

DATE: 7-28-99

TO: Participants in the 1999 Colorado Water Workshop

FROM: POWER

SUBJECT: Impact of The Colorado River Compact upon Trans-mountain
Diversion in Colorado

Please find attached a memorandum recently sent by the Steering Committee of POWER to POWER members. The memo briefly outlines its argument against further trans-mountain diversion in Colorado based upon the Colorado River Compact, Colorado's obligations to its down-stream neighbors, Arizona, California and Nevada and the great danger to all of Colorado should further efforts to divert Western Slope water to the Eastern Slope prove successful.

A more detailed version of POWER's argument, together with the citations used in constructing it may be found in POWER's letter to the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District and the Commissioners of Gunnison, Hinsdale and Saguache Counties, dated April 26, 1999 and also included.

If you wish to receive more information about POWER's arguments or about its up-hill struggle to attain a fair hearing of these arguments anywhere in Colorado, please contact POWER @:

Address	1050 Camino Del Rio Gunnison, CO 81230
Phone	970-641-1234
E-Mail	mjohn@rmi.net



DATE: 7-22-99
TO: POWER Members
FROM: Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Annual Report

J.C. P.C.K. P.V.
John Cope, P.C. Klingsmith, Paul Vader

During 1998-1999, POWER has concentrated almost all of its energy upon issues of Colorado River Compact-- arguing in some detail that Colorado's continued flirtation with further trans-mountain diversion is almost certainly in direct violation of many key provisions of the Colorado River Compact.

The basis of POWER's contention, supported by good, factual information from the Colorado Water Conservation Board and other sources, is that there is almost never enough water in the Colorado River to allow Colorado to fulfill its Colorado River Compact obligations to its downstream neighbors, Arizona, California, Nevada and Mexico **AND** to divert further large quantities of water from the headwaters of The Colorado east to the Front Range.

As developers, water managers, and politicians in Colorado continue to discuss plans for trans-mountain diversion as if there were no conflict between those plans and the Colorado River Compact, they run the grave risk of provoking Lower Basin states--which cannot afford to lose water required by the millions of citizens who inhabit the Great American Desert-- to demand all of the Colorado River water that the River Compact allots them--and, likely, much more.

Since current practices for dividing up Colorado River water between Upper and Lower Basin states are generous in favor of Upper Basin states, any action which provokes Lower Basin states to abandon the status quo by demanding a strict interpretation of the Compact is bound to increase allotments to Lower Basin states and to decrease allotments to the Upper Basin States. The irony is inescapable: by attempting to grab more water for the Front Range, proponents of trans-mountain diversion seem hell bent on provoking Lower Basin states to demand their rightful share and, thus, to disturb the present favorable balance of allotments, making **LESS** water available in Colorado.

Furthermore, the Compact is not written in stone; it clearly provides for its own revision in the event that any of its signatories become dissatisfied with existing allotments of water (Articles III g, VII, IX). POWER believes that Colorado's plans for trans-mountain diversion are very likely to supply Lower Basin states with the bone of contention they need to begin the process of reinterpreting the Colorado River Compact in favor of the Lower Basin.

The political and economic power of large populations in Arizona, California and Nevada are certain to make any water fight between Colorado and the Lower Basin unwinnable by Colorado. At the present time, for example, California has 56 representatives in Congress; Colorado has

only 5. The Lower Basin is home to 3 Supreme Court Justices; the Upper Basin states claim none. Or, should Lower Basin states argue that future allocation of Colorado River water be based upon the wealth it produces, who could dispute the fact that one ton of hay grown on an acre in the Upper Basin has an estimated market value of \$100.00 while one ton of strawberries grown on one acre or less in the Lower Basin can have an estimated market value exceeding \$20,000.00?

POWER has elaborated and discussed these Colorado River issues with the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District, the Commissioners of Gunnison, Hinsdale and Saguache Counties and with various water managers in Colorado and in the Upper Basin. It has also sent copies of this correspondence to selected Colorado senators and representatives and to the Attorney General of Colorado.

Responses to POWER's correspondence and oral presentations have ranged from non-committal on the part of the River District and County Commissioners to out-right hostile on the part of some of Colorado's water managers.

Perhaps the most generous interpretation of these responses is that they represent local and state entities' inability to confront or grapple with momentous issues that reach well beyond the limitations of Colorado water courts and water law.

From this perspective, the River District and the County Commissioners already have their water glasses full of pressing local issues--the most important of which are opposing trans-mountain diversion in Colorado water courts and trying to prove, also in Colorado water courts, that the Gunnison Valley has made sufficient progress toward using its conditional water rights to avoid having those rights lapse.

Meanwhile, Colorado senators and representatives seem unwilling to stir up a controversy that directly affects growth on the Front Range. Colorado and Upper Basin water managers--whose responses have been the most detailed and the most critical--can hardly be expected to agree with POWER that their own interpretations of the Compact are a ticking time bomb.

Because POWER's arguments have, so far, fallen upon deaf ears, the Steering Committee now believes that it is time to go public--to take our arguments to environmental groups and Colorado citizens on the Front Range as well as to seek some kind of decisive resolution within the regional politics of the West--even though we do not wish to take the matter up interstate if we can avoid it.

In spite of understandable hesitation in local commissions and water districts, and among Colorado water managers, to bring issues of this magnitude and potency out of the confines of Colorado water law and into the light of public scrutiny and regional politics, POWER believes that it is only these issues which can put an end to further, dangerous trans-mountain diversion in Colorado once and for all.

Adjudication of trans-mountain diversion in Colorado water courts seems bound to take decades and, since down-stream states are very likely to challenge any Colorado Supreme Court decision to permit trans-mountain diversion, there is no assurance that legal resolution in Colorado will be

final any time in the near future.

It is only the permanent resolution of conflicts affecting the entire Colorado River Basin discussed herein that can resolve the threat of further trans-mountain diversion in Colorado conclusively and, therefore, these are the water issues which offer Coloradans the greatest hope of a future that includes prosperity for both eastern and western Colorado, pristine environments as well as suburban developments, wild, wilderness experiences as well as culturally stimulating, urban ones.

Other issues with which POWER has been occupied during 1998-1999 are:

- * The need for the River District to pay more attention to the uses of water by Gunnison Valley citizens and visitors, other than irrigators, in its efforts to prove diligence in Judge Brown's water court.

POWER does not wish to devalue or to impinge upon the needs of irrigators but, rather, to recognize the needs of other citizens who also use the valley's water and contribute significantly to the region's economy.

- * The need of the River district not to place too much emphasis on dams and irrigation within the Gunnison Valley in its efforts to prove diligence. POWER believes that a substantial majority of Gunnison Valley citizens, who are paying taxes to support the Water District's activities, are as opposed to building more dams within the Valley as they are opposed to Union Park and trans-mountain diversion itself.
- * The need to operate the Aspinall Unit to meet the natural water flow requirements of the Black Canyon National Monument as defined by its charter and, thereby, to guarantee the preservation of the Monument's unique identity and to protect endangered species of fish.

If you agree with the Steering Committee of POWER that Colorado River issues will do more to impact the future of Colorado, the Western Slope and the Upper Basin of the Colorado River than all others, we invite you to join us in continuing our up-hill battle. Your membership, your encouragement, suggestions and criticism, together with your continued financial support will enable us to carry on. Thank you.



April 26, 1999

The Board of Directors
Upper Gunnison River Water
Conservancy District
275 S. Spruce
Gunnison, Colorado 81230

The Board of County Commissioners
The County of Gunnison
200 East Virginia
Gunnison, CO 81230

The Board of County Commissioners
The County of Hinsdale
Courthouse
Lake City, CO 81235

The Board of County Commissioners
The County of Saguache
Courthouse
Saguache, CO 81149

In re: POWER'S response to the Evans and Lochhead letter, 1/25/99, and
Mr. Kuhn's letter, 2/19/99, concerning Colorado River water shortages.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Recently Mr. Peter Evans, Acting Director of the Colorado Conservation Board, Mr. James Lochhead, Upper Colorado River Commissioner for Colorado, and Mr. Eric Kuhn, Manager of the Colorado River Conservation District and member of the Colorado Water Conservation Board replied to POWER's interpretation of the Colorado River Compact, indicating how they believe POWER's interpretation to be at variance with their own. In the following document, "A State at Risk: A Study of Colorado River Compact Obligations" POWER continues the dialogue by indicating in some detail how and why it believes the water managers' interpretation to be flawed.

Members of POWER believe that it is vital for the UGRWCD and the Commissioners of Gunnison, Hinsdale and Saguache Counties to learn exactly how Mr. Evans, Mr. Lochhead and Mr. Kuhn have chosen to interpret the Colorado River Compact and the "Law of the River." This information is vital because it highlights the weak points of Colorado's legal defenses against potential future calls by down-stream states of Arizona, California and Nevada--offering any Colorado and Upper Basin water officials and commissioners willing to study the matter a chance to strengthen the argument and/or effectuate counter measures prior to the fateful time when down-stream calls are made in earnest.

If you agree with POWER that large portions of the official representation of Colorado's positions and interpretations of the Colorado River Compact and the "Law of the River" to be flawed in light of current knowledge, we invite you to join us in making this known to Colorado citizens. Our water is our state's most valuable resource; protecting and managing it wisely deserve the highest degree of prudence and legal far-sightedness.

Sincerely yours,


Gunnison Basin POWER
by P.C. Klingsmith, Chairman

P.O. Box 1742
Gunnison, CO 81230

A STATE AT RISK: A STUDY OF COLORADO RIVER COMPACT OBLIGATIONS

I. ABSTRACT

Over the past year, POWER members have engaged in a dialogue with Colorado and Upper Basin water managers about the availability of water in the Colorado River Basin for trans-mountain diversion east over the Continental Divide to the Front Range. Within that dialogue, POWER's position has consistently been that-- according to the Colorado River Compact and the body of law, legal decisions, and administrative guidelines that have been used to allocate Colorado River resources and have come to be known as the Law of the River--there is no water available for trans-mountain diversion. The managers' position has consistently been that, according to the Colorado River Compact and The Law of the River, there is considerable water available for that purpose.

It is POWER's position in this study that the prospects of water shortages in the Colorado River Basin are alarming and, in face of these shortages, managers of Upper Basin have failed to develop a clear, strong, reliable legal defense against potential calls from down-stream states of Arizona, California and Nevada.

Unfortunately, the positions taken by the river managers about how much water is available within the Colorado River Basin and their insistence upon overly optimistic estimates of how much Colorado River water is available for trans-mountain diversion puts Coloradans at grave risk of one day having to shut off water they have grown to depend upon, or of having to pay high reparation fees that they cannot afford, or both.

II. MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 1 MILLION ACRE-FEET

Contrary to comments by Evans and Lochhead, the delivery requirement for an additional 1 million acre-feet to the Lower Basin states given in Article III (b) of the Colorado River Compact is not the only, nor even the major argument of POWER (see Evans and Lochhead, 1999; pp. 1 - 3). However, this issue will be addressed first. POWER's position is that this quantity of water can be claimed by the Lower Basin states and will be claimed in the future under conditions of water shortage and increased demand.

Evans and Lochhead assert that this quantity, if demanded, should come from tributary water flowing into the Colorado River below Lee Ferry. This interpretation is based on defining the "Colorado River system" as the entirety of the Colorado River within the United States to include both Upper and Lower Basins and their tributaries (see Articles II (a) and Article III (a) and (b) of the Compact). According to this argument, tributary flows ought to be credited against delivery requirements imposed on Upper Basin States at Lee Ferry (Evans and Lochhead, 1999; p. 5).

Apparently Evans and Lochhead believe that the 1 million acre-feet, if it were called for, does not have to be measured at Lee Ferry. Instead, it could be appropriated and measured as flows from Lower Basin tributaries. This interpretation could just as logically be made applicable to the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to each basin each year (Article III (a) of the Compact; see also Nathanson, 1978; p. 4). POWER doubts that the Lower Basin states will ever agree to this interpretation.

Moreover, this position is incorrect for several reasons:

First, Lower Basin tributaries often do not produce 2 million acre-feet of water in a year. When the Lower Basin tributaries produces less, it would appear the Lower Basin could call for the shortage to be made up from Upper Basin flows, presumably as measured at Lee Ferry (see Article III (a) and (b) of the Compact).

Second, if several million acre-feet were thus released to meet shortages over a 10 year period, the Upper Basin states would still appear to be obligated to furnish the total of 75 to 85 million acre-feet measured at Lee Ferry over the 10 years as required in Article III (d) of the Compact, thereby not providing any relief as a result of Lower Basin tributary use.

Third, Evans and Lochhead suggest that Upper Basin states have no duty under the Compact to furnish water to states in the Lower Basin on an annual basis. This interpretation seems contrary to the meaning of Article III (a) and (b) altogether, failing to recognize both benefits and obligations clearly bestowed on both basins.

Total water allocations in the Colorado River Basin below Lee Ferry are: 2.8 million acre-feet to Arizona; 4.4 million acre-feet to California; 0.3 million acre-feet to Nevada; and the 1.0 million acre-feet allocated under Article III (b) (see Pontius, 1997; p. 15). The specific quantities for each state were set out in the 1963 U.S. Supreme decision in *Arizona v. California*. In addition, 1.5 million-acre feet are due to Mexico under terms of the Mexican Water Treaty of 1944. However, Colorado water resource policy does not agree with the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Arizona v. California*, nor does it agree with each basin providing half the annual treaty obligation to Mexico (see Colorado River Compact Water Development Workgroup, 1995; p. 9; see also MacDonnell et al., 1995; p. 825)

Thus, the sum of allocations to the Lower Basin states and Mexico is 8.5 to 9.23 maf. Actual annual average flow to be divided between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry is closer to 13.5 million acre-feet rather than 15 maf, leaving about an average of 4.6 maf for consumptive use by Upper Basin states. (MacDonnell et al. 1995; p. 825 and Nathanson, 1978; p. 10; and Pontius, 1997; p. 6). However, the driest 10 years in the period of gauged measurements at Lee Ferry from 1896 to 1930 had an average annual flow of 11.8 million acre-feet (Nathanson, 1978; p. 2), providing an average shortage during dry years of 2.95 maf for Upper Basin use.

The Colorado River Compact guarantees Lower Basin states that Upper Basin states may not reduce the 10 year aggregate flow below 75 million acre-feet at Lee Ferry (Nathanson, 1978; pp. 4 and 24). POWER submits that Upper Basin states have an absolute duty to release, each year, 7.5 million acre-feet (to 8.5 million acre-feet, if called for) through the measurement point at Lee Ferry (MacDonnell et al. 1995; p. 831). Upper Basin states can not rely on any part of this obligation being supplied by any lower basin tributaries.

Special Master Rifkin states in his report for Arizona v. California (1963) that Article III (a), and by its association, III (b), is considered by Congress as a source of supply, and not merely a ceiling on water use by Lower Basin states (Nathanson, 1978; p. VIII - 6). POWER prefers to adopt Congress' interpretation of the Colorado River Compact and so should the state of Colorado. Moreover, this part of the Master's report was not adopted by the Court in Arizona v. Colorado, nor has it been later (373 US 546 (1963)).

Evans and Lochhead state that, in the last 8 years, no Lower Basin state has called for an added 1 million acre-feet under Art. III (b) (Evans and Lochhead, 1999; p. 4). Perhaps contrary to expectations, entitlements, and need, the Lower Basin states will be content to make do with what they now receive. In POWER's estimate, such conjecture is wishful thinking.

III. MEXICO

Evans and Lockhead misrepresent POWER's statements about Mexico's entitlement under the latter's treaty with the U.S. (1999; p. 5). POWER did not suggest that Mexico had been, or was being, shorted. POWER did not state that the Upper Basin states "must always" provide one-half of the treaty obligations, though this appears to be the accepted interpretation (for examples see Nathanson, 1978; p. 10 and MacDonnell et al., 1995; pp. 826 - 827, 831). "The 1944 Mexican Water Treaty guarantees delivery 1.5 maf to Mexico, but provides for a pro-rata reduction in times of shortage." (Pontius, 1997; p. 10).

IV. DROUGHT

If a severe drought occurs, what plans, if any, does Colorado have in place, or does it envisage, to provide for obligations to Lower Basin states and Mexico? To a major extent, the Upper Basin states take the risk for drier years and drought (see Swan, 1997; p. 3 and McDonnell, et al., p. 831). This risk is a consequence of the Upper Basin states' guarantee to deliver water to the Lower Basin (Compact, Article III (d) and Nathanson, 1978; p. 4). If Colorado acted prudently, it would not rely on being relieved of this obligation because, to this point, no agreement is in place upon which the Upper Basin states can rely. Merely to describe this obligation to the Lower Basin states does not address the significance of potential drought problems (see Evans and Lochhead, 1999; pp. 2 - 3). A more comprehensive and substantive response is needed.

A C/SO R. BASIN PROJECT ACT of 1968 § 602

V. RESERVED RIGHTS - TRIBAL AND FEDERAL

POWER also is concerned about Indian reserved water claims that can severely limit water consumption from water flow in the Colorado River by the Upper Basin states. There are many questions about whether, how, and when those claims of entitlement to water resources will be quantified and satisfied when these claims are presented. This matter was not settled in 1963 by the Arizona v. California decision as suggested by Evans and Lochhead, nor by the "Law of the River." This matter was addressed in the Compact, Article VII; and both the U.S. and the Colorado Supreme Courts have held that such claims to water, whatever they turn out to be when quantified, will be given precedence. Such tribal claims could amount to around 2 to 5 million acre-feet or more (Pontius, 1997; Tables 10 and 11, pp. 73 - 74). Priority dates for these claims are mostly senior to the Compact and these rights could thus supersede the Compact's allocations.

Comments by Evans and Lochhead about tribal rights are plausible (1999; p. 6). They suggest that such claims are to be satisfied by Lake Mead waters. However, this interpretation does not appear in the Arizona v. California decision (1963). The matter of tribal claims requires much further study and agreement before further water development and consumption in the Upper Colorado River Basin can occur with confidence that it will not have to be relinquished later to Indian tribes - once again, at great cost and expense.

In addition to tribal rights there are the federal reserved rights of the national forests, parks, and other recreational areas. If there is a shortage of water, must reserved claims below Lee Ferry be satisfied with Lake Powell, or would Lower Basin states call upon Upper Basin for releases of water? POWER believes the latter could be the decision.

VI. UNRESOLVED CLAIMS

The "Law of the River" has many ambiguities (see McDonnell et al., 1995, pp. 834 - 835). To rely on the assumption that Colorado can consume an additional 450,000 acre-feet per year borders on recklessness. Growth and demands for water in the Lower Basin states and in Mexico for its full 1.5 million acre-feet delivered at Morales Dam should not be ignored (see Pontius, 1997; p. 69).

The Compact itself provides that it can be reopened (Article III (f), and (g) and Article IX). These sections should be carefully read and considered.

VII. PERFECTED RIGHTS

Present perfected rights are prior rights to use Colorado River water created under federal or state law, whether or not water granted by the right has been put to use before 1929 (Nathanson, 1978; pp. 152 - 194 and Chapter X). If the quantity of consumption from the perfected rights in the

Colorado River Basin are added to the Compact entitlements of both the Upper Basin states and Lower Basin states, a dramatic shortage to Lower Basin-states could occur. In such a case, the Lower Basin states may well claim water from the Upper Basin states, using the compact as their authority to do so.

VIII. COMPACT REVISIONS

In the future, it may be possible for Arizona, California and Nevada to claim that the Colorado River Compact no longer apportions water equitably--using population growth, among other arguments, as the basis of their claim. Article I of the Compact allows for this kind of complaint, clearly providing for a reopening of the compact in the event that such complaints emerge. California has 56 Representatives in Congress, Colorado has only 5. The Lower Basin States have 3 Supreme Court Justices, the Upper Basin States have none. Colorado should not wish to have to fight these strong political and economic forces. Consider for example, one ton of hay grown on an acre in the Upper Basin has an estimated market value of \$100 whereas 1 ton of strawberries grown on an acre or less in the Lower Basin can have an estimated value exceeding \$20,000 (see current pricing at City Market in Gunnison, Colorado).

Evans and Lochhead imply that the Upper Basin states are not to worry about the concerns that POWER raises because both the Upper Basin states and the Lower Basin states are satisfied with the status quo (see Comments p.4-5). If Colorado could count on this as being firmly in place, then Hallelujah! POWER suggests, however, that until such time, Colorado and the other Upper Basin states should: (1) prepare their defenses against the time when they will have to do battle with the giant down stream and (2) not provoke the giant by tampering with his water supply while he is still asleep.

The apportionment of the Colorado River under the Compact is not perpetual as some may assume (Evans and Lochhead 1997, p. 7). For reasons perhaps prompted by economic and political causes, reapportionment of Colorado River waters can occur at the request of two or more signatory states (Article III (f) and (g) and subject to Congressional approval). Many have recommended a market-driven water allocation system which, depending on its details, could benefit or burden the Upper Basin states (see MacDonnell et al., 1995; p. 835; see also earlier discussions for example in White (1968) and Engelbert and Scheuring 1984).

IX. EMERGENCIES

POWER is concerned that insufficient thought has been given to how to deal with emergencies. These are most likely to exist in the event of drought or perhaps simply over- allocation of the Colorado River - already asserted to be over-allocated by 20-30% (Pontius, 1997; p. 14). Prudent people set aside a portion of their incomes and assets to tide them over in the event of sickness, old age, or other misfortunes. Evans and Lochhead suggest that the presently "unused" Colorado entitlement to the Colorado River water of approximately 450,000 acre-feet is available and should be used, presumably on the Front Range of Colorado, because that is, at the moment,

where the demand is located (1997; pp. 6 - 7).

If Colorado spends or commits all of its entitlement to Colorado River Basin water on current consumptive projects (especially on additional trans-mountain diversions to Front Range projects), such actions can only be deemed negligent, improvident, unwise, and surely very expensive.

Colorado should publish realistic reports about the amount of Colorado River water available for consumption and trans-mountain diversion. It should not encourage avid developers and it should not discourage conservation of the state's water resources. Neither should Colorado provoke Lower Basin states by diverting additional water from the Colorado River Basin at this unsettled period of time. As a state, Colorado should seek to maintain and formalize the status quo - a situation not requiring delivery of 1 million additional acre-feet to the Lower Basin. To achieve this goal, Colorado should discourage further trans-mountain diversions to the Front Range of Colorado, at least until the myriad problems associated with shortages of water flows in the Colorado River and ambiguities of the Compact have been addressed and resolved.

X. UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Questions needing answers:

- 1) Where are Compact obligations to be determined, if not at Lee Ferry, and by what authority?
- 2) What does Article III (b) of the Compact referring to the obligation to provide an additional 1 million acre-feet to Lower Basin states mean?
- 3) How is water to be delivered under Article III (a) and (b) of the Compact managed, overseen, and monitored in the event of shortage and under what authority?
- 4) Should ambiguities should all be identified and cleared up before the present flow of the Colorado River is further depleted by trans-mountain diversion and by other forms of consumption?
- 5) If any agreements are in place answering POWER's concerns, can you list them for us for further scrutiny?

XI. CONCLUSION

Mr. Evans and Mr. Lochhead aptly point out that in the early 1920s Colorado's representative on the Colorado River Compact Commission, Delph Carpenter, warned that the first and fastest areas to grow within the Colorado River Basin should not be permitted to hog available water and, thus, to stifle future growth in as yet undeveloped areas. What Delph Carpenter wanted for the State of Colorado in the 1920s, POWER wants for the Gunnison Basin, the Western Slope and the San Luis Valley in the early part of the 21st Century. The water and the futures of these regions must not be sacrificed to Los Angeles style sprawl along the I-25 and I-70 corridors.

Prepared by POWER Executive Committee.

xc: Rep. Russell George	Randy Seaholm
Sen. Ray Powers	Kathleen Klein
POWER Steering Committee	Peter H. Evans
R. L. Bratton	James S. Lochhead
Rep. Carl Miller	R. Eric Kuhn
Sen. Kenneth Chlouber	Jennifer Gimbel
David Baumgarten	Carol Angel
Charles Cliggett	Wayne Cook
Steve Glazer	Ken Salazar

REFERENCES

Arizona v. California of June 3, 1963; 373 U.S. 546.

Colorado River Compact of 1922, House Records Doc. No. 605, 67th Congress, 4th session, 1923, pp. 8-12.

Colorado River Compact Water Development Workgroup (1995) Colorado River Compact Development Projection - DRAFT, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colorado, 17 pages and additional appended material.

Engelbert E. A. and Scheuring A. F., eds. (1984) Water Scarcity. Impacts On Western Agriculture, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 502 pages.

Evans P. and Lochhead J. S. (1999) letter to Board of Directors of Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District dated January 25, subject - November 18, 1998 letter from Gunnison Basin POWER concerning Colorado River Compact, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colorado, 8 pages.

Kuhn E. R. (1999) letter to Board of directors of Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District dated February 19, subject - Position of "POWER" concerning Colorado River Compact Interpretation, Colorado River Water Conservation District, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, 2 pages.

MacDonnell L. J., Getches D. H., and Hugenberg Jr. W. C. (1995) The Law Of The Colorado River: Coping With Severe Sustained Drought in Severe Sustained Drought: Managing The Colorado River System In Times Of Shortage, The Powell Consortium as coord., pp. 825 - 836, Arizona Water Resources Research Center, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona and The Water Resources Bulletin, v. 31 n. 5, October 1995, pp. 825 - 836.

Nathanson M. N. (1978) Updating The Hoover Dam Documents, USDI - Bureau of Reclamation,

U.S. Government Printing Office for the Bureau of Reclamation Engineering and Research Center, Denver, Colorado, 230 pages and approximately 780 pages of additional appended material.

Pontius D. (1997) Colorado River Basin Study, report to the Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission, Congress of the United States, published by the Commission, Denver, Colorado, 132 pages and additional appended material.

Swan B. (1997) The Law Of The Colorado River, course outline, California Western School of Law, Los Angeles, California, 12 pages and additional appended material.

White G. F., chair (1968) Water And Choice In The Colorado Basin, report by the Committee on Water of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., 107 pages.