Basic route, 2.5 million acre-feet

Assumptions.—As explained previously, some experts believe that 2.5 m.a.f. of augmentation annually will be required to provide for 7.5 m.a.f. of consumptive use in the Lower Colorado River Basin. The basic physical plan described above was modified to include the additional capacity necessary to meet the 2.5 m.a.f. capacity.

Hydrologic studies, based upon the assumptions inherent in the larger augmentation requirement, indicate that appropriate staging of the project would

be as follows:

Stage	Year	Water delivery		Cumulative
		Each stage (acre- feet per year)	Cumulative (acre- feet per year)	pumping power (megawatts) ¹
1 2 3 4	1985 1990 1995 2010	750, 000 500, 000 750, 000 500, 000	750, 000 1, 250, 000 2, 000, 000 2, 500, 000	425 708 1,133 1,416

¹ Thermal power requirement after deducting power produced at aqueduct power drops.

Costs.—Costs for the dual-purpose nuclear desalting plant were derived as explained in the discussion of the base plan. The summary of costs is as follow:

DUAL-PURPOSE NUCLEAR DESALTING PLANT—CONSTRUCTION AND O.M. & R. COSTS L
[In millions of dollars]

	Stage						
	1985	1990	1995	2010	Total		
Construction: Total Less non-Federal power	536. 00 194. 00	372. 00 130. 00	536. 00 194. 00	372. 00 130. 00	1,816 648		
Federal Desalted water Nuclear pumping power Annual O.M. & R.:1	342. 00 (300. 00) (42. 00)	242. 00 (214. 00) (28. 00)	324. 00 (300. 00) (42. 00)	242. 00 (214. 00) (28. 00)	1,168 (1,028) (140)		
Total, operation maintenance, and "interim replacement"Non-Federal power	11.87 3.00	20. 20 4. 99	32.07 7.99	40.40 9.98	·		
Federal: Desalted water Nuclear pumping power	8. 23 . 64	14.14 1.07	22. 37 1. 71				
SubtotalSinking fund for rebuilding plants	8. 87 7. 31	15. 21 12. 47	24. 08 19. 78				
Total, Federal O.M. & R	16.18	27.68	43. 86	55. 36			

¹ Cumulative costs after completion of stage.