Utah has prided herself in her possession of a rich variety of valuable, undeveloped resources. We are constantly endeavoring to attract the attention of outside capital to this state to help us convert this potential wealth into actual dollars and cents.

Obviously Utah is unable to consume her entire output from factory, mill, shop and mine. We depend naturally upon other states for our markets.

Our present concern, therefore, should be to discover ways and means of increasing the radius of our trade area--to find new and substantial consumers for our products. This must be accomplished if our industries are to be saved from gradual shrinkage and ultimate disintegration.

As we view it, the attitude of our entire citizenship on any proposition likely to affect our industries should be determined by the results which any such proposition would have upon this state at large and the effect upon our industrial development and prosperity.

Such a proposition is now before us.

Almost nation-wide agitation is being carried on respecting the proposed Colorado River Development. A great deal is being said about the allocation of waters and the undreamed of possibilities possessed by this stream in the interest of reclamation, colonization and production of power. Thus far there seems to be a rather well crystallized sentiment in Utah that the seven states compact shall first be ratified before any development work is authorized. This decision has come as a result of careful analysis of the fundamental aspects of the question.

So far so good.

But the people of Utah--its public officials as well as its private citizens must continue to analyze other equally important angles of the question. Let us, for instance, refer to the effect which the erection and operation of a Federal power plant would have upon one of our leading industries, namely: the coal industry of Utah.
In order that that relation may be understood, it is necessary to present a picture of existing conditions in California—a state which is admittedly one of our greatest potential markets.

At the present time there is a surplus of oil in California. It provides the power from which steam is generated. It is quite generally conceded that the supply is only temporary. When that is gone southern California, especially, must look elsewhere for fuel—it must turn to coal. Where is that coal to come from? Shall it be from Wales, British Columbia, or Utah?

A survey shows that California industries are looking toward Utah to supply them with this product so that when the day arrives that there is insufficient oil supply on the coast they are expecting that Utah will be ready to make up the shortage. Not only are the large power plants decided upon that point, but other industries as well.

One concern, known as the Southern California Edison Company, is now building a huge tidewater steam plant. It is designed for the use of oil or pulverized coal, and will have an ultimate capacity of 1,000,000 horse power. That would require the daily consumption of about 5,000 tons of coal. Utah coal is to be preferred for that purpose because of the short distance and also because our coal is better. The consumption of 5,000 tons of coal would amount to about 100 carloads or three trainloads of the black diamonds moving every day from the Utah coal mines to the California consumer.

And with southern California using Utah coal, northern California would be quick to recognize the advantages of trading with us. That would mean that ultimately Utah coal would be filling the industrial needs of the entire state of California.

What would that mean to Utah?

As a direct result the coal industries would receive new impetus.
It would mean not only increased operation of the existing coal mining concerns but also the possible opening up of other coal deposits in which Utah is so rich and which, with the addition of some few short railway lines, could be made accessible to the market.

This would build up an immense payroll in the state. It would maintain and increase the population of our mining communities which are wholly dependent upon this industry. It would open up the markets for the nearby farmers and gardeners. It would add measurably to our banking deposits and would stimulate trade to our merchants, manufacturers and wholesalers. In a word, this trade expansion would constitute a continued flow of gold from California into the pockets of the people of Utah.

The coal industry, stimulated to greater productivity, would add to the taxable wealth of Utah, helping to distribute the tax burden over a wider field and giving a measure of relief to the present overburdened taxpayers. In fact there is hardly a citizen of this state—there is not an industry here that would not directly, or indirectly, profit by this vitalizing of the coal industry.

It is clear, therefore, that both California and Utah will derive mutual benefits and advantages through this trade expansion.

And since freight rates are based largely upon volume of business, lower rates to the coast must logically follow this increase of transportation. Utah then will be able to sell for less to our consumers for the reduction in freight rates will be reflected in the costs of the Utah product to the people of California. Moreover, the freight rates on California goods to Utah points and to the east should be advantageously affected. California manufacturers and producers will be better able to meet eastern competition in this field.

But a dark cloud appears on the horizon.

It is proposed through the Swing-Johnson bill to erect a huge
power plant at Boulder Dam to be owned and operated by the Federal government. It is planned to give it an initial capacity of 1,000,000 horse power. If this project is put into effect, all Utah's hopes of supplying coal on any large scale to California will vanish as in a dream. It would at once close these big Western markets against our product.

No matter what the original construction costs; no matter how blundering the operations of such a government-owned plant would be; no matter how inefficiently conducted under public ownership; no matter to what point the operating expenses would mount--electric current furnished from that point would be made available for use by, and would reach, the California industries which otherwise would be using power generated from Utah coal.

Moreover, this huge plant would be tax free--another discrimination against which Utah could not possibly contend; for the reason that the concerns in California using Utah coal for power purposes would be subject to taxation, and the mines in Utah furnishing the coal would also be doing their share, through taxation, to maintain local and state government. We could not compete with a tax exempt concern that could dip into the public treasury at will and ask the taxpayers to meet its deficits.

As coal men, we do not object to fair, open competition with other coal producers anywhere in the world who might be seeking markets that we may even claim as our own, but we do strenuously object (and we believe, consistently,) to being put in unequal competition with a subsidized organization such as the government owned project would be. The result would be that we would be forced to stand by to see our natural markets ruthlessly closed against us.

Such a project, therefore, as is now in the minds of the authors of the Swing-Johnson bill, would strike at the very vitals of one of our biggest Utah industries and rob the people of Utah of one of their most promising fields of expansion.
With these facts before them, the people of Utah should be found a unit contending against such a scheme which, in its very conception, is contrary to public interest, placing as it does the government of the United States in unfair competition with its own citizens. It strikes at the very genius of America's greatness. It represents a philosophy foreign to America's institutions.

It is hardly conceivable, therefore, that any public official or private citizen of Utah, in the light of these facts, will either directly or even by implication, condone, encourage—much less support—such an insidious, withering attack upon our industrial life. No matter what political advantages are contemplated by the promotion and passage of this feature of the measure, it defies all sound economic laws. For that reason Utah's opposition should be vigorous and sustained. We should also appeal to the sound judgment of the President and the Congress of the United States to set their faces against this class of legislation. For it is with them that the final decision rests.

With this thought in mind, therefore, that we are now on the point of deciding a question of far-reaching importance to Utah, as citizens, taxpayers and state-builders, we respectfully ask the officials of this state, as well as those who represent us in Congress to consider this whole question referred to in the light of the facts here presented, bearing upon the future trade expansion, welfare and general prosperity of the citizens of this state.

Respectfully submitted,

L. F. Bains
Carbon Fuel Co.

J. H. Tonkin
Independent Coal & Coke Co.

S. F. Ballif, Jr.
Royal Coal Co.
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Mr. Delph Carpenter,
Greeley, Colo.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

I felt you would be interested in what the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee has done. No doubt you will recognize some of your own suggestions in their recommendations as given in the enclosed folder.

This committee has created very wide interest in the state. The last Sunday Tribune carried a front page story.

As you may well know, there is a death struggle on the part of the politicians in Utah to maintain the ascendancy on this question but it is our firm belief that this committee is very rapidly centering public opinion on its activities as representing the real sentiments of the people.

I shall be very pleased to have your reaction to this bulletin and, as I have already told you, we will always welcome your suggestions.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

ACR/MG
The Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee

OF

UTAH

"When the people know the facts, the country is safe."

—ABRAHAM LINCOLN

July 1, 1927
Invitation

(Agriculture invites business and industry to join with it in common council for a consideration of the Colorado River question).

Salt Lake City, Utah
May 16, 1927

Associated Industries,
Kearns Building,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Gentlemen:

Within the next few months the people of Utah will be called upon to pass judgment upon a question of far-reaching importance to this state, namely: the Colorado River development. When Congress convenes, it is expected that public sentiment will be well crystallized.

In order that a group of men may be brought together who can study this question dispassionately and free from sectional and other prejudices, we suggest that you accept this invitation to join with the Utah State Farm Bureau in selecting an appropriate, independent committee whose function it shall be to study the question and report its findings from time to time and to give the public the benefit of its investigations.

Since Utah occupies a strategic position in this whole controversy, the findings of such a committee should have a great influence on those who will be called upon to decide the question in the states and in Congress.

Trusting that we may be favored with an early and favorable reply, we remain

Yours very truly,

UTAH STATE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

M. S. Winder,
Secretary-Treasurer.
The Acceptance

May 20, 1927.

Utah State Farm Bureau,
Dooly Bldg.,
City.

Gentlemen:

We wish you to know that we are duly appreciative of your thoughtfulness and consideration in inviting the Utah Associated Industries to join you in bringing together a group of citizens of this state for the purpose of ascertaining the facts as they relate to our interests in the Colorado River.

We agree heartily with you that this is one of our largest potential assets and that the full light of sincere, honest and unprejudiced investigation should be thrown upon this subject precedent to our arriving at any conclusions.

We are heartily in accord with your thought that a committee of Utah citizens, such as you describe, can be named by the Utah State Farm Bureau and the Utah Associated Industries, acting jointly, and believe that the findings of such a committee will receive the confidence of the people at large.

We accept, therefore, your invitation and suggest that the appointment of this committee should proceed at once. It is obvious that they should have sufficient time and facilities at their command so as to be able to extract from the existing mass of confusing, conflicting and nebulous theories and proposals the simple, clear-cut facts in which this state has an interest. These should then be made available for wide-spread thought and consideration to the end that an enlightened, crystallized public opinion may be created.

We thank you for this opportunity and remain subject to your call for the purpose above indicated.

Very truly yours,

UTAH ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES,
John G. M. Barnes,
President.
Organization Perfected

Recognizing the necessity for an intelligent, unprejudiced and courageous investigation of this whole subject, representatives of the Utah Associated Industries and the Utah State Farm Bureau proceeded with caution and care to select a committee who were qualified to crystallize and reflect clearly and honestly the sentiments of the property owners, taxpayers and other interested citizens in this state.

After a careful survey of the entire state they chose men who had a background of rich successful experience, with ability to determine relative values, to appraise and assimilate information and to distinguish between facts and fiction and to arrive at such conclusions and to offer such recommendations on methods of procedure in developing the Colorado River that would inspire and command public confidence and approval.

Each appointee was approached individually. The nature and gravity of the responsibility resting upon him in serving with such a body was made clear. Every man thus approached willingly agreed to perform this important public service, thus evidencing the spirit of co-operation prevalent among the leading citizens of this state.

Thereupon these men of ability and character were called into session. After the usual preliminaries they proceeded to organize, with a Chairman, Vice-chairman and Secretary. A study of the personnel as given on the next page reveals how completely this group, known as the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee of Utah, is representative of the responsible property-owning, wealth-producing interests, of all sections and of both political parties, in Utah.

In a word, it is a complete distillate of thought of the people of this state.
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Outlines Its Plan of Procedure

The committee set about immediately to its task. In order to chart out its course a sub-committee was appointed to submit a plan which would describe the aims and purposes of the organization, its limitations, and its methods of procedure and which would define its objectives.

This report, as adopted by the General Committee, follows:

"It is the object and purpose of the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee to ascertain, analyze and publish the facts respecting proposals for the utilization, control or development of the Colorado River.

"The committee recommends and urges an early conference of the proper and duly authorized representatives of the seven states in the Colorado River basin to consider the possibility and advisability of effectuating a complete ratification of the seven states compact so that the rights and interests of the seven states involved and the Federal government as well, may be adequately protected.

"The committee accepts the responsibility to enter upon the study of the compact formulated by the Colorado River Commission and will proceed to study and analyze legislation dealing with the Colorado River development.

"The committee will also endeavor to ascertain at the earliest possible time what the conditions are in the Imperial Valley, especially as they relate to any existing emergencies."
Formal Appeal by the Chairman

To His Excellency, the President of the United States:
Members of Congress:
Cabinet Members:
Public spirited organizations throughout the United States, and
Public officials and interested citizens of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin:

GREETINGS:

From the foregoing you have learned of the conditions which brought about the formation of the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee of Utah and the inspiration back of a movement calculated to bring about an understanding of the problems involved in the development of the Colorado River.

After due deliberation upon, and analysis of, the essential, fundamental facts, the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee of Utah respectfully recommends the following preliminary course of procedure:

1. That there first be brought about an accord among the seven states.

2. That this understanding be effectuated through a conference of the duly authorized representatives of the states concerned.

3. That the sole purpose and business of this conference shall be to assist the lower states (Arizona, California, and Nevada) to settle any existing differences and to arrive at a definite understanding among themselves on all points now at issue between them.

4. That the representatives of the upper states (Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah) acting jointly and unitedly, if called upon, lend their good offices to the lower states to bring about such an understanding.

5. That the upper states shall make it clear at this time that they will not participate in the consideration of any other phase of the subject until the lower states have reached this amicable and definite settlement.

6. That the seven states shall then ratify unqualifiedly and unconditionally the so-called Santa Fe Colorado River compact.

7. That Congress shall thereupon set its seal of approval upon the compact.

8. That the consideration of legislation dealing with the Colorado River development shall then, and not until then, proceed.
9. That the influence and active interest of all public spirited citizens in the seven states shall be exercised with the national administration, with Congress and with the authorized public officials in the seven states, to execute this program in its entirety and in the order here presented.

We submit that this procedure, if followed, will not only preserve the integrity of the states in their relation to the Federal government; but will also define for all time the respective rights of the seven states in their common possession—the Colorado River.

It will also do this:

It will allow sufficient time for a deliberate, intelligent and thorough-going investigation of all issues involved in such contemplated development before any legislation is enacted and before any authority is granted for the expenditure of monies from the public treasury for development work on the Colorado River.

It will stay any precipitate action that may later prove an economic blunder and an unwarranted burden upon the taxpayers, and open up the floodgates of exhausting litigation and recurring collisions between otherwise friendly states and neighbors.

To the end, therefore, that public welfare may be promoted and lasting friendships established, we sincerely invite the full-hearted, unqualified support of all public spirited citizens in promoting and bringing to pass the fulfillment of this program.

The committee will welcome any comments on these conclusions and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

James H. Bucke

Chairman.

COLORADO RIVER FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE OF UTAH

Salt Lake City, July 1, 1927.
Colorado River Development

Economic Necessity vs. Political Expediency

Issued by the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee of Utah

April 20, 1928
COLORADO RIVER FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE
of Utah
Offices: 619 Kearns Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah
Organized June 4, 1927
Selected by the Utah State Farm Bureau and the Utah Associated Industries to obtain, analyze and disseminate essential facts concerning the Colorado River and to study the plans proposed for its development.

PERSONNEL

OFFICERS:
James J. Burke..................................................Chairman
Charles H. Barton............................................Vice-chairman
W. D. Beers......................................................Secretary

COMMITTEE:
L. R. Anderson................................................Manti
Wool Grower
Mark Austin......................................................Salt Lake City
Agricultural Agent
James J. Burke.................................................Salt Lake City
Engineer and Contractor
W. D. Beers......................................................Salt Lake City
Engineer
C. H. Barton....................................................Ogden
Banker
John G. M. Barnes...........................................Kaysville
Manufacturer and Irrigationist
D. N. Beal.......................................................Ephraim
Farmer
Fred P. Champ................................................Logan
Banker
O. W. Carlson................................................Salt Lake City
Attorney
R. S. Collett..................................................Salt Lake City
Reclamationist
J. Will Knight.................................................Provo
Manufacturer and Mining
J. R. Murdock................................................Heber
Reclamationist
Ephraim Bergeson..........................................Cornish
President Farm Bureau
THE ISSUE:

The daring pioneer spirit of America is still vibrant.

While technically our frontiers have all vanished, there still remain untouched fields that beckon the trail-blazers.

Men still yearn for the thrill of conquest. They are eager to subdue the stubborn, virgin lands, harness the wild mountain torrents and make the earth's depths yield up their hidden treasures.

And yet economic necessity guides and directs, and in turn, inspires or dampens the ardor of man in this passion for mastery.

Civilization sets its own pace.

Man moves in the direction of self preservation. In the conquest of nature he pursues his course with unconscious wisdom.

But there is much that he has not yet subdued.

For example, one may ask why he has not yet brought under cultivation and control the wild stretches of isolated lands in the West. Why has not his plow sunk into their fertile soil? Why has not the knowledge of irrigation and reclamation been applied to convert this potential empire into habitations for man?

One whose startled eyes first behold these illimitable wastes can scarcely suppress the question: Why permit the suffocating congestion of peoples in long established sections with these great open spaces still unpopulated—an apparent economic blunder and social injustice?

But with equal readiness comes the answer: Simply because men unconsciously respond to certain well-defined laws that decide such momentous questions—laws that are inexorable.

To follow a blind urge and uninstructed impulse that would lead men to break down this isolation, to seize upon the resources, to transplant teeming millions to these newly tamed lands in defiance of economic, physical, social and other determining factors, would be to court disaster.

That is why silence still broods over these hundreds of thousands of square miles in the West; that is why silence will continue to reign until man's needs justify their conquest—until necessity calls.
Wise, clear thinking, experienced men are not irritated at the sight of these challenging resources. While mindful of them they are also aware of the many perplexing angles to the problem. That is why they are content to utilize for the present that which is near at hand; that which is already accessible; that which is now yielding returns ample to satisfy all the needs of the hour.

They have learned to turn a deaf ear to the empty clamor of enthusiasts, dreamers and idealists who have the faculty for rushing past the immediate, the near and the proved in their zeal to plunge into the remote, the uncertain, the problematical.

There has always been this contest between reason and sentimentality.

Such a contest is now being waged. It occupies a foremost place in the minds of the public.

It involves the proposed development of the Colorado River.

Down through the geological periods that great stream has been chiselling its course, leaping from the dizzy mountain passes of the Rockies to the placid waters of the Pacific. There is every reason to believe that it will continue in its course for ages yet to come.

Throughout all the period of growth of the West covering nearly a century, men have set up their abodes at points that seemed to them most inviting, most fruitful. Up to the present their near-by resources have proved ample to maintain and encourage them in their unprecedented growth in population, and the marvelous expansion in agriculture, trade and commerce in the West.

All this while the Colorado River, out on the fringe of this new world, has been given only passing notice.

But suddenly, as if driven by some strange, unseen power, all eyes are riveted upon that river. It is being portrayed as a new found El Dorado, as the only means of saving a people faced with some awful peril, some impending disaster.

With the frantic, almost insane, eagerness of a religious crusade, men are demanding action, speedy action. They feel impelled to lay hold upon the river at once lest it escape them—lest they awaken to discover that their conjured vision has been only an empty dream.
So people are asking:

Is it possible that the West has unexpectedly outgrown its bounds? Have its present bounteous resources become all at once inadequate? Has the hour of necessity struck with such suddenness that utilization of the Colorado River must be rushed in to supplement that which up to the moment has so generously, almost profligately, provided for man’s comfort, safety and happiness? What is back of this feverish anxiety? How much substance is there in this whole contention?

That is the kernel of the whole question.

How are we to know?

GET THE FACTS.

Let reason sit in judgment.

Let sound economics be the sole basis upon which to formulate a conclusion.

BUT CLOSE THE DOOR TO MAUDLIN SENTIMENTALITY AND WILD IMAGININGS; TO SPECIOUS, EMPTY INSINCERITIES.

Since this is admittedly a highly technical question, call in men who know, men whose unbiased, trained minds are able to see and think clearly and honestly.

Call in that class of men who are accustomed to deal with sound, incontrovertible facts, which they do not “repudiate” nor ignore.

BRING IN THE ENGINEERS.

Let them tell us what the problems are.

Propound to them this question:

What Is Wanted on the Colorado River?

Not so much what can be done; but rather what should be done—for that constitutes the whole issue.

And for the sake of having a detailed analysis of that sweeping question, ask them about the feasibility, the practicability and, above all, the NECES-
SITY, for each and every proposition now being put forth for the development of the Colorado River.

That is exactly what the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee of Utah has been doing. It is upon such facts that it has based its conclusions set forth in its preceding four bulletins.

It is with these same economic facts that this committee has continued to deal in seeking, interpreting, assembling, and submitting the material in this bulletin as presented in the succeeding pages.

The Fact Finding Committee.
WHAT ENGINEERS SAY:

FLOOD CONTROL

In its Bulletin No. 2, this committee pointed out that flood control on the Colorado River represents an immediate necessity.

There is no dispute on this point, for in this decision engineers and practical economists are in complete agreement.

It is also generally recognized that this is a function and obligation of the Federal government, employing such expert, non-political agencies as it sees fit.

What people now wish to know is:

Has any plan for flood control been devised that will combine efficiency, safety, economy and permanency?

The answer is—Yes; one that is advocated and supported by the best engineering authorities on this subject.

Now to proceed to analyze that plan:

First, why the flood menace?

Largely because of man's own vandalism and carelessness. The underbrush, vegetation, shrubbery and forests that for miles formerly lined the banks of the Colorado River, served to check the overflow during the flood periods so that it did not concentrate at any one point but rather spread out and thus relieved the tension on the main channel.

The result was that only slight damage was done.

But for years man has systematically denuded these useful helps to this natural breakwater, thus removing the principal protection which stood between the low-lying adjacent lands and the raging flood waters.

And unwittingly he went still further to invite devastation. He cut two large gaps in the river banks, one on the Mexican, one on the United States side, to conduct water into irrigation canals. In so doing he failed to provide the necessary headgates so that when the first big floods came they naturally followed the line of least resistance, tore their way through these canals, and for eighteen months emptied into the Imperial Valley instead of continuing in their accustomed course to the Gulf.

During all that time the old abandoned channel was being choked with silt and luxuriant growth of willows, underbrush and vegetation with the result that its usefulness was virtually destroyed before the river could be checked in its wild rampage and made to take another course.
Pending the execution of any permanent plan, the river has been given a temporary tortuous path which it is still following.

What, then, is the key to the flood control problem?

Simply to restore the river to its channel in such manner as to prevent any further breaks.

For many years this very problem has been occupying the minds of some of America's most distinguished engineers, prominent among whom was the late lamented Epes Randolph, to whom probably more than any other man belongs the credit and praise for having saved the Imperial Valley from continuing devastation and ultimate inundation.

In this he succeeded after all others had signally failed.

It was then that he visualized the whole scheme for a permanent solution to the Colorado River flood problem—one that is endorsed by the best engineering authorities of the day.

His plan provides that the channel should be straightened so as to follow largely the original course of the stream. Beginning should be had at the Saiz levee just below the international border and continue practically 42 miles to tide water. While this proposed course will in the main follow the contour of the old bed, it will eliminate many of the previous annoying, troublesome curves and meanderings.

By a proved, practical system of pilot channels the river can be made perpetually self-excavating and will maintain itself forever within its prescribed bounds.

This will once and for all save the Imperial valley from any further flood menace. It will care for the floods which come so unexpectedly and in such great volume not only from the upper reaches but as well from the erratic, turbulent Gila River which was largely the cause of the extensive damage in the memorable flood of 1905-07.

This construction will consume only about two years and will cost in the neighborhood of $5,000,000.

In the main this plan has already been adopted by the Mexican government as its official program.

By mutual agreement the United States and Mexico could decide upon the apportionment of costs.

What would be achieved?

The river would be given a permanent course.

It would be made its own scavenger.

Adjacent lands would be assured complete, lasting protection from floods, irrespective of their origin on the river.
The construction would offer few, if any, physical difficulties.

Little time would be required for its completion.

The outlay in money would be insignificant.

The job would be done, once and for all.

This is Mr. Randolph's plan. It offers a complete answer to the question of flood control.

STORAGE DAM

The maintenance cost of this new channel can be materially decreased by breaking the force of the flood waters on the main stream.

How can this be accomplished?

By the construction of a dam at some advantageous point.

This dam would serve as a sort of shock absorber.

In order to reduce to the minimum the maintenance costs of the new channel, engineers contend that this storage reservoir need not exceed 4,000,000 acre feet capacity.

The size and location of the dam should be determined by its ability to do two required things at the least outlay of money:

(1) Reduce the maintenance cost of the new channel.

(2) Provide storage water for reclamation and irrigation.

Where is such a location?

Engineers answer: Topock, on the boundary line between Arizona and California.

The dam itself would be about twenty miles below Needles, California and close to Topock, Arizona.

A dam at this point would insure water adequate for additional reclamation, for present irrigation and for any contemplated domestic water supply. Later it could also be used for re-regulating the water supply for additional irrigation.

This dam would be less than 100 feet high above low water and only about one-third the height of other dams proposed on the Colorado River, intended to perform similar service.

The Topock site has the additional advantage of being nearest to any of the regions likely to be selected for reclamation.
Then, again, it is only eighty miles above the site spoken of as the point of diversion for domestic water intended for Los Angeles, so that if at any time in the future that question becomes a recognized factor, the Topock dam site will be found the nearest, most advantageous and the most economical for the purpose.

Another contingency:

If for the sake of analysis it is conceded that a dam must be built to provide for desilting, then naturally construction must be had as close as possible to the point at which desilting is desired. Here, again, the Topock dam satisfies the demand better than does any point higher up on the river.

Engineers estimate that a reservoir at Topock can have a feasible capacity of 22,000,000 acre feet. This would provide silt storage for more than 180 years, which would dispose completely with the agitated silt problem.

Now as to costs:

The outlay for this entire project, fulfilling all these requirements, both immediate and remote, would aggregate approximately $25,000,000, constituting only a small fraction of the amounts mentioned for similar construction at other points on the river intended to meet these same demands.

*If ease, simplicity, and low cost of construction, together with economy and effectiveness of operation are to be determining factors in the selection of the place and nature of construction work on the Colorado River, then a storage dam at Topock has no rival.*

**POWER PLANTS**

Discussion of this phase of the question should be introduced by the presentation of a fact well known to engineers but perhaps startling to Mr. Average Citizen. It is this:

If a reservoir is to be constructed to fulfill primarily the purposes above named, then it is not adaptable for generation of power.

Why?

Simply because such a reservoir as has been described must be used:

For re-regulating water supply—

For decreasing maintenance costs of the channel below—

For discharging the water at certain times of the year in such volumes that surplus stored water can remain potentially available for irrigation of additional United States lands—
For supplying additional domestic water to points in the lower basin whenever that may be found necessary.

To fulfill such conditions the water flow at such a dam must necessarily be widely fluctuating and inconstant.

What does a power plant demand?

JUST THE OPPOSITE—A FULL DAM AND A NEARLY UNIFORM FLOW.

Thus it becomes a physical impossibility for one dam to serve these two divergent purposes.

If, then, the erection of power plants is also to be made part of the Colorado River program, it must be considered as a separate and distinct problem.

While engineering students of this question are a unit in declaring that flood and silt control, provisions for domestic water, irrigation and reclamation, all call for construction in the lower reaches of the Colorado River, they are equally emphatic that the erection of power plants must begin at the upper end of the stream.

In a word, development of power must start at the top and work down stream.

Why?

Because the production of hydro-electricity, being simply a matter of economics (getting the greatest production at the least possible expense) requires just such a plan, whether on the Colorado River, the Nile, or any other power stream.

To that end one condition is always requisite without which no hydro-electric plant can operate with economic efficiency:

The main flow at the power site must be capable of regulation to uniformity.

To duplicate the work of regulating on the stream would be obviously a continuing economic waste.

To avoid this duplication a storage reservoir must be located above all the proposed power sites.

Lay the map of the Colorado River before you. Study the topography and the other physical features peculiar to the region traversed by that stream.

Where should such a storage reservoir be located if it is to do the work required?

If again, we defer to the judgment of engineers it must either be a simple structure with a dam in the vicinity of Lee’s Ferry or else a series of reservoirs on Green, Grand and San Juan—all tributaries in the upper reaches of the river.
The logical initial step for power development on the Colorado River is, therefore, the construction of a storage dam at, or near, one of these sites.

Now as to power plants:

Where should they be built?

Below the storage dam.

According to the United States geological survey there are a number of excellent power sites all along the river from Colorado to California.

As is well known, the operation of plants above would in no wise affect or minimize the efficiency of the plants below.

So that if people in the lower reaches of the river should ever decide to get power from the Colorado River they would naturally select the site or sites nearest and most accessible to them.

The same would hold true in cases where power from this river is to serve in the upper basin.

It is estimated that there is between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 potential horsepower on that stream.

Where can the power be used?

There's the rub, for no answer, supported with facts, has as yet come to that question.

The mere fact that electricity can be produced on the Colorado River obviously does not in itself justify the tremendous outlay involved; and the taxpayers of the United States have a right to expect that those responsible for deciding that question will proceed only as they are fortified with facts that warrant such a colossal undertaking.

As to who shall construct, own, or operate these plants (if authorized) is not an engineering question. Since that involves the policy of the Federal government respecting its relations to private enterprises, it will not be treated as part of this discussion.

From a taxation standpoint these power plants, under certain conditions can be made revenue producers to the states in which they are located; or the states concerned, by amicable arrangements, may agree upon a plan for the distribution of tax revenues accruing from the operation of such plants.

But the committee has confined itself in all these discussions to engineering problems, pointing out merely where and how certain development should take place if ever it shall be found necessary.
TO SUMMARIZE:

These things are conclusive:
Flood control should receive immediate consideration.
This is an obligation of the Federal government.
Some competent engineering board should be authorized to put into effect the Epes Randolph plan of flood control.
A storage dam should be constructed at, or near, Topock.
A dam designed for irrigation, reclamation, desilting and domestic water supply purposes cannot also serve for the generation of power.
If power plants are to be erected, beginning should be had in the upper reaches of the river.
A storage dam to equalize the flow should be constructed above all potential power sites.
Then what becomes of the Boulder Dam project?
In the light of all the pivotal facts here simply but truthfully told, the reader must already have seen (what practical, technical men have long since known and promulgated) that Boulder Dam has no place whatever in a program for the economic development of the Colorado River.
It is now for Congress and the President of the United States to decide two important phases of the whole controversy:
1. What is actually needed on the Colorado River?
2. In what manner, at which places, and by whom, shall that needed construction proceed?

Those who have taken occasion to plumb the depths of this problem are profoundly conscious of the confusing misunderstandings, legends, myths and fiction with which this whole question has been ingenuously enveloped.

But these can all be swept away if political expediency, personal ambition, pride of authorship and sectional interests are submerged; and if full expression is given to intellectual honesty and wholesome respect for general public welfare.

Respectfully submitted,

COLORADO FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE OF UTAH

April 20, 1928

Chairman.

[Signature]

James W. Buck
With supportive evidence before it, the Colorado River Fact-Finding Committee of Utah maintains that:

1. Preceding any national legislation on Colorado River development the legislatures of the seven Colorado River basin states should ratify the compact.

2. This action should then receive the approval of the Federal government.

3. The United States and Mexico should come to an agreement on all questions involving their respective rights on the Colorado River.

4. The Colorado River question should be considered and settled by these governments as a separate, independent issue, distinct and apart from any other problems that may be before them.

5. Jointly they should proceed at once to effect flood control.

6. For the present there is no need for providing for additional irrigation in the Imperial Valley.

7. 140,000 acres with water rights in that productive region are now lying idle on account of unfavorable economic and market conditions.

8. It would be prejudicial to agricultural interests to engage at present in further reclamation schemes.

9. What farmers now want is better returns from present holdings.

10. The proposed all-American canal would be an engineering blunder and an economic waste.

11. It would bankrupt the land owners in the Imperial Valley upon whom the whole burden would ultimately fall.

12. Los Angeles has ample water supply.

13. If properly conserved, her present water resources are adequate to care for a population of 8,000,000 people.

14. Being heavy in chemical content, the Colorado River can never be made entirely suitable for drinking purposes.

15. There is a surplus of electric power in Southern California. If additional power is brought in it will find no market in competition with existing plants.
Program

Utah Industrial Council

November 7th, 1927

10:00 a. m.
I. Partnership between Industry and Agriculture.
II. Fundamental Questions on Colorado River Development.
III. Analysis of our Tax Situation.

2:00 p. m.
I. The Establishment of Sound Industrial Relations.
II. Keeping Sound Legislatively.
III. Education and Industry.
IV. How the Church Can Help.
V. Utah’s Influence Abroad.
VI. Summarization.

NOTE: Discussion will follow the presentation of each subject.
This is to certify that

Mr. Delph Carpenter

has been elected to membership in

Utah’s Industrial Council

and is invited to participate in the annual conference of that body to be held November 7, 1927 at the Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City.

Hours:
10:00 A.M.
2:00 P.M.

President
Utah Associated Industries

[Signature]
TO MEMBERS:
Utah Industrial Council:

Several years ago a movement was inaugurated in this state by the Utah Associated Industries to bring together, upon occasions, representative citizens from all walks of life, to discuss problems that influence and determine our state's peace, growth and prosperity.

The men who direct, and those who compose, the Utah Associated Industries are the heads of the business and industrial institutions throughout the entire state. They were the men who conceived and laid the foundation for this co-operative movement because experience had taught them that better understanding always comes through contacts and interchange of views.

In order to bring about these contacts, the Utah Industrial Council was formed. It is an informal gathering of the men in Utah who are doing constructive things in their respective communities and in their chosen lines of activity.

The Industrial Council is an open forum—a common meeting ground—where the banker rubs elbows with the farmer, the manufacturer with the educator, the churchman with the merchant, and so on down the line.

It is on November 7th, commencing at 10 o'clock, that such a cross-section of Utah's leaders will be assembled. The program on the attached sheet tells its own impressive story. Each discussion will bring out the accomplishments of Utah's leading groups, will stimulate thought and lead to helpful, wholesome conclusions and reactions. It will consolidate the progressive agencies of this state, working to a common, clearly understood objective.

It is to this splendid gathering that you are invited and in which you are respectfully and urgently requested to participate. Men from beyond our borders are coming to sit in with as observers so that they may witness how Utah's citizens set about to make for a bigger and better Utah.

We will appreciate having the enclosed card returned to us so that it may convey to us the assurance of your attendance and helpful co-operation.

Sincerely,

Lafayette Hanchett  A. P. Bigelow,
Salt Lake  Ogden

H. E. Hatch,  E. S. Hinckley,
Logan  Provo

E. M. Ashton,  J. D. Stack,
Salt Lake  Salt Lake

October 12, 1927.  Committee on Invitation
December 24, 1927

Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley, Colorado.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

As has been suggested to you by Mr. Williams of the Greeley Chamber of Commerce in my behalf, I find myself assigned to a job by the Board of Regents of the University and I come to you for help. At the last meeting of the Regents a resolution was adopted asking for the appointment of a fact finding committee of ten, of which I was named chairman, to go into the Colorado River problem from as nearly a scientific and unbiased point of view as possible. After the resolution had been passed, I was called into conference with the Regents and we were agreed that my first move would be to see you and to ask your help on two matters especially. First, in naming the Committee and second, in giving us at the very start what you consider the most important points of investigation and how best to go about such investigation. The Regents are clear that you should be on the Committee, because you more than any other man see the whole problem and that is the regard with which you are held here at the University, as you already know. It is not intended that the Committee shall do chores, but more particularly shall act in an advisory capacity.

As far as the second point is concerned, I thought that if you could dictate to a stenographer as briefly as you like your opinion in the whole matter it would give us a sound starting point. I shall be very glad to come and see you at your leisure when ever it is convenient for you. Unfortunately I do not have every day open in the week for this opportunity, and that is the reason why I am bothering you with this letter. It will give you an opportunity to know just what is in our minds. Some names that have been suggested to us as members of this Committee in addition to your own name and mine, are as follows:

Wm. Weiser, Grand Junction
M. S. Wheeler, Steamboat Springs
L. C. Paddock, Boulder
Fred Hart, Denver
Fred Farrar, Denver
H. S. Sands, Denver
Ralph Snodgrass, Walsenburg
R. G. Breckenridge, Pueblo
James M. Woy, Telluride
John L. McNeil, Durango
Charles J. Moynihan, Montrose

I wish you would strike out those which you think might not serve so well and add any names that you are sure ought to be on the Committee. You know better than any one else. You can either write me, or have someone call me on the telephone, where I can meet you. I shall have to be in Denver on Tuesday and Wednesday, December 27 and 28, and in Boulder on December 30. Otherwise I am free for the next ten days.

Cordially yours,

EP 1

[Signature]
December 30, 1927.

Mr. Elmore Petersen,
University of Colorado,
Boulder, Colorado.

Dear Mr. Petersen:

I am in receipt of yours of the 24th inst in re, the appointment of a "Fact Finding Committee" on Colorado River matters.

I fully appreciate the benefits to be derived from a careful study of Colorado River problems but fear that unless the matter is undertaken deliberately and is in the hands of those qualified to speak, the undertaking may present serious difficulties. In the first place, I would suggest that there be no such body as a "Fact Finding Committee". That phrase is about worn out. Every governmental bureau at Washington which has desired to shift the responsibility, has appointed such a committee and during the past several months, the name has been applied to committees appointed in some of the Colorado River states upon the inspiration of certain power companies. For illustration, the Fact Finding Committee of Utah is said to have been organized upon the suggestion of the Utah Light and Power Company. It is in no sense official and in no manner speaks for the state of Utah. You will readily see that the field has not only been occupied but abused.

You might name your committee the "Colorado River Committee" or give it some other appropriate name but don't call it a "Fact Finding Committee".

It is very important that the personal of your committee be carefully selected and I wish to confer with you regarding this phase before anything is done or anyone is selected or approached. A man like Dean James C. Rogers would be of tremendous assistance while another lawyer of equal standing at the bar might make you wish you had never entered upon your undertaking. Some of the names you suggest are good and others are very bad because of prejudice either against interstate compacts and for other personal reasons.

Secondly, by this undertaking, you assume a task of stupendous proportions. The problem literally bristles with internal phases and if your committee attempted to go into details, endless time and unlimited capital would be required. If you are going to attempt to penetrate to the very bottom of
the whole problem, don't start in. Your committee would disintegrate. If you are going to be content to approach the matter along the lines of generalities, you may succeed. Probably you have overlooked the fact that there are very few individuals who have ever seriously considered (much less mastered) interstate relations and fewer still who have taken serious thought of interstate water problems and that many of these are unsafe because of failure to approach the subject with an open mind.

However, if you seriously believe that it is advisable to have some such committee, I shall be glad to confer with you. I shall probably have to leave for Washington next week and, in view of the good or mischief that may arise from the personal phase of the membership of your committee, I would suggest deferring serious action until the later part of January.

Very truly yours,

Delph E. Carpenter,
Commissioner for Colorado.
Honorable Delph Carpenter,
Greeley,
Colorado.

Dear Delph:

We held a conference yesterday, Sabin, McHendrie and myself, at Denver in regard to the testimony needed to close our preliminary case in Colorado vs. Kansas. We are having the greatest difficulty getting any substitute, even weak as any substitute would be, for what you could contribute to the history of the compact matter and the general development of irrigation law and state representation thereof, and we made up our minds that, short of being outrageously inconsiderate, we must ask you again if you couldn't do something for us on the hearing of February twenty-fourth? The testimony is in the hands of Sabin and McHendrie and I have not been appearing in the hearings since the opening days. Anything you can do for us in any form would be invaluable and they will accord with your convenience in every way possible. We don't know how to say this except by a letter of this sort, but if you could communicate with Fred and tell us the situation, it would be greatly appreciated.

I feel mean and cruel about the whole thing, but our responsibilities are so great that we are practically helpless without you.

As ever, cordially,

JGR/RD.
COLORADO RIVER COMMITTEE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

1. James Grafton Rogers, Chairman, Dean of the School of Law, University of Colorado.
2. Elmore Petersen, Secretary, Director of the University Extension Division, University of Colorado.
3. L. C. Paddock, Editor, Daily Camera, Boulder.
4. Fred A. Sabin, Attorney at Law, Pueblo.
5. Charles A. Lory, President, State Agricultural College, Fort Collins.
8. C. I. Colwell, Brush.
10. W. S. Partridge, Manager, Arkansas Valley Sugar Beet and Irrigated Land Company, Holly.
13. Hubert P. Wolfe, University Extension Division, Boulder.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,  
Greeley, Colorado.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

I am enclosing for your information the completed list of the University of Colorado Committee on the Colorado River. All of the members indicated have filed their acceptances to serve.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

April 7, 1938
Hon. Delph Carpenter  
Greeley, Colorado  

Dear Delph:

I am writing a letter to the Governor which I think you ought to see but which I think you should see only through him, because I do not want him to feel that we are broadcasting our suggestion.

I find we have a very earnest Committee, that the Governor approves our ideas and that the Committee is anxious to be useful without being officious. It is quite a long story. It looks now as if we would hold another session early in June as soon as Congress adjourns and would then ask you to discuss the situation with us, as well as hearing from others who are interested.

Sincerely,
June 9, 1928.

My dear Rogers:

I enclose herewith a copy of my paper entitled "Interstate River Compacts and their Place in Water Utilization" to be read by Meeker on June 15th, at San Francisco, which I wish you would give your critical scrutiny and advise me of your reaction at your early convenience. I would especially appreciate any suggestions of changes before it is released to the press.

The history of the paper is this:- In an unguarded moment I agreed to collaborate with Meeker in the preparation of an address to be read before the association. I soon found that I must prepare the entire paper and was brought to realize that I would be held responsible for every statement. For some time I have felt that I should undertake the preparation of an article on interstate river compacts which would be understood by both layman and lawyer. Accordingly, I have tried to make this paper cover the ground. I wish you would tell me just what you think of it, how far I should go in releasing it to the press, whether it is worth printing in pamphlet form etc.

Very truly yours,

To James Grafton Rogers,
State University,
Boulder, Colorado.