

State of Idaho
Department of Fish and Game
Region 4, Jerome

M E M O R A N D U M

April 1, 1992

To: Will Reid, ✓ Gary Hompland

From: Fred Partridge *FP*

Subject: Mud Creek Hydro, FERC Project No. 4769

On March 25, 1992, I received a call from Mike Collins of Kanaka Ranches near Buhl inquiring about bypass flows on a hydro on Mud Creek. He reported that all flow was being diverted at the head gate structure. He also stated that the day previously, the hydro personnel had assisted him in cleaning his diversion structure which is located in the bypass reach and that there was sufficient flow at that time. From the location that he gave me, I determined that it was FERC 4769 which has a five (5) cfs minimum bypass.

I inspected the project at about 11:30 AM on the same day and observed that the only flow in the stream was some seepage. Since I had not been to the project previously, I was not aware of the bypass design and did not notice that a board had been placed over the bypass orifice at that time. While looking at the headgate, a Mr Castle drove up and indicated that he also irrigated out of the canal, but did not say anything about the covered orifice. I do not know if he was aware of it or not. I continued on down the road to the powerhouse and determined that the project appeared to be operating. I also observed that the next diversion on the project immediately below the powerhouse was bypassing approximately five cfs and that the second powerhouse at the end of the project was in operation. Both overflows at the penstock intakes were also bypassing water which reenter the stream near the powerhouses. (My files do not indicate that there are two diversions and two powerhouses. If your file has information on the lower structures, would you send me a copy.)

As I returned to the upper diversion, I was met by Don Campbell who had seen me inspecting the area. Don also diverts water from the canal supplied by the upper diversion and indicated that there should be a bypass flowing in the upper portion of the stream. When we inspected the diversion again, Don found that someone had placed a piece of board over the bypass orifice, which he then opened partially. He explained that he did not feel he had the right to remove it since he was not responsible for maintaining the diversion. Since most of the 5 cfs was again in the stream, I left it as it was until I could talk to Scott Kaster.

APR 6 1992

I have not made connections directly with Scott but did receive a message from him on March 26, 1992 in answer to my call. He indicated that they had placed the board in the diversion to conduct a test. He also said that they have removed the board and the bypass flow is in the stream again. I am not sure exactly what they were testing, whether it was the turbine or water availability. What ever, I don't believe they are suppose to be drying up the stream to do it.