Pursuant to notice mailed to all water users a meeting of the water users of Utah Lake was held at 11 A. M. Friday, June 3, 1932, in room 303 at the State Capitol.

The State Engineer called the meeting to order, explained its purpose, stated briefly the requirements of the law with relation to the appointment of a water commissioner, and outlined the proceeding and action of such meetings.

Mr. Bacon said for the purpose of this meeting he had taken the records of the last five years and was allowing each of the water users what might be called a proportionate vote out of this total according to their five year average use of the water. He said the law provided that the salary and compensation of the commissioner shall be paid pro rata according to established rights and that voting should be on that basis.

Mr. Bacon said this was the firstmeeting, of its kind, to be held by Utah Lake users and the general practice in such meetings was to choose a chairman.

It was moved and seconded that Mr. Beers be chairman.

It was moved and seconded that Mr. Bacon be chairman.

Mr. Beers said he thought Mr. Bacon was the proper person to be chairman and, with the consent of the two gentlemen who had moved and seconded, it was carried unanimously that Mr. Bacon be chairman.

After some discussion it was moved by Mr. Beers, that Mr. Knight be retained as commissioner for this season; seconded. Other nominations being called for it was moved, seconded, and carried, that nominations close.

Mr. Bacon said following out the practice on other systems voting was to be done by companies, this vote being rated according to the draft on the lake.

Mr. Beers asked if he was correct in his understanding that the assessments would be based on the draft that each company receives.

Mr. Bacon said for the purpose of voting he was taking the water users who had made actual draft of the lake the last five years and that recommendations would be based on the average acre feet received, as follows:

Utah Copper Co.	55,290.
Provo Reservoir	4,650.
Draper Irr. Co.	8,460.
Utah Lake Dist.	31,780.
Utah & Salt Lake	68,716.
East Jordan	43,870.
Salt Lake City	22,890.
South Jordan	36,410.
Utah-Idaho	1,610.
North Jordan	16,100
	289,770.

Mr. Beers said he understood that if the Utah Copper Company did not receive any water this year they would not pay any of the commissioner's expense.

Mr. Bacon said that the present assumption was merely for the purpose of voting.

The roll was then called with the following results:-

Voting yes, Salt Lake City, South Jordan, North Jordan; voting no, Provo Reservoir Co., Draper Irr. Co., Utah Lake Distributing Co., East Jordan, Utah and Salt Lake Canal Company; not represented, Utah Copper Company and Utah-Idaho Sugar Company.

The matter of compensation was then taken up and it was duly moved and seconded that the compensation be the same as last year, namely, $250 per month, to include all expense.

Mr. Beers spoke in favor of the leaving the fixing of the compensation to the State Engineer, pointing out that when Mr. Knight was commissioner part of his compensation came from supervision of the pumping plant and that if someone else was appointed commissioner the compensation would be far too low.

Mr. Bacon said that the commissioner on the Weber, Ogden and Sevier Systems received considerably more than Mr. Knight. He said that the work on Utah Lake was going to be a difficult and hard job this year.

Mr. Beers moved that the matter of fixing the salary be left in the hands of the State Engineer. No second.

Mr. Allen said it was necessary to keep expenses down and they were not in a position to pay a higher salary.

Mr. Bacon said there was nothing personal in his view, that he was simply citing conditions on the various streams.

Roll of companies being called resulted as follows:

Voting yes, Draper Irrigation Co., Utah & Salt Lake Canal

Co., East Jordan Canal Co., South Jordan Canal Co.; voting no, Salt Lake City and North Jordan Canal Co. Not voting, Provo Reservoir Co. and Utah Lake Distributing Co..

Mr. Bacon said the law did not make binding on the State Engineer the recommendations as to assessment. He said the situation on Utah Lake was very peroulier in that the established rights technically and legally amounted to somewhere in the neighborhood of one million acre feet; that the past five years showed a draft of 289,000 acre feet. He thought that the assessments this coming year should be pro rated according to the available draft.

Mr. Beers said about the only thing to do was to pro rate according to the acre feet.

Mr. Bacon said that the four main streams of the state were run on the acre foot delivery basis which was much the fairest.

Moved by Mr. Beers that each canal company be assessed on the acre foot basis average of the past five years. Seconded.

Mr. Evans said the Utah Lake Distributing Company had contended all the time that they should not be assessed as much as they were; that all reports could be furnished to the commissioner and he would be asked to do no work whatever in connection with that company. He said they were willing to pay part of what they had been assessed in the past but protested the full amount.

Mr. Bacon said the same thing came up from time to time relating to pro rate and service rendered. He said there was absolutely no way of determining the amount of service rendered ahead of time and that the assessments must be made at the first of the season; that the fellow who pays the least usually gets the most service. He also said that the law was quite definite in that it called for the pro rating of compensation and expense on the basis of established rights.

Roll of companies being called resulted as follows:-

Voting yes, Provo Reservoir Co., Draper Irr. Co., Utah and Salt Lake Canal Co., East Jordan, South Jordan Canal Co., North Jordan Canal Co., Salt Lake City; voting no, Utah Lake Distributing Company.

Mr. Beers said if Mr. Evans was allowed to vote for the commissioner and have something to say about the management of the lake system he ought to be willing to pay his share; that the distribution of the lake was just as vital to Mr. Evan's Company as to any other.

Mr. Rasmussen said he did not object to paying on acre foot basis but did object to established right payment basis.

Mr. Bacon said that covered the formal business of the meeting.

Mr. Rasmussen asked about the duties the commissioner was to perform and Mr. Bacon said they were defined by law.

In answer to a question Mr. Bacon said that priorities governed absolutely.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

6/3/32

Geo. M. Bacon
State Engineer.