Ioka Utah
June 12, 1940

Mr. J. H. Humphreys
State Engineer.
Capital Bldg.
Salt Lake City

Dear Sir;

Yours of June 11, is at hand and I am more than pleased to receive instructions therein contained. I desire to say that for three years 1926, 27, and 28. I had this same position, under Mr. George H. Bacon as State Engineer.

My first concern in this thing is the method you require of my receiving pay for services rendered.

In the first place there is a lack of co-operation between the water users and as I see it, the State Engineer is the only one in a position to collect the fees from the water users. As I see it all should pay except George Potts whose point of diversion shows that it has not been used this year and probably for several years.

It appears to me that I will probably do a lot of work here and receive nothing for it unless the State Engineer collects the fees from the water users. Indeed that was the method under Mr. Bacon and I should have hesitated to give a bond for the service on other conditions.

As your letter of June 7, requires daily measurements of the mainstream and diversions, I can say this;

To go over the system daily would make the water so expensive that the water users could not pay the bill. In the past this has been the custom to go over the system not more than once each week unless a complaint came in that the flow was being tampered with, or other special reason for so doing. There is not to exceed seven second feet in the stream now.

I note that in the abstract furnished me that the cannon and case filing is shown as one second foot, while all old abstracts as well as the decree of the court show 1½ second feet. Is this a mistake, if so when was the mistake made now or previously.

I was over the entire system yesterday and find in one instance evidence of a diversion of water on ground belonging to Paul S. Hanson of Roosevelt. I note that the new abstracts shows no filing and it appears that he is ~~at~~ fencing a plott of ground containing a few acres and has built a ditch from a feeder of the Sand Wash to the head of this ground. Though no water was running yesterday (in the ditch).

I measured the water on the water on the main wash which I turned to the Sanwash Irrigation Co. there being 5½ second feet.

Then with the best means at hand I calculated the flow at case and Cannons diversion. There being about 1½ second feet. I turned down the

wash a small stream. And left a note at the diversion staing that I had regulated it.
After which I interviewed Mr. Chester Hartman who now owns the Ira B. Cannon rights and notified him that a weir and a headgate would be required so that proper measurement and adjustment could be made. (I here observe that the rating flume they put in years ago has been torn out and head gates are removed dams across the channel are constructed of dirt and rocks so that all the water that comes down the channel is taken by their canal. I should think the canal would probably carry about four second feet.) Mr. Hartman practically defied me, but I left him in good spirits and he may reconsider his position.
I suppose I should report also, he has made another canal, about which I have received numerous complaints. This new canal has its heading in his own field and is at a point higher up the wash than a live stream developed when I was ~~in~~ observing this stream prior to the suit for adjudication. There was not any flow at that point yesterday. I suppose that there is nothing wrong with this diversion. The flow here it appears would be runoff from Mr. Hartman's own irrigation.
If the state Engineer will permit I should like to have all rating flumes or weirs made after the plan

of those used by the U. S. Indian department that carry a guage which is ~~easily~~ read from a gauge. Otherwise we may have to employ an engineer to rate the flumes when put in.

Yours very Truly

Robert H. C. Marchant.

RECEIVED
JUN 14 1940
State Engineer's
Office