SAN LUIS UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

APRIL 8, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Kuchel, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 44.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

TEXT OF S. 44, AS AMENDED

The text of S. 44, as recommended to be amended, is as follows:

That for the principal purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five hundred thousand acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, California, hereinafter referred to as the Federal San Luis unit service area, and as incidents thereto of furnishing water for municipal and domestic use and providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. The principal engineering features of said unit shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, a forebay and afterbay, the San Luis Canal, the Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, channels, levees, flood works, and related facilities. The works of the San Luis unit (here-
in after referred to as joint-use facilities) for joint use with the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the State) shall be the dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, forebay and afterbay, pumping plants, and the San Luis Canal. The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be constructed so as to permit future expansion; or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area as hereinafter provided and the State’s service area. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) except so far as the provisions thereof are inconsistent with this Act. Construction of the San Luis unit shall not be commenced until the Secretary has (1) secured, or has satisfactory assurance of his ability to secure, all rights to the use of water which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the unit and the terms and conditions of this Act, and (2) received satisfactory assurance from the State of California that it will make provision for a master drainage outlet and disposal channel for the San Joaquin Valley, as generally outlined in the California water plan, Bulletin Numbered 3, of the California Department of Water Resources, which will adequately serve, by connection therewith, the drainage system for the San Luis unit or has made provision for constructing the San Luis interceptor drain to the Delta designed to meet the drainage requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in San Luis project report by the Bureau of Reclamation of May 1955, as transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior December 17, 1956.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled “San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project,” dated December 17, 1956. The Secretary shall not commence construction of the San Luis unit, except for the preparation of designs and specifications and other preliminary work, until the execution of such an agreement between the United States and the State, but if such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: Provided, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either
the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree equitably to share the total cost of constructing the joint-use facilities and as a part of its share shall make available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: Provided, That the performance of such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act: And provided further, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

Sec. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (i) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (ii) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the States share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or
modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act:

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the operation, maintenance and replacement costs of the joint use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction cost of the joint use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area.

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) Notwithstanding transfer of title or of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint use facilities, shall continue to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1950 (70 Stat. 483, 43 U.S.C. 485h-1), in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;
(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U.S.C. 662, as amended), the features of the unit to which such allocation is attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of title or of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State.

SEC. 4. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contracts conforming generally to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws with respect to irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925, 43 U.S.C. 523).

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 6. The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley project," dated December 17, 1956.

(a) The Secretary is authorized to provide Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties: Provided, That construction of the works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary and by the Congress, and in no event prior to July 1, 1964, unless, in the meantime, the Governor of the State of California shall have notified the Secretary that the State approves the construction of such works by the United States.
Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for
construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including
joint use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than dis-
tribution systems and drains, the sum of $290,430,000, plus
such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason
of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in
the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. There
are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto,
such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such
distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by
local interests, and (b) for operation and maintenance of
the unit. All moneys received by the Secretary from the
State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts
as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available,
without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of
this Act.

Amendments to S. 44 (San Luis Bill)

Amendments recommended to S. 44 as introduced are as follows:
Page 1, line 5, after "California," insert "hereinafter referred to
as the Federal San Luis unit service area,"
Page 2, line 8, after "works", insert "of the San Luis unit".
Page 2, beginning line 12, strike "Those joint-use facilities may be
constructed" and insert in lieu thereof the following:
The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir
shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be
constructed so as
Page 2, line 13, strike comma and insert semicolon in lieu thereof.
Page 2, beginning line 13, strike "and upon" through word "con-
structed" in line 16.
Page 2, line 16, after "or", insert "the joint-use facilities".
Page 2, line 17, after "both the", insert "Federal".
Page 2, line 18, after "area", insert "as hereinafter provided".
Page 3, line 9, strike beginning "or has" through "San Luis unit"
line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
or has made provision for constructing the San Luis inter-
ceptor drain to the Delta designed to meet the drainage
requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in
San Luis project report by the Bureau of Reclamation of May
1955, as transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the
Interior December 17, 1956.
Page 3, line 17, after "the", insert "Federal"; and, after "San
Luis", insert "unit".
Page 3, line 25, after "by", strike "July 1, 1960" and insert in lieu
thereof "January 1, 1962".
Page 4, line 22, after "State", insert the following:
shall agree equitably to share the total cost of constructing
the joint-use facilities and as a part of its share
Page 5, line 5, after "interfere", insert "unduly".
Page 6, line 1, strike "appropriate" and insert in lieu thereof
"equitable".
Page 6, line 16, after "interfere", insert "unduly".
Page 6, line 19, after "an", strike "appropriate" and insert "equitable".
Page 7, line 19, after "the", insert "Federal".
Page 8, line 20, after "U.S.C. 662)",, insert "as amended, ".
Page 10, line 2, after line 2, insert new section 6 as follows:

SEC. 6. The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956.

(a) The Secretary is authorized to provide Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties: Provided, That construction of the works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary and by the Congress, and in no event prior to July 1, 1964, unless, in the meantime, the Governor of the State of California shall have notified the Secretary that the State approves the construction of such works by the United States.

Page 10, line 3, strike "Sec. 6", and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 7".

**Explanation of Amendments**

For purposes of clarification, an analysis of the amendments to S. 44 recommended by the committee is as follows:

The first two amendments on pages 1 and 2 are designed to precisely define the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project that is specifically authorized by the bill.

The amendment on page 2, beginning line 12, is for the purpose of emphasizing that the Secretary of the Interior has a mandate to construct the dam and reservoir so as to permit future expansion, and that such construction of other joint-use facilities is permissive, subject to the limitations on appropriations authorized and an agreement with the State of California.

Such an intention is made clear in the colloquy among members of the full committee at the executive session on March 24, 1959, which is reproduced in the appendix to this report.

Other amendments on page 2 are consequential and for purposes of clarification.

On page 3, the first amendment is designed to insure that the Secretary shall make provision for adequate drainage requirements for the San Luis unit as proposed in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation. The second amendment on page 3 is consequential.

On page 3, line 25, the cutoff date for an agreement by the State of California to participate in a joint venture with respect to the San Luis unit is extended to January 1, 1962.

On page 4, line 22, the amendment provides that the State shall agree equitably to share the cost of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit.
Amendments on pages 5 and 6 are corrective and consequential.

On page 10, after line 2, a new section 6 is inserted that deals with the application of the acreage-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation law to lands outside those under contract to receive a water supply from the Federal San Luis unit. Under this section, lands receiving water from State facilities under State contracts would be subject only to California law.

(The position of the committee is that the Federal reclamation law with respect to acreage limitations should apply only to lands under contract with the United States.)

Section 6(a) authorizes the Secretary to provide Central Valley project service by way of the Pacheco tunnel route to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties in California. Construction shall not start until a feasibility report is approved by the Congress, unless the Governor of California advises the Secretary that the State approves construction of the works by the United States.

In any event the appropriations for construction authorized by S. 44 are limited to the figure stated in section 7, which is $290,430,000.

BACKGROUND OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments recommended by the committee were proposed by the sponsor (Senator Kuchel) of S. 44 with the concurrence of the cosponsor (Senator Engle). The proposals were analyzed by the light of testimony at public hearings.

The Governor of California, Hon. Edmund G. Brown, endorsed the amendments at a personal appearance before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation at a hearing on March 16, 1959. The Governor also outlined in detail his proposals to expedite financing of a California State water plan.

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of the substantive amendments in section 1 is to clarify provisions of the bill to pave the way for integration of the Federal San Luis unit, Central Valley project, with the California State water plan under a public partnership arrangement. This arrangement will assure full protection for the Federal investment and at the same time evidence cooperation with the State of California in the conservation and development of its water resources.

The amendments reflect a composition of some of the major differences among Californians as to the Federal-State relationship with respect to the Federal program for the San Luis unit and particularly for paving the way for its integration with the State water plan.

Adequate protection is afforded for the proposed Federal investment in the San Luis unit by the bill as amended. In the event the State fails to consummate an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior by January 1, 1962, the Federal program would proceed with the construction of San Luis Dam and Reservoir with capacity to serve the Federal project area. Limited expenditures for footings and other features of the San Luis Dam and Reservoir would permit increased capacity to serve areas in the southern San Joaquin Valley by way of Avenal Gap if authorized by the Congress, or permit later integration with the Feather River project of the State water plan.
An earlier agreement between the Secretary and the State of California in accordance with the provisions of S. 44 would, of course, expedite the program that the committee recommends to the Senate in the form of S. 44.

Sponsors of Bill

S. 44 is sponsored by the senior Senator from California (Mr. Kuchel) and his colleague, Senator Engle.

Consideration by Committee

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, especially the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, have considered the proposed San Luis unit, Central Valley project, over a period of 3 years. Hearings were held on May 11, 12, and 14, 1956, on the proposed San Luis phase of a joint development with the Trinity project, which was subsequently authorized. On March 17–18, 1958, hearings were held on S. 1887, which proposed authorization of the San Luis unit only.

The committee reported favorably on S. 1887 and the Senate passed the bill on August 15, 1958.

Transcripts of previous hearings and the committee report on S. 1887 (Rept. No. 2202) have been incorporated in the record by reference and have been considered in formulating the favorable recommendations on S. 44. New material developed at the hearings on March 16, 1959, has been given particular attention as well as discussions at a subcommittee meeting on March 23 and at a full committee session on March 24.

At the latter meeting, a colloquy among members of the committee was ordered printed as a part of the hearings, in order to make crystal clear the intent of the proposed legislation with respect to the relationship of the Federal and State Governments as to respective specific responsibilities in connection with the development of San Luis Dam and Reservoir.

Incidentally, it should be noted that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation (Mr. Anderson) has viewed the San Luis area from the air, and the record reflects his reactions to the worthiness of the development from the standpoint of the Federal interest and concern for cooperative development of water resources through irrigation.

Description of San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project

The San Luis unit is proposed as the next major addition to the Central Valley project. Its service area of approximately half a million acres is located on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley in California. New works required to serve the area include the San Luis Dam and Reservoir, San Luis Canal, Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, and related works. The estimated cost of the main supply facilities is $290,430,000, of which all but about $100,000 for minimum basic recreation facilities would be reimbursable.

The area to be served is composed of nearly all class 1 or 2 land capable of growing a wide variety of crops if adequate water is provided. The area receives less than 10 inches of rainfall per year and
has no appreciable natural surface water supplies. About three-fourths of the area now is irrigated from wells but the ground water is poor in quality, and limited in amount. The wells are expensive to develop and the water levels have been receding without interruption for more than a decade.

Payment by the farmers for water deliveries plus financial assistance from the Central Valley project would repay the reimbursable portion of the cost of project works in 50 years. A rate of $7.50 per acre-foot was assumed in the financial analysis of the proposed project. This rate would be within the ability of the water users to pay.

In addition to the main water supply features the San Luis area would require distribution systems, drains, and some deep wells. The estimated cost of these works is $192,650,000. The local districts could finance and construct these works by themselves, or request the Federal Government to do it. In the latter event repayment for these works in 40 years would be required.

The San Luis unit, as provided in S. 44, can be constructed for coordinated operation with the Feather River project of the State of California. This would involve building certain joint features, such as the San Luis Reservoir and Canal, to ultimate capacities initially or providing in their initial construction for later enlargement. The sharing of the costs of joint facilities should result in savings to both the Federal San Luis unit and the State Feather River project.

Correspondence Concerning the San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project, California

Letter to Senator Anderson from Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Aandahl on the Legislative Intent of the Bill as Amended

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C., March 24, 1959;

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: The language of Committee Print No. 1 on S. 44 in lines 17-20, page 2, provides that the San Luis Dam and Reservoir shall be constructed so as to permit future expansion. We assume this language applies to enlargement to accommodate the State plan rather than an enlarged Federal project.

I am informed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and I agree, that in the event the Bureau of Reclamation so constructs the San Luis Dam, the provisions to permit future expansion will be generally as follows:

1. Installation of outlet works in the initial structure of sufficient capacity to accommodate ultimate use;

2. Acquisition of lands and rights-of-way to elevations ample to accommodate the 2,100,000-acre-foot reservoir; and

3. Construction of those elements of the dam, such as the cutoff trench and the impervious core that would be extremely difficult and costly to modify later, to specifications that would serve the larger dam structure.
I am advised further by the Bureau that if provision were to be made for enlargement the main structure would not be constructed initially to the base width necessary for the higher dam. Several minor saddle dams would also be involved in construction of a 1 million acre-foot reservoir. These would be constructed in the most economical manner to permit their later enlargement.

Sincerely yours,

Fred G. Aandahl,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ANDERSON CONCERNING ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER DOMINY'S LETTER OF MARCH 19

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
March 20, 1959.

Memorandum to Senator Anderson.

I have reviewed the record of the hearing on S. 44, to authorize the San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California, together with Associate Commissioner Dominy's letter to you of March 19. My particular attention was directed to an analysis of the cost involved in the amendments, principally to section 1, with respect to the authorization for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the joint-use facilities. I come up with these figures, which appear to be controlling:

1. The authorization for appropriations in section 6 of the bill is $290,430,000.

2. Included in this total of $290,430,000 are: (a) $10,814,000 for footings and other facilities of San Luis Dam, whereby the capacity may be increased from 1 million acre-feet to 2,001,000 acre-feet (i) if the State comes into the project, or (ii) if the service area of the San Luis project is extended to the Avanol Gap area in the Southern San Joaquin Valley;

   (b) $4 million for additional capacity or facilities at the Tracy pumping plant, under either of the conditions mentioned in (a); and

   (c) $2,887,000 for San Luis modifications in the event the enlargement project is developed.

   The total of these figures provided for in the $290,430,000 authorization for appropriations is $17,701,000.

3. This $290,430,000 appears to be an absolute limitation so far as the facilities mentioned with the respective amounts estimated. Any additional facilities, such as further enlargement of existing canals or additional canals would require reauthorization by the Congress. It is estimated that in event the State project comes in, an additional $5 million to $8 million would be required to finance extra outlet capacity in the dam.

4. The State of California has been engaged in the purchase of the right-of-way for the dam and reservoir and it has generally been the understanding that it would make the contribution of the cost of the right-of-way to its share of the additional cost of the projected facilities of the dam and reservoir in connection with the possible cost of extra outlet capacity in the dam, in the event the State comes into the project.
5. Because of the sharing of the cost of San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other joint-use facilities, it is estimated that the cost to the United States of the San Luis unit will be reduced to something like $230 million or $240 million because of the State's assumption of its share.

6. The best engineering advice that can be gotten is that enlargement of the San Luis Canal to accommodate the State's Feather River project would be infeasible. Therefore, the permissive language that the Secretary may construct joint-use facilities, other than the San Luis Dam and Reservoir, should be construed to authorize the Secretary to act as the constructing agent in connection with the State project. The permissive "may," in this connection, is interpreted to mean just that. In other words, a second canal as a part of the State project would be constructed only if the State put up the money for that purpose.

In reviewing the transcript and the Dominy letter of March 19, as well as checking personally with Reclamation personnel, I am convinced that the amendments to section 1 fully safeguard the maximum authorization of $290,430,000 for the construction of the Federal San Luis unit as a maximum, and that any departures or substantial modifications of the construction items listed will require congressional authorization or approval.

In other words, the suggestion that the project might involve a Federal expenditure upward of $400 million or so has been eliminated by the modifying amendments in the committee print, supplemented, by the explanations I have summarized in this memorandum.

Goodrich W. Lineweaver,
Committee Assistant.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER DOMINY'S LETTER TO SENATOR ANDERSON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1959;

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: As requested during the March 16 hearing before your committee on S. 44, a bill to authorize the San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California, the following is an analysis of the cost required to provide in the initial construction of the unit for future enlargement of certain facilities.

Our estimate of $290,430,000 as the cost of a Federal San Luis unit contains $17,701,000 for such modifications that would permit enlargement later to provide specifically for irrigation service to lands additional to those now included in the San Luis unit. This $17,701,000 comprises $10,814,000 for modification of the San Luis Dam and outlet works, $4 million for modification of the pumping plant, and $2,887,000 for modification of the San Luis Canal.

The modifications for future enlargement of the reservoir and the pumping plant to accommodate the Feather River project would be essentially the same as those we had contemplated to accommodate expansion of the Federal San Luis unit. Some additional outlet...
capacity would be required, which might raise cost of the dam modification from $10,814,000 to $16 million. Cost of the pumping-plant modification would remain at $4 million.

The situation in respect to the San Luis Canal, however, is quite different. To expand the Federal San Luis unit to serve the Avenal Gap area would require a relatively modest increase in the capacity of the San Luis Canal. This is true because of the ability to use the canal on an off-peak basis in the same manner as the Delta-Mendota is used for the San Luis unit. To accommodate the Feather River project, however, would require doubling the capacity of the San Luis Canal in its upper reaches and increasing the capacity by tenfold in the lowest reach. There is no practical way to construct this canal now for enlargement to such proportions later at costs significantly less than would be required for initial construction to ultimate capacity. If the canal is not constructed originally to ultimate capacity, it is our judgment that the only feasible alternative would be to construct a second parallel canal in the future when the additional capacity is required.

In that event, there is little that can be done at the time the first canal is built to reduce significantly the total construction costs of the two canals other than savings which might be effected through purchase of additional right-of-way and provision of enlarged protective structures.

The above comprise the best estimates that we can make with available information. We hope they are sufficient for the purposes of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Acting Commissioner.

LETTER FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY AANDAHL

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,

Hon. James E. Murray,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Murray: This responds to your request for the views of this Department on S. 44, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

We recommend that this bill be enacted.

If its enacted, S. 44 will permit the carrying out of the proposals made in this Department's project-planning report on the San Luis unit, Central Valley project, dated August 1, 1956. After clearance through the Bureau of the Budget, copies of this report were transmitted to the Congress on December 17, 1956. The general plan of Federal development of the unit was described in our report to your committee dated June 28, 1957, on S. 1887, 85th Congress, and need not be repeated in this report.
The bill would provide, also, that certain of the main supply works could be constructed in a manner and to capacities to permit their joint use by the United States and the State of California. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with respect to the construction, operation, and financing of these joint-use facilities. Under the provisions of the bill, an equitable division of the costs of construction, operation and maintenance of such facilities would be arrived at by negotiation. While rights to the use of capacities in the joint-use features would be similarly the subject of negotiation and agreement, subsection (f) of section 3 of the bill would require that the United States be unrestricted in its right to the use of sufficient capacities to serve the Federal San Luis unit.

In addition to favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction by the Federal Government of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, we support the concept embraced in S. 44 that the main supply features may be constructed, pursuant to suitable agreement, also to serve proposed water developments by the State of California. We are of the opinion that the bill would furnish adequate authority to accomplish both of these objectives. It would provide a legislative framework within which the United States and the State could work out appropriate, mutually acceptable arrangements for operation of the joint-use works of the San Luis unit so that the State's water development requirements could be served without adversely affecting the operation of the Federal project and without any impairment of the Federal investment. The provisions of the bill properly recognize, we believe, that such matters as the sharing of costs and of capacities of the joint-use works cannot be determined by any fixed statutory formulae but must be worked out by the contracting parties upon taking into account all relevant factors.

In order to clarify certain of the provisions of the bill dealing with the sharing of costs, we suggest the following amendments for the committee's consideration:

1. In place of the sentence appearing in lines 12 through 18, on page 2, substitute the following: "Upon agreement by the State or some other public agency to equitably share the cost as later provided in this Act, those joint-use facilities may be constructed initially either to permit future expansion or to capacities necessary to serve both the San Luis unit service area and the State's service area."

2. In line 22, on page 4, after the word "State", insert the words "shall agree to equitably share the total cost of constructing the joint-use facilities and as a part of its share".

3. In lines 1 and 19, on page 6, substitute the word "equitable" for the word "appropriate".

The sentence beginning at line 12, on page 2, indicates that the costs of the joint-use facilities should be apportioned between the United States and the State on an equitable basis. The amendments suggested above are designed, first, to rephrase the language of that sentence to make it clearer without changing its meaning in this respect and, second, to make the other provisions consistent with that sentence.

In addition, we suggest that on page 8, in line 20, between the comma and the word "the" which follows, there be inserted the words "as amended," to take cognizance of the recently enacted amend-
The data called for by Public Law 801, 84th Congress, are attached for your information.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee. However, that Bureau has requested that your committee be advised that it would recommend that the provisions of S. 44 be modified to provide for treating the cost of minimum basic recreational facilities as part of the overall Federal cost to be allocated to the major purposes of the project subject to the cost-sharing or reimbursement requirements applicable to such purposes.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDahl,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

---

**Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment and expenditures for the 1st 5 years of proposed new or expanded programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, executive direction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative services and support:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, administrative services and support</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive (program):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, substantive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, estimated additional man-years of civilian employment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated additional expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>32,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, estimated additional expenditures</td>
<td>2,650,000</td>
<td>9,700,000</td>
<td>32,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**LETTER FROM PHILIP S. HUGHES, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET**

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,**

**BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,**

**Washington, D.C., March 12, 1959.**

**Hon. James E. Murray,**

**Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,**

**U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.**

**My Dear Mr. Chairman:** This is in reply to your letter of January 19, 1959, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 44, a bill, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San
Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

The bill would authorize Federal construction of the San Luis irrigation development in California, and would permit participation by the State of California in the financing, construction, and operation of the project under a partnership arrangement.

Section 5 of the bill would authorize Federal construction of minimum basic recreational facilities on a nonreimbursable basis. We believe that the costs of such facilities should be treated as part of the overall Federal costs and allocated to the major purposes of the project subject to the cost-sharing or reimbursement requirements applicable to such purposes. Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget would recommend that the bill be amended to delete the last sentence of section 5.

Subject to modification of the bill as indicated above, the Bureau of the Budget would recommend enactment of S. 44.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.
Appendix

(The following colloquy at an executive session of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 24, 1959, was ordered to be printed as an appendix to the committee report on S. 44, to authorize the San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California.)

Statement by Senator Anderson

Senator Anderson. Now, Mr. Chairman, we come to a third bill, which is S. 44, to authorize the San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California, I guess we should allow Senator Kuchel to speak about.

I do want to say for myself that the San Luis unit is one which I had the privilege of carefully inspecting because it involved a total of $290 million as a Federal undertaking alone, and, if combined with the State project, involved a total of $480 million. I thought a project that ran nearly half a billion dollars was one I wanted to see myself, if I could do so.

I have been not only all over the area where the canals are to be constructed but I have gone to the Tracy pumping plant. I have followed the Delta-Mendota Canal up to the spot where water will be taken from it and put into a lift that would raise it up into the San Luis Dam and Reservoir. I have flown around the area of the San Luis Reservoir and then returned and followed the canal line down into the area which would eventually take the water probably down to Los Angeles if the large State project is constructed, or perhaps into the Kern County area or something of that nature.

But at least I can say I have been over the project. I want to put into the record that I endorse the project strongly, that I completely endorse this bill, and that I hope it may be reported to the Senate as unanimously by this committee this year as it was last year.

It passed the Senate last year after some discussion. It is a better project this year than it was last year because every year you delay the construction of works of this nature, the more desperate the situation becomes as to certain additional works that may be constructed in the future.

I am referring, for example, to the groups who were represented here.

It is a strange thing for a person, like me from an area that is devoid of water in certain spots to find a State like California that has got too much of it in spots. Under this situation, it needs to bring the water up and put it into a large reservoir and then possibly take it out of the other end of that reservoir and pour it down into another area for use on the lands that are involved in that irrigation project.

This is a sample of intelligent planning on the part of the Federal Government plus, I think, good planning on the part of the State of California.
I use the word "good" only because California has not yet completely joined in this San Luis project. When it does and takes its share of it, I think it will be an extremely fine project.

I am happy, of course, to yield to my good friend from California who, with Senator Engle, has worked hard to bring out a bill on which the State of California finds itself in general agreement.

I would like the record to show that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I would commend the two California Senators who put in a lot of time on this bill, and helped us by avoiding a fight over the distribution of this water by putting in language that I think is satisfactory to all concerned.

Senator Kuchel, I am glad to give you the floor.

Senator Kuchel. Once again I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the monumental assistance he has given to the people of California in an attempt to make progress and to solve this continuing basic problem of water.

Senator Anderson. I wonder if I could be excused because there may be discussion of the amendments and I would like to be reported, Mr. Chairman, as voting in favor of all these amendments. I hope that there will go into the record this language with an explanation of why it is going in, and I would like very much to be recorded as voting in favor of the bill, if I may, on the final report.

Mr. Lineweaver. You mean the amendments in the committee print?

Senator Anderson. Yes.

Senator O'Mahoney. And no others?

Senator Anderson. No others.

I think, for the record, I had better say what my problem has been, I would like to see the project developed so that the State can join with it. Therefore, I would like to see the dam, when the first construction is done on it, built so it later could fit into the State plan and the reservoir have a capacity of 2,100,000 acre-feet of storage rather than 1 million acre-feet of storage as planned for the San Luis unit alone. But I would not want to commit the Federal Government to build a big dam unless the State of California was going to put up its share.

**QUESTION BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY**

Senator O'Mahoney. Are those figures to be in the report?

Senator Anderson. The report is going to be worked out to show that the bill authorizes a $290 million project, which includes $10,800,000 for the basis for enlargement of the foundations and footings for the dam. That is what the Bureau of Reclamation recommended, and that is what I think this committee would be wise to do.

There is no disagreement between Senator Kuchel and myself. The only misunderstanding was as to language. I believe the best way to clarify the language is by the report.

I might say to the Senator from Wyoming I hope he takes a good look at the report, too, because it is going to be shown by Senator Kuchel to Senator Allott. I made a commitment to Senator Allott that he would have a chance to look at the language. It is going to be seen by Senator Bible, and I would be very happy if the Senator from Wyoming would take a look at it also.
STATEMENT BY SENATOR O’MAHONEY

Senator O’MAHONEY. I notice that on page 2, lines 17 and 18, the amendment contains the alternative language which was suggested by Senator Kuchel at the last meeting when this was discussed, by substituting for “the joint-use facilities” the words “the joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed and its joint-use facilities may be constructed so as to permit future expansion.”

That seems to meet all the objections that were raised at that time.

Senator ANDERSON. I surely appreciate that statement from the Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O’MAHONEY. But I notice this is the Committee Print No. 1. The print we had at our last meeting showed amendments. So is this not Committee Print No. 2?

Senator ANDERSON. This is the same text, I think.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank also my good friend, the able senior Senator from Wyoming, for participating in the hearings and in helping to eliminate the question which arose when we did have the hearings a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, in effect, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project. That unit is to become an integral part of the Central Valley project, which is a Federal reclamation project operating in the two great valleys of California. Meanwhile, the people of the State, through their State government, have gone forward in the development of plans for a series of water projects to be developed and built by the State to bring supplemental water to those areas which need it by reason of the tremendous increase in population in my State.

The State water plan, as conceived by the State government, is an $11 billion undertaking. A portion of the State water plan is termed the Feather River project. In a word, a State project by which supplemental northern water would be transported over the mountains or around the coastline of Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties into all the areas of southern California, to be used in the main, of course, for supplying supplemental water for people and for industry as well as for agriculture.

These two great projects, one a Federal project and one a State project, would cross at the San Luis Reservoir site. Here is one instance where the Supreme Being saw fit to place in the mountains at San Luis an admirable site for a storage reservoir.

Thus, working together, the people representing the State and the people representing the Federal Government conceived the idea of an integrated reservoir which would supply storage needs for both the Federal reclamation project and the State project.

Thus, as has been previously suggested by the Senators from New Mexico and Wyoming, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a dam of the size necessary for the Federal project but upon a foundation large enough and strong enough to permit subsequent enlargement so that the State, paying for that enlargement, would be able to utilize the storage reservoir as a part of the Feather River project when it comes into being.
Senator Bible. What is the date by which they must meet that agreement?

Senator Küchel. The bill provides that the agreement must be reached by the 1st day of January 1962. In the interim period of time a general election will have been held. The State legislature now is in its general session.

The Governor of California, appearing and testifying in favor of the legislation here before us, indicated that he had complete optimism that the legislature would proceed with the required State legislation to implement this bill. Beyond that he expects the State to pass such legislation as would require the people's approval to raise those moneys by a bond issue which would be necessary to carry on the Feather River project.

In connection with the statement I made just a moment ago about the Secretary's authority to construct this dam and to construct it in a fashion to permit subsequent enlargement, I would like to read the letter of Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl, which was received by the committee at the committee's request:

"Dear Senator Anderson: The language of Committee Print No. 1 on S. 44 in lines 17 to 20, page 2, provides that the San Luis Dam and Reservoir shall be constructed so as to permit future expansion. We assume this language applies to enlargement to accommodate the State plan rather than an enlarged Federal project.

"I am informed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and I agree, that in the event the Bureau of Reclamation so constructs the San Luis Dam, the provisions to permit future expansion will be generally as follows:

"1. Installation of outlet works in the initial structure of sufficient capacity to accommodate ultimate use,

"2. Acquisition of lands and rights-of-way to elevations ample to accommodate the 2,100,000 acre-foot reservoir, and

"3. Construction of those elements of the dam, such as the cutoff trench and the impervious core that would be extremely difficult and costly to modify later, to specifications that would serve the larger dam structure.

"I am advised further by the Bureau that if provision were to be made for enlargement the main structure would not be constructed initially to the base width necessary for the higher dam. Several minor saddle dams would also be involved in construction of a 1 million acre-foot reservoir. These would be constructed in the most economical manner to permit their later enlargement."

I want, of course, that that be made a part of the report at this point so that the intent by which this legislation would be considered here and, I hope in the Congress generally, would be clear and unmisakeable.

The bill thus provides for a contract to be entered into with the State under which the dam to a capacity of 2,100,000 acre-feet would be constructed. It provides for the transfer of title of the necessary real property interests from the State to the Federal Government, and it has adequate and reasonable provision for operation of the reservoir.

This, Mr. Chairman, represents, I think, an admirable type of cooperation between the two levels of government, Federal and State. It provides for an equitable cost sharing between them. It also pro-
vides that if the State were to be unable to come into any agreement, then the Secretary, as a Federal project alone, would commence construction of the project, but in no event should such construction commence until 90 days after the Secretary has reported to the Congress.

This legislation has been approved by the Department of the Interior, the Budget Bureau, the Governor of California and, in essence, by this committee and by the Senate last year.

I want to say very frankly that, in my judgment, the reason that this long overdue legislation has not previously been written into law by the Congress has been because of a sectional dispute, sometimes bitter, between people in the north of my State and people in the south. But I am delighted to tell you that, as a result of a series of conferences in which I participated last week or the week before last, the people representing the various sections of the State have agreed to urge, on a unanimous basis, favorable consideration of this legislation by the Congress.

Two more things ought to be mentioned.

An amendment was proposed by both the Senators from California, which is in the bill now before us, to make crystal clear that reclamation law will apply to all waters flowing from San Luis Dam which serve the Federal Central Valley project, and, further, that State law and State law alone shall govern the use to which the waters may be put which flow from the San Luis Dam into the State system.

One more thing.

As Senator Anderson suggested, the bill also authorizes the Secretary to provide supplemental water service to the lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties.

I recall with pleasure that my friend from Idaho, the able junior Senator from that State, matriculated at Stanford. That area, he will recall, is in exceedingly dire straits now from the standpoint of supplemental water, and this would recognize that responsibility. It would further provide, however, that no construction of such additional facilities should be undertaken until feasibility has been determined, and, beyond that, that the Governor of California shall have notified the Department of the Interior that the State approves such works of construction.

Aside from those amendments which I have commented on, Mr. Chairman, the balance of the amendments, I think I may say in all truthfulness, are technical in character where they differ from the bill as it was approved last year.

**QUESTION BY SENATOR BIBLE**

**Senator Bible.** The overall cost of the project is $290 million; is that correct?

**Senator Kuchel.** The overall cost to the Federal Government would be approximately $290 million, and that would be the ceiling which would be placed on this present legislation.

**Senator Bible.** Does that include the larger cost for the footings?

**Senator Kuchel.** Yes; it does.

**Senator Bible.** That is an additional $10 million, the footings for a larger dam?
Senator Kuchel. Yes; in round figures, $10,814,000; almost $11 million for the footings and other facilities of the dam.

Mr. Lineweaver. Senator Kuchel, you may desire to state that should the State and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation work out this joint contract, the cost to the Federal Government would probably be reduced to $250 million.

Senator Kuchel. And is that included in your memorandum of yesterday, Goodrich?

Mr. Lineweaver. No, sir; but it was stated at the hearing.

Senator Kuchel. By the Department of the Interior?

Mr. Lineweaver. Yes, sir.

Senator Kuchel. Yes, that is important, and I thank you for it.

FURTHER QUESTION BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Senator O'Mahoney. May I ask you, Senator, if this letter of Secretary Aandahl, dated March 24, 1959, which you have just read into the record, was written on the basis of this document which we call Committee Print No. 1? This is the precise one that he had before him?

The reason I ask that question is because in the opening sentence it is not altogether clear that he is referring to this specific amendment.

Senator Kuchel. I will answer that, Senator, unequivocally. That is, however, the fact.

Senator O'Mahoney. That is what I thought.

Then it is your understanding that these subparagraphs in Secretary Aandahl's letter, labeled "1, 2, and 3," constitute the type of dam and reservoir construction which is meant by the amendatory language "the joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed"?

Senator Kuchel. It is, without any reservation at all.

Senator O'Mahoney. And then I notice from the remaining phrase of that opening part, the new sentence reads as follows: "and other joint-use facilities may be constructed so as to * * *"?

Now the use of the word "may" there has been followed, I assume, because the construction of these other joint-use facilities is dependent upon the agreement with the State.

Senator Kuchel. The Senator is correct.

Senator O'Mahoney. Then in line 23 of page 2 there is amendatory language consisting of the words "or the joint-use facilities," and it says: "or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area and the State's service area as hereinafter provided."

The words "hereinafter provided" are amendatory words?

Senator Kuchel. Yes, indeed.

Senator O'Mahoney. And that, likewise, is intended to make it clear that the obligation of the Federal Government to build these additional joint-use facilities is dependent on the agreement with the State?

Senator Kuchel. Precisely.

Senator O'Mahoney. Then on page 4 there is no amendment, but there is a proviso beginning in line 19 which reads as follows: "Pro-
That, if the Secretary so determines,—that is to say that he determines that the prospects for agreement with the State are not reasonably firm—"he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety-calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days)."

There appears to be no language to indicate why that 90-day calendar period is provided. Is it the intention to give to Congress 90 days in which to reexamine the matter and the failure of the State to enter into a joint contract?

Senator Kuchel. I will say "Yes," but I will say more than that.

This is, without any question of a doubt, an authorization for the construction of the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. It is the hope and it is the belief of those who sponsor the bill that the State will join in the development, and that the San Luis will be an integrated reservoir of twice the capacity which the Federal construction alone would envisage.

The 90-day provision was added a year ago in an attempt to indicate to the people in the House of Representatives the desire on the part of the sponsors of this legislation in the Senate a fairness in which that additional period would be given for any activity by Congress which Congress might deem appropriate.

Senator O'Mahoney. Would that include a decision not to proceed because the State had not made the contract?

Senator Kuchel. By repeal legislation; yes, sir.

Senator O'Mahoney. In other words, that is the intention of it?

Senator Kuchel. Precisely.

Senator O'Mahoney. And on page 5, line 16, of Committee Print No. 1, the word "it" refers to the State, does it not? "* * * it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time * * *"

Senator Kuchel. Yes, sir.

Senator O'Mahoney. Then why is the word "unduly" inserted in line 21? "Provided, That the performance of such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation * * * *"

That is an amendment, that word "unduly"?

Senator Kuchel. Yes, and I think that was recommended so that, while it is clear, I think, that any such performance of work would to some extent, however minor, interfere with the operation, that it was not that minor interference which the Congress wished to disregard, but, rather——

Senator O'Mahoney. Do you have a statement to that effect in the report?

Senator Kuchel. At this point, Mr. Lineweaver, may I suggest, so there will be no misunderstanding, in answer to the question of the Senator from Wyoming, that we indicate why the word "unduly" on page 5, line 21 was put in there along the lines indicated.

Mr. Lineweaver. Yes, sir. The word "unduly" was suggested in order to protect the Federal operations.

Senator O'Mahoney. Thank you very much, Senator.
STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

Senator Church. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say it was my pleasure to sit in on the meeting of the subcommittee at the time this project was explored last week, to hear the many witnesses that the State of California brought to Washington to testify. I was very much impressed at the time with the excellence of the project, with the example it gives of the possibility of effective collaboration between the State government and the Federal Government, and also with the probing questions that were addressed to the text of the bill by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. I think he rendered a very real service in strengthening the language, in clarifying points that were obscure and subject to serious question, and that his work is reflected in the final text as it appears before the whole committee today.

I commend him for that and also the senior Senator from California for the excellent summation he has given the committee.

I think it is a very worthy project, and I would like to move that the committee report it out favorably.

Senator Kuchel. I gratefully appreciate what my friend has said, and I want to join with him in his comments with respect to my friend from Wyoming because he did perform an invaluable service. Beyond that let me say this is an example, I think, of where partnership between two public agencies represents a real opportunity for progress and a real example which I hope will be followed in other instances.

Senator O'Mahoney. I think it stands a very, very fine chance of establishing a very fine precedent.

Senator Kuchel. Once again I think my friend from Wyoming.

Let me second the motion, and, in doing so, say that I look forward, to the help of you gentlemen on the floor. The bill did pass a year ago. I would like to see it pass again, and then, more important, I would like and hope that this time it might pass the House of Representatives.

Senator Carroll. Just one question, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Church mentioned the hearings of last week or the week before.

Is there ample testimony in the record, in our reports? This is a large sum of money, and I think it would be wise for us to have the testimony of last week, or, if necessary, incorporate the testimony from other hearings.

Do you think there is adequate testimony in the testimony now?

Senator Kuchel. Yes, I do, although we have copies of the hearings of last year available which were incorporated in our proceedings by reference. I think a fairly clear picture was developed in our hearings this year.

Mr. Lineweaver. May I just, for Senator Carroll's information, say that the previous hearings—last year and the year before—were incorporated in the record last week by reference, so that the committee has the complete story.

Senator Kuchel. May I ask unanimous consent that in the report of S. 44 there be included the colloquy which occurred this morning between the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Colorado, and the Senator from California?
The Chairman. It is so ordered.
You have heard the motion. Those in favor of reporting S. 44 signify by saying "Aye?"
Opposed?
The "Ayes" have it, and it is reported unanimously with the amendments.
Senator Kuchel will make the report.
Senator O'Mahoney. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the request of the Senator from California for inclusion in the report covers the interrogation of the Senator by me also.
Senator Kuchel. Oh, yes; let us be a little liberal on that.
The Chairman. The entire colloquy will be printed as an appendix to the report on S. 44.