"It is the policy of the people of the State of Colorado, speaking through their elected representatives, to seek the wise and beneficial development of God-given resources for the greatest benefit of all the people, and that in order to carry out this policy, the Congress of the United States should be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to . . . decline passage of any of the presently proposed versions of the so-called 'Wilderness Bills' . . . " From the Joint Resolution of the Forty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado.
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The Wilderness Bill didn't get out of Committee!

That's good news for western water users.

It's particularly good news for Coloradans because Senator Gordon Allott and your Water Congress were instrumental in seeing that this dangerous bill did not get out of Committee unless it carried adequate amendments.

Senator Allott sponsored several amendments that focussed Senate Interior Committee attention upon basic issues that wildlifers were trying to cover up . . . issues that couldn't be resolved prior to adjournment of the first session of the 86th Congress. Senator Allott, effectively assisted by your Water Congress, saved the day for western water development.

'Sounds big and it is big! It's an inside story of what can be accomplished by a congressman when he has effective water user support . . . an unpublicized story that you won't find anywhere but in your Water Congress Newsletter.

Here's what happened. Last November, the Colorado Water Congress passed a resolution opposing the anticipated Wilderness Bill. This bill would establish a vast wilderness preservation system that would exclude all uses except scenic enjoyment and scientific study. Over one-third of Colorado is federally owned. In the high country, where most water projects originate, nearly all of the land is federally owned. The Water Congress resolution was the first step in a series of steps that eventually led to the wilderness summit on Capitol Hill.
The second step: Passage by the Colorado General Assembly of a Water Congress sponsored Wilderness Memorial. This Memorial was sent to the Colorado congressional delegation, to the President, to the Senate and to the House.

Your Water Congress had attempted to work through the Colorado Water Conservation Board on wilderness legislation. CWCB wanted to help but couldn't. Public opposition by the Colorado Game and Fish Department sparked a "keep quiet" edict by the Governor. His reason: Public statements should be withheld until state agencies could develop a unified resource policy on wilderness legislation. But the head-knocker who was supposed to coordinate and unify divergent views within Colorado's official resource family . . . The Director of Natural Resources . . . wasn't appointed.

Note this: Your Water Congress has no state house strings such as kept CWCB on ice during the wilderness legislation battle. Given state-wide water user approval, your Water Congress can move, quickly and effectively.

Third step: Wilderness Bill hearings. Donald Hamburg represented your Water Congress at Albuquerque. Chairman John Barnard, Jr., testified at Seattle . . . or tried to testify. After traveling thousands of miles at Water Congress expense, he was given only five minutes speaking time.

After the hearings concluded, Senator Jackson of Washington prepared amendments to the Wilderness Bill. Objective: Overcome public criticisms of the bill without giving away anything considered basic by the wildlifers. Senator Gordon Allott sent word home that he would like technical guidance on the proposed Jackson amendments.

Step four: Chairman Barnard, acting as First Assistant Attorney General under Duke W. Dunbar, submitted a point-by-point analysis of the Jackson amendments. He also submitted additional amendments aimed directly at removing basic water user objections to the Wilderness Bill.

These amendments would recognize that federally owned lands directly affect vital interests of people residing in western states. They would protect legitimate non-federal interests. They would eliminate interference by the wilderness system with reasonable and logical development. They would help water developers who are currently
hamstrung by existing Forest Service restrictions on rights-of-way. They hit head-on
the basic issues in wilderness legislation.

Mark-up of the Wilderness Bill by the Senate Interior Committee was reported to be set for an August 4th closed-door executive session. Wildlifers went to work on Senate Committee members with a flood of letters. But the pressure of unfinished business apparently cause the Committee to postpone consideration of the Wilderness Bill.

Angered wildlifers placed a full-page advertisement in the Washington Post on August 3rd. It was an open letter urging Senate Interior Committee members to favorably report the Wilderness Bill to the full Senate. Signators: Many nationally known, well-heeled Easterners and Midwesterners. Cost: About $3,000.

The Committee put the Wilderness Bill back on its August 4th agenda. Reports filtering out through Washington organizational sources indicated that strong objections were raised to this attempt to report out the Wilderness Bill without due consideration of the Allott amendments. Permission was obtained by Senator Allott to have Chairman Barnard sit in as a technical assistant on the Interior Committee's wilderness executive sessions.

Word of the Colorado amendments and Barnard's legislative opportunity spread quickly among western resource interests. Representatives assembled hastily in Washington to generate support for the amendments. This movement was spontaneous and completely unofficial. But wildlifers used the meeting to support widely circulated public contentions that Senator Allott was acting as spokesman for a small special interest group . . . the western economic exploitationists.

Step five: Closed-door executive sessions of the Senate Interior Committee on August 14th and 18th. Western water users' blue chips were on the table, although many may not have realized it. Senator Allott pressed hard for his amendments. Barnard helped Allott bring the senators face to face with wilderness legislation realities . . . the serious issues, stripped of emotionalism. Barnard's effectiveness was indicated by the label that wildlifers pinned on him . . . "that s.o.b. from Colorado".
It was nip and tuck. It appeared that the Allott amendments and Barnard's presence had made it impossible to get the Wilderness Bill out of Committee this year. Then the Committee appeared to waver and lean the other way. At a crucial point Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming, still hospitalized following a stroke, sent letters to each Senate Committeeman. These letters supported a position in accord with the purposes of the Allott amendments. The Committee then decided to defer further consideration of the Wilderness Bill until next session of Congress.

Note the significance of this delay. Wildlifers tried desperately to get the Wilderness Bill out of Senate Committee and through the full Senate this session. They realized that the House Interior Committee, headed by Congressman Aspinall of Colorado, would not consider the Wilderness Bill until it had passed the Senate. They knew that the House Committee would insist upon extensive hearings in the West . . . that even if the Wilderness Bill passes the Senate next year, the House probably wouldn't complete its hearings until after the next session of Congress adjourns. Consequently, they fear that the Wilderness Bill will die in 1960 with the conclusion of the 86th Congress. Wildlifers would then have to start all over again.

Colorado water users, write your congressmen. Generate broad support for the Allott amendments to the Wilderness Bill. Urge them to push for adoption of these amendments in order to protect Colorado's future prosperity. Consider this: Put politics aside long enough to thank Gordon Allott for his effective work on the Wilderness Bill. He went all-out for the water users of Colorado on this one. It was a dedicated effort that received practically no recognition in the Colorado press.

When an elected official does something worthwhile for the water users of Colorado, let him know you appreciate it. Grass roots letters are more effective than many people realize.

Talk Water Congress with your friends. Let people around you know that there is a unified water users' organization in Colorado. Do your part to bring in new individual and sustaining members.
Please remember this: Your Water Congress is trying to do something about Colorado water problems. This is good for the water users of Colorado. But it's not putting money in the Water Congress bank account. Putting first things first has meant postponement of a Water Congress financial drive.

* * *

There's trouble brewing on the Colorado River. It's been brewing for some time. The trouble: Glen Canyon!

Glen Canyon, in north-central Arizona, is one of four large storage projects authorized for the Upper Colorado River basin. The others: Flaming Gorge, under construction on the Green River in Utah . . . Navajo, under construction on the San Juan River in New Mexico . . . and Curecanti, not yet started on the Gunnison River in Colorado.

These keystone dams will store 35 million acre feet. Powerplants at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and Curecanti will have an installed capacity of 1.2 million kilowatts. These dams will harness the Upper Colorado River for two purposes: Hold-over storage to make Compact deliveries to the lower basin . . . power revenues to pay most of upper basin irrigation project costs.

Glen Canyon is the big one: 28 million acre feet . . . 900,000 kilowatts. Only Hoover and Grand Coulee are bigger. Glen Canyon is strategically located, like the stem of a giant funnel, within 15 miles of the lower extremity of the upper basin. It will provide most of the upper basin's river regulation and most of its power revenues.

The trouble over Glen Canyon centers around reservoir operating criteria, particularly for the initial filling period. When the gates are closed at Glen Canyon, Southern California's power honeymoon on the Colorado River will lose some of its glamour. For the first time, some of the river flow that spins giant generators at Hoover Dam will be stored upstream. Seventeen million acre feet will be accumulated to fill the Glen Canyon power pool so that its generators will run at full efficiency, putting maximum power revenues into the upper basin irrigation fund.
Southern California wants to continue receiving cheap Hoover power. She likes Hoover firm energy at 1.466 mills per kw-hr and secondary energy at 0.533 mills. Why wouldn't like it at that price?

The Boulder Canyon Project Act established rates for Hoover Dam energy in 1938 based on the cost of energy produced by steam plants at Southern California load centers. These rates included a falling water charge (1.63 mills per kw-hr firm energy, ½ mill secondary) and a charge for the use of Hoover generating equipment.

Southern California power contractees got their power costs lowered by persuading Congress to pass the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act in 1940. It changed power rates from a competitive basis to an amortization basis. It set up a power revenue schedule to pay off project costs in 50 years at 3% interest and also pay certain other expenses. It provided for adjustment of energy charges every five years, as necessary to amortize the remaining Boulder Canyon Project investment on schedule.

When Glenn Canyon fills, there will be less Hoover energy to sell ... especially the dirt-cheap secondary energy. Result: Hoover energy charges will have to be raised in order to meet the amortization schedule. This will cost power customers of the City of Los Angeles and Southern California Edison millions of dollars ... possibly up to $17 million or more, depending upon water supply conditions.

Southern California's way of holding down Hoover power costs is to persuade the Bureau of Reclamation to by-pass more water at Glen Canyon than is required under the Colorado River Compact. Thus far the Bureau has appeared to be receptive to Southern California's Glen Canyon persuasion.

The Bureau of Reclamation proposed an operating plan for Glen Canyon that by-passed considerably more water than is required under the Compact. The Bureau's top engineers participated actively in lower basin operation studies for Glen Canyon ... But not in upper basin studies! All the Bureau could offer to the upper basin was some drafting and clerical help.
Why? It appears to your Water Congress that the Bureau fears the political power that Southern California may hold over congressional purse strings.

Regretably, this same fear has reached some of the upper basin states, particularly New Mexico. She wants to start building her San Juan-Chama Project.

Colorado has a big stake in upper basin power revenues . . . 46% of the 4-state total. Colorado is not insensitive to the political power of Southern California, with the Fry-Ark and Curecanti projects at critical stages on Capitol Hill. But Colorado is going ahead anyway, virtually alone it seems at times, in an all-out attempt to hold Southern California to Compact commitments.

As it now stands, the Bureau of Reclamation will submit its Glen Canyon operating principles to the Secretary of Interior by October 15, 1959. The Secretary will submit these criteria to Congress next January as part of a status report on Colorado River Storage Project repayment. The Bureau's criteria for Glen Canyon by-passes during the filling period are expected to be favorable to Southern California and unsatisfactory to Colorado.

Then what? Probably a lawsuit. Possibly by Colorado alone, if other upper basin states are unwilling to go along. Colorado's day of decision will be no later than the day that Glen Canyon starts to fill under Bureau of Reclamation operational control.

Will Colorado, through her Water Conservation Board, be prepared?

The Colorado Water Investigation Commission recently transmitted an excellent report to the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Its title: "The Future Operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir as Related to the Colorado River Compact". It provides comprehensive technical support for the tough position taken on Glen Canyon last September by Colorado's Upper Basin Commissioner, Ed Johnson.

Much credit is due John Barnard, Sr., who did most of the work on this report. Assisting Barnard: Leonard Kuiper on hydrology . . . Kieth Millen and L. N. McClellan on Hoover power contracts.
CWIC is an advisory group composed of lawyers and engineers interested in helping CWCB cope with complex interstate water problems. It was organized and put to work by CWCB, acting on recommendation by your Water Congress.

Another CWIC task force is initiating power studies at the request of CWCB. Power experts are studying the marketing and distributing of Colorado River Storage Project power.

Bureau of Reclamation power transmission studies have been cloaked in secrecy. The Bureau hasn’t invited CWCB to participate in any of its power planning studies. Last July, the Bureau met with power users in Salt Lake City. CWCB requested permission to attend. Request denied. Official agencies of California, Arizona and Nevada attended. They were invited.

The Bureau apparently intends to construct a transmission line from Glen Canyon to Flaming Gorge via Richfield, Utah in 1959-60. Utah Power and Light Co. is already constructing a transmission line from Richfield to the Provo-Salt Lake area. Conclusion: Utah P. & L. will either purchase or wheel Colorado River Storage Project power. It's action must be based upon confidential power planning information obtained from the Bureau.

Director Sparks of CWCB:

"... No construction of transmission lines should take place until a power allocation is made. The available evidence indicates that perhaps such an allocation has already been made, at least tentatively. I am at a total loss to explain the secrecy attendant upon these power studies. Since the excess power revenues are allocated to the upper basin states for the constructing of the many participating projects, each of these States has a vital interest in power marketing, aside from the fact that the State of Colorado has a direct interest in obtaining Colorado River power for local consumption."

It appears that competition for power will be between states of the basin rather than between public and private power interests. Public power agencies such as REA can probably absorb the entire output by 1975. But private power agencies need to be in on the ground floor. They plan and construct their backbone transmission system years ahead of actual need. They try to build economically, without duplicating public lines. Costs can be reduced by using private lines to wheel public power, and vice versa.
Colorado should receive an allocation of upper basin power at least equal, percentage-wise, to her water allocation (51.75%). Colorado has a vital interest in seeing that the power transmission system is designed to yield maximum net power revenues.

CWCB has asked other upper basin states to join Colorado in demanding a voice in the allocation and transmission of upper basin power. It has asked the Bureau of Reclamation in strong language to consult with Colorado and other upper basin agencies on power planning.

* * *

October 28-29-30th . . . Red letter days for Colorado water users. On these days the National Reclamation Association will hold its annual convention in Denver.

Colorado water users, through their Water Congress, will host over a thousand water users from the 17 reclamation states. Mark the dates on your calendar. Try to attend.

NRA was organized in Salt Lake City in 1932 "to save reclamation". Some say NRA has meant the difference between life and death for reclamation. Since 1932, NRA's scope and functions have broadened considerably. But NRA's primary objectives have remained the same: Development, control, conservation, preservation and utilization of the water resources of the reclamation states.

NRA is a private, non-profit, voluntary grass roots organization, entirely independent of government. Most of its members are western irrigation farmers. NRA's governing body: A Board of Directors composed of one member from each of the 17 member states. Colorado's NRA Director: Harold Christy. Christy is also NRA's Second Vice President.

NRA policies are established by resolutions adopted at the annual convention. Policies are implemented by a full time Secretary-Manager, Bill Welsh. He's had the job for ten years. Welsh maintains a Washington office. He lobbies for irrigation interests in Congress, sometimes assisted by members of the NRA legislative committee. He publishes Reclamation News, Legislative Digest, and other information materials.
NRA's annual convention is the highlight of the reclamation year. Make your reservations now. Write to the Housing Chairman, NRA, 225 West Colfax, Denver 2. Indicate type of room, names of party, dates of arrival and departure. Hotels: Brown Palace, Cosmopolitan, Shirley Savoy (headquarters).

The annual convention of the Colorado Water Congress will be held on Monday, October 26. Big pre-convention plans are cooking for Tuesday, October 27.

Colorado wives attending the NRA convention will be expected to act as hostesses to visiting NRA women. Centennial dress is encouraged on the day of the NRA centennial luncheon.

* * *

Colorado's new Director of Natural Resources is Dr. Edward L. Clark, age 51. He is a geologist from Missouri. His job during the past four years: Vice President of the Four Corners Oil & Minerals Company at Grand Junction. He starts work October 15th.

Colorado has contributed $20,000 to start a two-year study of the effect of weather on the flow of the Upper Colorado River. It's aimed at determining time probabilities for the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir. Colorado U. at Boulder and CSU at Fort Collins will make the studies. Total cost: $80,000. Colorado hopes other upper basin states will help finance the project.

Top-drawer U. S. Geological Survey engineers recently used probability mathematics . . . statistical hocus-pocus . . . to conclude:

". . . The Colorado River is an example of a river basin where storage development may be approaching, if not exceeding, the useful limit. It appears that the gain in regulation to be achieved on the Colorado by increasing the present 29 million acre feet to nearly 50 million would be largely offset by a corresponding increase in evaporation."

The USGS engineers probably didn't realize the political dynamite in their highly technical reports. Southern California has undoubtedly packed this ammunition away in her Colorado River arsenal on Capitol Hill. It fits her big legislative guns.

The Senate Select Committee on Water Resources began its first leg of field hearings on September 12. Hearings will be held in 19 cities, concluding on December 8th. Water Congress question: Why weren't any hearings scheduled in Colorado?