June 12, 1951

Joseph M. Tracy
State Engineer

Mr. Oscar L. Chapman
Secretary of the Interior
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

RE: COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS — VIEWS AND COMMENTS

Receipt of your letter of transmittal dated January 30, 1951, together with copies of the "Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, Upper Colorado River Basin", dated December 1950, as prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, is acknowledged. It is understood that said reports were submitted to the State of Utah on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior in compliance with the provisions of Section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 867). Included in each report was the Commissioner's letter to the Secretary of the Interior under date of December 22, 1950.

Under authority of Utah's Governor, the Honorable J. Bracken Lee, it becomes my responsibility to submit official views and recommendations on the reports for the State of Utah.

We wish to commend the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation and their staffs on the painstaking investigations that have made the reports possible. The basic principles underlying the reports are sound. The reports are comprehensive, well prepared, and the many details of preparation are well done. Region IV of the Bureau of Reclamation is to be particularly commended. Utah appreciates the complete cooperation and congenial working relationship that has existed continuously between the State and the Bureau of Reclamation during the period of report preparation. Full compliance with the spirit and purpose of Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 has been exemplified.

Conferences have been held with state officials; the Utah Water and Power Board; the Utah Water Users Association; the Colorado River Development Association, representing twenty-one affected counties within the State; Chambers of Commerce and their water resources committees; the Utah Fish and Game Commission; the Utah State Agricultural College and Agricultural Experiment Station; the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City; various consulting engineers; and many water users and other citizens of this State. In these conferences, the basic principles and details of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin have been explained and discussed. All of the above mentioned organizations and individuals have officially endorsed and approved the project plan. Two exceptions, however, have been made relative to the details of distribution and construction as it relates to the Central Utah Project. These exceptions are discussed under the Central Utah Project.
The State of Utah is in accord with and fully endorses:

(a) The proposed plan of development. We believe that such plan will be of invaluable assistance in permitting the Upper Division States — first, to fulfill their obligations for deliveries at Lee Ferry; and second, to achieve their full measure of development within the limits of apportionment made to the Upper Basin by the Colorado River Compact of 1922. It is further believed that the plan contains that desirable degree of flexibility which will permit the Upper Basin States, the Department of the Interior, and the Congress, to consider from time to time, the addition of other worthy units and participating projects. It also provides coordination of the interests of the Nation and the Upper Colorado River Basin States.

(b) The Upper Colorado River Basin Account as proposed in the report. We strongly endorse the provision for aid to irrigation from surplus revenues.

(c) The Upper Colorado River Development Fund, as set out in the report. We recommend a development whereby all states of the Basin will move forward on an even basis.

Relative the development of the Whitewater Unit, as proposed in the report, Utah wishes to indicate its support of the views and concepts of the State of Colorado with respect to the more complete development of power potentials on the Gunnison River. We understand that such development will be basically comparable to that proposed within the report.

With respect to the Shiprock Project we wish to point out that inasmuch as the report treats it as a participating project, a project planning report should be prepared and made available to affected states. As of this date, no such report has been made available to the State of Utah. Without a planning report on the proposal and therefore not being advised as to project cost, size, or the water users ability to return operation and maintenance costs, we are not prepared to comment further. It is believed that any approval or construction relating to the project should be deferred until there has been made available to all of the affected states, as provided under the Flood Control Act of 1944, and approved by the Congress, a report on the project comparable to reports already prepared for the other participating projects. Such report should demonstrate project feasibility, its favorable qualifications as a participating project and its compatibility with other major projects on the stream which compete directly for the same water supply.

The hydroelectric plants of the Colorado River Storage Project should be operated in conjunction with other power plants present and potential on the Colorado River in such a way as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates. In this connection, however, Utah calls attention to the possible necessity, in the interests of its future economic welfare, as well as the welfare of that portion of the state which lies in the
Upper Colorado River Basin, of making available the full power output of the Colorado River Storage Project for use within the Upper Basin or within the states of the Upper Division. The determination of this objective involves consideration of conditions, such as production and market demand, which can not, at this time, be foreseen. It also involves consideration of the extent of future interconnections and of the effect of Federal laws pertaining to preference in the use of power and the application of such laws to an entire river basin, comprising a number of states. Utah, for a number of reasons, reserves the privilege to seek at the appropriate time, adequate provisions of law or approval of plans or procedures for such power operations as will insure the use of the power output of the Colorado River Storage Project in a manner consistent with greatest future benefits for the Upper Colorado River Basin or the states of the Upper Division.

Provision should be made, either in the report or in ensuing Legislation, or both, for the specific authorization of appropriations of investigation funds, in addition to those provided by the Colorado River Development fund, Reclamation funds, and those recommended in sub-paragraph (j) of the Commissioner's letter of December 22, 1950.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

The initial phase of the Central Utah Project plan reported in the supplement to the Colorado River Storage Project Report dated February 1951, would bring water into Salt Lake County, now being partially served by the Provo River Project, and also contemplates the use of works of the Provo River Project including the Provo Reservoir Canal and the Salt Lake Aqueduct. The Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, in commenting upon the report, has raised questions which are of concern to the district. The district points out:

(1) That water from the Central Utah Project should not be brought into Salt Lake County in competition with existing supplies from the Provo River Project;

(2) That the district should be given the first opportunity to replace with water from the Central Utah Project its Provo River Project water disposed of to Salt Lake County interests;

(3) That the district cannot surrender any of its capacity in the Salt Lake Aqueduct and the Provo Reservoir Canal; and

(4) Expressed some alarm as to integrating the proposed power development at Deer Creek Dam with the Central Utah Project.

Any legislation authorizing the Central Utah Project should be sufficiently broad to permit scheduling the availability of water to Salt Lake County and repayment with respect thereto so as to permit full use of the water now available from the Provo River Project. It appears that no Central Utah Project water for municipal and industrial purposes will be required in Salt Lake County prior to the year 1970.
Project authorization should also permit the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, or other proper organizations, to obtain water made available by the Central Utah Project for use in Salt Lake County. The circumstances existing at the time should determine the organizations to which Central Utah Project water should be made available.

Use of capacity in the Salt Lake Aqueduct and the Provo Reservoir Canal which is in excess of that required to deliver Provo River water is in the interest of development in Salt Lake County. Appropriate arrangements should be made with the Provo River Water Users Association, Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City and other proper interested parties for the use of any works of the Provo River Project. Such an arrangement, we believe, can be accomplished without detriment to any participants in the Provo River Project, and is for the best interests of developing the State of Utah. Legislation authorizing the Central Utah Project should be sufficiently flexible to permit these arrangements to be worked out and agreed upon when the Central Utah Project plan is in the final planning stages.

In regard to integrating the proposed power development at Deer Creek Dam with the Central Utah Project, appropriate agreements should be made with the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City and the Provo River Water Users Association and other proper interested parties during the final planning stages of the Central Utah Project.

Some concern has been expressed by the Utah Water Users Association about building the Strawberry Aqueduct from Rock Creek to Strawberry Reservoir in two barrels as proposed in the report, see pages 27 to 34 of the Central Utah Project. Careful consideration has been given to this matter and it appears that the most economic way is to build the aqueduct to the capacity as required in the initial phase and then to build an additional barrel in the future when required. It is our view that since the second barrel of the aqueduct will not be needed for many years, the report presents the most economic plan for construction of the Strawberry Aqueduct and we favor proceeding in accordance with the plan recommended in the report.

We have given careful consideration to all questions raised by the Metropolitan Water District and the Utah Water Users Association. These questions should not be interpreted as objections to the project plan. They are matters that can be dealt with appropriately during the final planning stages of the Central Utah Project.

In the light of the above comments, the State of Utah approves the plan of development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin described in the report and requests authorization for the construction of the projects listed in Paragraph (b) of the Commissioner's letter of December 22, 1950. We recommend that such projects be constructed and thereafter operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, in accordance with the Federal Reclamation Laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 392, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).
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While recommending the construction of these projects, we believe such construction should be deferred if it in any way will impede the defense effort or injure our economy. It would appear to be desirable, in view of the shortages of materials and manpower, to defer such projects until those shortages no longer exist.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Joseph M. Tracy

Joseph M. Tracy
STATE ENGINEER