

COLORADO RIVER ASSOCIATION
417 South Hill Street, Room 929
Los Angeles, California 90013
Phone: 626-4621

September 9, 1965

FOR NEWSPAPERS DATED
SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 12

Population pressures could increase California requirements for Colorado River water from today's 5.1 million acre-feet yearly to 7,900,000 acre-feet in order to meet growth demands.

This estimate was made today by Dallas Cole, Chief Engineer for the Colorado River Board, after he had compiled data from the six public agencies which own all rights to put to use water from that river in Southern California.

Where this additional water will come from is unsettled. Some proposals under discussion in Congress involve transfer of surplus waters from the Columbia River to the already over-committed Colorado River, and study of other possible sources is being urged as well.

Water from the "bankrupt" Colorado River now meets 80% of the needs of more than 10,000,000 residents of the seven southern counties of California. Additional supplies from Northern California are taken into account in estimating the increase in demands by both natives and new settlers expected in the Southland.

The 5.1 million acre-feet yearly which now must come from the Colorado River to meet present needs includes requirements of the Bard Irrigation District and of the Yuma Indian Reservation. Projected figures include also the decreed rights of three other Indian reservations.

And the figures include estimated needs not otherwise met of cities and industries in the burgeoning areas west of the mountains which rely upon service from the Metropolitan Water District. In these cities live almost all of the millions who need water, and who will need more water, to stay healthy and clean, to find work in water-consuming industry including food production, and to grow.

(More)

The projected agricultural requirements allow for development of all irrigable lands within (1) the present boundaries of the Palo Verde Irrigation District, (2) the area covered by the Imperial Irrigation District's 1932 water supply contract with the Secretary of the Interior, including the East, West and Pilot Knob mesa units, (3) the Colorado River Service Area established by the 1934 water supply contract between the Coachella Valley County Water District and the Secretary of the Interior, (4) the present boundaries of the Reservation Division of the Yuma Project, and (5) the decreed rights of the Chemehuevi, Fort Mojave and Colorado River Indian reservations in California.

The Coachella projection includes water in significant quantity for future urban development within the service area.

The projection for the Metropolitan Water District almost entirely reflects increase of municipal and industrial growth demand.

Cole said quantities estimated to round numbers in the following table are in terms of net diversions, which means gross diversions minus returns to the river:

	<u>Net annual requirements in millions of acre-feet</u>	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Projected</u>
Palo Verde	0.4	0.55
Imperial	3.0	4.8
Coachella	0.5	1.2
Bard, Indian Reservations, etc.	0.05	0.10
Metropolitan	<u>1.15</u>	<u>1.25</u>
Total	<u>5.10</u>	<u>7.90</u>

COLORADO RIVER ASSOCIATION
417 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90013
Phone: (Area 213) 626-4621

December 9, 1966

FOR PAPERS DATED
WEDNESDAY, DEC. 14, 19

"Finding a supplementary supply of fresh water to add to the overburdened Colorado River is just as important to control pollution consequences of proposed new developments as it is for that new water to provide the additional quantities essential to our future growth in the Southwest. A study of ways and means to transfer surplus water from other river systems should be undertaken as quickly as possible."

This was said today by Paul Mitchell of Brawley, Chairman of the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board of California, in commenting on the resolution passed last week in Las Vegas, Nevada, by members of the Colorado River Water Users Association representing California, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming and New Mexico.

That resolution read, in part, "...this Association endorses the regional planning concept for future development of the Colorado River and strongly urges each of the seven Basin States and their authorized representatives to promptly join in the cooperative efforts leading to passage of legislation in the 90th Congress which will authorize a long range regional development program...as well as providing supplemental water...The program (should) include provision for early augmentation of the Colorado River flow by the most feasible means in order to increase the quantity and improve the quality thereof."

This proposal is controversial in States of the Columbia River Basin where large suspected surpluses of water are now subject to only local study.

"The national interest also is deeply involved in the economic future of the Southwest," concluded Mitchell.

COLORADO RIVER ASSOCIATION
417 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90013
Phone: (213) 626-4621

May 19, 1967

FOR PUBLICATION IN NEWSPAPERS
DATED MONDAY, MAY 22, 1967

Backing Gov. Ronald Reagan, Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch and Senators Thomas Kuchel and George Murphy, the Colorado River Board of California announced in Los Angeles today that it unanimously voted to oppose in Congress the legislation affecting the Colorado River which is supported by Arizona and the Administration.

Legislation supported is the Kuchel bill, S. 861, in which Sen. Murphy has joined, and its counterparts in the House. Three main provisions of this bill are:

1. Loss to the Metropolitan Water District aqueduct in the event of shortage must be limited to 662,000 acre-feet annually against demand from later projects.
2. A meaningful study of ways to augment the water supply of the Colorado River mainstream, including studies of importation possibilities, should get underway at once.
3. A 5,000,000 kilowatt hydroplant at Hualapai Dam in Bridge Canyon with pumped storage features to meet power demand peaks should be authorized as an essential source of low cost electricity for the growing economy of the Southwest as well as an essential source of funds to finance works to add water to the Colorado River.

Text of the Colorado River Board resolution follows:

The Colorado River Board of California endorses the statement of Governor Ronald Reagan to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presented by William Gianelli, Director of Water Resources, and that of Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch, presented by Special Assistant Attorney General Northcutt Ely, in support of Senator Kuchel's Colorado River bill, S. 861.

The Board expresses to Senator Kuchel its appreciation, and that of California's water users, for his leadership in the fight to protect California's rights in the Colorado River.

MORE---

The Board reaffirms the policies outlined in its resolution of March 1, 1967. It now appears appropriate to restate California's position with respect to the three major issues which developed during the Senate hearings.

1. With Respect to the Protection of Existing Uses of Water

The construction of the Central Arizona Project will in time result in water shortages for existing projects on the Colorado River. If that project is to be authorized in advance of congressional authorization of works to augment the Lower Basin water supply, the Central Arizona Project must bear a portion of the shortages it will create, and existing projects in California, Arizona and Nevada must have priority protection. We recognize that the protection to California's existing projects must be limited to 4.4 million acre-feet annually to conform to the Supreme Court decree. This means that California, not Arizona, actually bears the first burden of the shortage, losing 662,000 acre-feet of the Metropolitan Water District supply when California's is reduced to 4.4 million. The protection to California's remaining supply must not end until the river is augmented to firm up the 7.5 million acre-feet annually which the Supreme Court apportioned among Arizona, California and Nevada. This was our agreement with Arizona in the 89th Congress. We will not agree to terminate this protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet at the end of any specific number of years, or to reduce it to a lesser quantity at some future date, as Arizona now proposes.

2. With Respect to Importations

California cannot support a bill to authorize the Central Arizona Project unless that bill also authorizes an immediate and meaningful study of ways to augment the water supply in the main Colorado River, including studies of importation possibilities, by at least the quantity necessary to firm up the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned by the Supreme Court decree. We are willing that this investigation include sources in northwestern California, but only on a parity of intensity and of timing with studies of all other possible sources. The bill must contain adequate protection for areas and

states of origin. We have no objection to the creation of a National Water Commission to exercise jurisdiction over these investigations, provided that this is not used as a device for delay. The investigation should get under way at once.

3. With Respect to Hualapai Dam

It is essential that Hualapai Dam and power plant be included in the Central Arizona Project bill, as they always have been. Hualapai Dam is an essential source of low-cost power for the economy of the Southwest, as well as an essential source of funds to finance works to add water to the Colorado River. We endorse the proposal of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power that the Hualapai power plant be built as a 5 million kilowatt pumped storage peaking plant. We will not agree to the creation of a basin account or development fund which mortgages the future power revenues of Hoover, Davis and Parker Dams unless revenues from Hualapai (which will have more capacity than all three of these dams combined) are also included in the fund.

The Kuchel bill, S. 861, and its counterparts in the House, include all three of these essentials, as did the bills in the 89th Congress on which Arizona, California and the other Basin states agreed. California has not changed her position, will keep the agreement she then made; we therefore support the Kuchel bill. But California must oppose the Hayden bill, S. 1004 and the Administration bill, S. 1013, which leave out all three of these essentials to which previously Arizona agreed, and by which she secured California's support for her Central Arizona Project.