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1922 BEGINNINGS

• California proposes a dam at Boulder Canyon and the All American canal in Swing/Johnson bill.

• Arizona Congressman Carl Hayden proposes a central Arizona diversion plan to bring Colorado River water to the state’s fertile central valleys.

• State interests propose the Arizona Highline Canal from Boulder Canyon to central Arizona.
FRUSTRATIONS IN THE 1920’S AND 1930’S

• Arizona’s legislative and judicial attempts to block Boulder Dam fail.
• The Supreme Court refuses to consider Arizona’s Colorado River claims.
• California develops the All American canal and Colorado River Aqueduct.
• Arizona divided and unable to develop a unified, coherent strategy.
PROGRESS IN THE 1940’S

• In 1944, the Bureau of Reclamation presents preliminary reports on importing Colorado River water to Arizona primarily for irrigation use.
  – Marble Gorge Dam Plan
  – Bridge Canyon Dam Plan
  – Parker Pump Plan

• Tucson, Pima County and Cortaro Farms join the effort and seek Colorado River water for domestic and agricultural use.
BACK TO COURT IN THE 1950’S WITH SUCCESS IN 1963

• But the House refuses to act without a judicial determination of Arizona’s rights.
• The case is filed in 1952, and after eleven years, the Supreme Court rules for Arizona on June 3, 1963 and issues its decree on March 4, 1964.
BARRIERS TO CAP AUTHORIZATION

• Power needed for pumps & to repay the project:
  – Bridge Dam and Marble Dam not acceptable.
• California delegation—insists on protection of its 4.4 MAF in shortage years.
• Upper Basin states—insist on protection of their entitlement for future development.
1968 BASIN PROJECT ACT
OVERCOMING THE BARRIERS

• For the first time, a coal fired power plant made a part of a reclamation project.

• California’s 4.4 MAF entitlement is given priority over CAP in shortage years.
  – Arizona agrees because the U.S. assumes the 1.5 MAF obligation to Mexico as a national obligation.
  – Commitment for federal studies for augmentation—potentially desal and weather mod for Mexican water.

• Criteria established for storing enough water in Lake Powell to protect the Upper Basin (§602a).
THE 1968 BASIN PROJECT ACT
CAP ELEMENTS

- Ownership of a portion of coal fired power plant.
- Aqueduct from Lake Havasu to Tucson.
- Orme Dam at the junction of the Salt and Gila Rivers.
- Buttes Dam on the Gila River near Florence.
- Charleston Dam on the San Pedro River and canal to Tucson.
- Hooker Dam on the Gila River in New Mexico.
BRINGING IT UP TO DATE (PHYSICAL)

- Navajo Power Plant provides energy and money.
- The aqueduct is to San Xavier District south of Tucson.
- Buttes and Charleston Dams gone.
- Hooker Dam potential in Arizona Water Settlement Act.
- Orme Dam replaced by Plan Six features:
  - Enlarged Roosevelt Dam for flood protection.
  - New Waddell Dam for regulation and conversion of winter energy to summer energy.
  - Cliff Dam planned but never built.
BRINGING IT UP TO DATE (LEGAL)

• With potential shortages looming, Arizona has questioned the Bureau’s 602a algorithm for storage in Lake Powell to protect the Upper Basin—temporarily resolved by Interim Guidelines.

• The U.S. has not fulfilled its obligation to provide 1.5 MAF to Mexico through augmentation—and is making no efforts to do so.
BRINGING IT UP TO DATE (CONCEPTUAL)

• CAP originally conceived and promoted as rescue for Central Arizona agriculture.
• By 1968, CAP important for long term domestic water supplies too. Cost/benefit in 1968:
  – $59.4 m/yr for agriculture
  – $18.6 m/yr for M&I.
• Today, 2/3 of Ag water transferred to Indian Ag use; 1/3 to be allocated to M&I.