

# North Jordan Irrigation Co. RECEIVED

January 28, 1992

4788 Hidden Cove  
Taylorsville, Utah 84123  
261-3166

31 JAN 29 1992

Mr. Robert L. Morgan  
Utah State Engineer  
1636 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

WATER DIVISION  
SALT LAKE

RE: Draft Utah Lake Drainage Basin Distribution Proposal

Dear Mr. Morgan:

North Jordan Irrigation Company ("North Jordan") submits the following comments with respect to the October 15, 1991 draft distribution proposal for the Utah Lake Drainage Basin. North Jordan supports the concept of a more fully integrated distribution program for the Utah Lake Drainage Basin. However, any such proposal must protect established rights in Utah Lake and the Jordan River. In this regard, North Jordan has some concerns and questions resulting from the current draft proposal:

- 1) There is somewhat of an inconsistency between Table 1 on page 8 and the tabulation which sets forth storage rights greater than or equal to 100 AF. Table 1 shows North Jordan as a primary storage right for the irrigation of 1,069.99 acres with an annual supply of 5,350 AF of water. Whereas, the tabulation only shows a flow of 27.54 cfs and a footnote reference that the acre-foot value of this right is being evaluated by the State Engineer. The footnote comment seems to be unnecessary and tends to give the impression that Table 1 is in error.
- 2) It is difficult at this time to forecast the precise impact of the draft distribution proposal on the regiment of Utah Lake and the Jordan River. This is so because the draft proposal will, to some degree, alter the manner in which the water has been historically managed through the various reservoirs on the system. Also, the operation of the Jordanelle Reservoir, once it is completed, will introduce an additional factor into the overall management of this system. Consequently, if a new distribution plan is implemented, it should be done on an interim or trial basis and should be without prejudice to the respective rights of the water users. This should be coupled with an annual meeting and report of the State Engineer which reviews the operation of the system for the previous year.
- 3) Any distribution proposal that is implemented should reaffirm that it is not an adjudication of the individual rights of the parties and that any such adjudication will occur within the framework of the pending statutory adjudication. Further, it should be made clear that this is not a proceeding under either the Utah Administrative Procedures Act or under the Utah Rule-Making Act.

Very truly yours,



K. L. Hansen  
President