

because I hounded all of his predecessors to get some of these things. And some of my pipelines told me certain things were available. So they are available, and I think it would be excellent for all members of the committee to have them as we continue with this discussion and just find out what the Bureau has done.

Mr. FOLEY. My recollection is that whatever cost comparison studies were made of desalting and diversion in recent years, they have been inconclusive; that is, without further investigation it was difficult for the Department to say—

Mr. DOMINY. Yes, I recall the discussion you and I had on this point now. I said we had not made any studies that were definitive at all, but just broad horseback estimates. We could not tell definitely unless we had specific engineering studies of a pretty basic nature.

Mr. FOLEY. Has the trend of that judgment changed to favor desalting in recent years?

Mr. DOMINY. For my own part, this reconnaissance study we just made makes it look more and more apparent that the economics of providing augmentation in the Southwest may well lie in desalting when you compare it with importing water as far away as the Columbia River.

Mr. FOLEY. Even your reconnaissance report suggests that the actual estimated costs of desalting the water are roughly half the costs of transporting it where modest lift distances are involved.

Mr. DOMINY. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. As I think you answered in reply to Mr. Wyatt's question, the costs of moving water from; for example, the Columbia Basin area would be very substantially larger because of the distance, lift and climatic conditions?

Mr. DOMINY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. FOLEY. Do you have any general estimates on what we are talking about in terms of acre-feet costs?

Mr. DOMINY. On a straight projection basis, if it costs \$50 an acre-foot to transport the water 313 miles over a lift of 2,800 feet, it looks like it could well cost you \$125 to \$150 an acre-foot to transport it 1,200 miles because of the extra length and extra pumping head to move it from the Columbia.

The one thing that would favor the Columbia, perhaps, would be that you might go for a bigger quantity and build a larger size aqueduct and thereby reduce the unit costs.

Mr. FOLEY. That is an interesting subject, because we have been talking here in terms of meeting the needs of the Colorado River based on the effect of authorizing the central Arizona project. I think you know that part of the concern in the Northwest is that diversions would merely be an excuse for moving infinitely larger quantities of water because of the need for enhancing feasibility.

Mr. DOMINY. To go back to your exchange with the Secretary just a moment ago, all of us who are dealing with this problem and who are making estimates of the depletions and losses and salvageable percentage of the losses are all in agreement that somewhere between 2 and 2.5 million acre-feet augmentation is necessary if we are going to assure the Lower Basin States the consumptive use of 7.5 million acre-feet annually. Anything beyond that would provide water for future growth.