What You Can Do

Logically, it is an easy choice. Politically, preservation of the Stanislaus will not be easy. H.R. 4223 will be passed or rejected in 1980. It's now or never. Here's what you can do:

- 1. Help the Stanislaus campaign by contributing your time, ideas and money. Mail the attached card today.
- Send a letter to Senator Alan Cranston (at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510). Urge him to strongly support preservation of the Stanislaus. Please send a copy of your letter to our Bay Office.

If you have time, send letters to Representative Phil Burton, Chairman of the National Parks and Insular Affairs Subcommittee, and to Representative Don Clausen and Robert Lagomarsino, ranking Republicans on that Subcommittee. H.R. 4223 must pass through that Subcommittee. So urge each Representative to strongly support it. (Write to: Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.)

 If you have a few hours, seek an endorsement of this bill from any group (outdoors, political club, union, church, business) to which you belong. Write or call us for details.

Choice of the Future

Of the 25.000 miles of river and stream once flowing in California, nearly all are polluted, dried up, flooded behind 1,300 major dams and thousands of minor dams, otherwise developed, or just inaccessible. Only 200 to 400 miles of relatively pristine river are available for recreation; and the United States Bureau of Land Management has determined that none compare in beauty and accessibility, to the stretch of the Stanislaus between Camp 9 and Parrott's Ferry.

If the campaign to preserve the Little Tennessee River behind Tellico Dam² had been successful, a significant precedent for the South-east and the entire nation, would have been set — a precedent of respect for wilderness and instorical heritage, a precedent of conservation rather than waste of energy and water.

The campaign to preserve the Stanislaus is like the Tellico campaign, except we will win.

Help turn the nation around: it's your heritage and your future. Support H.R. 4223: make the Stanislaus Wild and Scenic in 1980.

Friends of the River 401 San Miguel Way Sacramento, CA 95819 (916) 451-9955

FOR/Bay Office Bldg. C, Fort Mason San Francisco, CA 94123 (415) 771-0400

FOR/Los Angeles Office 17758 Willard Reseda, CA 91335 (213) 343-6869

¹ Every fact and figure in this brochure is based on government reports. Write us for references.

² Just as the Stanislaus campaign is often described as a conflict between rafters and farmers, so the Tellico campaign was described as a conflict between a snail darter (an endangered species of fish) and a dam. In fact, each dam is demonstrably uneconomic, constructed for the profit of very special interests; and each dam was designed to destroy verplacable historical and recreational heritages.

The Stanislaus River Canyon:

Wild and Scenic in 1980?



Passage of a bill now in Congress would include a stretch of the Stanislaus in the National Wild and Scenic River System. That bill, H.R. 4223, will be passed or rejected in 1980.

Or Buried in 1981?

The Stanislaus: Your Heritage



It is your heritage

Melones Dam: The **Thief of Your Heritage**

New Melones Dam might rob you of the Stanislaus. Initially planned in 1944, this dam is now completed. The owner, the United States Water and Power Resources Service, the former Bureau of Reclamation, plans in 1981 to massively increase the size of the present reservoir upstream of the dam, principally to generate energy and to provide water for irrigation. The proposed reservoir, at an average depth of 100 feet, would flood the most precious stretch of river, from Camp 9 to Parrott's Ferry. (See the following map.) At what gain?

Because the flow of the Stanislaus is overly controlled at 12 because the how of the Stanislaus is overly controlled at 12 other dams. New Melones Dam cannot economically produce energy or water. Only 10% of its proposed reservoir could be diverted for irrigation. And energy could be generated there only 10% of the time. No sound business would own it: even if you ignore the principal cost. \$350 million, just the cost of running it would probably exceed the revenues from the sale of water and energy.

Moreover, eighteen years after the dam was authorized, the Federal Government has not been able to determine who deserves or needs the water for irrigation. No canals for delivery of the water have been authorized or built.

The hydroelectric energy from the dam would be used mostly to pump the water for irrigation. The net yield of energy would be sufficient to power California an hour or so, once a year

Given the doubtful value of storage for water or energy, the state's Resources Agency has concluded that the dam should be used to control floods, and to store only the present reservoir, sufficient for providing releases downstream during the dry summer and fall. These releases would maintain downstream fish and wildlife. The State of California is negotiating with the Federal Government to limit the size of the reservoir.

Meanwhile, an exciting coalition of financial, civic, political, educational and environmental organizations are supporting H.R. 4223, which would permanently limit the reservoir to



Parrott's Ferry. H.R. 4223 would include the Stanislaus, from Camp 9 to Parrott's Ferry, in the National Wild and Scenic **River System**

The permanent size of the reservoir, the fate of the upper river, will be determined in 1980.

The Big Picture of Energy and Water

The size of New Melones Reservoir must be determined in the context of the overall supplies of energy and water in California. How will an increased population be supplied with energy and water? How can industry and agriculture receive increased supplies, to allow for an expansion in the economy?

Some suppliers of energy and water, including the Federal Government, have grand plans for developing rivers and wilderness. Plans for over \$15 billion of new dams in California are on the drawing boards, for the near future. And between now and 1990, building new dams and other power-plants to produce energy for the increased population would cost our nation at least \$1.5 trillion in taxes and bills.

Still, energy and water seem in short supply, not because of a shortage of dams and power-plants, but because of waste.

According to an unpublished study by the Water and Powor Resources Service, farmers in the West apply 56% more water than is needed by the crops. The farmers use water so inefficiently because the Federal Government sells them water dirt-cheap and because many believe new dams can be built to remedy any shortage.

Similarly, the California Energy Commission has reported that at least 50% of the energy presently used is wasted.

Conservation - increased efficiency of use, decreased waste — is a leasible solution to shortages of water and energy. According to the National Water Commission and the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, the nation's population could increase to 300 million by the year 2000, the economy could increase proportionately — and if a moderate program of conservation is put into effect soon. only present supplies of energy and water will be needed

Besides being feasible, conservation is cheaper than new production of energy and water. Typically, it costs one-tenth to one-third as much. And it provides more jobs per dollar. The Joint Economic Committee has reported that conservation of energy (for example, installing insulation or solar collectors) provides nine times as many jobs per dollar as new production (like drilling new gas wells)

Economists estimate that half of inflation is caused by the high price of producing and supplying energy. Unemployment is similarly worsened. A moderate but serious program of conservation would lessen inflation. increase employment, and of course, preserve wilderness

It is time to choose our future: new dams and power-plants at boggling costs to the economy lesser cost and with greater benefits. - or conservation, at a

A massive reservoir behind New Melones Dam would encourage the continued squandering of water and energy. and the continued building of dams and power-plants. A moderate reservoir, a just and reasonable compromise. would set a tremendous precedent: serving increased population with conserved energy and water.

It is your choice.