

be maintained during those periods when return flows would cause the TDS to exceed the suggested standards.

This water can be provided at an incremental cost of pumping energy estimated to average \$14,000 annually. This cost would be allocated to all functions of the unit.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration will continue their cooperative studies during preconstruction investigations to refine these findings and develop operating criteria and safeguards.

Total project and assigned costs for the initial stage of the Oahu unit are as follows:

Project costs -----	\$191,389,000
Assigned costs—storage and power-----	42,649,000
Total cost -----	234,038,000
Less assigned costs and money spent or appropriated to June 30, 1965 -----	—45,546,000
Total cost to complete-----	188,492,000

The assigned costs are the investments already made for the mainstream reservoirs and power system of the Missouri River Basin project.

The total new money required to complete the project is, as I said, \$188,492,000.

The costs to June 30, 1965, include \$2,897,000 for the existing James Diversion Dam and investigation costs through fiscal year 1965.

As indicated in the Secretary's August 29 transmittal of his feasibility report—House Document No. 163, 90th Congress—on the unit, certain changes were made in the plan of development that reduced the estimated costs.

Some of the principal supply works originally were sized to accommodate requirements for the ultimate stage of development. This proposal has now been dropped from the plan, and facilities will be built only to accommodate initial stage requirements. This reduces the project cost by \$11,417,000.

Senator McGOVERN. May I ask a question at that point?

The reduction in the size of these main canals to accommodate only the first stage rather than the ultimate 495,000-acre project which we all expect to be completed, in no way jeopardizes the ultimate completion of that project, does it?

Mr. HOLUM. I think not, Senator, not at all. I think that this reserves options for the executive branch and the State of South Dakota and was a good decision. It in no way indicates any attitudes in the future with respect to the construction of the additional stages of the unit.

Senator McGOVERN. With or without the \$11 million figure which you quoted as representing the reduction in project costs, the question of moving ahead on completion of the ultimate project is not affected?

Mr. HOLUM. I think not.

Senator MUNDT. I want to button that down a little more definitely, if I may. I think my colleague brings out a good point. The way this sentence reads, if you take it out of context, somebody might get the wrong impression. You say that the proposal has now been dropped. I am sure you meant the proposal that was dropped was to insert into