

STATE OF COLORADO  
IRRIGATION DIVISION NO. 4  
MONTROSE

FREDERICK W. PADDOCK  
IRRIGATION DIVISION ENGINEER  
P. O. BOX 15

SUBJECT:

November 22, 1965

Mr. A. Ralph Owens  
Acting State Engineer  
232 State Services Building  
Denver, Colorado

Dear Sir:

No year appears to be like another where the runoff of water is concerned. In 1965 our water sheds received large amounts of heavy wet snow during the spring months. Until the snow readings of March 1 and later April 1 were published, it appeared that we were in for a tough drouth or shortage of water year. Instead, we had cold weather which kept flows at a minimum but steady pace, interspaced with many rains during our growing season. Basically speaking we had a poor year from a production of agriculture standpoint. Field crops started out two weeks later than in usual, fruit ripened two to three weeks late, and livestock, in many cases, did not come off the ranges as heavy as they ordinarily would have been. The feed was too lush or washy.

In Water District 28, the Water Commissioner supervised installation of numerous Parshall Flumes. We

expect a sort of general rush next season to get in Parshall Flumes and headgates because of commencement of storage, *in the Blue Mesa Unit of Curacanti Project.* He also supervised installation of a new gage rod on the Razor Creek Reservoir Dam. Due to the installation of headgates and measuring devices it became necessary to have a reasonably accurate method of keeping track of flows in and out of the Razor Creek Reservoir, and of the storage height in the same.

From a major problem area, Razor Creek has now become a matter of daily routine business, a most welcome situation. Many decreed ditches did not run water due to rainfall during 1965.

A number of years ago, the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation proposed several dams in Water District 28. We believe this proposal to be worth further consideration at this time. Surveys were made by the Bureau of Reclamation in this district, and several projects were taken under advisement on Tomichi, Cochetopa, and Quartz Creeks. Again, at this time, and at the point of being repititious, it appears these proposed projects do have merit.

Water users in District 28 no longer come to me, as they go to their local Commissioner. I am not receiving appeals or protests in regard to his work.

In Water District 40, several problems arose due to conflicts between the City of Delta and one or two

users on Doughspoon Creek. These problems were worked out with one field trip and two or three conferences.

On Dirty George Creek, however, one situation got into court, and ended in a kind of stalemate.

An adverse situation developed, as it was alleged, and there was some evidence to the effect, that our Deputy Commissioner acted as Ditch Company Superintendent for the Granby Ditch and Reservoir Company. While we do not believe this was the case, it does appear that the Granby Company did not, at the initiation of the suit, have a Company Superintendent as required by law, as they now do. We are progressing satisfactorily to date in resolving the problems with the Grand Mesa Water Users' Association.

Several dams have been worked on, on Grand Mesa, and specifically we mention the Deep Slough and Delta No. 3. Work has started on repair of Kiser Reservoir Dam. At the request of the U. S. Forest Engineer, Vincent Maloney, we inspected Deep Slough Reservoir Dam with him and Mr. Charlie Miller. The specifications called for the embankment material to be composed of a rather ideal mixture of clay, sands, and gravel. Tests revealed the material to be principally clay. There was a fair percentage of gravel in the clay

in one volume of material. Since a dam must, by necessity, be built with the material available at the site, and since the remaining portion of the dam would have only three to four feet of vertical storage against it, it was decided to use the clay mixed with gravel, which would go above highwater line and complete the job, <sup>or</sup> if need be, above highwater line with straight clay. Under the circumstances, we had no other solution. The Forest Service does not permit their field men as much leeway under the above mentioned conditions as our department does, and in my general recommendations I will make some specific suggestions.

We are going to hold the storage level of the Beaver Dam Reservoir Dam at the 76 foot gage mark for the 1966 season.

There is some work being done on the Overland Reservoir Dam with which I am not acquainted. Mr. Alan McDermoth, Company Engineer for Overland, reports some settlement. I will therefore make an inspection in May or June, at the earliest possible time it can be done.

It was necessary to insist that the water in the Beaver Dam Reservoir be released as provided by <sup>statute</sup> ~~State~~ 148-5-3, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963 to the letter of the law, for a thirty day period. We believe we made our point, and

that this will not again be necessary. In December we will issue notice for automatic registers.

There were no great problems in District 40 during the 1965 season.

In District 41, the normal procedures went along with one exception. No regulation of water was required, as the rainfall kept things going well. The <sup>ow</sup>growing season was not good here, as in other Water Districts, as there was too much cool weather, and too much rain. Farm production was down.

In District 42, we had further problems on Kannah Creek. Mainly it concerns gage rods, capacity tables, and measuring devices. It appears, at this writing, that our campaign to talk instead of fight is slowly paying off. It would appear that all water users on Kannah Creek take any action which circumstances may require of the Water Officials as a personal affront.

There were no problems over the rest of the district, other than of purely routine nature, involving the lack of devices to regulate and measure water, and the replacement and/or repair of worn out structures.

In District 59 - 62, storage was started in the Blue Mesa Reservoir, the key unit of the Curecanti

Project by the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, on or about October 20, 1965. As of the date of November 20, the water had backed upstream some five miles. To date we have found the Bureau of Reclamation very cooperative. There was an unusual situation in the spring, in that it was desired to use Taylor Reservoir Dam as a flood control structure to assist in the construction of the Blue Mesa and Morrow Point Units of the Curecanti Project. Our office pointed out that the problem would be to drain Taylor Reservoir before the high runoff period occurred, not to refill it, as the April snow survey indicated a heavy runoff potential. The Bureau <sup>really</sup> ~~was~~ got a break because of the particular type of runoff season and thereby lost none of their work at either site.

With the addition to our division of a hydrographer, one new gaging station was installed, Slate Creek near Crested Butte. Measurements were taken at Taylor River at Almont and East River at Almont, Willow and Texas Creeks above Taylor Reservoir, and Taylor River above Taylor Reservoir. The U. S. G. S. measures Taylor River below the reservoir, and also at Almont. Our new hydrographer is doing a very fine job in our opinion.

In District 60, routine functions went on as usual. Consolidation of the Farmers' Water Development

Company and its storage and junior flow rights with the senior flow rights with the bankrupt or defunct Gurley Ditch Company stopped a running battle of some sixty years.

Hastings Mesa had so much water they didn't know what to do with it. All reservoirs in this district, as in several others, have ended up with heavy holdover storage.

In District 61 a greater run of water than normal was run, and a very good supply of storage is left in the Buckeye Reservoir. Our groundwater suit has been postponed for a hearing until I have a chance to meet with the various parties in December and attempt to settle out of court.

In District 63 the story is much the same, plenty of water, rain, and unusually cool weather. Crops here, as elsewhere, were two to three weeks late in maturing.

In District 68, for the first time since I have been Division Engineer, there were no complaints. The law suit on East Horsefly Creek filed two years ago came to trial and damages of \$1.00 were awarded one plaintiff. Our office was directed to go in the field with the defendant and set up a series of headgates and spillways to run the water as the law provides. This was done and is incorporated in another subsequent court order.

In conclusion, I make the following recommend-

ations:

1. It appears that our State Office and the regional office should get together and iron out the different areas that we work in to prevent confusion and overlap. Our principal concern is first, Public Safety, second administration of priorities of rights. It appears that while the Forest Service men are concerned with safety too, basically their reports reflect greater concern over esthetic appearances. Our police powers are much greater than theirs in regard to the Safety and Administration, while we have no authority whatever in regard to clean-up and burning of trees, stumps, etc.

It therefore appears we should work something out to avoid conflicts and/or areas of overlap in construction, specifications, etc. It appears that much of the Forest Service Engineering is coming down to the Forest Field Men from an office group, ~~and~~<sup>which</sup> are given no latitude to meet situations in the field. It further appears to permit water users an opportunity to attempt to play off the two agencies against one another.

In regard to reservoirs needing repairs, we recommend somewhat greater amounts reduction of allowable storage, sufficient in volume to prod action on the part of



owners reluctant to perform their statutory duties. This is probably our greatest problem at this time. The Commissioner of the district should be notified in writing as well as the division engineer.

We would not care to comment on our 1965 statutes, until we have some experience with them in actual use.

Finally, we wish to thank the State Office for your help and cooperation this year. It has made for a most pleasant year of work.

Yours very truly,

*Frederick W. Paddock*  
Frederick W. Paddock  
Irrigation Division Engineer

1965

Annual Tabulation of  
Water Commissioner Reports for  
Irrigation Division No. 4  
STATE of COLORADO  
Reservoir Report

Water District Number	No. of Reservoirs in District	No. of Reservoirs Administered	Amount of Storage on June 15, in Acre Feet	Irrigation Storage delivered during the season in Acre Feet	Domestic and Municipal Storage in Acre Feet, delivered	Manufacturing and Storage Acre Feet, Deliv-	Amount of Holdover storage November 1, in Acre Feet
28	20	5	2,711	1,451	- - - -	- - - -	1,719
40	603	141	81,221	61,157	- - - -	- - - -	48,592
41	6	3	273	126	117	- - - -	117
42	467	70	52,537	17,622 *	22,326	15,119	28,699
59	19	5	106,000	65,000	- - - -	803	100,400
60	73	2	11,570	5,320	- - - -	- - - -	6,250
61	None	1	1,900	1,071	- - - -	- - - -	760
62	29	6	4,113	10,113	480	- - - -	none
63	4	6	1,320	1,320	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -
68	24	12	842	422	- - - -	- - - -	420
<b>Total for Division 4</b>	<b>1,245</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>262,487</b>	<b>163,602</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>16,252</b>	<b>186,987</b>

\* Turned 17,622 Acre Feet from the Reservoirs, delivered actually 14,986 Acre Feet.

1965  
Annual Tabulation Report of  
Water Commissioner  
Irrigation Division No. 4  
State of Colorado  
Ditch Report

Water District Number	No. of Ditches in the Water District	No. of Ditches Administered	Irrigation Water Delivered in Acre Feet	Daily Amount of Water run in Second Feet	No. Days Water was Run	Domestic and Municipal Water Run in Acre Feet	Power & Manufacturing Water Run in Acre Feet	No. of Acres Irrigated in the Water District
28	565	220	190,579	833	125	- - -	- - - -	29,092
40	2,095	484	489,498	1,519	270	- - -	10,950	152,076
41	222	72	789,700	1,292	269	- - -	- - - -	77,490
42	1,014	246	810,834	2,268	365	22,326	903,469	126,505
59	673	96	235,605	1,454	81	- - -	- - - -	35,596
60	483	21	69,070	205	155	520	- - - -	10,240
61	59	12	4,369	16.8	160	- - -	- - - -	3,347
62	371	20	291,299 *	1,224	119	- - -	- - - -	23,015
63	114	22	7,505	28.12	365	1,356	- - - -	1,187
68	452	140	116,582	556	80	- - -	- - - -	25,647
Total for Division 4	6,048	1,333	3,005,041	9,379	1,719	24,202	914,419	484,195

\* Includes 6,000 acre feet of storage delivered to Gunnison Tunnel from WD 59.