

3. Based on its reconnaissance studies, it is said that the Bureau of Reclamation has settled on the Hooker site as the best site for the project as conceived. What is the extent of these site studies?

4. What alternate sites along the Gila River were considered and studied by the Bureau? If any submit the studies.

5. (a) What is the benefit-cost ratio for Hooker Dam?

(b) What are the results of the studies by the Bureau with respect to each alternate site considered in comparison with the Hooker site, in terms of details, figures, prospective benefits, and benefit-cost ratio?

6. (a) How does the benefit-cost ratio of Hooker Dam compare with a potential project to supply New Mexico's water entitlement utilizing ground water storage and pumping? The ground water used in this manner would appear to be adequately recharged by periods of high flow in the Gila River. In view of its effect on surface flows in the Gila River above Coolidge Dam, such a project should include most presently irrigated land which might benefit from Hooker Dam. Potential benefits for such a project might include no evaporation losses from surface water storage and possible reduction in evapotranspiration by phreatophytes to lowering of the water table.

(b) Has there been consideration of any other alternate plans to the Hooker Project (n.b., project, not just dam)?

7. The primary objective of the Hooker project is to provide additional water for consumptive uses in New Mexico amounting to 18,000 acre feet per annum. How was this amount of water established. Is it?

8. What is the planned breakdown of this 18,000 acre feet to the various consumptive uses?

9. How was this breakdown arrived at?

10. Assuming that there was some delay in completing the Hooker project to its full capacity and that at a lesser capacity, presumably 98,000 acre feet, the project could provide some lesser amount of water for additional consumptive use, how much water would be provided and how would this quantity be broken down to consumptive uses?

11. (a) Is Hooker actually part of the Central Arizona Project in an engineering or an operating sense?

(b) If Hooker is actually essential to the Central Arizona Project, in what respect is this true?

12. What would be the type of construction of the Hooker Dam?

13. What would be the cost of the project as of October 1, 1967?

14. What would be the effect on type of construction and cost if the dam were constructed in stages?

15. Benefits to be derived from Hooker have been claimed for flood control, outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife, and for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses through the provision of a firm water supply resulting from river regulation. Is this the extent of the claimed benefits?

16. These claimed benefits pertain only to New Mexico, do they not?

17. What are the full details in facts and figures which are the basis for the claimed benefits to agriculture, in terms of flood control, firm water supply, or additional consumptive use?

18. Does S. 1004 permit the irrigation of new lands in New Mexico with Gila River water? If so, how will the water be supplied to these lands?

19. How much land with appurtenant water rights was brought up in the Gila Valley on behalf of the Phelps-Dodge Corporation for use of the water rights in support of their Tyrone operation?

20. What will be the effect of the diversion of these water rights on the potential of the Gila Valley as an area for irrigated farming?

21. Would the Hooker project serve in any way to salvage the agricultural potential of the Valley in the foreseeable future?

22. What is the basis in detail for the benefits claimed for outdoor recreation?

23. Are the benefits claimed for outdoor recreation adequately discounted for the negative effect on outdoor recreation which would be caused by the intrusion of the reservoir on the Gila Wilderness and Primitive Areas?

24. How would a site for the project, downstream of the Hooker site, compare with Hooker site for conventional outdoor recreation?

25. What is the basis in detail for the benefits claimed for fish and wildlife?

26. Have the claims for benefits to fish and wildlife been checked by a qualified ecologist?