

MINUTES OF A MEETING
OF THE
STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Held in the Upper Room, City Hall, Grand Forks, North Dakota on July 19, 1943.

A meeting of the State Water Conservation Commission and the Advisory Drainage Board of the Red River Valley was held in the Upper Room, City Hall, Grand Forks, North Dakota, July 19, 1943.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. CWT, with Vice-Chairman Simons presiding. Commissioners Orlady and Thompson, Secretary Walsh and Clifford Jansonius, Assistant Attorney General, were present. Governor Moses and Commissioner Dahl absent.

Vernon M. Johnson, representing Richland County; Andrew McSparron, Traill County; W. H. Halfpenny and John Halcrow, Pembina County; James Bolger, Grand Forks County; J. W. Matejcek, Walsh County; Lt. Gov. Henry Holt, and Dean Walster of the North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, upon direction of Governor Moses, were also present. Cass County was not represented by a member of its Advisory Drainage Board.

Vice Chairman Simons explained that the purpose of the meeting was to lay out a policy for the expenditure of the drainage appropriation, which Mr. Johnson, Mr. Halcrow and fellow representatives of the Legislature, secured for the Water Commission; such funds to be used for the drainage situation in the Red River Valley.

Simons: "You have had an opportunity to think this thing over since our meeting in Fargo on May 12, 1943, and to consult with your local people. I know that you recognize the desire of the Water Commission to get the most for this money, to spend it in the best economical and intelligent manner possible. This meeting is now open for suggestions."

Dean Walster: Is the fund that is available, or must this fund be expended for legal sub-divisions of the state rather than on any private individual?

Simons: So far as I know, there is no limitation whatever upon the expenditure of this money. It is as much subject to the discretion of the Water Commission as any fund could possibly be.

Johnson: That is also my interpretation of the appropriation.

Jansonius: It might be a violation of the constitutional provision to use public money for private purposes.

Dean Walster: Since the amount of funds is limited, are there available projects so public in character that the major benefit will redound to the municipalities or townships and only indirectly benefit the individuals?

Simons: What we want to do is to establish benefits to private individuals in a regular, orderly and fair manner. It is not the job of this Commission to spend this money running around the state making surveys. We would like to get some substantial results from this expenditure. I think the Commission would prefer to work through the established drainage districts or districts which might be established. I personally would not favor selecting a farmer, for example, and going in and fixing up his farm as state expense and thereby subsidizing an individual very strongly to the exclusion of thousands of other who might be in the same general situation without requiring him to put up something substantial to justify our interest in him.

Dean Walster: Assuming that since this is for drainage, would the Commission be most interested in serving a legally organized drainage district?

Simons: I think the Commission would prefer to work through them and operate in that way. We have \$50,000 and there is a million dollars' worth of work to be done in this Valley. How are we going to get at it? Three proposals have been made to the Commission by various people. One is that the Commission go in and spend 100% on drainage works in a district. The second is that the Commission limit itself to doing the engineering work. The third is that the Commission do the engineering and arrange some sort of a subsidy so that the Commission would pay for all of the engineering and subsidize a part of the cost of actual construction. There are six counties in this Valley. Only five are represented here today. The interest in this problem is limited. Apparently some of these people are not as hard hit as we have been told they are. They are too busy. Because they are not here we should not exclude them in the participation of a statewide appropriation. The people affected may not be as greatly concerned as some of our public officials. That brings up the question of local financial support. The Commission is a unit in its desire to avoid any public scandal by subsidizing any individual or some group of individuals to the extent of paying 100% of the cost. The Commission is very decidedly in the position of opposing paying 100% of the cost of any development. We will have to discharge our responsibility as we see best, regardless of the advice that comes to us. It is our responsibility. The question we should consider here is how interested are the drainage districts; how much can they give; and the legal processes of going about it.

Johnson: I have a proposal, but first of all, the question of the constitutionality of spending this money. I don't think that is an issue. Our law, as it is now set up, specifically makes point of the fact that a drain should be conducive to health and public welfare.

My suggestion is this: analyse your water damage on the basis of counties and then allocate a certain amount to each county, with the understanding that the County Commissioners make a survey of the damages. Take Richland County - give us a specific amount in which the Commission can recommend that this money be used on a matching basis. The percentage of participation by Richland County may be greater than in some other counties. The County Commissioners should recommend that there are some instances in which drains should be constructed from the standpoint of public health, without regard to drainage districts. In the matter of public health; that has actually become an issue North of Wyndmere in our county. The idea is that there may be some epidemic develop that would have very serious results. I think the issue is so great that it is no problem. As far as the benefit to the individual; that is purely incidental. This is the same situation as when a road is built. It will be utterly impossible for this Commission to supervise every project and I think you have to have confidence in your County Commissioners to use the money properly. Let the County Commissioners make the recommendations and then have such recommendations approved by the Water Commission. I think this takes care of it from the legal angles and from the supervision angle.

Simons: At the meeting in Fargo we had a very general statement from each county as to its damages. The statements were too general.

Thompson: Each county should submit a statement of its damages to the Water Commission.

as

Johnson: You have/a basis the surveys made by the AAA, which gives the total acreage out of production in all counties. I think that the basis of need is the test for this expenditure. The proposition is this: you allocate a certain specific amount to Richland County. They determine what drainage districts are interested. If we don't need it by a set date, then the money should revert to the Water Commission and be allocated to the other counties.

Thompson: Before this money is allocated, we should have something definite on the counties maintaining the drainage districts and keeping them up after the work is done.

Mr. Johnson quoted from the North Dakota Drainage Law on this point.

Thompson: It was not my thought that the county do this work. The drainage district should do it.

Johnson: When you have a condition as exists now, I don't think it would be out of line to match funds on a 50-50 basis.

Thompson: There should also be a levy made on the individual property owners who receive the benefits.

Johnson: You have a situation as a result of road construction wherein if the drainage commissioners met and properly assess the cost of the drain, it is going to mean that the fellows a long way from the water problems are going to have to pay a part of that cost. Assume that a township goes ahead with the work. I think that the township should be one of the legal entities that should be recognized.

Simons: To approach this from a slightly different angle; we want to lay out a short time policy for the intelligent expenditure of this money; also lay out a long time policy. I would like to leave this thought with the counties - we have on our books now a statute which provides for a county levy for water conservation purposes. I think drainage is water conservation. The counties are permitted to levy up to one-half mill for water conservation. I wonder what the reaction of the people in the various counties would be to a county-wide approach to the problem under that law or some revision of it.

Johnson: I take this position; you people are not too interested in this drainage, but when the Act was written, it was very specifically included as one of your functions. Minnesota has appropriated a lot of money for drainage. I think over a short period the county and township laws should be corrected so that they can help themselves. I think the next session of our legislature should appropriate a substantial sum for putting the drainage into shape in this state. We know that some of these drains are going to mean an increase in taxes each year. Then the question is this: if we have hard times, are they going to be able to carry that load for a long period of years? Drainage has been allowed to go into such disuse that a considerable sum of money will be needed to put it back into shape. A beautiful job of drainage can be done at the same time a road is built.

Simons: I think that your statement that this Commission is not greatly interested in this proposition was at one time substantially correct largely because we did not understand it. As you know, the Commission did not ask for this money in its budget. You people have seen to it that we are interested now.

Jansonius: How would it work to make each county a drainage district?

Dean Walster: A county is not a natural drainage unit. The Soil Conservation Service, I am sure, would be delighted to cooperate in approaching one or two of these areas with the possibility of invoking the Soil Conservation law. I think they have the Wild Rice River in mind particularly. I am inclined to think that in a long look ahead we are going to have to get a combination of these measures so that the whole thing works together; road laws, soil conservation and water conservation laws.

Matejcek: We had a meeting in Walsh County in line with Dean Walster's remarks. The eastern sixteen townships want to form a Soil Conservation District. The machinery angle is very important.

Simons: We can get a lot of free service from the Soil Conservation Service.

Dean Walster: The Soil Conservation Service, when it was first set up, shied away from drainage problems.

Thompson: We must not lose sight of the fact that four or five years ago anyone that drained the country was severely criticized. We must store the water and save it for the time when it is needed.

Johnson: Drainage is not going to be any big expenditure over a long period of years. If the system is once put into shape, it is then going to be a continued expense. You have to have some idea on how to maintain it.

Walsh: I have a few comments to make on Mr. Johnson's remarks. In the first place, it costs money and in paying this money out, we have to pay on the basis of something worthwhile. We have to have engineering which is absolutely necessary to get proper drainage; otherwise your water will pound up and not release.

Johnson: Your law provides that before any drainage system can be created or any project exceeding a certain amount, you have to have a survey. It seems to me this could be taken care of by the county. We can get money legally for surveys, but not for drainage.

Walsh: You should have engineering.

Johnson: It will be the responsibility of the Water Commission to set up the requirements for each county to conform to before getting any money. It is up to the Commission to ascertain the division of this money.

Simons: Mr. Jansonius, there is nothing in the law which would prevent us from designating the county surveyor in a county to do the engineering work?

Jansonius: You are permitted to hire anyone you desire.

Simons: If the county surveyors are qualified, there is no objection to our having them do the work. Mr. Walsh might feel that he, or his engineers, should check up before we allocate the money.

Johnson: We can hire an engineer in our county. I am just as interested as you are to see that this money is used for drainage. There is urgency about this work.

Matejcek: Do you always need an engineer to do this work? Sometimes, it is useless to spend money for engineering.

Mr. Al Dexter of the NPPRR, came into the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Matejcek: In our county there is no engineer or surveyor.

Halfpenny: There is no provision in our budget for such services. How could we pay one?

Matejcek: Set up an emergency fund.

Halfpenny: If you do, you are taking the money from the entire county to use in one particular district for surveying.

Orlady: Why couldn't you use the Soil Conservation Service to do the survey work?

Halfpenny: We wrote to that set up in Park River. We did not get any results.

Matejcek: They have to stay within their physical districts.

Simons: What we are trying to establish here is a system whereby the entire county would subsidize a little. In view of the situation which is created in regard to health, wouldn't the county be justified in dealing with that under its general powers?

Halcrow: In regard to Mr. Walsh's proposal on engineering; when I had Bill 165 on drainage to sponsor, I went over to the Drainage and Irrigation Committee of the Senate and explained it to that committee. When I got through outlining what the bill was intended to do, the Committee voted 100% for it. I think it should be used for engineering and surveying in the Red River Valley. The Chairman of the Drainage Committee said he would write up a resolution that this appropriation should be used exclusively for engineering and surveying, but he did not get that done.

Simons: We want to do whatever the legislature directs us to do.

Halcrow: I think your idea of allocating money on a matching basis is excellent. The County Commissioners in Pembina County will go as far as they can, Engineering expense is not very great on an already established drain. My thought was that the Water Commission should sponsor this thing. The people would feel that the state was behind them.

Simons: How should we go about this?

Halfpenny: About 50% should be paid by the drainage districts.

Matejcek: Is this a problem for the County Commissioners or drainage boards?

Simons: We are regarding the County Commissioners as the chief functioning board for each county. The County Commissioners, I think, are the proper ones for us to begin at least.

Jansonius: The law contemplates only the repair of an old drain and putting it back into its original condition. The new construction will have to be done through your drainage boards.

Johnson: The County Commissioners are the all powerful unit in the county. The drainage commissioners are named by the County Commissioners. They can act as a clearing house between the Water Commission and the drainage commissioners.

McSparron: In Traill County we have 22 drainage ditches laid out by engineers and paid by property owners. They all need repairs and cleaning out. We have levied a small levy each year. We also have a county engineer who looks after our bridges, roads and drainage ditches.

Simons: What do you think about the various propositions which have been furnished here?

McSparron: We would be satisfied if we could get a small percentage for assistance

Bolger: I think Grand Forks County will be very well satisfied to work out Mr. Johnson's plan. We have a surveyor who can do a great deal of this work. We will have to get an engineer from some other county. I think the plan of Mr. Johnson's is very good

Simons: On what basis are we going to make this allocation? How should the Commission approach the matter of allocating the money - on the basis of the information obtainable - and how are we going to get this information?

Johnson: In setting this thing up I think that when the County Commissioners meet and submit their problems, you can decide whether or not they are qualified for this money. You are going to get six different proposals as to how to go about it. I think the plan is flexible enough so that they should decide as to how they want to use that money.

Simons: We have engineers who might be available. We could send an engineer out to Pembina County and deduct his expenses from Pembina's allotment. I would like to get the work all done this year and get the land ready for next year's crop. The important thing is to get started. Let's get back to the problem as to where are we going to get this information on the factual, cold, hard basis to determine the needs for the allocation to each county?

Dean Walster: Ask the County Commissioners to submit statements.

Simons: For the Water Commission to go out and examine and estimate all of the acreage, it would cost a lot of money. What about the crop reports of the AAA?

Johnson: They make periodic surveys. Secure the crop report published by the AAA and you will get a clear picture.

Dean Walster: I think the AAA crop reports are rather general, but their coverage is excellent. They have a group of field men to collect their crop reports from community committeemen. In addition, of course, you do have the crop abandonment figures which I think are even more accurate, collected by Mr. Ben Kienholze of the office of crop estimates, Fargo. They will show the reasons for abandonment. I think the AAA figures on abandonment are good.

Simons: When are these figures collected?

Dean Walster: About once a month during the growing season. You should check your figures with Mr. Kienholz, however, because he has been on the job for many years.

Simons: Would you recommend to this Commission that it accept the AAA figures or those of Mr. Kienholz, or a combination of both?

Dean Walster: A combination of both?

Simons: I would like to have a conference with Mr. Walsh and the Commissioners about this. Suppose you people go into a committee and come back with a written form as to how we should proceed?

Matejcek: In order to speed this up suppose the Commission appropriate \$5,000 to each county and hold the balance back in reserve and when an emergency comes, up allocate the rest to the county?

Simons: Only one objection that I see. That is we want to be fair to everybody. We want to do the most work where the need is most acute. What we want to do is to appropriate this money equitably. We can get accurate data from impartial agencies. On that basis we could take the crop estimate figures of the AAA and see how each county has been affected by this drainage proposition and we could use that as a formula for allocating the money. I would rather do it this way than make a blanket allocation.

Bolger: Will you get all of the information you need from the crop figures? How about the damages in the city of Grand Forks?

Simons: I believe so. The expenditure of the money is limited to good agricultural lands.

Jansonius: The legislature specifically outlined what it could be spent for. I think the Commission is limited to agricultural lands.

Simons: Let's have a further discussion about Dean Walster's suggestion of using the AAA and crop estimate figures.

Dean Walster: You can get a relative figure; an over-all figure.

Johnson: There would be no reason for the AAA to be prejudiced.

Halfpenny: What would be the reaction to using the drainage district areas as a basis for allocating this money?

Orlady: Would it be satisfactory if the Commission would make the allocation on the basis of the crop figures as of August 10th.

Thompson: They want it done before that time.

Orlady: Would it be satisfactory to use the report of July 10th?

McSparron: For Traill County it would be satisfactory.

Simons: Can we ask the AAA for the Federal Crop Statistician, Mr. Kienholz, to make a report immediately?

Dean Walster: I am sure Mr. Kienholz would be glad to make use of his crop reporters to gather water damage surveys from each county.

Orlady: I think that would be very good to get it done right away.

Dean Walster: If I were going to do the job, I would get the cooperation from this office.

Dexter: I think the last suggestion is the most practical without any question. We go over Mr. Kienholz' files all of the time. The AAA figures are lumped. You would not know what loss was due to water damage or other damages.

Simons: We would like the support of this group in whatever we do in some sort of a formal way. We want to make a record here. The technical people have given us a great deal of help and advice. The Commission would like a formal recommendation as to the procedure to be given to the public. I think we can solicit the office of Dean Walster to get the Federal Government to make this survey for us. This would give us something to work on which is impartial and beyond protest. The question of the percentage of participation by the state is now at hand. We would like some advice on that also. The Commission may or may not accept your suggestions, but we would like to have them. First, how are we going to get the allocation among the counties, the six in this Valley? Second, what percentage do you recommend that we establish as a basis for subsidy? The Commission will announce what the deal will be as soon as they can consult with the Governor and Comm. Dahl and then it will be up to the County Commissioners to get going. The Commission probably will want the plans and specifications and estimates to be filed with it and in

a shape satisfactory to our engineering department. I can say that the Commission would want to handle it in such a way as to be the least expensive and still effective. Immediate results should count.

Walsh: All we would require would be a location map and the profile showing that the water will drain out.

The representatives of the six counties, with Dean Walster as Chairman, went into session at 12:00 noon, to draw up recommendations on the expenditure of the drainage fund to be presented to the Water Commission: Halfpenny, Johnson, Worner, Matejcek, Bolger and McSparron present.

The Committee then presented the following recommendations:

1. State Water Commission is requested to allocate drainage fund to the various counties based on the figures of the Federal Crop Statistician on water damage to agricultural lands.
2. In the allocation and expenditure of this money the recommendation of the County Commissioners of the various counties involved should be given primary consideration as to the expenditure of these funds within their respective counties.
3. It is recommended that any allotment of funds to any drainage district, township, county or legal sub-division be matched on a basis of not less than 50% by such drainage district, township, county or legal sub-division.
4. It is recommended that the Water Commission use all speed and diligence with a view to reaching a definite decision as to the percentage of allocation prior to the August meeting of the County Commissioners in the various counties.
5. It is recommended that the Water Commission make a study of the drainage laws of other states and of our present drainage laws as respects the right of the township and county to participate and the inadequacy of our present laws as regards the creation and functioning of drainage districts with a view to making recommendations to the next session of the legislature and also with the view of determining the amount of their request for an appropriation to match funds of the drainage districts, townships, and counties in the cleaning out of existing drainage channels and the construction of new drainage channels.

Commissioner Thompson moved that the recommendations as read be accepted by the Water Commission and placed on file. Commissioner Orlady seconded the motion. Carried.

Orlady: Personally I think the plan presented here by Mr. Johnson is a fine sound plan. I think also the recommendations by this group are excellent. They are important and should be given careful consideration. The action taken by Traill County in the past on drainage is excellent.

Halcrow: Can we take into consideration damage done by the river when it overflows or backs up on land in connection with this?

Simons: That's flood damage, not drainage.

Walster: If you are going to get the action of Mr. Kienholz's office, the Water Commission should definitely make the request for the survey.

Commissioner Orlady moved that a formal request be made to Mr. B. Kienholz as quickly as possible for a survey of the Red River Valley counties as to water damage to agricultural lands. Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion. Carried.

The Water Commission asked Dean Walster to take this matter up immediately with Mr. Kienholz, in view of the urgency, and a formal request will be sent out by the Secretary.

Halfpenny: I think the County Auditors should have a copy of these recommendations. The Drainage Board should have a copy of these minutes.

Simons: I want to thank all of you on behalf of the Commission for your kindness and courtesy in coming here. I want to assure you that the Commission and its staff will attempt to carry this out as quickly as possible and with the least expense possible.

The Commission went into its executive session at 12:30 CWT.

Commissioner Thompson suggested that the Commission decide now as to what the percentage of participation on the part of the counties should be. Commissioner Orlady suggested a 40-60 percentage.

Commissioner Orlady moved that the Commission adopt a policy of contributing to the engineering, supervision and construction and reconstruction of established drains, or in the construction of new drains in cooperation with the County Commissioners, or other legal drainage entities.

Provided, however, that the Commission hereby establishes a policy of contributing not more than 40% of the cost of such work.

Provided Further that plans and specifications for such work shall be approved by the Chief Engineer of the Commission before authorization of such work is granted and

Provided further that payment of the Commission's share of such work or other expense shall be made only upon vouchers properly certified by appropriate officers of the counties or municipal sub-divisions thereof and approved by the Water Commission.

Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion. Roll call vote taken with all Commissioners voting aye. Governor Moses and Commissioner Dahl absent. Motion carried.

Commissioner Thompson moved that the resolution regarding sewage disposal, adopted on July 8, 1943, by the Commission, be amended to read as follows:

"No system for the disposal of sewage, industrial waste, garbage, or refuse tending to pollute water courses, shall be installed by any public agency or by any person or corporation, nor shall any such existing system be materially altered or extended until satisfactory plans and specifications for the installation, alteration, or extension, together with such information as the State Water Conservation Commission and the State Department of Health may require, have been submitted in duplicate and approved by the State Water Conservation Commission and the State Department of Health, and no construction shall take place except in accordance with the approved plans."

Commissioner Orlady seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Commissioner Orlady moved that the following resolution be adopted by the Commission. Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion. Carried.

WHEREAS, State Water Conservation Commission Revenue Bonds, Series "A", aggregating \$150,000.00, dated June 1, 1938, were issued by the Commission for the purpose of financing the construction of irrigation facilities for the irrigation of lands lying in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District of McKenzie County, North Dakota, and

WHEREAS, the cost of constructing said irrigation facilities, except the sum of \$39,000.00 has in effect been paid by the North Dakota Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, and the State Water Conservation Commission, and

WHEREAS, State Water Conservation Commission Revenue Bonds, Series "I-B", were issued in the aggregate amount of \$39,000.00 by the State Water Conservation Commission in lieu of Series "I" Bonds and Series "A" Bonds in that amount.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the bookkeeper of the Commission is hereby directed to cancel of record on the Commission's bond register, State Water Conservation Commission Revenue Bonds, Series "A", and State Water Conservation Commission Revenue Bonds Series "I", and to stamp said bonds with the word "Cancelled."

WHEREAS, the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission authorized the issuance of its Series "B" Bonds aggregating \$50,000.00 in denominations of \$1,000.00, dated June 1, 1938, and

WHEREAS, these bonds were printed but never sold because the Farm Security Administration later arranged to finance the Cartwright Irrigation Project for which these bonds had been issued.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the State Water Conservation Commission declare its Series "B" bonds now in its vault null and void, and the bookkeeper of this Commission is hereby directed to cancel said Series "B" bonds and the coupons attached, by perforation or other suitable means, and to note on the Bond Register of this Commission that said Series "B" bonds were never sold, and were ordered cancelled by this resolution.

Dated July 19, 1943.

WHEREAS, The North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission did not April 2, 1940, authorize the issuance of its bonds in the aggregate sum of \$25,000.00 to be known as Series "E", for the purpose of financing the construction of a drainage system for the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District in McKenzie County, North Dakota, and

WHEREAS, at that time arrangements were made for the North Dakota Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to purchase said bonds under certain agreed conditions, and

WHEREAS it appears that other arrangements were made later for the financing of the drainage construction constructed jointly by the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and the State Water Conservation Commission, and that the Series "E" bonds authorized as aforesaid were never printed or issued, and in effect by the settlements made these bonds have been fully redeemed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission that its authorization for the issuance of \$25,000.00 Series "E" construction bonds is hereby rescinded, and the bookkeeper instructed to make appropriate notation on the bond register showing this action.

WHEREAS, The North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission authorized the issuance of its bonds in the aggregate amount of \$15,000.00 to be known as Series "J", the proceeds of which were to be used for the purchase of certain "Turner lands," and

WHEREAS, THE PROPOSED PURCHASE OF lands could not be consummated because of a sale having been completed to other parties.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission that its authorization for the issuance of \$15,000.00 of its bonds to be known as

102

Series "J" be rescinded, and the bookkeeper be instructed to make notation of this action on the bond register.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.CWT, to the call of the chair.

Respectfully submitted,



Acting Secretary _____

ATTEST:



Chairman

(S E A L)

NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MONTHLY REPORT OF ACCOUNTS AS OF JULY 31, 1943

1943-1945 Appropriation

No.	Appropriation for	Total Approp. 24 mo.	1/4 Held By Law to 1-1-45	Balance Available 7-1-43	July Expenses 1943	Balance in Fund	Apportioned Monthly
1	Commissioners Per Diem	4,000.00	1,000.00	3,000.00	49.00	2,951.00	166.66
2	Administration	27,700.00	6,925.00	20,775.00	2,446.05	18,328.95	1,154.16
3	Maintenance Existing Dams	10,000.00	2,500.00	7,500.00	859.02	6,640.98	
4	Tri-State Waters and Portion of Admin. and conference expenses.	7,500.00	1,875.00	5,625.00	280.00	5,345.00	312.50
5	Internat'l. & Interstate Stream Com- pacts, Comm. & Conf. expenses	12,500.00	3,125.00	9,375.00	258.50	9,116.50	520.83
6	Topographic & Conserv. Branches Coop. with U.S. on 50-50 basis	20,000.00	5,000.00	15,000.00	nil.	15,000.00	833.33
7	Hydrographic Surveys	8,000.00	2,000.00	6,000.00	83.33	5,916.67	333.33
8	State Engineers Salary	4,400.00	1,100.00	3,300.00	183.33	3,116.67	183.33
9	Secure Amendment Relating to Ft. Peck Dam Waters for Missouri and Souris R. Diver.	2,500.00	nil.	2,500.00	nil.	2,500.00	104.16
10	Promote Maintenance Drainage and Construct Channels	50,000.00	nil.	50,000.00	2,995.00	47,005.00	
11-a	Balance Post war 50-50 with U.S.	164,534.59	nil.	164,534.59	35.15	164,499.44	
11-b	Other Post War project planning	100,000.00	nil.	100,000.00	823.96	99,176.04	
12	Bal. Construction Bond Guarantee	72,420.00	nil.	72,420.00	nil.	72,420.00	
		483,554.59		460,029.59	8,013.34	452,016.25	

FGO

104