TATE WATER RIGHTS BOARL

11.01/18	5
5/11/68 may 23 168	A.A.C.

REPORT OF INSPECTION Owner Southern Pacific Company Application 553 Address 65 Market Street Permit. 94105 San Francisco, California Date of Inspection April 16, 1968 Inspected by D. J. Leve Accompanied by Thomas C. Bridges, Water Supervisor (S.P.Co.), A. L. Severtson Persons interviewed (Mr. Bridges Ass't), Bob Bailiff (lessee of SP land), and Mr Resum xfor Amspersion Patrick Rogers, General Manager of the Cabazon County Water District Reason for inspection: No report of licensee Filing Data Date filed January 3, 1917

Date approved Licensed: January 31, 1928

Time allowed to complete In license

Permitted accesses: if invitation 1/2 0.16 cfs (about 72 gpm) Permitted acreage, if irrigation 13 Recommendation NO ACTION AT THIS TIME . Revisit in 1969 to determine if use of water has recommenced. Source Name Springs arising in Millard Canyon Is record of flow maintained? Is supply natural flow? Yes County Riverside Unknown North Estimated minimum flow... From (direction) During what portion of year does minimum flow occur? Late summer and fall Measured or estimated flow at time of inspection 8 gpm (measured by SP personnel May 7, 1968) Diversion System Is point of diversion at location specified in permit, license or order? Yes If not, when will petition be submitted?... If diversion point has been moved, roughly describe present location with respect to authorized location..... Would change cause any injury?_____ Gravity Is diversion by gravity or pumping? Is diversion system complete? Yes * If not, briefly explain what remains to be done *See remarks If not complete, does it appear to have been pursued with reasonable diligence? See Remarks What is the capacity of the limiting section? See Remarks

19 68

Explain briefly manner of determining above capacity See Remarks

MAY 2 4 168 S.S.S.

Juspection

4th Inspection

89545-957 2-67 2M ① OSP

1

					(T:)
		Pla	ce of Use	4	(License)
a ²	Kara esta			100 mg 10	
Name of place of	f use (if there is one i	in local usage)	None	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Briefly describe	any changes from p	lace of use as describ	ed in license or order	No changes	
		<u> </u>		**************************************	
				<u></u>	
Ta maaikiina maanaa		1 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	A COMMENT OF THE COME		*
is pecition requi	reat If	so, indicate when it	will be submitted		
Does licensee ow	n or control all of t	the land covered und	er license? Yes		
				45	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		•	i Light hy in		
		Use	of Water		part of the second
Briefly describe	method of applying	water to each of th	e uses described in licens	se No use has be	een made of
water under	this license	for about 3 to	4 years other th	an some than fo	or non-licens
domestre-an		ng uses. SEE	REMARKS		
·	- V	1 - 4			
,	i de la companya de				
Does season of us	se conform to season	shown on license?_N	o use If different, d	escribe	.
List approximate	e acreage of each in	dividual crop served	in each of the past three	e seasons (If use is oth	ner than irrigation li
	,		of Hot reservoir fifted each	year and give approxima	ite withdrawai)
None.	See REMARKS.		N.		100 mg (100 mg)
		1	majanja da		
	and the second s				
	*				
			ting the second of the second		
•				*** **********************************	: · · ::
	•				
		4 ··· .	• Marie Talenton (Marie Talenton)		
	• **		$ x_{\lambda}-x_{\lambda} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} x_{\lambda}-x_{\lambda} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$		
•		en e			
	e de				
dive approximate	e rate of use during	maximum period ar	d briefly describe manne	•	
No use in re	ecent years	, maximum period ai	d brieny describe manne	or or computing same	
					\$
f rate of use is	less than amount of	hown in license state	reason for reduction in		
ormai situation	m merulule <u>Vii</u>	CTIECO TIL CIIC O'	ryerston system b	v the Capazon C	Ounty Water
District pro See REMARKS	evented use of	water under t	ne amounts and co	nditions of the	license.
		\$3.00 X	Del succession		
)	MA
WRB 19-2A (4-66)		e e e			69161-957 4-66 400 ① OSI

At the time of inspection preliminary discussions with Messrs. Bridges, Severtson, and Bailiff, brought to the writer's attention that no use of water, other than for minor domestic purposes, had been made under the subject license for a period of about 3 or 4 years. According to them, the diversion system had been materially changed by the Cabazon County Water District whereby the licensee, Southern Pacific Co., or the lessee of their land (place of use), had been unable to receive water from the source point of diversion (the District is holder of License 660 from the same point of diversion as the subject license and of the same priority). When inspected in 1964, the diversion works comprised a flowing spring west of the creek, aided by a concrete cutoff wall, and another point on the east side of the creek with a submerged cutoff intercepting percolating water flowing under the bed of the creek. Water developed at both of these points flowed into a "common" box and thence downline to another box from which diversion could be made to the place of use as needed. At the current inspection it was seen that extensive changes had been made to the entire diversion system serving this license. The easterly point of diversion, the "common" box, the diverting box, and all pipelines existing in 1964 had been either disconnected or destroyed to a distance of about 910' downline from the source points of diversion. However, the westerly point, the spring, had been extensively redeveloped and converted from a surface intake works to a drilled, cased (perforated), and gravel packed manhole and intake leach line. Also, new 6" A C pipe has been installed replacing the portions of the former main diversion pipeline which had been removed. According to Mr. Rodgers of the Water District, the redevelopment has substantially increased the amount and efficiency of the source output, said output being the common supply for the subject/and for the District's License 660.

In redeveloping the system for their own use, the District did not reconnect the line through which water could be diverted from the main line to the place of use for the subject license. After some time however, the District installed the "Loop" shown on the accompanying sketch from which a section of 1" line was installed leading, through a 1" valve, to the existing 2" line to the place of use. According to Mr. Rodgers, the loop connection served a twofold purpose. It physically enables a connection to be made near the ground surface instead of 8' to 10' below at the main line depth, and more important, by use of the valve in the main line at the loop the flow in the main line can be throttled down so to back water up into the manhole thereby raising the head available at the loop diversion line. This

REMARKS continued:

throttling technique was necessary because redevelopment of the source spring had resulted in lowering of the outlet line therefrom with a resulting loss of output head (the outflow system is capable of taking all of the production without an accumulation of water in the manhole with a resulting head near the outflow pipe invert elevation). Capacity of the diversion system to the place of use is unable to be determined because the maximum head the source will develop under full throttled conditions is unknown. However under similar conditions to the date of inspection, at which time a 7' 10" head was present in the manhole above invert elevation, the capacity of the l' diversion line was tested and found to be 8 gpm (measured by Southern Pacific Co. personnel on May 7, 1968). This amount is insufficient for irrigation purposes and accordingly all irrigation has ceased and the water is presently being used for domestic and stockwatering purposes only. However, according to the licensee's representative Mr. Bridges, the Southern Pacific Company intends to maintain this water right by making full use of the licensed amount for the purpose of irrigation. Mr. Bridges stated to the writer subsequent to the inspection, that his Company plans to replace the 1" outlet and line from the loop with a 4" line about 85' long and thence into new 2" lines to the place of use (due to the long period when water was unavailable the pipes deteriorated and are badly clogged and must be replaced). Under the present intake system the changes contemplated, if installed, would result in a diversion capacity far in excess of the licensed amount. Also, Mr. Bridges stated that he has recommended that the lease to Mr. Bailiff, or any subsequent lessee, should require operations by the lessee which will make use of the water as provided under the licensed conditions.

in use of water under this license for about 3 years. However it appears that this was at least partially due to actions of the Cabazon County Water District. Discussions held with representatives of both the licensee and the District have led to an understanding of the problems involved and they have indicated that they will work together to solve the problems.

It is recommended that no action be taken at this time. However another visit should be made in 1969 in order to determine if the use of water has recommenced.

D. J. Luc







