Mr. ASPINALL. Whose projections are these?

Mr. RITER. These are projections of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. ASPINALL. I just wanted this committee to know that.

Mr. RITER. The table on page 236 of the 1965 hearings shows that the spills from Lake Mead as of year 1975 average 653,000 acre-feet, for the year 1990, the spills from Lake Mead average 269,000 acre-feet per year, for the year 2000, the spills from Lake Mead are shown to be 148,000 acre-feet per year, and for the year 2030, these spills are listed as averaging 158,000 acre-feet per year. These all reflect average conditions.

I would like also to qualify them to this extent: these computations assumed a 60-year runoff cycle—1906 through 1965, inclusive. In each one of these studies, we repeated this hydrologic cycle for the projected level of development of the year involved.

If you examine the details year by year, you will find a good many years when there was no spill. Values shown are averages for a 60-year period.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that complete operation studies be placed in the record at this place.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. May I reserve the right to object, please?

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. The spillage Mr. Riter has told us about is over a 60-year period and embraces a period when by and large, the upper basin projects were not operative.

Is this correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. So the million acre-feet that is being spilled on a yearly basis would largely be upper basin water.

Is that not a correct assumption?

Mr. ASPINALL. I think this is correct. On the other hand, they will furnish the information for us to take up in committee.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I just wanted to have that clear in my mind, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. HOSMER. Further reserving the right to object, the Secretary introduced a factor of 24- and 48-year historic dry cycle on the river and the historic average of a 24-year wet cycle. If you take the mean 24- and 48-year historic dry cycle at 36 years plus 24 years wet cycle, that gives you a 60-year full cycle. As this averaging has been done on a 60-year cycle, does this take cognizance of these wet and dry cycles in the sense that there might be a better time to start the cycle as an independent calculation, assuming that we are now at some point in the cycle, and work out the years ahead on that basis, rather than just averaging out as you have done?