



THE STATE OF UTAH
OFFICE OF STATE ENGINEER

T. H. HUMPHERYS
STATE ENGINEER

SALT LAKE CITY

June 20, 1939

REL: REPORT OF PRICE RIVER - GOOSEBERRY RESERVOIR PROJECT.

Memorandum for Office Study Only, by B. F. Lofgren

In Mr. Cahoon's report of the Price river - Gooseberry reservoir project the synopsis at the beginning of the report appears to be more expanded than necessary. However, a brief statement might well be added to the synopsis or as a summary showing the interdependence or independence of all the various parts of the Price river project. These relationships are given in the report, but the reader would see them more readily if they were given in one paragraph.

Data relative to the water supply in the Willow creek and White river are too meager to give more than a general idea of the amounts available for storage. The water supply in Fish creek and in Price river at Heiner, available for future development, is based on stream records sufficiently long to give reliability to the estimates. It is estimated that with Scofield reservoir enlarged to 60,000 ac. ft. capacity and an annual demand in the Price area of 52,000 ac. ft., there would be only one year of shortage and a total spill at the reservoir of only 7,000 ac. ft. in eleven years. Of the 52,000 ac. ft. annual yield, 44,000 ac. ft. are required for existing projects in the Price area, leaving 8,000 ac. ft. available for new projects. It is assumed that requirements for the Price area will eventually be reduced from 44,000 ac. ft. to 35,000 ac. ft. At present however, there is not more than 8,000 ac. ft. available in Fish creek for new projects and to secure the 8,000 ac. ft. will require enlargement of Scofield reservoir to a capacity of 60,000 ac. ft. Any new project, therefore, which contemplates use of 17,000 ac. ft. should also include plans for acquiring present rights attached to marginal lands now in use in the Price area or should provide for a prolonged delay in delivery of water until the present use decreases from 44,000 ac. ft. to 35,000 ac. ft. and existing rights lapse through non use.

From the report, it appears that storage on Huntington creek will be necessary before unrestricted diversion from that source can be made to the Gooseberry reservoir. That means that practically all the water available to the Gooseberry reservoir will require double storage, either in Scofield and Gooseberry or in Huntington and Gooseberry.

In a discussion of the Spanish Fork diversion project, the report states that with a live storage of 55,000 ac. ft. (dead storage 6,000 ac. ft.) and demand of the Price area of 35,000 ac. ft. there would be an average delivery to Spanish Fork of 20,000 ac. ft. It is not clear how the total annual yield of 55,000 ac. ft. in this project should differ from the 52,000 ac. ft. annual yield in the former case in which there was only 7,000 ac. ft. spilled from the reservoir in eleven years.

