Dear Mr. Dugan:

This is in response to your letter of 29 October 1965 concerning coordination of our planning studies for the Chatfield Reservoir Project with your feasibility studies for the Two Forks Reservoir Project. The specific points raised in your letter are discussed in the following paragraphs.

First, with regard to the forthcoming public hearing scheduled by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, our discussion of planning for the Chatfield Project will be limited to the nature and results of an economic feasibility study undertaken as an initial step in the advanced planning process. As you know, the Chatfield Project was in an inactive status for several years prior to the occurrence of the South Platte River flood last June, and available data concerning project economic feasibility were not up to date. With reclassification of the project to an active category following the flood, we were committed to preparation of a report on the project's current feasibility for submittal to Congress next spring.

In view of the somewhat uncertain status of the Two Forks Project, we have based our economic feasibility studies on a Chatfield Reservoir designed to operate without flood-control storage at the Two Forks site. A demonstration of economic feasibility on this basis will permit us to proceed with the remainder of our planning studies. It does not in itself limit our ability to give further consideration to the desirability of flood-control storage in the Two Forks Project and to design the Chatfield Project accordingly. However, if our planning studies are not to be unduly delayed, final design criteria for the Chatfield Project must be established very soon.
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I am sure you recognize that the difference in status of the Chatfield and Two Forks projects presents a somewhat difficult problem. We recognize that the preferable solution would optimize the division of flood-control storage between the two reservoirs. However, without assurance that the Two Forks Project will be built in the near future, it is not practicable to proceed on that basis. In view of the disaster potential of South Platte River floods, as demonstrated last June, flood protection should be provided as soon as possible. I am sure that you would not propose that advanced planning for and construction of the Chatfield Reservoir be postponed indefinitely until the future of the Two Forks Project is definitely determined.

A possible solution to this problem is to proceed with advanced planning for the Chatfield Reservoir, and with construction, without dependence on flood-control storage at the Two Forks site. Subsequently, if the Two Forks Project is authorized for construction, inclusion of flood-control storage in the Two Forks design would permit allocation of some of the flood-control storage in the Chatfield Reservoir to conservation purposes. This is the solution to which we are currently inclined and the one we shall probably be required to adopt unless there is some way whereby we can be assured that flood-control storage will be provided at the Two Forks site in the near future.

Under this procedure, I see no reason why the desirability of appropriate flood-control storage in the Two Forks Project and the benefits of its inclusion should not be recognized in your Two Forks feasibility studies. I shall pass on to Colonel St. Clair your request for confirmation or revision of the flood-control capacity value previously furnished you.

I would appreciate any comments you may have with respect to the procedures described in the preceding paragraphs. If you feel that discussion between our respective staffs would be desirable, I shall be pleased to arrange therefor.

I note that a copy of your letter was furnished to Mr. Sparks. Accordingly, I am furnishing him a copy of my reply.

Sincerely yours,

B. de MELKER
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Acting Division Engineer

cc: Felix L. Sparks
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