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James R. Clark
Division Engineer Room 208 8th and 8th Office Bldg.
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(303) 352-8712

January 16, 1984

Dr. Jeris A. Danielson, State Engineer
Division of Water Resources
Room 818 - Centennial Building
1313 Sherman street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Dr. Danielson:
Please find submitted herewith the Annual Report for Irrigation Division No. 1 for the 1983 water year.

The encouragement, guidance, and assistance that we have received from you and your staff as well as the outstanding efforts of my own staff have been greatly appreciated.


万ames R. Clark, P.E. Difision Engineer
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## I. Water Administration

A. Current Water Year

1. Accomplishments for the year
a) Our goal of determining how much surface water was available was accomplished through the efforts of our hydrographers. The technological aspects of hydrographic activities were extended by use of the COMSAT system.
b) Began a program of providing more broadbased experience for hydrographers by involving them more in administrative and legal activities.
c) Tabulation of augmentation plans worked out.
d) Coding of diversion records for augmentation plans was worked out and implemented.
e) Streamlined and made more efficient the information gathering system for Referee consultation.
f) Instituted a system of spending more time with water commissioners resulting in closer supervision and improved administration.
g) Began administration of Northglenn augmentation plan with the help of a special court approved water commissioner.
h) Involved water commissioners in closer surveillance of dams.
i) Survived a long period of high flows on many division streams with the help of COMSAT and the Emergency preparedness program.
2. Involvement in Water User Community
a) Daily public contact - providing information and answering questions.
b) Meetings with several entities regarding high water problems. These entities included Corps of Engineers, County Commissioners, Ditch Company

Associations, Ditch Companies, Conservancy Districts and Others.
c) Chatfield Reservoir release coordination for construction in the South Platte River Channel.
d) Cherry Creek Reservoir release coordination for construction in the channel of Cherry Creek.
3. Issues that impact, or may impact, existing policies, statutes and administrative practices - nature and degree of impact.
a) San Luis Valley Supreme Court case.
b) Huston decision on deep wells - further legislation required.
c) Cherry Creek Administration.
d) Satellite program will take a considerable amount of time, but will expand our capabilities. Close monitoring last year took one man two to three hours each day.
e) Monitoring of wells continues to take more time away from surface water administration.
4. Problems, concerns, issues, tasks not addressed this year. Why?
a) Court decrees beyond headgate.

1) Expanded use.
2) Tabulation.
3) Investigation.
4) Ownership.
5) Reuse of transferrable consumptive use water.
b) Items ennumerated in (a) above were not addressed in sufficient detail due to shortage of personnel.
5. Effect of workload changes on staff? Cause for the change?
a) Workload changes have occurred in the hydrographic section due to the loss of part/time employees. These employees were utilized very effectively for many years without a regular part/time position being established. These positions have now been eliminated as a result of the budget crunch. The result has been the loss of several published records which we were not able to complete and station maintenance has not been held up to desired levels.
6. Impact of budget on division operations? Are adjustments possible to more efficiently utilize available funds?
a) Budget reductions have primarily resulted in not allowing vacant positions to be filled. Although staff positions have not been eliminated, the effect has been the same. The result has been reduced output and the inability to address new issues adequately.
B. Coming Water Year
7. What particular problems and concerns will impact division operations? Why?
a) Three water commissioners will retire. Timely examinations and replacement will reduce the problems that vacancies cause.
b) One hydrographer will retire this month. His replacement is needed on February 1, 1984. Delay will probably result in the loss of additional record publications.
c) Additional complex water right decrees to be administered. This will require the keeping of diversion records beyond the headgate in order to enforce the conditions of the decrees.
8. What particular problems and concerns will not be addressed? Why?
a) Items ennumerated in $A(4)$ above will continue to be of concern due to staff shortages.
9. Projected work items planned for division staff?
a) Incorporate the new state operated satellite monitoring system into our operations.
b) Increase our efforts to make the coding of our diversion records more uniform and complete.
c) If staff increases make it possible, we will work toward the goal of anticipating problems and investigating them rather than reacting to emergencies.
d) Continue our newly implemented policy of working more directly with the water commissioners. This involves getting into the field with each commissioner once a month.
e) Increase and improve well administration.
f) Investigate computer applications that would benefit the Division.
10. Priorities in terms of goals and objectives?
a) Read each decree and review with appropriate water commissioner.
b) Investigate each court application in more detail.
c) Pursue more vigorously the goals set forth in FAPAS.

## II. Recommendations

A. Policies (new or change)

1. Water administration.
a) Some guidelines on Cherry Creek would be helpful for possible future administration.
b) Rules and Regulations from Groundwater Section would help to provide some consistency in administration.
c) Coding system needed to handle reuse or total consumption water.
d) Use of computers in division office and by water commissioners would improve administrative capabilities.
2. Personnel
a) Training program.
3. Budget
a) More understandable information for use of division offices.
4. Litigation activities
a) What kinds of items should be especially pursued in determing whether a specific case should be litigated.
B. Personnel changes
5. Additional water commissioners needed if we are to fulfill our statutory mission.
C. Budgetary priorities
6. Personnel
7. Operating
8. Capital outlay
D. Administrative practices
9. Seek to develop practices that would be responsive to statutes and decrees.
E. Legislation
10. Attempt to keep informed on progress of bills before the legislature that affect our area of responsibility.
11. Provide timely input to our legislators.
F. Other

## III. Statistical Information

Attached are the completed formats for the following listed categories.
A. Transmountain Diversions
B. Storage Water
C. Water Diversions
D. Court Activities
E. Office Administration
F. River Calls
G. Compact Deliveries
H. Administration of Plans for Augmentation

1) Due to the "adequate" water supply this year, augmentation plan administration was minimal. The water released for augmentation was $10,864 \mathrm{AF}$ this year.
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WATER COURT ACTIVITIES
No. of Applications for Decree No. of Consultations with Referee.
No. of Decrees issued by Water Court
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The Colorado-Nebraska Compact on the South Platte provides that Colorado shall have the full use of the river water between the fifteenth of October of any year and the first day of April of the succeeding year but that, between the first day of April and the fifteenth of October of each year, Colorado shall not permit diversions from the river below the Washington-Morgan County line to supply water rights having priority dates junior to June l4, 1897 to the extent that they would diminish the flow of the river at the Julesburg gaging station below a daily mean flow of 120 cfs.

Normally it is not necessary to curtail any surface diversion in Colorado to honor the compact because stream flows are inadequate to satisfy all the water rights senior to the compact date.

Preliminary flow data for the Julesburg station indicates that during the 198 day period from April l to October l5, 1983 the mean daily flow did not drop below 120 cfs.

## REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The Republican River Compact allocates water to the signatory states, Colorado, Kansas and Nebraska on the basis of beneficial consumptive use. Colorado's total allocation of 54,l00 acre feet is broken down as follows:

> North Fork of the Republican River Drainage Basin Arikaree River Drainage Basin South Fork of the Republican River Drainage Basin Beaver Creek Drainage Basin and in addition, for beneficial consumptive use in an Colorado annually, the entire water supply of the Frenchman Creek (River) Drainage Basin in Colorado and the Red Willow Creek Drainage Basin in Colorado. The computed annual consumptive use in Colorado in the Republican River Basin for the l982 water year, the last year for which official figures are available, was as follows:

STREAM
North Fork of Republican River South Fork of Republican River Arikaree River Beaver Creek

CONSUMPTION

| 7,240 | 72.4 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 15,380 | 99.9 |
| 4,060 | 16.0 |
| 0 | $\frac{0}{49.3}$ |

72.4
99.9
16.0
$\overline{49.3}$ Percent

The 1957 decree of the United State Supreme Court limits the diversions from the Laramie River and its tributaries to 49,375 acre feet annually for the State of Colorado. Of that amount, 19,875 acre feet are allocated to Transmountain Users and the remaining 29,500 acre feet to the Meadowland Users within the river basin. The Meadowland Users are further restricted to diversions of not more than 1,800 acre feet after July 31 of each year. In the event that the Transmountain Users do not divert their full allotment, the Meadowland Users may divert the difference between the 19,875 acre feet and the actual amount if diverted within the same year.

Sand Creek, which arises in Colorado, later becoming tributary to the Laramie River in Wyoming, is not included within the terms of the compact. Instead, Colorado and Wyoming have a working agreement whereby senior water rights on Sand Creek in Wyoming are recognized before junior diversions are made in Colorado through the Wilson Supply Canal a transbasin diversion.

In 1983 the transmountain diversions under the Laramie River Compact totaled 15,790 acre feet of the 19,875 acre feet compact allowance. The meadowland diversions totaled 4,230 acre feet or some $14 \%$ of the allotment. Total Colorado diversions were 20,200 acre feet or $41 \%$ of the total allotment of 49,375 acre feet.


[^0]:    +Involving New or Changes to 3,453 Priorities
    *Includes 5 Minimum Flow "Structures"

