

1950

STATE OF COLORADO

IRRIGATION DIVISION NO. 4

MONTROSE

SUBJECT:

FREDERICK W. PADDOCK  
IRRIGATION DIVISION ENGINEER  
ROOM 7, COURT HOUSE  
P. O. BOX 15

November 1, 1950.

Mr. M. C. Hinderlider,  
State Engineer,  
Capitol Building,  
DENVER, Colorado.

Dear Sir:

I herewith submit my Annual Report for 1950;-

1950 was a poor year for water supply, the streams being considerably deficient from July 1, on to the end of the irrigation season. Late spring freezes killed almost all of the peaches and apricots in Delta and Montrose counties. Portions of Mesa County were likewise injured. Hay and grains, however, do not appear to have been particularly hurt in yield or quality by frosts in any locality. In some communities yield was hurt by shortages of water however. This was most apparent in parts of San Miguel, Ouray and Delta Counties.

Snow reports indicated up until May 1, that a good year might be expected. However, in May it became obvious that a hard year for water supply was definitely with us. High velocity winds of warm temperatures took a heavy toll by evaporation of the snow on the water-shed.

Water District #28 was unusually short of water, necessitating administration of water during June and July. As June is normally one of ample water in all portions of Irrigation Division #4, it can be seen that the shortage was very acute. There are two or three transmountain diversions which sometimes complicate conditions due to their inaccessible locations in W. D. #28.

In Water District #40 many reservoirs on Grand Mesa failed to fill, causing hardship in communities around Cedaredge.

On Dirty George Creek litigation has developed over changes of point of diversion and changes of use, also questions regarding priorities and so called "prescriptive rights." Certain water users immediately went to Court when the local water officials refused to recognize "prescription" ahead of the District Courts Decrees; the local water officials being upheld on appeal to the State Engineer. We will be happy when the above prescription question is settled by the Court as it affects some three or four watersheds in its entirety.

*most important*  
The ~~heaviest~~ piece of construction on Reservoir Dams in W.D. #40 was the  
^

STATE OF COLORADO

IRRIGATION DIVISION NO. 4

MONTROSE

SUBJECT:

FREDERICK W. PADDOCK  
IRRIGATION DIVISION ENGINEER  
ROOM 7, COURT HOUSE  
P. O. BOX 15

Mr. M. C. Hinderlider

-2-

Nov. 1, 1950.

Overland Res. Dam Rehabilitation and Enlargement. It has reached a stage where we can recommend full storage be allowed if water is available. Several minor things need to be done before final approval is recommended ~~for considering the construction complete.~~

The Eggleston Res. Dam was breached, and a new steel conduit laid to replace the old wooden outlet conduit. The same owners likewise repaired the Sheep Slough Res. Dam which was saved from failure by prompt action on the part of Mr. Gordon Aldridge, Deputy Water Commissioner and another gentleman, the Company Reservoir tender, in May of 1950. Both dams are in much better shape than formerly, due to the new work.

A part of the face of the Main Bruce Park Res. Dam slid in the latter part of the 1950 season. Plans are under way for the rehabilitation, repair and enlargement of this structure. X

Crops and livestock did well in Water District #41 during 1950. The Taylor Park Reservoir Dam, by furnishing water for the Uncompahgre Project during periods when the direct flow is very low, enables the project to furnish its users with a flow of 60%, when in times past they would be down to approximately 20% or even be completely out of water. In an irrigation season of abnormally low flow as has been 1950, a reservoir means the difference between failure and bountiful crops. There were no particular administrative problems in this district.

In Water District #42 crops were good, altho some fruit was killed by late frosts. There were several administrative problems due to the shortage of low snow. There was no early spring ~~flow~~ <sup>which were</sup> Big Creek and Rapid Creek had the most severe of problems, their problems being quite different in character however. Big Creek was simply one of too many ditches with too small an amount of water. On Rapid Creek, the stream bed absorbs large quantities of water which makes for a very bad situation. We have been unable to date, to find anyone who can give us reliable figures on the stream bed losses of Rapid Creek, ~~who has no interest in the stream.~~ The Water Commissioner has been requested to keep track of the stream flow and reservoir releases in such manner that these losses may be ascertained with some reasonable <sup>degree of</sup> accuracy. A lack of measuring devices that meet legal requirements appear to be another cause of friction. It has been requested by this office in writing that this be corrected. X

The Water Commissioner resigned in Water District #60 on July 1, 1950. However, No successor has been appointed to date.

STATE OF COLORADO

IRRIGATION DIVISION NO. 4

MONTROSE

SUBJECT:

FREDERICK W. PADDOCK  
IRRIGATION DIVISION ENGINEER  
ROOM 7, COURT HOUSE  
P. O. BOX 15

Mr. M. C. Hinderlider

-3-

Nov. 1, 1950.

*Some communities in*

*suffered from*

Water Districts 61 and 68 ~~had~~ a shortage ~~in some communities~~ of water.

Crops appear to be fair at ~~this~~ <sup>the</sup> end of the season.

As there are no commissioners in Water Districts 59, 62 and 63, ~~there~~ <sup>it is not possible</sup>  
~~is no report to be made.~~ <sup>to</sup> *on conditions there in.*

~~Statistical~~ Reports follow for those Water Districts having commissioners,  
~~on duty.~~

Very truly yours,

*Frederick W. Paddock*  
Frederick W. Paddock,  
Irrigation Division Engineer  
Irrigation Division #4.

at.

Irrigation Division No. 4.

Tabulated Statement of Water Commissioner's Annual Reports

1950

DISTRICT NUMBER	DITCHES REPORTED	AMOUNT OF APPROPRIATIONS SECOND FEET	CAPACITY OF CANAL OR DITCHES IN SECOND FEET	NO. OF ACRES THAT CAN BE IRRIGATED	ACTUAL NO. OF ACRES IRRIGATED
40	484	3102	4265	228,205	149,828
41	98	1866	2738	113,299	68,374
42	224	3204	3620	151,019	73,891
61	13	56	112	11,900	2,262
<hr/>					
TOTALS	820	8227	10,732	504,288	294,355

Irrigation Division No. 4.

Tabulated Statement of Water Commissioners' Annual Ditch Reports

1950

DISTRICT NUMBER	FIRST DAY WATER WAS USED	LAST DAY WATER WAS USED	AVERAGE DAYS WATER WAS USED	AVERAGE DAILY AMOUNT IN SECOND FEET	NUMBER ACRE FEET USED
40		10-31-50	126	1447	394,357
41	3-1-50	10-30-50	164	1334	573,818
42	4-1-50	10-30-50	108	2420	523,175
61	4-1-50	10-14-50	149	6.76	5,920
<hr/>					
TOTALS				5208	1,497,270

Irrigation Division No. 4.

Tabulated Statement of Water Commissioners' Annual Crop Reports

1950

District Number	Alfalfa	Natural Grasses	Cereals	Orchards
40	52,683	28,240	20,437	13,268
41	22,335	3,697	24,452	955
42	25,296	14,794	16,057	2,047
61	676	383	460	3
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100,990</b>	<b>47,114</b>	<b>61,406</b>	<b>16,273</b>

District Number	Market Gardens	Potatoes	Sugar Beets	Other Crops	Total Irrigated
40	787	2292	4351	28,159	149,828
41	466	1343	2056	13,070	68,374
42	1523	619	695	7,840	73,891
61				740	2,262
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>2776</b>	<b>4254</b>	<b>7102</b>	<b>49,809</b>	<b>294,355</b>

Irrigation Division No. 4.

Tabulated Statement of Water Commissioners' Annual Reservoir Reports

1950

DISTRICT NUMBER	NUMBER IN DISTRICT	NUMBER REPORTED	CAPACITY IN ACRE FEET	QUANTITY OF WATER IN RESERVOIR, May 1	QUANTITY OF WATER IN RESERVOIR, Nov. 1
40		157	52,222	32,804	1064
41	(no report)				
42	137	62	15,925	10,824	none
61	(no report)				
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>68,147</b>	<b>43,628</b>	<b>1064</b>
DISTRICT NUMBER	FIRST DAY WATER USED	LAST DAY WATER USED	AVERAGE NUMBER DAYS WATER USED	AVERAGE DAILY FLOW USED	NO. ACRE FEET CARRIED
40	3-18-50	10-31-50	34	316	30,489
41	(no report)				
42	5-22-50	10-15-50	52	171	10,638
61	(no report)				
			<b>86</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>41,127</b>