

State Assn. of Washington Irrigation Districts - Meeting held at Spokane on Friday,
September 10, 1948:

Present:

Marjorie L. Dickens	North Spokane Irrig. Dist. #8
Fred J. Cunningham	Spokane Valley Irrig. Dist.
H. deSchepper	South Columbia Basin Irrig. Dist.
Clifford Kail	Yakima-Tieton Irrigation Dist.
J. R. Downie	" " " "
W. R. Longacre	Vera No. 15
D. R. Jenkins	Deputy County Treasurer, Spokane
M. L. Howard	" " " "
Joe A. Stewart	County Treasurer, Spokane County
Lionel E. Wolff	Orchard Ave. Irrig. Dist.
Homer E. Manley	Orchard Ave. Irrig. #6
G. L. Sterling	Kittitas Reclamation Dist.
T. Newstrum	" " " "
Earl Buzzell	
John Rummell	

G.L.S. Referring to the reports and recommendations of the various committees, which are scheduled to be presented at the annual meeting, we feel that the membership should have ample time to study these reports and recommendations and suggest that they be mimeographed and copies handed out at the time of registration.

Asked for suggestions as to speakers for the luncheon and annual banquet.

Speakers suggested:

Hal Holmes
Warren Magnusen
O. W. Lindgren, or someone from the Bureau
Frank Webster
Someone from Pullman
Walt Horan

G.L.S. stated that it was thought that Frank Webster should be asked to take charge of the portion of the program headed "Use and Conservation of Water".

Mr. Kail suggested that the subject of the speech at the banquet should be confined to irrigation matters.

G.L.S. suggested that the subject of the speech be "Irrigation and Farm Marketing and Prices".

It was decided to ask Hal Holmes to be speaker at the annual banquet.

There was discussion regarding the suggestion that various suppliers of irrigation equipment, weed control products, sprinkler systems, etc. be requested to have displays and persons to discuss and explain their products, after the banquet. Mr. Wolff suggested that it might be possible to rent display space. Mr. Kail was asked to investigate the possibilities of this.

Mr. Kail took over the meeting and there was discussion regarding the classification of irrigation districts. Mr. Buzzell suggested that several difficulties in his work could be overcome if irrigation districts were classified the same as school districts.

Mr. Buzzell announced that he had been appointed State Auditor for Irrigation Districts, and told of the difficulties he had encountered in the districts he had been auditing recently, and the time it takes to do this work after it had been neglected for two or three years.

He recommended the following:

That irrigation districts should maintain themselves on their current assessments plus any incidental income.

That some basis for classification of irrigation districts be worked out.

That all irrigation districts, regardless of size, should be compelled to have some definite accounting system.

That there should be a minimum assessment against each tract of land - suggested the minimum be \$1.00.

There was discussion regarding the payment of assessments on State land. Mr. Rummell stated that the State should be compelled to pay assessments each year the same as any other land-owner.

Mr. Cunningham referred to the classification of districts and asked what basis should be used for such classification. Mr. Kail reported that this had been discussed but nothing definite had yet been worked out, that consideration had been given to size of district, irrigable acreage, budget required for district operation, etc. Mr. Rummell stated he thought a No. 1 district should have far more power than others. That such a district should pay all its own bills and that the district directors and Secretary should be responsible for the acts of the district.

Mr. Manley suggested that an accounting manual be prepared, similar to that for school districts.

There was discussion regarding the withholding of tax from employees wages and regarding the payment of excise tax by irrigation districts. There were conflicting reports on this.

Returning to the discussion of classification of irrigation districts, Mr. Rummell suggested that there be Class 1 districts and the balance left in a second classification. Mr. Cunningham stated that in Spokane County there were so many districts where size, or acreage, did not mean much in comparison with the total revenue of the district. Mr. Sterling said he thought that in the classification of districts some attention should be given to the soundness of their financial position.

Mr. Stewart brought up the point that the position of districts is subject to fluctuation and that a Class 2 or 3 district may eventually attain a position where it could be classified as a Class 1 district. It was thought that in such cases the position of the district should be reviewed by the executive committee of the Washington State Irrigation Assn. and that the district should be reclassified if it met with the conditions governing Class 1 districts.

There was discussion regarding the work of the Recodification Committee and Mr. Cunningham stated that it was the recommendation of this committee that someone be secured on a full-time basis for this work. That it could not be done right by the use of voluntary help and that money should be appropriated by the legislature to provide for the employment of someone to recodify irrigation district laws under the supervision of this organization.

It was recommended that the subjects of classification of irrigation districts and recodification be presented to the members of the Association at the annual meeting for discussion and decision.