

February 2, 1910

1
302

February 2, 1910.

H. F. Robinson, Esq.,

Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of January 18 at hand, and I will endeavor to answer the questions you propound in the order given.

Your plan of completing first the work from the tunnel to the big arroya is one I approve of. Regarding the funds available, your apportionment of \$30,000 for the Navajo and Mequi work is all you will likely be able to get this year. You can use such portion of this amount as can be spared to prosecute the work at San Juan. Next year I shall recommend a more liberal apportionment for the Hogback Canal.

I think you should file applications for water rights in accordance with the laws, but if the question of priority is one of importance as yet on the San Juan, could we not gain several years by simply filing papers showing change of location at heading and perhaps obtain the benefit of the earlier date of diversion from the old tunnel heading.

RG 75, BIA, Irrig. Div.
Gen. Corres, 1901-31
Dist. 5, Cen., Box 103
February 1910

IF

-2-

Your idea of riprapping the river below the tunnel seems feasible, and I especially agree with your plan of throwing out a good dyke at a point opposite the present tunnel by ~~blasting that point down~~ and subsequently making a thorough ~~cut~~ through the same for our enlarged canal. By doing this you should have a quarry that would furnish plenty of large rock for riprapping.

You are probably informed as to the situation with reference to Zuni ere this, since you will have seen Mr. Martin. Unless the entire sum needed for complete repairs was available, it would not be wise to change disbursing officers on the job or transfer property. You and Martin can visit the work and advise Rollin from time to time as the work of temporary repairs progresses.

With reference to the change of line at San Juan, two controlling features seem to enter into the determination of the proper course to pursue there, namely, are conditions in the arroya above the upper crossing such as to lead you to think from inspection that trouble similar to that which occurred at the lower crossing would be likely to take place in the future? If so, there would be no object in changing the line; second, will your dirt levees as proposed ^{with} for the riprap as contemplated be sufficiently stable to withstand the high velocity of the flood waters? If so, it would again seem that the lower crossing would be the feasible one under conditions obtaining. Use your judgment as to which line

-3-

seems best to adopt, with your superior knowledge of conditions on the ground, and do not hesitate to choose the higher line if in your opinion the future safety of the canal will be insured.

Superintendent Werner left yesterday for his post, and I have not as yet received your report on the Southern Ute matter. Mr. Werner still seems to have in mind that it would be wise for the Government to invest some \$150,000 in that upper canal. I hope Engineer Carroll's report will clear up the situation in this respect.

I do not see how we can retain Carroll unless you obtain authority to give him a non-competitive Civil Service examination. You might take this matter up with the Office.

With reference to Holstrom, I think I wrote you a few days ago that we would pay him \$6.00 per diem, and you can get an amended authority to pay him the additional \$1.00 per diem.

Very respectfully,



Chief Engineer.

MMCG-2
7522