

COMPILATION OF

---

RESOLUTIONS, COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

received by the  
COLORADO WATER CONSERVATION BOARD

relating to the reports on  
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS  
and  
GUNNISON RIVER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \*  
\*

April, 1951

PREFACE

During the week of April 2-7, 1951, the Colorado Water Conservation Board arranged and sponsored a series of public meetings to explain and discuss the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects Report, and also the Reconnaissance Report on the Proposed Development of the Gunnison River Basin.

These meetings were held as follows:

Durango . . . . .	Tuesday, April 3
Gunnison . . . . .	Thursday, April 5
Delta . . . . .	Friday, April 6
Meeker . . . . .	Saturday, April 7

At each of the meetings, it was requested that any and all interests should carefully consider the proposals contained in the two above-mentioned reports, and that after such consideration, submit their views and comments to the Colorado Water Conservation Board.

These requested comments, in the form of resolutions and communications, have been arriving at the office of the Board. Copies thereof in mimeographed form are herewith submitted.

## INDEX TO COMMENTS

\* \* \* \*

	Page
Austin Fruit Association . . . . .	4
Cedaredge Lions Club . . . . .	21
Colorado Cattlemen's Association . . . . .	11
Colorado Echo Park Dam Association . . . . .	32
Colorado River Water Conservation District . . . . .	28
Consolidated C. of C. of North Fork Valley . . . . .	25-27
Consolidated Road Committees (Hotchkiss-Crawford). . . . .	10
Crawford-Smith Fork Project Association . . . . .	31
Delta Business and Professional Women's Club . . . . .	13
Delta Chamber of Commerce . . . . .	12
Delta County Agricultural Planning (52 Groups) . . . . .	18
Delta County Commissioners . . . . .	18
Delta-Montrose Rural Power Lines Association . . . . .	17
Ditch Companies (Five) . . . . .	15
Florida Water Conservancy District . . . . .	9
Fruitland Mesa Women's Community Club . . . . .	22
Graham, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon (Rifle) . . . . .	23
Gunnison Watershed Conservation Committee . . . . .	1
La Plata Water Conservancy District . . . . .	7
Pine River Irrigation District . . . . .	6
Savage, Leslie (Crawford) . . . . .	26
Southwestern Water Conservation District . . . . .	5
Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association . . . . .	31
 Delta County Water Committee . . . . .	 32

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, officials of the Bureau of Reclamation under the sponsorship of the Colorado Water Conservation Board have submitted to the citizenry of the upper Gunnison River Basin (which means that area from Crystal Creek east to the Continental divide) their plans for the construction of certain dams under the Colorado River Storage Project report, for the storage of water in the Upper Colorado River Basin, and

Whereas, one of the dams proposed, known as the Curecanti Dam, will, if constructed, impound approximately 2,500,000 acre feet of water, and the reservoir will extend from the dam site east to within one mile of the city limits of the City of Gunnison, Colorado, and all of the ranches, resorts, and other property along the Gunnison River Basin between the dam site and the City of Gunnison will be inundated, and

Whereas, a series of meetings have been held in the upper Gunnison River Basin by the various groups and organizations for the purpose of determining whether the construction of the Curecanti Dam would be beneficial or detrimental to the people in the upper part of the Gunnison River Basin, and

Whereas, the Gunnison Watershed Conservation Committee was organized and selected for the purpose of representing the interested organizations and people in the upper part of the Basin in connection with said matter, and

Whereas, after careful and thorough consideration it is the opinion of the people represented by said Committee that the losses and damages that will result from the construction of the Curecanti Reservoir, as now planned, will far outweigh any benefits that might accrue to the people in this area, and that the construction of the said Curecanti Dam as now planned and the reservoir which will result therefrom will cause irreparable injury and loss to the people and property in this area for the following reasons, to-wit:

1. That it will inundate approximately 20% of the ranch land in this part of the Basin and that the ranches affected are some of the finest anywhere in the State of Colorado; that it will completely inundate two towns, Sapinero and Iola, and twenty-three resorts and many private homes along the Gunnison River; U. S. Highway No. 50, all approach roads, and approximately 27 miles of railroad.
2. That the inundation of said lands will result in a loss of actual revenue to the County of Gunnison from ad valorem taxes amounting to approximately \$50,000.00 per year, or about 20% of the total operating budget of Gunnison County.
3. That the lands which will be inundated by the reservoir, as now planned, carry and support about 5,000 head of cattle and 1,000 head of sheep, and that this livestock will be lost to the tax structure and economy of Gunnison County.
4. That the proposed reservoir, as now planned, will completely destroy approximately 40 miles of the finest trout stream fishing in the United States and about 50% of the winter range for big game in the upper Gunnison River Basin.

5. That the major industries in Gunnison County are livestock raising and recreation or tourist business, and that the proposed reservoir will decrease the economy in Gunnison County approximately 25%.

6. It will cause the dispersal of eighteen herds of famous Gunnison Herefords which have required two generations of improved breeding to bring up to the present high standards.

7. That there is no certainty whatsoever that the proposed projects in the upper Gunnison River Basin will be found feasible as the surveys have not yet been completed; the appropriations for the construction of said projects rest with Congress alone; and it is problematical if the local people would be willing to burden themselves with the necessary indebtedness to develop said projects even though appropriations are eventually made for their construction, and

Whereas, notwithstanding the seriousness of the situation and the loss and irreparable injury that will result to the people in the upper Gunnison River Basin, it is their sincere desire to consider the problems fairly, altruistically and broadly, particularly with respect to the benefits that will result from the construction of the dam to other people in western Colorado, and to the people in the rest of the State and Nation as well, but by the same token the people in the upper Gunnison River Basin, who will be the only ones injured, are entitled to fair treatment and consideration and have definitely concluded that certain adjustments must be made and that the same must be ratified and confirmed by congressional act as a part and parcel of the proposed projects if the construction of the Curecanti Dam is authorized.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Gunnison Watershed Conservation Committee, representing the people in the upper Gunnison River Basin, that the following adjustments be made and incorporated as a part and parcel of the Colorado River Storage Project plans and that the same be sanctioned and approved by congressional act;

1. That a coffer dam be constructed at some suitable point below Iola for the purpose of preventing the water in the reservoir from inundating that part of the Gunnison River Basin above the coffer dam.

2. That the Taylor Park dam, reservoir waters and increased storage rights be transferred and conveyed to the people in the upper Gunnison River Basin for domestic, irrigation and industrial purposes and that the water stored therein be used to firm the Curecanti Reservoir, thereby permitting and supporting the construction of the coffer dam lower down the river.

3. That the engineering surveys and investigations of projects in the upper Gunnison River Basin be completed as quickly as possible and prior to any congressional action on the Curecanti Dam, and if the surveys disclose that one or more of the proposed projects is found to be feasible that the people thereby affected shall have the right to insist upon the construction and completion of said project or projects prior to or concurrently with the construction of the Curecanti Dam and as a participating project or projects.

4. That the Government as compensation for the loss of revenue in the form of taxes and for lowering the economy of Gunnison County, pay to Gunnison County the sum of \$500,000.00 prior to the construction of the dam, and a reasonable amount annually thereafter as may be determined by a survey and investigation of an impartial committee or group working in conjunction with the local people.

5. That the Government provide whatever funds are necessary for the additional school facilities as well as maintenance and operation of the same, as may be required in Gunnison to take care of the additional student load during the construction period.

6. That the Government re-locate and construct U. S. Highway No. 50 in accordance with the standard specifications pertaining to a transcontinental road of that character, and that Gunnison be the terminus on the east and Montrose the terminus on the west.

7. That the Government construct a hard surfaced, modern highway, from the City of Gunnison into the Powderhorn and Lake Fork areas to the Hinsdale County line, and all other access roads on both sides of the reservoir as may be destroyed by the reservoir and as may be found necessary to properly serve the people in this area.

8. That a definite agreement be made between representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wild Life Service, the Colorado Game and Fish Commission, the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and the people in the upper Gunnison River Basin for the formulation of policies relative to the protection and preservation of fish and wild life and for the regulation of the waters in the reservoirs, and all other matters pertaining to projects directly affecting the local people.

9. That surveys be made and completed in the upper Gunnison River Basin, using whatever material and information are available in the offices of existing federal agencies, before the construction of the Curecanti Dam, for the purpose of determining the best manner and method of irrigating and re-seeding mountain ranges in order to prevent erosion and to provide additional grass and forage for livestock and all wild life and upon the completion of the surveys and investigations some definite arrangement be made to use a reasonable amount of revenues annually from the sale of power developed under the Colorado River Storage Projects for the development and irrigation of such ranges.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in addition to the requirements above mentioned, that the following adjustments be provided if the legal considerations will permit:

1. That definite arrangements be made for those ranchers whose lands are to be inundated by the Curecanti Reservoir to have the first priority and right to re-locate on other arable lands under participating projects in Gunnison County, and that the provisions of the present law with respect to the 160 acre tract limitation be waived or changed to meet the economic conditions in this area.

2. That proper arrangements be made for the transfer, without reduction, of range rights and privileges on the National Forest and Public Domain, from the ranches that will be inundated, to any new lands that will be taken up by the permittees or their assignees.

3. It is questionable whether there will be any good resort sites bordering the Curecanti Reservoir yet the resort owners whose lands will be inundated should be given a preferential right to new locations on Government lands bordering this reservoir, and on other reservoirs which may be constructed in the upper Gunnison River Basin.

4. That in the acquisition of the lands that will be inundated, and other property affected by the proposed Curecanti Reservoir, the Government shall take into consideration the effect of the income tax burden and the devaluation of the dollar in awarding its compensation to the owners of said properties.

5. That arrangements be made in the regulation of the water from the Taylor Park reservoir to prevent, as much as possible, the injury to and adverse effect upon the fish life and fishing conditions along the streams affected, and that the local people have a permanent voice in such regulatory measures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that as the above conclusions and requirements have been made after careful, thorough and complete study, debate and consideration, that it is the firm belief of the people in this area that such requirements are fair, reasonable and just.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of these resolutions be transmitted to Governor Dan Thornton, The Colorado Water Conservation Board, the Colorado River Conservancy District, the Delta County Agricultural Planning Committee, the Board of Directors of the Montrose Chamber of Commerce, the Colorado State Agricultural Planning Committee, and to the press.

Upon motion duly made and seconded the above and foregoing resolution was unanimously passed, approved and adopted by the Gunnison Watershed Conservation Committee representing the people in the upper Gunnison River Basin, the 19th day of April, A. D. 1951.

ATTEST:

GUNNISON WATERSHED CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Guy Cox  
Secretary

By E. L. Dutcher  
Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

# AUSTIN FRUIT ASSOCIATION

Austin, Colorado, April 16, 1951

Judge Clifford Stone  
Denver, Colorado

Dear Sir:

The Austin Fruit Association unanimously passed a resolution as being in favor of the Curecanti dam project over the Bridgeport dam project

Yours truly  
Austin Fruit Ass'n.  
Hover Dixon, Secy.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF SOUTHWESTERN WATER  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT TO THE COLORADO WATER CONSERVATION BOARD  
RELATIVE TO THE REPORT OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES.

- - - - -

At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Southwestern Water Conservation District the matter of the recommendations to be made to the Colorado Water Conservation Board concerning the report of the Reclamation Service to the Congress of the United States came up for discussion. All members of the Board were present, but some members had not had full opportunity to examine the proposed report, and all felt their suggestions should relate to the area included in their own district.

The general plan of developing liquidating projects first, and out of the revenues derived therefrom to assist various participating projects met with the unanimous approval of the Board. The general plan of the Reclamation Service to first install and develop the Echo Park and Curecanti Projects in Colorado appears logical and meets with the approval of this Board. It is the feeling of this Board that as soon as power projects are put in operation, the power developed should first be used in Colorado to the greatest extent possible, and especially should such power be reserved for use by plants erected near to the place where generated. This means the greatest possible saving in cost, and also means a Statewide development instead of a localized one.

The Board further believes that as soon as the power projects have reached a certain stage of development, a portion of the net revenues derived therefrom should immediately be diverted to the investigation and study of the development, conservation and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin, and to that end recommends the creation of a special fund to which shall be transferred a proper proportion of the net revenues derived from Upper Colorado River liquidating projects, known as the Colorado River Storage Project, to be used for the purposes stated--in accordance with the recommendations heretofore made by the Regional Director and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. If these investigations and studies are to be delayed until all ten liquidating projects are completed, it will mean such a long delay that few people now living will see the completion of this work.

The Board further believes that it is illogical and unnecessary to divert water from the Western Slope of Colorado to the Eastern Slope at enormous expense, until all available lands are irrigated on the Western Slope. Many of these lands under the proposed projects now contemplated are already partially developed, and thousands of acres of fertile land can be made productive by the application of waters available in the near vicinity of these lands; and it seems useless and foolish to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to take this water to distant areas of development on the other side of the mountain range. Among the participating projects we especially recommend for the consideration of your Board what is known as the Pine River Extension Project, the Florida Water Conservation District Project and recommend that the La Plata Conservancy Project be reinstated as being worthy of the most serious consideration. This will benefit a large number of people who have already spent a great amount of money in improving their lands and



who will eventually have to abandon such fertile soil because of lack of water, unless this project is completed. Some are already moving away. The Pine River Extension Project means simply the enlarging or addition to the Pine River Project already completed and the extension being originally contemplated when the first dam or reservoir was built. This project is largely self-liquidating and it may be noted that 14,000 acres of land are now paying construction costs of the dam without any benefit whatever to the owners of such land.

Beyond this, the Board, because of its limited knowledge, makes no further recommendations.

Done at Durango, Colorado  
this 14th day of April, 1951

SOUTHWESTERN WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

By D. W. Sexton  
Secretary

\* \* \* \* \*

# THE PINE RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Ignacio, Colorado

COMMENT OF THE PINE RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT ON REPORT ON THE COLORADO  
RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS OF THE UPPER COLORADO  
RIVER BASIN  
APRIL 3, 1951

The Pine River Irrigation District approves of the report of the Commissioner and of the Regional Director, but desires to make some reservations concerning the Pine River Project Extension, which is one of the approved participating projects recommended for authorization.

Our comment is fully set forth in our letters of April 4, 1949 and July 12, 1949 addressed to the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and was discussed at a meeting of the Colorado Water Conservation Board held in Denver, Colorado on December 16th and 17th, and set forth in the comment of the Board which was addressed to the Regional Director under date of December 17, 1949. However, we wish to very briefly outline the objections to the proposed report of the Regional Director dated January of 1949.

1. The Pine River Irrigation District has always objected to that provision of the report which provides that the persons within the District who have water available for their lands would pay the entire balance of the reimbursable construction costs of the Vallecito Reservoir, and that the persons benefitting under the Project Extension will be relieved of further payment of these construction costs. We have been orally advised that the report will be revised to eliminate this feature, but we note that in Paragraph "e" of the report of the Regional Director on the Colorado River Storage Project that the Director desires that there be Districts of the Water Conservancy type "one purpose of which shall be to provide revenues for the Project over and above those paid by irrigators to assist in repayment of construction costs allocated to irrigation." Does this mean that the objectionable feature of the proposed report on The Pine River Project Extension is to be retained?

2. The District had previously stated that unless it can be shown that there is sufficient water in the Vallecito Reservoir to irrigate the lands within the present boundaries of the District, the District should not be enlarged to include additional lands in either Colorado or New Mexico; and we will particularly object to inclusion of additional lands if there is to be any more trans-mountain diversion of the waters of the Pine River or its tributaries into the Rio Grande Valley.

3. Is there any reason why The Pine River Project like the Eden Project and Paonia Project cannot be authorized and construction commenced in 1951? We ask this question particularly in view of the fact that for over ten years more than 14,000 acres of privately owned land within The Pine River Irrigation District has been paying construction costs of the Vallecito Reservoir and cannot receive any water from the Reservoir until the construction of this Extension.

4. When the project is constructed it will be necessary to revise the existing contract with the United States in order to eliminate some of the unworkable features, and to extend the time of repayment of construction costs of the Reservoir in order that persons participating in the cost of the Extension will be able to meet their obligations.

#### THE PINE RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

By A. M. Emigh  
Attorney

\*\*\*\*\*

#### COMMENTS OF THE LA PLATA WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT UPON THE PROPOSED REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE UPPER COLO- RADO RIVER BASIN

It seems to the Board of Directors, by whom the undersigned is authorized to make these comments, that the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Upper Colorado Basin is sound and economically feasible. The placement of a dividing point between the Upper and the Lower Basin at Lee's Ferry has probably created some spirit of animosity between the Upper and Lower Basin States. As a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation aptly pointed out, the Lower Basin States receive a smooth flow of seven and one half million acre feet per year average at Lees Ferry, whereas the Upper Basin States are forced by the very nature of the Colorado River Compact to accept as theirs, the uneven cyclic flow of water in the Colorado River.

It appears to us without question, that there must be some form of hold-over storage on the upper reaches of the Colorado River in order best to utilize all of the water in the river, not only for the benefit of the Upper Basin but also of the Lower Basin States.

An undertaking of this magnitude is, as the project report points out, very expensive. We believe that the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed the best possible method for the financing of the project. We feel that the Bureau has considered the problems of silt, proximity of power markets and what irrigation may be aided by "main stem projects"; but, we also feel that if any precedence is to be given to any of the projects, the Echo Park and Navajo projects should be considered first, since it appears to us that the construction of either of these would in some manner facilitate irrigation in the Upper Basin States.

It occurs to us, that, in these days of large governmental expenditures, such a project as this, with automatic repayment provisions, would be highly desirable, and we do therefore, endorse the Bureau of Reclamation report on the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Since our interest in the development of The Upper Colorado River Basin is primarily in the participating project known as The La Plata Project, we take the liberty of making our comments upon that Project separately.

We are informed that, under the criteria set up by the Bureau of Reclamation, the La Plata Project has temporarily been stalled pending further investigation. We suppose that each project may urge that the development of its own area is absolutely essential and that the project and the area involved have some peculiarity which should appeal to the Department of the Interior and the Congress of The United States.

Historically, the La Plata River and the La Plata River Compact are very important. We are given to understand, that the United States Supreme Court, in approving the La Plata River Compact, decided as a question of first impression, that two sovereign states, may by Compact, settle matters of dispute concerning rights as between the States. The La Plata River is an inter-state stream having under it more irrigable acres per second foot of water than any of the other streams in the San Juan Basin.

These lands lie not only in Colorado but also in New Mexico. Imagine how difficult it must be for a Colorado farmer to stand facing a stream in which some water is running while at his back his crops are burning; yet he cannot take the water in the stream because this is the ten day period in which New Mexico is entitled to the water. The lands lying within the exterior boundary of the La Plata Water Conservancy District comprise a well-settled area; homes are already built and have been in existence for many years. These farmers have been plugging for 23 or 24 years to get dams built and are now getting desperate for water. Many have moved out.

Is it too much to ask, then, that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Colorado Water Conservation Board get the proposed La Plata Project completed and in shape for inclusion in the initial list of participating projects? Certainly there is no area which needs the water more in the whole Colorado River Basin, nor which could use it to better advantage. Although we stated above that we approved of the general plan of the Bureau, let us say that our primary interest is in the inclusion of The La Plata Project therein, particularly in so far as the State Line and the Long Hollow reservoirs are concerned. We do not in this comment urge that the Animas-La Plata diversion unit of the project be completed and included. We realize that that is asking too much for the present; but we do say that the construction

of either or both of the reservoirs above mentioned would be of invaluable benefit to the area.

Dated at Durango, Colorado, this 5th day of April, 1951.

Victor A. Paulek  
President, La Plata Conservancy District

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENTS OF THE FLORIDA WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT UPON THE  
PROPOSED REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FOR DEVELOPMENT  
OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

---

It seems to the Board of Directors, by whom the undersigned is authorized to make these comments, that the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Upper Colorado Basin is sound and economically feasible. The placement of a dividing point between the Upper and the Lower Basin at Lee's Ferry has probably created some spirit of animosity between the Upper and Lower Basin States. As a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation aptly pointed out, the Lower Basin States receive a smooth flow of seven and one half million acre feet per year average at Lees Ferry, whereas the Upper Basin States are forced by the very nature of the Colorado River Compact to accept as theirs, the uneven cyclic flow of water in the Colorado River.

It appears to us without question, that there must be some form of hold-over storage on the upper reaches of the Colorado River in order best to utilize all of the water in the river, not only for the benefit of the Upper Basin States but also of the Lower Basin States.

An undertaking of this magnitude is, as the project report points out, very expensive. We believe that the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed the best possible method for the financing of the project. We feel that the Bureau had considered the problems of silt, proximity of power markets and what irrigation may be aided by "main stem projects"; but, we also feel that if any precedence is to be given to any of the projects, the Echo Park and Navajo projects should be considered first, since it appears to us that the construction of either of these would in some manner facilitate irrigation in the Upper Basin States.

It occurs to us, that, in these days of large governmental expenditures, such a project as this, with automatic repayment provisions, would be highly desirable, and we do therefore, endorse the Bureau of Reclamation report on the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Since our interest in the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin is primarily in the participating project known as The Florida Project, we take the liberty of making our comments upon that part of the report separately.

-10-

The facts and figures concerning The Florida Project are of course, incorporated into the Project Report and it is not our present intention to burden the readers hereof with unnecessary repetition; therefore we shall quote no facts nor figures. We need only to observe a farmer watching his crop burn up for lack of water when there was, at one time of the year, water available for storage, to realize that The Florida Project should be dealt with with all expedience. It may be true that there is not enough water to irrigate all lands lying under The Florida River, with all of the water needed, but the margin of productivity of most of the lands lying under The Florida River is directly related to the amount of water therein available for irrigation; thus each foot of water in July and August of any year which can be applied to the irrigation of lands lying under The Florida River is worth many times the cost of re-payment proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

It is true that in the past there was some dissension concerning the construction of a hold-over storage dam for irrigation on The Florida River; that was before the time of the formation of The Florida River Water Conservancy District, in 1948, and we feel that we can unequivocally state that there is no opposition to the construction of a dam on The Florida River, and that there is very active agitation for such construction.

We are satisfied with the figures as presented by the Bureau of Reclamation, and feel that as concerns The Florida Project, the Bureau's Report on the Upper Colorado Storage Projects should be approved without delay.

Dated at Durango, Colorado, this 6th day of April, 1951.

Lloyd B. Mason

President, The Florida Water  
Conservancy District

\*\*\*\*\*

Consolidated Offices Road Committees

North Fork Chamber of Commerce, Hotchkiss, Colo.

Crawford Chamber of Commerce, Crawford, Colo.

Crawford, Colorado  
April 13th---1951

Members of The Colorado River Conservation Board,  
State Office Building,  
Denver, Colorado

Gentlemen:

Please accept this written evidence of our desire to ask that the first Dam, Reservoir and Power Plant to be constructed on the Gunnison River be located some place in the Black Canyon of this River above the confluence of The Smith Fork

-11-

Creek and the Gunnison River. It is our firm belief that a dam constructed on the Gunnison River that will store over two million acre feet of water and produce over 48,000 kilowatts of Electric power would be more beneficial to a larger number of citizens and tax-payers than would a dam constructed at Bridgeport where only 80,000 acre feet of water can be stored and less than 48,000 kilowatts of power produced. We further believe that the dam located several miles below Sapinero, Colorado will eventually be of GREAT BENEFIT not only to Montrose and Delta Counties but likewise to the County of Gunnison and the city of Gunnison.

We ask that you weigh the question of the location of the first Dam to be constructed on the Gunnison River with the following thought in mind: "Which of the two proposed dams will be the most beneficial to the largest number of citizens and tax-payers".

Very sincerely yours,  
Consolidated Offices of the Road Committees  
of Hotchkiss, Colorado  
and Crawford, Colorado

By Leslie J. Savage  
Chairman of the Road Committee

\* \* \* \* \*

Delta, Colorado--April 12th 1951

Judge Clifford Stone and Associates,  
Colo. Water Conservation Board  
Denver, Colorado

Gentlemen:

It is the desire of this committee to protect the western slope and its economic future on the Gunnison River with the recommendation for construction of Curecanti Reservoir primarily, since the findings of the engineers are that it will give us greater generation of electrical power and greater storage of water than any other project examined in this region. We feel that Curecanti Reservoir must be given precedence over any other dam on the Gunnison River because it is agreed by the engineers that it will be the most economic in its costs of construction and that is the only basis to fully protect the tax-payers dollar, which should be protected first under the present set-up. Curecanti Reservoir will have a minimum of silting and evaporation with maximum of results for power and irrigation within the Gunnison River area.

Curecanti Dam is the only dam proposed on the Gunnison River which will store water for more than one year to the next year. This storage is needed to assure delivery of water to meet the terms of the 1922 compact and some water will be held as much as 25 years to guarantee delivery in low run-off years like 1931 and 1940. Since the water will be committed under compact--it cannot be diverted. Bridgeport, near Whitewater, wont hold any lower basin water, its capacity,

therefore, cannot be used in Colorado for other than a limited supply to Grand Valley (about 1400 acres) so that a little diversion could be made from the head waters of the Colorado River. There is some question whether Bridgeport Dam should ever be built, but Bridgeport Dam is given priority in the project plan--not Curecanti Dam. Under the 1922 compact the Curecanti Reservoir should be constructed FIRST for the protection of our state and western counties and the taxpayers dollar.

Western Slope Committee  
Colorado Cattlemens Association  
C. W. Blake, Secretary

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, representatives of the DELTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, have heard the reports and discussion of the Bureau of Reclamation on the hold-over storage program of the Upper Basin States and have considered the reports on the relative costs and benefits of the Currecanti Reservoir and the Whitewater or Bridgeport Reservoir and have now given further consideration to the plans for the development of the Colorado River and its tributaries, including particularly the Gunnison River; and

WHEREAS, we have come to the conclusion that the overall plan for the construction of ten hold-over storage Reservoirs on the Colorado River and its tributaries in the Upper Basin States is sound; and

WHEREAS, it is our considered opinion that the Currecanti Reservoir has substantial advantages over the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir; and

WHEREAS, the members of this organization realize the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir would require the reconstruction of Highway No. 50; and would require payment for privately owned lands and resorts; We also realize that the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir would require the relocation of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad; would also require the acquisition of privately owned lands and fruit orchards. On the other hand, it is our firm belief that a lake of the size and at the elevation of Currecanti Reservoir would be a valuable recreational asset to the area above and below said Reservoir site; and

WHEREAS, we believe that unless the waters of the Gunnison River are fully put to a beneficial use at the earliest practicable date, that the water will be put to a beneficial use elsewhere.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this organization approves the overall hold-over storage program as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation in principle.

-13-

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir on the Gunnison River be designated as the initial project of the storage Reservoirs proposed for the Gunnison River.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Currecanti Reservoir be included in the initial construction projects and that it be given equal priority with the construction of the proposed Echo Park Reservoir project.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Hon. Clifford Stone, Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and that a copy be sent to the Board of Directors of the Colorado River Water Conservation District forthwith.

DELTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

H. R. Holliday  
H. R. Holliday, President

W. M. Murfin  
W. M. Murfin, Secretary-Manager

\*\*\* \*\*

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, representatives of the DELTA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB have heard the reports and discussion of the Bureau of Reclamation on the hold-over storage program of the Upper Basin States and have considered the reports on the relative costs and benefits of the Currecanti Reservoir and the Whitewater or Bridgeport Reservoir and have now given further consideration to the plans for the development of the Colorado River and its tributaries, including particularly the Gunnison River; and

WHEREAS, we have come to the conclusion that the overall plan for the construction of ten hold-over storage Reservoirs on the Colorado River and its tributaries in the Upper Basin States is sound and for the ultimate benefit of the United States of America; and

WHEREAS, it appears to us that it is necessary that one of the proposed storage and power Reservoirs should be constructed on the Gunnison River as an initial Reservoir in said program; and

WHEREAS, it is our considered opinion that the Currecanti Reservoir has the following substantial advantages over the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir:

(a) That it will store approximately three times as much water at twice the cost.



-14-

(b) That it is the key to the development of the Gunnison River in that neither the Whitewater Reservoir nor the proposed Crystal Creek Reservoir can develop their rated capacities nor furnish firm power until the said Currecanti Reservoir is constructed.

(c) That upon its construction the Currecanti Reservoir will produce its full rated electrical energy without the necessity of constructing additional Reservoirs later.

(d) That it is an important integral part of the circuit of power plants proposed in connection with the hold-over storage program.

(e) That the percentage of evaporation loss will be considerably less at the higher elevation of Currecanti than the evaporation loss of the Whitewater Reservoir downstream.

(f) That it will furnish a higher rate of power revenue for the construction of necessary and vital participating projects at an earlier date and in larger amount than a smaller, lower elevation reservoir such as Whitewater, dependent upon a fluctuating water supply.

(g) That the storage of water in the head waters of the Gunnison will tend to firm the irrigation decrees on the River below the Reservoir and will result in an effective flood control in the Lower Basin of the Gunnison River.

(h) That the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir will make it possible to apply greater quantities of water to beneficial uses in the area affected and many years earlier.

AND WHEREAS, the members of this organization realize that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir would require the reconstruction of Highway No. 50; would require the payment for privately owned lands and Resorts; and would require a change in type of fishing and recreation on the Gunnison River. We also realize that the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir would require the relocation of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad; would also require the acquisition of privately owned lands and fruit orchards, and because of the low elevation would produce a lake having very little recreational value. On the other hand, it is our firm belief that a lake of the size and at the elevation of Currecanti Reservoir would be a valuable recreational asset to the area above and below said Reservoir site; and

WHEREAS, it is contemplated by the overall program of Federal hold-over storage Reservoirs that all of said projects will eventually be completed and that sacrifices will eventually be made to that end and it is our conclusion that we should start with the largest and most valuable development possible at the present time; and

WHEREAS, we believe that unless the waters of the Gunnison River are fully put to a beneficial use at the earliest practicable date, that the water will be put to a beneficial use elsewhere.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this organization approves the overall hold-over storage program as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation in principle.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir on the Gunnison River be designated as the initial project of the storage Reservoirs proposed for the Gunnison River.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Currecanti Reservoir be included in the initial construction projects and that it be given equal priority with the construction of the proposed Echo Park Reservoir project.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Hon. Clifford Stone, Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and that a copy be sent to the Board of Directors of the Colorado River Water Conservation District forthwith.

\* \* \* \* \*

Attest a true and correct copy.

Iva Reed  
Secretary, Delta Business and Professional  
Women's Club

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, representatives of the undersigned ditch companies have heard the reports and discussion of the Bureau of Reclamation on the hold-over storage program of the Upper Basin States and have considered the reports on the relative costs and benefits of the Currecanti Reservoir and the Whitewater or Bridgeport Reservoir and have now given further consideration to the plans for the development of the Colorado River and its tributaries, including particularly the Gunnison River; and

WHEREAS, we have come to the conclusion that the overall plan for the construction of ten hold-over storage Reservoirs on the Colorado River and its tributaries in the Upper Basin States is sound and for the ultimate benefit of the United States of America; and

WHEREAS, it appears to us that it is necessary that one of the proposed storage and power Reservoirs should be constructed on the Gunnison River as an initial Reservoir in said program; and

WHEREAS, it is our considered opinion that the Currecanti Reservoir has the following substantial advantages over the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir:

(a) That it will store approximately three times as much water at twice the cost.

(b) That it is the key to the development of the Gunnison River in that neither the Whitewater Reservoir nor the proposed Crystal Creek Reservoir can develop their rated capacities nor furnish firm power until the said Currecanti Reservoir is constructed.

-16-

(c) That upon its construction the Currecanti Reservoir will produce its full rated electrical energy without the necessity of constructing additional Reservoirs later.

(d) That it is an important integral part of the circuit of power plants proposed in connection with the holdover storage program.

(e) That the percentage of evaporation loss will be considerably less at the higher elevation of Currecanti than the evaporation loss of the Whitewater Reservoir downstream.

(f) That it will furnish a higher rate of power revenue for the construction of necessary and vital participating projects at an earlier date and in larger amount than a smaller, lower elevation Reservoir such as Whitewater, dependent upon a fluctuating water supply.

(g) That the storage of water in the head waters of the Gunnison will tend to firm the irrigation decrees on the River below the Reservoir and will result in an effective flood control in the Lower Basin of the Gunnison River.

(h) That the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir will make it possible to apply greater quantities of water to beneficial uses in the area affected and many years earlier.

AND WHEREAS, the members of this organization realize that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir would require the reconstruction of Highway No. 50; would require the payment for privately owned lands and Resorts; and would require a change in type of fishing and recreation on the Gunnison River. We also realize that the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir would require the relocation of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad; would also require the acquisition of privately owned lands and fruit orchards, and because of the low elevation would produce a Lake having very little recreational value. On the other hand, it is our firm belief that a Lake of the size and at the elevation of Currecanti Reservoir would be a valuable recreational asset to the area above and below said Reservoir site; and

WHEREAS, it is contemplated by the overall program of Federal hold-over storage Reservoirs that all of said projects will eventually be completed and that sacrifices will eventually be made to that end and it is our conclusion that we should start with the largest and most valuable development possible at the present time; and

WHEREAS, we believe that unless the waters of the Gunnison River are fully put to a beneficial use at the earliest practicable date, that the water will be put to a beneficial use elsewhere.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this organization approves the overall hold-over storage program as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation in principle.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir on the Gunnison River be designated as the initial project of the storage Reservoirs proposed for the Gunnison River.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Currecanti Reservoir be included in the initial construction projects and that it be given equal priority with the construction of the proposed Echo Park Reservoir project.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Hon. Clifford Stone, Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and that a copy be sent to the Board of Directors of the Colorado River Water Conservation District forthwith.

-----

Attest a true and correct copy

ORCHARD RANCH DITCH CO.

By V. Olin Bruton Pres.

FOGG DITCH COMPANY

By W. R. Griffith Pres.

THE LAKE FORK DITCH COMPANY

By Ernest A. Bull Pres.

THE FORREST DITCH COMPANY

By A. P. Starr Pres.

THE GRAND MESA WATER USERS ASSN.

By J. A. Hunnsicker Sec.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS The Delta-Montrose Rural Power Lines Association has actively encouraged and fostered the construction of the Currecanti Dam on the Gunnison River for many years, it is hereby

RESOLVED that the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Colorado River and its tributaries, known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Project, is hereby approved; and it is further

RESOLVED that we favor the substitution of the Currecanti Dam for the White-water Dam, as the dam on the Gunnison River to be constructed in the first phase of the Upper Colorado River Project concurrently with the Echo Park Dam.

Dated at Delta, Colorado this 13th day of April 1951 at a Special meeting of the Board of Directors.

Attest:

John L. Burritt  
President

Kate E Tracy  
Secretary-Treasurer

G. Blanchard  
Vice-President

Alph L. Foster  
Director

Frank Meakor  
Director

Nancy Nulter  
Director

E. H. Franzmeier  
Director

O. A. Ehrgott  
CLERK AND RECORDER  
Delta County

Delta, Colorado  
April 7, 1951

At a regular meeting of the Board of Delta County Commissioners held on April 6, 1951 the following Resolution was adopted by the unanimous vote of the said Board:

RESOLVED: That we the Board of County Commissioners of Delta County believe that it is to the best interests of Delta County and of the citizens of Delta County that the Curacanti dam be given the No. 1 Priority in the construction of dams on the Gunnison River.

Voting Aye:	W. F. Blaine, Chairman
" "	Charles Kiser
" "	Joe Barnie

ATTEST: O. A. Ehrgott  
County Clerk & Recorder

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Delta County Agricultural Planning Committee

Delta, Colorado  
April 13, 1951

Honorable Clifford H. Stone  
212 State Office Building  
Denver, Colorado

We the undersigned organizations and service clubs of  
Delta County wish to present the following:

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, representatives of the undersigned organizations have heard the reports and discussion of the Bureau of Reclamation on the holdover storage program of the Upper Basin States and have considered the reports on the relative costs and benefits of the Currecanti Reservoir and the Whitewater or Bridgeport Reservoir and have now given further consideration to the plans for the development of the Colorado River and its tributaries, including particularly the Gunnison River; and

WHEREAS, we have come to the conclusion that the overall plan for the construction of ten hold-over storage Reservoirs on the Colorado River and its tributaries in the Upper Basin States is sound and for the ultimate benefit of the United States of America; and

-19-

WHEREAS, it appears to us that it is necessary that one of the proposed storage and power Reservoirs should be constructed on the Gunnison River as an initial Reservoir in said program; and

WHEREAS, it is our considered opinion that the Currecanti Reservoir has the following substantial advantages over the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir:

(a) That it will store approximately three times as much water at twice the cost.

(b) That it is the key to the development of the Gunnison River in that neither the Whitewater Reservoir nor the proposed Crystal Creek Reservoir can develop their rated capacities nor furnish firm power until the said Currecanti Reservoir is constructed.

(c) That upon its construction the Currecanti Reservoir will produce its full rated electrical energy without the necessity of constructing additional Reservoirs later.

(d) That it is an important integral part of the circuit of power plants proposed in connection with the hold-over storage program.

(e) That the percentage of evaporation loss will be considerably less at the higher elevation of Currecanti than the evaporation loss of the Whitewater Reservoir downstream.

(f) That it will furnish a higher rate of power revenue for the construction of necessary and vital participating projects at an earlier date and in larger amount than a smaller, lower elevation Reservoir such as Whitewater, dependent upon a fluctuating water supply.

(g) That the storage of water in the head waters of the Gunnison will tend to firm the irrigation decrees on the River below the Reservoir and will result in an effective flood control in the Lower Basin of the Gunnison River.

(h) That the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir will make it possible to apply greater quantities of water to beneficial uses in the area affected and many years earlier.

And

WHEREAS, the members of these organizations realize that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir would require the reconstruction of Highway No. 50; would require the payment for privately owned lands and Resorts; and would require a change in type of fishing and recreation on the Gunnison River. We also realize that the construction of the Whitewater Reservoir would require the relocation of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad; would also require the acquisition of privately owned lands and fruit orchards and because of the low elevation would produce a Lake having very little recreational value. On the other hand, it is our firm belief that a Lake of the size and at the elevation of Currecanti Reservoir would be a valuable recreational asset to the area above and below said Reservoir site; and

WHEREAS, it is contemplated by the overall program of Federal hold-over storage Reservoirs that all of said projects will eventually be completed and that sacrifices will eventually be made to that end, it is our conclusion that we should start with the largest and most valuable development possible at the present time.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that these organizations approve the overall hold-over storage program as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation in principle.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir on the Gunnison River be designated as the initial project of the storage Reservoirs proposed for the Gunnison River.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Currecanti Reservoir be included in the initial construction projects and that it be given equal priority with the construction of the proposed Echo Park Reservoir project.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Clifford Stone, Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and that a copy be sent to the Board of Directors of the Colorado River Water Conservation District forthwith.

-----  
Delta County Agricultural Planning Committee

Delta Kiwanis Club	Delta County Commissioners
Delta County Farmer's Union	Delta Lions Club
Delta County Farm Bureau	Delta Sportsman's Club
City of Delta	Surface Creek Creamery
Paonia Farmer's Union Local 179	City of Cedaredge
Orchard City	Delta, Montrose R E A
Austin Fruit Association	Orchard City Irrigation Company
Battlement Mesa Ditch & Reservoir Co.	Granby Ditch and Reservoir Company
Surface Creek Ditch and Reservoir Co.	Crawford Clipper Ditch Company
Bone Mesa Domestic Water Company	Western Colorado Beetgrower's Assoc.
Fruitland Mesa Irrigation Company	Pilot Rock Irrigation Company
Fire Mountain Canal Company	North Fork Water Conservancy District
Hartland Ditch Company	Overland Ditch Company
Delta Chamber of Commerce	Holly Sugar Corporation
Uncompahgre Cattle & Horsegrower's Assoc.	Paonia Chamber of Commerce
Stewart Ditch Company	Paonia Rotary Club
Delta Rotary Club	Needle Rock Ditch Company
Crawford Chamber of Commerce	Delta Rod & Gun Club
Hotchkiss Rod & Gun Club	Black Mesa Cattle Pool
Hotchkiss Kiwanis	Hotchkiss American Legion
Hotchkiss V. F. W.	Hotchkiss Business Men's & Women's Club
Harry White Post of American Legion, Delta	Lee Marts Post of V. F. W., Delta
Crawford American Legion	Monitor Livestock Association
Crawford Farmer's Union Local No. 62	Delta Canal Company
Paonia Lions Club	Alfalfa Ditch Company
Delta County Veteran's on-the-job Training Classes	Delta Business & Professional Women's Club

This resolution is the result of the combined thinking of the leaders of the above organizations; but the leadership of these organizations reserve the right to make further recommendations to help solve the problems confronting the people of the Gunnison Area. It is felt that the concessions should be made wherever practicable to protect the people in the Gunnison Area, and as long as these concessions do not interfere with the overall program, it is the opinion of this group that they should be honored.

Melvin Jaynes, President

Carl H. Powell, Secretary

Delta County Agricultural Planning  
Committee

\*\* \* \* \* \*

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The members of the Cedaredge Lions Club of Cedaredge, Colorado, a duly chartered service club of Lions International, have studied a report of the Bureau of Reclamation setting forth its recommendations for the development of storage reservoirs, power and new irrigation projects in the Upper Basin under the Interstate Compact of 1922 and the Colorado River Upper Basin Compact of 1948, and

WHEREAS, The members of the Cedaredge Lions Club believe that the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Colorado River Upper Basin should be approved, but that

WHEREAS, Since the Bureau of Reclamation has specified that one of the first two dams should be constructed on the Gunnison River and has recommended the site at Bridgeport, Colorado, the Cedaredge Lions Club should urge the Bureau of Reclamation to change its recommendation from Bridgeport to Curecanti as the first storage reservoir to be constructed on the Gunnison River, in order to obtain the greatest benefit for the Gunnison and Uncompahgre Basins:

NOW, THEREFORE, Be It Resolved by the Cedaredge Lions Club that the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Colorado River Upper Basin is hereby approved, and

Be It Further Resolved that the Cedaredge Lions Club recommends that the proposed Curecanti Reservoir Dam be designated as the first storage reservoir to be constructed on the Gunnison River,

And Be It Further Resolved that the Cedaredge Lions Club recommends that said Curecanti reservoir should in no way be used to further plans for trans-mountain diversion of waters of the Gunnison River until such time as present



and potential uses of water in Western Colorado are fully protected and that the Cedaredge Lions Club respectfully recommends that property owners in the Upper Gunnison Valley be given relief in the form of income tax exemption in the forced sale of property as the result of the above construction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the above resolution was duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted on the 23rd day of April, A. D. 1951.

Cedaredge Lions Club

ATTEST:

Benson Palmer

By Philip R. Aust  
Philip R. Aust, Secretary

By Marion F. Mills, President

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, a joint meeting of the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Colorado River Water Conservancy Board was held Friday, April 6, 1951, at Delta, in order to advise those interested of the fact that the plans of the Bureau call for the construction of two dams on the Gunnison River, i.e., one at the Curricanti site and the other at Bridgeport, and

Whereas, it seems that the wishes of the citizens of this area are to be given full consideration in arriving at a decision as to which dam shall be constructed first, and

Whereas, several members of our club attended the said meeting and have a clear understanding of the need by Colorado of these dams in order to protect our water rights as against the claims and demands of California, and

Whereas, it seems to us that inasmuch as both dams are to built, and

Whereas, Judge Clifford H. Stone stated that "The greatest weapon to hold our water and ultimately defeat the claims of California and the lower basin states was to put it to beneficial use in the quickest possible time", and

Whereas, when comparison is made of the immediate results to accrue by the construction of the two dams it is difficult to understand why any one cannot see the importance of building the larger dam as soon as possible.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that we, the undersigned, as residents of Delta and Montrose Counties and members of the Fruitland Mesa Womens Community Club wholeheartedly ask to be put on record as favoring the Curricanti dam prior

to the Bridgeport construction, and that a copy of this resolution, adopted at a regular meeting on this 11th day of April, 1951, be forwarded to the Colorado River Water Conservancy Board at Denver, Colorado.

Julia Endsley  
Mrs. Evelyn Williamson  
Mrs. M. J. Stanfield  
Mrs. Kenneth Ayer  
Mrs. W. B. Roe  
Virginia Zimmermaker  
Mrs. Buford Crisler  
Mrs. Floyd Wilcox  
Mrs. C. E. Crowder  
Mrs. A. Hulteen  
Mrs. Everett George  
Mrs. Leigh Ankenman  
Mrs. Edwin Rodstrom  
Mrs. Charles Bingham

Mrs. Danel Polson  
Mrs. Ralph Caldwell  
Mrs. Nelson Ankenman  
Mrs. Pete Wilcox  
Mrs. Wm. E. Zimmermaker  
Mrs. Darrell Oglesby  
Mrs. Chas. Majnik  
Mrs. I. C. Polson  
Mrs. O. D. Glenn  
Mrs. N. P. Hammond  
Mrs. Howard George  
Mrs. Guy Oglesby  
Mrs. W. R. Klaseen  
Mrs. Bruce G. Hammond

\*\*\*\*\*

Rifle, Colorado  
April 23, 1951

Att. Judge Stone  
Colorado Water Resources Board  
Denver, Colorado

Dear Judge Stone:

Mrs. Graham and I want to cast our votes for the development of the water resources of the western slope of Colorado both for power and for irrigation, Glen Canyon and Echo Park and as these pay out from the sale of power, develop the smaller units which will store up our surplus spring flood water for summer irrigation.

I have tried to awaken these people around here and to get people to tell us of any mineral deposits that they know of, but not much in results. I am glad that Mr. Larson gave us his pledge all access roads to Echo Park Dam would be fully explored and where we can save the most in construction to build roads that will be best for hauling in heavy construction (dam) machinery, of steel, cement and gravel.

I feel we can find adequate gravel east of Elk Springs and south of Cross Mountain and I think it can be hauled into the dam site, just under the Blue Mountain rim, with a very good grade and at the same time build or have laid out the grade for the finest scenic road around Echo Park Dam.

Having seen in years past the many Highway 40 (old and new) roads laid out and the best winter road never surveyed or looked over, I feel we should explore all excess roads to Echo Park Dam.

-24-

If Artesia or Vernal can show an access road that can be built cheaper and better and have as good scenic attractions as the under the Blue Mountain rim on the south side of the Bear River, I am for that road.

We surely enjoyed the Meeker meetings and we are proud of you and the Water Board for the gallant fight you are making to protect the water and power of Colorado.

I have analyzed the addresses of all the men from your office, Washington D. C., the Park and Salt Lake, and I feel they are not just paper men, but that you all know your business.

Yours truly,  
Gordon and Mrs. Graham

\* \* \* \* \*

The Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association

Montrose, Colorado  
April 16, 1951

Colorado River Conservancy District Board  
Grand Junction, Colorado

Gentlemen:

As a result of the two public hearings held, one at Gunnison and one at Delta, in our opinion, the Colorado River Storage and Participating Projects are justified and should have a far-reaching effect on the economy of the Upper River Basin.

The Principle that waters arising in Western Colorado should be first used to serve the consumptive need, present and potential, in the area in which they arise, should be recognized by all interests.

The Bureau of Reclamation should make every effort to complete surveys so that the determination can be made of the present and potential needs for water on the Western Slope area.

We further believe that it is essential and necessary that said waters be put to a beneficial use without undue delay and that immediate development for the irrigation of new lands and the supplying of supplemental water to lands now inadequately irrigated on the Western Slope should take place.

The Curecanti Dam is the key dam for development in Gunnison, Delta and Montrose Counties. Unquestionably this dam will be constructed if the Colorado River Storage Project is carried forward. We believe that the Curecanti Dam should be first constructed and that its construction should be at the earliest practical date. In our opinion such economic loss as is suffered by Gunnison County by reason

of the Curecanti Dam and the formation of a reservoir on the Gunnison River above the dam will be more than offset by the gains which will accrue to Gunnison County.

We urge that the program outlined by the Jex report named, "The Gunnison River Project", be put into operation immediately and that the facilities for the irrigation of new land and the furnishing of supplemental water to lands now irrigated be constructed without delay.

In our opinion this Project should be considered as a part and parcel of the Colorado River Storage Project and when the Colorado River Storage project is submitted to Congress for its approval the Gunnison River Project should be submitted as a part thereof.

Yours truly,

CC  
Colorado State Water Board  
Denver, Colorado

H. D. Galloway, Sec.

Governor Dan Thornton  
Denver, Colorado

Congressman Aspinall  
Washington, D. C.

Congressman Ed. Johnson  
Washington, D. C.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of the North Fork Valley

Crawford, Colorado  
April 11th--1951

Honorable Clifford H. Stone, Director, and Board Members,  
Colorado River Water Conservancy Board  
State Office Building  
Denver, Colorado

Dear Judge Stone and all Board Members:

The Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of The North Fork Valley have requested that this communication be addressed to you for the purpose of conveying to each of you the unanimous opinion of the members of this Organization that The U. S. Bureau of Reclamation should construct a dam across The Black Canyon of the Gunnison River at a point several miles below the town of Sapinero near or at Curicante Creek--or Pine Creek as the first dam to be constructed on the Gunnison River--it being our opinion that such a dam would be more beneficial to a larger number of water users and tax payers than a dam at Bridgeport.

We have no desire to ask that you recommend the construction of a dam that would not be just and fair to the people of Gunnison and Gunnison County. We have given careful consideration to the suggestions made in a report made by

-26-

Mr. Frank Merriell--as an individual and tax payer and not as an Officer of your Board--and will attach hereto this report made by Mr. Meriell - which we feel is based upon justice and fairness. We would like to state that we feel that a secondary dam should be built below the town of Gunnison that would insure an all year round water level lake where the tourist and people of Gunnison could build their Summer homes. Such a lake would eliminate the possibility of their being mud flat below the town of Gunnison--or rather just below the City limits of Gunnison. Also we would like to see the dam located further below Sapinero if it could be done to prevent the water from backing up so close to the town of Gunnison. However we don't know that this could be done.

The people of this community and all members of this organization have an indirect interest in the town of Gunnison because of the large number of boys and girls of the North Fork Valley who attend Western State College which is a State owned College--located at Gunnison. In addition to this tie these same citizens have many loyal friends who live in Gunnison County and the town of Gunnison-- and there is certainly no desire or intent to ask you to do anything that would result in bringing about a development in that County which should be located in another place--after all factors involved have been given careful and honest consideration. We have certainly given this matter careful consideration--in the light of the knowledge that Western Colorado and the State of Colorado must - in order to carry out their part of the water division agreement -- use or store the waters of the Colorado River Basin or they will be called upon to let it go to the lower Colorado River basin States--who are prepared to use every gallon of this water--not used or stored by Western Colorado and the State of Colorado.

We all know that you can't build Reservoirs without covering up some land and we all know that dams have to be built where there is running water and where nature has provided natural storage basins--so in order to take advantage of these natural storage basins the dams have to be built at "CERTAIN" locations. We surely can't go to work and DIG RESERVOIR sites at locations where nobody will be disturbed--therefore the location of a Dam site is on a par with building a road--neither can be built without damaging somebodys land--that's why we have the law of eminent domain. Without such a law we would not have any highways--and there would be no dams and other public benefits. Our Nation is a Democracy and as such we believe in and practice the tried and well founded philosophy that we should do that which is best for the MAJORITY of the people involved.

Sincerely yours,  
Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of the  
North Fork Valley  
By Leslie J. Savage, Secy. Pro Tem

P.S. Just a personal word from Leslie J. Savage

As proof that the views concerning the question of where dams should be located--as outlined in this letter are in line with my personal views and actions I wish to make the following observations; The location selected for the Smith Fork dam--in event this participating project is constructed--as it now looks like it will be--within a reasonable time--the waters impounded by this dam will furnish supplemental water for 7700 acres of land--now in cultivation and 2100 new land that can be irrigated--making a total of 9800 acres under this Smith Fork project. The water stored in this dam to irrigate 9800 acres of land will absolutely cover

-27-

up over 786 acres of land that I own--which is as good ranch land as there is in the Gunnison River Valley--and which is supplied by as good water right as there is in the North Fork of the Gunnison Valley. The quality of the land that I own (this 786 acres) is far above the average quality of the lands that will be under the Smith Fork Reservoir (9800 Acres) so that you can see that it will be necessary for me to give up over 8% as much land as will be benefitted by the construction of the Smith Fork 9800 acre reservoir--and I might mention here that from this 786 acres of land I receive an income that is more than sufficient to provide for me and my family--but regardless of this splendid income- I will pay any one \$1,000.00 in cash that will prove that I have ever said or done anything that would slow up or prevent the construction of the Smith Fork project--and the reason for my action is in keeping with the views expressed in this letter concerning the construction of the dam in the Black Canon of the Gunnison--I want to see these dams located where the greatest good to the greatest number will be realized, knowing as we all do--that if we fail to store or use the waters that are now available--the day will come--and it's not far off when somebody else will own title to this water and those who are to follow us--will find that we sold them down the river by failure to do our duty to them--and future generations.

Sincerely yours,  
Leslie J. Savage

\* \* \* \* \*

Crawford, Colorado  
April 21st---1951

Honorable Clifford H. Stone-Director & Board Members,  
Colorado River Water Conservancy Board,  
State Office Building  
Denver, Colorado

Gentlemen:

Will you please attach this as a P.S. to letter we wrote you dated 11th inst.

Since we wrote you on the 11th in which we said that it was our opinion in order to carry out the obligation of the State of Colorado with reference to the Division of the water of the Colorado River Basin--we would be compelled to either store or use the water our State was entitled to that it would be best for the first dam located on the Gunnison River to be located below Sapinero, we have conferred with Mr. Ed Dutcher and P. P. Mickelson of Gunnison and they have told us of a number of requests that the people of Gunnison and the Gunnison River Valley expected to make in event it was decided to build the first dam below Sapinero. It is our opinion that careful and favorable consideration should be given to the requests made by these Colorado-Gunnison County citizens--as we are of the opinion that they should be given special priority rights because of the many hardships that will fall upon Gunnison County and the citizens who own ranches and all those

-28-

who own Summer homes along the Gunnison River. In our letter of the 11th we stated that we had no desire to recommend the construction of a dam that would result in not being just and fair to the people of Gunnison and Gunnison County. We also pointed out the ties of friendship that existed between the people of the North Fork Valley and the people of Gunnison because of the large number of boys and girls from the North Fork District who attend Western State College.

We ask that you give the requests and resolutions that will be submitted to you by the people of Gunnison County every possible consideration and treat them in keeping with the Golden Rule which teaches us to do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

Sincerely yours,

Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of  
North Fork Valley

By Leslie J. Savage Secy. Pro Tem

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT OF  
THE COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
Upon Two Reports of the Bureau of Reclamation:  
Viz, Gunnison River Project, Colorado; Colorado  
River Storage Project and Participating Projects,  
Upper Colorado River Basin.

(Received May 10, 1951)

After such study as the Directors have been able to give the reports on these projects, and such information about local views as they were able to obtain in their own localities, and the following meetings:

April 4th - Meeting of the Board of Directors in Gunnison for preliminary study of the problems of Curecanti reservoir and the probable Gunnison County reaction to the proposal;

April 5th - Meeting under the auspices of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in Gunnison, at which both the Gunnison River Project Report and Colorado River Storage Project Report were explained and questions were asked and answered;

April 11th - Meeting in Delta at which some fifty county groups were represented and a resolution was adopted expressing the general county view in favor of Curecanti reservoir;

April 12th - Meeting at Montrose at which some twenty county groups were represented and which endorsed a resolution adopted by the Montrose County Chamber of Commerce on April 3, 1951;

April 16th - Meeting of the Board of Directors in Gunnison with the Drafting Committee of the Gunnison Watershed Conservation Committee at which the Board learned most of the conditions the Drafting Committee felt were necessary to prevent loss or damage to Gunnison County;

April 17th - Regular quarterly meeting of the Board of Directors in Gunnison at which consideration was given to general comment with respect to the two projects;

April 17th - Meeting with Mr. Craig Goodwin in Gunnison at which were discussed some conditions not mentioned in the meeting on the 16th to be set up by Gunnison County, and there was a general discussion of the matter; and with information which has come to the Directors from various sources as well as studies that have been made in their office, the Board of Directors of the District has the following comment to make concerning these reports:

1). The Gunnison River Project Report is a good catalogue of some of the possibilities for growth and improvement in that Basin, but the Directors feel that it is by no means a complete report on all the problems and possibilities of the Basin. Further investigation, which it is assumed will be done, is needed in several areas to assure more complete and economical plans for the efficient use of existing water supplies, and perhaps improving the economic status of some of the projects proposed.

Specific examples are: Further study should be given the use of high power heads on Uncompahgre river above Ouray; study should also be undertaken with the idea of producing and storing enough water from Uncompahgre river, and possible diversions to it, so that, with Cimarron creek as an added source of supply, the Uncompahgre Valley might be irrigated without recourse to Gunnison river, or at least, with reduced demand on that river.

Similarly more complete studies of the high sources of North Fork of Gunnison river should be undertaken with the idea, by storage, of power production and possible salvage of water to fully develop the North Fork area, itself, and possibly to supply areas outside the North Fork Valley.

Finally, it is suggested that the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Investigation of the Bureau of Mines, strive to determine at the earliest possible time the prospective demands for water which will follow upon the undertaking of commercial production of oil from coal within the Gunnison River Basin. It should be attempted to secure from the Bureau of Mines a reliable estimate as to plant and attendant domestic use of water for such a development.

2). The Directors sincerely hope that quick authorization and appropriation for the building of the Colorado River Storage Project, even if necessary, without the participating projects, can be secured from the Congress. The present situation of the Upper Division States is a precarious one, and safety in the use of water allotted to the Upper Basin can only be assured by prompt and continued prosecution of this project until a reserve of water in storage large enough to assure the required delivery to the Lower Basin in periods of low runoff has been made.

3). If the consent of the Congress can be secured to the creation of the proposed Colorado River Account, the monies it is proposed to accrue in this account can be used, as the report proposes, to reimburse the United States for such part of the cost of Participating Projects as cannot be repaid by the irrigation beneficiaries of those projects. This will assure the construction of many projects from which the National benefit is worth while, in spite of the fact that the projects themselves are not individually repayable.



But the Board of Directors recommends that at all times funds from the Colorado River Account be given priority for reimbursement of participating projects within the natural basin.

4). The Board of Directors is in complete agreement with the proposal to build Echo Park reservoir within the Dinosaur National Monument.

In spite of the objection of many "Wildlife" organizations that this reservoir would ruin the Monument, the Directors wish to point out that when the Monument was created it was only with the understanding that future water facilities were not to be precluded by such creation, and that the National Park Service has held this area closed to any development for 12 years without spending a penny of public funds to open it up, and that condition will continue indefinitely unless from the building of this reservoir means may be found to permit the general public access to and enjoyment of its scenic beauties in safety. If it is not built, limited access to the canons of Green and Yampa rivers will only be possible to people willing to make such journeys at the risk of their lives, and who will be more concerned with getting out alive than the beauties of what they can see. Even with the reservoir in them these canons will be beautiful and people can see them.

5). The proposed investigations by agencies of the Department of Interior, other than the Bureau of Reclamation, in the Upper Colorado River Basin, should be quickly carried out by those agencies to the end that a fully implemented view of all the resources of the Upper Basin, in all respects, can be visualized.

6). The proposal for funds to be accrued in a special account to speed Upper Basin investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation, is admirable; but attention is called to the interval at the start of the project when such funds will not be available, and it is especially urged that funds for continuing investigation at the quickest possible rate are essential.

The residents of the natural basin of the Colorado river within Colorado have not been able to secure the surveys needed to establish the present and potential use of water within the natural basin in Colorado. Until the data made available by such surveys are considered, it is impossible to determine the relative benefits from the use and re-use of the water within the natural basin, with the resultant residue or return flow which remain in the stream and be available to fulfill our obligation at Lee Ferry, or to determine how such uses will conform to the State policy to protect the present and future needs within the basin. Hence we cannot wait until the accumulation of funds from the Colorado River Storage Project to complete the general features of the Upper Basin survey in Western Colorado.

7). Insofar as the sentiment of the immediate locality is known, it is believed that it would be preferable not to build the Whitewater or Bridgeport reservoir at this time, nor in any case, unless and until holdover and regulatory storage is built higher on Gunnison river.

The reasons for this view are: a) this reservoir does not contribute to the main aim of the Storage Project since it has practically no holdover, and very little regulatory value; b) considerable money will be saved in its construction

if it is built after the river is controlled by storage built above; c) without regulation and holdover storage above it, its value in power generation is very small for it will only produce uneconomical amounts of seasonal energy at very high cost; d) no effort has been made to ascertain that the necessity to move the railroad out of the river canon between Grand Junction and Delta will not result in an attempt to abandon this railroad on the part of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company.

(In the foregoing the changes suggested by Mr. Delaney have been incorporated as well as some other changes and additions. The whole has been rearranged, so that the only thing necessary to finish the comment is what may be drafted as applying to Curecanti reservoir).

\*\*\*\*\*

Crawford, Colorado  
May 8, 1951

Judge Clifford H. Stone, Director  
Colorado Water Conservation Board  
Denver 2, Colorado

Dear Sir:

At a meeting called to consider the Smith Fork Dam Project, the following Resolution was passed and ordered sent on to you at once.

Whereas, the Bureau's Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects has been presented to this Crawford-Smith Fork Project Association.

And Whereas local interest desires authorization of the Colorado River Storage Program.

Therefore be it resolved that this Association go on record approving Congressional Authorization of the entire Program.

Harvey A. Barsch chairman

C. E. Drexel secretary

After further study, this Association will report the sentiment found here regarding the local Dam project. We can have it, we think well within the stated time limit.

Yours truly,

C. E. Drexel

Mr. Ray E. Peterson  
Administrative Assistant  
Colorado Water Conservation Board  
212 State Office Building  
Denver, Colorado

(Received by phone  
5-17-51)  
Meeker, Colorado

Dear Mr. Peterson:

This will acknowledge your letter of May 1 and confirm our telephone conversations on subsequent dates relative to the comments from northwest Colorado on the proposed Colorado River Storage Project. We understand that such comments, together with those submitted from other sections of the State, will serve as a basis in the formulation of the Official Comments of Colorado by the Water Conservation Board, and that such comments must be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior not later than June 15, 1951.

It is our intention, and work is now in progress to such end, to prepare rather detailed comments of a comprehensive nature concerning the proposed storage units that will be established on the Green and Yampa Rivers in and near the Dinosaur National Monument. We will seek the endorsement of the various civic and county organizations and governments at that time.

Such a report will give a general endorsement to the principle of the necessity of river regulatory facilities of the type proposed in the Colorado River Storage Project report, as being essential to the continued agricultural and industrial development in the Upper Basin of the Colorado River. Specific support will be voiced concerning the locations of the Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Split Mountain and Cross Mountain dam sites.

Specific reservations and objections, however, will be made relative to certain administrative and planning details as that concerning the above-mentioned reservoir sites, the agricultural economy of northwest Colorado, and the general complexion of the program.

We will reserve all comments at this time relative to the controversial aspects of the proposed project which are concerned with other tributary basins, particularly the Gunnison. It is our position that such problems must be solved by the people directly affected and our interests therein will be devoted solely to those phases which will affect the program as a whole.

I have been authorized to make such statements herein contained as well as to prepare the complete comments as mentioned above by the Board of Directors of the Colorado Echo Park Dam Association meeting at Meeker, April 15, 1951. The Chambers of Commerce of Grand Junction, Rifle, Glenwood Springs, Meeker, Rangely, Artesia, Craig, and Steamboat Springs, are currently affiliated with the Colorado Echo Park Dam Association, as well as the city governments of Glenwood Springs and Meeker.

We anticipate that our comprehensive comments will be completed and mimeographed for distribution through your channels within the next two weeks.

Sincerely yours,  
Gordon A. Weller  
Executive Secretary  
COLORADO ECHO PARK DAM ASSOCIATION

Cooperative Extension Work  
in  
Agriculture and Home Economics  
Delta, May 16, 1951

Mr. Ray E. Peterson  
Administrative Assistant  
Colorado Water Conservation Board  
212 State Office Building  
Denver, Colorado

Dear Mr. Peterson,

In reply to your letter addressed to Mr. William Dodd and Allen Brown both of Delta, I am sending you a copy of a letter which was mailed May 3rd to the Gunnison Water Shed Conservation Committee. This letter states in part, the feeling of the people of this area in regard to the construction of Curecanti Dam. It also expresses our feeling in regard to the Gunnison proposal made to protect their interests.

If you would care for further information from our committee we would be glad to send you further reports.

Very truly yours,  
Carl H. Powell  
County Agricultural Agent

Delta, Colorado  
May 3, 1951

The Gunnison Watershed Conservation Committee,  
Gunnison, Colorado.

Attention Mr. E. L. Dutcher, Chairman:

Gentlemen:

Subsequent to the general meeting of the 52 organizations in Delta County on April 11th and the passage of a Resolution in favor of the construction of the Curecanti Reservoir, we received your suggestion that we consider such reasonable conditions as Gunnison County might wish to demand in connection with the construction of this Reservoir.

In delivering our original Resolution, we reserved the right to furnish a Supplemental Resolution to assist Gunnison County in obtaining reasonable protection against damage premises on the condition that Gunnison County would actively support the construction of this Reservoir.

On receipt of your Resolution, we called another general meeting of the Delta County organizations and as a result appointed a Committee of 9 to consider your Resolution and to make an effort to unify our positions. After individual and group study of your Resolution, this Committee met on May 2nd and we may be wrong in our interpretation of the Resolution, but we are unable to come to the conclusion that the Resolution favors the construction of Currecanti Reservoir. We are unable to find a recitation of any of the advantages of the construction of this Reservoir, such as were outlined not too many years ago by the Gunnison

Watershed Committee. The Resolution does appear to set forth a number of disadvantages. At the same time, we honestly believe that the Gunnison County Committee is endeavoring to consider the problems fairly, altruistically and broadly with respect to the benefits that will result from the construction of the dam to other people in Western Colorado, the State and the Nation, and it is upon this basis that we still hope that a unified conclusion can be reached between Gunnison, Montrose and Delta Counties.

Our over-all conclusion is that the Currecanti Reservoir is the key to the future development of the Gunnison River and that unless this project is included in the initial phase of the construction of the hold-over projects, that a very serious and probably successful attempt will be made to put the waters of the Gunnison River to a beneficial use elsewhere before the water can be put to a beneficial use in its present locality. We know what happened to the Roaring Fork. From the point of view of firm power production, aid to participating irrigation projects, River control, silt control, and for the future development of other power and hold-over projects on the Gunnison River, and other benefits, it is our conclusion that the construction of the Currecanti Reservoir is of paramount importance and transcends any local losses that may result from its construction.

In general, we concur with Gunnison County that the individuals affected should be fully compensated; that any dispossessed stock men should be given preference in the selection of newly developed lands; that resort owners should be given preferences for sites on the Lake; and that a definite understanding should be reached to retain the waters of the Taylor Park Reservoir in the local area and that the people of Gunnison County should be given all of the protection that is economically and engineeringly feasible.

In connection with the requests specified in your Resolution, a group of Delta County representatives sat in with the Montrose group in arriving at their conclusions and at the present we are inclined to agree with them on their specific comments. We are inclined to believe that the Gunnison Committee is taking too dark a view of the effect on recreation potentialities and from a tax point of view, we are unable to find any credit given for the tax revenue that no doubt will be derived from the use of at least a million dollars worth of construction machinery being brought into the County during the entire construction period. It also appears to us that at least some of the members of the Gunnison Committee are not familiar with the number of livestock and assessed valuations shown by the 1950 Gunnison Tax Roll.

It occurs to us that there is much room for better understanding of the problems connected with this project between the peoples of these Counties and subject to your desires, we feel that it would be worth while to have a meeting of the Gunnison County Committee of 9, the Montrose County Committee of 6, and the Delta County Committee of 9, to make an honest effort to unify our support of this project. We know that all of these Committees have put in hours and days of time on this problem; that their work has been done in good faith and for the benefit of the whole rather than for the benefit of any particular section or County.

Since it has been announced that the Colorado Water Conservation Board will now have until June 15th to make its recommendations to the Bureau, this additional time can be used to advantage by the representatives of these three Counties in an effort to get together on the united front and we will appreciate it if you will advise us of your further desires.

Very truly yours,

THE DELTA COUNTY WATER COMMITTEE

By Wm. J. Dodd  
Chairman

By Carl H. Powell  
Secretary