



STATE OF IDAHO

IDAHO WATER RESOURCE BOARD

STATEHOUSE
BOISE, IDAHO 83720

MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 10-84
IDAHO WATER RESOURCE BOARD
BOISE, IDAHO
DECEMBER 13, 1984

Meeting No. 10-84 of the Idaho Water Resource Board was called to order by Chairman Donald R. Kramer at 8:30 a.m., Thursday, December 13, 1984 at the Department of Water Resources, Conference Room, Third Floor, State Towers Building, 450 W. State Street, Boise, Idaho
(Sony Recording Tapes #1-8.)

Agenda Item No. 1. Roll Call.

PRESENT:

Donald R. Kramer, Chairman
Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman
Franklin Jones, Secretary
Richard W. Wagner, Member J. D. Williams, Member (arrived 8:50 am)
James Shawver, Member F. Dave Rydalch, Member
Robert M. Hammes, Member (arrived 8:30 am)

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES STAFF PRESENT:

Director: A. Kenneth Dunn
W. Haas, N. Young, B. Eastlake, F. Sherman, P. Rassier, J. Hammond, V. King,
R. Mellin, D. Tuthill, P. Castelin, F. Eisenbarth and A. Warntjes

OTHERS PRESENT:

Steve Ellis, BLM--Idaho State Office; Richard Hahn, Idaho Power Company;
Mark Warbis, Associated Press; Rob Holland, Idaho Water Users Association;
Bob Lewis, USGS; Harold Niles, Idaho Wildlife Federation; Ed Gheen, BLM;
Renec Quick, Idaho Conservation League; Monte McClendon, BLM; Doli Obce,
Idaho League of Women Voters; Pat Ford; Gary Carson, BLM; Ted Milesnick, BLM;
Charlie Bryant, Federal Land Bank; Ron Golus, USBR; L. V. Gray, Pioneer
Irrigation District; LeLand Baker, Flood District #16; Paul M. Searle, Flood
District #16; Will Reid, Idaho Fish & Game; Richard Wicherbury, Utah Power
& Light Company; Alvin Neddo, Flood District #15; Lyle Woodbury, Flood
District #15; and Dick Gardner, Division of Financial Management; Elmer Smith,
city engineer for the city of Rathdrum; Dr. Evan Kackley; Ellis Kackley.

Agenda Item No. 2. Approval of 9-84 Minutes of November 2, 1984 Board Meeting.

Franklin Jones, Secretary, moved Board adoption of 9-84 Minutes of November 2, 1984 Board meeting as circulated to members. Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, Hammes, Absent, Williams, Absent.

Agenda Item No. 3. Film on Snake River.

The Board viewed a film prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) entitled, "The Snake: Jewel of the Gem State," a report of the BOR's activities in the Upper Snake River Basin. Potential future projects recognized by the BOR include the Salmon Falls Diversion which could provide additional irrigation water to lands south of Twin Falls already under production and improve habitat for wildlife. 12,500 acres of undeveloped land near Rupert are being studied for development with the unique approach to provide farmers with federal land in exchange for an agreement to manage part of it as co-wildlife habitat. Also, a power study shows that a 30 mw plant at the Minidoka Dam could increase power generation by 50 percent without changing irrigation water supplies; examination of the existing Palisades powerplant shows potential for an additional 110 mw without affecting the current reservoir and river regulation.

Agenda Item No. 4. Swan Falls Agreement

- a. Petition to FERC for Declaratory Order
- b. Adjudication Study
- c. Legislative Package
- d. Other

Tom Nelson, attorney representing Idaho Power Company, briefly explained that the power company has filed a petition with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). FERC has made a determination that no formal request for hearing is required before the PUC in the state of Oregon. The next formal action would be a motion to intervene in both regulatory proceedings by the state. Mr. Nelson suggests that if the Board concludes its work on the State Water Plan while the legislature is still in session, the Board present its findings and recommended amendments to Policy 32 to the legislature immediately.

Pat Kole, Attorney General's Office, commented that all the district court's proceedings are stayed until seven days following the adjournment of the legislature. There will be no pressure from the court system as the parties try to implement the Swan Falls Agreement.

Pat Costello, Governor's Office, informed the Board that the draft legislation to implement the Agreement should be completed by the end of the week and will be submitted to the legislature as part of the Governor's package.

A. Kenneth Dunn, Director, read into the record a letter (ATTACHMENT 1) he received just prior to the signing of the Swan Falls Agreement from Speaker of the House, Tom Stivers, encouraging the Board to support the Agreement.

Agenda Item No. 5. Review and Update of State Water Plan

- a. Policy 32 - Snake River Basin
- b. Ground Water Policy Alternatives
- c. Scheduling of Public Hearings

a. Policy 32 - Snake River Basin. Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, stated that staff has prepared proposed changes to Policy 32 for the Board's review and consideration to take to the public in scheduled hearings on amendments to the State Water Plan. Mr. Haas requested the Board pass or amend the proposed changes to Policy 32 and allow staff an opportunity to prepare text material on the policy statements to clarify them.

Frank Sherman, department staff, advised the Board that the proposed amended general statement of Policy 32 sets the parameters by which the Snake River Basin will be managed and then a series of sub-policies speak to specific water uses that are addressed in the existing State Water Plan. The general guidance statement sets the minimum stream flows for the Snake River Basin. This proposed statement differs from the existing policy in that it sets the minimum flows at Johnson's Bar and Lime Point instead of a reference to a FERC license and it also makes a distinction that there are waters which are not held in trust by the state which may be subject to appropriation. Management flexibility is the key to the proposed policy. The proposed changes (ATTACHMENT 2) to amend Policy 32 were presented to the Board for review and action. The proposed amendments will appear in bold print as Policy 32 of the existing State Water Plan and staff will prepare in the next few weeks the text material to amplify and state background information for each statement. This will be the proposed package staff recommends the Board take to the public in its hearings. The existing sub-policies, interstate considerations and Indian water rights, have been left out of the proposed amendment to Policy 32 because staff felt that interstate considerations were not a clearly identified policy and the Indian water rights will be part of an adjudication in which they will be identified and recorded.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved Board accept the proposed amendment to Policy 32 as presented today for hearing to receive public comment. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

Chairman Donald R. Kramer requested Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, review the text material before sending copies to Board members for their review.

b. Ground Water Policy Alternatives. Frank Sherman, department staff, reminded the Board members that they have been studying ground water policy alternatives for over a year. The Swan Falls Agreement does not remove the

necessity for the state to have a ground water policy, but may provide direction for the Board in establishing that policy. Three potential ground water policies identified are: (1) management of ground water as a perpetual resource, (2) maximum utilization of ground water resources, and (3) management as a single resource the ground and surface waters of the state.

The Board has placed a temporary hold on further ground water policy study until the Swan Falls Agreement has been implemented.

c. Scheduling of Public Hearings. The Board set the schedule for hearings to receive public comments on the proposed amendment to Policy 32 as follows:

Idaho Falls	January 28	2 & 7 pm
Pocatello	January 29	2 & 7 pm
Burley	January 30	2 & 7 pm
Twin Falls	January 31	2 & 7 pm
Boise	February 5	2 & 7 pm
Lewiston	February 6	2 & 7 pm

At the Board's hearings, the public should submit comments on the proposed amendments to Policy 32 which reflect the proposed legislation submitted to the legislature. The Board has no effect on Idaho Code and all public comments on the proposed statutes should be expressed to the legislature. Letters that have been received to date by the Board in regard to the Board's proposed amendments to Policy 32 will be made part of the official hearing record.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, suggested that the citizens of the state contact their legislators to insure that the Swan Falls Agreement is implemented to avoid years of litigation. Pat Costello, Governor's Office, responded that everything the Governor has signed was done with the interest of good sound public policy. The Governor can support the recommended changes to Policy 32 as written and would suggest the Board go forward on that basis.

Agenda Item No. 6. Jarbidge Resource Area Management Plan - BLM

Gary Carson, Area Manager for the Jarbidge Resources Area, addressed the following concerns of the Board: (1) Proposals that were made in the Jarbidge Resources Management Plan as it relates to the agricultural entry applications and transfer proposals of public land into private ownership, and (2) restraints the land use plan would put on present and future agricultural development. The Jarbidge Resources Management Plan was distributed a few weeks ago to the public for review and comments; the comment period will close January 4. At that time, revisions will be made and a final report will hopefully be completed by June 30, 1985. The plan is a broad land use plan that addresses all the resource values in the area based on the demands and needs, and includes a preferred alternative for the management of all the resources in the area. Alternatives that were analyzed in the document were: (1) continue present

management, (2) production alternative by maximizing the utilization of all resources, (3) multi-use alternative trying to balance the uses of the resources ("preferred alternative" as determined through analysis), (4) maximizes environmental protection to the components of the ecosystem in the resource area, and (5) no grazing alternative. The ag. development proposals and water requirements for the "preferred alternative" consists of 74,500 acres of ag entry development, 1200 acres for sale (approximately 40 percent for ag uses), 9600 acres for sale or exchange, 3200 acres for exchange only, and 1701 cfs water requirements met by 90 percent of the water coming from the Snake River (60 percent above Milner Dam and 30 percent below the dam). One of the restrictions imposed on the ag use plan is a range for wild horses required by the Wild Horse and Burro Act as it existed when the bill was passed in 1971. The plan identifies a range for a herd of wild horses in Sailor Creek planning unit to be co-managed. The designated range is open to other uses such as livestock and recreation, but cannot be transferred from the range use. The "preferred alternative" identifies 83,000 acres of range land for 50 herd of wild horses with a reservation of 600 animal units per month (aum). The only other constraint on the land use plan is special designations. The plan identifies Salmon Falls Creek as a natural area and Sandpoint Area of Critical Environmental Concern, which is identified by the Bureau of Land Management as a special resource value area entitled, "Sandpoint Paleontologic Site."

Agenda Item No. 7. Cottonwood - West Oakley Fan Area

- a. USGS Report - Ground Water Conditions in Cottonwood--West Oakley Fan Area
- b. IDWR Public Meeting in Burley on November 30
- c. Water Users Effort to Organize Irrigation District

a. USGS Report - Ground Water Conditions in Cottonwood--West Oakley Fan Area. Norman C. Young, Administrator, Resources Administration Division, reported on the history and findings of the USGS report entitled, "Ground Water Conditions in Cottonwood--West Oakley Fan area." In 1962 the department designated critical ground water areas and closed for development the West Oakley Fan and Cottonwood areas. In the Cottonwood area, 20 wells had been drilled prior to the closure of the area causing the water levels to continue to decline through the mid-1960's. A lawsuit resulted in an adjudication of the ground water basin and a decree was entered in 1971. From 1972 to present, a maximum of 5500 af was allowed to be pumped in the Cottonwood area. Of the 20 wells drilled, only five have been allowed to pump water. During the years 1962-1967, little development occurred in the West Oakley Fan area causing little decline in the water levels. Consequently, the area was reopened for development in 1967. At present 36,000 acres have been developed into irrigated farmland. The water levels have commenced to decline. As a result, the department closed the West Oakley Fan area in January 1982.

The legislature in 1982 authorized the funding for a study to gather regulatory data on both the critical ground water areas of Cottonwood and West Oakley Fan. The purpose of the study was to: (1) develop a water balance

between the recharge and depletion of the aquifers, (2) evaluate the ground water trends, and (3) develop a relationship between the Cottonwood Critical Ground Water Area and the West Oakley Fan Critical Ground Water Area. The study results indicate that in the West Oakley Fan area in 1980 (a typical water year), 60,000 af of consumptive withdrawals were made from the aquifer and the annual recharge was estimated to be between 10,000 and 26,000 af--an annual depletion of at least 34,000 af. The water levels have continued to decline in this area. In the Cottonwood area during the period of 1977-1982, the study indicates a discharge pumpage of 5300 af and an annual recharge of 4,000 af--mining of the aquifer by 1300 af with a potential of 1500 af. Water levels are declining at five feet per year in the area. During the study, USGS determined that the fault was fairly effective in isolating the limestone aquifer in the Cottonwood area, located south and west of the fault, from the volcanic aquifer in the West Oakley Fan area, located north and east of the fault. There was 200 feet difference in water elevation between the aquifers; thus, indicating that the fault barrier is relatively impermeable. The study's conclusion is that the two aquifers in the two critical ground water areas are separate.

b. IDWR Public Meeting in Burley on November 30. Norman C. Young continued that the Department of Water Resources held a meeting in Burley on November 30 to inform the area water users of the report and the department's actions. USGS presented the study's results at the meeting. Based on these results showing the water levels declining even in the wet years, particularly in the Cottonwood area where the court decree does not allow mining of the aquifer, the Director of the department has the responsibility to take action to insure that aquifer depletion is stopped. The department must limit the pumping from 5500 af of water to 4000 af. To accomplish this, orders will be issued on the five present water allotments in the area--three allotments will not be affected, one will be terminated and the other will be reduced. The reduction of 1500 af probably means two acre feet per year or about 750 acres that will not be irrigated from the ground water. The West Oakley Fan area has the same situation of mining the aquifer, but because of the local efforts ongoing to find an alternate water source, the department at this time feels it does not seem wise to reduce the land base and the number of citizens participating in the project. At the meeting, department staff advised the local citizens that the department would hold the applications in the West Oakley Fan area and would not issue summary orders to stop depletion in a "wait and see" attitude" on what progress occurs in getting another source of water for the area.

c. Water Users Efforts to Organize Irrigation District. Mr. Young conveyed that the local water users in their efforts to finding an alternate water source has received funding from the Board, and U.S. Geological Survey and Montgomery Engineers have done studies for them. The most crucial effort is to form an organization that would allow development to occur. One solution the water users have considered would be to form an irrigation district and then try to seek legislation to allow the irrigation district to perform some of the recharge district functions. In a meeting last week, the water users decided to proceed with petitions to form an irrigation district.

Agenda Item No. 8. Review of Application for Amendment of Permit No. 63-3618, Lucky Peak Reservoir - USBR

Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, reported that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BoR) submitted on March 15, 1984 an application for amendment of permit for storage at Lucky Peak Reservoir. No protests were received on the amendment. In accordance with Section 42-1737, Idaho Code, the amendment is being submitted to the Board for approval or disapproval. The amendment proposes to maintain the 50,000 af streamflow, change the 28,800 af dead storage to storage for recreation, and change the 228,200 af for irrigation to 102,300 af streamflow maintenance and 111,950 af for irrigation (allowing 13,950 af flood control). Two issues the Board may wish to consider are: "Is streamflow maintenance from storage in conformance with the State Water Plan?" and "Should the duration of the water right be conditioned?". In regard to the first issue, Lucky Peak Reservoir is not a natural body of water and the stored quantities are not subject to the provisions of Chapter 15, Idaho Code. Most water rights in Idaho require diversion and beneficial use. The dam is considered to be the diversion for a storage water right, and if the streamflow maintenance uses can be considered to be beneficial, a valid water right can be constituted. Historically the BoR has not allowed the 102,300 acre feet of storage to be contracted except on a limited basis. On the issue of conditioning a water right, the Board may wish to consider the increased competition between the various uses of the limited water supplies in Idaho and the notion that "higher and better use" now may be viewed differently in the future.

Ron Golus, Bureau of Reclamation, discussed the development of the recommendations for the noncontracted space in Lucky Peak Reservoir. On March 20, 1964 a storage permit was granted to the BoR with a stipulation that beneficial use of water storage be made on or before March 20, 1975. In 1975, no designation use had been made for 116,250 af of noncontracted space. At that time, the directors of Idaho Dept. of Water Resources and Bureau of Reclamation met to discuss the potential uses of stored water. The permit issued stated that the water from Lucky Peak storage would be used as supplemental supply for irrigated lands in the Boise River valley, but the existing Boise River valley irrigation entities could not prove beneficial use for supplemental water from the uncontracted space. It was also agreed that using noncontracted storage space for maintaining flows in the Boise River to dilute the city of Boise's Lander Street sewage discharge into the river was not a beneficial use. Two studies were recommended: (1) review ways to improve the flood control and maintain streamflow operation of the river, and (2) review the possibility of irrigating parts of the Mountain Home and Bruneau plateaus. The studies were accomplished through the Boise Project Power Modification Study and the Corps/BoR Regulation Manual Study for the Boise River System. Upon completion of the studies, agency meetings from the federal, state, county and city were held to receive input and a public meeting and workshop were held to inform the public and receive comments. The recommended plan agreed upon was for the Lucky Peak Lake noncontracted space to be used for the Boise River streamflow maintenance jointly with the authorized flood control use.

Will Reid, Dept. of Fish and Game, commented that 150 cfs has been identified as the practical streamflow maintenance for the Boise River from the Diversion Dam to Star diversion.

F. Dave Rydalch, Member, moved Board adoption that "streamflow maintenance from storage" is a water use in conformance with the State Water Plan and recommended director approval of the application for amendment. Robert M. Hammes, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved the Board adopt a recommendation that the term of the Lucky Peak storage permit be thirty (30) years prior to review. James Shawver, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

Agenda Item No. 9. INRB Financing Programs

- a. Loan and Grant Applications
- b. Bond and Inducement Resolutions
- c. Boise Water Corporation Revenue Bond

a. Loan and Grant Applications. Fred Eisenbarth, department staff, advised the Board that Goose Creek Flood Control District #16 requested in a letter of December 5, 1984 the Board make a \$164,000 loan to them from the Revolving Development Account for one year at nine percent interest to repair, maintain and enlarge the West Canal from Oakley Reservoir to Murtaugh Lake. The West Canal was constructed last spring to accommodate the high spring runoffs to avoid excessive flooding. The district was legally organized in August, 1984, but in accordance with Idaho law, the district is unable to levy a tax for operating money until next year. The flood control district is a legal entity and both the applicant and project do qualify for a Board loan as outlined in the rules and regulations of the Revolving Development Account.

Leland Baker, Chairman of the Goose Creek Flood Control District #16, informed the Board the district had the taxing authority, but timing was such that they could not get a tax levy on this year's tax bills.

J. D. Williams, Member, moved Board adoption of a resolution (ATTACHMENT 3) to make a \$164,000 loan for one year at nine percent interest from the Revolving Development Account to Goose Creek Flood Control District #16 to be used for payment of costs associated with the repair and enlargement of the West Canal. Richard W. Wagner, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by roll call vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays. Gray, Aye; Hammes, Aye; Jones, Aye; Kramer, Aye; Rydalch, Aye; Shawver, Aye; Wagner, Aye; and Williams, Aye.

Fred Eisenbarth, department staff, reported the department had received a letter of intent dated November 29, 1984 from the city of Rathdrum for a grant request of \$2750.00 from the Board to be used for maintaining and enlarging a sump for discharging the flood waters of Rathdrum Creek. In 1976 and 1977, the Bureau of Reclamation (BoR) undertook the East Greenacres Irrigation Project to create a more dependable source of irrigation water by deep wells, outlet control works at Twin Lakes and a sump at Rathdrum. This negated the need for water from Rathdrum Creek. The BoR also entered into an agreement with Kootenai County regarding the maintenance and operation of the outlet control work and the sump. The problem the city is facing is an inadequate sized sump which is not maintained, and with no overflow through the canals for flooding waters. The sump problem is one the city did not design, construct or agree to maintain, and thus, it has not budgeted moneys for it. Elmer Smith, city engineer, feels that there will be an overall solution to the sump problem, but due to the legal posturing of the duties between the county and BoR, both parties have taken the position they have no funds available to help now with prevention of flooding problems.

J. D. Williams, Member, moved adoption of a resolution (ATTACHMENT 4) for a \$2750.00 grant to the city of Rathdrum to remove silt from the discharge sump for Rathdrum Creek, with the conditions that the city seek redress for the city's damages caused by the sump's overflow and to refund the grant moneys to the Board in the event the amount is recovered from the parties responsible for its damages. Richard W. Wagner, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by roll call vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays. Gray, Aye; Hammes, Aye; Jones, Aye; Kramer, Aye; Rydalch, Aye; Shawver, Aye; Wagner, Aye; and Williams, Aye.

Chairman Donald R. Kramer acknowledged the presence of Dr. Evan M. Kackley, one of the first Water Board members, and his son, Ellis Kackley.

Fred Eisenbarth, department staff, explained the department received a letter of intent dated November 20, 1984 from the Salmon Golf Association for a \$6,153.70 grant request to the Board for construction of a drip-irrigation system on the Salmon Golf Course for adequate tree growth and survival. Board members felt the request was not an emergency situation and could find no reason to justify a grant to the association.

Robert M. Hammes, Member, moved the Board reject the \$6,153.70 grant request from the Salmon Golf Association. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved the Board direct staff to write a letter to the Salmon Golf Association indicating moneys would be available to them for a loan. Franklin Jones, Secretary, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

\$6153.70 will be held for the Salmon Golf Association should they wish to request a loan to construct a drip-irrigation system on the Salmon Golf Course.

b. Bond and Inducement Resolutions. Bill Eastlake, department staff, explained the department has prepared for the Board's consideration Recission Resolution No. 83-09 to Fall River Rural Electric Coop. and National Hydropower Corporation for \$18 million to develop a hydropower project. National Hydropower Corp. is no longer in business and Fall River Rural Electric Coop. has taken over Bonneville Pacific and will be able to arrange private financing. The Coop. is no longer interested in the bonding program.

Richard W. Wagner, Member, moved Board adopt Recission Resolution No. 83-09 (ATTACHMENT 5) for Fall River Rural Electric Coop. for \$18 million for a hydropower project. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

The department has prepared for the Board's consideration Recission Resolution No. 84-18 to Elk Creek Hydro for \$2,750,000 to construct a two megawatt hydropower facility on Elk Creek. The project sponsor has changed and the new sponsor does not wish to seek financing through the bonding program.

Richard W. Wagner, Member, moved Board adopt Recission Resolution No. 84-18 (ATTACHMENT 6) for Elk Creek Hydro for \$2,750,000 to construct a hydropower facility on Elk Creek. Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

The department has prepared for the Board's consideration Bond Resolution No. 84-79 to Jay Martin for \$24,000 through the Board's bonding program to install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$29,785. Inducement Resolution No. 84-79 was approved by the Board at its last meeting.

Robert M. Hammes, Member, moved Board adoption of Bond Resolution No. 84-79 (ATTACHMENT 7) to Jay Martin for \$24,000 to install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Richard W. Wagner, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, Gray, Absent, Shawver, Absent.

On November 23, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from DeWitt and Carolyn Moss for \$50,400 to install a center pivot irrigation system including canal bridges, pipeline and rock clearing on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$56,000.

The department has prepared for the Board's consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-82 to DeWitt and Carolyn Moss for \$50,400.

J. D. Williams, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-82 (ATTACHMENT 8) and Bond Resolution No. 84-82 (ATTACHMENT 9) to DeWitt and Carolyn Moss for \$50,400 to install a center pivot irrigation system including canal bridges, pipeline and rock clearing on existing farmlands. Richard W. Wagner, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 7 Ayes, 0 Nays, Gray, Absent.

On December 4, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from William Assendrup for \$23,802.54 to purchase and install a portable irrigation mainline and handlines on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$29,753.18. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-83 to William Assendrup for \$23,802.54.

Robert M. Hammes, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-83 (ATTACHMENT 10) and Bond Resolution No. 84-83 (ATTACHMENT 11) to William Assendrup for \$23,802.54 to purchase and install a portable irrigation mainline and handlines on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, Gray, Absent, Wagner, Absent.

On December 4, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Ted and Lois Peterson for \$80,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$92,900. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-84 to Ted and Lois Peterson for \$80,000.

F. Dave Rydalch, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-84 (ATTACHMENT 12) and Bond Resolution No. 84-84 (ATTACHMENT 13) to Ted and Lois Peterson for \$80,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. J. D. Williams, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, Gray, Absent, Wagner, Absent.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Sherwood Ricks for \$33,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system and mainline on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$44,811. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-85 to Sherwood Ricks for \$33,000.

James Shawver, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-85 (ATTACHMENT 14) and Bond Resolution No. 84-85 (ATTACHMENT 15) to Sherwood Ricks for \$33,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system and mainline on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, Gray, Absent, Wagner, Absent.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Alan Tsukamoto for \$49,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system and mainline on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-86 to Alan Tsukamoto for \$49,000.

Robert M. Hammes, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-86 (ATTACHMENT 16) and Bond Resolution No. 84-86 (ATTACHMENT 17) to Alan Tsukamoto for \$49,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system and mainline on existing farmlands. James Shawver, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 6 Ayes, 0 Nays, Gray, Absent, Wagner, Absent.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Southeastern Idaho Potato Company, Inc., Dennis Murdock, President, for \$106,504 to purchase and install two center pivot irrigation systems for existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-87 to Southeastern Idaho Potato Company, Inc. for \$106,504.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-87 (ATTACHMENT 18) and Bond Resolution No. 84-87 (ATTACHMENT 19) to Southeastern Idaho Potato Company, Inc. for \$106,504 to purchase and install two center pivot irrigation systems on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Lawrence Stander for \$47,429 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$48,912.50. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-88 to Lawrence Stander for \$47,429.

Richard W. Wagner, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-88 (ATTACHMENT 20) and Bond Resolution No. 84-88 (ATTACHMENT 21) to Lawrence Stander for \$47,429 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from J. Randy Leavitt for \$26,442 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$32,412.50. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-89 to J. Randy Leavitt for \$26,442.

Robert M. Hammes, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-89 (ATTACHMENT 22) and Bond Resolution No. 84-89 (ATTACHMENT 23) to J. Randy Leavitt for \$26,442 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Searle Brothers, c/o Merwyn Seale, for \$250,000 to purchase and install three center pivot irrigation systems on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement Resolution No. 84-90 to Searle Brothers for \$250,000.

Richard W. Wagner, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-90 (ATTACHMENT 24) to Searle Brothers for \$250,000 to purchase and install three center pivot irrigation systems on existing farmlands. J. D. Williams, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Lynn Broadhead for \$150,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement Resolution No. 84-91 to Lynn Broadhead for \$150,000.

J. D. Williams, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-91 (ATTACHMENT 25) to Lynn Broadhead for \$150,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. James Shawver, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Evan Dance for \$75,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement Resolution No. 84-92 to Evan Dance for \$75,000.

F. Dave Rydalch, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-92 (ATTACHMENT 26) to Evan Dance for \$75,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Richard W. Wagner, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 10, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from John Olsen for \$50,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system, including a mainline and pump, on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement Resolution No. 84-93 to John Olsen for \$50,000.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-93 (ATTACHMENT 27) to John Olsen for \$50,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system, including a mainline and pump, on existing farmlands. James Shawver, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 11, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Mitch Jacobs for \$32,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Total project cost is \$40,000. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-94 to Mitch Jacobs for \$32,000.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-94 (ATTACHMENT 28) and Bond Resolution No. 84-94 (ATTACHMENT 29) to Mitch Jacobs for \$32,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 11, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from Alan Cannon, Jr. for \$42,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-95 to Alan Cannon, Jr. for \$42,000.

Richard W. Wagner, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-95 (ATTACHMENT 30) and Bond Resolution No. 84-95 (ATTACHMENT 31) to Alan Cannon, Jr. for \$42,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

On December 12, 1984 the department received an application for Board financing through the bond program from George Hansen for \$78,000 to purchase

and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. The department has prepared for Board consideration Inducement Resolution No. 84-96 to George Hansen for \$78,000.

Robert M. Hammes, Member, moved Board adoption of Inducement Resolution No. 84-96 (ATTACHMENT 32) to George Hansen for \$78,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. F. Dave Rydalch, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

c. Boise Water Corporation Revenue Bond. Bill Eastlake, department staff, explained that an agreement was before the Board for adoption to increase the interest rate .26 percent from 8.9 percent to 9.16 percent on Boise Water Corporation's revenue bond for four million dollars for ten years. The original contingent purchase agreement states that if there are changes in tax laws which impact the borrower's tax situation, it is proper to make adjustments for that tax law. Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, bank which bought the bond, was under the old tax law which allowed it to deduct from its income 85 percent of the interest cost of the bond. The new July tax law reduces the deduction to 80 percent. To compensate for the lower deduction and keep the tax consequence relatively the same, the bank wishes to increase the interest rate. The Board's bond counsel has reviewed the proposal and finds no problem with it.

Richard W. Wagner, Member, moved Board adoption of an agreement (ATTACHMENT 33) to increase the interest rate on Boise Water Corporation's revenue bond; agreement to be signed by the Water Resource Board, Fidelity Bank, General Waterworks Corporation, Boise Water Corporation and Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York. James Shawver, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

NEW AGENDA ITEM. Flood Control District #15 Financial Request.

Chairman Donald R. Kramer, having received consent from the Board, added a new agenda item of Flood Control District #15 Financial Request.

Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, explained that Raft River Flood Control District #15 requests a \$30,000 one-year loan from the Board to pay costs associated with rehabilitating the flood control structures.

Alvin Neddo, Chairman, Flood Control District #15, stated that this past spring 10,000 acres of Raft River valley was inundated for approximately two and half months according to the ASCS. Periodically there is flooding in the valley but nothing as severe as last year since 1921. The district needs to dredge and clean the drainage channels in the valley.

J. D. Williams, Member, moved Board adoption of a resolution (ATTACHMENT 34) to loan \$30,000 for one year at nine percent interest from the Revolving Development Account to Raft River Flood Control District #15 to rehabilitate its flood control structures. Robert M. Hammes, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by roll call vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays. Gray, Aye; Hammes, Aye; Jones, Aye; Kramer, Aye; Rydalch, Aye; Shawver, Aye; Wagner, Aye; and Williams, Aye.

Agenda Item No. 10. Status Report

- a. Market Lake Studies
- b. Palisades Project
- c. Galloway Project
- d. Utah Study on Diversion of Bear River to Snake River Drainage
- e. Smith Fork Project by Wyoming Development Commission

a. Market Lake Studies. Paul Castelin, department staff, reported that the Market Lake area has habitually been an area where surface water has been a problem. During the last two or three years, the farmers in the area have not been able to handle the abnormally high spring runoffs. The farmers formed the Northwest Flood Control Coop. and requested a \$50,000 grant from the Board to study means of controlling the flooding. As a result of the study, the Coop. in accord with Westside Soil and Water Conservation District applied and received from the Board a \$120,000 mirror bond. The Board in June, 1984 passed a resolution directing staff to work with the Department of Fish and Game and other appropriate agencies to develop a management plan for removing excess waters from the area. The project was underway by late summer and operational by October 26, 1984. Presently, the surface water has been removed effectively and pumped into the Snake River. The project consisted of excavating two small reservoirs and equipping them with pumps and an 18-inch mainline to the Snake River. Ditches were graded and land leveled to move flooding waters across the fields more effectively. Several different alternatives are proposed to prevent the different sources of water from flooding the area. Groundwater moves into the area primarily from the north-east and seepage comes from the Butte and Market Lake Canal, Bell Larsen Canal and the Taylor Slough. The Department of Fish and Game, agency who manages the wildlife management area, has used several drain wells to dispose of excess water, but the agency is under order to close the wells. This will result in the entire area flooding. One of the first alternatives to pursue will be to find a means of eliminating the excess waters without using the drain wells.

F. Dave Rydalch, Member, moved Board direct staff to continue to cooperate with Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Northwest Flood Control Cooperative group to monitor the effectiveness of recently installed water management facilities and recommend any additional work that may be required to control flooding in the Market Lake area. Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

b. Palisades Project. Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, reported that the state will be submitting a Palisades bill for congressional approval this year. In reviewing last year's support and opposition to the proposed bill, the American Public Power Association accepted the project and Northwest Power Planning Association rejected it based on Idaho cooperative utilities' recommendation. The Idaho cooperative utilities will be meeting in Boise on December 20, and the department has requested they consider approving the Palisades project. The Board may wish to be represented at the meeting. Chairman Kramer responded that either he or Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, will attend the meeting.

c. Galloway Project. Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, said that the Corps of Engineers will complete the feasibility study this year on the Galloway project. The department told the legislature last year that the department would not seek study funds beyond this fiscal year ending in June 30, 1985; if the project study results showed the project to be feasible, general funds would be used for department staff to continue work with the local people on the project in FY 86. It does now appear that the Galloway project is feasible from a benefit-cost ratio and financial feasibility. If the local people wish to continue the project as a state sponsored project, the department will be asking the legislature for a major funding commitment. The department feels that it is important that the Corps address in its feasibility report the economic and financial feasibility of the project. The next meeting of the Weiser River Advisory Committee will be January 16, 1985.

d. Utah Study on Diversion of Bear River to Snake River Drainage. Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, commented that Higginson-Barnett, consultants, did a report for the state of Utah in 1983 on the preliminary investigation for diversion of Bear River water in the vicinity of Alexander, Idaho for the purpose of decreasing inflows to the Great Salt Lake. In the Summary of Findings, they pointed out that such diversions could be done with existing canals or construction of new facilities. Diversions using existing canals could divert as much as 60,000 af of water per year; new facilities would be limited to its built capacity. The report discouraged further study. It stated that the quantity of water that could be successfully diverted out of the Bear River system would be so small that its effect on the Great Salt Lake would be meaningless. Nevertheless, the Utah legislature and water resources department have decided to proceed with further study on decreasing the inflow to the lake, and awarded a contract to a consulting engineering firm called Horrocks/Carollo Engineers from Salt Lake City.

e. Smith Fork Project by Wyoming Development Commission. Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, explained that Wyoming Development Commission has contracted to study a proposal to construct a 125,000 af reservoir on Smiths Fork of the Bear River north of Cokeville in Lincoln County Wyoming. A draft study report was placed on the agenda of the last Bear River Commission meeting, but withdrawn from the agenda because of major revisions requested from the Commission. Department staff will continue to review information as it is received on the study.

Agenda Item No. 11. Review of IDWR Energy Programs.

Wayne T. Haas, Administrator, Resources Analysis Division, presented an overview (ATTACHMENT 34) of the department's energy program summarizing the grants funded to the department and the cooperative agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Bonneville Power Administration and the U.S. Department of Energy. The department will be requesting the legislature appropriate \$116,000 in general fund moneys for the energy program. Without the state moneys for the energy program, the state will lose several million federal dollars.

Agenda Item No. 12. Director's Report

A. Kenneth Dunn, Director, advised the Board that no minimum stream flow applications will be submitted to the legislature for approval and no more applications will be processed through the department until the appeal by the Department of Fish and Game on the Pahsimeroi River permit is decided by the courts. The appeal was made on a term condition the department placed on the permit.

David Tuthill, department staff, reminded the Board that at its last meeting minimum stream flow application No. 22-7369, Teton River, was tabled. Since that time additional information has been received on the application. The minimum stream flow application on Teton River was filed on June 19, 1981 for 106 cfs based on a request of the Department of Fish and Game. Public notice was advertised in the Teton Valley News and four protests were received. A public meeting was held in September, 1984. The department received one letter in opposition from the Fremont Madison Irrigation District and 12 letters in favor of the minimum stream flow. CH2M Hill has developed a flow availability graph, based on data through 1979, in its design of the new power facility at Felt Dam. It was found that 106 cfs was available 100 percent of the time at the site. Fremont Madison Irrigation District's main concern about the minimum stream flow application is in regard to its exchanges on the Teton River. The district diverts water upstream on the Teton River and then replaces it with its storage water from Island Park Reservoir through a canal to satisfy prior water right holders downstream. The district has 808 af storage owned by individuals on Teton and 1500 af rented in Island Park Reservoir (equivalent to 10 cfs diverted for approximately 117 days). At this time, it is not a significant amount of water in terms of the overall river supply. Another problem raised was in respect to Felt Dam which bypasses approximately .2 miles of a reach on the Teton River. Raft River Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Dept. of Fish and Game entered into an agreement in 1982 that 20 cfs should be allowed to bypass the river nine months of the year and 50 cfs should be bypassed three months of the year. Dept. of Fish and Game has requested the Board include in the minimum stream flow application the agreement with Raft River Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Gene M. Gray, Vice Chairman, moved adoption of a resolution (ATTACHMENT 35) in the matter of minimum stream flow application No. 22-7369 on Teton River requesting the Director proceed with administrative action on the application. Robert M. Hammes, Member, seconded the motion.

Motion passed by voice vote: 8 Ayes, 0 Nays.

Agenda Item No. 13. Items Board Members May Wish to Present

J. D. Williams, Member, requested staff write a letter to Tom Stivers, Speaker of the House, responding to his letter of support for the Swan Falls Agreement, indicating the Board's appreciation for his support and informing him of the Board's actions in listing the dates of the hearings; and, request Speaker Stivers communicate to the members of the legislature to give them the opportunity to attend the hearings. Also, express the Board's concern that some of the legislation may not be in place which the Board will be referring to at the hearings and suggest he may wish to discuss this with the Director or other members of the legislature.

The next Board meeting will be January 17, 1985 in Boise.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.



SECRETARY

BOARD ACTIONS:

1. Approval of 9-84 Minutes of November 2, 1984 Board meeting. (Page 2)
2. Accepted the proposed amendment to Policy 32 for hearing to receive public comment. (Page 3)
3. Adopted "streamflow maintenance from storage" as a water use in conformance with the State Water Plan and recommended Director approval of the application for amendment of U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. (Page 8)
4. Adopted a recommendation that the term of the Lucky Peak storage permit be thirty (30) years prior to review. (Page 8)
5. Adopted a resolution to make a \$164,000 loan for one year at nine percent interest from the Revolving Development Account to Goose Creek Flood Control District #16 to be used for payment of costs associated with the

repair and enlargement of the West Canal. (Page 8)

6. Adopted a resolution for \$2750.00 grant to the city of Rathdrum to remove silt from the discharge sump for Rathdrum Creek, with the conditions that the city seek redress for the city's damages caused by the sump's overflow and to refund the grant moneys to the Board in the event the amount is recovered from the parties responsible for its damages. (Page 9)
7. Rejected a grant request of \$6,153.70 from the Salmon Golf Association. (Page 9)
8. Directed staff to write a letter to the Salmon Golf Association indicating moneys would be available for a loan. (Page 9)
9. Adopted Recission Resolution No. 83-09 for Fall River Rural Electric Coop. for \$18 million for a hydropower project. (Page 10)
10. Adopted Recission Resolution No. 84-18 for Elk Creek Hydro for \$2,750,000 to construct a hydropower facility on Elk Creek. (Page 10)
11. Adopted Bond Resolution No. 84-79 to Jay Martin for \$24,000. (Page 10)
12. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-82 to DeWitt and Carolyn Moss for \$50,400 to install a center pivot irrigation system including canal bridges, pipeline and rock clearing on existing farmlands. (Page 11)
13. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-83 to William Assendrup for \$23,802.54 to purchase and install a portable irrigation mainline and handlines on existing farmlands. (Page 11)
14. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-84 to Ted and Lois Peterson for \$80,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 11)
15. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-85 to Sherwood Ricks for \$33,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system and mainline on existing farmlands. (Page 12)
16. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-86 to Alan Tsukamoto for \$49,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system and mainline on existing farmlands. (Page 12)
17. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-87 to Southeastern Idaho Potato Company, Inc. for \$106,504 to purchase and install two center pivot irrigation systems on existing farmlands. (Page 12)
18. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-88 to Lawrence Stander for \$47,429 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 12)

19. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-89 to J. Randy Leavitt for \$26,442 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 13)
20. Adopted Inducement Resolution No. 84-90 to Searle Brothers for \$250,000 to purchase and install three center pivot irrigation systems on existing farmlands. (Page 13)
21. Adopted Inducement Resolution No. 84-91 to Lynn Broadhead for \$150,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 13)
22. Adopted Inducement Resolution No. 84-92 to Evan Dance for \$75,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 14)
23. Adopted Inducement Resolution No. 84-93 to John Olsen for \$50,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system, including a mainline and pump, on existing farmlands. (Page 14)
24. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-94 to Mitch Jacobs for \$32,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 14)
25. Adopted Inducement and Bond Resolutions No. 84-95 to Alan Cammon, Jr. for \$42,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 14)
26. Adopted Inducement Resolution No. 84-96 to George Hansen for \$78,000 to purchase and install a center pivot irrigation system on existing farmlands. (Page 15)
27. Adopted an agreement to increase the interest rate on Boise Water Corporation's revenue bond; agreement to be signed by the Water Resource Board, Fidelity Bank, General Waterworks Corporation, Boise Water Corporation and Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York. (Page 15)
28. Adopted a resolution to loan \$30,000 for one year at nine percent interest from the Revolving Development Account to Raft River Flood Control District #15 to rehabilitate its flood control structures. (Page 16)
29. Directed staff to continue to cooperate with Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Northwest Flood Control Cooperative group to monitor the effectiveness of recently installed water management facilities and recommend any additional work that may be required to control flooding in the Market Lake area. (Page 16)
30. Adopted a resolution in the matter of minimum stream flow application No. 22-7369 on Teton River requesting the Director proceed with

administrative action on the application. (Page 19)

BOARD ATTACHMENTS:

1. Letter sent to Director from Tom Stivers, Speaker of the House, supporting the Swan Falls Agreement. (Page 3)
2. Proposed changes to amend Policy 32 in accordance with the Swan Falls Agreement. (Page 3)
3. Resolution to make a \$164,000 loan for one year at nine percent interest from the Revolving Development Account to Goose Creek Flood Control District #16. (Page 8)
4. Resolution for a \$2750.00 grant to the city of Rathdrum to remove silt from the discharge sump for Rathdrum Creek, with the conditions that the city seek redress for the city's damages caused by the sump's overflow and to refund the grant moneys to the Board in the event the amount is recovered from the parties responsible for its damages. (Page 9)
5. Recission Resolution No. 83-09 to Fall River Rural Electric Coop. for \$18 million. (Page 10)
6. Recission Resolution No. 84-18 to Elk Creek Hydro for \$2,750,000. (Page 10)
7. Bond Resolution No. 84-79 to Jay Martin for \$24,000. (Page 10)
8. Inducement Resolution No. 84-82 to DeWitt and Carolyn Moss for \$50,400. (Page 11)
9. Bond Resolution No. 84-82 to DeWitt and Carolyn Moss for \$50,400. (Page 11)
10. Inducement Resolution No. 84-83 to William Assendrup for \$23,802.54. (Page 11)
11. Bond Resolution No. 84-83 to William Assendrup for \$23,802.54. (Page 11)
12. Inducement Resolution No. 84-84 to Ted and Lois Peterson for \$80,000. (Page 11)
13. Bond Resolution No. 84-84 to Ted and Lois Peterson for \$80,000. (Page 11)
14. Inducement Resolution No. 84-85 to Sherwood Ricks for \$33,000. (Page 12)
15. Bond Resolution No. 84-85 to Sherwood Ricks for \$33,000. (Page 12)
16. Inducement Resolution No. 84-86 to Alan Tsukamoto for \$49,000. (Page 12)

17. Bond Resolution No. 84-86 to Alan Tsukamoto for \$49,000. (Page 12)
18. Inducement Resolution No. 84-87 to Southeastern Idaho Potato Company, Inc. for \$106,504. (Page 12)
19. Bond Resolution No. 84-87 to Southeastern Idaho Potato Company, Inc. for \$106,504. (Page 12)
20. Inducement Resolution No. 84-88 to Lawrence Stander for \$47,429. (Page 12)
21. Bond Resolution No. 84-88 to Lawrence Stander for \$47,429. (Page 12)
22. Inducement Resolution No. 84-89 to J. Randy Leavitt for \$26,442. (Page 13)
23. Bond Resolution No. 84-89 to J. Randy Leavitt for \$26,442. (Page 13)
24. Inducement Resolution No. 84-90 to Searle Brothers for \$250,000. (Page 13)
25. Inducement Resolution No. 84-91 to Lynn Broadhead for \$150,000. (Page 13)
26. Inducement Resolution No. 84-92 to Evan Dance for \$75,000. (Page 14)
27. Inducement Resolution No. 84-93 to John Olsen for \$50,000. (Page 14)
28. Inducement Resolution No. 84-94 to Mitch Jacobs for \$32,000. (Page 14)
29. Bond Resolution No. 84-94 to Mitch Jacobs for \$32,000. (Page 14)
30. Inducement Resolution No. 84-95 to Alan Cannon, Jr. for \$42,000. (Page 14)
31. Bond Resolution No. 84-95 to Alan Cannon, Jr. for \$42,000. (Page 14)
32. Inducement Resolution No. 84-96 to George Hansen for \$78,000. (Page 15)
33. Agreement to increase the interest rate on Boise Water Corporation's revenue bond. (Page 15)
34. Resolution to loan \$30,000 for one year at nine percent interest from the revolving Development Account to Raft River Flood Control District #15 to rehabilitate its flood control structures. (Page 16)
35. Resolution in the matter of minimum stream flow application No. 22-7369 on Teton River requesting the Director proceed with administrative action on the application. (Page 19)

Proposed Revisions and Amendments to
Policy 32, Idaho State Water Plan

Policy 32 - Snake River Basin

It is the policy of Idaho that the ground water and surface water of the basin be managed to meet or exceed a minimum average daily flow of zero measured at the Milner gage, 3900 cfs from April 1 to October 31 and 5600 cfs from November 1 to March 31 measured at the Murphy gage, and 4750 cfs measured at the Weiser gage. A minimum average daily flow of 5,000 cfs at Johnson's Bar shall be maintained and an average daily flow of 13,000 cfs shall be maintained at Lime Point (river mile 172) a minimum of 95 percent of the time. Lower flows may be permitted at Lime Point only during the months of July, August, and September.

Waters not held in trust by the State in accordance with Policy 32A shall be allocated according to the criteria established by Idaho Code 42-203A.

(TEXT)

Policy 32A - Water Held in Trust by the State

It is the policy of Idaho that water held in trust by the state pursuant to Idaho Code 42-203B be reallocated to new uses in accordance with the criteria established by Idaho Code 42-203A and 42-203C.

(TEXT)

Policy 32B - Domestic, Commercial, Municipal and Industrial (DCMI)

It is the policy of Idaho that 150 cfs of water for consumptive purposes held in trust by the state pursuant to Policy 32A be reallocated to meet future DCMI uses in accordance with state law.

(TEXT)

Policy 32C - Agriculture

It is the policy of Idaho that appropriated water held in trust by the state pursuant to Policy 32A, less the amount of water necessary to provide for present and future DCMI uses as set forth in Policy 32B, shall be available for reallocation to meet new and supplemental irrigation requirements which conform to Idaho Code 42-203A, 203B, and 203C.

(TEXT)

Policy 32D - Hydropower

It is the policy of Idaho that hydropower use be recognized as a beneficial use of water, and that depletion of flows below the minimum average daily flows set forth in Policy 32 is not in the public interest.

(TEXT)

Policy 32E - Navigation

It is the policy of Idaho that water sufficient for commercial and recreational navigation is provided by the minimum flows established for the Snake River.

(TEXT)

Policy 32F - Aquaculture

It is the policy of Idaho that water necessary to process aquaculture products be included as a component of DCMI as provided in Policy 32D. The minimum flows established for the Murphy gage provide an adequate water supply for aquaculture, however it is recognized that it may be necessary to construct different diversion facilities than presently exist.

(TEXT)

Policy 32G - Fish, Wildlife, and Recreation

It is the policy of Idaho that the minimum flows established under Policy 32 are sufficient and necessary to meet the minimum requirements for aquatic life, fish, and wildlife and to provide water for recreation in the Snake River and tributary streams. Streamflow depletion below the minimum flows is not in the public interest.

(TEXT)

Policy 32H - Water Quality and Pollution Control

It is the policy of Idaho that the use of water to provide pollution dilution is not a beneficial use of water.

(TEXT)

Policy 32I - New Storage

It is the policy of Idaho that maximum use must be made of the existing storage facilities in the basin. New storage upstream from the Murphy gage should only be approved after it is determined that in so far as possible maximum use of existing storage is being made. Approval of new storage projects that would divert water from the mainstem of the Snake River between Milner and Murphy during the period November 1 to March 31 should be coupled with provisions that mitigate the impact such depletions would have on the generation of hydropower.

(TEXT)

Policy 32J - Stored Water For Management Purposes

It is the policy of Idaho that reservoir storage be acquired in the name of the Idaho Water Resource Board to provide management flexibility in assuring the minimum flows designated for the Snake River.

(TEXT)

ATTACHMENT NO. 2 TO MINUTES OF 10-84 MEETING OF
IDAHO WATER RESOURCE BOARD. December 13, 1984