

accomplishment of that exchange would require storage facilities in New Mexico.

Answer No. 12.—Hooker was originally planned as a concrete structure but, due to technological advancement since that time, we believe that definite plan studies may indicate that an earthfill structure would be more economical.

Answer No. 13.—The cost of constructing a 98,000-acre-foot reservoir with a concrete Hooker Dam is estimated at \$28,797,000.

Answer No. 14.—If stage construction should be adopted, an earthfill design would probably be adopted. Costs for the first stage would be increased somewhat by the inclusion of structural features required for enlargement. Such costs might or might not be offset by savings in deferment of a portion of the total cost for a number of years.

Answer No. 15.—Benefits were claimed for flood control, outdoor recreation, and fish and wildlife. The benefits for municipal and industrial and irrigation water supply for the Central Arizona Project are associated with the quantities of water delivered by the main aqueduct (and also those developed at Buttes and Charleston Dams) without regard to the specific area of use. This amount of water, and hence these benefits, would be the same whether or not an exchange of water to New Mexico is accomplished. We do not, therefore, claim any additional irrigation or M&I water supply benefits for the Hooker Dam.

However, the benefits of the Central Arizona Project must be redistributed by means of the Hooker Unit to give New Mexico its equitable share in Lower Basin development as determined by the May 1966 agreement between the States.

Answer No. 16.—In addition to the benefits in New Mexico, there would be flood control benefits in the Duncan Valley in Arizona; and the project recreation and fish and wildlife benefits would accrue particularly to citizens of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, and to some extent to all of the citizens of the United States.

Answer No. 17.—As indicated above, no benefits to agriculture were claimed in terms of additional consumptive use. Flood control benefits of \$70,000 annually were evaluated by the Corps of Engineers on a reconnaissance basis using average future conditions and 1961 price levels. This reflects the value of damage prevented as is usual in Federal water resource projects, and is predicated upon the operation of the reservoir basically for flood control and would be reduced if the operation were varied to meet other considerations.

Answer No. 18.—Section 2(c) of S. 1004 as passed by the Senate provides:

"Unless and until otherwise provided by Congress, water from the Central Arizona Project shall not be made available directly or indirectly for the irrigation of lands not having a recent irrigation history as determined by the Secretary, except in the case of Indian lands, national wildlife refuges, and, with the approval of the Secretary, State-administered wildlife management areas."

Answer No. 19.—Our land status studies have not been recently updated, but we have been advised informally that the Pacific Western Land Company is reported to have acquired approximately 3,500 acres of land in the Gila Valley having surface and ground-water rights. We are not informed whether or not this company is affiliated with mining interests.

Answer No. 20.—If water rights appurtenant to farmlands are transferred to other uses, the lands would have to be retired from production until such time as an additional water supply is available.

Answer No. 21.—Yes. Under the Arizona-New Mexico agreement, water from Hooker Reservoir could be used to prevent the retirement of agricultural lands.

Answer No. 22.—Information on outdoor recreation is presented in summary in the report prepared by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which is included in the appendix of the Secretary's report of January 1964 on the Pacific Southwest Water Plan. We are requesting the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to reply further to you concerning Questions No. 22, 23, 24, and 35.

Answer No. 23.—See Answer No. 22.

Answer No. 24.—See Answer No. 22.

Answer No. 25.—The fish and wildlife benefits are reported in summary in the substantiating report of the Fish and Wildlife Service included in the appendix to the Secretary's January 1964 report on the Pacific Southwest Water Plan. We are requesting the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to reply further to you concerning Questions No. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 35.

Answer No. 26.—See Answer No. 25.

Answer No. 27.—See Answer No. 25.

Answer No. 28.—See Answer No. 25.

Answer No. 29.—See Answer No. 25.

Answer No. 30.—See Answer No. 25.

Answer No. 31.—See Answer No. 25.