"Problems of immediacy always have the advantage of attracting notice—those that lie in the future fare poorly in the competition for attention and money. It is not a task which should or can be done by the Federal Government alone. Only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local governments and private industry can it be done wisely and effectively. We cannot, however, delude ourselves—we must understand our resources problems, and we must face up to them now. The task is large, but it will be done." (President Kennedy's Special Message on Natural Resources)

Public power is firmly seated in the interior department's saddle. There's new life in the old power horse . . . more life than Capitol Hill has seen since the days when Harold Ickes cracked interior's whip.

Secretary Udall's power policy statement leaves no doubts about the administration's power goals. It's to be "a vigorous program of full development and maximum utilization of our total energy resources to meet the nation's growing demands."

Udall reaffirmed the basic power policy established in 1946 by Secretary Ickes. He stressed that "utility systems of all kinds—federal, state, municipal, private, cooperative—must carry out their full responsibilities to the public welfare." He urged that immediate attention be given to "enlarging regional cooperative pooling of generation and transmission facilities and planning for the interconnection of areas served by the department's marketing agencies with adequate common-carrier transmission lines."

Out the window: The partnership approach.

Current emphasis on public power comes as no surprise. Tip-off was appointment of Kenneth Holum as assistant secretary for water and power. Other handwriting: "One of Udall's first announced policies was that no one should be employed in his department who did not favor putting the government in the business of producing and distributing electric power." (Raymond Moley, Los Angeles Times)
There is plenty of reaction coming from both sides of the power fence.

William H. Stringer (Christian Science Monitor): "When visitors ask to see a real-life 'liberal' in the Kennedy Cabinet, Washingtonians are wont to point out the firm-jawed, youthful Interior Secretary . . .

"Not since the days of Harold L. Ickes has Washington had a Secretary of Interior who is so outspoken and vigorous on the liberal side of the street. A colleague on the House Education and Labor Committee has called Secretary Udall 'brilliant, tenacious and courageous.'"

Los Angeles Times: "The myth about the electric power dam will not die. Most people do not analyze their superstition about dams, and as a result the public power advocates in the government . . . are able to keep lively the notion that if all the water power sources were developed, with public money, of course, the country could sit back and enjoy electricity practically for free.

'The use of electric power usually begets the use of more power—and only so much water falls over a dam. The promises of the Interior Department are false. Either the growing community must produce its own power, as Los Angeles has done, and as all Southern California has done through the private utility companies, or the federal government will step in and build supporting steam plants and charge them to the whole country.

"'Development of natural resources,'" which usually means building dams for power to irrigate unnecessary farm land, is a slogan that should make the people wary. It does not mean what the public power advocates say." (Editorial, 3-10-61, "The Water Power Superstition")

Interior's public power words are being translated into action. USBR has begun feasibility studies on interconnection of major federal power systems. Objective: Power interchanges from energy surplus areas to deficiency areas on a vastly larger scale than now possible. Outlook: Step by step toward an ultimate nation-wide power grid. Beneficiaries: Both public and private utilities.

N. B. Bennett, Jr. (USBR): "When (certain) modifications are accomplished it will be possible to have an interconnection from the Pacific Northwest all the way to the Tennessee Valley Authority system, including some systems on the Gulf Coast and extending north of TVA to the Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania systems on the East Coast. This will be a big day for electric utilities, both public and privately owned, in the two systems, because experience has shown that system interconnections result in increased capacities and a mutual savings in energy generation by virtually all the participating utilities . . .

"I think you can readily see that as a result of the Colorado River Storage Project, all major systems west of the Mississippi River, with the exception of a large part of Texas, will be interconnected and will be able to function as one power pool."
Big power developments are on tap in the Pacific Northwest. Over a billion dollars worth of new multipurpose water projects will probably result from the Columbia River basin treaty between U. S. and Canada. A 60-year treaty was signed last January, following ten years of negotiations. Ratification is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

**Treaty dam plan:** Three big dams in Canada (15.5 MAF), one dam (Libby) in Montana, enlargement of present U. S. powerplants. Total cost: $750 million for U.S. and $450 million for Canada. **Benefits:** Mostly hydroelectric power, split (for U.S.) three-fourths to federal plants, one-fourth to private plants. Also flood control, plus many river regulation benefits.

**Big power from treaty projects:** Over two million kilowatts of new saleable firm power . . . more than the combined dependable output from Grand Coulee (largest in U.S.) and Bonneville powerplants. **Cheap power:** Cost to U.S. about $14 per kilowatt-year delivered, or about 1.6 mills per KWH. Power will probably be sold at the Bonneville Power Administration rate of $17.50 per KW-year . . . lowest in the nation. BPA will get a much needed economic shot in its power arm. It's been running in the red.

Treaty ratification is expected. Then the battle will start over who is to build the facilities . . . federal or local agencies, private or public.

Another spectacular Columbia Basin federal project: The world's largest atomic powerplant . . equal in power production to one and a half Bonneville powerplants. It's to be built at Hanford.

Commercial and sports fishermen are hoping that the big boost in Columbia basin power will postpone the need for more power dams on the middle Snake River . . . particularly Mountain Sheep and Nez Perce. Applications for licences to build these dams are now before the Federal Power Commission. But proposed power system interconnections may take care of the power surplus problem. And Secretary Udall seems inclined to light up the smouldering Snake River power fires.
Udall told reporters that interior might intervene in the middle Snake cases. And he cited Hells Canyon on the upper Snake as the most notable example of what he did not like about the previous administration's power policies.

Trends suggest that if the Snake River power fight heats up again, there may be some congressional bone rattling in the Hell's Canyon vote closet. Vote commitments (or lack of them) on future power showdowns might have repercussions on authorizations for federal water projects that are far removed from the power battleground.

Sharp veering of interior's water ship toward emphasis on public power development leaves in its wake some unanswered questions.

William Stringer (Christian Science Monitor): "The policy switch to vigorous development of public power projects already has private power lobbyists, rural cooperatives, and everyone interested in power programs anxiously awaiting announcement of just which dams and developments Mr. Udall has his determined eye on."

Also wondering: Supporters of federal reclamation projects that aren't primarily power glamor boys. Colorado example: Fryingpan-Arkansas project. Fry-Ark's projected annual benefits split $5 million irrigation, $3.6 million power, $1.1 million municipal, $0.8 million flood and sediment control.

Fry-Ark is competing for the administration's project authorization favor with several projects, including Burns Creek. Burns is a proposed power and irrigation project (re-regulating reservoir and powerplant) 30 miles downstream from big Palisades Dam on the upper Snake River in Idaho. Measurements: 234,000 acre foot reservoir, 90,000 KW powerplant, $45 million cost (irrigation pays only $775,000). Secretary Udall urged authorization of Burns Creek project in a recent letter to Senator Anderson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee.

Still smouldering: Fires heating the public-vs-private fight over who is to build the backbone transmission system for the Colorado River Storage Project. Former Secretary Fred Seaton ruled in favor of federal construction on January 17th. Seaton's last stand was later reaffirmed by Secretary Udall. At stake: 2,000 miles of
transmission lines costing $157 million.

Private power interests say their lines can handle the project load. They claim their plan would save $136 million in transmission line capital investment. Investor owned utilities are expected to fight proposed appropriations for federal construction in a major congressional battle.

Private utilities point out that CRSP power will be only a drop in the upper basin's power bucket. Utah Power and Light Co. indicated (in a Salt Lake Tribune advertisement) that private utilities were investing $1.1 billion in steam generation for the Rocky Mountain area.

Utah Power and Light Co: "By 1980, major utilities of the Rocky Mountain area plan to have available 22 million kilowatts of electricity, 5 1/4 times present demands. To do this, these companies will add approximately 18 million kilowatts of generating capacity. The electricity to be provided by the Colorado River Storage Project is only 1.2 million kilowatts, just 6 2/3% of our needs in 1980."

PEOPLE: Representative Ray Farr of Sugar City took time out from a busy legislative day to attend the March 7th meeting of the Colorado Water Conservation Board . . . Pete Peters and Albert Pantle were re-elected to the board of directors of the Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co. at the annual meeting in Ordway. They were pro-sale faction candidates, were opposed by candidates sponsored by the Crowley County Improvement Association.

William J. Baker of Loma was re-elected president of the Grand Valley Water Users Association . . . Wayne A. Smith, Denver SCS engineer, won state honors recently for telling the story of water photographically. His pictures will be entered in national competition sponsored by USDA and a farm magazine. . . Donald Hamburg, formerly with the Denver Water Board legal staff, is now employed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board as supervisory water resources analyst.

Allen P. Mitchem, Denver attorney, has been named minority counsel to the Senate Interior Committee.
Sen. Gordon Allott of Colorado: "Mitchem will bring a broad and intimate understanding of the problems of the West to the committee staff. I feel certain that he will be of real help to the committee members in writing legislation to forward the development of water, resources, lands and the other fields with which we are charged."

Morris K. Udall, 38-year old brother of the Secretary, easily swept past five opponents for his party's nomination to Congress to fill the vacant House seat.

Arizonan's will vote May 2nd. When fast stepping Stewart Udall's recent power policy announcements gave impressions of putting interior's cart before the congressional horse, Colorado's Rep. Wayne Aspinall tactfully reminded him that Congress makes policy. The interior department recommends policies and carries out programs.

John S. Hamilton, principal staff assistant to the undersecretary of interior is a member of the Sierra Club, (pusher on wilderness legislation). Hamilton was a USBR engineer on the West Coast. Elmer Bennett, former undersecretary of interior and native Coloradan, has stirred some comment following his teaming-up with Northcutt Ely, California's top water attorney in Colorado River litigation.

Grand Junction Sentinel: "The Upper Basin had counted on Bennett to be its top water attorney when he went into private law practice after leaving Interior. He received an offer from a top Denver law firm, but Ely outbid the Upper Basin for Bennett's services.

"Bennett . . . is not only a top flight attorney, but he knows where all of the bones are buried in the Upper Basin. His gain to California is a grievous loss to the Upper Basin which has a shortage of top flight legal water talent."

Alfred Golze, former ass't USBR commissioner, has filled the newly created $18,000 a year job as chief engineer for the California Dep't of Water Resources. Director Warne is also a former USBR assistant commissioner. Another USBR alumnus joining CDWR is Haywood Dewey, who will head-up design and construction.

Congressman Edgar Chenoweth has commented on recent Water Congress Newsletter interpretations of his role in the historic struggle for Fry-Ark project authorization.
Chenoweth: "I want to state without equivocation that I have supported every reclamation and flood control project that has been considered by Congress since I have been a Member. My voting record has been an issue in recent campaigns and my opponents have been unable to cite a single project which failed to receive my support.

'Mr. Udall and I served on the House Interior Committee for several years and enjoyed the most friendly relations. Last year he had a bill pending for the purchase of a trading post in Arizona which went to a roll call vote in the House and was defeated. I was one of the few Republicans who supported his bill. I do not know of any western Congressman who would oppose the Fryingpan because of my voting record."

Your Newsletter welcomes friendly comments such as Judge Chenoweth's. It attempts to interpret the changing water scene for Colorado water users on a non-partisan basis. Your Water Congress is trying to develop real understandings of what is happening to Colorado's most important natural resource . . . water. It's not an easy thing to do.

James Marlow (Associated Press news analyst): "There will be a lot of wind (when Congress gets down to work on the administration's program), and a lot of rough water. The infighting should be fascinating.

"The trouble with infighting, from the spectator's viewpoint, is that so much of it is out of sight, like the mayhem that goes on constantly under the surface of a lake where the fish chew on each other and the unseen winners put on weight."

The Fry-Ark has many fires a-burning. One little noticed congressional brush fire was started recently by Rep. Craig Hosmer of Southern California. Hosmer urged California senators and congressmen to "unite in solid, bipartisan opposition to federal construction of any more reclamation projects in . . . Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada and Arizona". He said "additional projects in any of these states would consume water which otherwise would flow downstream for possible use in California."

Hosmer's fire was ignited by his interpretation of a letter sent to California congressmen by Cal's attorney general, Stanley Mosk, who stated that Rifkind's decision in the Arizona-California lawsuit could prove "disastrous" to California. But Hosmer's brush fire apparently died out for lack of California fuel."
Rep. B. F. Sisk of California: "While the State of California naturally and properly is concerned with retaining its full legal share of the Colorado River, in my opinion the state administration is not seeking to block other states in the legitimate realization of solutions for their water problems."

Northern California is cooling on the "fruitless and barren (Colorado River) lawsuit". Five northern state senators recently observed that "California has spent $5 million on the case and apparently will wind up with 1 million acre feet less water". The $5 million "would build 253 elementary classrooms".

The California legislature is reported to be on the brink of open warfare over proposed changes in the $1.75 billion water program. Downstate water people are "extremely concerned about bills designed to strangle the water program with political red tape". Brink deterrent: Gov. Brown's threat to veto any water legislation that would endanger the state's water contract with MWD for delivery of Feather River Project water to Southern California.

Several wilderness bills have been introduced in Congress during the current round of a five-year running battle over establishment of a national wilderness system. Best known proposal is the Anderson bill (S 174), sponsored by Sen. Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee. It incorporates modifications resulting from hearings on previous bills. But not enough modifications to make it palatable to Western water users.

Secretary Udall has urged enactment of the Anderson bill. He described it as "a reasonable measure on which reasonable men can agree." Secretary of Agriculture Freeman favors it. NRA opposes the Anderson bill. Gov. Mc Nichols sent an opposition letter to members of the Senate Interior Committee. Various water interests have submitted statements opposing S 174.

T. P. Campbell, President of Denver Water Board: "The Wilderness Bill would put affected areas of the National Forests and National Parks in a straight-jacket. Once a boundary becomes established, Presidential action becomes necessary to change the boundary. Also the Bill provides that reservoirs and water conservation works within National Forests and public domain areas included in the wilderness system may be established only after Presidential determination that such use in the specific area will better serve the interest of the United States than will its denial."
"We suppose that an attempt might be made to run the whole United States government by providing that nothing can be done without Presidential act. A President, already over-burdened with responsibilities, is put in an impossible position. It would appear that the wildlife interests promoting this Legislation want to make sure that these wilderness areas remain 'untrammeled' by men no matter how great the need of man may be for their use."

Sen. Gordon Allott of Colorado has introduced a wilderness bill. It's a copy of the 1960 O'Mahoney, Allott version. It protects western water users by giving Congress the power to decide which areas could be included in a wilderness preservation system.

Senate Interior Committee has started hearings on the wilderness bills. Closed-door executive sessions will be held soon. John Barnard, Jr. represented your Water Congress at the hearings on S 174 and will probably continue to aid during further congressional consideration of the wilderness bills. Senate Interior Committee members: Anderson, Allott, Carroll, Henry M. Jackson (Washington), Alan Bible (Nevada), Frank Church (Idaho), Ernest Gruening (Alaska), Frank E. Moss (Utah), Oren E. Long (Hawaii), Quentin N. Burdick (N.D.), Lee Metcalf (Montana), J. J. Hickey (Wyo.), Henry Dworshak (Idaho), Thomas Kuchel (California), Barry Goldwater (Arizona), Hiram Fong (Hawaii), Jack Miller (Iowa). Single purpose wilderness legislation opponents include Allott, Goldwater, Hickey, Gruening, and probably Carroll and Moss. Proponents include Anderson, Kuchel. Kuchel has to live with the strong Sierra Club in California.

Wilderness legislation outlook: Proponents may push S 174 through the Senate, but probably won't get it through the House this year.

Good reading about operations of a highly successful federal reclamation project is available in the "Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District's Twenty-Third Annual Report." Secretary-Manager J. R. Barkley notes that "some 5,000 acre feet of (CBT project) water may eventually be transferred from agricultural to rural domestic use." Barkley stresses the importance of project water to Northern Colorado crop production during 1960.
J. R. Barkley: "The dry, hot growing season allowed the application of irrigation water at the times and in the quantities most advantageous for crop production. Therefore it is significant to note that, with no substantial changes in farm commodity prices since the previous season, the value of crops produced in the South Platte Valley was almost $8,000,000 greater in 1960 than in the season of 1959."

GOOD NEWS: USBR is requesting nearly $15 million for construction and rehabilitation of reclamation projects in Colorado during FY 1962 ... plus $800,000 for investigations of Colorado water projects. It's a new high for Colorado and the outlook is for continued high-level federal investments in Colorado's water future. Joint Budget Committee of the Colorado Legislature has approved the funds requested by Colorado water agencies for FY 1962. Included: $25,000 to start a complete recodification of Colorado's archaic water laws (some additional funds are available for remainder of fiscal 1961) and $50,000 to expedite USBR studies of the South Platte River basin, including the revised and enlarged Narrows Project.

COLORADO WATER DOINGS: Extension of the Grand Mesa cloud seeding program to cover the whole county is being considered by Paonia ditch companies. Taos, N. M. ski enthusiasts handled the drought problem in their own way. They had Taos Pueblo Indians do a special snow dance asking for the white stuff to fall. Results were excellent. But Grand Lake residents don't want any man-induced snowmaking. They passed an ordinance in 1952 declaring cloud seeding a nuisance!

Boulder Water Department has been advised by engineering consultants to include universal metering as an integral part of its plan to increase Boulder's water supply. Arvada city council has received an engineering feasibility report on water treatment facility construction and the raising of water rates to both inside and outside city users. Engineers recommended construction of a 9 MDG Raisin Filter Plant by 1962, at a site suited to eventual expansion to an ultimate capacity of about 100 million gallons per day.