any more than that amount. That's my point.

Should we let Wally now indicate that this is too low, or this is just right, and the contract, then, would be based on this as a gross amount? That's probably it, unless you feel - I didn't quite understand about this backlog of extra work that you've got to do.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: In a nutshell - Ted's budget has had to help carry me for the last few months, and I don't like to get back into the complications of it; but, as you know, I budgeted with the idea that we did not have to budget for this money that goes into Civil Service Retirement. I found out later that this was a misunderstanding between me and the Regional Hydrologist. He had thought one thing; I had assumed another. As a result, we actually, in effect, ran over our budget two or three months ago. Fortunately, the overall District budget this year was able to carry some of my work. I held my time to a minimum because of it; and I didn't catch up with this backlog that I mentioned on the '79 records. They're still sitting there, waiting. As I ponder it and review it a little bit,

I think, well, budget or not, if we get a biennial report out by next April 1, we've got to bring those up-to-date and get them in.

In view of what Dan said, if we want to adjust this budget today before you act on it, I would suggest that we not only adjust it to handle some Social Security, but maybe we put a little 'cushion' in so that I probably would not have to come back to the Commission in April and say, 'Well, we need a revision on the budget'. In which case we might want to adjust it upward \$2,000 or \$3,000.

MR. HANSEN: Wally, let me ask you a question. Maybe you've already treated it - with you leaving as a reemployed annuitant, the \$7,200 will now be paid to you 100%. You've only been getting 21% of that haven't you?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I've only been getting - for this first 6 months I've only been getting 21% to 25% of that.

MR. HANSEN: I guess what I'm saying, in reality, you'll be getting a substantial increase.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: But my previous budget was much lower than this. I'd set up, in April, a budget of \$4,300 because I thought we only had to budget for 21% of it. Then I found out that was wrong. This will be a new ballgame and of course, I was aware of that when I fixed the budget up. But we would have to budget for a new ballgame if you approved it today. Some of these other things, we may have to take a second look at, and so, if agreeable, we could run another \$2,000 or \$3,000 into that item before you act on it, if you'd like; it's up to you.

MR. LAWRENCE: I guess we can always adjust it in April, too, if that's a better plan.

MR. JIBSON: We have made adjustments in mid-year.

MR. LAWRENCE: I guess my concern is, what are my constraints in writing a contract? If its \$8,000, then that would be the limit on what I would agree to pay on an annual basis. That's the only point I was making.

MR. ALLRED: Wally, are you suggesting you increase that to \$10,000?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Yes, about that. \$10,000 would probably do it. You see Dan's point here. He's given the responsibility of drawing up a contract. He's got to have a limit on that contract, and the only limit he has is the budget.

MR. LORD: I think we know definitely we're going to have some Social Security and these other costs. It would be reasonable to increase this to \$10,000 right

now, if its pretty much in line with what Dan might have to work with.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Is that agreeable with everyone, before we take any further action on it? We would increase, then, the personal service up here to \$9,200 and the total to \$10,000, which would increase our overall budget to \$63,690 and \$115,170; and would increase the cost per state another \$660? Make it a little over \$21,000 per state, which is still well within the assessment.

MR. LAWRENCE: I don't know if we should say per state. We're going to collect \$23,000 from each state.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I just meant the figure that I had down here at the bottom of the table.

MR. LAWRENCE: I know; but we're going to add to the reserve - either come from the State, or from the reserve. Has anybody started with a Motion to approve that budget?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: No, we haven't had a Motion yet. Wes was about ready to.

MR. MYERS: What does this change now? You're changing the, it's now \$9,200 at the top instead of \$7,200, and that adds \$2,000 all the way through.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: That makes the extension of item one, \$73,095.

MR. LAWRENCE: In keeping with what I really asked for, could we hedge to this extent? That the maximum is \$9,200 and - I thought what Dee's question was - the \$7,200 is direct, what Wally thought that he was offering to do the job for, and the only thing we're going to add is necessary increased expenses related to that. I would assume that the budget maximum would be \$10,000 for that item, and conceivably could be less, if Social Security figured out less.

MR. HANSEN: I think Wally was adding Social Security as well as some additional pay for extra work he's performed. But your actual maximum would be \$10,000. I presume that's what you'd contract for.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The \$10,000 you see here includes travel and some office supplies.

MR. MYERS: Subject also to further adjustment if necessary. We can't really do this until you guys come up with - maybe something else will come up that we haven't even thought of. It changes around pretty rapidly since a year ago.

MR. HANSEN: But if there's constraint that's the maximum Dan can contract with, unless you change it. So that does put a limit on it.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I suppose if we had to amend this budget in April we could have an amended contract. I don't know; I would hope not.

MR. LAWRENCE: Why don't you make your motion, then?

MR. MYERS: I so move.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The Motion, then, is to approve the budget with these changes.

MR. MYERS: Yes, with the addition of \$10,000^(2,000) wherever it shows up, after it's entered into the item \$7,200.

MR. FRANCIS: Second.

MR. ALLRED: I have agreed with the other two states to go along with the proposal here. I did that in our last meeting. I think it looks a lot better than it did then, because we're up to \$51,000 rather than \$33,000. As I said a minute ago, when we took the cut that we were required to take in Idaho, we protected this particular expenditure, and as we did, in part because of G.S.; and we also did the same thing towards our G.S. expenditures in Idaho. I can't expect, though, in the future to have very big raises because I've protected this. I can't take further cuts in my other programs if the costs were to increase very fast. Because of that, I think it's doubly important to contain costs as much as we can in the Bear River Compact expenditures.

There were several alternatives that were discussed at that Budget Committee meeting that I feel have to be investigated. While, as far as I'm concerned, we're going along with it this year, I would want the Commission to recognize that we feel strongly that there needs to be other alternatives identified. That before, at least I, would agree to a budget next year similar to this, I think it's necessary that the Commission look at those alternatives. In other words, what I am saying, if I'm sacrificing my state programs this year to protect this budget then I think we have a responsibility in Idaho to require that this budget be looked at carefully from the standpoint of other alternatives, and make sure that our costs don't increase. I would hope that our concurrence with the budget this time could also incur that obligation on the part of the Commission.

MR. HANSEN: Are you talking about state-run gaging station network, totally, no U.S.G.S.?

MR. ALLRED: That's one of the alternatives; yes. I think there's a desirability to have the U.S.G.S. involved in it. If I didn't, I wouldn't have a co-op program in Idaho. But I think that we need to look at involvement; we need to look at the state-run organization, or total state fund. I think we need to look at the reverse co-op that we've talked about. We need to look at any alternatives we can to see which will provide us with the best operation at our least cost. We didn't have time to do that this year, and I recognize that. I think that the U.S.G.S. is going to have, just like we the States are, a hard time continuing to get increases to match what the costs of inflation are going to be. I know we're having that problem in Idaho.

TED ARNOW: That's true; and if I don't get an increase to match the cost of inflation all I can do is cut down on the program - get rid of people. There's just no alternative.

MR. HANSEN: Well, we're facing that pretty seriously too.

MR. LAWRENCE: I think what I heard Steve say is, that would include reducing the number of gaging stations that we operate. We don't operate any unnecessary ones. There is always, I guess, a fear that we would cut something out that we'd wish we hadn't later.

MR. ALLRED: Another item, too, is that I don't think that it's a good practice for the three states to separate the gaging program the Commission has, and run it. This fragments our efforts, I think, considerably, from the standpoint of the Commission. I don't think that's in our interest. What I'm talking about there is to bring them into our own state co-op program. But if I were, because of the kind of arrangements we have in Idaho and the arrangements we have on direct services that we get credit for, it would be cheaper from a state cash standpoint. That's the kinds of things that need to be looked at before, I think, we're going to be willing to go with this traditional budget again. I think it takes discussions among ourselves; it takes some investigation; also takes discussion with the U.S.G.S. I guess what I'm saying is that, at least my concurrence with the budget this year is based upon my understanding that before we go with it again we're going to have a joint one - those kinds of discussions.

MR. LAWRENCE: Do you want to go so far as to put some kind of a stipulation right in the approval of this budget - responsibility of an ad hoc committee or something, to explore those alternatives so that they are crystal clear?

MR. ALLRED: Well, that would be fine. Whatever the Commission would like to do in that respect. I think Wally could call the budget committee together; that's probably the proper committee to work on this.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Prior to another year's budget.

MR. ALLRED: Well, early in this next budget year so we have time to do it. I just want the Commission to understand what my position is; and so that we get on the thing early enough, and we get those questions answered before we get into an approval situation.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Ordinarily, we would approve next years budget in April, If we get back to doing that, then, what you're saying is we should get together well ahead of April and start working on this. A lot of you here were at the June meeting; some of you were not. Steve discussed in quite a lot of detail s some of these alternative methods. We may have more time before the April meeting to sit down and take a hard look at it.

MR. LORD: One prime factor along those lines would be to find out, for sure, if the G.S. can reverse co-op with it. Could there be any way to resolve that? I think that would be one of the key factors. To proceed along major budget revisions.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: That would certainly have to be resolved before we considered that alternative very strongly.

MR. ALLRED: I think, frankly, and I'm sure Ted's aware that I've been discussing this with my U.S.G.S. people, and get different answers. I think what it takes is somebody out of Reston to come sit down with us and say, 'Alright; what's the G.S. willing to do?' I don't know what they're willing to do. I'm not after ths G.S.; that's not my concern at all. As we look at the operation of this Compact, we've got to find a way, and the gathering of data, which is also important; because we're all going to need it in the future - we've got to find the best way to get it. I'm just not convinced that we have the best way to get it. It may be. But certainly the questions are in my mind, and I can't serve my State without answering those questions.

MR. LAWRENCE: Before we actually put the question on the budget, do we need to discuss page 3 of Wally's report?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I would think, Dan, maybe action on the budget should come first.

MR. LAWRENCE: When we approve the budget, then you say you automatically take those out?

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Automatically, five; not necessarily this five. Automatically, five must come out. I think we should understand that before we approve the budget. This budget you have here will allow 33 gaging stations; we now have 38.

MR. LAWRENCE: It's clear, then, that we're automatically cutting 5 out when we approve this budget.

MR. HANSEN: We want you to know that the next cuts come out of the other states - these are all in ours.

DR. STAUFFER: We want to talk about these, too.

MR. LAWRENCE: Question on the Motion.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. ARNOW: I'd like to say something about the Geological Survey's position here, in response to some of Steve's comments. When Steve pointed out that he didn't cut the program with the Geological Survey, he cut other programs - I'd like to point out also that before, I mentioned that I got an increase of \$40,000 for the cooperative program. That was left as an option to me as to where to use it. I could have used the entire amount for some other cooperators. I chose to use it largely for the Bear River Commission; I want you all to know that.

The other thing, about the reverse flow proposition. When this was first brought up, I was very careful to point out that I could not make a decision on that; that I would have to appeal to my boss, who was the Regional Hydrologist for the Central Region. I did appeal to him, and he came back and said he was not in favor of a reverse flow for this particular program. Steve has talked to my counterpart in Idaho; and he feels that he has gotten a different point of view there. I don't believe that's correct. This communication of Steve with my counterpart in Idaho was documented in the letter to the Regional Hydrologist

in the West coast, who is my counterpart in Idaho's supervisor. He, in turn, sent a copy of this to my boss, who sent a copy of it to me. The two Regional Hydrologists - although there's an 'acting' one on the West coast - have discussed this. They agree that they're both not in favor of a reverse flow program for this agreement. If the Commission wants to formally send a letter to me, asking me to agree to a reverse flow program, I, in turn, would pass that on to Al Clebsch. If there is any question in his mind about how Washington feels about it, he'll ask them; if not, he'll respond officially, one way or another. If he wants to change his mind, that's fine; I do not make the decision on this.

MR. ALLRED: I realize that; and I realize that the people I've been talking to are not in this Region, too.

MR. ARNOW: If you really want something out of Washington, then I strongly recommend you sit down and write me a letter about it.

MR. ALLRED: Well, I personally think that if we feel strongly about it, what needs to be done is some of us need to sit down with U.S.G.S. - you guys and Washington - and say, 'Look, these are what we see as advantages; these are the disadvantages; what are you going to do?'

MR. ARNOW: That's true; I agree with you on that. I think it would be helpful to everybody in advance of making a decision if we could document the advantages and the disadvantages and write him first.

MR. ALLRED: That's why I think we need to sit down and do some homework on it. I don't want to get into something that's not going to give us a better program. But I also think that the reverse co-op is not a totally unilateral decision. I think that before that decision is made, at least I would think, that there would need be some discussions with whoever is going to make the decision. If it's something that is not traditional, I assume that decision is going to come out of Washington.

MR. HANSEN: We're really not to a point where we'd want to write a letter to Ted. We've got to analyze where we think we'd like to go, first.

MR. ALLRED: I would indicate that I'll be visiting with some Washington G.S. people in the next couple of months, and I intend to discuss it - but only as a private discussion, and not as a Commission. I think we need to do our homework before we make any formal proposal to U.S.G.S. I don't think we've done that.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Are we ready, then, to move on to the stream-gaging stations that we recommended for discontinuance?

MR. HANSEN: I don't have any real problem with, only the East Fork of the Little Bear above Porcupine. I guess I feel it has some value to us. Hyrum Reservoir will be continued as a record, probably. The Logan River below Blacksmith Fork, I think we can get along with that. The two canals will continue to be run as they have been in the past, with very little deviation. I do have a little concern about the East Fork.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Would you, and Mike, prefer to discontinue the lower station, the one below Davenport?

DR. STAUFFER: I'd like to comment. At the last meeting - I haven't read the Minutes - but I thought we were talking about the Chapman Canal and Malad River at Plymouth, dropping those two; and they're not on this list.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The reason we changed, Norm, was that the West Side and the East Side canals came up since the last meeting. We discussed them a little bit in June; but since April, the offer of the Power Company to continue those. I hadn't considered discontinuing them, actually, until it was called to my attention that we're running a couple of canals that we really don't use any more, as far as adding to the flow at Cutler - because we're using our Corrine gage now. This was kind of an after-thought on those two canals; and that left two others that you'd have some reservation about. Malad River, you had some reservation about discontinuing it. And the Chapman Canal, if it were discontinued it would have to be picked up, just like these two canals, would have to be picked up by Marv; because we need it, indirectly, in the Compact - but Marv needs it directly, for distribution of water. We do have a provision in the Compact stating the maximum flow that can pass that gage; so we have to check on it. If there are other stations less desirable, I would prefer to keep both Plymouth and Chapman Canal - or if you would sooner substitute Malad River near Plymouth for East Fork.

MR. HANSEN: Well, I would.

DR. STAUFFER: I think we would.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: The gas company just tore through it, and tore our cable down and everything this last week anyway; and when Bruce came and saw my list he says, "gee whiz, I wish you had included Malad River there."

MR. HANSEN: I don't mind substituting. I think Norm just said he wouldn't mind it.

DR. STAUFFER: We ran a correlation with Malad at Woodruff, and it's good except the Winter months. The Spring and Summer are excellent correlations. About three months during the winter it doesn't correlate very well, but the flows are quite low during that time.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Well, mention was made, maybe, of quality of water there - if there was any change in quality. As you know, we're getting conductance at Malad at Woodruff, that is, Idaho is. If you were primarily concerned about any further deterioration of the quality there, which is not good anyway - but then ^{between} Woodruff and Plymouth, you could continue a few spot samplings. Other than that, as you say, the correlation is so good with that other station on a year-round basis, if this would be your preference, it would certainly be alright with us.

MR. HANSEN: Well, I'd prefer that.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Do you see any problem there, Ted, at all from your standpoint?

DR. STAUFFER: I would suggest that the Bear River Commission put the Malad River at Woodruff in the report, because it didn't come out in Utah water resources data; so we don't have access to it in publication.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: I don't see any problem with that, Steve, we exchange records, anyway. Do you see any problem there, Ted, bringing in the Malad at Woodruff in your State report?

DR. STAUFFER: No; I was saying put it in the Commission report, so at least it's published somewhere. Or in the State report - one or the other - as long as it's published.

MR. ARNOW: It's more appropriate in the Commission report.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We can put it in the Commission report.

DR. STAUFFER: I noticed the Malad River hasn't been in the Commission reports. I think it should be included.

MR. HOLMGREN: I understand that the Deep Creek Irrigation Company in the Malad Valley has done a marvelous job of conserving water. They put in 40-inch metal pipe. They used to lose practically all their water. I guess they used about 15%. Now I understand they've gone miles and miles with a fine metal pipe and they're

getting 3,800 irrigated acres where they did irrigate about 900. I think they're irrigating 10 times.

MR. HANSEN: That would be classified as additional depletion in the Compact entitlement. (Laughter)

MR. HOLMGREN: Most of the irrigation is coming as sprinkler.

MR. HANSEN: I saw that on the TV or in the paper, I can't remember where I saw it; but I was going to ask you that question.

MR. HOLMGREN: Not that it amounts to much. The Malad River, when it gets down where we are, is a pretty bad river. For gaging, I was wondering if this new project up there, where we must have had some pretty substantial return flow from whatever they were doing up there, now they're sprinkling a tremendous amount more acres, we may not get that return flow that we had through there.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We still had a record of it, Paul, and we're going to continue that.

MR. ALLRED: What you're going to find - they're using the same amount of water; it's out of a reservoir. That reservoir was empty by mid-July or before, I guess the first of July. Now the reservoir will last them through the whole year. I don't know if they're irrigating additional lands; they irrigated a lot of land early in the Spring before. It's kind of like the Upper Bear. They give a lot of land one irrigation, and that was it. And then they'd have to cut way back on the full irrigation. Now they're able to get full irrigation over almost that total amount.

MR. HANSEN: May I remind you about your argument on Woodruff Creek Reservoir and storing direct flow rights. This is no different.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: This tends to offset some of the land you got above the highway.

MR. HANSEN: And I listened to you and Keith argue about that; and I want to remind you, you're on the other side of the horse now.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: If it's agreeable with all, then, that first station that we had, East Fork of Little Bear River, we would change to Malad River near Plymouth.

DR. STAUFFER: There might be water quality people, or someone else, that may want that gage.

MR. HANSEN: They can pay for it, then.

MR. ARNOW: You know the situation we're in, now, Dee.

MR. LAWRENCE: I'm not clear on what the Motion is now, then, with respect to the gages that would be discontinued.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We haven't really made a Motion on them. It was suggested by Utah that we substitute Malad River near Plymouth for the East Fork Little Bear River. Number 1256.

MR. ARNOW: Do you want to continue that one in the co-op program?

MR. HANSEN: No; just drop it.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: We're open for a Motion to approve discontinuance of these 5 gaging stations.

MR. LAWRENCE: I Move that the 5 gaging stations, as amended, be taken from the co-op program of the Commission.

MR. LORD: Second.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED.

MR. LAWRENCE: I was at Santa Fe, New Mexico at the meeting of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum with my wife, and my neighbor, Ralph Borrowman, and his wife - the four of us went a couple of days early, and our mission was to look at historical sights and see the ancient history of Santa Fe and so forth. On the way home we wanted to see Taos, New Mexico and the Indian lore there. We were very leisurely, and every time we'd see a roadside sign, a historic marker, or something like that, we weren't bashful about stopping to see what it said. We were on our way somewhere in New Mexico, traveling up the Rio Grande; and we saw this marker, and we went over and it was a citation by the American Society of Civil Engineers, 1973, commemorating the first gaging station ever operated by the United States Geological Survey. So Connie and I went down and got on the cableway, and started to go across the river, or at least we thought of it. And that was an interesting thing to note - across the Rio Grande, operated in 1886.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: It's interesting to read the history of those early gages.

MR. LAWRENCE: As a matter of fact, I'm going back to Santa Fe next month, and I thought that if somebody in the G.S. wanted to send me any literature on the establishment of that, if you've got some kind of a little historical note, maybe I could make note of that in the Western States Water Council meeting.

MR. ARNOW: I'll get it for you, we put something out on that one. It has a very beautiful-looking gaging station, doesn't it?

MR. LAWRENCE: Yes it does.

MR. ARNOW: We'll do that in the Bear River after 100 years has gone by.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: It's interesting to read the diaries of those early hydro-graphers. They would ride the railroad over to Cache Junction, and then rent a horse and buggy and go on up the River. It would take them two or three weeks; but they would move on up the River, and they were doing many things besides gaging streams. At that time the Geological Survey was handling the Patents for the United States Government. So they were hearing all the complaints of people as they went. There were a number of interesting things. One was that on one of those surveys, they'd run a survey of the Woodruff Narrows Reservoir site - a transit survey - long before anyone worried about storage; really, before anyone worried too much about using natural flow. It told what a beautiful reservoir site that was. It was also interesting to read some of the comments about the fact that they hadn't been paid, and could not reimburse some of the ranchers for hay that they'd bought for their horses. The Government was way behind in getting their pay to them. It was very interesting.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Well, to get on with this - the by-laws call for a report of the Secretary-Treasurer if there is one.

MR. LAWRENCE: We didn't make one. We thought this was a special meeting. I would suggest that what we do is mail you a report as of September 30, to all the Commission. Would that be acceptable? So that you have a report for the fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Report of the Assistant Secretary; there will be none. Then we're down to committee reports. Do we have anything further, Dee, on the State Engineers' Committee, other than what we discussed in April?

MR. HANSEN: I don't think we've met again.

CHAIRMAN JIBSON: Any Unfinished Business; or New Business?

Could we decide at this point whether we want to come back in November, or my suggestion earlier of sending you a copy of the applications for appropriation - have the state engineers send them to me, as usual, and I mail them out to the Commission members and advisors? Dan, in the meantime, would mail out a Financial Report? Would that suffice so that we don't have to get together again in November for our Regular meeting? Let's plan, then, on canceling that meeting in November, using this in place of it.

Do we have any further business that ought to come before the group today?

MR. ALLRED: Wally, I might let the Commission know about something in Idaho, on the Bear. As you may know we have a computer operations system on the Snake River which operates the system, essentially. We're also looking at the ^{Portneuf?} -Bear River Complex. We have been close to the point where we can make some initial trial efforts with that, and as we do, I'll keep the Commission informed as to how well that things works. As we have found in the Snake River, it's actually lowered the cost of distribution of water per acre-foot of water - primarily because it's accounting for a lot more water. It's also giving us a tremendously more efficient watermaster system up there.

MR. LAWRENCE: Watering your stock, is that what it means? You're adding more water, and therefore the cost per acre-foot is less.

MR. ALLRED: We're finding that there's a lot more water that goes a lot of places that's never been accounted for before. We've found in the Snake River system the natural flow accounted for is actually improved. There's actually more natural flow that we were previously accounting for by some of the old methods. We're also finding that those who have natural flow rights, particularly the early rights, the water they get has been much improved. The late ones, of course, aren't being collected.

MR. HANSEN: Do you have the Snake River on a telemetry basis, so you can read your gages?

MR. ALLRED: We've installed a lot of new gages - a lot of them on canals, a lot of those had telemeter marks on them. Those have now been switched over to the hydromat, which is a Columbia River system. They're now satellite. I don't know

if they're all switched over, but they'll all be switched over by the end of this year; so that next year it will be totally remote sensing.

MR. HANSEN: What does it cost per station to put in the satellite reading system? I heard a figure around \$40,000.

MR. ALLRED: I don't think it's near that. It might be if you were starting from scratch. We're just taking the telemeters out, and putting in the transmitting stations. If you start from scratch it's pretty expensive, but where we're just switching out the telemeters and putting in the transmitter and antenna - of course, that's not accounting for the receiving stations and all that, which are, in this particular case, the Bureau of Reclamation's. It comes into a central computer; the Bureau of Reclamation will operate at a central station, not only for our stations, but all the rest. They put in a computer system there that will take the data from the stations and transmit it to our computer system.

MR. HANSEN: Can't we con some federal agency into doing the Bear River?

MR. ALLRED: The reason this is going in, of course, is the tremendous hydropower operation. That's the justification for it.

MR. ARNOW: We have some stations like that in Utah and they're just part of our regular gaging station program. The additional cost is - assuming that we had a gaging station, this is what we call a data collection platform, which transmits the information to the satellite and that's about all.

MR. ALLRED: We have several of those in Idaho, in fact there's some on the Snake. The problem we've had with that program is that, first of all, the data has to be processed through Reston. You get it when the satellite collects it - where, with the hydromap system, it's there any time we ask for it. It also comes directly to Boise.

MR. ARNOW: A lot depends on your need for real time-data. If you've got a flood crest coming down the Mississippi, you want to know right away. But in most of the stations in Utah, there really isn't any great need for such immediate data.

MR. HANSEN: The reason I was quizzing Steve is that as we get closer - I guess I'm thinking of Colorado - as we get closer to full appropriation we need a very accurate monitoring system for our distribution, and I was hoping that we might move into something there - the computers being used with satellites.

MR. ARNOW: Okay, Dee, it isn't any more accurate than what we're doing now; it gives you quicker time return.

MR. HANSEN: That's what I'm interested in, is rapid reading.

MR. ARNOW: We have one that was paid for by BLM, for instance, at the mouth of White River - because this is the outflow for all changes that might occur as the result of oil shale development, and we've got this hooked to continue to monitor conductants, and dissolved oxygen, and pH, in case there are any changes in quality that is going to flow into the Green, BLM and EPA will know immediately. We're going to have needs for that any place up or down the line. These things can be put in without much difficulty.

MR. HANSEN: I'm glad to know the cost is lower. I was talking to Environmental Engineering Resources of Denver, and they were telling me that the cost per station was about \$40,000. They hoped to have it down to \$10,000.

MR. ARNOW: I would imagine that might be; and Steve would know about this perhaps. The cost of installing a gaging station from start, putting it in - you see, if you're going to relay something, you have to have automatic continuous collection of something anyway, so it could be a stage. This would have to be a digital recorder, and there would have to be automatic equipment collecting conductants, if that's what you're going to relay, or pH, or something. You're talking about \$40,000 for the whole works. I'm sure you are, I could get you figures, though.

MR. ALLRED: The prices we've found on the platform gages, that the G.S. has an advantage, is where we're away from a telephone line, or where we have difficulty getting people in. They can be expensive gages to construct and operate just because they're remote.

MR. HANSEN: What kind of power source do you need for those platforms?

MR. ARNOW: Well, they're battery-operated, if you can't get the power line in. It's better to have line power.

MR. HANSEN: But that would be a problem, wouldn't it?

MR. ALLRED: Some of them we've got are solar-powered. They're really not that expensive, assuming you have everything in there before. If you start the whole ball of wax, I think you will run at least to \$40,000.

MR. HANSEN: I'd sure be interested in visiting about the Bear River sometime. I think it would be very advantageous to expand your program to cover all three states - use your program, or something.

MR. ALLRED: I'm not sure how far along that is; but I told them not to cover the rest of the area in detail as we were in Idaho, but to put it in. If we put in any detail, it's a standardized model so that we could get a run for the Bear River Commission. Before you have something like that, though, you have to have people that can use it and you have to have terminals. You have to have watermasters that understand it.

MR. ARNOW: These things involve some complicated electronic equipment. The average person, as you say, really just can't handle the maintenance. They require a certain maintenance.

MR. LAWRENCE: Mr. Chairman, I make a Motion that we adjourn.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12 noon.

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES

FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 1979, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1980

<u>Income</u>	<u>Cash On hand</u>	<u>Misc. Income</u>	<u>Approved Budget</u>	<u>Total Revenue</u>
Cash Balance 10/1/79	\$17,181.42	\$-----	\$-----	\$17,181.42
State of Wyoming	\$-----	\$-----	\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00
State of Idaho	\$-----	\$-----	\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00
State of Utah	\$-----	\$-----	\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00
Interest on Savings and other income	\$-----	\$12,464.84	\$-----	\$12,464.84
 TOTAL INCOME TO October 1, 1980	 \$17,181.42	 \$12,464.84	 \$66,000.00	 \$95,646.26

DEDUCT OPERATION EXPENSE

EXPENDED THROUGH U.S.G.S.

	<u>APPROVED BUDGET</u>	<u>UNEXPENDED BALANCE</u>	<u>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</u>
Stream Gaging	\$36,300.00	\$-----	\$36,300.00
Personal Services	7,245.00	\$-----	\$ 7,245.00
Travel	200.00	\$-----	\$ 200.00
Fiscal Charge	405.00	\$-----	\$ 405.00
Washington Office Charge	810.00	\$-----	\$ 810.00
General Office	340.00	\$-----	\$ 340.00
 SUBTOTAL	 \$45,300.00	 \$-----	 \$45,300.00

EXPENDED THROUGH COMMISSION

Printing Annual Report	\$-----	\$ 968.20 CR	\$ 968.20
Treasurer Bond and Audit	350.00	55.00 CR	405.00
Transcription of Minutes	200.00	200.00	0
Legal Consultant	500.00	186.30	313.70
Office Expenses and Supplies	60.00	501.16 CR	561.16
 SUBTOTAL	 \$ 1,110.00	 \$ 1,138.06 CR	 \$ 2,248.06
 TOTAL EXPENDITURES	 \$46,410.00	 \$ 1,138.06 CR	 \$47,548.06

UNEXPENDED CASH BALANCE AS OF 4-1-80

\$48,098.20

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION
DETAILS OF EXPENDITURES
FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1980

281	Rose Printing Co.	\$ 968.20
282	Postmaster	30.00
283	Utah State treasurer	65,000.00
284	The Copy Center	53.20
285	USU Printing Services	76.48
286	Gilchrist & Co. - CPA's	355.00
287	Beacon Insurance Co.	50.00
288	USU Printing Services	244.83
289	Void	---
290	Skeen & Skeen	313.70
291	Edwards Floral	25.75
292	Postmaster	30.00
293	USGS	45,300.00
294	Void	---
295	USU Printing Services	100.90
		<u>\$112,548.06</u>
	Less Savings	<u>65,000.00</u>
	Total Expense	\$ 47,548.06

BANK RECONCILIATION

October 1, 1980

Cash in Bank per Statement 10/1/80	\$ 56,703.29
Less: Outstanding Checks	<u>\$ 45,400.90</u>
Total Cash in Bank	\$ 11,302.39
Plus: Savings Accounts - Utah State Treasurer	<u>\$ 36,795.81</u>
TOTAL CASH ON HAND AND IN THE BANK	<u>\$ 48,098.20</u>

BEAR RIVER COMMISSION

22 EAST CENTER ST.

LOGAN, UTAH 84321

SPECIAL MEETING

September 18, 1980

Wallace N. Jibson

Water Supply and Compact Operation

Streamflow records are not yet computed for the regular key stations usually reported in our November meeting. However, the preliminary record of flow entering Idaho past the Border gage indicates that runoff was in the 130 percent range from a longtime average. Extensive rains in May resulted in early and high runoff that raised Bear Lake to near the annual peak by June 8th (5,922.63 ft). Early flood releases then held the Lake in check with the highest level of 5,922.86 ft (1,365,000 ac-ft) occurring in mid-July. The Lake level has now declined an even two feet from the annual high and is about 3.5 feet higher than a year ago.

Adequate irrigation supply was available in all river sections. Interstate regulation was not required in the Upper Division, and the point of allocation was not reached in the Central Division until about August 1 when the Wyoming Section diversions were already well below the allocation with this pattern continuing for the balance of the season. Walt Scott, retired USGS District Chief from North Dakota, has served as Hydrographer-Commissioner in both Utah and Wyoming from Woodruff Narrows to Border. This was a good year for Walt to renew acquaintance with Bear River mosquitoes, and I expect a minimal amount of checking will be required on his records.

Budget

Two budget estimates were presented in the Annual Meeting, April 28, 1980. The first was based on 38 gaging stations and the second on 33 stations, each at a cost of \$3,120 per station (Utah District estimate for 1981 stream gaging). Further, the Compact Assistance part of the budget was included, as in past years, within the cooperative program with a pro rata share for District and Reston office administrative and technical service overhead. Neither budget was approved in April, but a meeting of the Budget Committee with at least one additional member from each State was requested and was held June 25, 1980.

The longstanding cooperative stream-gaging program, financed equally by the USGS and the Commission, was again reviewed at the June meeting with possible alternate methods of financing operation of necessary gaging stations in the basin. Considered was a continuation of the present cooperative program, also a reverse type of cooperation in which the Commission would do the

stream gaging and be reimbursed by the USGS, and a program in which the Commission would do all or part of the stream gaging without Federal assistance.

One item discussed -- on which I stood corrected from earlier statements made in April -- concerned local budgeting for a reemployed annuitant that must cover the portion of his salary required by law to be paid to the Civil Service Retirement Fund. Currently (as of September 1) this amounts, in my case, to 79 percent of the pre-retirement hourly salary rate for each hour worked as an annuitant with only 21 percent actually paid to the annuitant. As this budget item is not matched by Federal funds, the Commission would be paying into the retirement fund a large portion of the "Personal Services" item under "Compact Assistance" without direct benefit to the assistance effort. Moreover, because it is included in the cooperative agreement, 27 percent of the total is required for District and Reston overhead. There would remain then in the proposed budgets about 33 percent of \$7,000 for the assistance effort, and my hours would be limited to 30 to 40 percent of the time required in 1979 and 1980. Of course, this would have no effect on the stream-gaging program which makes up 92 percent of the total budget and in which I am no longer involved.

Action on the budget could not be taken in the June meeting because the full Commission was not in session and also because the firm cooperative offering from the USGS would have permitted only 23 gaging stations, and a requested increase was uncertain. Today, we expect that Federal matching funds of \$51,480 will be available. This is the amount that was included in budget # 2 as presented in April that would finance 33 gaging stations. This budget is again presented to the Commission (page 4) with one significant change. "Compact Assistance" would now be a direct-expenditure item outside the cooperative agreement and would be increased \$1,000 to adjust for the misconception in the April budget as discussed earlier.

Today's proposed budget would require a change in status if my services are to be continued in the assistance program. Reemployed annuitant status is on a temporary part-time appointment that requires a request for extension each six months or a year. I would expect to resign from this appointment, effective September 30, 1980. Reimbursement for expenses of the Federal Representative may also be administered differently. Our previous Chairman, Mr. Larson, served as a consultant rather than as a reemployed annuitant following his retirement from BuRec.

Stream-gaging Program

A total of 38 gaging stations are now being operated within the cooperative program. Beginning with the Commission meeting in August 1979 when a detailed review of stations was presented, various proposals have been made for reducing the 41 stations then in operation. Three were removed last fall: Hilliard East Fork Canal, Montpelier Creek, and Summit Creek.

If the stream-gaging portion of the budget presented today is approved, five more gaging stations should be considered for removal from the cooperative program as of September 30, 1980. The five now recommended are:

- 1049 - East Fork Little Bear R. ab Porcupine R.
- 1070 - Hyrum Reservoir
- 1152 - Logan River below Blacksmith Fork
- 1170 - Hammond (East Side) Canal nr Collinston
- 1175 - West Side Canal near Collinston

Utah Power & Light Company has given tentative approval to continue the operation of the two canals listed (Station equipment is owned by the Power Company.) These canals divert from either side of Cutler Reservoir. Whether they are to be published in USGS reports as a furnished record has not been resolved. Little Bear and Hyrum Reservoir stations are primarily of local or State concern. Sufficient record, we feel, has been collected on Logan River below Blacksmith Fork confluence for extension through correlation with other longtime records on the two streams.

BEAR RIVER PROGRAM

DETAIL OF BUDGET

Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1981

September 18, 1980

Revised

<u>Detail of Budget</u>	<u>Allocable for Stream Gaging (Coop. Agreement</u>	<u>Compact Assistance (Direct Expend.)</u>	<u>Administ. Allocation (Direct Expend.)</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
(1) Personal Services	\$ 64,795	\$ 9,200	\$ 0	\$ 73,995
(2) Travel & Subsistence	8,400	500	0	8,900
(3) Fiscal & Administ. (SLC)	18,533	0	0	18,533
(4) Washington Service Chge	9,266	0	0	9,266
(5) Rental (Office & Stor.)	See Item (3)	0	0	0
(6) Digital Recorders (Rent)	966	0	0	966
(7) Office, Supplies, Misc.	1,000	300	60	1,360
(8) Biennial Report	0	0	1,200	1,200
(9) Treasurer's Bond & Audit	0	0	350	350
(10) Printing & Reproduction	0	0	300	300
(11) Legal Retainer & Fees	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>
TOTAL	\$102,960*	\$ 10,000	\$ 2,210	\$ 115,170

Allocation of Budget

Geological Survey	\$ 51,480	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 51,480
Bear River Commission	<u>51,480</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>2,210</u>	<u>63,690</u>
TOTAL	\$102,960	\$ 10,000	\$ 2,210	\$ 115,170

* 33 gaging stations at \$3,120/station year

** \$21,230 per state (Approved assessment, \$23,000 per State)

Note: \$6,300 transferred from item (5) and \$2,624 from (6) & (7) to item (3).

(Nov. 1980)

Presented to Commission: April 20, 1981

Applic. Number	Date of Filing	Name	Source	Use	Location	Amount (cfs)	Act'n
			STATE OF WYOMING				
14-5-243	2/26/80	Alan Cook	groundwater	Misc. (Munic)	S12T14NR121W Uinta	0.14	App
14-6-243	2/26/80	Alan R. Cook	groundwater	Misc. (Munic)	S12T14NR121W Uinta	0.28	App
14-7-243	2/26/80	Alan Cook	groundwater	Misc. (Munic)	S12T14NR121W Uinta	0.28	App
UW146308	5/1/80	Br River Coal Co.	groundwater	Misc. (Munic)	S30T16NR120W Uinta	0.06	App
UW142313	5/5/80	Amerada Hess Corp	groundwater	Misc.	S23T25NR118W Linc.	0.22	App
UW142322	5/13/80	Daniel Const. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S21T17NR120W Uinta	0.56	App
UW143322	5/13/80	Daniel Const. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S13T18NR120W Uinta	0.56	App
UW144322	5/13/80	Daniel Const. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S24T19NR120W Linc.	0.56	App
UW141323	5/13/80	Wyo. Hwy. Dept.	groundwater	Misc.	S8T25NR119W Linc.	0.67	App
UW142323	5/13/80	Wyo. Hwy. Dept.	groundwater	Misc.	S31T26NR119W Linc.	0.67	App
UW143323	5/13/80	Wyo. Hwy. Dept.	groundwater	Misc.	S25T26NR120W Linc.	0.67	App
UW144323	5/13/80	Uintah Bible Ch.	groundwater	Misc. Dam	S25T15NR121W Uinta	0.02	App
23 6/297	5/16/80	Parson Pro. Inc.	Mlf.Dr.Trb.Yel.	Indust.	S18T15NR120W Uinta	0.50	App
23 4/303	5/30/80	Concrete Pro.	Mlf.Dr.Trb.Yel.	Indust.	S18T15NR120W Uinta	0.11	App
23 5/303	5/30/80	R.W. Jones Co	Bear River	Indust.	S21T15NR120W Uinta	0.62	App
23 6/303	6/2/80	Parsons Conc.Co.	Alex Rd tr BR	Indust.	S19T14NR119W Uinta	0.11	App
23 5/307	6/11/80	Denny Crazier	WasatchCr.Tr.Yel	Stkwater	S26T15NR121W Uinta	0.044	Pend
UW147365	6/25/80	Kemmer Coal Co	groundwater	Misc.	S30T21NR116W Linc.	0.22	App
23 2/316	7/2/80	J.R. Broadbent	Brd D.LaChapell	Irrig.	S31T13NR118W Uinta	505acft	Pend
23 3/316	7/2/80	J.R. Broadbent	LaChapelle Cr	Res.Sup.	S9T12NR118W Uinta	28.36	Pend
UW149389	7/16/80	DanielCo/J.Welling	groundwater	Misc.	S30T16NR120W Uinta	0.11	App
UW148395	7/22/80	David H. Cook	groundwater	Misc.	S13T16NR121W Uinta	0.02	App
UW141397	7/23/80	Republic SupplyCo	groundwater	Misc.	S30T16NR120W Uinta	0.04	App
UW15-12-2	7/25/80	Brown Oil Tool Co	groundwater	Misc.	S25T15NR121W Uinta	0.06	App
UW15-2-14	8/5/80	Gulf Oil/St.Land	groundwater	Misc.	S36T18NR120W Uinta	0.16	App
23 1/336	8/18/80	Art Linder	WahsatchCr.trib	Irrig.	S26T15NR120W Uinta	0.033	Pend
DW15-7-31	8/18/80	Kemmerer Wyo.Stk.	groundwater	Misc.	S29T17NR120W Uinta	0.05	App
DW15-9-38	8/25/80	Amoco Prod. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S3T14NR120W Uinta	0.33	App
DW15-10-388	8/25/80	Amoco Prod. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S10T14NR120W Uinta	0.33	App
DW15-11-388	8/25/80	Amoco Prod. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S3T14NR120W Uinta	0.33	App

(Nov. 1980)

Presented to Commission: April 20, 1981

Applic. Number	Date of Filing	Name	Source	Use	Location	Amount (cfs)	Act'n
STATE OF WYOMING (Continued)							
23/5/343	9/8/80	Seismograph Corp	Twin Cr.TribBR	Indust	S12T21NR120W Linc.	0.167	App
23 1/347	9/16/80	Geo.Ser.&St.Brd	Yel.Cr.Trib.BR	Indust	S12T14NR121W Uinta	0.11	App
23 5/349	9/25/80	Union Pacific RR	Russel Sp&Choppy	Misc.	S12T14NR119W Uinta	0.358	Pend
23 6/349	9/25/80	Union Pacific RR	Dr. Stowe Cr	Misc.	S13T14NR119W Uinta	0.044	Pend
UW 15-1-79	9/25/80	Amoco Produc. Co.	Altamount Sp.& Choppy Dr. Stowe Cr.	Misc.	S7T12NR120W Uinta	0.33	App
23 3/359	10/15/80	Amoco Produc. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S18T14NR119W Uinta	1.33	App
23 1/363	10/22/80	Northwest Explor.	Bear River	Indust	S11T19NR120W Linc.	0.167	Pend
UW15-8-108	10/28/80	Chevron Inc.&BLM	Sp.Cr.Trib.Brid	Indust	S32T18NR119W Uinta	0.07	App
UW15-7-114	11/3/80	Amoco Produc. Co.	groundwater	Misc.	S17T13NR120W Uinta	0.33	App
				Approved	Pending	Total	
Total Surface Water (Wyoming)				2.947 cfs	29.006 cfs	31.953 cfs	
Total ground water (Wyoming)				7.07 cfs	0	7.070 cfs	
Total Surface Water Storage (Wyoming)				0	505 ac.ft.	505 ac.ft.	

(Nov. 1980)

Presented to Commission: April 20, 1981

Applic. Number	Date of Filing	Name	Source	Use	Location	Amount (cfs)	Act'n
<u>STATE OF IDAHO</u>							
13-7280	4/4/80	K.&B.Kendall	Groundwater	Stckwtr	S33,T13S,R38E Frnk	0.11	App
15-7062	4/7/80	Darrel Swartz	Springs	Irrig.	S1,T13S,R34E Onei	2.45	Pend
11-7179	4/9/80	Elton Sorenson	Groundwater	Stckwtr	S27,T7S,R41E Cari	0.06	App
15-7063	4/18/80	Myron Jones	Birch Cr.	Power	S29,12S,R36E Bann	12.0	Pend
11-7180	4/28/80	Bert Westlake	Groundwater	Irrig.	S19,T11S,R44E B.L. S28,T11S,R44E	6.0	App
11-7181	5/1/80	Richard & L.J. Shaw	Groundwater	Irr/Dam	S22,T16S,R43E BrL.	0.35	App
11-7186	5/12/80	USDA & For.Serv.	Spring	Stckwtr	S12,T11S,R44E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7182	5/13/80	L. Jr. Wallentine	Groundwater	Irrig.	S27,T13S,R43E BrL.	2.24	Pend
11-7183	5/16/80	Terracor	Groundwater	Domestic	S32,T9S,R43E Cari S5,T10S,R43E Cari	3.5	App
11-7184	5/28/80	F.B. Panting	Formation Sp.	Irrig	S27,T8S,R42E Cari	4.00	App
11-7185	5/30/80	Roy Walker	Bailey Cr.	Fish Pr.	S5,T10S,R42E Cari	3.0	App
13-7281	5/6/80	L.J. Stenssas	Groundwater	Irrig.	S4,T15S,R39E Fr.	1.00	Pend
13-7282	5/13/80	Joseph Viehweg	Groundwater	Irrig.	S22,T15S,R39E Fr.	0.03	App
13-7284	5/13/80	Joseph Viehweg	Wagland & Squaw Sp.	Heating & Indust.	S8,T15S,R39E Fr S17,T15S,R39E	10.0	Rej
13-7283	5/13/80	City of Preston	Bergquist Sp.	Power	S11,T15S,R41E Fr S10,T15S,R41E	13.0	Pend
13-7285	5/13/80	Joseph Viehweg	Groundwater	Ind. Fsh	S17,T15S,R41E Fr	2.0	Pend
13-7286	5/16/80	C. Jorgensen	Wastewater	Irrig.	S8,T11S,R41E Car.	3.0	App
13-7287	5/27/80	Keith Hodges	Spring	Dom.Stck	S8,T15S,R39E Fr.	0.06	App
13-7288	5/30/80	Last Chance Canal	Bear River	Power	S30,T9S,R41E Car.	440.0	Pend
13-7289	6/3/80	Bill Jorgensen	Groundwater	Irrig	S18,T10S,R40E Cari.	2.3	Pend
15-7064	6/16/80	Geo. Jones	Groundwater	Irrig.	S31,T14S,R36E Onei	1.6	App
13-7290	6/17/80	Berdean Harris	China Cr.	Irrig.	S19,T10S,R40E Cari	0.8	Pend
11-7190	6/20/80	USDA & For.Serv.	Unnamed Str.	Stckwtr	S18,T11S,46E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7191	6/20/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Str.	Stckwtr	S19,T11S,R46E BrL.	0.02	App

(Nov. 1980)

Presented to Commission: April 20, 1981

Applic. Number	Date of Filing	Name	Source	Use	Location	Amount (cfs)	Act'n
STATE OF IDAHO (Continued)							
11-7192	6/20/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Spring	Stckwtr	S19,T11S,R46E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7193	6/20/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Spring	Stckwtr	S19,T11S,R46E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7194	6/20/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Spring	Stckwtr	S29,T11S,R46E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7195	6/20/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Spring	Stckwtr	S32,T11S,R46E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7189	6/20/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S32,T11S,R46E BrL.	0.02	App
11-7187	6/27/80						
11-7188	7/9/80	Heber Stock	Groundwater	Domestic	S22,T16S,R43E BrL	0.12	App
13-7291	7/11/80	Eldon B. Bingham	Groundwater	Irrig.	S20,T15S,R39E Fr.	0.70	Pend
15-7065	7/17/80	P. Lon Neal	Groundwater	Ir.Dm.Stk	S16,T15S,R36E Oni	3.29	Pend
11-7196	7/21/80	Louise W. Seamons	Groundwater	Dm.Stck	S9,T9S,R41E Car.	0.06	App
11-7197	7/21/80	Steven W. Seasmon	Groundwater	Dm.Stck.	S9,T9S,R41E Cari	0.06	App
13-7191	8/8/80	Idaho Fish & Game	Groundwater	Domestic	S18,T11S,R41E Cari	0.12	Pend
11-7198	8/11/80	Parson Ready Mix	Groundwater	Commerc.	S10,T13S,R44E BrL.	0.5	Pend
11-7199	8/26/80	George Harris	Hamp Spring	Stckwtr	S5,T10S,R42E BrL.	0.09	Pend
11-7200	9/9/80	H.C. Heninger	Groundwater	Domestic	S11,T15S,R43E	4.08	Pend
11-7201	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Stream	Stckwtr	S29,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7202	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Spring	Stckwtr	S20,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7203	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S20,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7204	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S19,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7205	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S36,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7206	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S27,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7207	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S30,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7208	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S35,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7209	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S19,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
11-7210	9/11/80	USDA & For. Serv.	Unnamed Spring	Stckwtr	S35,T9S,R43E Cari	0.02	Pend
13-7293	9/24/80	R. & F.E. Larsen	Unnamed Spring	Irrig.	S25,T15S,R39E Frn.	0.12	Pend
				Approved	Pending	Total	
Total Surface Water (Idaho)				10.22 cfs	468.66 cfs	478.88	cfs
Total Ground Water (Idaho)				11.89 cfs	16.23 cfs	28.12	cfs
Total Surface Water Storage (Id.)				0	0	0	

APPLICATIONS TO APPROPRIATE WATER
BEAR RIVER DRAINAGE

STATE OF UTAH

(Nov. 1980)

Presented to Commission: April 20, 1981

AREA CODE	DATE OF FILING	NAME	SOURCE	USE	LOCATION	AMOUNT (CFS)	ACTION
			STATE OF UTAH				
23-3563	4-23-80	Roger Peart	UGW	I D S	S14T12NR7E Rich	3.0	App
23-3564	4-24-80	Mountain Fuel Supply Co c/o Dick Brown	UGW	I D	S20T10NR7E Rich	1.0	Pend
23-3573	7-11-80	William D. Rufi	Drain	I-S	S16T9NR7E Rich	3.0	Pend
23-3574	7-14-80	Raymond Cox	UGW	I S	S21T9NR7E Rich	4.0	Pend
23-3576	8-22-80	Signey J. Nebeker	S Eden Canyon	I	S36T14NR6E Rich	80 a f	Pend
25-8145	4-2-80	H. A. Summers, Jr.	UGW	I S	S15T9NR1E Cache	1.0	Pend
25-8151	4-14-80	O. Claude & Louise S. Wennergren	UGW	I S	S20T12NR1E Cache	1.5	App
25-8160	5-1-80	Logan City Corporation	Drains & Spgs	Munic.	S32T12NR1E Cache	40 a f	App
25-8162	5-12-80	B.B.I. Incorporated	UGW	I	S28T13NR1W Cache	1.5	Pend
25-8163	5-13-80	Bruce Stucki	UGW	I D S	S16T10NR1E Cache	1.0	Pend
25-8186	8-11-80	Utah Power & Light Co.	High Creek	Hydro.	S10T14NR2E Cache	32.0	Pend
29-2392	2-26-80	Ukon Water Company c/o Virgil Coombs	Unnamed Sprgs	I D S	S15,16,22 T12NR2W Box E	1.5	Pend
29-2507	5-13-80	Nucor Steel Division Nucor Corp	Malad River	Indust.	S9T13NR3W Box E	1.0	Pend
29-2510	5-14-80	Glen S. Mason	UGW	I D S	S23T14NR3W Box E	10.0	Pend
29-2520	6-25-80	Tremonton City Corp	Unnamed Sprgs	Munic.	S31T12NR2W Box E	3.0	Pend
29-2521	6-26-80	Reid McMurdie	Overflow from Bear River Distri. Co. Canal	I S	S26T10NR3W Box E	1.0	Pend
29-2523	7-17-80	Raymond G. Yaworsky c/o William D. Marsh	UGW	I D S	S7,5,8 T14NR2E Box E	7.5	Pend

APPLICATIONS TO APPROPRIATE WATER
BEAR RIVER DRAINAGE

STATE OF UTAH (Cont.)

(Nov. 1980)

Presented to Commission: April 20, 1981

AREA CODE	DATE OF FILING	NAME	SOURCE	USE	LOCATION	AMOUNT (CFS)	ACTION
<u>STATE OF UTAH (Cont.)</u>							
23-3578	9-15-80	Woodruff Town	Well	MUN	S18T4NR7E (Rich)	0.154	Pend
23-3583	9-29-80	BLM	Flowing Seismic Hole	S-WL	S12,13, S7,18 T8NR8E (Rich)	0.1007	Pend
25-8195	9-17-80	Reese Poppleton, etal	Seeps & Springs	S	S1T10NR1W (Cache)	0.5	Pend
25-8200	10-29-80	Cache County Corp.	Well	D-M	S34T11NR1E (Cache)	0.5	Pend
25-8201	10-24-80	Craig Poppleton	Well	I-S	S7T10NR1E (Cache)	0.5	Pend
25-8202	10-25-80	James L. Maples	Well	D-I	S10T13NR1E (Cache)	0.5	Pend
25-8203	10-25-80	James L. Maples	Unnamed Spring	I	S10T13NR1E (Cache)	0.3	Pend
25-8206	11-3-80	Michael W. Maughan	Well	D-S-I	S7T12NR1W (Cache)	0.5	Pend
25-8209	11-6-80	Jerry Thomas Smith	Well	D-S-I	S2T10NR1W (Cache)	0.25	Pend
29-2531	8-25-80	J.Y. Ferry & Sons	Unnamed Springs & Stinking Spr.	S	S23,24,30 (Box E.) T10NR4W	0.5	Pend
29-2532	8-25-80	John Ferry & Ben Ferry	Unnamed Open Drains & Canal Overflow	I-S	S2,11,15 (Box E.) T9NR3W	5.0	Pend
				<u>Approved</u>	<u>Pending</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Total Surface Water (Utah)				0	42.3 cfs	42.3 cfs *	
Total Ground Water (Utah)				3.0cfs	34.505 cfs	37.505 cfs	
Total Surface Water Storage (Ut.)				40. af	80.0 af	120.0 af	

* Includes 32.0 cfs for hydroelectric on High Creek (Cache)