

RICHARD D. LAMM
Governor



J. A. DANIELSON
State Engineer

DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES

P.O. BOX 269
ALAMOSA, COLORADO 81101
OFFICE: 589-6683

January 13, 1983

Dr. Jeris A. Danielson
State Engineer
Division of Water Resources
1313 Sherman Street
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Jeris:

On behalf of the staff of Division III, I submit herein the Annual Report for 1983.

I would like to express special thanks to the Division III staff as well as you and your staff for your help and support in fulfilling the various responsibilities of water administration in our division.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven E. Vandiver
Division Engineer
Division III

Steven J. Witte
Assistant Division Engineer
Division III

se

1983

ANNUAL REPORT
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
DIVISION III

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. WATER ADMINISTRATION.	1
A. 1983 Water Year	1
1. Accomplishments	1
2. Involvement in Water User Community	2
3. Issues of Concern	2
4. Effect of Workload Changes.	3
5. Impact of Budget.	4
B. 1984 Water Year	4
1. Concerns Which Will Impact Division Operations.	4
2. Concerns Which Will Not be Addressed.	4
3. Projected Work Items.	5
4. Goals and Objectives.	5
II. RECOMMENDATIONS	5
A. Change in or New Policies	5
1. Water Administration.	5
2. Personnel	5
3. Budget.	5
4. Litigation Activities	6
B. Personnel Changes	6
C. Budgetary Priorities.	6
D. Administrative Practices.	6
E. Legislation	6
 APPENDIX A - Rio Grande Compact Report	
 APPENDIX B - Transmountain Diversion Summary	
 APPENDIX C - Water Court Activities	

I. WATER ADMINISTRATION

Water administration throughout Division III in 1983 was a blend of many successes and problems. Most significantly, the 1982 fall rains, a good snowpack, a late ditch turn-on, spring rains, above normal return flows, and tributary inflows provided an adequate water supply throughout the irrigation season for most every water user in the San Luis Valley for the first time in several years. This was accomplished even though it wasn't a particularly high water year. These factors also resulted in a comparatively low curtailment schedule for the index supplies.

A. CURRENT WATER YEAR

1. Accomplishments

a. The obligations of the Rio Grande Compact were met due to the efforts of the State Engineer's Office, the Division staff, and the users on both streams. Because of the estimated 62,000 a.f. tributary inflow from Trinchera, LaJara, and Alamosa Creeks the initial 18% curtailment on the Rio Grande was reduced in late June and eliminated in mid-July. Even recognizing this inflow that early in the year an over-delivery of 23,000 a.f. was made to New Mexico. Knowing we were going to over-deliver on the Rio Grande also enabled us to remove the 40% curtailment on the Conejos in mid-August. A new spirit between the users on the two rivers was much appreciated when the Rio Grande users agreed to the Conejos' possible under-delivery to "bite" into their over-delivery. In fact, the Conejos under-delivered some 1,000 a.f. This attitude was very encouraging.

b. Many stream channel problems were identified over much of Division III this year. Serious problems of delivery efficiency on the streams and the impetus from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' Conservation Study led the staff to spend considerable time and effort identifying specific, critical reaches and bringing them to the attention of appropriate land owners, water user groups, and the counties.

c. The river call sheet for the Conejos River was refined this year and several revisions are still needed for it to provide the information needed. A similar sheet is being drafted for the LaJara-Alamosa Creek system.

d. Efforts of the Division staff got several troublesome diversion dams, headgates, and measuring devices upgraded this year. This was accomplished most readily by refusing to deliver water until the proper devices were installed.

e. Several contested applications for water rights were settled out of court this year with the help of many people. This, of course, resulted in the saving of considerable resources. This approach remains the most acceptable method of resolving court cases. Much better control of the outcome in the cases is possible rather than relying on the judge to decide the issues.

f. We were able to establish a better rapport with the referee than in years past, especially as to him including information we feel is necessary in his rulings.

2. Involvement in Water User Community

a. Education of the water users, covering many varied topics, was the main involvement of the water user community in 1983. It is incredible the number of users who still do not understand the basics of the Rio Grande Compact, what a water right is and means, what an alternate point of diversion does as compared to a replacement well and many other concerns that affect them every day. This year a tremendous effort was made to get educational and informational material to the user public such as daily river reports and Compact status reports. Explanation of the above items were provided to both newspapers and the radio stations of the San Luis Valley. A weekly radio spot allowed us to explain many areas of water administration in detail that many people were unaware of and they did seem to appreciate the information.

b. In the meetings we had with many of the user groups, we constantly tried to point out areas of concerns that could be addressed by the groups that would make them some water. Poor channel conditions and various management schemes were among the most talked about topics.

c. An explanation of water supply plans as they relate to subdivisions and exemptions from subdivisions was brought to the attention of the Alamosa and Rio Grande County Commissioners. As a result, we have seen some changes in their procedures of addressing these matters.

d. A great deal of time was spent promoting a satellite monitoring system for Colorado this past year. Before COMSAT was terminated, we were able to demonstrate the advantage of real time data in water administration to many groups. They, in turn, put considerable pressure on state legislators to fund the system which is now in the process of being set up.

3. Particular Issues of Concern and Their Impact

a. On December 8, 1983 the Colorado Supreme Court ruled in Case 80SA288 which is the case involving the State Engineer's proposed rules and regulations involving both surface and underground water located in the Rio Grande and Conejos River Basins and their tributaries. The case ruled on three main points: 1) the Rio Grande and Conejos should be administered separately and meet their own Rio Grande Compact obligations; 2) the three main tributaries to the Rio Grande below Alamosa, Trinchera, Alamosa and LaJara Creeks should not be administered for Compact purposes and; 3) the proposed rules concerning underground water were remanded back to the State Engineer for further consideration. Also the ruling, very importantly, gave the State Engineer much discretionary power in water management issues which could bring many changes to water administration in the future. The ruling did not affect the basic administration of the two rivers because our policy of the last 15 years has been the same as the court ruled in the surface water issues. Formulation of new rules for groundwater will take a tremendous effort to be done properly and will have a large effect on the well owners of the San Luis Valley.

b. Court cases involving LaJara Creek, Ted Cook, Meadow Ranch, Travelers, Alan Beard, Ray Slane and Tonso-Sandy Farms have or will have a large impact on both surface and ground water policies and administration in Division III. Although too lengthy to detail the cases, each has or will have great significance in several areas of the State Engineer's interpretation of statutes and case law and, therefore, his policies.

c. Poor river channel conditions on several streams in Division III have and will continue to have impact on administrative practices and policies, especially concerning futile call and maximum utilization of water.

d. The U.S.G.S. Conejos Depletion Study will be published in the near future and will have considerable influence on the amount of water well owners feel they must augment to the Conejos River for the depletions caused by their wells. The sponsoring agency for the study, the Rio Grande Water Conservation District, had many unfavorable comments to the report but it will be published just the same.

e. Construction of the Closed Basin Project was begun in 1983. This project and especially the allocation of the waters from it will surely provide particular impact on our time and administration practices in the next two years.

f. The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' new conservation study of the Rio Grande Basin in Colorado was begun in 1983 and, if properly done, could provide much needed information to the State in many areas of concern as well as some construction or rehabilitation of water courses and structures in Division III.

g. Because of a need to define policies for small exempt wells, wells in subdivisions, and subdivision exemptions a need was seen for a "blanket" plan of augmentation that could cover the depletions of more than just a particular development along the main stream of the river. Two such plans have been submitted to water court and one more is anticipated. If a good plan can be decreed, a tremendous burden would be lifted from the Division of Water Resources staffs in Denver and Alamosa as well as provide a real boost for development in areas such as Creede and South Fork.

4. Effect of Workload Changes

a. One of the principle workload changes in 1983 was the tremendous push from the public, developers and county commissioners for explanations, justifications, and remedies for the State Engineer's policies concerning water supply regulations for subdivisions. This consumed countless hours in meetings addressing these concerns. The cause for this change was the demand for development along the Rio Grande and Conejos River mainstems.

b. The effect of H.B. 1416 caused considerable change in the hydro section workload. Because routine annual inspections could not be performed by State inspections, the hydros and water commissioners were recruited to inspect as many dams as possible. This, coupled with a vacant position in the hydro section, caused some neglect of streamflow record computations and ditch measurements.

5. Impact of Budget on Division Operations

a. Budget deficiencies have reduced the number of field inspections of wells, hydro visits to gaging stations, water commissioner visits to headgates and reservoirs as well as travel for the Division Engineer and staff. Therefore, field inspection information provided to Denver staff, streamflow records, diversion records, and documentation for court case exhibits were less timely and less accurate.

b. The budget cutbacks have also caused the inability to fill vacancies and accomplish upgrades causing poor morale among much of the staff resulting in less productivity.

c. The budget cuts that occur throughout the course of the fiscal year are extremely difficult to handle after gearing up for the initial budget in July.

B. COMING WATER YEAR

1. Concerns Which Will Impact Division Operations

a. The formulation of a new set of rules and regulations concerning groundwater and the optimum use of all water in Division III will surely place a considerable demand on the time and resources of the Division staff in 1984.

b. The situation on LaJara and Hot Creek will continue to be in chaos as long as the court insists on not taking a consistent stand on the River Ranch rights, the San Luis Valley Drain and their relationship to the upper LaJara users.

c. The vacant hydro position and those created by retirement will continue to negatively impact operations in stream gaging and well administration. It is absolutely necessary that all positions be filled as soon as possible to insure division operations continue properly.

d. The cases on U. S. reserved rights are due to be heard beginning in late summer and could make many demands on time and inspection resources.

e. The new satellite monitoring system will certainly have a positive impact on the administration of the Rio Grande and Conejos systems, especially with regard to the Compact.

f. The annual problem of forecasting and administration of the Rio Grande Compact will again take up a larger portion of time and effort than any other concern in Division III.

2. Concerns Which Will Not Be Addressed in 1984

a. Channel rectification continues to elude us in all streams because of our inability to define whose responsibility it is to maintain them.

b. The present illegal fish ponds in the division will also probably go unaddressed in 1984 because of their numbers and tremendous amount of legal work which could result and the disinterest of the injured parties.

3. Projected Work Items Planned in 1984

a. Formulation of new rules and regulations and a management plan for Division III,

b. To merge the water rights data base into the water data base.

c. Continue to work for a blanket plan of augmentation on the main stem of the Rio Grande.

4. Priorities of Goals and Objectives

a. Meet Compact obligations.

b. Have a working draft of the new rules and regs with needed studies underway.

c. Fill vacant position, refill retiring position, accomplish upgrades, reallocation of man months.

d. Establish a responsive and effective satellite monitoring network.

e. Force accountability of augmentation plans.

f. Continue to develop personnel for better accountability on diversion records.

g. Tighten up the administration of LaJara Creek.

h. Water data base conversion.

i. Continue to upgrade diversion structures and identify illegal ones.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CHANGES IN OR NEW POLICIES

1. Water Administration

a. A blanket 37-92-137 3(c) letter to all uncompleted well permit applicants and attempt to clean up those outstanding permits.

b. Formulate management plan of optimum use of water.

c. A study be commissioned by the State Engineer to determine the availability of unappropriated groundwater in southern Costilla County.

2. Personnel

a. When retirement makes in possible, one water commissioner be assigned to District 21.

b. Establish new senior water resource position in groundwater.

c. Make a concerted effort to have water commissioner meeting continue in the spring.

3. Budget

a. A genuine effort should be made to reduce the mid-fiscal year changes in our budget.

4. Litigation Activities

- a. Eliminate last minute entry into court cases.
- b. Continue to try and reach out of court settlements.
- c. Complete pending cases; i.e., Robins, spen Springs, New J. B. Romero, Hot Creek, etc.

B. PERSONNEL CHANGES

See paragraph II, A, 2.

C. BUDGETARY PRIORITIES

1. Insure money is available for the operation and maintenance of the satellite monitoring program.

D. ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

1. We recommend trying to establish definitions of beneficial use and waste policies.

E. LEGISLATION

1. Try to get a legislative determination of who is responsible for deteriorating channel maintenance.

A P P E N D I X
A

1983 RIO GRANDE COMPACT REPORT
Preliminary Figures

1.	Rio Grande River Index.674,700	acre feet
	Required Rio Grande Delivery.192,900	" "
	Rio Grande Delivery as of December 31, 1983210,800	" "
	Margin Including 5,200 af credit.	<u>.23,100</u>	" "
2.	Conejos Index387,700	" "
	Required Conejos Delivery177,910	" "
	Conejos Delivery as of December 31, 1983.172,200	" "
	Margin Including 4,800 af credit.	<u>- 910</u>	" "
3.	Combined Rio Grande River System Index.1,062,400	" "
	Total Required Delivery370,810	" "
	Actual Delivery as of December 31, 1983383,000	" "
	Margin Including 10,000 af credit	<u>.22,190</u>	" "
4.	Estimated Tributary and Return Flow Below Alamosa .	62,000	" "
5.	Recharge in November and December Rio Grande.	13,000	" "
6.	Recharge in November and December Conejos	3,850	" "
7.	Total Recharge to Rio Grande System	16,850	" "
8.	Rio Grande Curtailment	Jan. 1, 1983 thru April 24.100%
		April 25 thru July 10	18%
		July 10 thru Dec. 31, 1983.	0%
9.	Conejos Curtailment	Jan. 1, 1983 thru April 17.100%
		April 18 thru August 17	40%
		August 18 thru Dec. 31, 1983.	0%
10.	1980 Compact Flood Water Released From Platoro.	5,494	acre feet
	February 1-28, 1983		
11.	1983 Compact Water Stored in Rio Grande Reservoir .	13,177	" "
	May and June, 1983		
12.	Compact Water Released June 9-13 for dam rehab.	<u>7,500</u>	" "
13.	Water Remaining December 31, 1983 that Rio Grande .	<u>5,677</u>	" "
	Water Users Will Share		

APPENDIX B
 TRANSMOUNTAIN DIVERSIONS SUMMARY - INFLOWS

WD	NAME	STREAM	PREVIOUS TYR		TYR OF RECORD		WD	SOURCE STREAM
			AF	Days	AF	Days		
			20	Weminuche Pass Ditch	Rio Grande	1590		
20	Pine River	Rio Grande	613	47	803	111	31	Pine River
20	Weminuche Pass Ditch	Rio Grande	1684	188	1168	151	62	Gunnison
20	Tabor Ditch	Rio Grande	144	36	149	56	78	Piedra
20	Williams Fork	Rio Grande	388	64	450	75	29	San Juan
20	Squaw Pass Ditch	Rio Grande	144	22	0	0	78	Piedra
20	Treasure Pass Ditch	Rio Grande	716	80	0	0	28	Gunnison
26	Don LaFont Ditch	Rio Grande						
	Tarbell	Saguache						

TRANSMOUNTAIN DIVERSIONS SUMMARY - OUTFLOWS

16	Hudson Branch Ditch	Huerfano	combined	NA	378	NA	35	Medano Creek
16	Medano Ditch	Huerfano	826	NA	2344	NA	35	Medano Creek

ROBERT W. OGBURN
JUDGE OF THE WATER COURT
JOE VAN R. CLARKE
WATER REFEREE
CAROL S. DALPIAZ
CLERK OF THE WATER COURT

APPENDIX C

WATER COURT-DIVISION 3

ALAMOSA COUNTY COURTHOUSE • ALAMOSA, COLORADO 81101

(303) 589-9107

January 6, 1984

Mr. Steven Vandiver
Division Engineer
422 Fourth Street
Alamosa, CO 81101

Dear Steve:

Enclosed please find the information that you were concerned about.

Number of applications received from January 1, 1983, through December 31, 1983: 83CW1 through 83CW96.

Types of claims received from January 1, 1983, through December 31, 1983:

- 1390 wells
- 9 springs
- 1 lake
- 9 creeks
- 6 streams
- 1 reservoir
- 1 pit
- 1 pond
- 1 seep
- 1 pipeline
- 27 ditches
- 3 ditches with 2 priorities each

1453 TOTAL

Number of cases terminated from January 1, 1983, through December 31, 1983: 192 cases.

Mr. Steven Vandiver
January 6, 1984
Page 3

Application for Water Rights to Protect the Natural Environment
to a Reasonable Degree

83CW38	83CW45
83CW39	83CW46
83CW40	83CW47
83CW41	83CW48
83CW42	83CW49
83CW43	83CW50
83CW44	83CW51

14 TOTAL

Application for Surface Water Rights

83CW12 (conditional)	83CW60
83CW13 (conditional)	83CW61
83CW17	83CW63
83CW21	83CW73
83CW22	83CW87
83CW33	83CW94
83CW36	83CW96
83CW59	

15 TOTAL

Application to Make Absolute a Conditional Water Right

83CW58 (W-3902)
83CW81 (W-3945)

2 TOTAL

Application for Underground Water Rights

83CW2	83CW54 (conditional)
83CW9	83CW55
83CW10	83CW64
83CW18	83CW66
83CW19	83CW67 (conditional)
83CW20	83CW68
83CW25	83CW69
83CW31	83CW78
83CW37 (conditional)	83CW82
83CW53	83CW88

20 TOTAL

Mr. Steven Vandiver
January 6, 1984
Page 2

Structures terminated from January 1, 1983, through
December 31, 1983:

1880 wells
1 pond
20 springs
1 spring/ditch
13 ditches
20 creeks
3 rivers
14 reservoirs
1 pass diversion
1 drain diversion
1 drain pump
1 drain
1 pipeline
(this does not include any cases or structures
which were re-opened and re-terminated)

1957 TOTAL

Break down of types of cases filed on from January 1, 1983,
through December 31, 1983:

Plan of Augmentation

83CW15 (water storage right; plan of augmentation including an
exchange and change of use and alternate point of diversion)
83CW52 (including exchange)
83CW75
83CW76
83CW83 (change of water right)
83CW86
83CW93 (including exchange & change of use)
83CW95 (including exchange, change of use and provision of substitute
water supplies)
8 TOTAL

Complaint for Injunction and Damages

83CW71
1 TOTAL

Mr. Steven Vandiver
January 6, 1984
Page 4

Change of Water Rights

83CW1
83CW3
83CW4
83CW5
83CW6
83CW7
83CW8
83CW11
83CW14
(83CW15-see under plan of aug.)
83CW16
83CW23
83CW24
83CW26 (pt. of diversion & underground water rights)
83CW27
83CW28 (and underground water rights)
83CW29
83CW30 (and underground water rights)
83CW32
83CW34
83CW35
83CW56 (conditional)
83CW57
83CW62
83CW65
83CW70
83CW72
83CW74
83CW77
83CW79
83CW80
83CW84
83CW85
83CW89
83CW90
83CW91 (conditional)
83CW92

36 TOTAL

Mr. Steven Vandiver
January 6, 1984
Page 5

The number of cases pending as of December 31, 1983 is 351.

Steve, I am also enclosing copies statistics for three years, four years, five years and fourteen years for all Water Courts showing number of cases filed, number of claims filed per case and average of claims per case. I am, also, enclosing a copy of my 1983 statistical report and Water Division 3 totals. Also please find a running tabulation of the United States Cases filed to date. This would include 1979, 1980, 1981, 1983 and 1983.

If you have any questions concerning the tabulations and enclosures, please give me a call.

Sincerely,



Carol S. Dalpiaz
Clerk of the Water Court
Water Division 3

cd

Enclosures

cc: Judge Ogburn
Referee, Joe van R. Clarke
Pat Stanford

FY 1980-1981, FY1981-1982, and FY1982-1983

STATISTICS FOR THREE YEARS FOR THE WATER COURTS SHOWING NUMBER OF CASES FILED (THE TOTAL THREE YEAR NUMBER)
NUMBER OF CLAIMS (TOTAL OF THREE YEAR NUMBER) AND AVERAGE OF CLAIMS PER CASE. THE FOLLOWING APPEAR
IN THE ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR AND THE ONLY THING ADDED IS
AVERAGE OF CLAIMS PER CASE.

	<u>DIV. 1</u>	<u>DIV. 2</u>	<u>DIV. 3</u>	<u>DIV. 4</u>	<u>DIV. 5</u>	<u>DIV. 6</u>	<u>DIV. 7</u>
TOTAL CASES FILED FOR THREE FY'S	1431	666	588	1173	1434	860	508
TOTAL CLAIMS FILED FOR THREE FY'S	4539	4656	6135	2015	4347	2101	899
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLAIMS PER CASE FOR THREE FY'S	3.17	6.99	10.43	1.72	3.03	2.44	1.77

9/21/83 PSL

STATISTICS FOR FOUR YEARS FOR THE WATER COURTS SHOWING NUMBER OF CASES FILED, NUMBER OF CLAIMS AND AVERAGE OF CLAIMS PER CASE - THE FOLLOWING APPEAR IN THE LAST ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR - THE ONLY THING ADDED IS AVERAGE OF CLAIMS PER CASE

DIVISION NUMBER	FY 1978 - 1979			FY 1979-1980			FY 1980-1981			FY 1981-1982		
	CASES	CLAIMS	PER CASE	CASES	CLAIMS	PER CASE	CASES	CLAIMS	PER CASE	CASES	CLAIMS	PER CASE
1	450	6006	13.35	399	1556	3.90	520	1821	3.51	482	1456	3.02
2	229	3771	16.47	136	875	6.44	240	978	4.08	241	2931	12.17
3	137	240	1.76	83	267	3.22	178	2117	11.90	218	3290	15.10
4	380	582	1.54	342	439	1.29	449	613	1.37	327	711	2.18
5	377	673	1.79	507	1063	2.10	453	1427	3.15	500	1332	2.67
6	161	246	1.53	238	430	1.81	316	441	1.40	303	808	2.67
7	140	343	2.45	194	299	1.55	165	402	2.44	167	229	1.38
TOTAL CASES FILED FOR ABOVE 4 FY'S			<u>DIV. 1</u>	<u>DIV. 2</u>	<u>DIV. 3</u>	<u>DIV. 4</u>	<u>DIV. 5</u>	<u>DIV. 6</u>	<u>DIV. 7</u>			
			1851	846	616	1498	1837	1018	666			
TOTAL CLAIMS FILED FOR ABOVE 4 FY'S			10839	8555	5914	2345	4495	1925	1273			
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLAIMS PER CASE FOR ABOVE 4 FY'S			5.86	10.11	9.60	1.57	2.45	1.89	1.92			

STATISTICS FOR FIVE YEARS FOR THE WATER COURTS SHOWING NUMBER OF CASES FILED, NUMBER OF CLAIMS AND AVERAGE OF CLAIMS PER CASE - THE FOLLOWING APPEAR IN THE LAST ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR - THE ONLY THING ADDED IS AVERAGE OF CLAIMS PER CASE

DIVISION NUMBER	FY 1978 - 1979		FY 1979-1980		FY 1980-1981		FY 1981-1982		FY 1982-1983							
	CASES	AVG. CLAIMS PER CASE	CASES	AVG. CLAIMS PER CASE	CASES	AVG. CLAIMS PER CASE	CASES	AVG. CLAIMS PER CASE	CASES	AVG. CLAIMS PER CASE						
1	450	6006	13.35	399	1556	3.90	520	1821	3.51	482	1456	3.02	429	1262	2.94	
2	229	3771	16.47	136	875	6.44	240	978	4.08	241	2931	12.17	185	747	4.03	
3	137	240	1.76	83	267	3.22	178	2117	11.90	218	3290	15.10	182	728	3.79	
4	380	582	1.54	342	439	1.29	449	613	1.37	327	711	2.18	397	691	1.74	
5	377	673	1.79	507	1063	2.10	453	1427	3.15	500	1332	2.67	481	1588	3.30	
6	161	246	1.53	238	430	1.81	316	441	1.40	303	808	2.67	241	852	3.53	
7	140	343	2.45	194	299	1.55	165	402	2.44	167	229	1.38	176	268	1.52	
TOTAL CASES FILED FOR ABOVE 5 FY'S		2280	1031	808	1895	2318	1289	842								
TOTAL CLAIMS FILED FOR ABOVE 5 FY'S		12101	8302	6642	3036	6083	2777	1841								
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLAIMS PER CASE FOR ABOVE 5 FY'S		5.31	9.03	8.22	1.61	2.63	2.21	1.83								

DIV. 1	DIV. 2	DIV. 3	DIV. 4	DIV. 5	DIV. 6	DIV. 7
2280	1031	808	1895	2318	1289	842
12101	8302	6642	3036	6083	2777	1841
5.31	9.03	8.22	1.61	2.63	2.21	1.83

STATISTICS-WATER COMPTS-FILINGS

	<u>DIVISION 1</u>		<u>DIVISION 2</u>		<u>DIVISION 3</u>		<u>DIVISION 4</u>		<u>DIVISION 5</u>		<u>DIVISION 6</u>		<u>DIVISION 7</u>	
	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>	<u>CASES</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>
FY 1969-70	159	261	60	181	18	32	177	308	185	374	32	60	234	310
FY 1970-71	1133	2375	258	531	160	529	138	217	181	210	31	50	133	149
FY 1971-72	5645	13327	3251	7732	2422	9405	886	1598	1148	1804	213	486	498	575
FY 1972-73	492	1005	543	1984	582	1250	687	783	501	770	275	441	207	298
FY 1973-74	297	10888	156	2588	110	693	441	664	420	611	176	178	167	294
FY 1974-75	285	4121	148	366	129	207	382	889	379	622	154	164	131	170
FY 1975-76	329	885	212	908	141	231	188	215	486	317	170	259	114	249
FY 1976-77	363	1782	217	825	172	367	291	395	278	603	145	296	216	291
FY 1977-78	716	1573	268	1483	176	1126	330	681	478	789	305	368	135	201
FY 1978-79	450	6006	229	3771	137	240	380	583	377	673	161	246	140	343
FY 1979-80	399	1556	136	875	83	267	342	439	507	1063	238	430	194	299
FY 1980-81	520	1821	240	978	178	2117	449	613	453	1427	316	441	165	402
FY 1981-82	482	1456	241	2931	218	3290	327	711	500	1332	303	808	167	229
FY 1982-83	429	1262	185	747	192	728	397	691	481	1588	241	852	176	268
Totals	11699	48324	6144	25900	4718	20482	5415	8786	6374	12183	2760	5079	2677	4078
Average Claims Per Case	4.13		4.21		4.34		1.62		1.91		1.84		1.52	

ROBERT W. OSBURN
JUDGE OF THE WATER COURT

WATER DIVISION 3
ALAMOSA COUNTY COURTHOUSE
ALAMOSA, COLORADO 81101

GAROL S. DALPIAZ
CLERK OF THE WATER COURT

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Cases Filed</u>	<u>Number of Wells</u>	<u>Number Structures</u>	<u>Cases Terminated</u>	<u>Structures Terminated</u>
TOTALS	4,755	18,743	2,962	4,404 (this does not include reopened & reterminated cases and structures)	16,041 wells and 600 others (this does not include reopened and reterminated cases and structures)
12-31-83					

RICHARD D. LAMM
Governor



J. A. DANIELSON
State Engineer

DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES

P.O. BOX 269
ALAMOSA, COLORADO 81101
OFFICE: 589-6683

RECEIVED

AUG 09 1984

**WATER RESOURCES
STATE ENGINEER
COLO.**

August 8, 1984

Walter

Dr. Jeris A. Danielson
State Engineer
Division of Water Resources
1313 Sherman Street
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Jeris:

As I brought to your attention at the annual Division Engineer's meeting in January of this year, some of the statistical information you've requested to be included in the annual reports is not conveniently accessible until the summary reports have been generated.

We received these reports last Friday and are herewith returning the information you've requested as a supplement to the Division 3 1983 Annual Report.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Vandiver
Division Engineer
Division 3

se

encl.

cc: Walt Knudsen

RESERVOIR STORAGE SUMMARIES

WD	RESERVOIR NAME	STREAM SOURCE	PREVIOUS IYR				IYR OF RECORD				
			Beg IYR	%	Beg Irr Season	%	Beg IYR	%	Beg Irr Season	%	End IYR
20	Continental Res	N Clear Creek	7,112	31	5,577	25	198	1	6,284	28	0
20	Rio Grande Res	Rio Grande R	16,650	33	28,273	55	1,489	3	24,370	48	14,255
20	Santa Maria Res	N Clear Creek	248	1	18,487	41	25,815	57	23,003	51	7,487
21	Terrace Res	Alamosa R	2,164	14	7,188	47	10,900	72	14,200	94	5,950
22	Platoro Res	Conejos R	19,690	26	19,860	26	19,700	26	14,246	19	14,197
24	Sanchez Res	Culebra Creek	9,118	1	11,470	11	23,361	23	26,535	26	43,677
35	Mountain Home	Trinchera Creek	2,092	12	5,681	33	7,480	43	11,936	69	5,804
35	Smith	Trinchera Creek	2,589	17	2,677	17	5,273	34	6,808	44	5,062

TRANSMOUNTAIN DIVERSIONS SUMMARY - INFLOWS

		RECIPIENT				SOURCE		
WD	NAME	STREAM	82		83		WD	STREAM
			PREVIOUS YR AF	Days	YR OF RECORD AF	Days		
20	Weminuche Pass Ditch	Weminuche Creek	1,616	51	1,879	104	31	Rincon LaVaca Cr
20	Pine River Weminuche Pass D	Weminuche Creek	625	49	743	112	31	N Fork Los Pinos
20	Williams Cr Squaw Pass D	Squaw Creek	104	29	102	48	78	Williams Creek
20	Tabor Ditch	Clear Creek	1,688	188	1,136	153	62	Cebola Creek
20	Don La Font #1 Ditch	South River	121	22	0	0	78	Trib Piedra River
20	Don La Font #2 Ditch	South River	88	21	0	0	78	Trib Piedra River
20	Treasure Pass Ditch	South Fork Rio Grande	391	64	427	77	29	Wolf Creek
26	Tar Bell	Saguache Creek	0	0	0	0	28	Cochetopa Creek

WATER DIVERSION SUMMARIES BY DISTRICT

WD	TOTAL DITCHES REPORTING				ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DITCH VISITATIONS	TOTAL DIVERSIONS - AF -	TOTAL DIVERSIONS TO STORAGE - AF -	IRRIGATION			
	ACTIVE		INACTIVE					TOTAL DIVERSIONS - AF -	NUMBER OF ACRES IRRIGATED	AVERAGE AF PER ACRE	
	WA	NWA	NU	NR							
20	205	4	105	ANR	5,125	659,568	3,212	655,241	327,284	2.00	
21	70	4	4	ANR	1,750	142,921		142,921	44,786	3.19	
22	95	0	12	ANR	2,375	235,241		235,178	107,241	2.19	
24	63	0	6	ANR	1,575	124,916	41,421	83,495	34,407	2.43	
25	102	4	28	ANR	1,020	97,743		97,741	17,567	5.56	
26	71	29	6	ANR	1,775	66,133		66,133	21,696	3.05	
27	22	0	19	ANR	700	25,050		25,050	3,575	7.01	
35	48	18	4	ANR	1,200	81,738		81,738	19,266	4.24	

