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THE WATER USER AND THE GROUP EFFORT

I welcome this opportunity and appreciate the invitation to meet with you in this, your 12th Annual Convention. I also bring you greetings and best wishes for a successful meeting from Commissioner Dominy.

Reflecting on the subject assigned for discussion, "The Water User and the Group Effort," it appears rather obvious that this assembly subscribes to the idea of the group effort inasmuch as this is your 12th meeting for the exchange of ideas and experiences for the good of the group. And I might add that from a review of the proceedings of some of those meetings it is also obvious that you have discovered the importance of balancing meetings like this with periodic field reviews and tours. "One look is worth 1,000 words." Over the centuries men have learned and relearned the value of the Group Effort as reflected in time-tested quotations with which you are familiar, such as:

"United we stand, divided we fall;"

"All for one, and one for all;"

"Your strength is in union, your danger in discord."

Some years ago the Denver Post took a very dim view editorially of a public statement that had been made on cooperation and the group effort, denouncing it severely. Someone asked the Post's editor, "How can you publish your newspaper without the group effort?" The editor-
replied, "The Post is issued not by cooperation or by the group effort, but by the individual efforts of many people." I mention this only to emphasize that there may be several ways to define the effort about which I am speaking, but the end result is the same.

The entire Nation has become alerted to the impending explosive growth of our population. I won't dwell upon the statistics, but want to relate this growth to our increased use of water. In the year 1900, when the United States population was 76 million, the per-capita daily use of water for all purposes was 530 gallons. Today, the population is nearly 180 million, and the use per capita is not 530 gallons, but 1,600 gallons. By 1980, only 20 years hence, there will be 250 million people in the United States and there have been forecasts that each will be using 2,500 gallons a day.

Because all uses are expanding rapidly, we are approaching the time when the available water supply will be taxed to meet demand. The available supply can be expanded somewhat, I recognize, but only within modest limits. Thus there is urgent need for all water users, not only irrigators but also municipal and industrial water users, to work together in planning for the highly competitive water situation that will face us in the not too distant future. It's hard to realize that keen competition could soon develop in the Northern Plains, but I am informed that it could. Expenditures from public and private sources for all kinds of water resource development — irrigation, municipal, and industrial — in the United States over the next 15 years have been estimated by the Department of Commerce to be about $170 billion.
Irrigation is the greatest single user of water in the United States, accounting for about 46 percent, and it is least able to pay for water. Thus, municipal and industrial uses can outbid irrigation in the coming competitive market.

Does this mean a reduction in irrigation, or at least no expansion? Not necessarily. We can do much in the future to expand irrigation even within present water quantities. Before irrigation can effectively defend its demand for its proper share of water, it must eliminate or greatly reduce the waste that now prevails. You are aware that for every 3 acre-feet of water diverted for irrigation, too often only 2 acre-feet reach the farmers' headgates. Of the water reaching the farm, about one-half is lost through such means as deep percolation, runoff at the lower end of the fields, and evaporation. Thus, only about 1/3 of the water diverted for irrigation is used by the crops produced.

As time marches on, we must work together to gain greater efficiency in the use of irrigation water. State and Federal research agencies have been working on this problem for some time and will point the way, but final accomplishment cannot be gained without the concerted efforts of the irrigators themselves.

You are all familiar with the Board of Control type of operation wherein a single organization operates the facilities of several irrigation districts. You know, too, that while no two Boards of Control are organized and operated exactly alike, the aim is the same and their history demonstrates clearly the value of that group effort. Five such Boards of Control are in operation in the Pacific Northwest where I have been stationed,
one of which has been in operation for some 35 years. I will not attempt a full discussion of operations by a Board of Control since that topic warrants a separate spot on the program. I will take a minute, however, to mention that recently I had occasion to poll by mail, through the questionnaire procedure, all of the farmers of nine irrigation districts who had served at one time or another over the past 10 years as board members for districts whose facilities were being operated under a Board of Control. The questionnaire was designed to obtain their experience and opinions with respect to costs, efficiency of operation, maintenance of facilities, service provided to the water users, and water user attitudes. The response to virtually all questions was unanimous in favor of the Board of Control type of operation. A Board of Control is the obvious answer to a situation where two or more districts are served through common facilities and where equitable distribution of water and costs could be a problem.

Federal Reclamation has been concerned with the group effort from the very beginning. The irrigation district itself is fundamentally a cooperative undertaking by the group for the benefit of the individuals. Problems sometime stem from the fact that the total Reclamation group is not really a single, homogeneous group, but a number of groups which are separated geographically as well as functionally. Even though all groups are working on or under the same general Reclamation program, their viewpoints, interpretations, functions, or responsibilities may be sufficiently different to create problems.

Smooth working relationships within a group, among groups, or between groups and outside interests, require good communication. We need to know people to understand them, and we know and understand best those
people with whom we communicate most. For the good of the program we need good communication among all facets of the complex Reclamation group, which stretches from the farm to Washington, D. C. We need to understand the viewpoints of others and see that they understand ours.

The Bureau employees here today have the same objectives as the farmers. Reclamation may mean many things to many people. It has multiple functions and some of its features and structures are spectacular, but when you brush away the glamour and get down to its heart, you find that the primary objective is to deliver irrigation water to each farmer's headgate in amounts and at times required for the successful production of crops. This service must be performed at costs that are within the farmers' ability to pay. The total program is successful only if the projects are successful, and the projects are successful only if the water users on those projects are successful. Thus, from the farmer to the Commissioner, our main objective is to build successful farms.

A primary purpose and important accomplishment of this meeting and similar ones held in other areas, is getting to know each other and thus to understand why we do what we do. In revealing the "why" we need to start with those who are closest to us. We should be certain that they are as fully informed as is reasonably possible regarding the reasons behind our actions, which might otherwise be misunderstood. Without knowing the reason, many actions appear absurd. I heard once of a man who arose at midnight, saddled his horse and took a ride in a downpouring rain. I thought the man probably was crazy. Then I learned it was Paul Revere. The action is justified when the reason is known.

The business world recognizes the value of good communications. They call it public relations and allot a large share of its budget to create and maintain the community interest and good will that result from
good communication. A little effort in this direction not only can save us the costs that frequently attend a negative approach, but can actually contribute toward greater efficiency of our people and a reduction in overall operating costs.

The irrigation manager is a key figure in the group effort and in the establishment and maintenance of good communication between and among all facets of the Reclamation group. I'd like to give him a little attention at this point. To generate in you a little more appreciation than you might otherwise have for the irrigation manager, I would like to run hurriedly through the chronology of a typical irrigation manager's experience in a 12-month period.

Starting in October, the irrigation manager becomes concerned about the irrigation water supply for the following year. Not knowing whether precipitation will be as much as normal, he must capture in his reservoirs all storable inflow against the possibility of a short water year.

Upon closing the outlet gates at the dam, he is like to receive complaints that fish are being lost. He is sympathetic, because he, too, is an ardent fishermen and sportsman. But at this season those responsible for irrigation storage works have no alternative but to hold all storable inflows for future irrigation needs. Whenever precipitation and runoff forecasts indicate that the irrigation water supply for the coming season is assured, the tension eases.

At that point the problem may shift. In my hypothetical, yet typical, situation the manager may find by mid-winter that it has snowed more than usual, resulting in a need to evacuate space to catch the spring runoff peak and control streamflow below the reservoir to nonflood stages. If no part of the storage space is allocated to flood control, the easy solution would
seem to be simply to fill the reservoir and thereafter let it spill. This would mean that the peak inflow yet to come would necessarily be passed through the reservoir and would leave no opportunity for controlling floods in the channel downstream. Even though the legal obligation may be only to fill and spill, he feels a responsibility to accomplish as much flood control as possible without, of course, reducing the yield of water for irrigation purposes. He has done this before and has accomplished much good for many people by reducing peak stream flows and preventing flood damage. Because of past control, however, the job becomes more difficult. Landowners adjacent to the stream below the dam have encroached on the stream with their bridge piers and fences. The channel has become restricted so that now the stream will not carry nearly as much flow without flooding as it would have before the dam was built.

As the manager evacuates space for flood control, his farmers may believe he is depending too much on the forecasts and is releasing too much, while those interested in flood control contend that he is not evacuating enough space for the expected runoff. He tiptoes between these two interests with an eye on the watershed, the temperature, the weather forecast, and the advancing spring season. Finally the snow is largely gone, the season is well advanced, and he has storage space enough to catch the runoff expected from, say, a week of hot weather. He breathes easier and believes that once again he has operated a single purpose irrigation reservoir for multiple purpose benefits. This, however, may really be the critical time.

During this critical period, usually in May or June, one of several things can happen. It may turn hot for two weeks instead of one, or the watershed might get an unseasonal rain that upsets the manager's
best intentions and calculations. Either event results in the necessity for passing more water than the restricted channel below the reservoir can carry without flooding. Needless to say, if this occurs, the manager is again the target for criticism from those damaged or threatened with damage. Those complaining probably are not his water users. More likely they are the railroad, a rancher, or townspeople.

Nobody seems to understand that the irrigation manager could not foresee an unseasonal rain or an extended hot spell, but he nevertheless did reduce the peak flow substantially, even though not completely.

By this time the irrigation season is well under way. Water users have long since been notified of water charges for the season and have paid the minimum charge. But they perhaps complained bitterly because of an increase in operation and maintenance costs. They point out that costs are twice what they were in the early 1940's, and farmers are sure that the manager is spending more than is necessary. What farmers may not realize is that in terms of 1940 dollars the O&M costs may actually be no more, perhaps even less, than was the cost 20 years ago. Very likely the manager has mechanized his operations and is actually performing his job more efficiently now than ever before.

Next, almost invariably, comes a prolonged summer hot spell when most farmers want more water than the irrigation system can deliver. When it comes, the manager is on the run again because the system lacks capacity to meet peak season demands.

This little recitation of events in the life of an irrigation manager only lists a few high spots but serves to demonstrate that he is plagued with problems around the calendar. He is expected to foretell
the weather, control floods, preserve fish, conserve water, expand ditch capacities, and work miracles in performing better water service at lower costs. He must be a good technician, a good administrator, a prophet, and a diplomat.

He is usually underpaid, overworked, under-appreciated, and over-criticized. He inherits all of the unsolved problems of project design and construction. But, let me emphasize, without him the Reclamation program would fall flat on its face.

Meetings such as this, bringing together farmers, irrigation district directors, irrigation managers, Reclamation representatives, and utility and business people, not only have a therapeutic benefit in solving problems, but, more important, are the preventive medicine, or vaccine, by reason of which many problems do not develop. You are all aware of the timeworn truism, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." I have seen long-standing breaches in the group effort completely remedied solely as a result of re-establishment of good communications, and I have seen the group effort preserved and extended to a significant degree through the preventive medicine generated and administered in sessions like this.

Let's resolve to gain a sympathetic understanding of each others particular objectives, views, and obligations in seeking solutions to our mutual problems. Thank you.

#####
The many problems we are encountering in connection with the acquisition of lands for Bureau projects are not new to us. They are simply occurring more frequently these days. Increased settlement of the West since the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902 has resulted in a marked decrease in the amount of public domain. Prior to World War II by far the greater portion of lands required for most reservoirs were obtained by withdrawals from the public domain. Today, however, the ratio of available public domain to privately-owned lands has been reversed to the extent that on some projects it is now necessary that we buy 100% of the lands needed for construction. Incidentally, the shrinking of the public domain has caused a marked change in the procedure we must follow to effect a withdrawal. Until a few years ago we could withdraw lands for reclamation purposes pretty much on our own say-so. Bureau of Land Management concurrence and Secretarial approval were usually obtained within a matter of days from the time we recommended the withdrawal. Today, however, the process takes years, and our requirements receive minute scrutiny all the way from the local land offices to the Congress. The aftermaths of this change are two-fold. First, we must take early action to initiate requests for withdrawals and secondly, we must carefully screen the list of lands to insure that we ask only for lands we can justify as needed for project purposes.
As I mentioned earlier, we are today obtaining most of our lands by purchase. The acquisition of privately-owned lands by the Government always has been and always will be a process resented by a large percentage of the people from whom we acquire lands. This is true even though the price offered is full fair market value. People naturally resent having to give up their homes involuntarily. This fact is further complicated because in many instances the project we are building is of little or no benefit to the person whose land we buy.

As all of you are undoubtedly aware, we have two main approaches available for the acquisition of privately owned lands; by the extension of a land purchase contract or through the right of eminent domain - in other words - condemnation. It has been determined (by the Administration) that all possible steps within reason would be taken to acquire lands through purchase and thus avoid condemnation whenever possible.

The successful acquisition of lands by purchase contract depends upon a number of factors, the first and most important of which is the price we offer for the interest to be taken. The Reclamation Act of 1902 specifies that lands shall be acquired at prices satisfactory to the Secretary but does not provide how the price shall be determined. The Bureau of Reclamation, as well as practically all other Federal, State, and local agencies, determine price on the basis of fair market value. While there
are several approaches in the appraisal process to determine fair market value, the one most suited to our needs in appraising farm and ranch properties is known as the "comparable sales" method. The appraiser investigates recent sales of comparable properties in the area and compares them to the land he is appraising to arrive at an estimate of fair market value. It is important to emphasize at this point that the appraisal process is not an exact science and that an appraisal report is but the appraisers' estimate of fair market value. As stated earlier we acquire on the basis of prices satisfactory to the Secretary and there is no requirement, statutory or otherwise, that we acquire at the price determined by the appraisers to be the fair market value.

Good public relations with landowners is nearly as important as the purchase price when we are dealing with a landowner. Courteous treatment of landowner from the inception of a project investigations is in many instances the deciding factor in obtaining a land purchase contract. Project investigative activities without a right of entry permit, the cutting of trees and failure to close gates by survey crews and other Bureau employees have in many instances reflected to our disadvantage when the negotiator calls on the landowner in an attempt to obtain his signature.
Our major responsibility in the land acquisition field ceases when we request the Solicitor to submit a condemnation action to the Department of Justice. From there on the case is handled by the United States Attorney having jurisdiction over the area in which the land is located, in cooperation with the appropriate Field or Regional Solicitor. You should be prepared, however, to be available at all times to furnish such assistance or information as the attorneys may require for the successful prosecution of the action. In recent years there has been a growing tendency on the part of the Department of Justice to settle condemnations out of court. Each of you has undoubtedly had some experience along this line and time does not permit me to go into detail. However, these out-of-court settlements are today averaging about 35 percent above our estimates of fair market value, with the result that project costs are being increased correspondingly.

This is all the more reason for our taking all possible steps to acquire the lands we need through purchase contracts.

The appraisal of various types of properties is a process requiring considerable experience and good judgment. Today experienced appraisers can obtain much higher pay under Civil Service regulations. This, together with recent heavy criticism of our land acquisition program, has resulted in an increased program of training our own appraisers. Numerous
Many schools, particularly in the Western States, are now offering short-term appraisal courses. Bureau employees engaged in land appraisal work at the present time, as well as those showing an interest in this field, should be recommended for this training at Government expense. We are also hopeful that the Department will soon sponsor an appraiser training program for the employees of all agencies in the Department of the Interior.

The Departmental report on land appraisal activities of the various agencies of the Interior Department recommends that the Bureaus utilize the services of staff appraisers to the maximum extent practicable. Generally speaking, we have always made it a practice to use staff appraisers. Recently, however, there has been a growing tendency on the part of the United States Attorneys handling Bureau condemnations, to have reappraisals made by consultant appraisers of their own selection and to use the consultant as the Government's expert witness rather than the Bureau's staff appraiser. The testimony presented by these consultant appraisers as to the fair market value of the land being condemned usually indicates a value of from 50% to 100% higher than the value estimated by our staff appraisers. This results in an award of from 25% to 50% above our estimate of just compensation. In an effort to alleviate the situation our trend has been to the employment of outside appraisers, either on a consultant or contract basis. One result of this action
has been to show us that appraisals by staff appraisers result in a lower figure as compared to the findings of the consultant appraisers. You undoubtedly quickly deduce that we are not saving any money through this procedure. However, I should like to point out in that regard that the Constitution guarantees just compensation for property taken and we are as lax in the exercise of our responsibilities by paying too little for land as we are if we pay more than we should.

The acquisition of land is a complicated process. In addition to the detailed review of various records, checking of title reports and related actions and numerous contacts with the owner or owners, the process is further complicated by absentee owners, dealings with partnerships and corporations, minors and persons legally declared incompetent. All of this takes time. Repeated studies have not disclosed any way in which the acquisition process can appreciably be speeded up. We conservatively estimate that a minimum of 90 days' time is necessary to do the job and 120 days from the time land needs are made known to land acquisition personnel would be more realistic. Changes in land requirements occasioned canal and transmission realignment further complicate the picture. To attempt to hurry results in errors in land descriptions which place a cloud on the title. Landowners expect and should receive sufficient time to consider our offer to purchase.
Many of them would be willing to sign a purchase contract if they are given the opportunity to do a little dickering or horse-trading on such items as the date of possession, salvage value of movable equipment such as pumps and motors, and the retention of improvements. Insufficient time to handle this phase of our operation results in increased condemnation actions which is what we are trying to avoid.

The necessity for more time for land acquisition resulted in the issuance of the letter of November 2, 1956, from the Commissioner's office that all future bid opening reports and requests for authorization to award should, if all right-of-way is not available, be accompanied by a report showing the status of right of way acquisitions. This directive was supplemented by instructions on January 24, 1957, to the effect that all right-of-way be available on the bid opening date. I believe this to be a sound policy and that generally it is working to the Bureau's advantage. The Commissioner's office has never attempted to dictate the manner in which the Regional or Project offices should schedule land acquisition.

We believe that this is properly a responsibility of the field offices. However, there remains the fact that sufficient time must be allocated for the land acquisition and the inevitable result is that acquisition must be started sooner or bid opening must be delayed.
It has been argued on several occasions that it is not necessary to have all right of way in certain instances, for example that construction of an entire transmission line cannot take place at one time. However, if the contractor is to be given the option of starting construction anywhere within the area covered by the specifications, all right-of-way must be available to avoid claims for delays. In this regard your views are solicited as to the practicability of providing in the specifications the point or points at which a contractor should start work on a canal or transmission line. If such should prove to be feasible it would be possible to schedule right of way acquisition to coincide with construction progress.

Whenever it appears desirable to issue frs before Row is far enough along to assure its availability, I believe the practice has been to recommend that the Row deficiencies be spelled out in the frs and claim. Each case has been considered on its merits.
Special Land Categories

Right of way acquisition often involves lands in special categories and hence we are confronted with problems out of the ordinary. Indian lands may be placed in two classes, allotted and Tribal. Allotted lands are appraised in the usual manner by Bureau of Reclamation appraisers but in addition the appraisal should receive the approval of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. A recent experience along this line on the Washita Basin Project makes it advisable to receive Bureau of Indian Affairs approval of our appraisals before any contact is made with the Indian owners. Tribal Indian lands are not public lands in the usual sense even though title has not passed from the United States by a patent. Accordingly, such lands are not subject to withdrawal. Agreement must be reached with the Tribe and the Bureau of Indian Affairs as to the price to be paid, and legislation is usually the final answer in such type of acquisition.

Reservoir sites are usually encumbered with a large number of mining claims. Many of these claims are filed as speculative ventures; then word reaches the public that we are about to undertake construction of the project. Valid mining claims must be acquired in the same as any other privately owned lands, even though the actual title still remains with the Government.

The greater number of such claims, however, are usually invalid. It takes time to determine which are valid. The determination as to the validity of mining claims is a responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management.
The acquisition of privately-owned mineral lands, including valid mining claims, involves an appraisal of a special type. The Secretary has recommended that mineral appraisals for all agencies of the Interior Department be conducted by the Bureau of Mines or the Geological Survey.

I have pointed out these few examples to you to emphasize some of our varied problems in land acquisition. Essentially, they all require considerable time to handle. I am sure you will appreciate that it takes a year at the minimum to obtain passage of an Act of Congress to determine the sum to be paid the Indians for their interest in reservoir site lands. Our recent acquisition of the Crow Tribal lands at the Yellowtail site is now an accomplished fact but it took many years to become so. Other Governmental agencies such as the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, and Bureau of Land Management must also be afforded sufficient time to assist us as mentioned above while still performing their other essential services.

Our land acquisition program was given a shot in the arm by the passage of the Act of May 29, 1958, which authorizes payments to landowners and tenants for expenses they incur in moving from the lands we buy from them. Up to a maximum of 25 percent of the purchase price may be paid for such items as the cost of finding a new farm, trucking charges, and for losses incurred in the move.

Departmental Manual - 604.1 has been issued. Provides general guide lines and many claims have been paid. Many more remain unaided because of situations not covered by the Manual.
These are referred to a committee established by the manual procedures. That committee has ruled on a number of cases but has more
incurred in the move. Passage of this Act involves a new
procedure for us and there are numerous unsolved problems.

The Secretary has established a Departmental Committee to
consider and rule on the varied questions. The Committee
was set up at the Departmental level because the Act applies
to all agencies of the Interior Department. We have received
a considerable number of questions from you folks in the field
and have passed them along to the Committee. We are hopeful
that the answers will be forthcoming within the next few days
so that the Regional offices may proceed to process the many
pending claims.

A member of the Committee was
optimistic last Tuesday that
many of the pending questions
would be ruled on soon—perhaps
a matter of days.
Now for a few remarks on the Admin. phase comprised of several separate programs, but has a single program with several phases.

The Bureau is a resource development agency and while several functions are involved, our primary mission is land reclamation by means of irrigation or more specifically, to build, operate and maintain works for delivery of water to the water users when needed in quantities needed, success can be measured by success + satisfaction at costs that can be paid.

Obviously the pre-requisites are planning, design and construction of dams, power plants, pumping plants, canals, laterals, etc.

But these are the means not the end.

First cost not the only consideration, pumpers accommodate all weather operating roads = use of heavy equipment.

First cost against long-range cost

Sufficiency of cost - Efficiency of same.

Don Forester's part - His part in BR 1st dam with safety factor. No stress - no strain, no water - no pressure.
Jerry Dinkin, in court, regime, & Wash. D.C., changed with land & raw acre, land disposition when no longer needed for court, urban, or protection & reclamation works, and urban & land while in our custody.

In acre & land & raw, it should be our job to facilitate court, cost, harming it. The policy of sequestering raw before the awards have been intended to minimize subsequent delays and to avoid grounds for contraction claims as far as the Raw is concerned. If our Raw policies are going beyond that and are creating more delay and cost than they are saving in these two important matters, we want to know about it.

I can't take much credit for pursuit policies and practices but I hope to do something about both in the future.
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When I find a weed rack
located in a high traffic bottle neck
obviously put there to take advantage of combining it
I thought to save a few dollars
I low cost, but creating other
Dangers of costs the
Which defeat the purpose the
weed rack, still the first to
complain be since I knew that
the designers did not intend
it to.

When you find New policies
procedures not of preparation
create problems out of proportion to those
they are intended to alleviate or
prevent. (Assume you will
not hesitate to make it known,
and facilitate to make it known,
these policies for the designers)
I procedures glad not intend if
New one should be handled to
and different mean to
facilitate count - of policies procedures prevent
make count be changed.

The they you want to open up the
Now if you want to open up the
big guns - fire away - still prepared to
listen - I can assure you I'll continue to do all I
can to prove that we have won.
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FROM: Chief, Division of Irrigation and Land Use

TO: Mr. Curtis Ness  
c/o Regional Director  
Billings, Montana

Mr. Stamm asked that I send you the attached copy of the address he made at the Twelfth Annual Water Users' Irrigation Conference at Billings on January 21, for inclusion in the proceedings of that meeting.

Prebble I. Brady  
Secretary to Mr. Stamm
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Air Mail 1/28/60

FROM: Chief, Division of Irrigation and Land Use

413 E. Fremont
Riverton, Wyoming

Mr. Stamm asked that I send you, by February 3, the attached copy of the address he made at the Twelfth Annual Water Users' Irrigation Conference at Billings, Montana, on 1/21.

Mr. Stamm reported a very worthwhile meeting and enjoyed all the sessions very much.

Prebble I. Brady
Secretary to Mr. Stamm

Attachment
FROM: Chief, Division of Irrigation and Land Use

TO: PJB

Billing salt wanted by Lucero—must have them Feb 3.

Also send one to Curtis—Use Reg 6.

[Signature]
12th Annual Water Users Irrigation Conference

Luke Lucero Att
413 E Fremont
Riperton, Wyo

Program
TWELFTH ANNUAL WATER USERS IRRIGATION CONFERENCE
EAGLES HALL, CORNER 29TH AND MINNESOTA AVENUE, BILLINGS, MONTANA

THURSDAY - January 21, 1960

Morning Session
W. E. Rawlings, Presiding Regional Supervisor of Irrigation, Region 6

9:00 Program Announcements - W. E. Rawlings

9:10 Regional Director's Report - F. M. Clinton, Regional Director

9:40 The Water User and the Group Effort - Gilbert G. Stamm, Chief, Division of Irrigation, Washington, D. C.

10:00 Report of Resolutions Committee - Floyde Riggs, Committee Secretary, Belle Fourche Project

10:15 Selection of Resolutions and Program Committee

10:30 Business Session

Luncheon Session
F. M. Clinton, Presiding

12:15 Multipurpose Use and the Free Loaders - Harrel F. Mosbaugh, Chairman, MRB Field Committee

Afternoon Session
W. A. Boettcher, Presiding Chief, Irrigation Operations, USBR, Billings

1:30 MANAGEMENT OF PROJECT WORKS

Panel Discussion: Extraordinary Maintenance and Replacements

Moderator: O. A. Dolven, Irrigation Division, USBR, Region 6

1. Replacement of Major Equipment - Bob Hungerford, Nash-Davis Machinery Company; Bob Fagerberg, Manager, Shoshone Project; Jim Doyle, USBR, Billings; Hollis Sanford, USBR, Denver

2. Major Structure Maintenance or Replacement - Dave Brooks, Manager, Lower Yellowstone Project; Victor Norlin, Manager, Belle Fourche Project; Herbert Sharpe, Manager, Fort Shaw Project; Hollis Sanford, USBR, Denver

4:00 The North Dakota Irrigation District Directors Association - Bill Long, Pres.

4:15 The Drainage Story - C. R. Maierhofer, Drainage Engineer, USBR, Denver

5:00 Social Hour - 6:30 Banquet Stockman Steakhouse - Grant Bloodgood, Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer, Guest Speaker

FRIDAY - January 22

Morning Session
John Robertson, Presiding Chief, Land Use & Settlement Branch, Region 6

8:30 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND WATER

Panel Discussion: The Successful Irrigated Farm

Moderator: Willard V. Wilson, President, Owl Creek District

Lloyd Snider - Shoshone Project
Donald Peck - Angostura Project
Reece Silve - Sun River Project
9:30 A Forward Look in Irrigation Practices - Ivan D. Wood, Irrigation Consultant, Farmhand Tractor Company

10:15 New Developments in Weed Control - Dick Yeo, Huntley Station

10:30 Panel Discussion: Multipurpose Use of Reclamation Works

Moderator: George Ebner, Project Manager, Greenfields Irrigation District

Guy C. Thatcher, Chief, Reservoir Regulation Branch, USBR, Billings
Bruce Garlinghouse, Project Superintendent, Milk River Project
Harold Odde, Wyoming State Parks Commission
W. A. Leach, Sr., North Dakota Game and Fish Commission

Luncheon Session

12:15 Movie

Afternoon Session
F. M. Clinton, Presiding

1:15 Agricultural Outlook for 1960 - Dr. John Fischer, Head, Agricultural Economics, Montana State College

2:00 Report of Resolutions Committee

Report of Program Committee

Summarization - F. M. Clinton

3:30 Adjournment