

~~105-1-1~~
J. H. [unclear]

19

RESOLUTION OF THE GUNNISON WATERSHED CONSERVATION
COMMITTEE RELATIVE TO THE CURECANTI DAM

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

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 in Gunnison as well as maintenance and operation of the same as may be required to take care of the additional

Remuneration

✓

*Remuneration
to be left to
committee*

QINS

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 Gov. Dan Thornton, the Colorado Water Conservation Board, to the Colorado River Conservancy District, to the Delta County Agricultural Planning Committee, to the Board of Directors of the Montrose Chamber of Commerce, to 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, this 19th day of April, A.D. 1951.

GUNNISON WATERSHED CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

By: E. L. Dutcher, Chairman

| <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 2,500,000 af | | Curecanti 1,935,000 af | | Curecanti 940,000 af | | Curecanti Eliminated | |
|------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| | Ini- tial | Ulti- mate | Ini- tial | Ulti- mate | Ini- tial | Ulti- mate | Ini- tial | Ulti- mate |
| Curecanti | 327.9 | 196.1 | 296.5 | 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.