

STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN
Bismarck, North Dakota
July 19, 1962

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Governor William L. Guy, Chairman, Bismarck
Oscar Lunseth, Vice Chairman, Member from Grand Forks
Henry Steinberger, Member from Donnybrook
William W. Corwin, Member from Fargo
Richard P. Gallagher, Member from Mandan
Einar Dahl, Member from Watford City
Math Dahl, Commissioner, Agriculture and Labor Department, Bismarck
Fred J. Fredrickson, Planning Coordinator, Valley City
Milo W. Hoisveen, Secretary and Chief Engineer, State Engineer, Bismarck

OTHERS PRESENT:

Oscar Berg, Secretary, North Dakota Water Users Association, Minot
Lyle Witham, Towner
Mrs. Lyle Witham, Towner
Jonathan Eaton, Attorney, Minot
Victor Ziegler, Operations Engineer, State Water Commission, Bismarck
Don Mushik, Bismarck
Sam McQuade, Bismarck
Loren Anderson, Bismarck
S. C. Jennings, County Commissioner, Washburn

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. with Vice Chairman Lunseth presiding. Present were Commissioners Einar Dahl, William Corwin, Henry Steinberger, Math Dahl and Milo W. Hoisveen, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
May and June 1962

Commissioner Corwin moved the approval of the minutes for May and June 1962. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Math Dahl. Carried.

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
COMMITTEE REPORT ON
WATER LAW

A discussion was held relative to the Legislative Research Committee hearing on June 11, 1962. Suggested changes in the water laws were made by the Legislative Research Committee and the State Water Commission. These changes were reviewed in considerable detail. The Commission expressed a desire to have Mr. Fredrickson assist in coordinating the water law studies with the Legislative Research Committee. The Commission members were requested to present any suggestions they might have relative to changes in the water laws. One suggested change was called to the attention of the Commission members. The Legislative Research Committee is recommending that a watermaster law be set up. If the law is passed, the watermaster would be appointed by the State Engineer and the State Water Commission. Secretary Hoisveen stated that he believed this law should be modified to avoid the use of a watermaster on a stream or river on which the government claims at least 50 per cent of the waters. Our participation on such streams should be limited to protecting individuals, municipalities and industries from encroachment by federal agencies. He indicated the Water Commission could be adversely affected if it became necessary

7-19-62

to guard against encroachment on the water of the Fish and Wildlife Service or the Bureau of Reclamation. Secretary Hoisveen stated that he suggested to the Legislative Research Committee that the State Water Commission should be granted the right to determine the streams on which a watermaster might be used to the best advantage of the state and water users. No appropriation for hiring a watermaster or watermasters was provided for in this proposed law. It was the recommendation of the members of the State Water Commission that the Commission should be the one to determine the streams to which a watermaster might be assigned. Should such a law be passed it should be applicable only to very few streams. Copies of the Watermaster Law have been mailed to the Commission members for further study.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE AGREEMENT (Field Activities) The procedures and working relations of the Soil Conservation Service and the State Water Conservation Commission were reviewed. It was the opinion of the Commission members that a similar agreement covering drainage should be developed. Progress has been made in the Commission's relationship with the Soil Conservation Service relative to their watershed program. The Commission has been excluded from watershed planning in the past. Under present arrangements the Water Commission will be in on the basic planning and carry on through the construction features. It will be necessary for staff members to attend some of the meetings and participate in public hearings to determine that watershed planning is compatible with the functions of the State Water Conservation Commission.

REPORT ON DRILLING OPERATIONS CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT WITH PRIVATE DRILLERS The Secretary reported that the contract test drilling operations in Burleigh County have been progressing without difficulty. The Commission has contracted with a private well driller, Mr. Mann of Dickinson, through bid to conduct the test drilling activities. The work is being supervised by a Commission geologist. The Commission has obtained such information as necessary, including soil samples taken at five feet intervals and water samples. The relationship between the contractor and the geologist is excellent. It was the opinion of the Secretary that the Commission could expand its water drilling program through contract agreements with private drillers should the program require further expansion.

WITHAM WATER RIGHT #859 Secretary Hoisveen briefed the Commission on the status of the Witham water right. At the June Commission meeting it was decided to continue the hearing which had been recessed in June of 1960. J. C. Eaton had objected to the granting of a water right to Mr. Witham because he was of the opinion it would deplete the water table that was located under his land and thereby adversely affect his alfalfa plantings. The hearing was recessed until further information could be obtained relative to the aquifer from which Witham was obtaining his water. It was pointed out that Mr. Witham had been forwarding water level readings on well 1 to the Commission for the past two years. This material was of much value to the Commission staff and the geologist from the U. S. Geological Survey in determining the adequacy of the ground water supply. Mr. and Mrs. Lyle Witham and Mr. Jonathan Eaton were invited to appear before the Commission.

Secretary Hoisveen stated that this was a continuation of the water right hearing held June 13, 1960 which was advertised and appeared in the official newspaper of McHenry County on May 12. The hearing was

recessed to obtain additional information of the aquifer in that particular area. The water right application requested a right to obtain water from a ground water supply. (A map was used to show the location of the wells.) It was pointed out that Mr. Witham is pumping from well 1. The Commission staff thought it advisable to observe just what would occur in the way of depletion of the ground water in that area. Mr. Witham drilled a second well which was referred to as well #2. This installation was used as an observation well. Mr. Witham's cooperation with the State Water Commission has been excellent and the basic information obtained as to the effect of the pumping on the aquifer over a sustained period has been very helpful. Mr. Witham started his pumping activities in August 1960. There was little information available prior to that time as no ground water study had been made in the area. When Witham started operations the water was approximately 77 inches below the surface. After he commenced pumping operations a gradual drawdown was observed in the observation well which was approximately 1,300 feet south of the well being pumped and 2,000 feet north of the Eaton property. The water level declined to a level of 100 inches below the surface on July 15, 1961. It regained two inches of the decline following a rain on July 19. Pumping operations were discontinued after that date. The water table continued to decline indicating that a movement to the Mouse River was occurring. It reached an all time low on March 14, 1962, when the observation well showed a level of 108 inches. No pumping took place until May 1962. The recharge resulting from minor snow melt brought the water table back up to 92 inches on May 1, 1962. Pumping operations were resumed by Witham on May 1, 1962 until May 12. A minor build-up in the ground water table was observed during pumping operations. Pumping was discontinued on May 13 because of a 6 inch rainfall occurring over a period of one week. A gradual build-up in the water table became apparent. It attained an elevation to where it was almost equal to the water table elevation a little over a year ago approximating $77\frac{1}{2}$ inches below the surface. Mr. Witham commenced his operations again on June 6. During a 15 day period there has been very little depletion; however, there has been a heavy recharge of moisture in that area from rainfall. From the previous information submitted to the Commission it seems reasonable to assume that when the rainfall starts to taper off the water table will again recede as the underground movement continues toward the Souris River. From information available it was felt that if water could not be used for beneficial purposes with fear that it might conceivably adversely affect some one else that the Commission's ground water program might as well be dropped. It resolved itself into a situation where if the resources cannot be developed there is no use in exploring and cataloging them.

Mr. Witham stated that he had purchased a second hand pump very reasonably and it is sitting there waiting to be used on well #2. Mr. Witham pointed out, on the diagram, the amount of rainfall that had occurred between the end of April and the first of May 1961. He was of the opinion that the major reduction in the groundwater level has been because of depletion into the Souris River from this aquifer. Because of lack of rainfall, Mr. Witham stated he continued to pump. He pointed out on the diagram where a large amount of rainfall occurred and its affect on the water table. The well Mr. Witham is presently pumping from is 45 feet deep. The observation well is 57 feet deep. The second well is on a little rise. It is a greater distance from the ground surface to the water table. There was no difference in the quantity of water available from these wells.

Mr. Jonathan Eaton, Attorney from Minot, stated he was representing his father, J. C. Eaton. Mr. Eaton was unable to be present because of the illness of his wife. He further stated that he was in full accord

with the statement that the water resources of the state should be used. The Eatons own the acreage to the south of Witham. Their alfalfa land is to the south of Witham's land. The land is generally overlain with sandy soil. The water table, generally, in the Denhigh area is very high. It is higher as it approaches the Souris River. The alfalfa planted in that area and the hay further away in the valley receives surface irrigation from the water that rises in that area. Mr. Eaton was concerned about the water benefits to his hay land. The water right would not limit any particular well to a particular quantity of water. Jonathan Eaton stated that his father was of the opinion that the Commission or Mr. Witham should offer some proof as to the quantity of water available in the aquifer and the possible affect to the adjoining landowner. Mr. J. C. Eaton had requested that Mr. Witham's pumping be confined to the northermost well and his findings be submitted to the Commission. Mr. Eaton stated it was his understanding, from the statements made by Mr. Hoisveen and Mr. Witham, that during dry years there is a fairly substantial depletion of water. This shows up on the diagram some distance south of where the pumping took place and would probably affect a large area. If Mr. J. C. Eaton had been present it was his intention to have an outside engineer testify. The Eatons were concerned over the fact that if the water right is granted it will hurt his source of supply that is now being used for subsurface irrigation. Also, Mr. Eaton may want to use his water for pumping water for irrigation on his land at some future date. Mr. Eaton requested the privilege of bringing in some expert testimony. He further stated that they had no objection to Mr. Witham continuing his irrigation as he has been doing.

In answer to Mr. Corwin's question as to whether Mr. Eaton has any wells on his property that have been checked for fluctuation Mr. Eaton replied that most of their wells were of sand pipe and only go down 7 to 10 feet. In answer to Mr. Steinberger's question as to the gradient of the land in question, Mr. Witham's and Mr. Eaton's, Mr. Ziegler stated that generally the terrain slopes from west to east.

Mr. Witham informed the Commission that the elevation 1495 MSL is the highest point on his land, that the bayou, which has water in the year around, is 1455. This well is 5 feet from the ground surface to the water table. The hay lands are subirrigated. There is a constant recharge into the Souris River. Mr. Witham stated that Mr. Eaton used the expression "fairly substantial" and requested that Mr. Eaton define what he meant by "fairly substantial". Mr. Eaton explained that he referred to the area over which there had been an effect as to levels of water. There is a fairly substantial depletion over a fairly substantial area.

In answer to Mr. Hoisveen's question as to the acres irrigated last year, Mr. Witham stated he irrigated probably 80 acres and when he swung the pipes it probably covered 100 acres. He further stated that he irrigated about 5 times. His first application was two inches but that was too much. He stated he probably applied an average of 6 inches on the 100 acres.

Mr. Eaton asked if the Commission checked Mr. Witham's figures. Mr. Ziegler reported that spot check readings were made periodically and the records have been very close.

Mr. Eaton inquired how the Commission knew how much water was being put on the land. Mr. Witham reported that the pump was gaged at 450 gpm. If it ran 60 minutes it would be 27,000 gallons; 20 hours, 600,000 gallons.

Mr. Hoisveen asked what his maximum operation was and Witham said that from May to July 1961 he pumped for 24 hours per day. For 60 days the pump ran approximately 24 hours with 120 acre-feet of water being applied on 100 acres of ground which would make approximately a 14 inch application during the period.

Mr. Lunseth inquired as to what per cent of water the 14 inch annual application would be returned as recharge. Secretary Hoisveen stated that in sandy soils, such as those on the Witham land, it would probably be 50 per cent.

Mr. Einar Dahl inquired whether that would be recharged from the Mouse River if there was no rain. Mr. Witham reported that the 1455 foot elevation of the oxbow or low area would be constant. The water table is 15 feet above. They get 5 to 6 feet during a flood.

Mr. Steinberger asked what the elevation was on Mr. Eaton's land. Mr. Eaton replied that their land immediately south of Mr. Witham's land would be the same. The land drops to the east fairly sharply.

Mr. Steinberger inquired about the observation well, whether that would show a variance when the pump was operated. Mr. Witham didn't think so. There is a variance of 14 inches in a month's time.

Mr. Witham objected to Mr. Eaton's request that further time be taken and the Commission not act on the Witham water right at this time.

Mr. Eaton countered that he would like to produce technical evidence. He also inquired whether Mr. Witham was pumping water out of the second well. Mr. Witham said he wasn't and further stated that irrigation was important from day to day. His first crop of hay was in the stack. If he is to get a second and third crop of hay from this land he must have water. He was of the opinion that it was up to the person protesting to produce the evidence. As it stands now he is convincing himself. He felt that Eatons should produce readings that could be compared to his. Mr. Witham could see no reason for continuing this matter. The Eatons have had two years in which to prepare their evidence. They could have placed sand point wells on their property for observation. He also felt it was very discouraging to him not to be able to develop water right on his own land. He has a well sitting there and he can't operate it.

Mr. Hoisveen called on Commissioner Corwin for his comments. Mr. Corwin has a similar situation near his land.

Commissioner Corwin stated the reason he agreed to the issuance of several water rights next to his land was to see the entire area developed. He felt there was enough water for everyone if properly used. He also stated that if he were to oppose someone putting in a well near his land he should be relieved from his position as a commissioner. He felt no one had a right to have an aquifer for his own land or to stop development on the basis that he might use the water at some future date. He averred such a position could not be tolerated by the Commission.

Mr. Eaton stated they had never opposed any water permit to Mr. Witham. Their objection to the issuing of a water right was that they did not know the extent of the aquifer. He commented that they were probably delinquent in not having an engineer present as they did not know the extent of the aquifer or how the water was being affected below their land. He also stated they did not want to be put in a position of stopping water development. He also stated that Mr. Witham could continue to use the water as he has in the past. He did not think Mr. Witham should use well #2 until they could get some information to see if it would affect them.

Mr. Hoisveen stated the Commission did not have extensive knowledge regarding this aquifer and it was for this reason that the granting of a water right was delayed. He stated that the material supplied by Mr. Witham was the best the Commission had received to date. It permitted us to have geologists from the Commission and the Ground Water Branch of the U. S. Geological Survey evaluate the aquifer. The geologists contend that the water, when not used, spills into the Mouse River. Mr. Ziegler concurred in this statement. Mr. Ziegler further stated that he had been working on this problem for some time because he was interested in the development of water in North Dakota. He did not recommend irrigation on Mr. Witham's land because of the poor soil for irrigation. Mr. Witham should be operating 5 days in order to keep the top soil saturated. The water is going down to the aquifer from which he is pumping. Mr. Ziegler described a similar situation in Burleigh County.

Mr. Witham said that reference had been made to his soil by Messrs. Hoisveen and Ziegler. He stated that Hoisveen visited his project and checked the soils for silt at various points and indicated disappointment because there was no silt present. He said it would take four or five years to make the soil productive. Mr. Witham then explained the method he intended to use to bring this about.

Mr. Eaton said he did not think there had been a good showing made on adjacent lands. The proposed permit did not call for so many acre-feet from a particular well. This could be done, Mr. Hoisveen stated. Mr. Eaton further stated that if a permanent water right is granted it would be effective for a long term and he didn't think they would be jeopardizing Mr. Witham's right by asking for a delay. He reiterated that they did not want to be put in the position of saying they were not in favor of ground water development. A permit could be granted but not on the basis of a permanent right.

Mr. Witham stated that under such a permit he would not know whether he had water or not. He had made a tremendous investment in the system. Two years had passed and the only evidence submitted was what he had gathered, and he felt it wasn't up to him to provide this information. The drilling is completed, the water is being used, the well is on his land. He stated the law read that the protestant is the man who is to bring in the evidence, not the applicant to bring in evidence against himself. Mr. Witham would like to orderly develop his water right on his own land in the most economical way.

Commissioner Lunseth was of the opinion that there was enough evidence submitted for the Commission to decide whether a water right should be issued. Mr. Lunseth asked whether the Commission has a right to limit the amount of water that is issued. Mr. Eaton's objection was that no limitation was made.

Mr. Hoisveen explained that the legal amount is two acre-feet per acre. Mr. Witham is limited by the capacity of the pump he has operating on his well. The amount requested by Mr. Witham can be reduced to 21 inches per acre if that is the desire of the Commission. This would provide Witham 7 three inch applications each season. Water applied in excess of three inch applications would be wasted due to the limited field capacity of the soil.

Mr. Witham explained the operation of the sprinkler system he was using on his land.

Commissioner Corwin moved that the Witham water right application be approved to cover the acreage applied for but that the allocation of water on an acreage basis be determined by the State Engineer. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Einar Dahl. On voice vote Commissioners Lunseth, Steinberger, Corwin, Math Dahl and Einar Dahl voted yes. Commissioner Gallagher voted no and stated that he thought a temporary right should be issued to give Eaton a chance to bring in technical information. The State Engineer recommended that the quantity applied for be reduced from 24 inches of water per acre to 21 inches per acre.

Commissioner Corwin did not agree with Commissioner Gallagher as to the granting of a temporary water right in view of the fact that Eaton had had two years to bring in this information and under such a procedure North Dakota would be held back in its water development.

Commissioner Gallagher felt that the initial proof should come from the applicant and the protestant should be given the opportunity to study the engineer's information and then a decision should be made. Eaton's engineer should have an opportunity to make a study of the State Engineer's information.

Mr. Eaton did not think a permanent water right affecting other landowners in the area should be granted and before any commitment was made Mr. Eaton wanted to have an engineer tell them what to do. To date no engineer has been requested by the Eatons to check this information.

Mr. Hoisveen stated the Commission could grant Witham a permit and then hold off for further observation to see how it might affect the Eaton property below; however, the Commission is putting the burden of proof on Mr. Witham.

Mr. Corwin was of the opinion that if a temporary permit were granted or a permanent permit denied the ground water development program would be set back. Further, no one wanting to install an irrigation system is going to gamble that much money without a water right.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the present draw down is in the neighborhood of 3 or 4 inches. On the second well he is going to have a draw down between the two wells. He would have to go 20 to 22 feet before there would be an excessive draw down. Two feet is now being taken and it can stand 4 or 5 wells if the recharge comes back.

Commissioner Gallagher was of the opinion that those interested in a particular water right should be notified when the material is available in the State Engineer's office.

Governor Guy averred that the Commission may or may not know the interested parties and the Commission may set a precedent and there may be parties the Commission does not know. As soon as the hearing has been held interested people know a study is being made. The weight of responsibility is on the party to keep current on it. The weight of responsibility does not rest on the Commission to inform all parties.

The meeting recessed until 1 p.m. Mr. Math Dahl was not present for the afternoon meeting.

**GAMMA RAY EQUIPMENT
PURCHASE**

Secretary Hoisveen reported to the Commission relative to the bids for the purchase of gamma ray equipment. The bids came to more than had been anticipated. There were three bids which ranged from \$7,550 to \$8,480. Letters were written to various firms who have used the gamma ray equipment as to their opinions. The preference was for the Geo Logger, as it was more servicable and would better meet the requirements of the Commission. There was discussion on the advisability of purchasing a three way unit. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Einar Dahl that the Commission purchase the Geo Logger Gamma Ray equipment with three way attachment not to exceed \$8,400. Carried.

**REQUEST FROM CITY OF
DICKINSON TO EXTEND
GROUND WATER STUDIES**

The city of Dickinson has requested a ground water survey and has made an initial deposit of \$3,000 for such survey. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Einar Dahl that the Commission approve the ground water study for the City of Dickinson. Carried.

**COLEHARBOR REQUEST
FOR DAM SURVEY**

The Village of Coleharbor has requested the State Water Commission to proceed with a survey to construct an underground dam and reservoir for a water supply for that community. The Village Commission has had trouble in attempting to obtain a water supply for Coleharbqr. The village does not now have a municipal water supply. They have several individual wells. The water obtained from the local wells was not of good quality and did not meet public health standards. The Commission staff was of the opinion that a small dam employing principles similar to the Ellendale dam could be built in a draw near the village. A remittance in the sum of \$200 accompanied the request. It was moved by Commissioner Gallagher and seconded by Commissioner Corwin that the Commission cooperate with the city of Coleharbor in establishing a water supply. Carried.

**PORTAL PIPELINE COMPANY
REQUEST FOR CROSSINGS ON
SOURIS AND RED RIVERS**

A request was received from the Pipe Line Technologists of Houston, Texas, to construct a pipe line crossing on the Souris and Red Rivers. The company was informed that they would be required to meet certain standards set by the State Health Department and the State Water Conservation Commission, which they agreed to do. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Gallagher that the Pipe Line Technologists be authorized to construct crossings on the Souris and Red Rivers provided the requirements of the State Health Department and the State Water Conservation Commission are met. Carried.

CALEDONIA PETITION FOR
CONSTRUCTION OF DAM ON
GOOSE RIVER

A petition was received from Caledonia requesting the construction of a dam on the Goose River. The petition was directed to the Board of County Commissioners, the Traill County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, the State Water Conservation Commission, the State Game & Fish Department and the Caledonia Township Board. A preliminary estimate for the construction of the dam was \$90,000, which did not include the cost of a bridge. This would be a recreational area. It was moved by Commissioner Einar Dahl and seconded by Commissioner Corwin that the Commission hold in abeyance the request of the Village of Caledonia for the construction of a dam and bridge until further information has been secured. Carried.

WATER AND RELATED LAND
RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
IN THE MISSOURI RIVER
BASIN

A copy of the publication "Water and Related Land Resources Development in the Missouri River Basin" was given to each Commission member. This publication was suggested by Governor Guy and was compiled by the Mapping Committee of the Missouri River States Committee. It was the opinion of Governor Guy that such a publication would be helpful to the governors of the Missouri River States Committee to know what was taking place in the basin. It was recommended that a copy be sent to the congressional delegations, with a special note from the Governor calling it to the attention of the various members of Congress.

WILDWOOD LAKE RESTORATION

A delegation interested in the restoration of Wildwood Lake requested audience with the State Water Conservation Commission. Secretary Hoisveen reviewed what had transpired previous to this appearance. He informed the Commission that he thought it would be a good idea to have the Wildwood water situation brought to the attention of the Commission to show some of the problems that result from ground water investigations. Wildwood Lake is located six or seven miles southeast of Washburn. Before the Garrison Dam was built the lake depended on flood waters from the Missouri River for its recharge. Since the Garrison Dam has been built there is no flood water and the lake has deteriorated. Some of the landowners have tried to pump water into the lake with only modest success. Because this was a negation of the Garrison Dam, \$35,000 was secured from Congress for the restoration of this lake. The State Water Commission is to match this amount. In talking to the chamber of commerce at Wilton it was their opinion that this was now a private development and state and federal funds should not be used for such development. A hearing was held, at which time certain restrictions were decided upon. It appeared that 50 per cent of the lake shore should be held open for the public. Since the hearing there has been considerable controversy. One group feels that the lake shore should be completely open to the public. The cottage owners feel that there could be 50 per cent access to the lake. Mr. Hoisveen averred that he would like to see it opened up to a degree where the public would have access to it but not to the extent where it would destroy private property. Mr. Hoisveen pointed out that a dam could be constructed at the lower end of Wildwood Lake and a channel could be constructed to divert water from Painted Woods Lake into Wildwood Lake. The control structure near Painted Woods Lake would permit adjustment of the diversion waters.

Messrs. Mushik, McQuade, Anderson and Jennings appeared before the Commission. Mr. Mushik was spokesman for the group.

He stated that with the exception of Mr. Jennings, they all owned cabins on the lake property. The land was leased. At the southeast end of the lake is a former Boy Scout Camp. Mr. Wetzstein owns a good share of the property on the northeast and northwest side of the lake. Mr. Mushik talked to Mr. Wetzstein and he was amiable to any reasonable agreement. He also stated he would not stand in the way of any easement on his property to get the water to the lake. Mr. Mushik further stated that his group had put in about \$3,000 of their own money. A corporation, composed of 8 members, known as the "North Shore, Inc." was formed. They assessed themselves so much money and brought in the REA and with the help of the Water Conservation Commission installed a pump. This is a non-profit corporation. Mr. Mushik said there was a lot of discussion as to access at the Wilton meeting. No one has ever been refused access to the lake. The negative benefits resulting from the Garrison Dam have caused the lake to be emptied.

Mr. Fredrickson stated that where federal money is used the lake has to be open to the public. There should be some plan for a definite number of access points, designed by someone who knows how to do this type of planning, and a public beach established. The Wilton Get-To-Gether Club want a 50 foot perimeter around the lake.

It was the opinion of those present that this was under the jurisdiction of the McLean County Park Board. Mr. Jennings, County Commissioner of McLean County, said the commissioners had talked this over. The Washburn people are not too interested in the project because of the recently constructed swimming pool in that city.

Vice Chairman Lunseth said that before the Commission could do anything to develop the lake three things would be necessary. (1) A minimum beach for public use established; (2) a legal entity to deal with; (3) the legal entity and landowners around the lake to contribute their share for the restoration of the lake.

Mr. Fredrickson informed the group there had recently been set up a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. This bureau is set up for the purpose of planning recreational areas for a state. He felt this bureau would fit right into the present situation.

Commissioner Lunseth was of the opinion that the first step was to establish a beach for public use and that the Burleigh County Park Board should deed their land to a political entity.

It was suggested by Commissioner Gallagher that a water conservation and flood control district be created. It was suggested that the group present confer with Commissioner Gallagher as to the procedure to be followed in the establishment of a flood control district.

**FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
May and June 1962
AND PROPOSED BUDGET FOR
1963-1965 BIENNIUM**

The May and June 1962 financial statements and the proposed budget for the 1963-1965 biennium were considered together. Consideration was given to consolidating the present 10 line items to 3 line items. It was the consensus of the Commission members that the 10 line items be continued. Secretary Hoisveen commented on the proposed budget, explaining why some increases were necessary. The requests for ground water surveys have increased considerably and if this program is to be carried forward an increase in this item in the budget is

necessary. More and more counties are requesting groundwater studies in view of the meetings held in the various counties by the North Dakota Water Users Association.

Mr. Berg stated that 35 county-wide meetings had been held. The most pressing problem, as found by the county commissioners and the city officials, was the ground water effort. The demand has been such that the North Dakota Water Users Association found it necessary to curtail their meetings. The county officials wanted to participate in this study, and were requesting participation on the part of the Water Commission for a survey three or four years from now to establish a priority date. Mr. Berg stated he hoped the money would be found somewhere so a complete inventory of the ground water resources could be completed within the next 15 years and that the work could be accelerated and not retarded.

Mr. Fredrickson again mentioned the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which has just been established. He was of the opinion that a recreational program should be a part of the Water Conservation Commission and desired to see such a department made a part of the present budget. Governor Guy commented that whether a recreational department was established in connection with the Water Commission or not, the Legislature would put such a department where it saw fit, whether with the Tourist Bureau, the State Park Board, etc., and he was of the opinion that it was better not to mention it in the present budget. Governor Guy also stated that the State was in debt several million dollars and the departments were going to have to cut their budgets. The Governor stated he did not oppose the Water Commission budget, that he thought it very reasonable. He did not suggest any changes but advised that if at all possible the Secretary cut back rather than have the budget board cut out an entire item.

FRED FREDRICKSON SALARY ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Hoisveen advised the Commission that Mr. Fredrickson had retired from his position with the Greater North Dakota Association. He is presently the Planning Coordinator for the State Water Commission. The Garrison Diversion Conservancy District requested that Mr. Fredrickson submit a statement to them as to what it would take to retain him as a part time employee on their payroll. The Water Commission is currently paying Mr. Fredrickson \$421.67 as a portion of his salary. Mr. Fredrickson proposed to the Conservancy District that he could continue, for the remainder of the year, to work for the two groups on the basis of a salary of \$600 per month plus \$200 per month for expenses, a total of \$800. The Conservancy District has agreed to pay \$300 a month towards Mr. Fredrickson's salary and Secretary Hoisveen recommended that the Water Commission absorb the difference to make up the \$500 for salary and expenses.

Governor Guy stated that Mr. Fredrickson was one of the most valuable people we have serving the State Government. He further stated that he has been greatly impressed with the ease with which Mr. Fredrickson has handled problems with which he has been confronted. He felt that this was a very good investment. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that the Commission pay to Mr. Fredrickson for salary and expenses the sum of \$500. Carried.

**ASSISTANT SECRETARY
SALARY ADJUSTMENT**

The State Water Commission has been paying half the salary of the Assistant Secretary, Vernon Cooper. Mr. Cooper is also secretary-treasurer for the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, who pay half his salary. It is anticipated that Mr. Cooper, sooner or later, will be absorbed by the Conservancy District as full time secretary. His work for the past year or two has been more and more for the Conservancy District. Some of the duties of the assistant secretary have been combined with the chief accountant for the Commission. The Commission has been confronted with a problem in retaining Mr. Schulz's services, as private industry has offered him a position which would pay him \$1450 more a year than the Commission is paying him. In view of the uncertainty of Mr. Cooper's position, Mr. Hoisveen thought it best to retain Mr. Schulz and see what the Conservancy District would do in the way of absorbing that amount of Mr. Cooper's salary. Mr. Hoisveen informed the Commissioners that the Commission provides office space for the Conservancy District, the use of Commission equipment, etc. Mr. Hoisveen felt this should be done in view of the immense benefit that would accrue to the State from the Garrison Diversion Unit when constructed. He was of the opinion we should continue to pay a reasonable part of Mr. Cooper's salary, as his services to the Commission were of much value. He averred that the Commission and the Conservancy District should continue to cooperate in all matters pertaining to their mutual problems and benefits. Many items cared for by Mr. Cooper for the Conservancy District precluded the necessity of Mr. Hoisveen's attendance which lightened his obligations, such as Conservancy District meetings and other matters relating to the Garrison Diversion Unit.

Mr. Steinberger expressed appreciation for what the Commission has done to aid the Conservancy District in getting started. Mr. Steinberger reported that Mr. Cooper's salary adjustment was presented at the board meeting of the Conservancy District and the Board decided to hold this matter up until the October meeting. (The Commission took no action.)

**COTTAGE DEVELOPMENT -
GOLDEN LAKE**

A mutual aid corporation has assumed supervision of Golden Lake. The Game and Fish Department, the State Water Commission and the mutual aid corporation put in considerable money to improve the lake. Inquiries have been received in the Commission office relative to developing the land around the lake by constructing cottages. It was the opinion of the Commission members that a non-profit organization should be responsible for developing this land; that it definitely should not be a profit organization. It was recommended that at the next session of the Legislature a policy be established for handling property around developments of this kind.

CASS COUNTY DRAIN
#2B

The Commission was presented with information concerning Drain 2B which is being contested by Cass County landowners in the area to be served by the drain. Drain 2B is within the confines of the Rush River Water Conservation and Flood Control District. It appears that the Rush Lake Water Conservation and Flood Control District only took care of the north portion of the drainage basin, whereas, there are two segments to the Rush River Basin. The flood control board is now levying assessments over the entire area to the extent of 3 mills although improvements were confined only to the north branch. The Cass County Drain Board now proposes to extend Drain 2 and refers to it as 2B. Many of the landowners in the area have objected to the routing of the drain and have petitioned the State Engineer to make a study and determine whether the route is the proper one or not. This request would also deal with special assessment features of the drain. Mr. Hoisveen explained what the Commission proposes to do on this drain, using a map of the area. Governor Guy was of the opinion that if the situation could be helped without hurting others, the Commission should go ahead with the project. Mr. Hoisveen stated that the Commission did make a commitment before it had obtained detailed information relative to the proposed route. Additional information and surveys will be required before a proper decision can be made as to which of the routes is more desirable. Governor Guy was of the opinion that the Commission should withdraw its support of the project until further hearings on the matter could be held. The State Engineer is also requested to submit his decision as to the special assessments.

There was considerable discussion as to what the Commission could do to stop the drain board from going ahead with the construction of the drain until the difficulty has been resolved. Commissioner Gallagher moved the adoption of the following resolution, which was seconded by Commissioner Corwin:

WHEREAS, an appeal has been filed with the State Engineer to determine the design of proposed drain #2B and also to review the assessments of benefits for such drain,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the State Water Conservation Commission desires to further examine the location of the drain for the purpose of ascertaining the design and in the meantime the proposed grant-in-aid of construction be held in abeyance pending further studies and hearings by the State Engineer.

Upon voice vote all Commissioners voted yes.

RED RIVER BASIN PLANNING
COMMITTEE MEETING-Grafton

The Commission was informed that the Red River Basin Planning Committee is holding a meeting in Grafton August 8. The following day the International Joint Commission and the Pembina Engineering Board will meet in Grand Forks. Representatives from The Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the New Red Lake Association and Manitoba are expected to be present at the Grafton meeting.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT
COMMISSION

Secretary Hoisveen pointed out that the International Joint Commission may be coming into the State and suggested a resolution be prepared inviting the International Joint Commission. It was the recommendation of the Commission that a letter would be sufficient.

BOWMAN-HALEY DAM

Mr. Fredrickson reported that in connection with the Bowman-Haley Dam, the interested departments and affected states had 90 days within which to make comments on the report. The 90 days will be up on July 26, 1962. South Dakota and the Department of the Interior had not yet made a report in connection with the Bowman-Haley Dam because it is of the opinion the Shade Hill Dam, some distance downstream, will be hurt. It was understood that the Governor of South Dakota was coming out with a good report for the Bowman-Haley Project. The letter from the South Dakota Park Board has been placed in the hands of the congressional delegation. Mr. Grimes, Chief Engineer, South Dakota, has been called relative to the proposed dam and a letter has also been written to him relative to submitting South Dakota's report. After considerable discussion it was decided to do nothing further concerning South Dakota's report.

WATER RIGHTS

#989

Godfrey Grenz, Livona, North Dakota requests the right to divert 1059.2 acre-feet of water from Horsehead Creek and the Missouri River to irrigate 529.6 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Einar Dahl that Mr. Grenz be granted the right to divert 765 acre-feet from the Missouri River to irrigate 382.5 acres and 146.8 acre-feet from Horsehead Creek to irrigate 146.8 acres, subject to the needs of downstream riparian owners. Carried.

#994

Alfred O. Benson, Valley City requests the right to divert 4.6 acre-feet of water from the Sheyenne River to irrigate 2.30 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Alfred O. Benson be granted the right to divert 3.5 acre-feet of water from the Sheyenne River to irrigate 2.3 acres. Carried.

#999

Montana-Dakota Utilities Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, request the right to divert 0.92 acre-feet of water from a well (Dickinson Compressor Station) for industrial purposes. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Montana-Dakota Utilities Company be granted the right to divert 0.92 acre-feet for industrial purposes. Carried.

#1002 The Game and Fish Department requests the right to divert 3,300 acre-feet for storage and 950 acre-feet for annual use from Sweetbriar Creek, tributary to the Heart River for recreational purposes. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that the State Game and Fish Department be granted the right to divert 3,300 acre-feet for storage and 950 acre-feet annual use from Sweetbriar Creek for recreational purposes, subject to the uses with higher priority. Carried.

#1003 Henry Entzel, Mandan requests the right to divert 545 acre-feet of water from the Missouri River to irrigate 272.8 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Henry Entzel be granted the right to divert 545 acre-feet of water from the Missouri River to irrigate 272.8 acres. Carried.

#1004 Fred Hall, Chaseley, requests the right to divert 620 acre-feet of water from a well to irrigate 310 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Fred Hall be granted the right to divert 120 acre-feet of water from a well to irrigate 80 acres. Carried.

#1005 Emma Voigt , Mandan, requests the right to divert 133 acre-feet of water from Sweetbriar Creek tributary to the Heart River to irrigate 113 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Emma Voigt be granted the right to divert 50 acre-feet of water from Sweetbriar Creek to irrigate 40 acres. Carried.

#1006 August Feil, Fortuna, requests the right to divert 38 acre-feet of water from an undefined and unnamed watercourse (spring runoff from own land) to irrigate 38 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that August Feil be granted the right to divert 38 acre-feet of water from an undefined and unnamed watercourse to irrigate 38 acres. Carried.

#1007 Lila Wheeler, Carlyle Wheeler, Ray, request the right to divert 92 acre-feet of water from an unnamed stream, tributary to an unnamed lake, to irrigate 46 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Lila Wheeler, Carlyle Wheeler be granted the right to divert 46 acre-feet of water from an unnamed stream to irrigate 46 acres. Carried.

#1008 Mrs. Clemens Clooten, Bismarck, requests the right to divert 300 acre-feet of water from the Missouri River to irrigate 150.2 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Mrs. Clemens Clooten be granted the right to divert 300 acre-feet of water from the Missouri River to irrigate 150.2 acres. Carried.

#1009 Walter Will, trustee of the Edw. L. Will Trust, Stanley, requests the right to divert 80 acre-feet of water from Paulson Creek, tributary of White Earth River, to irrigate 44 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Walter Will be granted the right to divert 44 acre-feet of water from Paulson Creek to irrigate 44 acres. Carried.

#1010 Daniel P. Rosted, Kelso, requests the right to divert 88.2 acre-feet of water from the Elm River to irrigate 44.1 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Daniel P. Rosted be granted the right to divert 44.1 acre-feet of water from the Elm River to irrigate 44.1 acres. Carried.

#1011 Alwin C. Carus, Oakdale, North Dakota and M. Elizabeth Carus, LaSalle, Illinois, request the right to divert 90 acre-feet of water from the Little Missouri River to irrigate 45 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Alwin C. Carus and M. Elisabeth Carus be granted the right to divert 45 acre-feet of water from the Little Missouri River to irrigate 45 acres. There is to be no diversion when the stream flow in the Little Missouri River is less than 20 cfs. Carried.

#1013 Larry Woznick, Washburn requests the right to divert 332 acre-feet of water from the Missouri River to irrigate 166 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Larry Woznick be granted the right to divert 332 acre-feet of water from the Missouri River to irrigate 166 acres. Carried.

#1014 Dan McDonald, Jr., Bismarck, requests the right to divert 387.6 acre-feet of water from a well to irrigate 193.8 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Dan McDonald, Jr., be granted the right to divert 289.5 acre-feet of water from a well to irrigate 193.8 acres. Carried.

#1015 Ralph Tormaschy, Dickinson, requests the right to divert 34 acre-feet of water from Crooked Creek and tributary of same (tributary of Knife River) to irrigate 17 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Ralph Tormaschy be granted the right to divert 17 acre-feet of water from Crooked Creek to irrigate 17 acres subject to maintenance of water in stream for downstream users and to uses with higher priority. Diversion is to be curtailed when downstream flow in Crooked Creek is less than 2 cfs. Carried.

#1016 Chris G. Schmalz, Manning, requests the right to divert 126 acre-feet of water from the Little Knife River and unnamed tributary to irrigate 63 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Chris G. Schmalz be granted the right to divert $22\frac{1}{2}$ acre-feet of water from the Little Missouri to irrigate 15 acres and 35 acre-feet of water for waterspreading from the unnamed tributary of the Little Knife River to irrigate 35 acres. No diversion to be allowed when the flow in the Little Knife River is less than 2.0 cfs. Carried.

#1017 Frank Salveson, Wildrose, requests the right to divert 286 acre-feet of water from underground sources to irrigate 143 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Frank Salveson be granted the right to divert 143 acre-feet of water from underground sources to irrigate 143 acres, with a maximum withdrawal rate of 500 gallons per minute. This can be extended if observation indicates that transmissability rate of aquifer is adequate for such extension. Carried.

#1019

Olaf Norstog, Watford City, requests the right to divert 35 acre-feet of water from Dry Run Creek, tributary of Cherry Creek to irrigate 20.4 acres. It was moved by Commissioner Corwin and seconded by Commissioner Steinberger that Olaf Norstog be granted the right to divert 20.4 acre-feet of water from Dry Run Creek to irrigate 20.4 acres. Carried.

adjourned at 5 p.m.

There being no further business the meeting

Respectfully submitted,

Milo W Horsvick
Secretary

ATTEST:

William L. Guy
Governor

NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
 MONTHLY REPORT OF APPROPRIATIONS AS OF JULY 31, 1962
 1961 - 1963 APPROPRIATIONS

FUND	AVAILABLE FUNDS		DISBURSEMENTS		FUND BALANCES		
	APPROPRIATION	RECEIPTS	TO DATE	JUL'62	UNEXPENDED	ENCUMB.	UNENCUMB.
1. COMM PER DIEM & EXPENSES	6,000.00	.00	2,786.13	315.08	3,213.87	50.00	3,163.87
2. ADMINISTRATION	62,000.00	1,016.59	35,135.99	3,842.27	27,880.60	112.40	27,768.20
3. MAINTENANCE OF DAMS	150,000.00	52,719.30	171,431.96	10,590.52	37,287.34	7,763.07	29,524.27
4. INT'L & INTERSTATE EXP	10,000.00	.00	2,846.33	484.85	7,153.67	.00	7,153.67
5. TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEYS, USGS	30,000.00	.00	13,580.88	.00	16,419.12	16,419.12	.00
6. HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS, USGS	27,500.00	.00	13,044.54	.00	14,455.46	14,455.46	.00
7. ENGR & GEOL SURVEYS, USGS	50,000.00	22,200.00	52,065.20	12,372.98	20,134.80	1,520.13	18,614.67
8. COOP WITH U. S. DEPT, ETC	60,000.00	.00	24,049.55	2,722.24	35,950.45	4,187.50	31,762.95
9. ENGINEERING INVESTIGATIONS	145,000.00	4,413.16	73,893.24	5,374.60	75,519.92	7,067.02	68,452.90
10. ADM OF WATER RIGHTS	10,000.00	.00	4,964.52	1,097.63	5,035.48	.00	5,035.48
	<u>550,500.00</u>	<u>66,349.05</u>	<u>593,798.34</u>	<u>36,800.22</u>	<u>243,050.71</u>	<u>51,574.70</u>	<u>191,476.01</u>

NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATUS OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS
AS OF JULY 31, 1962

FUND	AVAILABLE FUNDS		DISBURSEMENTS		FUND BALANCES		
	APPROPRIATION	RECEIPTS	TO DATE	JUL'62	UNEXPENDED	ENCUMB.	UNENCUMB.
20. MULTIPLE PURPOSE "CARRIED FORWARD"	300,000.00 163,583.61	31,252.97	60,217.40	4,166.78	434,619.18	348,346.75	86,272.43
21. CONST BOND GUARANTEE	90,000.00	18,272.94	20,539.00	.00	87,733.94	.00	87,733.94
22. SHOP BUILDING "SPECIAL"	30,000.00	.00	28,998.04	.00	1.96	.00	1.96

NOTE- FUND #21 RECEIPTS ARE OBTAINED FROM RETIREMENT OF AND INTEREST ON SECURITIES THAT WERE IN THE COMMISSION'S SINKING FUND IN EXCESS OF THE AMOUNT REQUIRED TO RETIRE THE SERIES "J" BOND ISSUE ON DECEMBER 10, '57. ORIGINAL DISBURSEMENTS FROM FUND #21 WERE MADE DURING THE EARLY 1940'S IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 61-02-56 OF THE CENTURY CODE WHICH PROVIDES THAT THE COMMISSION MAY GUARANTEE OR INSURE, OR AGREE TO PAY, THE INTEREST ON AND PRINCIPAL OF COMMISSION REVENUE BONDS, NOT EXCEEDING 20% OF THE PAR VALUE OF ANY SUCH BONDS.

SCHEDULE OF BONDS & INTEREST RECEIVABLE - FUND NO. 21

TYPE	DUE DATE	INTEREST RATE	INTEREST REC. TO MATURITY	PRINCIPAL AMT.	TOTAL INCOME ANTICIPATED
U. S. SERIES K BONDS	5-65	2.76%	\$ 124.20	\$1,500.00	\$1,624.20
U. S. SERIES K BONDS	4-67	2.76%	276.00	2,000.00	2,276.00
U. S. TREASURY BONDS	12-68	2.50%	487.50	3,000.00	3,487.50
SIoux IRRIG DIST. BONDS	1984 SERIAL	2.25%	4,938.75	17,500.00	22,438.75
			<u>\$5,826.45</u>	<u>\$24,000.00</u>	<u>\$29,826.45</u>

THE CONSTRUCTION BOND GUARANTEE FUND WILL ATTAIN ITS ORIGINAL CASH LEVEL OF \$90,000 IN 1964 AT WHICH TIME LEGISLATION WILL BE REQUIRED TO DETERMINE DISPOSITION OF THE FUNDS RECEIVED IN EXCESS OF THE ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION AS NOTED IN THE ATTY GEN OPINION DATED 1-2-58.

FUND BALANCE	87,733.94
LESS ORIG. APPROPRIATION	-90,000.00
EXCESS	<u>\$27,560.39</u>

NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
PAYROLL - JULY 31, 1962

SALARIED EMPLOYEES

NAME	POSITION	PAY GRADE	REMARKS	SALARY JUL '62	WITH. TAX	SOC. SEC.	INS	BONDS	NET
HOISVEEN, MILO W.	STATE ENGR	O-9	INC JUL '61	950.67	139.20		21.20	56.25	734.02
ANDERSON, LARRY	RODMAN	C-6	INC APR '62	220.42	30.00	6.89			183.53
BAESLER, GORDON	DRAFTSMAN	G-5	INC JUL '62	410.67	53.80	12.83			344.04
BARES, KATHLEEN	TYPYST	C-5	INC DEC '61	214.67	28.50	6.71			179.46
BURKHARTSMEIER, G.	DRILLER	E-5	PER MAR '62	298.67	44.00	9.33			245.34
COOPER, VERNON S.	ASST SECY	1/2M-7	INC JUL '61	393.84	71.30	12.31	21.20		289.03
ENGSTROM, VIRGLE	RODMAN	C-5	INC APR '62	214.67	28.50	6.71			179.46
FREDRICKSON, FRED	COORDINATOR	G-6	INC JUL '61	421.67	47.40	13.18			361.09
FROELICH, LARRY	GEOLOGIST	G-4	STA JUN '62	400.00	33.80	12.50			353.70
FRY, GORDON	ENGR AID	E-2	STA JUN '62	274.67	39.70	8.58			226.39
GEHRING, EDNA	FILE CLERK	C-8	RES JUN '62	99.39	18.45	3.11			77.83
GRINDBERG, ALAN	ENGINEER	J-9	INC MAR '62	640.67	98.80	20.02			521.85
HILAND, LEONE	CH STENO	F-8	INC JUL '62	383.17	48.40	11.97	8.20		314.60
HILLS, DAVID	ENGR AID	E-2	STA JUN '62	274.67	19.70	8.58			246.39
JOB, RHODA	FILE CLERK	C-6	STA JUN '62	275.53	25.40	8.61			241.52
KNUTSON, LEWIS	DRILLER	G-3	INC AUG '61	388.67	39.80	12.15			336.72
LIVERSAGE, KAY	STENO	B-9	STA JUN '62	206.67	27.10	6.46	7.90		165.21
NELSON, C. P.	ENGINEER	K-6	INC MAR '62	651.67	108.80	20.36			522.51
OLHEISER, ROGER	RODMAN	B-8	STA JUN '62	201.67	26.40	6.30			168.97
PEDERSON, GARY	OFF ASST	C-6	INC MAR '62	220.42	30.00	6.89	7.90		175.63
PUTZ, ROY	OFF ASST	C-4	INC JUL '62	208.92	17.80	6.53	7.90		176.69
REITER, DANIEL	FOREMAN	H-4	RES JUL '62	450.00	41.00	14.06	20.45	37.50	336.99
RIVINIUS, MERRIL	ENGINEER	J-3	INC JUL '62	547.67	89.00	17.11	8.45		433.11
SACKMAN, EUGENE	INST MAN	F-9	INC APR '62	392.67	21.30	12.27	20.45		338.65
SANDWICK, HAZEN	ENGINEER	M-3	INC DEC '61	707.67	76.00	17.34	20.45	37.50	556.38
SCHMID, ROGER	GEOLOGIST	H-4	INC JUL '62	454.17	41.00	14.19			398.98
SCHULZ, DELTON	ENGINEER	J-3	INC JUL '62	547.67	89.00	17.11			441.56
SCHULZ, JIM	ACCOUNTANT	K-3	INC JUL '62	600.67	81.60	18.77			500.30
SCHWINKENDORF, DON	INST MAN	E-10	INC AUG '61	338.67	51.20	10.58			276.89
SWENSON, HELEN	TYPYST	D-5	INC JUL '62	252.00	45.40	7.88			198.72
VOELLER, PIUS	ASST FOREMAN	F-5	PER FEB '62	354.67		11.08			343.59
WALTERSON, HOWARD	CONST SUPT	H-4	INC MAY '62	450.00	61.00	14.06	20.45		354.49
WALTERSON, JEAN	DRAFTSMAN	E-4	INC FEB '62	290.67	32.60	9.08			248.99
WESTGATE, SAM	OFF ASST	B-9	STA JUN '62	206.67	27.10	6.46			173.11
ZIEGLER, VICTOR	ENGINEER	M-3	INC DEC '61	707.67	106.00	17.34	20.85		563.48

NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
PAYROLL - JULY 31, 1962

HOURLY EMPLOYEES

NAME	POSITION	PAY GRADE	REMARKS	SALARY JUL '62	WITH. TAX	SOC. SEC.	INS	BONDS	NET
EIDE, RONALD	ASST DRILLER	1.70	RES JUN '62	168.30	25.60	5.26			137.44
JOHNSON, GEORGE	OPERATOR	2.00	INC APR '61	271.00	42.40	8.47			220.13
KNUTSON, LANNY	ASST DRILLER	1.90	INC MAY '62	339.15	52.20	10.61			276.34
MARION, HERMAN	RODMAN	1.50	STA JUN '62	6.00		.19			5.81
PETERSON, JOHN	OPERATOR	2.10	INC MAY '62	302.40	48.00	9.46			244.94
SCHWEIGERT, CALVIN	OPERATOR	1.90	INC JUL '62	283.05	44.10	8.84			230.11
SENGER, ANTON	OPERATOR	1.80	INC MAY '62	253.80	11.20	7.93			234.67
URNESS, JOSEPH	OPERATOR	1.85	INC JUL '62	256.50	39.20	8.02			209.28
URNESS, WILLIAM	ASST DRILLER	1.60	STA JUL '62	76.80	11.60	2.40			62.80
				15,609.27	2,013.35	448.53	185.40	131.25	12,830.74