



Utah Department of **NATURAL RESOURCES**

WATER RESOURCES

Water Resources Conservation and Development Fund:

1. What is the purpose of this loan program? Why was a sales tax earmark designated as a source of revenue?

Through the revolving Conservation and Development Fund, the Board of Water Resources (Board) helps local water suppliers finance the construction of water projects throughout the state. These projects put the state's water to beneficial use for people, agriculture, and businesses to maintain standards of living and build local economies. All of these funds are repaid by local water users.

To provide consistent additional funding for the growing needs for water projects and to allow projects to be built when they are needed.

2. What is the current balance of the fund?

\$51,023,000 (of this balance \$31,226,000 has been committed to projects, leaving a working balance of \$19,797,000).

Total funds available in the Conservation and Development Fund (C&D Fund) notably increase in the winter and spring of each year. This is due to:

- a. Sales tax receipts increase as the \$17.5 million cap is reached and the bulk of the additional tax receipts come to the C&D Fund, per statute.*
- b. No or very few construction activities occur in the winter and spring, and fewer funds are distributed during this time, with minimal expenditures drawn from the C&D Fund.*
- c. Repayment of funds from the loans continue come in year-round, but more come in during the winter.*
- d. Lake Powell Pipeline and Bear River funds are also in this balance.*

3. What is the current number of outstanding loans?

The current number of C&D loans is 125.

4. What is the current total balance owing on all outstanding loans?

The total balance on all outstanding C&D loans is \$255.73 million.

5. Who are the recipients of the loans?

The recipients of these loans include water conservancy districts, irrigation companies, private water companies, and cities. The Board may also make loans to Indian Tribes, but has not yet. See the attached Table 1, which lists the recipients of currently outstanding loans.



6. What are the usual terms of the loans? Are loans being paid according to terms?

There is typically an 85-15% cost sharing between the Board and the project sponsor. A twenty year repayment is the target maximum; however, depending on sponsor circumstances the loan repayment term may be extended. Interest rate guidelines for the C&D Fund are as follows, and are blended for multiple use projects:

0% for public purpose projects

1% for agriculture projects

3% for municipal projects

7% for industrial projects

Yes. On occasion the Board has agreed to modify loan terms on a temporary or permanent basis to help sponsors through difficult situations. The Board has only had one default in 68 years and over 1,400 loans.

7. For FY 2015 (to date), FY 2014 and FY 2013, what is the total number of loans granted and the total dollar amount of all loans granted. Please also provide a brief description of each loan, including the recipient, amount of loan, terms, and the project funded by the loan.

<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
7 projects	8 projects	6 projects
\$13.8 M	\$11.3 M	\$18.8 M

See Table 2

The attached Table 2 includes a list of all the of the loans, including recipient, amount of loan, interest rate, loan repayment, and total loan amount for FY 2013, 2014, and 2015.

8. Are the proceeds of these loans ever used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness?

No.

9. Do you have any recommendations for changes or improvements to this loan program?

No changes are recommended

10. Do you have any other information that would help the TRC in reviewing this loan program?

Table 3 lists:

16 projects that are presently committed for \$31.2M

12 projects that have been authorized by the Board for \$65.2M

26 projects that are active totaling \$183.9M.

The authorized and active projects are in line for funding in the future.

The availability of funds is critical to allow these projects to move forward.

WATER RIGHTS

Resource Development Fund created in Section 59-12-103(4)(d)

(d) (i) For a fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2003, 1% of the amount described in Subsection (4)(a) shall be transferred each year as dedicated credits to the Division of Water Rights to cover the costs incurred in hiring legal and technical staff for the adjudication of water rights.

1. What is the purpose of these expenditures? Why was a sales tax earmark designated as a source of revenue?

The Division of Water Rights is responsible to participate in general water right adjudications described in Utah Code Chapter 73-4. Section 73-4-20 instructs the state engineer to pay all costs of determinations with money appropriated to the office and deposit monies for that purpose in an adjudication fund which does not revert to the general fund. The water right adjudication process brings order and certainty to the record of water rights in the state through district court decrees affirming and clarifying all water rights in the general adjudication boundary. The goal is to have an accurate record of all water rights. A lack of resources is delaying general adjudications. As progress on adjudications is delayed, administration of water rights is complicated by uncertainty. Economic growth and new development is stymied by uncertainty and delay as water is sought for new uses. Currently 13 general adjudications are under way statewide. Some of those proceedings have been under way for over 60 years.

Although we do not claim to understand the motivations for legislative appropriation decisions our understanding is the legislature concluded some of the sales tax revenue was established on the basis of a need to fund flooding issues and that after that need subsided a decision was made to tie water related needs to that sales tax revenue rather than roll back the sales tax increase. General adjudication funding has been insufficient so it was targeted as a specific use of that money.

2. For FY 2015 (to date), FY 2014, and FY 2013, what is the total dollar amount of expenditures and the purpose of each expenditure?

FY2015 \$175,000 to pay costs of one attorney and one technical staff

FY2014 \$175,000 to pay costs of one attorney and one technical staff

FY2013 \$175,000 to pay costs of one attorney and one technical staff

3. Are these expenditures ever used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness? If so, what are the terms for repayment of the bonded indebtedness?

No.

4. Do you have any recommendations for changes or improvements to this expenditure program?

The funding need for adjudication remains. Whether it is funded from sales tax revenue or general funds is not an agency concern as long as funding continues.

5. Do you have any other information that would help TRC in reviewing this expenditure program?

SENSITIVE SPECIES

Utah Code 59-12-103(4)(b)(i)(A)and(B)

(b) (i) For a fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2003, 14% of the amount described in Subsection (4)(a) shall be transferred each year as dedicated credits to the Department of Natural Resources to:

(A) implement the measures described in Subsections 79-2-303(3)(a) through (d) to protect sensitive plant and animal species; or

(B) award grants, up to the amount authorized by the Legislature in an appropriations act, to political subdivisions of the state to implement the measures described in Subsections 80-2-303(3)(a) through (d) to protect sensitive plant and animal species.

(ii) Money transferred to the Department of Natural Resources under Subsection (4)(b)(i) may not be used to assist the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or any other person to list or attempt to have listed a species as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1531 et seq.

1. What is the purpose of this grant program? Why was a sales tax earmark designated as a source of revenue?

The purpose of these funds is to serve as a species protection account “to protect any plant or animal species identified as sensitive by the state or as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA]” by providing funding to facilitate the conservation of sensitive species and their habitats in need of protection. The primary objective is to direct funds towards the protection of federally listed and state sensitive species, to promote their recovery and conservation thereby making progress toward down-listing or de-listing federally listed species and precluding the need for listing additional species under the ESA.

The sales tax earmark was designated as the revenue source because of the need to fund the state’s contribution to three endangered fish recovery programs: 1) the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program; 2) the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program; and, 3) the Virgin River Resource Management and Recovery Program. Each of these multi-partner efforts operate under the dual goals of recovering the targeted federally listed species while allowing for continued water use and development. As long as sufficient progress is being made toward recovery, water use and development can continue uninhibited by potential restrictions and federal oversight associated with the Endangered Species Act.

2. Who are the recipients of these grants?

Grant recipients are, by law, political subdivisions of the State and include counties and local communities, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and other entities that implement activities to recover federally listed species or implement conservation actions in an effort to prevent federal listing.

3. For FY2015 (to date), FY2014, and FY2013, what is the total number of grants awarded and the total dollar amount of all grants awarded? Please also provide a brief description of each grant, including the recipient, amount of grant, terms, and the project funded by the grant.

FY 2015 - \$2,450,000.00

Project Expenditure	Purpose	Amount
Utah Participation in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fishes Recovery Implementation Program	Recovery	\$147,125.00
June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program	Recovery	\$300,000.00
Virgin River Resources Management and Recovery Program	Recovery	\$730,000.00
Utah Lake Carp Removal	Recovery	\$500,000.00
Utah Prairie Dog Recovery Efforts	Recovery	\$301,372.00
Washington County HCP/Desert Tortoise Recovery Implementation	Recovery	\$50,000.00

Implementation of the Utah Wildlife Action Plan	Listing Prevention	\$421,503.00
Total		\$2,450,000.00

FY 2014 - \$2,450,000.00

Project Expenditure	Purpose	Amount
Utah Participation in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fishes Recovery Implementation Program	Recovery	\$146,058.00
June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program	Recovery	\$300,000.00
Virgin River Resources Management and Recovery Program	Recovery	\$730,000.00
Utah Prairie Dog Recovery Efforts	Recovery	\$365,372.00
Washington County HCP/Desert Tortoise Recovery Implementation	Recovery	\$150,000.00
Least Chub Conservation and Habitat Monitoring	Listing Prevention	\$74,685.00
Implementation of the Utah Wildlife Action Plan	Listing Prevention	\$683,912.00
Total		\$2,450,000.00

FY 2013 - \$2,450,000.00

Project Expenditure	Purpose	Amount
Utah Participation in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fishes Recovery Implementation Program	Recovery	\$144,171.00
June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program		\$300,000.00
Virgin River Resources Management and Recovery Program	Recovery	\$730,000.00
Utah Lake Carp Removal	Recovery	\$500,000.00
Utah Prairie Dog Recovery Efforts	Recovery	\$245,372.00
Washington County HCP/Desert Tortoise Recovery Implementation	Recovery	\$50,000.00
Implementation of the Utah Wildlife Action Plan	Listing Prevention	\$480,457.00
Total		\$2,450,000.00

4. Are the proceeds of these grants ever used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness? If so, what are the terms for repayment of the bonded indebtedness?

No, these expenditures are not used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness.

5. Do you have any recommendations for changes or improvements to this grant program?

6. Do you have any other information that would help the TRC in reviewing this grant program?

Section 4 of the ESA requires the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service base listing decisions on the best scientific and commercial data available after taking into account efforts being made by any State to protect the species. The primary source of funding for proactive conservation to prevent listing in Utah comes through this fund. From 2010 to 2014, Utah species accounted for 25 percent of those the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found precluded from listing due to efforts funded through this program. Funding through this program often supplies the required state/local match for federal grant programs (i.e. State Wildlife Grants, Lands Acquisition Grants, etc.). Accomplishment reports are required for each project that receives funding through the program. Specific reports can be made available to help TRC in their review of this program if that would be helpful.

WATERSHED PROGRAM

Utah Code 59-12-103 (5)

(5) (a) Notwithstanding Subsection (3)(a), for a fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2006, the difference between the following amounts shall be expended as provided in this Subsection (5), if that difference is greater than \$1:

(i) for taxes listed under Subsection (3)(a), the amount of tax revenue generated for the fiscal year by a 1/16% tax rate on the transactions described in Subsection (1); and

(ii) \$17,500,000.

(b) (i) The first \$500,000 of the difference described in Subsection (5)(a) shall be:

(A) transferred each fiscal year to the Department of Natural Resources as dedicated credits; and

(B) expended by the Department of Natural Resources for watershed rehabilitation or restoration.

1. What is the purpose of these expenditures? Why was a sales tax earmark designated as a source of revenue?

The primary purposes of these expenditures is to improve water yield to Utah rivers and streams, to provide habitat restoration to assist in the delisting of sensitive or endangered plant and animal species so Utah water infrastructure can be developed and maintained. The primary reason the sales tax earmark was designated is to ensure a constant source of funding to develop and maintain water infrastructure in Utah for future growth of the state.

2. For FY2015 (to date), FY2014 and FY2013, what is the total dollar amount of expenditures and the purpose of each expenditure?

Department of Natural Resources Watershed Expenditures

	Forecast		
	FY 2015	FY 2014	FY 2013
Watershed Expenditures	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000

The purposes of these expenditures were to improve water yield, habitat restoration for delisting of sensitive and endangered plants and animal species, to reduce fire suppression costs and to provide opportunity for water infrastructure development in Utah.

3. Are these expenditures ever used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness? If so, what are the terms for repayment of the bonded indebtedness?

No

4. Do you have any recommendations for changes or improvements to this expenditure program?

The program is working very effectively in achieving the initial objectives set forth by the legislature.

5. Do you have any other information that would help the TRC in reviewing this expenditure program?

This program is matched by contributions from 16 different partners. In addition to improving water yield, delisting of sensitive or endangered plant and animal species, these expenditures benefit the reduction in fire suppression costs catastrophic fires. The watershed projects have proven effective in establishing fire breaks thus saving hundreds of millions of dollars in fire suppression costs and in preventing property damage and destruction.

WATER RESOURCES 59-12-103 (5)

(5) (a) Notwithstanding Subsection (3)(a), for a fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2006, the difference between the following amounts shall be expended as provided in this Subsection (5), if that difference is greater than \$1:

(i) for taxes listed under Subsection (3)(a), the amount of tax revenue generated for the fiscal year by a 1/16% tax rate on the transactions described in Subsection (1); and

(ii) \$17,500,000.

(b) (i) The first \$500,000 of the difference described in Subsection (5)(a) shall be:

(A) transferred each fiscal year to the Department of Natural Resources as dedicated credits; and

(B) expended by the Department of Natural Resources for watershed rehabilitation or restoration.

(ii) At the end of each fiscal year, 100% of any unexpended dedicated credits described in Subsection (5)(b)(i) shall lapse to the Water Resources Conservation and Development Fund created in Section 73-10-24.

(c) (i) After making the transfer required by Subsection (5)(b)(i), \$150,000 of the remaining difference described in Subsection (5)(a) shall be:

(A) transferred each fiscal year to the Division of Water Resources as dedicated credits; and

(B) expended by the Division of Water Resources for cloud-seeding projects authorized by Title 73, Chapter 15, Modification of Weather.

(ii) At the end of each fiscal year, 100% of any unexpended dedicated credits described in Subsection (5)(c)(i) shall lapse to the Water Resources Conservation and Development Fund created in Section 73-10-24.

(d) After making the transfers required by Subsections (5)(b) and (c), 94% of the remaining difference described in Subsection (5)(a) shall be deposited into the Water Resources Conservation and Development Fund created in Section 73-10-24 for use by the Division of Water Resources for:

(i) pre-construction costs:

(A) as defined in Subsection 73-26-103(6) for projects authorized by Title 73, Chapter 26, Bear River Development Act; and

(B) as defined in Subsection 73-28-103(8) for the Lake Powell Pipeline project authorized by Title 73, Chapter 28, Lake Powell Pipeline Development Act;

(ii) the cost of employing a civil engineer to oversee any project authorized by Title 73, Chapter 26, Bear River Development Act;

(iii) the cost of employing a civil engineer to oversee the Lake Powell Pipeline project authorized by Title 73, Chapter 28, Lake Powell Pipeline Development Act; and

(iv) other uses authorized under Sections 73-10-24, 73-10-25.1, 73-10-30, and Subsection (4)(e)(ii) after funding the uses specified in Subsections (5)(d)(i) through (iii).

(e) After making the transfers required by Subsections (5)(b) and (c) and subject to Subsection (5)(f), 6% of the remaining difference described in Subsection (5)(a) shall be transferred each year as dedicated credits to the Division of Water Rights to cover the costs incurred for employing additional technical staff for the administration of water rights.

(f) At the end of each fiscal year, any unexpended dedicated credits described in Subsection (5)(e) over \$150,000 lapse to the Water Resources Conservation and Development Fund created in Section 73-10-24.

For **Cloud Seeding** the following responses are presented:

1. What is the purpose of these expenditures? Why was a sales tax earmark designated as a source of revenue?

This money is cost shared (50/50) with local sponsors to augment the water supply in Utah. In 2010 it translated to a statewide increase of 182,000 acre-feet of additional water supplies that help to fill reservoirs, soil moisture, recharge groundwater aquifers and lessen the impact of drought. The legislature added this funding in 2007 to assist water providers in augmenting their water supplies.

2. For FY2015 (to date), FY2014 and FY2013, what is the total dollar amount of expenditures and the purpose of each expenditure?

FY15 - \$150,000

FY14 - \$150,000

FY13 - \$150,000

3. Are these expenditures ever used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness? If so, what are the terms for repayment of the bonded indebtedness?

No

4. Do you have any recommendations for changes or improvements to this expenditure program?

No changes are recommended.

5. Do you have any other information that would help the TRC in reviewing this expenditure program?

This is a good program that matches local funds with state funds to improve the State's water supply. The cost of water developed by Cloud Seeding is estimated to be \$2.30 per acre-foot. The cost of most new water development projects is greater than \$300 per acre-foot.

For the **Lake Powell Pipeline Development and Bear Development Act**, the following responses are presented:

1. What is the purpose of these expenditures? Why was a sales tax earmark designated as a source of revenue?

The purpose of the expenditures is to provide funding for the planning, design and construction of both projects as mandated by the legislature. These projects will help meet the water supply needs of the state in the future (2025 Lake Powell Pipeline and 2040 Bear River Project) with the expected doubling of the state's population per the latest GOMB projections.

2. For FY2015 (to date), FY2014 and FY2013, what is the total dollar amount of expenditures and the purpose of the expenditure?

Lake Powell Pipeline and Bear River Project

2013	\$1.10 M
2014	\$1.10 M
2015	\$1.13 M (to date)

The Lake Powell Pipeline work has included preliminary design, environmental archeological studies, licensing, permitting and agreements

The Bear River Project work has included planning studies to formulate most favorable aspect of the project including dam sites and pipeline alignments

3. Are these expenditures ever used to service a bond or other form of indebtedness? If so, what are the terms for repayment of the bonded indebtedness?

No.

4. Do you have any recommendations for changes or improvements to this expenditure program?

No changes are recommended

5. Do you have any other information that would help the TRC in reviewing this expenditure program?

The anticipated costs for the Lake Powell Pipeline is \$1B and for the Bear River Project \$1.5B. For your information, please see the Figure 1 noting the distribution of the 1/16 Cent Sales Tax for Water

TABLE 1

Loan #	Fund	Close date	Recipient	Principal balance	Scheduled payment amount
RE1450	5276	01-Sep-06	ASHLEY VALLEY RESERVOIR COMPAN	1,962,858.52	71,000.00
RD9940	5275	30-Jun-99	AXTELL SPECIAL SERVICES DISTRI	51,239.43	12,000.00
RD7380R	5275	17-Sep-08	BEAR RIVER WATER CD/BOX ELDER	542,000.00	41,000.00
RL5120R	5275	02-Feb-10	BEAVER CITY	272,000.00	87,000.00
RE245	5275	18-Dec-08	BELL CANYON IRRIGATION CO	63,743.58	66,000.00
RD7630	5275	29-Sep-92	BENSON CULINARY WATER IMPROV D	13,000.00	10,000.00
RL560RA	5276	10-Dec-08	BRIGHAM CITY	5,111,323.77	172,000.00
RL560RB	5276	10-Dec-08	BRIGHAM CITY	6,862,000.00	346,000.00
RE269A	5275	19-Nov-12	CACHE HIGHLINE WATER ASSOC.	2,462,989.05	121,600.00
RE0200	5275	02-Sep-05	CENTER CREEK WATER SYSTEM	789,690.12	23,000.00
RD889A	5275	29-Jun-98	CENTRAL UTAH WATER CONSERVANCY	840,000.00	130,000.00
RE205	5275	24-Feb-10	CENTRAL UTAH WATER CONSERVANCY	15,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
RE325	5275	17-Mar-14	COTTONWOOD CREEK CONSOLIDATED	971,495.95	171,000.00
RE339	5275	01-Jul-14	CUB RIVER IRRIGATION COMPANY	2,505,911.83	148,300.00
RE301	5275	14-Aug-12	CUB RIVER IRRIGATION COMPANY	1,939,236.98	104,500.00
RE173	5276	11-Dec-06	CUB RIVER IRRIGATION COMPANY	1,030,201.77	62,500.00
RE233	5276	20-Nov-08	CUB RIVER IRRIGATION COMPANY	1,265,223.69	76,000.00
RE286	5275	26-Apr-11	DAMMERON VALLEY WATER WORKS	228,868.43	50,000.00
RE123R7	5275	28-Jan-10	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	2,700,332.61	145,300.00
RE123R5	5275	07-Dec-06	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	1,801,405.53	117,000.00
RE0160	5275	10-Feb-00	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	1,865,616.51	166,000.00
RD6740	5276	05-Oct-89	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	8,300,000.00	720,000.00
RE215	5276	24-Oct-07	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	1,522,410.86	437,700.00
RE0350	5276	31-Oct-00	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	733,924.47	56,200.00
RD9270	5276	31-Dec-96	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	2,038,651.14	555,000.00
RE1680	5276	04-Apr-05	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	3,655,207.54	215,000.00
RE123R6	5276	06-Nov-08	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	2,812,305.66	155,000.00
RE035A	5276	26-Oct-01	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	1,736,443.50	133,600.00
RD7920	5276	20-Dec-91	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	4,884,000.00	371,739.00
RE1230	5276	08-Jan-04	DAVIS & WEBER CO CANAL CO	3,687,742.32	250,100.00
RE285	5275	30-Apr-12	DRY GULCH IRRIGATION COMPANY	3,495,843.43	71,000.00

RE302	5275	20-Mar-13	DRY GULCH IRRIGATION COMPANY	781,086.60	37,000.00
RD7490	5276	12-Aug-92	DUCHESNE COUNTY UPPER COUNTRY	96,000.00	48,000.00
RD749A	5276	29-Dec-97	DUCHESNE COUNTY UPPER COUNTRY	808,000.00	48,000.00
RL4990	5276	27-Jun-07	EAST CARBON CITY	1,238,166.69	53,833.33
RD8890	5276	30-Jun-99	EAST JUAB COUNTY WCD	1,678,541.69	71,000.00
RL5450	5275	07-Apr-03	ELSINORE TOWN	345,850.41	21,000.00
RE196	5276	20-Oct-06	EMIGRATION IMPROVEMENT DIST	2,462,000.00	71,000.00
RL5240	5276	20-Jan-00	ENTERPRISE CITY	850,000.00	69,000.00
RK2030	5275	04-Oct-80	ENTERPRISE RESERVOIR & CANAL	366,375.03	12,874.00
RN2360A	5276	05-Aug-82	ENTERPRISE RESERVOIR & CANAL	521,037.58	104,150.00
RE0610	5275	01-Jun-05	EPHRAIM IRRIGATION CO	1,522,579.12	40,000.00
RE1620	5275	04-Mar-05	FERRON CANAL & RESERVOIR CO	436,351.79	43,100.00
RD9420	5276	22-Jan-02	FERRON CANAL & RESERVOIR CO	769,611.20	83,500.00
RE220	5275	22-Oct-08	GARFIELD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRIC	377,761.37	28,000.00
TABLE 1 CONTINUED					
RB204C	5275	18-Jun-82	GRAND COUNTY SS WATER DIST	26,000.00	13,000.00
RE266	5275	18-Mar-10	GRAND COUNTY WCD	191,618.27	1,000.00
RB204A	5276	16-Aug-79	GRAND COUNTY WCD	490,309.49	205,200.00
RN2220	5276	18-Oct-83	GRANTSVILLE IRRIGATION COMPANY	7,329,825.71	380,000.00
RE0880	5275	28-Apr-06	GUNNISON CITY	747,000.00	32,000.00
RE346	5275	07-Apr-14	GUNNISON IRRIGATION CO	665,462.87	54,600.00
RE350	5275	24-Nov-14	GUNNISON IRRIGATION CO	466,794.85	41,600.00
RD9870	5275	14-Jun-99	GUNNISON IRRIGATION CO	511,789.01	81,000.00
RE0600	5275	01-May-03	HOOPER IRRIGATION COMPANY	4,949,662.81	277,000.00
RE311	5275	02-Aug-12	HOOPER IRRIGATION COMPANY	242,515.95	21,800.00
RE238	5276	17-Feb-09	HOOPER IRRIGATION COMPANY	5,055,407.82	152,700.00
RK2080	5275	11-Apr-81	HORSESHOE IRRIGATION COMPANY	31,023.15	17,959.87
RE211	5276	29-Jan-07	HUNTINGTON-CLEVELAND IRRIGATIO	2,174,192.15	200,925.00
RE306	5275	15-Jan-13	HUNTSVILLE IRRIGATION COMPANY	2,473,363.26	95,000.00
RE143	5276	09-May-07	HUNTSVILLE SO BENCH CANAL CO	971,684.86	49,900.00
RL4740	5275	18-Aug-92	HURRICANE CITY	62,450.00	20,000.00
RL4740A	5275	18-Aug-92	HURRICANE CITY	55,550.00	17,000.00
RE267	5276	24-Feb-10	JORDAN VALLEY WATER CONSERV	3,096,000.00	126,000.00
RN2370	5275	01-Feb-83	KANAB IRRIGATION COMPANY	238,607.39	36,150.00

RE276R	5275	20-Dec-11	KANE COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY	3,969,000.00	79,000.00
RE268	5275	16-Mar-10	KAYS CREEK IRRIGATION CO	740,736.22	65,000.00
RL5320	5275	01-Feb-00	LAVERKIN CITY INC	271,000.00	29,000.00
RE1320	5276	29-Jul-05	LEEDS WATER COMPANY	939,932.69	42,346.27
RE314	5275	09-Aug-12	LEVAN IRRIGATION CO	578,891.75	34,000.00
RE190	5275	07-Aug-07	MAGNA WATER COMPANY AN IMPROV	5,921,000.00	207,000.00
RE0680	5276	23-May-03	MAGNA WATER COMPANY AN IMPROV	685,679.00	53,400.00
RD9330	5275	29-Oct-98	MANTI IRRIGATION & RESERVOIR C	306,976.50	60,000.00
RE348	5275	24-Nov-14	MCARTHUR FRANSDEN DITCH CO	474,826.26	31,800.00
RL5030	5275	22-Aug-95	MILFORD CITY	39,000.00	39,000.00
RL5100	5275	14-Jul-97	MILLVILLE CITY	328,000.00	100,086.97
RL5090	5275	16-Dec-97	MONTICELLO CITY	180,000.00	21,000.00
RB2060	5275	06-Feb-80	MOON LAKE WATER USERS ASSOCIAT	1,294,662.92	103,150.00
RE0310	5276	27-Mar-02	MORGAN SECONDARY WATER ASSOC.	1,998,106.62	88,000.00
RE231	5275	12-Mar-13	MORONI IRRIGATION COMPANY	2,321,842.73	95,505.00
RE284	5275	10-Oct-13	MOUNTAIN GREEN SECONDARY WATER	463,085.69	120,000.00
RE248	5275	16-Mar-10	MUDDY CREEK IRRIGATION COMPANY	513,015.69	23,000.00
RN2260	5275	27-Nov-81	NEW ESCALANTE IRRIGATION CO	717,907.52	107,000.00
RE297	5275	16-Sep-14	NO SUMMIT PRESSURIZED IRR CO	3,861,456.57	151,600.00
RE0070	5276	15-Aug-00	NORDIC MOUNTAIN WATER; INC.	1,351,351.61	81,688.00
RE323	5275	20-Mar-13	NORTH OGDEN IRRIGATION COMPANY	883,000.00	57,300.00
RB2070	5275	09-Jun-80	OURAY IRRIGATION COMPANY	1,155,861.59	92,063.78
RC047	5275	12-May-14	OURAY IRRIGATION COMPANY	261,943.01	5,500.00
RE305	5275	20-Dec-12	OURAY PARK IRRIGATION COMPANY	1,083,755.60	15,000.00
RE319	5275	17-Dec-14	PAROWAN CITY	3,464,000.00	92,000.00
RE254	5275	24-Aug-09	PINE VALLEY IRRIGATION CO	321,455.76	111,700.00
RL5400	5276	17-Jan-03	PRICE CITY	1,747,000.00	113,000.00
RE177B	5276	19-Feb-10	PROVO RESERVOIR WATER USERS CO	22,742,000.00	657,000.00
RE177A	5275	19-Feb-10	PROVO RIVER WATER USERS ASSN.	24,882,000.00	603,000.00
RD9770	5276	30-Mar-00	RIVERTON CITY	390,000.00	78,000.00
RE199	5276	17-Apr-07	SALEM CITY	6,313,742.17	69,000.00
TABLE 1 CONTINUED					
RN2180	5276	06-Jun-84	SAN JUAN WATER CONSERVANCY DIS	2,678,881.72	170,000.00
RB205A	5276	24-Nov-81	SAN JUAN WATER CONSERVANCY DIS	2,182,191.83	284,235.00

RE240	5275	01-Jul-14	SETTLEMENT CANYON IRRIGATION C	709,992.21	60,500.00
RD9400	5275	11-Jun-97	SOUTH RIDGE MUTUAL WATER CO	116,638.73	34,280.00
RE208	5276	18-Dec-07	SOUTH WEBER IRRIGATION CO.	1,283,121.21	42,000.00
RE1180	5275	07-Jun-04	SPRINGDALE TOWN	710,000.00	68,000.00
RE1290	5276	22-Nov-05	ST GEORGE & WASH CANAL CO	7,444,176.89	251,309.46
RD8840	5275	12-Apr-96	STRAWBERRY HIGH LINE CANAL CO	24,065.74	5,300.00
RE308	5275	16-Jul-12	SUMMIT CREEK IRRIGATION & CANA	794,981.52	27,700.00
RD7760	5276	28-Jan-02	SUMMIT WATER DISTRIBUTION CO	474,190.71	284,000.00
RE0800	5276	03-Apr-03	TOOELE COUNTY	226,000.00	44,000.00
RE1610	5275	22-Apr-05	TROPIC & EAST FORK IRRIGATION	146,389.98	11,000.00
RE1040	5275	30-Mar-04	TROPIC & EAST FORK IRRIGATION	408,336.76	29,000.00
RD8730	5276	15-Feb-96	TWIN CREEKS SPECIAL SERVICE DI	1,442,890.00	70,000.00
RE212	5276	26-Aug-09	UINTAH WATER CONSERVANCY DIST	4,434,000.00	4,000.00
RE036	5276	14-Apr-08	UINTAH WATER CONSERVANCY DIST	946,000.00	41,000.00
RD6630	5275	26-Jun-00	WASHINGTON COUNTY WCD	6,000,000.00	1,500,000.00
RD9250	5276	11-May-04	WASHINGTON COUNTY WCD	1,381,000.00	80,000.00
RE225R2	5275	28-Jan-13	WEBER BASIN WATER CONSRV DIST	1,126,000.00	37,000.00
RE225	5276	06-Sep-07	WEBER BASIN WATER CONSRV DIST	4,565,000.00	180,000.00
RD9530	5276	01-Apr-99	WEBER-BOX ELDER CONSERVATION D	1,106,024.56	149,000.00
RE0180	5276	17-May-00	WEBER-BOX ELDER CONSERVATION D	955,000.00	480,000.00
RD9020A	5275	16-May-00	WELLINGTON CITY	245,000.00	13,000.00
RD9020AA	5275	02-Mar-00	WELLINGTON CITY	400,000.00	0.00
RD9020	5276	12-May-99	WELLINGTON CITY	494,670.70	95,000.00
RE338	5275	30-Apr-14	WELLSVILLE-MENDON CONSERVATION	159,000.00	12,000.00
RE1950	5275	10-Apr-07	WELLSVILLE-MENDON CONSERVATION	18,488.00	11,250.87
RE335	5275	26-Aug-14	WESTFIELD IRRIGATION COMPANY	727,686.60	48,600.00
RE1490	5275	28-Jan-05	WILLOW CREEK IRRIGATION CO	778,085.80	46,700.00
RD9610	5275	11-Jun-98	WOODLAND SOUTH HILLS IRRIGATIO	376,889.31	51,200.00

125

Totals 255,734,217.93 18,194,046.55

TABLE 2

PROJECTS COMMITTED FY 13,14,15		AGREEMENT	May 7, 2015 BOARD ACTION INTEREST RPMT			
PROJ NO	SPONSOR	AMOUNT \$	DESCRIPTION	COMMITTEE	RATE%	TERM
2013 PROJECTS						
RE269A	CACHE HIGHLINE WATER ASSN	3,000,000	Enclose canal in box culvert & pipe Ph2	08/09/12	0.10	25
RE306	HUNTSVILLE IRR CO	2,146,000	Replace open ditches with pipe	12/07/12	1.00	35
RE231	MORONI IRRIGATION COMPANY	2,975,000	Replace ditches & canals with Pipeline	12/07/12	1.00	29
RE297	NORTH SUMMIT PRESSURIZED IRR CO	3,910,000	Area wide L&G & sprinkler system	12/07/12	1.00	30
RE302	DRY GULCH IRRIGATION CO	810,000	Bluebell Lateral replace canal with pipe Class B	02/07/13	1.00	25
RE323	NORTH OGDEN IRRIGATION CO	883,000	Replace 2700' of canal with pipe	02/07/13	1.67	18
RE331	PLEASANT GROVE CITY	33,800	Detention basins for flood prevention, IRB grant-save \$268,000 int.	05/09/13	0.00	0
		2013 Total	13,757,800	No. of Projects 7		
2014 PROJECTS						
RE325	COTTONWOOD CREEK CONSOL IRR CO	2,500,000	Blue Cut Ditch & Mammoth Canal portion of Basin wide sprinkler proj	08/08/13	1.00	16
RE284	MOUNTAIN GREEN SECONDARY WATER CO	1,785,000	Cobble Creek dam, secondary pond, pipe, wells, etc.	08/08/13	3.00	17
RI0047	OURAY PARK IRRIGATION CO	1,000,000	Cliff Lake Dam repair [WILL BE DAM SAFETY UPGRADE]	02/13/14	0.10	20
RE338	WELLSVILLE- MENDON CONS DIST	159,000	Replac canal with pipe; line canal	02/13/14	1.00	11
RE346	GUNNISON IRRIGATION CO	710,000	Added sprinkler system & stockwater	03/19/14	1.00	14
RE335	WESTFIELD IRRIGATION CO	1,254,000	Replace Mill Race diversion structure	03/19/14	1.00	30
RE339	CUB RIVER IRRIGATION CO	3,825,000	Replace Middle Ditch with pipe, & construct hydro plant	05/08/14	1.00	30
RL574	SARATOGA SPRINGS CITY	87,000	Cul pipe, pump; Sec pump, reg pond, pipe. IRB grant-save \$1,211,000	06/12/14	0.00	0
		2014 Total	11,320,000	No. of Projects 8		
2015 PROJECTS						
RE280	NEWTON WATER USERS ASSN	3,060,000	Replace canal with pipe	08/14/14	2.00	20
RE319	PAROWAN CITY	3,464,000	Rebuild hydro power plant, replace penstock	08/14/14	1.00	20
RE350	GUNNISON IRRIGATION CO	540,000	Pressure sprinkle irr system for Old Field Canal	10/09/14	1.00	14
RE348	MCARTHUR FRANSDSEN DITCH CO	723,000	Replace 4.8 mi. of ditch with pipe	10/09/14	1.00	26
RE357	DRY GULCH IRRIGATION CO	1,037,000	Rehab Atwood Lake Dam	03/18/15	1.00	25
RE225R4	WEBER BASIN W C D	10,000,000	Phase 4 Enlarge Willard Bay (+)	03/18/15	2.20	30
		2015 Total	18,824,000	No. of Projects 6		
TOTAL PROJECTS		43,901,800		TOTAL PROJECTS		21

Table 3 Continued

Anticipated Future Funding by the Board of Water Resources

Projects Authorized		
1 Brooklyn Canal Co	E223	\$ 1,000,000
2 Fremont Irrigation Co	E279	8,177,000
3 Summit Creek Irrigation and Canal Co (Phase 3)	E308	1,700,000
4 Uintah WCD	E316	36,550,000
5 Lake Creek Irrigation Co	E333	3,275,000
6 Richmond Irrigation Co	E347	3,700,000
7 Green River Canal Co	E353	1,200,000
8 Holmes Creek Irr Co	E327	731,000
9 Manti City Creek Water Users Mutal Assoc.	E342	1,606,000
10 Cache Highline Water Association	E351	2,150,000
11 Ephraim Irrigation Co	E352	1,870,000
12 Woodruff Irrigating Co	E365	3,200,000
Total Funds Authorized		<u>\$ 65,159,000</u>
Remaining Funds Available		\$ (44,140,000)

Additional Active Projects		
1 Sanpete WCD (Narrows Dam)	D377	\$29,325,000
2 Woodruff Irrigating Co	D680	680,000
3 Kane County WCD	D828	1,700,000
4 Weber Basin WCD (Secondary, Ph 3-5)	E029R3+	27,178,000
5 Hooper Irr Co (Press Irr, Ph 3+)	E060R3+	11,033,000
6 East Juab County WCD	E071	425,000
7 Parowan City (Bond Ins Grant)	E121	34,000
8 Fremont Irr Co	E131	1,700,000
9 San Juan WCD	E198	3,400,000
10 Davis & Weber Counties Cnl Co (Secondary)	E215R6	2,593,000
11 Corinne City	E216	85,000
12 Weber Basin WCD	E312	85,000,000
13 South Willard Water Co	E317	1,700,000
14 Ferron Canal & Res Co	E320	2,720,000
15 Juab Lake Irrigation Co	E324	510,000
16 Ouray Park Irrigation Co	E343	850,000
17 La Sal Irrigation Co	E354	1,530,000
18 Duchesne County Water Conservancy District	E358	99,000
19 Uintah and Whiterocks River Commission	E359	47,000
20 New Fayette Irrigation Co	E360	850,000
21 Moon Lake Water Users Association	E362	1,382,000
22 Wellsville-Mendon Conservation District	E364	680,000
23 Taylor-West Weber Water Impr. Dist.	E366	6,120,000
24 Marion Upper & Lower Ditch Companies	E367	2,210,000
25 Rock Point Canal Co	E368	1,403,000
26 Perry Flood Control District	E369	638,000
Total Additional Active Projects		<u>\$ 183,892,000</u>
Remaining Funds Available		\$ (228,032,000)