August 25, 1922.

Personal

My dear Mr. Hoover:

I am taking the liberty of enclosing for your personal and confidential consideration a copy of a preliminary draft of a compact providing for the permanent and equitable distribution of the waters of the Colorado River upon a "fifty-fifty" basis pursuant to your suggestion. This is merely my first effort and I am submitting it to you and others for the purpose of obtaining personal suggestions and criticism. It is, of course, largely the work of a single mind and therefore possesses infirmities which may become at once apparent to any unbiased critic. I seek suggestions pointing out such infirmities.

As I have considered the whole problem the fifty-fifty plan proves more and more attractive. It provided a permanent basis of allocation and automatically takes care of all questions of tunnel diversions, intrastate uses and regulations, local interstate controversies (present and future), extensions of the duty of water, advantages to be obtained by local uses or contributions of return waters (be they large or small, and other like vexing questions.

The river basin is similar to a natural hourglass and nature formed the two divisions. By conforming to these natural divisions we arrive at a basis for permanent settlement of all grounds of controversy. All water from the upper division naturally passes Lee's Ferry. All waters not diverted through intermountain tunnels or consumed by plant life and evaporation must inevitably arrive at the funnel mouth at Lee's Ferry. No artificial works or human instrumentalities are required to force the continuation of this condition through all time to come. By fixing a minimum average annual flow past Lee's Ferry the upper country is left to develop at time, conditions and opportunities will permit. If the theory of some be true, that one-half of all water diverted and applied to lands automatically returns to the stream, the upper States could make a first use of the entire flow of the river above Lee's
Ferry and still deliver nearly the required minimum at that point. Of course, we know that such extensive diversions can never occur and that there will always be more than the required minimum passing Lee's Ferry, but all human factors and prejudices respecting the protection of an unlimited development within the States of origin are at once completely satisfied and silenced by the method suggested. There need be no interference from below. There need be no contest of speed giving rise to foolhardy rivalry to result in disaster and financial disappointment. The upper country is left to its natural and normal development. This will be gradual and will conform to the growth of the country, improvement of transportation, and all those conditions which call for or may warrant such development. It may proceed slowly or with speed as these conditions permit.

The lower country is assured a definite, perpetual minimum average flow at Lee's Ferry. This flow is ample for all needs of that country. Any excess over and above this minimum will simply add to the power possibilities upon the lower river and then will proceed on its way to the sea. Reservoir construction and other development may take place at once or any future time when financial and other conditions may justify. Reservoirs and other works may be constructed with a definite assurance that no less than a certain quantity of water will always be available.

The international situation is left entirely for the future. There need be no embarrassing consideration of the problem. Whatever burden is placed upon the river is equally distributed and the lower country will obtain the benefit of all power returns from the excess water passing Lee's Ferry to satisfy one-half of the international burden. While there will be some evaporation losses between Lee's Ferry and Yuma, the power development will more than offset any such losses. The upper States will be placed in a position where the future development upon the lower river will never become a menace and they may accordingly give that free and generous support to the development of the lower river required for flood protection and other necessities of the near future.

Evaporation losses from storage reservoirs within the upper division are automatically accounted for and charged to the upper division by reason of the
resultant diminution of the flow at Lee's Ferry. Evaporation from the reservoirs of the lower division, including the Glen Canyon Reservoir, are automatically charged to the division receiving the benefits. I have concluded that the benefits to be obtained from power development would more than offset the losses occasioned by evaporation.

We already have a pending controversy between New Mexico and Colorado respecting the waters of the LaPlata River. In the course of time many other matters common to two or more of the States may present themselves for future consideration. These should be disposed of as they arise. We cannot and should not foreclose any opportunity for their proper consideration at the appropriate times. We are unable to prophesy the questions to be presented or the best methods of solution. These are all matters for the future. The more we avoid attempting to deal with them the more simple becomes our present problem. I have accordingly provided that all such matters are left for future consideration.

You will note that the suggested draft does not abolish navigation. While we all realize that the navigation of the Colorado River is more of a fiction than a reality, such use of the water of the river need not be abolished but may be made subservient to other uses. Article VIII. deals with this phase of the problem.

A peculiar condition presents itself with respect to subordinating power development to other more beneficial uses. In a number of the States the constitutional provisions, as construed by the courts, merely permit the superior use to absorb the inferior through the exercise of eminent domain and upon payment of due compensation. On the other hand, the whole question becomes simplified by treating the question of preferences of other uses over power as intradivisional. By so doing the whole interdivisional problem is reduced to the one factor of the mean average annual flow at Lee's Ferry. Within each division and as between the States thereof, power is made subservient to other uses, but intrastate control is left unimpaired.

The great outstanding features of the application of the whole plan of equal apportionment between the two divisions are simplicity and permanence. Everything is left to proceed in its own way and in an order-
ly manner. There are no interfering commissions or contests of speed within limited terms of years. There are no bitter rivalries. No menace confronts the future welfare of either section and all grounds of sectional fear and rivalry are at once disposed of. While an ex officio continuing commission is created its sole purpose is that of ascertaining and publishing the annual flows at Lee's Ferry in order that all the High Contracting Parties may have proof of compliance with the provisions of the compact. Even this commission merely makes provision for ascertaining the facts and will probably authorize the Geological Survey or a similar institution to maintain a rating station at Lee's Ferry with ample opportunity for check rating by interested parties. Even this provision is made elastic so that it may conform to those changes which the future may bring forth.

In order to test out local sentiment I permitted an article to appear in "The Denver Post" suggesting the probability that the Commissioner for Colorado would offer a compact based upon the fifty-fifty division of the recorded Yuma flow of the river. To my surprise the re-action was very favorable. Even the most radical with whom I have conversed are reconciled to such an adjustment. They believe that sufficient latitude is afforded to recommend the plan.

One further matter — where reservoirs or ditches are constructed upon the territory of two or more States it should always be with consent of the interested States, otherwise chaos and conflict will inevitably develop. The Reclamation Service should never be allowed to build a plant in one State for use of the waters of that State within another State without a previous understanding between the States. Had such a rule been followed the lamentable conditions upon the North Platte and other rivers would have been avoided. The fundamental principles of our Federal Union forbid oppression of the States or overriding of State authority by national agencies. Every precaution should be taken to safeguard these principles. The very legislation creating our Commission proceeds upon the basis of State sovereignties. In view of this situation and the fears justly entertained by some of the upper States (Wyoming in particular), as well as by some of the lower States, I have incorporated provisions requiring consent of the State Governments in all such cases. While, in some cases, development may be somewhat retarded while awaiting an interstate adjustment, nevertheless, like all precautionary measures, the time consumed in the waiting is more
than compensated by avoiding subsequent strife and conflict. I am moved to incorporate this provision out of that degree of caution resulting from years of active participation with the controversies between States respecting waters of interstate streams. These controversies are not only interstate wars, in a broad sense, but are interminable and tend to break down the very elements necessary to be preserved under our form of Government.

I have written you thus fully in order that I may suggest in small part a few of the many lines of thought which I have followed in formulating the suggested compact now offered for your criticism. I wish that I might confer with you in person at more length respecting its several features, but I fear that I must forego that pleasure. As I stated at the outset I am forwarding this to you confidentially and purely as a personal matter, and I take the liberty of stating that I am prompted so to do out of a feeling of the deepest personal regard. I am keenly appreciative of that underlying spirit of broad-minded fairplay which you have exhibited. The sphere of my personal endeavors during the past fifteen years has in a large measure isolated me from others in my own profession and has frequently provoked a feeling of extreme loneliness which at times has been almost overwhelming, and as our hearings have proceeded your presence has prompted within me a sense of comradeship which now impels me to forward you the enclosed draft in the hope that you may give it your most rigid scrutiny, mature thought, and unstinted criticism.

Sincerely yours,

DELPHE E. CARPENTER,
COMMISSIONER FOR COLORADO.

To
Hon. Herbert Hoover,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.
Coachella Valley County Water District
of Riverside County
Coachella, California

Sept. 25, 1922.

Mr. W. F. McClure,
State Engineer,
Sacramento, Cal.

Dear Sir:

We hereby confirm our wire to you under date of Sept. 20, 1922:

W. F. McClure, State Engineer,
Sacramento, Cal.

District been considering Commissioner Carpenters proposition of dividing waters between upper and lower states on fifty fifty basis and are anxious know if under such arrangement Commissioner Carpenter would be willing restrict use within Colorado River water shed with exception of Denver and Strawberry diversions amounting approximately four hundred thousand acre feet STOP You have districts correspondence with Director Davis regarding matter such division of waters Colorado River and from study this correspondence you will see that while the Director does not state specifically there is implied inference that it would curtail power developments at Boulder Canyon dam site and as result possibly interfere with government considering building of said dam STOP We feel if water is to be used within watershed upper states will be continuously allowing enormous quantities water come to dam site because of their physical inability to use it within water shed thus making it possible for full power development at dam STOP May we respectfully request you communicate with Commissioner Carpenter and establish his attitude regarding first point raised in this message then communicate with us STOP In conversation with member Imperial Irrigation Board over phone few minutes ago he suggested it very likely solution this question and invited early conference in fact specified next Tuesday morning to go over proposition with Imperial Board STOP Will appreciate hearing from you soon as possible regarding this matter also would appreciate letter if there is anything new in reference work of Commission in which we can be of any assistance to you.

COACHELLA VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT
V. E. Skiles, Secretary.

Trusting that we may have a reply from you at your earliest convenience, we are

Yours very truly,

V. E. Skiles

COACHELLA VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT
September 26, 1922.

Hon. T. F. McClure,
State Engineer,
Department of Public Works,
Sacramento, California.

My dear Mr. McClure:

In reply to yours of the 12th instant I will state that it is possible that Mr. Emerson's impression is correct although, for my part, I earnestly hope that we will not have to make a trip to Washington. Be that as it may, I shall expect to conform to developments.

I have been working for some time upon a very simple solution of the entire Colorado River matter, based wholly upon the principle of the upper States guaranteeing to the territory below Lee's Ferry an average annual flow sufficient, when added to the average flow between Lee's Ferry and Yuma, to make a delivery of an amount equivalent to one-half of the average flow at Yuma computed from the twenty-year record at that point. In other words, the territory draining into the Colorado above Lee's Ferry would guarantee to the country below Lee's Ferry an average annual delivery of water sufficient to give the territory below that point the benefit of a quantity of water equivalent to one-half the Yuma flow. Subject to the fulfillment of this guarantee the upper country to have free and unlimited development, either within or without the drainage as its conditions and natural development may require.

Of course, it will probably be physically impossible for the upper country to ever reduce the flow down to the point of the guarantee. The object would be to fix an outside limit to which the upper country might go, which limit, in turn, positively guarantee to the lower country a perpetual minimum which would give sufficient basis for the proper developments of reservoir storage, etc., within the lower area.
I am leaving the international burden to fit the future requirements in that quarter, the upper territory to undertake one-half the burden and the lower one-half the burden of supplying whatever water may later be determined to be due the Republic of Mexico.

In short, my whole thought proceeds upon the basis of an equal division of the Yuma flow between the two natural divisions of territory within the Colorado River basin. The international burden, whatever it may later be to fall equally upon the two divisions. Of course, the lower division would get the power benefits from the water turned down from the upper division to supply its one-half of the international burden, such water being in addition to the quantity guaranteed to be delivered to the lower country in order to make available one-half the Yuma flow within the territory below Lee's Ferry.

The more I have worked along this line, the more I am convinced that it will meet all the requirements in both quarters and automatically cares for every phase and objection thus far presented. The very simplicity of the solution commends it. It would insure a perpetual understanding and comity between the States and would likewise assure the immediate aid of the four upper States to encourage the construction of the Boulder Canyon Dam, for the reason that all hazard to the upper States by reason of said construction would thus be perpetually removed. There will be no interference by continuing interstate commissions or with local State regulation by interests in other States. While Colorado furnishes the greater part of the water which passes Lee's Ferry and thus would be underwriting the burden of the four upper States, our water supply is so great and our acreage so proportionately limited that Colorado can safely undertake this burden.

If the ideas thus roughly stated impress you as feasible I shall be pleased to forward for your personal and confidential consideration a memorandum draft of a compact along the lines indicated, but as yet do not care to offer to the whole commission any proposed draft of compact or make the same public.
Nothing short of perpetual settlement of the entire river controversy will meet with the approval of people in this section. They will not look with favor upon continuing commissions or any permission to permit the construction of enormous reservoirs upon the lower river without guaranteeing perpetual immunity from later assertions of adverse claims from such structures. They will not subscribe to any programme which to any degree will leave the destiny of the seven States to a contest of speed and rivalry. They are willing to aid the immediate relief of the lower river country, but emphatically insist that they shall never be penalized for so doing.

The proposal which I have in mind cares for this entire situation, and while it gives authority to the State Engineers of the seven States, ex-officio, to make provision for annual determination of the flow of the river at Lee's Ferry, it meets every other objection which may be offered and leaves the entire basin to develop along natural lines with perfect assurance to every section and protection to every use wherever made.

If you have the time to devote a study of the question along the lines indicated, I believe you will be favorably impressed with the conclusions naturally following this method of treatment.

Very truly yours,

DELCH E. CARPENTER,
COMMISSIONER FOR COLORADO.
October 5, 1922.

Hon. Delph E. Carpenter,
Colorado River Commissioner,
Greeley, Colorado.

SUBJECT: COLORADO RIVER

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

Very pleased indeed to read your good letter of September 28, outlining with more definiteness than you have before attempted a proposed solution of the allocation or distribution of the waters of the Colorado between the upper and lower States.

Your proposal appeals to me as feasible, and I shall be pleased indeed to receive, as you suggest, for my personal and confidential consideration, a memorandum draft of such compact as you have in mind.

Some time ago I communicated to the Coachella Valley County Water District the suggestion made by yourself regarding distribution of the waters between the upper and lower States on a fifty-fifty basis, and on September 25 the District wired me. They confirmed the communication by letter, the original of which I enclose herewith.

Anticipating the pleasure of meeting you again at Santa Fe on November 9, believe me to be

Very sincerely yours,

State Engineer.

WFM:G
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON

PERSONAL

October 10, 1922.

Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley,
Colo.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

It was only yesterday morning that I returned officially to my desk, from the clutter of which I am only just crawling out from under. As yet I have not seen the Chief as he is at home, sick. He has, I think, been quite miserable, but I am happy to say is better today. As soon as possible, I will get to see him and take up the questions we discussed, after which I will communicate with you.

I will send you in a day or so page proof of my article in the World's Work, and hope you will take it in the spirit in which it was written,—neutral with a desire to get before the East through the medium of a monthly magazine which in my opinion stands for the best there is, a picture of the complicated questions which you have under consideration and of the possibilities of the seven states of the Basin. When you receive it, I wish you would regard it as confidential until publication, and also I would very much appreciate a candid expression of opinion thereon from a friend whose judgment I value.

I will write you in the course of a few days regarding the form and formalities of the compact.

Again let me thank you for the interesting visit I had with you and for your kindness to me while in Colorado.

Very sincerely yours,

Clarence C. Stetson.

CCS-AC.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,  
State Capitol Bldg.,  
Denver, Colo.

October 16, 1922.

Dear Carpenter:

Thank you for the letter of the 11th, which your Secretary, whose name I cannot make out, sent me enclosing the original of the letter addressed to you by the Denver Post with reference to the use of the picture by the "World's Work". There was evidently some misunderstanding as the picture which I wished to use was not that of my humble self but rather one of the distinguished Commission. For your personal information, I am enclosing a copy of the article, to which the World's Work has affixed the most glowing title. You will notice on page 95 of the enclosed sheets a picture of the Commission, which was the one I desired to have permission for the World's Work to use. You will also note that credit has not been given to the Denver Post, but I will see that this is corrected in the next issue of the World's Work. Is it necessary to get a corrected letter from the Denver Post regarding this picture or will the letter which you forwarded me, and of which I enclose copy, be satisfactory?

When we were talking over this article in Denver, you said that statements in print sometimes look terrible. I quite agree with you.

As I explained to you this article was written with a view to presenting the case in a neutral manner, with a purpose of bringing to the attention of the East, where the World's Work has a splendid standing and circulation, the difficult questions with which the Commission was confronted, and especially the possibilities and potentialities of the Colorado River Basin states.

There are one or two positive statements in the article which were not intended to be as strong as they appear. As a matter of fact, these statements were modified on the galley proof but unhappily were not incorporated in the final print. I refer more especially to the statement regarding the arguments for Boulder Canyon.
The McGraw-Hill publications have also requested me to prepare for them a statement of facts with reference to the Commission's work and the Colorado River generally. The Chief has given his consent to this, and I hope there will be no objection on the part of the Commission. I am using the World's Work article as a basis. If there are any suggestions which you would care to make, I would most certainly appreciate receiving them from you as soon as possible, for in writing this second article, as in the case of the World's Work article, my purposes are the same, namely, a neutral statement of fact and bringing to the attention of the East the questions which are under consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Davis' assistant has asked if it would be possible for him to have a copy of your form of compact to forward to Mr. Davis. What are your wishes in this matter?

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Clarence C. Stetson.

CGS-AC.

P.S. The World's Work has requested that no use be made of this article until after publication.

(2 Encl.)
THE DENVER POST

Denver, Colorado, October 5, 1922.

Delph E. Carpenter,
Commissioner for Colorado,
Legal Dept., Capitol Bldg.,
Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir:

RePLYING to your favor of the 4th inst. in reference
to giving the publishers of the "World's Work" permission to use the
picture of Clarence C. Stetson that was used in The Denver Post.
We are perfectly willing that they should use the picture provided
due credit is given to The Denver Post.

Yours very truly,

The Denver Post.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley,
Colo.

Dear Carpenter:

For your personal information, Representative Swing of California came in to see me this morning. During the course of conversation he stated that he had heard of a brief outline of your compact, and wanted to know if I had a copy. I told him one had been sent to the Chief but that it was marked "Personal" so that I was not at liberty to give it out without your consent. He said he understood my position perfectly and that he felt possibly McClure had a copy and he could get one from him.

I told Swing that of course the success at Santa Fe was to a certain amount dependent upon there not being any too great publicity in advance. He stated that he realized the importance of this fact. He also said that he was exceedingly interested in your suggestion on a 50-50 division, which he thought might work out as a possible basis for negotiation. He also said that he might drop out and see McClure before the meeting at Santa Fe in order that they might come there with some definite plan of action.

Under the above circumstances would you care to have me show Swing the copy of the compact which you forwarded Mr. Hoover, or would you prefer to have it come to him through Mr. McClure?

I saw the Chief for the first time this afternoon but only for a few moments as he was exceedingly tired so was unable to take up all the questions with him. He approved of Davis coming to Santa Fe. Acting on his instructions, I communicated with Mr. Davis' office and they in turn will write him. I also explained to his office that you were very anxious to have him there. Mr. Davis is at present in the West and before he returns home will probably pass through Denver. I think he will call you up. If he does not, why don't you give him a ring?

I have not yet had a chance to see the State Department but plan to go there tomorrow or day after to ascertain whether your
proposed compact is in proper technical form both as to body and signatures.

Don't hesitate to call upon me if I can be at all helpful.

Very sincerely yours,

Clarence C. Stetson.

CCS-AC.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
State Capitol Bldg.,
Denver, Colo.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

I have read with great interest your letter of August 25th, and your draft of a proposed compact, which must have represented many hours of careful and painstaking thought on your part. It is a matter of regret to me that I have not up to the present time had the opportunity to examine it with the care and scrutiny which it deserves. This has been due to the fact that I have been completely occupied with the pressing matters relating to the recent upheaval in our industrial situation.

Now that these are approaching something like a normal condition, I intend to study yours and other forms of compact. Whether I shall be able to write you in detail before Santa Fe depends somewhat on the pressure of immediate work. In the meantime you may rest assured that I will give your suggestions most careful consideration.

Mr. Stetson has told me of your kindness and courtesy to him on his recent trip, which was apparently very interesting and informative.

I assume that you have or are discussing your compact with the other Commissioners. It might be useful if this could be done in advance of the Santa Fe meeting as any important points that could be settled beforehand would be most helpful in expediting the work towards a satisfactory settlement, which I personally hope will be brought about by signature of an agreement next month. Such a thing would be an accomplishment of which we could all be justly proud.

With kindest personal regards to the Governor, who is to be congratulated on his able handling of the coal strike in Colorado, and to yourself.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

HH-C.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
State Capitol Bldg.,
Denver, Colo.

Dear Carpenter:

The following question has occurred to me with reference to the percentage of water:

Does the 14% which you state in your compact as furnished by the tributaries, including the Gila, below Lees Ferry, have the same value that a similar 14% contributed above Lees Ferry has? In other words, does the flash character of the lower division tributaries decrease their net value?

This is just an idea that has occurred to me as possibly worthy of consideration in determining the 50-50 division, and one which may be advanced by the lower states.

Very truly yours,

Clarence C. Stetson.
RECEIVED AT

105D KX 129 NL GOVT

WASHINGTON DC OCT 12 1922

DELPHE E CARPENTER

GREELEY COLO

IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE FOLLOWING NOTICE BE RELEASED MONDAY OCTOBER SIXTEENTH FOR PUBLICATION IN THE MORNING AND EVENING PAPERS OF TUESDAY OCTOBER SEVENTEENTH BY YOU AND OTHER COMMISSIONERS AND BY ME IN WASHINGTON QUOTE/THE SESSIONS OF THE COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION TO BE HELD AT SANTA FE NEW MEXICO COMMENCING NOVEMBER NINTH WILL BE EXECUTIVE, ACCORDINGLY ANYONE DESIRING TO PRESENT FURTHER FACTS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE COMMISSION SHOULD DO SO IN WRITING MAILING SAME ON OR BEFORE OCTOBER THIRTIETH TO CLARENCE C STETSON EXECUTIVE SECRETARY COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE WASHINGTON DC AFTER OCTOBER THIRTIETH ALL SUCH COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY IN CARE OF GOVERNOR MECHEM SANTA FE NEW MEXICO/UNQUOTE PLEASE WIRE IMMEDIATELY IF THIS MEETS YOUR APPROVAL SO THAT SIMULTANEOUS ACTION MAY BE TAKEN

CLARENCE C STETSON

1041P
COPY OF WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM

Greeley, Colorado,
October 13, 1922.

Clarence C. Stetson,
Executive Secretary,
Colorado River Commission,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Suggestions satisfactory will conform with
same at this point.

Delph E. Carpenter
RECEIVED AT
18D AX 17 GOVT

DC WASHINGTON DC 1030A OCT 19 1922

DELPH E CARPENTER
GREELEY COLO

ALL COMMISSIONERS HAVE AGREED TO RELEASE STOP ASSUME PUBLICATION

WAS MADE IN ACCORDANCE MY TELEGRAM OF TWELFTH

CLARENCE C STETSON
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
State Capitol Bldg.,
Denver, Colo.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

It has occurred to me that it might be advisable to have copies of the records of the hearings before the Commission printed at an early date in order that they may be ready for submission to the various legislative bodies by the various Commissioners.

Accordingly, I have investigated the methods of printing and secured estimates of the cost. There are two alternative methods:

(1) Have the records of the hearings presented to Congress at the time the Federal Representative makes his report on the negotiations to that body. At that time a motion could be introduced to have the records printed but probably only in sufficient quantities to meet the Federal Government's needs. The states would have to pay about $0.50 for every additional copy required.

(2) Have the records of the hearings printed immediately, the Federal and State Governments each to pay one-eighth of the cost. The estimates for this printing, which will have to be done by the Government Printing Office as the Federal share of expense is to be paid from a Federal appropriation, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$2,493.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2,721.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,947.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3,173.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each estimate could be reduced by $546.36 in the event that the job were not electrotyped. The advantage of electrotyping is that the set-up would remain available for a long time for additional copies. This same result might be obtained by not having the job electrotyped and having a total of say 5000 copies made, which would make the non-electrotype job net around $3800.00, or about $475.00 per state.
The advantage of the second method is that it makes immediately available a generous supply of copies at a known cost, whereas, if the first method is adopted, there may be considerable delay in securing Congressional approval, so much so that the records may not be available for the State Legislatures during their shorter sessions with the result that it may become necessary for each state to do its own printing at a cost above that of centralized printing at Washington.

Please let me hear from you as to which method you prefer, also as to the number of copies that your state will require. I would suggest that your estimate should include not only the number needed for your State Government in all its branches, but also for public circulation such as institutions, private individuals, etc., who have no connection with the State Government.

It was my idea that the records to be printed should be only those of the public hearings at Washington, Phoenix, Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, Grand Junction, Denver and Cheyenne, and not the minutes of the Executive Sessions of the Commission. Please let me hear from you on this point as well.

Very truly yours,

Clarence C. Stetson,
Executive Secretary,
COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
State Capitol Bldg.,
Denver, Colo.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

It has been suggested that one of the important facts to be considered in connection with the water requirements of each state is their estimated needs, both present and future, for power. Under these circumstances, it is thought advisable that each Commissioner should bring with him to Santa Fe such statistics as he may desire on this subject so that the Commission may have the full benefit of any and all information from each state.

It is therefore hoped by the Chairman that you will come to Santa Fe fortified with this or similar information such as irrigation requirements, etc. which will be of value in reaching a final settlement.

Very truly yours,

Clarence C. Stetson,
Executive Secretary,
COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION.

CCS-AC.