

acre-feet for the Kaiparowits power development in Utah because these water uses are now in definite planning stages. These additions would bring the total to 4,614,000 acre-feet. If the thermal electric generating plant contemplated in pending legislation is to be constructed, Arizona's additional Upper Basin depletion would raise the total to 4,643,000 acre-feet or 433,000 acre-feet more than the Department allowed for Upper Basin depletions for year 1975. Adding five Upper Basin projects to be authorized in the bills before you would cause the Department's estimate to be short by 824,000 acre-feet annually as of 1975, or between 1975 and 1980, depending upon the time of completion of those projects. In addition, non-Federal projects under active consideration could run this deficit even higher which, if taken into account in the Department's analysis would eliminate a large segment of the water supply contemplated for the Central Arizona Project in years 1975 or 1980, again depending upon the date of completion of the Central Arizona Project and the other projects. You should be reminded that the Department contemplates delivery of water to the Central Arizona Project by not later than the year 1979.

These probable water deficits that I have mentioned are based upon the Department's application of a long-term high-flow water supply assumption to which I also cannot agree. Therefore, it appears quite clearly that the Department's study demonstrates that a water supply can be made available for a Central Arizona Project only by throttling future Upper Basin water uses, unless a Colorado River water supply augmentation is put into effect almost simultaneously with the Central Arizona Project. Apparently the Secretary seems to agree with me because in his statement I notice that he agrees that land and other resources in the Upper Basin could be physically developed to deplete water at the rate the Upper Basin estimates it could be depleted. He then adds that it does not appear likely that projects which would completely dedicate the Upper Basin's total remaining unused Colorado River water supply to specific areas or uses would be developed at rates commensurate with Upper Basin projections. Could it be the intention of the Department to put a brake on the Upper Basin development through enactment of this legislation? Certainly I would have to agree that if water that is apportioned to the Upper Basin is put to use in the Lower Basin the chances of the Upper Basin's ever getting it returned are extremely doubtful. This is especially true, also, without an in fact resolution of the magnitude of the Upper Basin's obligation to deliver water to fulfill the burdens of the Mexican Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I wish to insert into the record tables showing the present stream depletions, authorized Federal projects, probable future depletions, etc.:

TABLE I.—Upper Colorado River Basin stream depletions

COLORADO		Units: 1,000 acre-feet accumulated
1. Present depletions:		
Yampa and Green Rivers.....		65
Hayden Steam project.....		4
White River.....		34
Gunnison River.....		407
Smith Fork project.....		6
Paonia project.....		10
Colorado River—Main stream.....		481
Collbran project.....		7
Pueblo—Eagle River division.....		8
Colorado—Big Thompson project.....		260
Small ditches.....		1
Colorado Springs—Blue River.....		45
Denver—Blue River.....		15
Denver—Moffat Tunnel.....		63
Denver—Williams Fork.....		10
Busk—Ivanhoe Tunnel.....		5
Independence Pass Tunnel.....		38
Grand River ditch.....		20
San Juan and Dolores Rivers.....		289
Florida project.....		16
Total.....		<u>1,786</u>