

MEMORANDUM

TO: TIM LUKE
FROM: NORM
SUBJECT: PORTNEUF RESERVOIR CAPACITY SURVEY
DATE: September 16, 1995
=====

Thoughts:

1. Why is the NRCS survey inadequate? I see nothing in the file to document the contention that more accuracy is required. What accuracy is needed?
2. Couldn't we simply assign a conservative estimate to interpolate or extrapolate? For example, wouldn't it be conservative to assume that the surface area of the reservoir was constant above the spillway? Conservative estimates would work to protect the downstream users and the safety of the structure. PMV could chose to supply data to show that the estimates were in error, but would not be required to do so.
3. Ordering the study and then offering to contract to do it may be viewed as extortion.
4. Under the present budget rules, we may not be able to spend any money we received under the contract. Need to check with Debbie Allen.
5. Do we have authority to contract to do this work? Is it unfair competition with consultants? What part of our costs were we intending to bill?
6. It is appropriate at state cost to take data to check and confirm the accuracy of the information PMV submitted.

Tim Luke —

MEMORANDUM

*I still like idea #2.
Sonny, Dave, & I discussed
briefly but did not resolve
at least to my satisfaction.*

TO: Norm

FROM: Tim Luke

DATE: 9/19/1995

RE: Portneuf Reservoir Survey

N49

I reviewed your thoughts regarding the Portneuf Reservoir. I believe Dave and Sonny have discussed items 1 and 2 with you.

OK { In response to your items 3 through 6, I would propose as an alternative that IDWR not pursue a contract or reimbursement of costs. If there is still some question as to the need of the supplemental survey or whether the existing work is complete, then I guess our efforts and costs associated with completing the additional work should be at state cost since we may only be confirming the accuracy of the information PMV has already submitted. I will not be upset if IDWR is not reimbursed. If rental equipment is needed and IDWR does not have funds for this purpose, then I don't think PMV would have a problem with renting the equipment directly. They have already offered any manpower and/or equipment at their disposal which could assist in additional survey efforts.

OK {

I do not know if IDWR has authority or acceptable budget rules regarding the suggested contract. I will not research this question. I do understand that last year Dave Tuthill billed Water District 65 for use of a regional staff employee to complete diversion measurements. Those were perhaps different circumstances and can not be compared with the Portneuf situation.

Your point about possible extortion is a point well made. For this reason then I again suggest that the state complete the additional work at its own expense. As Governor Batt reiterated in the Kagel matter, we should act as servant and not master, and thus provide assistance wherever possible. My concern with getting the survey completed and as accurate as possible stems from the fact we ordered the survey, allowed extensions and still do not have the information we want. IDWR has asked for an updated survey since the early 1980's. I am frequently contacted by other users about the status of the survey. I am tired of the questions and continued correspondence over this subject. We might be wise to spend a little time now to get this matter behind us. Since other users in the drainage see a benefit to a completed survey, then maybe we can justify the additional work under water district assistance program, or other broader Department program.

*Limit survey to the data needed to
continue their study.*