"The law of water rights is the law of water shortages and is a legal device to ration an insufficient supply. If we would devote ourselves to making the supply of developed water sufficient and stop striving for competitive financial advantages, water law problems would become obsolescent if not dead in California. If we were to deal with our water problems from a legal framework designed to positively promote abundance rather than merely dole out a meager supply, what we now call the problems of water law would remain as historical curiosities upon which future students of government could ponder as to why it took us so long to reach a solution when the means of solution were at hand" . . . Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General of California, 1957.

Texas and California . . . They're going all-out on water planning and water development. They're showing what can be done if the people of a western state decide to do something about their water problems.

Texas is taking giant strides in water development. The last Texas legislature passed 96 water bills, including bills to create 24 water districts which will provide a grass-roots base for water resource planning and development. The previous Texas legislature devoted most of its time to water legislation.

The Board of Water Engineers supervises and controls statewide water resource planning and development in Texas. Created in 1913, it was handed $1.2 million by the Texas Water Planning Act of 1957 for preparation of a master water plan for Texas. The last Texas legislature gave the Water Engineers its largest biennial appropriation in history . . . over $2 million. Then it directed the Texas Legislative Council to find ways to provide the Water Engineers with even more money next biennium. The Council is to consider not only direct appropriations but also other possible sources of revenue.

Texans aren't waiting for federal aid to finance their water projects. Two years ago they approved a constitutional amendment authorizing issuance of state water development bonds totaling $200 million. Funds derived from water bond sales will be used to finance loans to cities, water districts and other political subdivisions for water project construction. The loan program will be administered by the Texas Water Development Board.
The Texas Water Development Board consists of six capable members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the State Senate. Each member is from a different section of the State and represents a different background. The fields of engineering, law, business and ranching each have a Development Board representative. The other two representatives come from the field of public or private finance. Each Board member must have at least 10 years of successful business or professional experience.

The Texas Water Development Board collaborated with federal agencies in preparing a cooperative report on Texas water developments and potentialities. The report was completed last year. The Bureau of Reclamation spent $2.5 million on its part of the report.

Following this report, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas persuaded Congress to create a U.S. Study Commission on Texas. Commission members: Eleven Texans, including a representative of the Board of Water Engineers, plus six federal department representatives. Chairman: George R. Brown of Houston.


Congress also appropriated $11 million for Soil Conservation Service water resource programs in Texas for fiscal year 1960.

Texas water users have a strong organization called the Texas Water Conservation Association. It has an impressive slate of officers, a 15-man executive board and 42 directors . . . seven each on groundwater, industrial, irrigation, municipal, navigation, river authorities. It publishes an excellent monthly news magazine called "Texas Water".

The Texas Association's 15th annual convention is set for October 18-19. In urging a large attendance, Association President Max Starcke said:
Water is the primary substance of life. Here in Texas, how we solve our water problems will determine whether we continue to grow and prosper or not. The issue is that basic... Every person who drinks water from a tap, a well, a spring or stream—every person who holds a job—owns a business—runs a farm or ranch—helps direct the affairs of a city, town or community must give concern to water—for water concerns him."

Starcke means every word of it. Drouth fears prevail in Texas. The severe drouth of 1951-56 brought a sudden awakening. Texans listened thoughtfully to Colorado's Dr. Walter Orr Roberts when he told them recently that Texas may suffer the worst drouth of the century "if the sun's activities diminish in 1970-75 as several indications suggest".

Texans are taking their water problems seriously. So are Californians!

California's bold push for water is spurred on by her claim that the shortage in firm water supply in California is five million acre feet a year now and will be eleven million acre feet by 1965. This shortage is said to be made up principally by overdraft on groundwater. Add to this a population explosion...14.7 million today (twice the prewar population)...57 million expected by the year 2020 (almost four times today's population). Result: A serious water problem.

Seventy percent of California's water supply originates in the northern third of the state and 77 percent of her water need lies in the southern two thirds of the state. An area of origin versus area of need family battle has raged for years in California, much like Colorado's East Slope-West Slope water feud. But Californians now appear to be solidly behind a gigantic state-financed water development program.

California voters are expected to approve a $1.75 billion bond issue next year for water construction. That's a lot of money—even in California. Most of the money will be used for the Feather River Project...first unit of the California Water Plan. The Plan was developed by California after ten years of study at a cost of $8 million. It's a guide for future water development—federal, state, local and private—designed so that each future project will work for the benefit of all of the people in all areas of California.
The Feather River Project will bring water from the northern part of California to the Mexican border—750 miles away—serving water to areas of need along the way. It's the biggest single water development project ever attempted by any entity.

Key unit of the project is Oroville Dam, to be constructed on the Feather River above Sacramento. Capacity: 3.5 million acre feet. Height: 730 feet . . . 20 feet higher than Hoover Dam. And it's to be earthfill! The bottom 155 feet of its impervious core will be concrete, enclosing a powerhouse. Relocation of highways and utilities started in 1957.

Another integral part of the California Water Plan is the Biemond Plan. It's a $96 million project comparable in magnitude to work being done in the Netherlands to protect crops against salt water by closing off the coast and turning sea water inlets into fresh water lakes. The 1957 California legislature appropriated $1.3 million for plans and specifications aimed at an early construction start on the Biemond Plan.

The California Water Plan proposes to store 31 million acre feet underground in connection with 22 million acre feet of surface water storage. Available underground storage capacity is estimated to be over 130 million acre feet within 200 feet of the ground surface in the Central Valley area alone! Wells provide more than half of the water presently used in California: Groundwater recharge is planned on a tremendous scale. Much of the recharge water is expected to come from Colorado River diversions.

California's big state-financed water development program follows in the wake of vast federal projects. The Reclamation Bureau's Central Valley Project cost almost $800 million . . . five times the cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson Project. Between 1948 and 1958, the U. S. put $70 million each year into California reclamation and flood control projects. Another $30 million a year was spent by other public and private water agencies in California. This adds up to $100 million a year for California water development projects during the last decade.

Many agencies and firms are currently spending millions of dollars on northern California water projects. Total cost of California water projects now underway or recently completed exceeds a billion dollars. This is over and above the state-financed work.
Local California agencies have been busy on water development over the years. There are more than 300 major reservoirs in California, with an aggregate usable capacity of 22 million acre feet. Aggressive Los Angeles' Colorado River Aqueduct is designed to deliver 1,212,000 acre feet a year when completed to full capacity. Its cost at present price levels: One billion dollars.

But local agencies and the federal government aren't able to bridge the gap between what is being done and what needs to be done in water development, in the opinion of Californians. They feel that not enough federal money will be poured into the state, even through efforts of California's powerful congressional delegation, to close this gap. This is why California is entering the water project construction field in a big way.

The brains behind California's big state-financed push for water is her powerful Department of Water Resources. It was created two years ago by legislation which brought a multitude of overlapping state water agencies together into a single organization. It's a highly competent organization ... big (1,100 employees), well-financed (2.4 million in fiscal year 1958 for administration alone ... $3.8 million for investigations ... $20.3 million total). Serving as an advisory board to the Department is the seven-member California Water Commission. It is directed by law to confer with, advise, and make recommendations to the Director of Water Resources, Harvey O. Banks.

Director Banks: "Organized and with a common purpose in mind, California can continue to grow and prosper. Without a common purpose it is entirely possible that, to our future regret, we may grope and flounder. Water for California's future is the challenge of growth. Personally, I am sure we will meet it."

California and Texas are thinking-big on water development. They are doing something about their water problems. But what about Colorado?

Colorado is making admirable progress under the leadership of CWCB Director Felix Sparks, when viewed against the background of past CWCB performance. But try using the California and Texas yardstick ... the yardstick of action related to future needs ... and Colorado's water development program appears woefully inadequate.
Colorado has nothing even remotely resembling a bold, imaginative program to plan, protect and develop her water supplies on an integrated, state-wide basis. Colorado has no state water plan and she seems to be in no hurry to develop one. Colorado has no self-financing ideas on water development. She has exhibited little enthusiasm for fielding a big league technical water team. Colorado hasn't informed the public on interstate water problems and the need for state water development money.

A few Coloradans have understood these deficiencies . . . men whose life work is water. And they have done something about it by creating the Colorado Water Congress and putting it to work. But there is a limit to what the few can do. Local leaders . . . water users who can see beyond their headgate . . . will have to get into the Water Congress harness and help pull the load over the rough road that lies ahead.

A rare opportunity for development of local leadership in water is coming up soon. October 26: The annual meeting of the Colorado Water Congress. October 27-28-29-30: The annual convention of the National Reclamation Association. Invest a little time, effort and money in Colorado's future by coming to Denver for these important water talks.

*   *   *

Resource policy declarations of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce for 1959-60 have just been released in booklet form. Chamber views are described as "the reasoned views of a majority of its members". On the 45-member Natural Resources Committee: 20 from reclamation states, including Colorado's Harold Christy of Pueblo.

U. S. Chamber views coincide with western water development views on these issues: Western land withdrawals and reservations . . . Recognition of state water rights . . . Wilderness areas. They differ with project pushing westerners on hydro-power development, river basin financing, reclamation law.

The U. S. Chamber vigorously supports private power interests in the long-standing public vs. private power controversy. It labels additions to the federal power system as "an initial step toward socializing the electric power industry, leading to the ultimate socialization of other industries".
On river basin financing: Costs of direct benefits should be borne by direct beneficiaries in the area to be served. No power subsidy to irrigation. No earmarking of project revenues and repayments for later use as "additional appropriations".

On reclamation law: Eliminate the 160-acre land limitation provision. Junk the 1939 Reclamation Project Act provision which authorized water service contracts under which users do not eventually acquire ownership of the water rights.

Water Congress comment: U. S. Chamber views on power and reclamation are long-standing, deep-rooted and unlikely to change. Accept them as honest differences of opinion. Remember this: Western Chambers of Commerce, including those in Colorado, are strong supporters of reclamation and water development. Cultivate Chamber assistance within known areas of agreement.

Business groups are reported to have spent nearly $900,000 for lobbying in Congress during the first six months of 1959. This is nearly half the total amount reported by all lobbies. The U. S. Chamber has established a workshop in practical politics. Businessmen everywhere are being encouraged by their employers to participate in practical politics.

Colorado water users should urge their local Chambers of Commerce to stimulate U. S. Chamber activity on states' water rights legislation, the Allott amendments to the Wilderness Bill and other vital water legislation. They should urge their local Chamber to let state legislators know how they feel about state water issues, particularly appropriations. Water is business . . . everybody's business.

* * *

Water Congress Chairman John Barnard, Jr., testified at the recent Senate Select Committee hearing at Laramie. Thanks are due Senator John Carroll of Colorado for making it possible for Barnard to testify after Select Committeemen had expressed reluctance to schedule a Coloradan at the Laramie hearing. Reports are that Senator Carroll, probably with Senator Allott's support, will request that a hearing be held in Colorado. Neither serve on the Select Committee, so success is doubtful.
Colorado's biggest reservoir, John Martin, near Lamar, became a smelly battlefield this summer when irrigators drained it dry, leaving dead fish and angry fishermen. CWCB Director Felix Sparks has suggested that a 10,000 acre foot permanent pool be established and maintained by purchased water rights. Colorado water users have long advocated that principle. If the fish agencies want water reserved for fishermen, they should buy water rights.

CSU at Fort Collins has published an interesting, non-technical 28-page pamphlet, "Ground Water in Colorado", by Morton W. Bittinger. It is one of a series of three bulletins covering the physical, legal and economic aspects of ground water use. Copies can be obtained from the Bulletin Room, Colorado State University, Fort Collins or from County Extension Agents.

Grand Lake, Colorado, has been granted an interest-free advance of $4,000 for planning the construction of new water facilities. It's repayable following start of construction. Dollar source: The federal Program of Advances for Public Works Planning authorized by recent amendments by the 1954 Housing Act.

---

NRA CONVENTION NOTICE

Advance registration and ticket purchases for the National Reclamation Association Convention will save Water Congress members money and make it easier for the Water Congress to plan for the Convention. Check the "package" or "packages" you want below and send us your check for the amount indicated.

Registration, Air Force Academy Tour and meals for men ($24.50 value)  $22.50 ( ) $______________
Registration and meals for men without AFA tour ($18.00 value)  $16.50 ( ) _______________
Meals, AFA and Cherry Hills tours for ladies ($18.00 value)  16.50 ( ) _______________
Meals and Cherry Hills tour, without AFA tour, for ladies ($11.50 value)  10.50 ( ) _______________
Registration and AFA tour for men  11.50 ( ) _______________
AFA tour for ladies  6.50 ( ) _______________

TOTAL  $________________

(Name) (City)
(Address) (State)
All members of the Water Congress have received notice of the Annual Meeting of the Colorado Water Congress, which will be held at the Denver Public Library, 1370 Broadway, Denver, Colorado, at 1:30 P.M., Monday, October 26th. In order that members can be advised of the agenda prior to the meeting itself, and thereby be prepared to discuss the various items, the Rules Committee met on October 9th and approved the following items for the agenda. The Rules Committee will be standing by for additional action if necessary. I have added a few explanatory remarks after the actual agenda items. The agenda is as follows:

1. Address - Director of Natural Resources.
This has not been firmed up with the Director as yet, but we are hopeful that he will have the time to speak to us briefly on his plan for the organization and operation of the new Department of Natural Resources.

2. Report by the Director, Colorado Water Conservation Board.
We will ask Director Sparks to review the activity of the Board briefly, with particular reference to the Glen Canyon filling criteria, the Curecanti Project, the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, the John Martin Reservoir Recreation Pool, and the activities of the Water Congress from the viewpoint of the Colorado Water Conservation Board. The Rules Committee did not approve any discussion on the report.

Last spring, the Secretary of the Interior asked the Governor of Colorado to comment on an adverse report by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries on the proposed Curecanti Project, on the grounds that irreplaceable recreational values would be destroyed. The Water Congress Rules and Executives Committees jointly met and took action to recommend strong opposition to the position taken by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries. In addition, a resolution was adopted, affirming the principle that beneficial consumptive use of water for human consumption and production of food, fibre and power should always have first priority, and that recreational uses should be encouraged to the greatest extent possible in conformity with the priority of other uses. This is contrary to the basis of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries' attitude, which is that the use of water for domestic, agricultural and manufacturing purposes should be subservient to the maintenance of flowing streams for the use of fishermen who do not like to fish on lakes. This is a matter of such basic significance to the future policy of Colorado that the Rules Committee felt that the matter should be, at the next annual meeting, discussed and passed upon by the membership.

4. Report of the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Water Administration, by Mr. Philip A. Danielson.
Under the authority of the Rules Committee, a joint committee on water administration statutes was appointed. Three members were
appointed from the Water Congress, and three from the Bar Association. This committee has met and is prepared to make recommendations for a program to re-examine and possibly rewrite some of the archaic water administration statutes. Full discussion has been approved by the Rules Committee, but individuals will have a time limit because of the scope of the subject.

5. Report of the Chairman of the Colorado Water Congress, Mr. John B. Barnard, Jr.
This report will cover activities of the Chairman and staff of the Water Congress during the past 12 months. There will be a full report on the NRA Convention to be held the same week as the Annual Meeting, the Allott amendments to the Wilderness Bill and other wilderness developments, recommendations for state financed technical assistance and construction advances to local units and the activities of the Senate Select Committee on water resources.

6. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Charles C. Fisk.
This will be essentially a statement of the current financial condition of the Colorado Water Congress.

7. Report of the Finance Chairman, Mr. Ralph Sargent, Jr.
This will be one of the most important items on the agenda. The future of the Water Congress would seem to be assured if we can increase our income to the point where we can continue to carry on our present activities and expand those activities. We will have to take a hard look at this problem now.

8. Election of officers.
A Nominating Committee has been appointed and will report. Nominations will be received from the floor. Serious thought should be given to the qualifications of officers for the coming year. The present Chairman has announced that he will not serve again as Chairman. The present Secretary-Treasurer has likewise declined to serve another term. We want to emphasize again the importance of every concerned water user in the State being present at this meeting. The future of the Colorado Water Congress is at stake, and many of us feel this has a direct bearing on the future of Colorado.

John B. Barnard, Jr.
Chairman, Colorado Water Congress