It is good to be back in Idaho again, meeting with the Idaho Water Users Association, and seeing so many old friends and longtime associates.

When I was invited to speak at this session, I was asked to discuss certain subjects important not only in Idaho but in water resource development throughout the West.

Included in those subjects are: 1) the need to assess the environmental impact of our actions; 2) ways in which we might better manage the water resources already available today; 3) multi-objective planning and the need for public involvement in the planning process; 4) and, finally, a problem with which we are all wrestling, the prospects for authorizations and appropriations for future water resource development.
I plan to discuss all of those subjects in some detail, but first I think it might be helpful to review the Bureau of Reclamation's role in the development of water resources in Idaho.

Irrigation has been the backbone of southern Idaho's economic life for over a century. The future of this area also depends in large part upon continued irrigation development. If we look in the records, we find that the first decreed rights to divert water from Idaho rivers for irrigation purposes are dated 1864. Water diverted then from the Boise River irrigated the townsite of Boise and also supplied Fort Boise. Agricultural activity in the Boise and Payette Valleys started in the early 1880's. That's when settlers began filing on desert lands under private irrigation enterprises—placing about 148,000 acres under irrigation by 1900.

The Reclamation Act of 1902 made additional development possible. It started with the Boise Project and irrigation in the Upper Snake River
area. In 1904 the Minidoka Project was authorized by the Secretary of the Interior. The Minidoka Powerplant was the first Federal hydroelectric plant to be operated here in the Pacific Northwest.

We've come a long way since that time. The Bureau now operates five hydroelectric plants in Idaho. Over 1.6 million acres receive an irrigation water supply from or through facilities constructed or rehabilitated by the Bureau of Reclamation (515,000 full, 1,131,000 supplemental). The gross value of crops produced on these lands in 1973 totals over $490,000,000. Cumulatively, gross crop value of all crops produced on all of Idaho's Reclamation projects over the years is estimated at $5.9 billion. The cost of the Federal facilities constructed to provide the water needed to produce those crops has been $211 million.

Looking briefly now at some of our current programs of work, there are two items of major construction:

The Lower Teton Division, located in southeastern Idaho, was authorized in 1964 to be constructed in two phases. The first phase will provide a
supplemental water supply for 11,200 acres, 20,000 kilowatts of electrical power, a water-based recreational complex with facilities for public use, flood protection along the Teton River in the vicinity of Rexburg and Sugar City, and fish and wildlife mitigation features. The prime contract was awarded in December 1971 and is about 70 percent complete. If the prime contractor on Teton Dam remains on schedule, storage will commence in the fall of 1975.

The Second Phase of the Lower Teton Division was to have been irrigation of the Rexburg Bench area south of Teton Dam; however, most of the Rexburg Bench has now been privately developed by ground water pumping. Landowners in other nearby areas are very interested in using the Second Phase water supply. (Second Phase storage makes up 98,000 acre-feet of the 200,000-acre-foot active capacity of Teton Reservoir.) We are now determining which of these areas can be served and are making required environmental and other studies.
The East Greenacres Unit of the Rathdrum Prairie Project is located near the city of Post Falls in northern Idaho, and had obtained its water supply from the nearby Twin Lakes. As a result of litigation and an adverse court decision, the right of the irrigation district to the use of Twin Lakes water was severely restricted. To remedy the Twin Lakes water loss and provide needed water service, the Bureau is constructing four ground water well complexes with pumps and motors, a storage reservoir, and 40 miles of buried pipe distribution system. Construction of the unit was started in 1971. Irrigation and M&I water is expected to be available in the spring of 1975.

We are now completing a feasibility study on the North Side Pumping Division Extension near Rupert to identify the best use of the 12,000 acres of sagebrush land within the A&B Irrigation District. Major potential uses include new irrigation and wildlife habitat improvement, mainly for pheasants. Drainage, flood control, and other
problems also need to be solved in the irrigation areas.

The Salmon Falls Division is moving a step closer to realization. We should soon be able to begin the advanced planning studies which will lead to construction. This development will eliminate chronic water shortages and critical ground water problems on 50,000 acres south of Twin Falls, irrigate 15,000 acres of drylands and improve habitat for pheasants and other wildlife.

That gives you a rough idea of how far we have come in Idaho Reclamation activities over the past 70 years.

While we in Reclamation have long been concerned with the effects of all our projects on the total environment, in recent years the public generally has become environmentally conscious and is questioning many developmental and management proposals. A prime example of this is the Teton Project just a few miles up the road.

Our environmental impact statement on the Teton Project, prepared and filed pursuant to
the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), is presently in litigation. Several environmental groups filed a complaint in Idaho District Court to stop the project. The court agreed to hear the plaintiff's complaint regarding the adequacy of the environmental statement. In January 1974, the court filed in favor of the Bureau. That decision has been appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco where the matter is pending.

Today, there is a much greater public awareness of our environment and what is being done to it and what can be done to protect it. That means, by law and because the Bureau of Reclamation is responsive to the needs and desires of the public, we must make a more thorough assessment of all the impacts of water resource development and management programs and projects.

We are environmentally conscious and will continue to stress environmental protection and enhancement in our projects. Of course, there has to be a give and take, a "common sense"
approach in applying environmental considerations and weighing how we apply them against other human needs for our growing population. There are certain trade-offs that have to be made. We must search for acceptable common ground--recognizing that the growing needs and desires of mankind are diverse and must be met in a manner that not only will develop and manage our renewable resources for the multiple functions involved, but will do so in recognition of the public's desire...yes, demand...for a whole new set of standards.

There is common ground, I'm sure, that will enable us to do both, and thus serve best the needs of people today as well as generations far into the future. We must help to bring about general public recognition not only of the importance of water in our daily lives, but the physical works prerequisite to making it available appropriately in time and place. And we must listen to informed members of the public and involve them in the decision-making process.
While we're talking about environmental matters, I note that your association has voted to appeal the Environmental Protection Agency permit system for monitoring runoff waters. As I understand it, your appeals are based principally on three questions: (1) the basic legality of the law; (2) whether the law was intended to cover irrigation return flows; and (3) whether there is legal authority for the districts to assess members for monitoring the runoff waters.

I know that this matter of water discharge is a critical area of concern to you. There no doubt are good reasons for challenging the permit system, and I'm not questioning your right nor the propriety of doing so.

We feel as you do that some of the unusual problems associated with irrigation development and irrigation return flows were not fully recognized or covered in Public Law 92-500. Our conversations with representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington indicate
that EPA recognizes there are differences between irrigation return flows and flows from municipal treatment plants and industrial concerns. The people we have been talking with have indicated a willingness to consider those differences in developing appropriate approaches to water quality problems associated with irrigation operations. I have asked Regional officials to work closely with irrigation district, local, State, and Federal officials charged with administering the provisions of P.L. 92-500 so that we can help you come up with reasonable solutions to this problem, and I have asked them to let me know if and when we might provide additional help through discussions with EPA officials in Washington.

Based on what we have learned so far, we believe changes in the regulations, and possibly in the law, may be needed to find acceptable solutions.

Concern for the environment which leads us to continually attempt to improve our methods of water management can provide not only environmental benefits but also those broader benefits resulting from wise use of water resources. Although it varies from
area to area, there has been a definite trend, especially in the Pacific Northwest, toward converting from gravity to sprinkler irrigation systems.

The main reason for this is the adaptability of sprinkler irrigation to better management, minimizing use of labor, and resulting in reduced cost of production. Since management, to a great extent, dictates the amount of water used for irrigation, sprinkler methods usually result in less water use; although from a theoretical standpoint, gravity irrigation can be as efficient as sprinkler with good management and the right conditions.

Many of you are familiar with the Bureau's Irrigation Management Services program which is attempting scientifically and systematically to establish irrigation practices which insure more efficient use of water resources. It is a sophisticated program, using computer analyses, to determine how often to irrigate and how much water to apply.

We have been working with the A&B, the Falls, and the Minidoka Irrigation Districts, and with the Board of Control and several processing
companies in the Boise area to develop the IMS program. About 10,000 acres in the Falls Irrigation District and some 75,000 acres in the A&B District are cooperating in the program. Bureau personnel assist in developing the IMS program. They also are available to help in training and to supply technical help, but since IMS is basically a district program, it normally should be funded and operated by the district after it is developed and its value established.

Like any other new management practice, it takes time to get across the full significance of what IMS has to offer. In the field there are many benefits, including increased production and crop quality, decreased water use, improvement of water quality, reduction in deep percolation and drainage losses, conservation of energy by keeping pumping at a minimum, reduction of leaching of fertilizers and salts, and—certainly not the least—IMS can assist the districts in meeting their wastewater point discharge problems.

Next year we plan to develop further the program on the A&B, Falls, and Minidoka Irrigation
Districts. The IMS program will also continue in the Boise Valley, but the exact form it will take is not yet known.

We have had a lot of local help from such agencies as the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service in implementing IMS and we're always ready to cooperate fully with them and others in the development and implementation of better irrigation management programs.

Going a step beyond IMS, as we plan for the future, much of our study effort in southern Idaho is being reoriented toward total water management concepts. We now have two water management studies underway: one in the Upper Snake River Basin and one in southwest Idaho. These water management studies evaluate a river basin and its resources as a system with a view toward better utilization of existing facilities. We are looking at the coordinated use of the existing storage system, the highly productive Snake Plain ground water aquifer, and other water supplies.
We are developing improved computer models. We will also be looking at specific items such as the possible enlargement of the existing Minidoka Powerplant.

Another area of concern here and throughout the West is the application of the multiobjective planning concepts as we plan new projects. Most elements of the multiobjective planning process have been a part of Reclamation's planning efforts in recent years. However, implementation of the new procedures in conjunction with the National Environmental Policy Act has required a reorientation and a stronger emphasis in categories such as public involvement; formulation of alternative plans; and, as I mentioned before, environmental evaluation.

What do we mean by public involvement? To me, public involvement means going to the public with the problem, rather than the solution.

In the past the engineers, the water districts, the boards of supervisors, and the local members of Congress have labored sometimes for years to develop solutions to water resources development
problems which affect thousands of people without systematically involving diverse elements and segments of the public in the discussion and decision processes.

We have prepared reconnaissance studies and feasibility reports and traditionally have talked them over in great detail with those directly involved, but without bothering to discuss them with the general public which may be indirectly and variously affected by project construction, operation, maintenance, and management.

That approach was acceptable for many years because on balance our programs were beneficial to a large majority of people involved.

But during the last few years we have witnessed a dramatic change in attitude and an increase in interest on the part of many widespread segments of the public concerning public works programs. This broadened interest has introduced new values which require careful identification and evaluation of all impacts--economic, social, cultural, and environmental.

In the 1960's the general public became caught up in a wave of concern for its natural environment and, in the minds of many, economic
growth seemed less important than the protection of the balance of ecologic systems. Last year gasoline and heating oil shortages made most people aware of the energy crisis and the effect shortages of fuel could have on their way of life. Today, the economic recession and the threat of worldwide food shortages have become major topics of discussion and concern throughout the land.

Any water resources development programs proposed today must take into consideration all of those concerns—protection of the environment, energy conservation and production, long-term economic benefits, and the need to provide and conserve water for the production of food, fiber, and other needs of people.

While we as planners are considering all of these aspects of development, many segments of the public have indicated that they, too, want and intend to be a part of the decision-making process. They want their input to be considered in the planning stages. They want to know that their particular hopes and fears, their special interests, are at least being considered by the planners.
Therefore, we must provide the means for the public to become involved more deeply in the planning process today than we did in the past.

Public involvement, as I see it, means meeting with the public to discuss the problem, listening to the public's needs and desires, and considering suggestions from the public as to possible solutions to the problem.

It means the preparation of a series of alternative solutions to the problem and the presentation of those alternatives to the public along with an analysis of what would be gained and lost under each proposal.

It means listening to the public's comments on the alternatives proposed, and then evaluating those comments before a single solution is recommended.

And, it means going back to the people with the recommended solution and listening to their suggestions as to how accommodations might be made in the recommended plan which might meet their major concerns.
Finally, it means our recommending to the Administration and to the Congress a plan of development which meets the needs of the majority of the people and reflects a concern for all segments of the public which will be affected.

The Reclamation program has always been responsive to what the Administration and the Congress perceived to be the needs and desires of people. During this past year both Congress and the Administration have shown that they favor continuing the Reclamation program at a high level. Our budget for the present fiscal year exceeds $480 million, the second highest in our history, even after the President's request that Congress allow him to postpone the spending of $25.3 million as part of his program to fight inflation. It includes $310 million for construction—and $50,000 for preconstruction work on the Salmon Falls Division of the Upper Snake River Project.

In recent years the emphasis of our program has been on water for municipal and industrial use and on environmental enhancement, because that
is what the people appear to have been interested in. The emphasis seems now to be switching to water for energy. But in view of the growing evidence of a worldwide food shortage, the emphasis could easily shift again to water for agriculture.

If that shift occurs, it will be because the people, speaking in public meetings and through their elected representatives, let us know that they place at least as high a priority on water for food as they do on water for other purposes.

We in Reclamation will, as always, be listening for the voice of the people. So, I can assure you, will your members of the Congress.

Priorities may change, but I am confident the Congress, the Administration, and the people will continue to recognize the need for continuing Western programs of water resources conservation, development, and management—the need to continue to build—but wisely—for the benefit of mankind now and for generations to come.
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