Mr. William H. Nelson  
c/o Daily Sentinel  
Grand Junction, Colorado  

Dear Mr. Nelson:

The Colorado River Association has your letter of May thirtieth, and is happy to have an opportunity to state California's position on the Colorado River Compact.

"Neither the State of California nor any of the public agencies holding contracts for the use of Colorado River water has at any time sought, and does not now seek, to "scuttle" the Colorado River Compact.

"Because of Arizona's refusal, in 1928, to ratify the Compact, California, in order to secure progress on the Boulder (Hoover) Dam Project, was required to limit its use of Colorado River water. This was accomplished by an act of the California State Legislature, generally known as the "Limitation Act," which, with the Boulder Canyon Project Act, constitutes a compact made in terms for the benefit of all of the other States of the Colorado River Basin.

Certain questions of interpretation have arisen between Arizona and California relating to the Limitation Act and to the distribution, as between the States of the Lower Basin, of water available to the Lower Basin under the Colorado River Compact. One of the questions of interpretation involves the definition of terms used in the Compact and, when decided, will affect the application of the Compact in the entire basin. For that reason, the States of the Upper Basin are interested in the Arizona-California controversy.

California recognizes the Compact and Limitation Act as controlling, and seeks to have them applied according to their terms as understood when the agreements were made, and, incidentally, as understood and explained to the Congress at that time by Colorado's very able and distinguished Compact Commissioner, Delph Carpenter. Unfortunately, some of the recent spokesmen for the Upper Basin have aligned themselves with Arizona and have tried to create the impression that California seeks to destroy the Compact. On the contrary, California affirms the Compact, and desires a judicial interpretation of the respective rights of Arizona and California under its terms.

Under either the Arizona interpretation or the California interpretation, the Upper Basin will have reserved for its future development the quantity of water apportioned to it by the Compact.
Under either interpretation the Upper Basin States now are using less than one-third of their apportioned water, so that there remains for the Upper Basin States a large quantity of Colorado River water available for future development.

As I have already stated, California has never sought and does not now seek to "scuttle" the Colorado River Compact or in any way change its terms and conditions. There are no court proceedings or legislative proposals on the part of California directed against the Colorado River Compact or any of its provisions. The Colorado River Association favors the maintenance of the Colorado River Compact and stands for the settlement of the existing controversy between Arizona and California in accordance with the provisions of the Compact and the California Limitation Act.

You may be sure that your interest in the questions you have raised is appreciated. Please let me know if there is any additional or more detailed information which you may desire.

Very truly yours,

Don J. Kinsey
General Manager