

doc. 10  
10

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING

POLICY AND REVIEW COMMITTEE-GUNNISON RIVER STORAGE

December 14, 1951

Attendance

1. The Policy and Review Committee held its Second Meeting (executive session) on December 14, 1951, in the Conference Room of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colorado. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 10:40 a.m. The following members, Federal representatives attending as observers, and others were present:

Members of Committee

Clifford H. Stone, Chairman--Director, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colorado  
George Cory--Montrose, Colorado, representing Montrose County  
F. M. Peterson--Delta, Colorado, representing Delta County  
Ed L. Dutcher--Gunnison, Colorado, representing Gunnison County  
Silmon Smith--Grand Junction, Colorado, representing the Colorado River Water Conservation District Board  
R. M. Gildersleeve--Chief Engineer, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colorado  
Jean S. Breitenstein--Attorney, Colorado Water Conservation Board Denver, Colorado

Absent:

C. N. Feast--Director, Colorado Game and Fish Commission, Denver, Colorado  
Royce J. Tipton--Consulting Engineer, Colorado Water Conservation Board, Denver, Colorado

Secretary

Leon F. Maca--Hydrology Branch, Project Planning Division, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado

Federal Observers

Bureau of Reclamation

C. B. Jacobson--Engineer in charge of Colorado River Storage Project investigations, Region 4, Salt Lake City, Utah  
R. W. Jennings--Area Engineer, Region 4, Grand Junction, Colorado  
L. E. Holmes--Region 4, Salt Lake City, Utah

Fish and Wildlife Service

A. B. Eustis--Denver, Colorado

| <u>RESERVOIR SITE</u> | <u>PLAN A*</u> | <u>PLAN B*</u> | <u>PLAN C*</u> |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Curecanti             | 2,500,000 A.F. | 1,935,000 A.F. | 940,000 A.F.   |
| Crystal               | 40,000 A.F.    | 510,000 A.F.   | 510,000 A.F.   |
| Whitewater            | 880,000 A.F.   | 880,000 A.F.   | 880,000 A.F.   |
| Taylor Park           |                |                | 760,000 A.F.   |
| Gateview              |                |                | 308,000 A.F.   |

\*Active storage capacity of 2,480,000 acre-feet held constant in all combinations.

The study disclosed that the only increased service over the Bureau plan from these alternatives is added output of electrical energy (Plan B: 21.9 percent initially and 26.8 percent ultimately over Plan A; and for Plan C: 16.8 percent initially and 26.2 percent ultimately over Plan A). The cost of this additional generation varied from 13.1 to 22.4 mills per kilowatt hour, showing these alternatives to be relatively less feasible from an economic standpoint than the Bureau plan.

6. Question 2: What is the relative effect of decreased storage capacity in the Curecanti Reservoir on power production of Gunnison River units of the Colorado River Storage Project?

The results of the studies show the following power potential of the Gunnison River with various capacities for Curecanti Reservoir:

MEAN ANNUAL ENERGY GENERATION

Units: Million kwhr

|            | Curecanti<br>2,500,000 af |               | Curecanti<br>1,935,000 af |               | Curecanti<br>940,000 af |               | Curecanti<br>Eliminated |               |
|------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|
|            | Ini-<br>tial              | Ulti-<br>mate | Ini-<br>tial              | Ulti-<br>mate | Ini-<br>tial            | Ulti-<br>mate | Ini-<br>tial            | Ulti-<br>mate |
| Curecanti  | 327.9                     | 196.1         | 298.5                     | 173.2         | 224.7                   | 139.3         |                         |               |
| Crystal    | 284.1                     | 176.6         | 277.8                     | 175.0         | 243.7                   | 158.1         | 189.0                   | 145.0         |
| Whitewater | 290.0                     | 164.6         | 288.8                     | 168.0         | 274.7                   | 156.1         | 245.6                   | 152.5         |
| TOTAL      | 902.0                     | 542.3         | 865.1                     | 516.2         | 743.1                   | 453.5         | 434.6                   | 297.5         |

7. Question 3: What is the amount of regulatory storage required at the Curecanti Reservoir site to facilitate full irrigation development in the Gunnison River Basin from its mouth to the headwaters?

The Region 4 studies of storage required to facilitate irrigation use in the Gunnison Basin assumed that: (1) no allowance was made for a diversion to the Arkansas River Basin, (2) a demand on the proposed Whitewater Reservoir to replace water now being applied to Grand Valley from the Colorado River was not considered, (3) full irrigation development was assumed to include all the pro-



### General Discussion

13. Messrs. Cory and Peterson observed that the studies made at the request of the Committee show no alternatives in the Gunnison Basin to have an economic feasibility comparable to the Curecanti Reservoir site. Mr. Dutcher stated that he thought the studies would include all other possible reservoir sites in the Upper Gunnison and wondered whether any information was available to determine the aggregate amount of water that could be impounded in the Basin. He also felt that provision for some storage, but not necessarily in the amount of 2,500,000 acre-feet, might be feasibly substituted for the Curecanti. Bureau representatives pointed out the needs for the regulatory system of reservoirs in the Colorado River Storage Project plan and of the high favorability of the Curecanti site as one of the important points of regulatory control in the Upper Colorado River Basin System, and the relationship of providing regulation of water for within-use of the Gunnison River Basin.

14. Mr. Gildersleeve obtained from the Board's files and read to the Committee a list of reservoir sites in the Gunnison Basin compiled from various Bureau reports and other sources showing reservoir capacities, estimated dam and reservoir (only) construction costs based on 1949 prices, and unit costs per acre-foot of capacity. The list comprised 22 sites, totalling 1,917,400 acre-feet exclusive of the Curecanti (2,500,000 acre-feet) and the Parlin site (2,550,000 acre-feet), and ranging in capacities from 1,000 acre-feet to 750,000 acre-feet, and in unit cost per acre-foot storage from .638 to .26. Mr. Jacobson called the Committee's attention to the probability that sufficient water might not be available to develop the total capacities of these reservoirs and cited certain instances where the water supply would not be adequate, such as the Parlin site.

15. The Chairman called attention to the fact that the storage to be provided in the Basin must consider the following four items: (a) existing uses of water, (b) the additional projects in the Gunnison River Project reconnaissance report, (c) water required to round out the supply and provide supplemental water for existing projects, and (d) industrial development, keeping in mind the coal reserves within the basin. In response to Mr. Smith's question, whether the presently available draft of report on synthetic fuels was considered in the studies on questions relating to industrial use of water, the Region 4 representatives stated that the report was not available at the time of the studies, and although they now have a copy it has not yet been studied in detail. The Chairman clarified questions the members had about the use of holdover storage water that might be converted to consumptive use purposes under provisions of the Upper Colorado River Compact, by reading and explaining Section V (c) of that compact. He also described Congressional procedures necessary before the Colorado River Storage Project can be authorized and expressed hope that the State of Colorado might arrive at a conclusion on the Gunnison Basin problem before Congressional hearings are concluded.