

27. As planned, the Hooker Reservoir would encroach on the Gila Wilderness and Primitive Areas, and in doing so would be destructive of habitat for the native flora and fauna, thus altering the native ecology which it is the function of those Areas to preserve. Are the benefits claimed for "fish and wildlife" adequately discounted for this negative effect?

28. What is the meaning of "wildlife" as used in the claims for benefits from the Hooker project?

29. How could Hooker provide benefits for wildlife under any definition of the term?

30. What is the meaning of "fish" as used in the claims for benefits from the Hooker project?

31. Is the claim for benefits to "fish" based on prospective improvement of habitat for native water animals, or does it refer to improved facilities for stocking sport fish for "put and take" recreational fishing?

32. Would the New Mexico Game and Fish Department be allowed to contract for municipal and industrial water from the Hooker Reservoir to be used to compensate for evaporation at certain state-owned lakes?

33. What would be the effect of the Hooker project on the native flora?

34. How would a site for the project downstream of the Hooker site compare in terms of conventional fishing for recreation?

35. Has the prospective value of the Hooker Reservoir for conventional outdoor recreation and sport fishing been assessed by a qualified expert or experts on those subjects?

36. Has the Forest Service been consulted with respect to the problems of administering wilderness regulations on the Hooker Reservoir and in the vicinity, considering that it would lie astride the wilderness boundary?

37. Has the opinion of the Forest Service been sought concerning the Hooker project in general? What is its position? If in writing furnish copy of same.

38. What areas would be protected from floods that are not now protected or would be protected by authorized or pending projects?

39. How much water is allocated for use by Silver City? How would Silver City's share of the water be made available for use, what would be the cost of delivery, and at whose expense would this be?

40. It is understood that water allotments were established by interviews with appropriate industrial officials incident to the Bureau of Reclamation reconnaissance studies, thus allotments must be earmarked to specific users. Who are the prospective users for the 10,000 acre feet of water apportioned to mining and milling? How much would they be charged for this water?

41. (a) Is there any intention to transport mining and milling water east across the Continental Divide, or that is be so transported to users so located?

(b) If water is to be transported across the Continental Divide, for whom might it be destined and at whose expense would it be moved?

42. Will the income derived from water and power sales from Hooker Dam be sufficient to cover reimbursable project costs? If not, how much financial assistance is necessary from a basin fund?

In view of the fact that there is an unusual method of financing provided in the proposed legislation and which has already been approved by the Bureau, I also request an up-to-date breakdown of the amount of monies which will be advanced by the Federal Government for construction of a Thermal Electric Plant, which the Government will contract for, the length of time such power is available, your estimated cost to the taxpayers, and the cost per kilowatt under the most advantageous and adverse conditions.

The information that I am seeking is for my own personal edification and benefit. I would appreciate your forwarding these answers to *me personally* at your earliest convenience and without circulating them to any other Member of Congress as in the past.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.