

remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and prior to the period for the transaction of routine morning business, the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 9 a.m.

Following the recognition of the two leaders or their designees, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the distinguished junior Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Chair will lay before the Senate the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, H.R. 15418. On that bill, there is a limitation of 2 hours, and of course a time limitation on amendments thereto. Undoubtedly, there will be at least one roll-call vote, especially in connection with the final passage of the bill.

Upon the disposition of H.R. 15418, the Department of the Interior Appropriation bill, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3390, the unfinished business, the Foreign Assistance Act

Amendments. The pending question will be on the adoption of an amendment to be offered by the distinguished Republican leader, Mr. SCOTT, and the distinguished manager of the bill, Mr. SPARKMAN. There is a limitation on that amendment—the so-called Bahrain amendment—of 1 hour and 30 minutes. There will undoubtedly be a roll-call vote on that amendment.

Upon the disposition of the amendment by Mr. SCOTT and Mr. SPARKMAN, unless there are further amendments to S. 3390 at that time, ready to be called up, the Senate then will temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and will resume consideration of S. 3010, the OEO bill. Undoubtedly, there will be roll-call votes on that second-track item tomorrow.

The leadership would express the hope that Senators would be ready promptly to call up their amendments thereto, and would also express the hope that the bill can be disposed of tomorrow. It is the intention of the leadership to continue action on that bill until a reasonably late hour tomorrow evening, if need be, in order to dispose of it.

Only 2 days remain, following tomorrow, if the Senate is to hope to complete its business on Friday of this week, and much remains to be done. The debt limitation bill will be coming over from the other body presumably tomorrow morning. It is necessary that the Senate complete action on the debt limitation bill before it adjourns for the holiday and the Democratic Convention. The public works appropriations bill will be before the Senate on Friday. Conference reports will also be coming along and may necessitate yea and nay votes.

Senators have been alerted to the necessity of the Senate remaining in session on Saturday in the event action on the debt limitation bill is not completed by the close of business on Friday. Therefore, the Senate will come in early and will stay in late daily, in an effort to complete its work and, hopefully, still adjourn at the close of business on Friday, as previously stated.

Mr. President, I repeat: There will be several roll-call votes tomorrow. It cannot be estimated exactly, but the first roll-call vote could come—depending upon whether or not an amendment is offered to the Interior appropriation bill, there being a limitation of time on amendments—as early as 10:30 a.m., 11 a.m., or 11:30 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 8:56 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 28, 1972, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of June 26), 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert J. Blackwell, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs, vice Andrew E. Gibson.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DREXEL UNIVERSITY GRADUATION "PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT"

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 3, Gen. George A. Lincoln, the distinguished Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, addressed the 1972 graduating class of Drexel University, in Philadelphia.

In his speech, appropriately entitled "People Are Important," General Lincoln urged the graduates to avoid the easy pitfall that views the problems of our society with an attitude of cynicism. Instead, he encouraged members of the graduating class to face, as real, the problems which confront us, and to welcome crisis in the light of "challenging opportunity for improvement."

As General Lincoln himself concedes, graduation speakers are expected to talk of "challenge." Yet few addresses which I have read do so with the perspective and persuasion embodied in this speech.

Because I believe General Lincoln's

comments will be of widespread interest, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT

(Graduation Address by Honorable G. A. Lincoln)

President Hagerty; Distinguished Members of the Board of Trustees of Drexel University; Distinguished Guests; Members of the University Faculty and Staff; Graduating Class of 1972; Parents; Relatives and Friends.

We are here to do honor to and to mark a special and unique occasion in the lives of many people present today—you of the graduating class, your parents and your faculty. We especially honor you graduates who are Drexel's input this year to the essential flow of leadership for our complicated society. I note that this input goes beyond our own country, and that Drexel contributes to foreign lands as well.

Those here, including myself, who are, or have been, faculty know that our monuments, our successes, our disappointments, are embodied in each graduating class. The annual class represents the tangible product of each year of effort. Having come to know the objectives, the pattern, and ways

of education and development of our—for it is now mine also—university, I share with confidence the feeling that you of the faculty have built well with these young men and women for the years ahead.

Mine is a sobering responsibility to speak to the thousands of people here present. I am going to talk principally about people rather than policy—for policy exists only to help people.

Graduations should be, and are, principally personal occasions for the graduates and those personally associated with them and their institution. Words spoken formally are not essential to the day, but hopefully can be helpful to the audience. My words are directed centrally to you of the graduating class.

While I am going to speak briefly on at least one of the great problems with which you must live and grapple, my main point is a simple one. In our lives, whether they are oriented toward hardware, or management, or government, or housekeeping—or in some other direction—in this existence, only people count. People are really the aim and the goal of our efforts. And, only through and with people do you get things done. The art of getting things done is called "management" by some; the military people call the art "leadership;" there are occupants of some buildings in Washington who call the art of getting things done "politics." Whatever it might be called, it is only people that can make it happen, and

it is only for the benefit of people that it should happen.

The certainty of change characterizes our society, sector by sector, and our country as a whole. One of the tasks of leadership is to foresee and to influence change in the best interests of people. The alternative, too often, is to accept the future by default because of inaction in the present—and then complain about the situation when it is too late to do anything about it.

Forward-looking attitudes are what we need as individuals and as a nation. Yet, attitudes alone are not enough. It is necessary in our highly complex society to have the tools to translate attitudes into action and actions into results.

The tools of society are its institutions. Through them, we can direct our actions to get those results we wish from our lives. But only if the shape of our institutions so permit.

We are faced now, as in some other times, with an eroding confidence in those institutions. Recent polls indicate that compared to five and ten years ago, people do not think as highly as they did of the leadership and tenets of business, the professions, religion, the courts, labor, or of almost any field or institution one might mention. There is a skepticism, even a cynicism—sometimes an attitude of stop the world, I'm getting off.

We should not look on this temporary situation so much with alarm as with a sense of the need for people who will work to understand and solve complex problems in the realization that we live in a real, not an ideal, world.

Those institutions in which confidence has eroded have served us well in the past. They cannot always be expected to serve the future without change.

The course of realism and of caution is to join the institutions of society, but to join with eyes open to the needs and opportunities for change. Only by building better institutions, on the base of the old and proven ones, will we meet the demands placed on us.

It is to you who are part of, and representative of, the flow of new leadership in our society that we have to look for the needed continuing adjustment. It is also to you that we have to look for the skills that make the institutional changes safely and appropriately in our increasingly complex world.

In the perspective of our country's history, each generation has had its major tasks. They have at times been tasks obscured in controversy and not clearly recognized, even less applauded, until some time afterwards. Our wars, with perhaps one exception, have significantly lacked unanimity. So also did the great economic changes of the 1930's.

Even our country's magnificent support in rebuilding the post-World War II world was less than universally acclaimed by our people. But let us look at this last clearly. We have carried those external responsibilities in recognition of our own national self-interest and not as a continuing task justified on any other basis.

It is sometimes alleged, nevertheless, that our country is now turning inward, away from the great global responsibilities we have carried since 1940. Certainly those foreign responsibilities are changing but they will not disappear. The unprecedented arms control pact achieved last week in Moscow is another proof that we continue to shoulder our world responsibilities. I suggest that the present and the future require more of the effort already being devoted to our home problems, rather than a dramatic shift in emphasis away from foreign responsibilities. I also suggest that our society and our country are great enough to do both.

The future, like the past, does not hold quick, easy, and complete solutions. In fact, our current problems, both foreign and do-

mestic, are more likely to be only partially solved before new and more difficult problems arise to replace them.

In multiple problem solving, the first human reaction is to try to set priorities so as to make the task easier by doing first things first—even though there may be a lot of difference of opinion about what comes first.

But there can be no priorities among essentials, and we have a lot of essential things to do. All the problems must be tackled, and the central problem is the wise allocation of our skills and resources among them.

One thing in our favor, or more correctly in your favor because I am close to the end of my problem-solving career, and you are about to have to provide solutions, is that we have at least begun to work on some of the problems which require long lead times. We have, for instance, already moved to deal with our city problems and our environment—programs designed to preserve and improve our quality of life.

The curriculum of our University is significantly oriented toward these future problems of our society. It is not unusual to speak of life beyond graduation as a challenge—a challenge to meet and solve the crises of your generation. The word crises, I understand, is written in Chinese as a combination of the characters for "dangerous" and for "opportunity." I urge you to look upon crises in that light—challenging opportunity for improvement.

You of Drexel, as a result of a realistic higher education pattern, have combined study and work and are already well down the road to understanding that challenge.

A major part of that challenge, with problems in the near and long term, is energy supply and its use. This problem is fast approaching the status of crisis. I here take a few minutes to strive to enlist you of this graduating class in a major task of your generation, the continuing availability of an adequate, clean, secure energy supply at acceptable cost.

Our society, our position in the world, our very way of life, its quality and goals, are dependent on adequate and secure, energy sources.

Our country has been lavish in our use of energy because there has been an abundance. The controversies of the past have been over costs and controls, not over ways to provide enough energy of the right kind to meet our needs.

That picture has changed quickly and drastically. We now approach a period of scarcity. The extent and nature of the scarcity will depend on how quickly and wisely we move to meet the energy challenge.

Ours is not a problem of energy availability in the abstract. This is a problem in national security. It is also a problem in protecting our environment. Technological, scientific, economic, and social consideration must also be addressed. All of these have to be taken together in forging toward solutions.

Some might solve the energy dilemma by the single factor approach of stringent limits on increases in consumption. This is a doomsday view that concentrates on the limits of energy resources on our planet. It looks to the end of the fossil fuel age, perhaps within the lifetime of some of you here. I do not hold to the doomsday view, but rather to the more positive view that the energy problem is best met by resourceful adaptation of both production and consumption factors. The goal is to continue our present and planned quality of life. That is a major part of our challenge.

We cannot resolve the competition between, say, environmental imperatives and energy supply objectives by throwing away either. As I have already mentioned, there can be no priorities among essentials.

President Nixon closed his Clean Energy Message of a year ago by expressing his confidence, "that we can continue to know the

blessings of both a high energy civilization and a beautiful and healthy environment."

Our country now, of course, has an energy policy based for many decades on the assumption of continuing abundance. We need a change toward a comprehensive energy policy.

We do have some significant inconsistencies in our current energy policy which need review—such matters as the price of gas, Natural gas is now in short supply and our most desirable fuel, yet priced more cheaply than other fuels.

Our energy dilemma is going to be manageable only if we exercise the same resourcefulness on the side of moderating demand that we must exercise on the supply side. A million barrels per day equivalent of oil not used because of fuel energy conservation is an even better achievement than the same amount of energy developed—since we don't have to pay for it. There are vast opportunities on this little explored frontier of energy conservation. Transportation efficiency, production of electricity, home insulation—by which, incidentally, you can cut fuel consumption by half—and consumer incentives are just some examples. Of course, one of the more unpopular consumer incentives toward conservation is to raise the price of energy—which undoubtedly will occur.

In the context of the search for an energy policy to meet our needs, it is appropriate to speak here at this great technically based University of the need for a much more broadly based profession of engineering than has been traditional in the past. There have to be trade-offs—opportunity costs, for you graduating economists—in reaching wise decisions on our energy problems, calculated across the lines of academic disciplines and across the boundaries of sectors of our society and economy. Factories, cars, transit systems, cities can only be designed for the needs of America's future by many disciplines working together—by recognizing that trade-offs are required among economic needs, security needs, environmental needs—in sum people's needs—and the technical limits that must apply.

It is heartening to see Drexel taking a leadership role in providing this new socio-technology and to note that the University has a Center within which one finds, side by side, an Institute for Environmental Studies and an Institute for Energy Sources and Systems. This interdisciplinary cooperation reflects a forward commitment to developing solutions to the frontier problems of our society.

The great business of universities is education of people like yourselves. Many of you will work for Government, and as one who has done so for over 40 years, I encourage you to this gratifying life of service to your fellow man. Many of you will teach. All of you will influence the decisions made on the important problems of tomorrow.

I close these remarks with the words of a great American, Henry Stimson, a Secretary of State who was Secretary of War during World War II. He wrote at the end of his autobiography that:

"Those who read this book will mostly be younger than I, men of the generations who must bear the active part in the work ahead. Let them learn from our adventures what they can. Let them charge us with our failures and do better in their turn. But let them not turn aside from what they have to do, nor think that criticism excuses inaction. Let them have hope, and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat. The only deadly sin I know is cynicism."

Rather than cynicism, we need people with generosity, skill, and knowledge. People with hope for a better future. People with a willingness to heed the call to service of all the people and a realization of the satisfaction that such service gives.

I am confident we have these people in you.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as concerned member of the Democratic Platform Committee I have developed a statement of principle, and suggested plank affirming support for neighborhood schools. Copies were provided to each member of the drafting subcommittee upon its organization last Friday. These positions seem to me to be in the best interest of a great political party and of the Nation. I commend them to the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress as valid objectives of both political parties and of all Americans:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE AND SUGGESTED PLANK AFFIRMING SUPPORT FOR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

(By Congressman JACK BRINKLEY)

The Democratic Platform Committee, in the self interest of the Democratic Party and of the Nation, should adopt a common-sense platform. Not unlike a re-organizing or rebuilding football team, basic fundamentals should be emphasized over wild schemes and innovations.

For example, while adequate water and sewerage for our cities and towns might not be a burning national issue, it can be authoritatively and categorically stated and documented that it is a bread and butter, major consideration of America's backbone constituency.

Our Party should reaffirm the principles—
(a) That the war in Vietnam should be terminated by a negotiated agreement for an immediate ceasefire providing for mutual, immediate return of Prisoners of War and an accounting for service personnel missing in action; that our withdrawal will begin contemporaneously therewith; that we support maximum protection for every single American serviceman in Vietnam;

(b) That schools should be equal in quality and that children should attend school within their own neighborhoods;

(c) That use of narcotics and dangerous drugs in any form is not in the private or public interest and we vigorously support elimination of the licentious traffic in drugs, marked by an ever-broadening trail of broken lives;

(d) That we are fully committed to giving priority consideration to the special needs of our senior citizens;

(e) That our Party pledges an active and aggressive war on pollution but with the wisdom not to kill industry in the process;

(f) That the dignity of work and the dignity of man are inseparable; that there can be no substitute for training and job opportunity;

(g) That strong mandatory penalties should be assessed against anyone abusing his Constitutional right to keep and bear firearms;

(h) That amnesty under existing Selective Service laws and provisions of the Code of Military Justice would constitute a gross breach of faith with every man in the mili-

tary service of this country, and that individual cases and circumstances must be measured against applicable law and humane concepts;

(i) That a prosperous agricultural community is the Nation's insurance against domestic want and world famine;

(j) That a fair relationship with our trading partners is necessary to our industrial well-being; i.e., unrestricted flooding of our markets with foreign goods should no more be tolerated by us than it would be by them;

(k) That the need for urban rapid transit be met but without cannibalizing the Highway Trust Fund; and that said Fund be maintained and extended to encompass a greater network of interstate and defense highways, particularly in deficient areas and in the Western states;

(l) That Regional Commissions be more fully implemented and utilized as vehicles for orderly growth, consistent with a better environmental quality of life;

(m) That the integrity of marriage, the sacred union between a man and a woman, is in the national interest;

(n) That abortion is a moral and medical judgment subject to the laws of the various states;

(o) That the states continue their jurisdiction over closed or open shops under the proven principle that the government closest to the people governs best;

(p) That the preferential treatment of any group, whether majority or minority, is inconsistent with Constitutional concepts;

(q) That power, recreation and anti-flooding projects be considered individually, from the standpoint of the public good and the national need—development consistent with the 4-H Creed of making the best better.

PROPOSAL BY REPRESENTATIVE JACK BRINKLEY TO THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE, ADAPTED FROM STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE BRINKLEY BEFORE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1972

On January 20th of 1970 during the Second Session of the 91st Congress, I proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This proposal, H.J. Res. 1048, would provide that the involuntary busing of any student to a school or the required attendance of any student at a school outside the student's local school zone for the purpose of achieving racial balance or quotas is prohibited. On January 22, 1971, near the beginning of the First Session of the 92nd Congress, I reintroduced this Constitutional Amendment, designated H.J. Res. 43 which, like its predecessor, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, where it has lingered.

May I propound a question and briefly build around it, giving what I believe to be a fair perspective and an accurate evaluation.

Question: Should neighborhood schools whose students happen to preponderate in one race or another because of housing patterns be required to bus students to achieve proportional racial balance?

In the landmark decision of *Shelley vs. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948), the U.S. Supreme Court established the criteria that racially restrictive covenants on land are unenforceable. Prior to that time many housing patterns were strictly controlled in most sections of the country through this device—restrictive covenants based on race—with complete Government sanction. Schools resulting from that situation are just as surely de jure as those schools formerly operating under a dual system. Yet this has been the hypocritical excuse to exempt most non-Southern systems from that classification. Thus, if the answer to my question is in the negative, then neither should busing be required of former dual systems under no less authority than *Shelley vs. Kraemer*.

Just as busing to achieve segregation was wrong, busing to achieve integration is wrong. To draft other children from unwilling parents to serve as social leavening; to transport human beings from one end of a county to another to provide others with academic fellowship; to yoke together those of unequal learning readiness, ability, and cultural background in the faint hope of benefiting one at the almost certain expense of the other; to punish some to pamper others, to set the stage for disorder and educational chaos as an atonement for past real or fancied wrongs; to use educational institutions as factories for social experiment and reform; to deny the rights of many to grant a license to a few; is measureless folly!

Who is there among us who would seriously advocate resettlement of citizens around the country in order to achieve geographic proportional racial composition? But is not the principle of busing precisely the same?

We choose where we live, whether in Maine or Georgia, commensurate with our ability to afford it, based specifically on the considerations of school area, church affiliation, nearness to friends and the like.

In the words of Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "They (the Founding Fathers) conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), held that a black child cannot be excluded from one school and required to attend another school solely because of his race. All too many governmental officials have misconstrued *Brown* to require that black and white children must be excluded from one school and required to attend another solely because of their race (i.e., to meet racial quota or balance goals).

The situation might be likened to the invalidating of laws requiring black citizens to sit in the rear of a bus. A great many governmental officials are in the position of insisting that the decision requires black and white passengers to be seated according to a percentage or quota system so as to enforce a uniform racial distribution throughout the bus. We object to the government's conversion of a personal right into a personal duty, just as we would object to its equating a citizen's right of religious freedom with a duty to go to church.

I don't know how things are in the schools of New York or Michigan. If I am to believe hearsay evidence, things aren't so good. And in my District things aren't so good either, and it's because our systems are having to major in minors, chief of which is the judicial obsession to balance the races.

The identity of the individual, and in a larger sense the identity of his or her neighborhood, is also very important and worthy of protection. Our correspondence from black and white citizens alike point out the desirability of pride in identity and culture. An individual's identity in a democratic society—whether he is white or black—should not, under any reasonable circumstance, be bent to the will of the state. To absorb a minority into a majority as a judicial concept of the state is wrong to both minority and majority alike.

CONCLUSION

When emphasis in school is placed on the R of Race over the traditional Three R's of Reading, Writing and Arithmetic, we know what will happen. We have seen it with our eyes. We have felt it in our hearts. Noble motivation has not achieved the envisioned or desired results: the uplifting of all children.

Quality education can best be achieved in a learning environment. Our resources are limited and can best be utilized to create such a place in neighborhood schools where a feeling of belonging is present; where a feeling of security exists; where a sense of

participation by parent and child alike is present. To consume resources of time and money for busing, for the purpose of achieving racial balance, is so obviously wrong, meaningless, and unproductive; it is a void, demeaning. It is Mercurochrome when the need is Penicillin.

The present stage in history was thousands of years in the setting. As our republican form of government changes the scenery and improvises the dialogue, may it have the wisdom and patience to allow the players free constitutional choice in finding their changing roles and adjusting to their new parts—without coercion. This Nation is not playing a one-night stand.

Therefore, I respectfully submit that we include a plank in the Democratic Platform providing that schools should be equal in quality and that children should attend school within their own neighborhoods.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE DENIES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE ACCESS TO VITAL REC- ORDS FOR MANAGEMENT AUDIT PURPOSES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, last month the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee received testimony from Deputy Comptroller of the United States, Mr. Robert F. Keller, concerning the difficulties which the GAO has had in obtaining information from certain executive agencies. GAO must have access to agency records and procedures to adequately carry out its responsibilities as the watchdog for Congress under provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act. See RECORD, May 18, 1972, page 18121.

Most of the absolute refusals for GAO access have come from units of the Treasury Department, including the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Customs, the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, and from international lending institutions.

On June 1, Commissioner Walters of the IRS and other officials testified in response to the subcommittee's invitation to answer the charges by GAO. IRS acknowledged GAO's charges—admitted it denied access to GAO—and then defended its behavior on grounds which I and other members of the subcommittee consider exceedingly weak. It is incredible that IRS continues to thwart an effective review of its operations by the GAO. This matter will be dealt with subsequently in our report and recommendations based on our exhaustive hearings on the Freedom of Information Act.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the two excellent articles written on this subject by Mr. E. Edward Stephens, nationally known syndicated expert on tax matters. They appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 26, 1972, and on June 16, 1972.

The articles follow:

IRS REFUSES TO BE AUDITED

(By E. Edward Stephens)

DEAR COUNSEL: In fiscal 1971, which ended last June 30, the Internal Revenue Service collected nearly \$192 billion, and spent almost \$1 billion. Does the General Accounting Office audit these operations and report results to Congress?

A. GAO has tried to do so, but has failed. Reason: IRS wouldn't let GAO auditors see tax returns and other records.

This bombshell was exploded by Deputy Controller General Robert F. Keller, testifying May 16 before the House foreign operations and government information subcommittee, chaired by William S. Moorhead, D-Pa.

Rep. Frank Horton, R-N.Y., was amazed. He asked Keller if he was saying that GAO had "really" been accorded "literally no access" to information sufficient to make an audit or any study as to what IRS is doing.

"Yes, sir; that is what I am saying," Keller replied. Without access to IRS records, he said, "the management of this very important and very large agency will not be subject to any meaningful independent audit."

When asked why he thought IRS balked at the prospect of an GAO audit, Keller implied that some IRS operations might not stand the light of day. "I guess" IRS doesn't want anything to happen to break down public confidence in the Service, he said.

Confidence of taxpayers and their representatives on Capitol Hill already has been seriously shaken by recent disclosures of statistics that IRS keeps under wraps. To pick one example, they show that Manhattan taxpayers in fiscal 1971 were able to settle tax deficiencies at an average of 35 cents on the dollar, while New Jersey taxpayers had to pay 83 cents.

This is the type of information that GAO wants to unearth by auditing IRS operations, just as it examines the activities of other federal agencies. As an example, Keller said GAO would like to know whether IRS treats delinquent taxpayers the same from coast to coast. If not, GAO would recommend changes in operating procedures.

It certainly can't be argued that IRS does not need watching. Over the years, scandalous practices have been exposed in various offices of the Service, including those at Boston, New York and San Francisco.

In refusing to open its records to GAO, IRS relies on sections 6406 and 8022 of the Internal Revenue Code. But any law school dropout could see that the IRS interpretation of these sections is ludicrously strained. Subcommittee staff director William G. Phillips put it succinctly when he said IRS is "leaning on two weak reeds."

IRS completely ignores the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which set up the GAO to serve as the watchdog of Congress. There's no room for doubt about what Congress always has intended this organization to do. The act gives GAO sweeping authority to examine the "books, documents, papers, or records" of all federal departments and agencies. IRS is not exempted.

Phillips said it isn't only the GAO that has been straightarmed when attempting to examine IRS records. He said taxpayers also have had "great difficulty" in obtaining information from IRS under the 1967 Freedom of Information Act. This is the understatement of the year.

Phillips said "many, many" IRS denial of information cases had been called to the subcommittee's attention. "I think there is an attitude here on the part of IRS that extends to Congress, the GAO and the public at large," he concluded.

CONGRESS UNIT PUSHING IRS

(By E. Edward Stephens)

DEAR COUNSEL: All U.S. taxpayers are losers if the Internal Revenue Service doesn't ad-

minister the tax laws fairly, efficiently and economically. Is there a practical way to improve IRS administration?

A. Yes—give the General Accounting Office a free hand to audit IRS operations and come up with recommendations. If IRS won't adopt recommended improvements, Congress can force compliance by appropriate legislation.

IRS officials shudder at the thought. They contend that, since Congress has authorized the House-Senate Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to keep an eye on IRS administration, this cuts GAO out.

So IRS now collects nearly \$200 billion a year, and spends about \$1 billion a year—all without any independent audit by a disinterested organization.

Congress soon may end these freewheeling operations. If so, it will be one of the biggest tax reform developments in U.S. history.

Since Congress wants to keep tabs on how U.S. agencies handle money it set up the GAO to audit them. The 1921 Budget and Accounting Act gave GAO sweeping authority to examine the books and records of all U.S. departments and agencies.

There are a few exceptions. For example, Congress has specifically exempted the Central Intelligence Agency from Budget and Accounting Act requirements. But it never has exempted IRS. Yet the Service claims that Internal Revenue Code sections 6406 and 8022 let IRS off the GAO audit hook.

Deputy Comptroller General Robert F. Keller brought the matter to a head in his May 16 testimony before the House foreign operations and government information subcommittee. He said that IRS officials wouldn't let GAO personnel see tax returns and other records essential to any meaningful audit of IRS operations.

The subcommittee bristled. Chairman William S. Moorhead, D-Pa., called Commissioner of Internal Revenue Johnnie M. Walters on the carpet May 24. But committee members—Republicans and Democrats alike—could see from Walters' prepared statement, that IRS was evading the question.

So, instead of taking Walters' testimony, committee members lectured the IRS team and instructed them to come back in a week, prepared to meet the issue that Keller had raised very clearly. All members in attendance—Republicans and Democrats—joined in this action.

The IRS first string turned out in full force for the June 1 subcommittee hearing. Walters was supported by Deputy Commissioner Raymond F. Harless, Acting Chief Counsel Lee H. Henkle Jr., Disclosure Chief Donald O. Virdin, and Francis I. Geibel, Acting Assistant Commissioner for Inspection.

Walters and Henkle performed eloquently, but left the subcommittee members convinced that IRS had the wrong side of the case. Moorhead called the IRS legal position "very weak." And Rep. Frank Horton, R-N.Y., said Henkle had tried to push a camel through a legal peephole.

The subcommittee expects to conclude hearings on June 27. Hopefully, the Government Operations Committee then will draft legislation to remove all doubt about GAO's right to audit IRS operations and report results to the ladies and gentlemen on Capitol Hill who represent all U.S. taxpayers.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, early this June I went to Stockholm, Sweden, to

attend the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, as a representative of the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. I have served on this subcommittee for almost 6 years.

Several of our subcommittee hearings and reports have dealt with matters which touch on international environmental problems. For example, our hearings and reports on the San Francisco, Potomac, and Puget Sound estuaries involved matters such as oil tankers, pollution, and other issues crossing our national boundaries.

Similarly, our hearings and reports on phosphates and detergents have been closely followed by agencies of Canada and Sweden. Indeed, we had experts from those countries testify at our hearings.

Our subcommittee studies and hearings clearly show that eutrophication resulting from excessive phosphates, and oil spilled from tankers, do not respect international boundaries.

And recently, our subcommittee was instrumental in persuading the Departments of State, Transportation, and Justice to agree on having the Coast Guard enforce our oil pollution laws in the contiguous zone, which is that area of the oceans between the 3- and 12-mile limits around our country's seacoasts.

This was announced by the chairman of our subcommittee on June 4, 1972, as we were leaving for Stockholm, and I insert that announcement at this point in the RECORD.

DOT TO BEGIN ENFORCEMENT OF 1970 LAW PROHIBITING OIL SPILLS BY VESSELS IN 9-MILE-WIDE OFFSHORE ZONE, REPRESENTATIVE REUSS REPORTS

The Department of Transportation will begin this month to enforce provisions of the 1970 Water Quality Improvement Act which prohibit oil discharges by vessels in the Contiguous Zone, Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) reported today. Enforcement will be carried out by the Department's constituent agency, the Coast Guard.

Reuss is Chairman of the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. The subcommittee has been investigating the effectiveness of enforcement actions by Federal agencies under both the 1970 Act and the 1899 Refuse Act.

"The news from Transportation comes as a welcome ending to our intensive efforts over the last few months to get the Department to honor the 1970 law which sets penalties for oil spills at sea and makes the polluter liable for clean-up costs," Reuss said.

The 9-mile area in which departmental enforcement was in question is the so-called Contiguous Zone, which extends between three and 12 miles offshore immediately beyond the recognized territorial sea.

The Zone and the powers of each coastal nation within its boundaries were established in 1958 by the United Nations Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone. The Convention "entered into force for the United States" on September 10, 1964. More than 20 nations are signatories to it.

Reuss recently charged the Transportation Department with failing to enforce the oil pollution control provisions of the 1970 law in the Zone.

Reuss explained, "we discovered not only had DOT failed to enforce the law; but it had also failed to report to Congress that the Act was not being enforced. It was only

through our continuing investigations of how the anti-pollution laws are being enforced that we unearthed these facts."

However, by letter of June 1 to Reuss, the Department finally agreed to enforce the law. John W. Barnum, the Department's general counsel, agreed that a notice will be published in the Federal Register "on or about June 8" which "states that the United States exercises rights in a Contiguous Zone to a distance of nine miles beyond the territorial sea" as the 1970 Act requires.

Barnum informed Reuss that the Commandant of the Coast Guard has already "instructed" all Coast Guard units "to extend enforcement of the applicable provisions" of the 1970 Act to the Contiguous Zone. "In the cases of violations where court action is appropriate, the matter will be referred to the Department of Justice," Barnum wrote.

Reuss said today that the Transportation Department's action "should markedly reduce the number of oil spills occurring in the Zone; help prevent massive pollution which has despoiled our beaches, minimize the destruction of our offshore fisheries, and save millions of dollars in Federal clean-up costs."

More than 10,000 such spills were recorded in the period from September 11, 1970, to November 30, 1971, in all waters subject to the Act.

"We are heartened by the Transportation Department's action," Reuss said. "The important thing is that despite its two years of inactivity, the Department will now begin to enforce the Water Quality Improvement Act fully."

The meetings and deliberations I attended in Stockholm provided much information and suggestions that will be helpful to our subcommittee in future hearings and investigations, and will help us develop recommendations for the challenging times ahead.

The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held from June 5 through June 16, 1972, in Stockholm, Sweden, was the first international effort by nations to consider and seek to begin to resolve some of the important, common environmental issues facing all mankind.

Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, the very able chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, was indeed farsighted in directing that representatives of our Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee attend this Conference.

Just as Congress has in recent decades become more deeply involved in international military and political problems, Congress will find in every year ahead that we will be more deeply involved, and taking action, in environmental matters which extend beyond our national boundaries. The world which we see shrinking through advances in transportation and communication is also becoming one world environmentally. The entire globe feels the results of increasingly complex industrial technology, the continued growth of industry, and burgeoning populations in every country. Therefore, it is little wonder that practically every nation of the world attended and earnestly participated in the deliberations at Stockholm.

Nevertheless, some of the human frailties of greed, indifference, and ignorance which have produced the world's environmental plight were exhibited by all of these nations. The developed na-

tions, while admitting to their sins of environmental neglect, demonstrated some reluctance to make the investment of resources necessary for the type of clean-up to which their citizens are entitled. Correspondingly, the underdeveloped nations seemed to follow the illogic that two wrongs can make a right—that they have an equal right to pollute while developing, and need not comply with the rules of cleanup until after they have obtained their rightful share of the world's affluence.

While admitting past environmental sins and exhibiting a weakness to yield to future temptations, the moral compulsion to improve man's state was evident both in the deliberations and in the final outcome of the Conference.

The capable chairman of our U.S. delegation was environmentalist Russell Train, the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality. He set the tone of what our position ought to be by quoting Teddy Roosevelt's statement of 65 years ago:

The time has come to inquire seriously what will happen when our forests are gone, when the coal, the iron, the oil, and the gas are exhausted, when the soils shall have been still further impoverished and washed into the streams, polluting the rivers, denuding the fields, and obstructing navigation. These questions do not relate only to the next century or to the next generation. It is time for us now as a nation to exercise the same reasonable foresight in dealing with our great natural resources that would be shown by any prudent man in conserving and wisely using the property which contains the assurance of well-being for himself and his children.

The developed nations have not followed Teddy Roosevelt's advice. Instead, as Mr. Train pointed out:

Unfortunately, our country did not always follow that good advice, particularly in the generation just past. We not only committed many of the faults Theodore Roosevelt criticized, we went further, and, through inadequate control of our increasingly powerful technology, imposed burdens on our environment, urban and rural alike, such as he never dreamed of.

The U.S. delegation at the Stockholm Conference gave forthright leadership to the establishment of new ways to preserve our world environment. In addition, we have demonstrated for the world during this period that we are able, and determined, to take national action against one of the horrors of modern technology, namely, the hard persistent pesticide. The declaration by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus, that DDT will be banned except in the crucial instances involving human life, is most heartening. Hopefully, Congress will support that decision by adequate appropriations to expand research programs in integrated biological control in order that substitutes can be found for environmentally harmful control measures.

The U.S. delegation also provided firm leadership in urging that the Conference favor an international commercial whaling moratorium. Unless that international effort succeeds, several species of whales will undoubtedly face early extinction. The United States has already agreed to that moratorium, and our wise

action is particularly timely in light of the upcoming session of the International Whaling Commission in London this summer. In addition, the United States worked at the Conference for the protection of all genetic resources. We emphasized the importance of wildlife for purposes other than just hunting. They have roles and niches in ecosystems and in some cases substantial tourism value.

Our country also showed commendable initiative by our proposals to establish a "World Heritage Trust" and by our urging support of the monitoring and assessment of the global environment to supplement existing system for monitoring human health, the atmosphere, the oceans, and terrestrial environments.

However, I feel that in the area of petroleum transport in international and U.S. waters, our position leaves something to be desired at this time. Although the State Department has taken the initiative in pushing for regulations and control of international movement of petroleum by other nations, we must be willing to set our own house in order.

Since returning from Stockholm, I received a letter dated June 12, 1972 from Hon. G. F. Bruce, the Secretary General of the Canadian delegation at the Stockholm Conference enclosing two statements by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada relative to the June 4 discharge into Puget Sound of 12,000 gallons of crude oil from a tanker engaged in unloading operations at the Atlantic-Richfield Refinery at Cherry Point, in Washington State.

I might add at this point that our subcommittee held hearings last December on environmental problems in the Puget Sound and the Juan de Fuca Straits area, including the issuance of a permit by the Corps of Engineers to Atlantic-Richfield for a pier at Cherry Point. We heard testimony from Sierra Club witnesses and others concerning the potential of such spills if construction of this facility encourages the use of more and bigger tankers to enter and unload in these waters.

The Canadian statements note that, in the case of this June 4 discharge, oil "quickly spread" into Canadian waters. The Canadian Secretary said on June 8:

The incident at Cherry Point is a stark reminder of what we have stated on many occasions: that far more serious spills will inevitably take place on other occasions if oil is moved by Tanker through the Strait of Juan de Fuca. It demonstrates that in the event of a spill on the USA side, damage will almost certainly be suffered in Canada, and this damage could be severe. Even the small quantity of oil which escaped on this occasion moved rapidly northward across the boundary and collected on some five miles of one of the finest beaches of the area.

We have, of course, registered with the USA Canada's grave concern about this ominous incident. On instructions, our Embassy yesterday emphasized to the State Department that the incident confirmed our anxieties over the threat to the ecology and resources of this . . . inland marine area from oil tankers.

We have made repeated representations to the USA Government about the proposed increase in oil tanker traffic into this area, and indeed we raised this matter with Presi-

dent Nixon when he visited Canada in Mid-April. We proposed to President Nixon that the International Joint Commission should be requested by the two Governments to conduct a thorough investigation of the hazards of marine transport of oil into this area. We have since made specific proposals for this investigation, and in the light of this recent incident our Ambassador in Washington, D.C., is pressing for an early and positive response from the USA Government.

The Canadian Secretary again discussed this matter on June 9. He emphasized the dangers from oil spills and noted that predictions of more and more quantities of oil being transported in huge supertankers near or on Canadian waters "chill our blood with suggestions that there may well be more accidents." He noted that the "valve which broke" on the vessel *World Bond* at Cherry Point "was open for only 3 seconds." He concluded by saying:

Yet look at the damage which resulted. No wonder that the Government has repeated over and over again to the USA its concern at the growing risk to the environment of both countries which results from the arrival of large tankers at the Cherry Point Refinery.

This concern has been expressed publicly and privately, officially and unofficially, at all levels of the USA Government up to and including President Nixon himself. As I told the House in my statement yesterday, the Prime Minister discussed the problem with the President during the President's visit in April. At the same time Secretary Rogers had an opportunity to feel the strength of Canadian concern during a meeting with the Minister of the environment and myself.

The Government proposed to President Nixon that the International Joint Commission be requested by Canada and the USA to conduct an investigation into all aspects of the problem on May 4 and again on May 19. The Canadian Embassy in Washington, D.C. followed up this proposal in specific terms. Our anxiety on the subject was increased by the announcement at more or less the same time that Secretary Morton had decided to authorize construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. The Resolution unanimously adopted by the House [of Commons] on May 15 which declared that movements of large tankers in the narrow Straits of our Pacific Coast would be inimical to Canadian interests, was conveyed to the USA Government the next day.

I am confident we will receive the official response of the USA soon.

What we have been trying to impress on the USA is our sense of urgency and importance of the question.

It is my hope that the Canadian suggestion will receive a favorable response in the spirit of Stockholm.

The spectrum of environmental problems considered at Stockholm is awesome. But we addressed the problems and we made a beginning in a coordinated international effort to better man's welfare through the world.

However, the question of "additionality" is indeed the problem that is farthest from solution. The developed nations must come to grips with the problem and resolve it much better than was done at Stockholm. I do not believe that the developed nations will provide funds to fulfill their pledges for an international environmental fund in sufficient amount to adequately encourage the developing nations to improve their conditions with-

out degrading and unfortunate side effects. The demands for power, for transportation, and for all the commodities of luxury are going to have first priority with the political leaders of these nations. No amount of exhortations by the environmentalists will dissuade them from making these demands. To them, pollution control and environmental cleanup are the luxuries to be reserved for those who can afford them, that is, the developed nations in the European community, the United States, Canada, and Japan.

I believe the world community must devise a formula to develop some type of trust fund for international pollution research and pollution abatement. Such a fund could be financed by a carefully devised system of tariffs levied, perhaps, against the pollution potential of a raw commodity such as high sulfur oil or high polluting car models. The structuring of such a system should be one which would aid in financing the incorporation of antipollution features into the institutions and industries of the developing countries. Such trust fund structuring should also expedite and encourage cleanup already underway in the developed nations. Thoughtful and careful plans must be developed in the councils of the world—by developed and underdeveloped nations alike—to deal with the problem of "additionality."

The posture and thinking of the underdeveloped nations in reference to environmental problems was ably articulated at Stockholm by Mr. R. K. A. Gardiner, of the Economic Community of Africa, in his speech at the plenary session on June 9, 1972. I therefore insert his speech at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the public:

SPEECH BY MR. R. K. A. GARDINER

Mr. President, permit me to express the gratitude of the ECA for this opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the conference on the Human Environment. Sincere thanks of the member States of ECA go to the Government and people of Sweden for the part they have played in initiating, organizing and running of the Conference; also to the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Maurice Strong, for his devoted service; the Preparatory Committee, under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Keith Johnson, for providing an excellent set of documents and clear-cut procedures which have made our work less difficult.

FCA has taken part in the preparations for this Conference; and the meeting which took place in Addis Ababa in August 1971 enabled African States to identify the problems of environment which concern them, and to define the role which they should play in this conference.

When the idea of a meeting on Human Environment was first mooted, some considered that it concerned only the industrialized countries; but it became clear at a very early stage that even the least developed countries were involved in the developments which threaten the survival of mankind.

The pollution of coastal waters by oil discharged from tankers, atomic radiation and the destruction of marine life are a few instances of the damage which may overtake countries in spite of their state of underdevelopment. Moreover, the use of pesticides and detergents is on the increase in most parts of the world including Africa; and these, as it is well known, can destroy the resources of streams and rivers. This Con-

ference offers a unique opportunity for communities throughout the world to share experiences, draw lessons from what is happening in different communities, and to take measures to prevent the recurrence of harmful consequences.

The problems which have now caught the attention of the world and form the subject matter of this conference may appear to pose a dilemma to developing countries. Some, who see in these problems the aftermath of industrial growth, are now advocating a restraint on economic and social development. This is the "limits-to-growth" thesis which appears to be gaining currency, especially in the developed world. The underdeveloped countries are in no mood to accept the imposition of a restraint on developments on which their welfare, and indeed, their very existence depend. African Governments have come to Stockholm, not to accept an imposition of a restraint but to seek to clarify a false dilemma in consultation with the world community.

The world from which underdeveloped countries seek an escape is not a romantic paradise. Some 80% or more of Africa's population live in rural areas plagued with periodic famine; with inadequate water supplies for man, animal and crops; inadequate health services; with high mortality rates which result from the prevalence of water-borne and other endemic diseases; and where poor farming methods are rapidly destroying forests and grass cover—leading to soil degradation and turning marginal areas into desert land. Doing nothing will spell our doom. We must intensify our search for new techniques to cope with these age-old handicaps.

The populations of underdeveloped countries including those in Africa are increasing rapidly. Africa's population, growing at an average annual rate of 2.5%, may increase to 460 million in 1980. It is recognized that population policies which are being formulated today will take a decade or more to make any significant impact on current trends.

An obligation of every African government is to encourage more productive agricultural methods in order to be able to feed the population. It must resort to industrialization (small and large scale) including the development of service industries in order to generate enough employment. It must initiate measures for a more intensive exploitation of natural resources in order to produce raw materials for local industry and for export.

Indeed to be able to purchase capital equipment, to secure foreign skills and external inputs needed by local industries, it must increase export earnings from minerals and agriculture. In all these aspects, governments will be interfering with natural conditions. The problem, therefore, is how to satisfy the needs of the community in the best possible way and with the least harmful results.

Rural poverty, under-employment and unemployment have combined to drive rapidly growing numbers away from rural life into industrial and urban centres. The proliferation of slums and shanty towns is evidence of the need to take action to cope with changing aspirations and patterns of life. Garbage disposal, sewerage, the need to provide decent human dwellings, the control of vermin, etc., are now crying needs in the rapidly expanding towns in developing countries. The disposal of waste in the tropics where experience in scientific processes is lacking constitutes a very serious health hazard. These are some of the problems to which Africa must turn its attention immediately. What help can we expect?

Africa has constructed huge man-made lakes—Kainji and Volta in West Africa; Aswan in Egypt; Koka, Owen and Kariba in

Eastern Africa—to mention a few. These dams provide electricity, water transport facilities and water for irrigation. Their construction demanded the transplantation of whole populations to new and strange environments; and they have contributed to the spread of water-borne diseases of which malaria, river blindness and bilharzia may be regarded as the most serious.

The development of transport facilities has increased the chances of diseases being communicated between countries, regions and continents. History provides instances of erstwhile isolated communities being wiped out by such diseases as measles and small pox upon their contact with the outside world. Traffic in animals and plants especially into areas where phytosanitary services are not well developed poses a serious threat to vegetation. Special measures are required to control and eventually to eradicate sleeping sickness—a scourge to man and beast alike—not to mention migratory birds and the incidence of diseases of livestock such as foot and mouth in Europe and Africa, which emphasizes the interdependence of continents.

Such problems cannot be tackled successfully in isolation; and increasingly, such bodies like WHO and FAO as well as the wild life conservation movement will be called upon to intervene and to provide assistance to countries who are not in a position to cope with new and menacing situations.

In such fields as the human environment and population, international community is attempting to deal with very intimate personal issues. We need to convince all participants in such programs. Human understanding is as important, if not more important than formal declarations and conventions. This makes the attitude of developing countries a matter of some importance. The developing countries often show a historical hangover of fear and suspicion from their experiences of the recent past. The struggles to end colonialism tend to set us apart from the free world. These attitudes cause some amount of irritation to those who want to get on with the business. This reaction is also understandable. We are not here, in the face of a crisis which mankind has to tackle, to indulge in self pity, to exchange recriminations or to apportion blame. It is with this understanding that the Addis Ababa Seminar set out its contributions to the consideration of human environment and expressed its willingness to play a full and responsible role in the implementation of the recommendations which may come out of this Conference.

The fears of developing countries have been expressed by several speakers from developing countries. I repeat some of them because we need to keep them in mind in order to appreciate the moods of all parties to the effort which we are initiating here. I would express them, rather, in the form of hopes than fears.

We hope that measures for the protection of the human environment and the prevention of health hazards will not be used as a pretext for the imposition of non-tariff barriers to trade between developed and developing countries. We hope that the impact of recycling, on the volume of trade in raw materials, will be carefully examined to ensure that the developing countries do not lose export earnings. We hope that allowance will be made in the allocation of grants and loans to help developing countries meet any additional costs which may be incurred as a result of improvements in machinery, techniques and procedures brought about by attempts to protect the human environment. We hope that measures taken by developed countries will not lead to the creation of *cordon sanitaire* behind which they can shelter, and, from which they can run harmful industrial enterprises in territories which may appear to provide "flags of convenience."

These question marks in the minds of the developing countries have not stopped them from deciding to participate in the Conference and to commit themselves to carry out international decisions which we are here to take.

There are actions to be taken at the national, inter-country, regional and global levels. Indeed, various agencies are already occupied with activities in most of the fields which we are now considering under the general title of the theme of this Conference. It is the conviction of the African countries that the conclusions of the Conference will provide a framework within which such actions will continue to be carried on, and more effectively.

We hope that it will be possible to provide a mechanism and an organization at the regional level to give the people of each continent a voice in the formulation of programmes and a role in their implementation. ECA and OAU stand ready to assume responsibility to discharge any tasks which may be entrusted to them under a United Nations Human Environment Programme. OAU member States have already signed a convention on the protection of nature and wild life. Individual African Governments are developing national game parks and setting up administrative organs for environmental services.

Africa, together with other developing countries, have come to Stockholm with a determination to find a basis for cooperation. I may take this opportunity to emphasize the fact that when relatively poor countries send delegates to conferences of this kind, they make a real sacrifice. The financing of delegations is a drain on their limited resources. The presence of some 30 African delegations in Stockholm is therefore a token of our earnest in the matter under discussion.

Mr. President, Africa is ready for constructive and creative action in cooperation with the rest of the world. The first All-African Seminar on the Human Environment supported the establishment of an appropriate organ within the U.N. System to bridge gaps in existing knowledge and practices: to co-ordinate on-going programmes in the field of the environment; and to initiate measures to safeguard our fragile environment. ECA member states support the suggested creation of an Inter-governmental body serviced by a secretariat as suggested by the final documents for this conference.

In the name of the member states of ECA, I wish this conference success.

Among the most significant recommendations resulting from the convention were those designed: First, to facilitate completion in 1972 of an international convention to restrict ocean dumping; second, to strengthen the International Whaling Convention and to launch a 10-year moratorium on commercial whaling; third, to prevent national and environmental actions from creating trade barriers against the exports of developing countries; fourth, to give high priority in development assistance to environmental values such as land use conservation and quality of human settlement; fifth, to improve water supply and sewage in the rapidly growing cities of developing countries; and sixth, to create in the United Nations a permanent, high level environmental unit.

It is too early to declare that the Stockholm Conference was a success. It may be several years before we will really know whether this effort was successful. The most important thing, however, was that it was a beginning. From this beginning, we hope new and greater efforts will be

made by the community of nations to improve environmental quality, not at the expense of the developing nations or of the developed nations, but with the close coordination and cooperation of all nations.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR RESPONSIBLE PACKAGING AND LABELING

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs published its first official report, "Guiding Principles for Responsible Packaging and Labeling."

The report was authored by the NBCCA subcommittee on packaging and labeling. The vice chairman of that committee is a Cincinnati, Mr. Robert Aders, who is chairman of the board of the Kroger Co. which is headquartered in my home city.

The report represents a comprehensive set of guidelines for businesses to adopt in response to and in anticipation of consumer demands.

The significant factor is that this council is composed of some 100 business executives who are committed to developing positive action programs for consumers.

The council was created by President Nixon in August of 1971. As an advisory council, the members report to the President and other Federal departments and agencies through Secretary of Commerce Peter G. Peterson. I would like to place in the RECORD the NBCCA report.

The report follows:

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR RESPONSIBLE PACKAGING AND LABELING

PREAMBLE

It is our intent that these guiding principles be given the broadest possible application wherever they would assist the consumer in making his purchase or use decision and wherever the value received by consumers from their application exceeds the cost of their implementation. We urge industry associations and individual businesses to develop specific policies and manufacturing practices consistent with these principles.

Packages and labels should meet the consumer's need for useful information to facilitate value comparison prior to purchase and to promote the economical and safe use of the product after purchase. The information should be presented in a clear and conspicuous manner. The seller or supplier should be able to document adequately all performance, safety or economy claims listed or depicted on the package or label.

More specifically, businesses should provide the following information on packages or labels of consumer products unless the provision of such information would be clearly irrelevant within the context of the total circumstances surrounding the sale.

1. The identity of the product by its common or usual name, description, generic term, or the like,
2. The net quantity of the product in terms of weight, measure, size, or numerical count,
3. The name and address of the manufacturer, packer or distributor,
4. A prominent warning of imminent hazards inherent with the use, maintenance,

storage, or disposal of the product, and a description of the necessary treatment or antidote if the warning is ignored or misunderstood,

5. Clear and complete directions for use and care of the product. Separate use and care instructions should be provided for those products not normally consumed from or stored in the original package,

6. Relative price information in a convenient and understandable form. Price information should be displayed at the point of purchase when it is impractical for the seller or supplier to include price on the package or the label,

7. The date beyond which the product should not be sold if the product is perishable.

Businesses should also provide the following information on packages and labels of processed food products offered for sale.

8. The size, weight, or measure of servings where the label states number of servings,

9. The common or usual name of ingredients or, where appropriate, the class of ingredients, listed in order of decreasing predominance. The most significant ingredient listed by percentage if it will aid consumers in assessing economic value and food quality,

10. A statement of nutrient value conforming to applicable Federal guidelines.

In addition to the above, all packages should contain the full and declared weight, measure or numerical count and be filled as full as practicable in accordance with good business practices. Packages should be designed to:

11. Protect the quality and form of the product,

12. Protect the persons who come into contact with the product during use, storage, maintenance and disposal,

13. Offer sufficient variety to serve the varying needs of consumers without unnecessarily complicating selection.

Finally, for the benefit of society in general, businesses should conserve natural resources in the original package, encourage reuse of both packaging materials and packages themselves, and, minimize pollution in the disposal process.

NEW YORK TO LOS ANGELES—ONE-HALF HOUR

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in our vast search for ways to transport people through the air, on the ground, or by water with better efficiency, a Rand Corp., physicist has come up with a new approach—transportation under the ground.

Here, importantly, there is no need to plow through or thunder over our cities or our remaining open spaces. Here there is power—through the use of magnetic fields—which will not spew noxious gases into our air. And here is speed such as we seldom imagine for travel on earth itself—10,000 miles per hour is the top speed of the magnetically floating tunnel trains this scientist conceived.

As he openly admits, the main drawback is the enormous cost of tunneling clear across the United States. But after that, "everything else would be practically free." The cost of transcontinental train trip would be \$50.

The whole thing boggles the imagination. It sounds like something out of

Jules Verne. But it is available with today's technology.

Of course the problem still remains—how do we get a fellow from the train station to his home or office just as efficiently. But Mr. Salter's concept for transcontinental travel points out what we can do today to unshackle our transportation problems if we just gear up and use our wits.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an article from the Austin American explaining Mr. Salter's concept of a tunnel train.

The article follows:

UNDERGROUND MAGNETIC TRAIN ACROSS UNITED STATES SAID POSSIBLE

LOS ANGELES (AP).—You could go from New York to Los Angeles in half an hour, shuttling through a transcontinental underground tunnel in one-car trains floated on magnetic fields. The cost: \$50.

It's not science fiction, but a concept propounded by a top physicist for the Rand Corp.

R. M. Salter Jr., head of the physical sciences department at Rand, said in an interview that existing technology makes the tunnel train concept feasible. He said electromagnetic suspension for trains was first proposed in 1905 and patented in 1912.

The essence of Salter's idea is to dig a tunnel, roughly along the present routes of U.S. Highways 66 and 80. The tunnel would contain several large tubes for the east-west travel of single car trains, big enough for passengers and freight. The cars would float on magnetic fields, moving at top speeds of 10,000 m.p.h.

He envisions intermediate stops at Amarillo, Tex., and Chicago on the main line, with subsidiary lines branching from the two main terminals.

One drawback to the Salter system is the enormous cost of tunneling across the United States, but, he said, "after the tunneling was finished, everything else would be practically free."

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in regards to the legislation we are considering today relative to appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, I would like to make several observations concerning funds for the liquid metal fast breeder demonstration plant.

I am aware of the AEC statement that early introduction of the LMFBR will save the United States \$20 billion over the next 50 years and that every year of delay will cost \$2 billion. I am also aware that there has been disagreement with this conclusion by Dr. Thomas Cochran of "Resources for the Future" and others who conclude that the LMFBR would not be competitive with other forms of power production. The question of commercial practicality of the LMFBR must be given careful consideration.

It is my understanding that the AEC is having a difficult time in locating private funds to help finance the LMFBR demonstration plant. This reluctance on

the part of private industry may stem in part from doubt as to the breeder's commercial feasibility and in part from the knowledge that the Government is so committed to the LFMFR program that if industry does not contribute the project will still not be scrapped. Instead, Government will finance the program alone.

I am somewhat concerned that we may be overemphasizing breeder technology at the expense of other energy sources. The breeder is justified by AEC because research is the furthest advanced, with the probable exception of solar energy. Yet the first breeder demonstration plant will not be built until 1980. Significant use will not be achieved until the mid-1990's. It may be that longer periods would be required for the development of other power sources, but adequate funding might bring them into existence within that same time frame. Fusion, for example, is not adequately funded because it is deemed to be too far in the future. It may be too far in the future because it is not adequately funded.

AEC argues that the LMFBR is necessary to protect our uranium reserves. It has at the same time embargoed all foreign uranium sources because the domestic market is soft. It would seem to me that during a period of low prices it might be reasonable to stockpile uranium from foreign sources to protect America's future supplies.

I would hope that AEC would give the most careful consideration to these observations. America's future and environment must be protected.

A TRIBUTE TO CAPT. ROBERT CROWN, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to advise the House today that ground will be broken early next month for the new Robert Crown Center at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.

The two-story sailing center with docks and anchorage basin is being built in memory of the late Capt. Robert Crown, U.S. Naval Reserve, as a gift to the Academy by the Crown family of Chicago.

At the time of his death on July 6, 1969, Captain Crown commanded an organized reserve training unit at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

Captain Crown's philosophy was attuned to the idea that a civilian military force must be built around the nucleus of the professional career men whose studies at the academies and active experience qualify them for the higher ranks in the service. To this end he pursued the belief that civilian defense of the Nation cannot be abandoned, no matter how great the desire for peace may be.

Since his death, and with this philos-

ophy in mind, friends and relatives of Robert Crown, eldest son of Henry Crown, set up a memorial in 1970 as a tribute to his memory, including scholarships to sons of Navy or Marine enlisted personnel from the Ninth Naval District, Great Lakes.

In 1971, the Great Lakes Naval Reserve Training Center established the Capt. Robert Crown Memorial Trophy system to reward outstanding efforts in U.S. Naval Reserve units and individual performances.

These very commendable steps to honor the memory of Capt. Robert Crown are a reflection of the high degree of respect so many people had for his dedication.

But the construction of the Robert Crown Center at the Naval Academy fulfills in a living way the high regard that he had for career officers of the Navy and their impressive contribution to our entire Navy, including the Reserve components.

Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy, announced on May 4, 1972, plans for construction of the Robert Crown Center at Annapolis.

When completed in July 1973, the center located along the Severn River-Chesapeake Bay sailing area will house the intercollegiate Sailing Hall of Fame with its trophies and memorabilia from famous U.S. Navy sailing ships. It will provide facilities for Academy activities in connection with plebe summer cruises, sailing courses which every midshipman is required to take, and the Academy's program of variety and intramural sport sailing. In addition, it will be used for meetings of various sailing organizations, including collegiate groups and regatta committees.

The center, designed by Ellerbe Architects of St. Paul, Minn., will be a central point of interest for more than 1 million tourists who visit the Academy each year.

Captain Crown served on active duty with the Navy in the Pacific, Philippine, and American theaters from 1942 to 1946. After World War II, he returned to civilian life, retained his Naval Reserve commission, and served as a member of Greater Chicago area.

He was twice recipient of the Secretary of the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award, the highest honor the Navy can bestow on a civilian, for his work in behalf of the Navy after the war.

From 1961 to 1963, he served two terms as national president of the Navy League of the United States, a civilian organization espousing the doctrine of maintenance of U.S. maritime strength.

Capt. Robert Crown was born in Chicago, the son of Col. Henry Crown and the late Rebecca Kranz Crown. He married Joanna Strauss of North Manchester, Ind., and had two daughters and a son. Robert Crown attended the University of Arizona and graduated with a BA degree from Northwestern University in 1942.

A young and dynamic leader, Captain Crown was highly respected in commerce and industry. His inquiring mind and executive ability led him into many areas of interest and position of leadership. He was one of that new breed of young executives actively engaged not only in

civic, military, and charitable work, but in business as well.

He played an important role in business in Chicago and in other parts of the country. He served as an executive officer of a number of successful enterprises and was on the board of directors of many leading business organizations.

I am proud to join today in paying honor and tribute to the late Capt. Robert Crown. I am sure that all of us as Americans will also want to express our gratitude to the Crown family for this generous contribution to our Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of the Crown family is known to all of us in Chicago, but it should be known to all of the people of America, for indeed this is a family that over the years has consistently endowed worthwhile projects as part of their deep commitment to human dignity.

Chicago has a long list of inspiring projects in the field of art, education, medicine, medical research, the performing arts, aid to less fortunate citizens, and special programs for young children—all endowed by the Crown family, which has generously shared its own fortune with the community.

The Crowns have been a source of inspiration to decent people for more than three decades.

They have carved for all of us as Americans a new dimension of commitment by those more fortunate to those less fortunate among us. The Crown family is legend in Chicago, because of its deep commitment to the common good.

It is typical of the Crown family to seek out a need at the Naval Academy in Annapolis and then in a very inspiring manner, with their own financial resources, fill that need for the Academy. It is a blessing that the Crown family had arranged for the construction of this Robert Crown Center at Annapolis. My colleagues will understand when I say that prospects for building such a center, so urgently needed, would be most slim if it had to wait for Government funds.

This is why I wanted to call this generous act by the Crown family to the attention of my colleagues. May this unselfish act by the Crown family rekindle our respect and appreciation for our fellow Americans. For indeed, the Crowns prove again that people do care and that within their means, try to fill the needs of our Nation.

God grant that there will be many more Crown families in America with their deep dedication of building monuments to their ideals. The Capt. Robert Crown Center will be such a monument.

UNION CARBIDE AND WASHINGTON WORKSHOPS: AN INVESTMENT IN AMERICAN YOUTH

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, at a time in American history when youth is involved in the political process

as never before, especially in view of the passage of the 26th amendment, I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention a fine program that convenes this week and has served young Americans and our Nation since 1967. This program is the series of study seminars in American government sponsored by the Washington Workshops Foundation in conjunction with Mount Vernon College of Washington.

I am particularly pleased to note that in this year of newly enfranchised youth voters, the Union Carbide Corp. seeks to involve Americans in this seminar series by generously offering scholarships to a number of qualified high school students. These scholarships, giving the recipients a firsthand study of American government through participation in the Washington workshops seminars, are awarded to exceptional students representing the Union Carbide plant communities across the Nation.

Among the group of students selected this year is one of my constituents, Miss Cathy Costantino of Lewiston, N.Y. Cathy has just completed her junior year at Madonna High School, and I congratulate her on being chosen as a 1972 Union Carbide scholar to the Washington Workshops Congressional Seminar. Young citizens such as Cathy are indeed deserving of such an honor and reflect a continuing faith in our political system.

I find it gratifying to realize that through the efforts of Union Carbide and the Washington Workshops, young Americans are recognized for their excellence and leadership potential while enrolled in a creative and successful program that highlights a better understanding of the human quality of American government.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF GREAT NECK, N.Y.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 4, I had the pleasure and privilege of attending the 50th anniversary celebration of the incorporation of the village of Great Neck, N.Y.

As a resident of this community and as its elected representative here in Washington, I was deeply honored to be able to present to the village of Great Neck on this occasion a flag which had been flown over this building. I want my colleagues in the House to know that this flag will be flown proudly over Great Neck.

In addition to the formal presentation ceremonies, a delightful program of festivities had been arranged in the spirit of the 1920's, the era of the village's incorporation.

At this point in the RECORD, I list those who contributed to make this event such an overwhelming success.

The list follows:

COMMITTEES

Hon. George Mitterperl, Chairman.
Honorary Chairmen: Hon. Bertram Har-

nett, Hon. Joseph Liff, Hon. Robert C. Meade, Hon. Michael J. Tully, Jr., Hon. Sol Wachtler, Hon. Jack Weinstein.

Joseph T. Borzell, Mrs. Maro Charno, Robert E. Cohen, Jeff L. Flowers, Mrs. Martin Gilbert, Mrs. M. Robert Goldstein, Hon. Joseph S. Grasso, Mrs. Joseph S. Grasso, Gerald Houck, Mrs. Andrew J. Imperatore, Hon. David H. Isacson, Mrs. David H. Isacson, Mrs. Fred Levitan, Hon. Seymour G. Mackler.

Mrs. Seymour G. Mackler, Howard C. Mis-kin, Leonard Motchkavitz, Hon. Frank Neubert, John Post, Aaron Pyle, John H. Reed, Jr., Hon. Joseph G. Rose, Mrs. Joseph G. Rose, Morton A. Shapiro, Mrs. Alda Snow, Werner Stein, Herman Sussman, Louis M. Wolf.

In cooperation with: Alert Fire Company, Great Neck Park District; Great Neck Police Boys Club, and Great Neck Village Business Association.

HOSTESSES

Mary Diffley, Sue Friedman, Barbara Imperatore, Lauria Imperatore, Ann Lauria Wenzel, Sue Wenzel.

THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY'S "102 MONITOR"

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may be aware of the information therein contained, I ask that the text of the June 1972 issue of the Council on Environmental Quality's "102 Monitor" appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The text follows:

[From 102 Monitor, May 16, 1972]

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ISSUES SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDANCE TO AGENCIES FOR IMPROVING AGENCY NEPA PROCEDURES

(The following is the full text of a memorandum making recommendations to improve agency NEPA procedures issued by CEQ May 16, 1972.)

MEMORANDUM FOR AGENCY AND GENERAL COUNSEL LIAISON ON NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) MATTERS

Subject: Recommendations for Improving Agency NEPA Procedures.

In response to a variety of agency inquiries, we are circulating the attached recommendations for improving agency NEPA procedures, taking particular account for judicial decisions constraining NEPA. In a previous memorandum dated February 29, 1972 (a copy of which is also attached) Chairman Train drew attention to the continuing need for reviewing and improving agency NEPA procedures and made two basic recommendations:

1. "In particular we are interested in finding ways of consolidating numbers of impact statements into fewer but broader and more meaningful reviews."

2. "On the matter of applying the NEPA statutory language 'major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment' to your particular agency programs and pinpointing the precise timing of the NEPA review and interagency consultations called for, your agency procedures must provide the specifics within the framework of the statute and our Guidelines. These procedures are important both in helping to identify the types of action on which impact statements are likely to be necessary and those where statements are not called for."

In addition to agency inquiries about the effect of court decisions, a number of agencies have raised procedural questions relating to the interpretation of existing provi-

sions of the CEQ Guidelines which we feel deserve clarification in a general memorandum.

Agencies should consider the extent to which the issues discussed in this memorandum and Chairman Train's memorandum of February 29 are adequately dealt with under their existing NEPA procedures. In many cases, actual revision of NEPA procedures may not be necessary. In other cases, procedures or practices may have to be modified. Agencies are requested to inform the Council of the action they take in response to these recommendations.

TIMOTHY ATKESON,
General Counsel.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING AGENCY NEPA PROCEDURES

A. Substantive Issues: The Required Content of Environmental Statements.

1. *Duty to Disclose Full Range of Impacts.*
Court decisions under the National Environmental Policy Act have established that the "detailed" statement referred to in section 102 of the Act must thoroughly explore all known environmental consequences of and alternatives to major proposed actions even though this may lead to consideration of effects and options outside the agency's actual control.

Viewed as simply an application of NEPA's "full disclosure" requirement, this basic principle is meant to ensure that relevant officials and the public are alerted to the environmental impact of Federal agency action. See *EDF v. Corps of Engineers*, 2 ERC 1260, 1267 (E.D. Ark. 1971).

Furthermore, the range of impacts which must be considered cannot be limited to the traditional area of agency jurisdiction or expertise. NEPA in essence adds a new mandate to the enabling legislation of all agencies, requiring the development of environmental awareness for the full range of impacts of proposed agency action. By failing to discuss reasonably foreseeable impacts or by discussing those impacts in a perfunctory manner, an agency defeats the purpose of the statement and lays itself open to the charge of non-compliance with the Act. See, e.g., *Calvert Cliffs v. AEC*, 2 ERC 1779, 1782 (D.C. Cir. 1971) (purpose of statement is to aid agency in its decision and to fully inform other interested agencies and the public of environmental consequences); *EDF v. Corps of Engineers*, 2 ERC 1260, 1267 (E.D. Ark., 1971) (statement must alert President, CEQ, public, and Congress to all known possible environmental consequences); *EDF v. Hardin*, 2 ERC 1425, 1426 (D.D.C. 1971) (agency must undertake research in planning stage adequate to expose potential environmental impact); *Ely v. Velde*, 3 ERC 1286 (4th Cir. 1971) (genuine rather than perfunctory compliance with NEPA requires agency to explicate fully its course of inquiry, its analysis and its reasoning); *NRDC v. Morton*, 3 ERC 1558, 1562, (D.C. Cir. 1972) (statement is for the guidance of ultimate decisionmakers—Congress and the President—as well as agency, and must provide discussion of all reasonable alternatives); *Greene County v. FPC*, 3 ERC 1595, 1600 (2d Cir. 1972) (statement must present "a single coherent and comprehensive environmental analysis").

In order to ensure full compliance with this requirement it is desirable that agencies develop in advance a list of the typical impacts of those classes of actions that the agency regularly takes. In developing such a list, agencies are reminded that impacts include not only direct effects, but also secondary effects such as "the effect of any possible change in population patterns upon the resource base, including land use, water, and public services, of the area in question." CEQ Guidelines § 6(a) (ii).

By giving consideration to such impacts agencies should also be able to develop an increasingly specific set of standards for

determining what constitutes "major," environmentally "significant" actions. Application of such standards to the normal range of agency actions will make possible earlier and more accurate identification of actions subject to the § 102 requirement.

Recommendation #1: Agencies should develop a list of the full range of impacts likely to be involved in the typical types of actions they undertake. This will require a listing both of typical agency actions affecting the environment, see, e.g., Forest Service NEPA procedures, 36 Fed. Reg. 23670 (1971), as well as a list of related, potential impacts, see, e.g., Water Resources Council "Proposed Principles . . .," 36 Fed. Reg. 24159-62 (1971). This description of potential impacts will help guide officials responsible for preparation of impact statements by ensuring that critical impacts are not overlooked and by making possible earlier, more accurate identification of "major," environmentally "significant" actions.

2. Duty to "Balance" Advantages and Disadvantages of the Proposed Action.

Inherent in the duty imposed on any agency by NEPA to promote environmental quality is the obligation to weigh the possible environmental effects of a proposal against the effects on other public values the agency is mandated to consider. If the environmental effects are adverse, the agency must consider whether they outweigh the benefits of the proposal in deciding whether to go ahead. This implicit requirement is confirmed by the directive of Section 102(2)(B) that agencies develop methods for giving "presently unquantified environmental amenities and values . . . appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations."

However, NEPA does not specify whether this balancing of environmental and other considerations must be spelled out in the environmental impact statement under Section 102(2)(C). Each of the five items expressly required to be included in the statement relates to environmental effects—except the third, which does not specify what type of information should be given about "alternatives to the proposed action." From the bare language of Section 102(2)(C), it is not wholly clear whether the 102 statement is to catalog only the environmental effects of the proposed action and of alternatives, or whether the statement is to discuss all of the important considerations bearing on the wisdom of the proposed action.

The legislative history suggests that Congress did expect the 102 statement to record the agency's trade-offs of competing values. In explaining the bill on the Senate floor, designed to insure that in instances where Senator Jackson said:

Subsection 102(c) establishes a procedure proposed major Federal action would have a significant impact on the environment that the impact has in fact been considered, that any adverse effects which cannot be avoided are justified by some other stated consideration of national policy, that short-term uses are consistent with long-term productivity, and that any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources are warranted. 115 Cong. Rec. 29055 (Oct. 8, 1969). (Emphasis added.)

This interpretation is supported by several statements in court decisions. In the *Calvert Cliffs* case the court stressed the necessity for "balancing" under NEPA and the role of the 102 statement in showing how the balancing with done:

In some instances environmental costs may outweigh economic and technical benefits and in other instances they may not. But NEPA mandates a rather finely tuned and "systematic" balancing analysis in each instance.

To insure that the balancing analysis is carried out and given full effect, Section 102

(2)(C) requires that responsible officials of all agencies prepare a "detailed statement" covering the impact of particular actions on the environment, the environmental costs which might be avoided, and alternative measures which might alter the cost benefit equation. 2 ERC at 1781-82.

Similarly, in *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Morton*, the court observed that:

The impact statement provides a basis for (a) evaluation of the benefits of the proposed project in light of its environmental risks, and (b) comparison of the net balance for the proposed project with the environmental risk presented by alternative courses of action. 3 ERC at 1561.

These judicial comments do not, however, detract from the primary purpose of the 102 statement: the assessment of the environmental effects of possible actions. NEPA was enacted out of a concern that environmental considerations were not being fully canvassed before action, and the purpose of Section 102(2)(C) is primarily to require a "detailed statement" of environmental effects. Where an agency's proposal entails adverse environmental consequences, the 102 statement must identify the countervailing interests that would support a decision to go ahead. This does not mean that the statement may be used as a promotional document in favor of the proposal, at the expense of a thorough and rigorous analysis of environmental risks. In most cases it may be impossible and unnecessary to discuss the countervailing interests in the same detail as environmental factors. The court in the *Morton* case observed that "the consideration of pertinent alternatives requires a weighing of numerous matters, such as economics, foreign relations [and] national security . . ." 3 ERC at 1561. A detailed discussion of each of these subjects could require as much space as the environmental analysis itself, destroying the focus of the 102 statement and undercutting the purpose of NEPA. What is necessary is a succinct explanation of the factors to be balanced in reaching a decision, thus altering the agency decisionmaker, as well as the President, Congress, and the public to the nature of the interests that are being served at the expense of environmental values.

Recommendation #2: Wherever adverse environmental effects are found to be involved in the proposed action, the impact statement should indicate what other interests and considerations of Federal policy might be found to justify those effects. The statement should also indicate the extent to which these stated countervailing benefits could be realized by following reasonable alternatives to the proposed action that would avoid some or all of the adverse environmental effects. In this connection, agencies that prepare cost-benefit analyses of proposed actions should attach such analyses to the environmental impact statement.

3. Duty to Consider Opposing Views.

In *Committee for Nuclear Responsibility v. Seaborg*, 3 ERC 1126 (D.C. Cir. 1971), the Court of Appeals considered the duty to discuss opposing views under NEPA. The Court observed that in order for the 102 statement to meet adequately the "full disclosure" requirement, it must "set forth the opposing views" on significant environmental issues raised by the proposal. To omit from the statement any reference whatever to such views would be "arbitrary and impermissible." Again, however, the court noted that "only responsible views need be included." What is required is "a meaningful reference that identifies the problem at hand" for the agency decisionmaker. 3 ERC at 1129.

An earlier district court opinion stressed this requirement in even stronger terms:

Where experts, or concerned public or private organizations, or even ordinary lay citizens, bring to the attention of the respon-

sible agency environmental impacts which they contend will result from the proposed agency action, then the § 102 statement should set forth these contentions and opinions, even if the responsible agency finds no merit in them whatsoever. Of course, the § 102 statement can and should also contain the opinion of the responsible agency with respect to all such viewpoints. The record should be complete, *EDF v. Corps of Engineers*, 2 ERC 1260, 1267 (E.D. Ark. 1971).

Again the relevance of this requirement for agency NEPA procedures is primarily a matter of ensuring that opposing views are fairly treated and discussed in the process of preparing draft and final statements.

Recommendation #3: Agencies should make an effort to discover and discuss all major points of view in the draft statement itself. Where opposing professional views and responsible opinions have been overlooked in the draft statement and are brought to the agency's attention through the commenting process, the agency should review the positive and negative environmental effects of the action in light of those views and should make a meaningful reference in the final statement to the existence of any responsible opposing view not adequately discussed in the draft statement with respect to adverse environmental effects, indicating the agency's response to the issues raised. All substantive comments received on the draft should be attached to the final statement, whether or not each such comment is thought to merit individual discussion by the agency in the text of the statement. At the same time that copies are sent to the Council, copies of final statements, with comments attached, should also be sent to all entities—Federal, State and local agencies, private organizations and individuals—that made substantive comments on the draft statement, thus informing such entities of the agency's disposition of their arguments.

4. Reasonable "Alternatives" to the Proposed Action. The recent decision in *NRDC v. Morton*, *supra*, discussed the "full disclosure" requirement in relation to the requirement that agencies consider the "alternatives" to the proposed action. See also *EDF v. Corps of Engineers*, 2 ERC 1260, 1269 (E.D. Ark. 1971) (discussing respects in which consideration of alternatives in proposed dam project was legally deficient). The most significant aspect of the *Morton* decision is the court's conclusion that all alternatives reasonably available to the Government as a whole must be discussed—even if some of those alternatives are outside the control of the agency preparing the statement. Discussion of such alternatives is required in order to guide the decision at hand as well as to inform the public of the issues and to guide the decisions of the President and Congress.

The court in this case was careful, however, to emphasize that it was not requiring the impossible. "A rule of reason is implicit in this aspect of the law, as it is in the requirement that the agency provide a statement concerning the opposing views that are responsible." 3 ERC at 1561 (citing *Committee for Nuclear Responsibility, Inc. v. Seaborg*, 3 ERC 1126, 1128-29 D.C. Cir. 1971). What NEPA requires is "information sufficient to permit a reasoned choice of alternatives so far as environmental aspects are concerned." 3 ERC at 1563. Detailed discussion is not required of alternatives that "are deemed only remote and speculative possibilities, in view of basic changes required in statutes and policies of other agencies." 3 ERC at 1564. And the agencies need not indulge in "crystal ball" inquiry in assessing the effects of alternatives. The agency will have taken the "hard look" required by NEPA if it has discussed the reasonably foreseeable effects with a thoroughness commen-

surate with their severity and the significance of the action.

The relevance of this decision for agency NEPA procedures is primarily one of ensuring that the reference to "alternatives" is interpreted consistently with applicable judicial opinions: In most cases a judicial interpretation of a statutory term does not require an amendment of related documents employing the term. Presumably the term will be applied and interpreted by an agency in accordance with governing judicial decisions. However, in view of the importance of the *Morton* decision and in view of the conflicting practices of some agencies prior to the decision, it seems preferable to expand the reference to "alternatives" in agency NEPA procedures at least to the extent of indicating that all reasonable alternatives will be evaluated, even though they may not all lie within the agency's control. Such a revision would not add in any way to an agency's current legal responsibilities, and might ensure that officials preparing the statements keep in mind the proper scope of alternatives they must consider.

Recommendation No. 4: Agencies should indicate that all reasonable alternatives and their environmental impacts are to be discussed, including those not within the authority of the agency. Examples of specific types of alternatives that should be considered in connection with specific kinds of actions should be given where possible. Such examples should include, where relevant:

- (1) the alternative of taking no action;
- (2) alternatives requiring actions of a significantly different nature which would provide similar benefits with different environmental impacts (e.g., a fossil fuel v. a nuclear power plant);
- (3) alternatives related to different designs or details of the proposed action, which would present different environmental impacts (e.g., pollution control equipment on a nuclear plant).

In each case, the analysis of alternatives should be sufficiently detailed and rigorous to permit independent and comparative evaluation of the benefits, costs and environmental risks of the proposed action and each alternative.

B. Procedural Issues: Preparation and Circulation of Environmental Statements.

1. The "Pre-Draft" Stage.

The issues discussed above with reference to the required content of impact statements necessarily have implications for the procedures that agencies follow in preparing such statements. It has already been noted, for example, that agencies should make every effort to anticipate and discuss all major points of view on the impact of the proposed action in the draft statement itself. A related procedural question concerns the extent to which agencies should formally seek advice from other agencies or members of the public prior to preparing a draft statement.

The CEQ guidelines do not require a formalized "pre-draft" consultation process. Indeed, the reason for requiring a draft statement in the first place was in order to satisfy the "prior consultation" requirement found in § 102 of the Act, which refer only to a "detailed statement." At the same time, however, in order for the draft statement to present an adequate basis for discussion and comment, it must provide a fairly thorough discussion of the impacts of the proposed action and alternatives. Where an agency lacks the expertise for making such an evaluation, it should not hesitate to solicit help on an informal basis from other agencies. Cooperative arrangements of this sort have already been tried in a number of cases. Furthermore, in preparing a draft statement any agency should welcome whatever helpful information may be forthcoming from other agencies or from the public.

In order for such information to be forthcoming, however, agencies would need to de-

velop means of alerting other agencies and interested members of the public to the fact that a draft statement is being prepared. An announcement to this effect, at least with respect to administrative actions, would serve three useful functions:

- (1) it would enable agencies and interested persons with relevant information to make such information available in time for use in the draft statements;
- (2) it would provide advance notice of the fact that a draft statement will soon be available for comment;
- (3) it would furnish evidence of the point in time in the agency decisionmaking process that the 102 process is initiated.

Recommendation No. 5: Agencies should devise an appropriate early notice system, by which the decision to prepare an impact statement is announced as soon as is practicable after that decision is made. (Compare in this respect the "notice of intent" provisions contained in § 8b of the NEPA procedures of the Environmental Protection Agency and the provisions for early public notice contained in paragraphs 12 and 14 of the NEPA procedures of the Corps of Engineers.) In connection with the development of such a procedure, an agency should consider maintaining a list of statements under preparation, revising the list as additions are made and making the list available for public inspection.

2. Draft Statement Reference to Underlying Documents.

The concern that underlies many of the judicial interpretations of the § 102 requirement is one of ensuring that the 102 process provides an adequate opportunity for comment and participation by other agencies as well as interested members of the public.

In addition, the requirement that agencies consider and respond to opposing views suggests that the 102 statement must consist of more than simple assertions about expected environmental impacts; the statement must also reflect the underlying information on which those assertions are based. One of the primary reasons for the injunction issued in *EDF v. Corps of Engineers*, for example, was the discrepancy between assertions made in the impact statement and the evidence on which those assertions were based. See ERC at 1267-69. This problem can largely be avoided by indicating in the draft statement the basis relied on for assertions that are likely to prove controversial or debatable.

Recommendation No. 6: Draft statements should indicate the underlying studies, reports, and other information obtained and considered by the agency in preparing the statement. The agency should also indicate how such documents may be obtained. If the documents are attached to the statement, care should be taken to ensure that the statement remains an essentially self-contained instrument, easily understood by the reader without the need for undue cross-reference.

3. Publication and Circulation of Statements.

Section 10 of the CEQ guidelines emphasizes the importance of preparing and circulating draft statements "early enough in the agency review process before an action is taken in order to permit a meaningful consideration of the environmental issues involved. The Council has recently received complaints from a number of agencies, as well as from members of the public, that the minimum periods established for comment and advance availability of statements are being unduly shortened by the delay in actual receipt of the statement. Confusion appears to have developed over whether the time periods are to run from the date the agency mails the statement, or from the date the statement is received by the commenting group.

In accordance with § 10(b) of the CEQ Guidelines, the Council's policy has been to

calculate the time periods from the date the statement is received at the Council on Environmental Quality. This date will appear in the Council's weekly publication in the *Federal Register* of statements received during the past week as well as in the monthly 102 Monitor. In order to avoid future confusion on this issue, agencies should ensure that their practices in calculating the minimum time periods reflect this policy.

In many cases, of course, a time lag will still occur between the date of receipt of a statement by the Council and the date of receipt by other agencies or members of the public. To some extent, the problems created by this delay can be avoided by adoption of the early notice device described in Recommendation No. 5, *supra*: such a device would enable potential commenting entities to request direct notification as soon as the draft statement is available. In large measure, though, the problem of providing "timely public information," see Executive Order 11514, § 2(b), requires agency initiative in publicizing the fact that a draft statement is available.

Agencies should not rely solely on the fact of *Federal Register* publication by the Council, but should consider adopting such practices as publication in local newspapers and automatic notification of (and possible automatic distribution of statements to) organizations and individuals that the agency knows are likely to be interested in the project.

Recommendation #7: Agencies should ensure that the minimum periods of review and advance availability of statements are calculated from the date of receipt of the statement by the Council on Environmental Quality, as noted in the Council's *Federal Register* and 102 Monitor announcements. Agencies should also devise appropriate methods for publicizing the existence of draft statements, for example by publication in local newspapers or by maintaining a list of groups known to be interested in the agency's activities and directly notifying such groups of the existence of a draft statement, or sending them a copy, as soon as it has been prepared.

4. Actions Which Involve More than One Agency.

Some confusion has arisen in applying the "lead agency" concept to actions involving more than one agency. Section 5(b) of the CEQ Guidelines provides that the lead agency is "the Federal agency which has primary authority for committing the Federal Government to a course of action with significant environmental impact." This description of "lead agency" was not meant to foreclose the possibility of having a statement prepared jointly by all agencies involved in the program or project. The critical consideration is that the cumulative impacts of the entire project be evaluated, even though each individual agency's action relates only to a part of the project. In some cases it will be most efficient for the agencies involved to agree on a single lead agency to prepare the statement on the entire project, obtaining assistance as necessary from the other agencies involved or from other agencies with relevant expertise. Relevant factors in determining the proper agency to assume such a role include: the time sequence in which the agencies become involved in the project, the magnitude of their respective involvement, and their relative expertise with respect to the project's environmental effects. But these criteria are not absolute and do not foreclose either a cooperatively prepared statement, or advance agreement on designation of a "lead agency" for purposes of ensuring leadership and assigning responsibility. Whichever procedure is followed, the two critical considerations inherent in the provisions of Section 5(b) are: (1) evaluation of the entire project; and (2) preparation of the 102 statement before any of the participating agencies

has taken major or irreversible action with respect to the project. See *Upper Pecos Ass'n v. Stans*, 2 ERC 1418 (10th Cir. 1971), *pet'n. for cert. pending*, 40 USLW 3444 No. 71-1133, Mar. 6, 1972).

Recommendation #8: In resolving "lead agency" questions, agencies should consider the possibility of joint preparation of a statement by all agencies involved, as well as designation of a single agency to assume leadership responsibilities in preparing the statement. In either case, the statement should contain an environmental evaluation of the entire project, and should be prepared before major or irreversible actions have been taken by any of the participating agencies.

5. Statements which Cover More than One Action.

Related to the above problem, is the problem of determining the proper scope of an environmental impact statement in connection with Federal programs that may involve a multiplicity of individual "actions." Section 10(a) of the CEQ Guidelines makes reference to the need for such "program" statements in certain cases, and this topic was explored in some detail at our agency review sessions in December. In part, the problem requires careful agency attention to the definition of the "action" that the agency is undertaking. If the definition is too broad and the program too far removed from actual implementation, the resulting analysis is likely to be too general to prove useful. On the other hand, an excessively narrow definition is likely to result in impact statements that ignore the cumulative effects of a number of individually small actions, or that come so late in the process that basic program decisions are no longer open for review.

Individual actions that are related either geographically or as logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions may be more appropriately evaluated in a single, program statement. Such a statement also appears appropriate in connection with the issuance of rules, regulations, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or in the development of a new program that contemplates a number of subsequent actions. Examples of such program statements include the Interior Department's statements on its oil shale program and on its exploitation of geothermal steam under the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970. In all of these cases, the program statement has a number of advantages. It provides an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practicable in a statement on an individual action. It ensures consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis. And it avoids duplicative reconsideration of basic policy questions. The program statement can, of course, be supplemented or updated as necessary to account for changes in circumstances or public policy and to measure cumulative impacts over time.

A program statement will not satisfy the requirements of Section 102, however, if it is superficial or limited to generalities. Where all significant issues cannot be anticipated or adequately treated in connection with the program as a whole, statements of more limited scope will be necessary on subsequent, individual actions in order to complete the analysis.

Recommendation No. 9: In preparing statements, agencies should give careful attention to formulating an appropriate definition of the scope of the project that is the subject of the statement. In many cases, broad program statements will be appropriate, assessing the environmental effects of a number of individual actions on a given geographical area, or the overall impact of a large-scale program or chain of contemplated projects, or the environmental implications of research activities that have reached a

stage of investment or commitment to implementation likely to restrict later alternatives. Preparation of program statements in these cases should be in addition to preparation of subsequent statements on major individual actions wherever such actions have significant environmental impacts that were not fully evaluated in the program statement.

6. Environmental Protective Regulatory Activities.

Section 5(d) of the CEQ guidelines indicates that certain activities of the Environmental Protection Agency do not constitute "actions" for purposes of Section 102. A number of agencies have been confused by the reference in this section to activities "concurrent" in by EPA. That reference is not meant to permit agencies to avoid the 102 process merely because the views of the EPA have somehow been secured with respect to environmental aspects of proposed activities.

Additional confusion has been created by recent district court decisions, severely restricting the applicability of § 5(d) with respect to regulatory activities taken by agencies other than the EPA. See *Kalut v. Resor*, 3 ERC 1458 (D. D.C. 1971); *Sierra Club v. Sargent*, 3 ERC 1905 (W.D. Wash. 1972). These cases are being appealed. In addition, legislative proposals have been introduced seeking Congressional clarification of some of the issues involved. In this respect, agencies should be aware of the testimony given by Chairman Train on March 22, 1972 before the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

There has been some confusion about the Council's views on the *Kalut* decision and what clarification of NEPA's applicability to environmental protective regulatory activity is necessary. In my opinion, the most narrow possible legislative action, addressed only to the water quality permit program, is desirable. With respect to EPA's other environmental protective regulatory activities we are asking EPA to study and revise its NEPA procedures to state specifically what activities and authorities are included under Section 5(d) of our Guidelines and the rationale for such inclusion.

Recommendation No. 10: Except for the Water Quality permit program, and those activities of the Environmental Protection Agency determined by EPA and the CEQ to justify inclusion under Section 5(d) of the CEQ Guidelines, no other agency actions should be considered as exempted from the requirements of Section 102 under Section 5(d).

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., February 29, 1972.

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF AGENCIES

Subject: Continuing Effort to Improve Agency NEPA Procedures

The Council on Environmental Quality Revised Guidelines for the Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) issued April 23, 1971, (36 Fed. Reg. 7724) called for your agency's issuance of NEPA procedures applying the Act's requirements to your particular programs. In virtually all cases you have now issued draft or final NEPA procedures for the relevant components of your agency and are operating under them.

Section 12(b) of the Council's Guidelines asked that you make a continuing assessment of your experience in the implementation of NEPA and comment to us in writing by December 1, 1971. In order to respond to those few agencies filing such comments and review general agency experience with NEPA, the staff of the Council, OMB and EPA held extensive review sessions with most Federal agencies in December. At these

meetings a number of questions concerning implementation of NEPA were raised informally to which CEQ responded.

We recognize that a continuing effort must be made to improve agency NEPA procedures and have assigned a significant staff effort to monitoring your agency's impact statements with a view to identifying needs for such improvement. We have also invited public comment (36 Fed. Reg. 23666, Dec. 11, 1971) on your procedures as an aid to this improvement. In particular we are interested in finding ways of consolidating numbers of impact statements into fewer but broader and more meaningful reviews.

On the matter of applying the NEPA statutory language "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment" to your particular agency programs and pinpointing the precise timing of the NEPA review and interagency consultations called for, your agency procedures must provide the specifics within the framework of the statute and our Guidelines. These procedures are important both in helping to identify the types of action on which impact statements are likely to be necessary and those where statements are not called for. Our staff is available to assist your staff in strengthening your procedures, particularly where you can supply us with the necessary information as to the nature of your activity, the extent of potential environmental impact, and the range of alternatives that ought reasonably to be considered. We expect to start meeting with staffs of individual agencies soon to review possibilities for improvement of procedures to implement NEPA.

We find that the courts are increasingly willing to sustain good faith agency efforts to comply with NEPA and will, from time to time, draw your attention to developments in this area. For the present I am asking our General Counsel to recirculate to your staff who serve as liaison with the Council on NEPA matters the informal guidance we have circulated since issuance of the Council's Revised Guidelines last April.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Chairman.

SOURCES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

In order to receive more efficient and prompt service, requestors are urged to order draft and final impact statements from the Department of Commerce's National Technical Information Service (NTIS) rather than the preparing agency. Each statement will be assigned an order number that will appear in the 102 Monitor (at the end of the summary of each statement) and also in the NTIS semi-monthly Announcement Series No. 68, "Environmental Pollution and Control." (An annual subscription costs \$5.00 and can be ordered from the NTIS, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22151.)

Final statements will be available in microfiche as well as paper copy. A paper copy of any statement can be obtained by writing NTIS at the above address and enclosing \$3.00 and the order number. A microfiche costs \$0.95. (Paper copies of documents that are over 300 pages are \$6.00.)

NTIS is also offering a special "package" in which the subscriber receives all statements in microfiche for \$0.35 per statement.

Statements will still be available for public scrutiny in the document rooms of the various agencies. However, only limited copies will be available for distribution.

Yet another possible source of statements is from the Environmental Law Institute, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. To order a document, please indicate the Department, date, and EIR Order # (given at the end of each summary). The Institute charges \$0.10 per page, and as

you will note the number of pages is also given at the end of the summaries. Please enclose the correct amount of money with your order and mark the envelope to the attention of the "Document Service."

SOURCE FOR BACK ISSUES OF THE 102 MONITOR

Because the supply of past issues of the 102 Monitor is not sufficient to meet all requests, a list is provided below indicating where the various issues of the 102 Monitor appeared in the Congressional Record. You may wish to order these Congressional Records from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (\$25 per copy).

Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 2, & 3; Congressional Record (page E 3607)—April 28, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 4; Congressional Record (page E 5151)—May 27, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 5; Congressional Record (page E 6023)—June 16, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 6; Congressional Record (page E 8458)—July 28, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 7; Congressional Record (page E 9483)—September 13, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 8; Congressional Record (page E 10002)—September 24, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 9; Congressional Record (page E 11596)—November 1, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 10; Congressional Record (page E 12213)—November 15, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 11; Congressional Record (page E 13322)—December 11, 1971.

Vol. 1, No. 12; Congressional Record (page E 76)—January 18, 1972.

Vol. 2, No. 1; Congressional Record (page E 1886)—March 2, 1972.

Vol. 2, No. 2; Congressional Record (page E 2409)—March 13, 1972.

Vol. 2, No. 3; Congressional Record (page E 3778)—April 13, 1972.

Vol. 2, No. 4; Congressional Record (page E 4929)—May 13, 1972.

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS RECEIVED BY THE COUNCIL FROM MAY 1 THROUGH MAY 31, 1972

NOTE: At the head of the listing of statements received from each agency is the name of an individual who can answer questions regarding those statements.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Dr. T. C. Byerly, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C. 20250, (202) 388-7803.

Title and description, date.

FINAL

Revised Poultry Inspection Regulations. The statement evaluates proposed poultry regulation revisions under the Poultry Productions Inspection Act. The regulations apply to the slaughter, preparation, and handling of poultry, and to the disposal of condemned carcasses and parts. Comments made by EPA. (ELR Order #4465, 15 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4465 F), May 16.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

FINAL

Water Bank Program. Proposed incentive payments to landowners and operators for preserving wetlands and conserving migratory waterfowl habitat and other wildlife resources. Under the program 10-year agreements would be entered into with consenting landowners. Selected areas (having wetlands and high potential for migratory waterfowl nesting) are located in 56 counties of 13 States. The action would help reduce the loss of wetlands, preserve wildlife habitat, reduce water runoff and maintain water table levels. Comments made by EPA and DOI. (ELR Order #4367, 64 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-206 159-F), May 4.

Animal and Plant Health Service

FINAL

Cooperative Boll Weevil Diapause Control Program. Proposed aerial spraying, in fall 1972, of 100,000 acres with 1 to 1.25 lbs of malathion per acre. Four applications of aldicarb at 1 to 2 lbs. per acre, will be sprayed on 1,000 acres in the spring. Acreage involved is located in Texas, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and California. The purpose of the action is the retardation of the spreading of the boll weevil. Malathion also affects some beneficial arthropods and other non-target organisms, and is toxic to bees. Comments made by EPA. (ELR Order # 4338, 21 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208, 733-F), May 2.

Forest Service

DRAFT

San Francisco Peaks, Coconino County, Arizona. The statement evaluates ten alternative management plans for the San Francisco Peaks area of the Coconino National Forest. Each plan is designed to promote optimum conditions for particular objectives (such as timber production, wildlife habitat, recreational use). (ELR Order # 4464, 60 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4464 D), May 5.

Ocala National Forest, Marion and Putnam Counties, Florida. Initiation of studies for the acquisition and management by the Forest Service, as part of the Ocala National Forest, of certain lands and structures associated with the Cross Florida Barge Canal along the Oklawaha River. Also proposed is legislative designation of the Oklawaha as a Study River, with immediate, temporary drawdown of Rodman Reservoir considered a prerequisite to an effective, comprehensive study. (ELR Order # 4551, 62 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4551 D), May 26.

Santa Fe National Forest, Sandoval and Santa Fe Counties, New Mexico. Proposed transfer of 13,440 acres of the National Forest to the Cochiti Pueblo. The land would be utilized for the grazing of animals, and would serve as a buffer between the Forest and Indian developments at Cochiti Lake. (ELR Order # 4501, 32 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4501 D), May 19.

FINAL

Beaverhead National Forest, Beaver and Madison Counties, Montana. Proposed spraying of 2,4-D herbicide on Beaverhead rangelands in order to control big sagebrush. The purpose of the action is the increase of forage production for domestic livestock. Non-target plants will also be destroyed; the herbicide will enter local water systems. Comments made by HEW, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4455, 158 pages) (NTIS order No. 206 786 F), May 12.

New Mexico and Arizona. Proposed granting the rights-of-way to the Tucson Gas and Electric Co. for construction of a single 345 kV powerline from Waterflow, New Mexico to Tucson, Arizona. The total length of the project is 403 miles, with 256.5 miles in New Mexico and 146.5 miles in Arizona. The primary impact of the line will be its visual one upon the landscape. Comments made by USDA, EPA, FPC, DOI, state and local agencies, and concerned citizens. (ELR Order No. 4358, 299 pages) (NTIS Order No. 204 960-F), May 3.

Rural Electrification Administration

DRAFT

Blue Mesa, Gunnison and Hinsdale Counties, Colorado. The statement is concerned with the proposed release of REA loan funds to the Colorado-Ute Electric Assoc., Inc., for construction of 33 miles of 115 kV transmission line between Blue Mesa and Lake City. A new substation will be built at Lake City. The line will be a major intrusion upon the landscape. (ELR Order No. 4525, 186 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4525 D), May 23.

Maysville Generating Station, Mason County, Kentucky. The proposed action involves loans of \$37,500,000 from REA to the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. The funds would be utilized to finance a 300,000 kV coal-fired steam electric generating station and 110 miles of transmission line. Oxides of sulfur and nitrogen will be emitted; the lines will be intrusions upon the landscape. (ELR Order No. 4524) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4524 D), May 23.

FINAL

New Madrid, Missouri. Proposed granting of loan requests by the Federated Electric Cooperative, Inc., in order to finance 189 miles of 345 kV transmission line between Dixon and New Madrid, Missouri; and construction of a new substation near Palmyra. The route will traverse the Clark National Forest and several rivers, including the Gasconade, which has been designated for possible addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Comments made by USDA, EPA, FPC, DOI, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order No. 4401, 176 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 958-F), May 9.

Soil conservation service

DRAFT

Banlick Creek Watershed, Boone and Kenton Counties, Kentucky. Application of land treatment measures and construction of one floodwater retarding structure and 2 multi-purpose reservoirs. Approximately 915 acres of land would be committed to the project, 8.5 miles of stream would be inundated, and 48 families would be displaced. (ELR Order No. 4536, (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4536 D), May 25.

FINAL

Oolenoy Watershed, Pickens County, South Carolina. Proposed conservation land treatment and construction of 6 flood water retarding structures and one 58 acre multi-use lake. Fifty-three acres of agricultural and wildlife land along with 2.4 miles of stream will be lost to the project. Comments made by COE, EPA, HEW, DOI, state and regional agencies. (ELR Order No. 4491, 18 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB 201 687 F), May 17.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Contact: Mr. Christopher L. Henderson, Assistant Director of Regulation for Administration, Washington, D.C. 20545, (202) 973-7531.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama. Proposed issuance of a construction permit to the Alabama Power Co. for the plant. The station will consist of 2 pressurized water reactors, each with a capacity of 2660 MWt and 861 MWe, and a maximum "stretch" power of 2774 MWt and 898 MWe. The Units would be cooled by a closed-cycle system using mechanical-draft towers. Water would be utilized from the Chattahoochee River. Low concentrations of radioactive gaseous effluents will be released to the environment; some fish will be impinged on intake filters; and some land will be taken out of cultivation. (ELR Order #4382, 205 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 888-D), May 5.

Port Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska. Proposed continuation of the construction permit and issuance of an operating permit to the Omaha Public Power District for the start up and operation of Unit 1. The Unit will employ a pressurized water reactor to produce up to 1420 MWt and a steam-turbine generator to provide 457 MWe (net). A "stretch" power level of 1500 MWt and 457 MWe is anticipated and considered in the statement. Condenser cooling water will be heated to 180° F

above ambient and discharged at 800 cu. ft./sec. to a bend in the Missouri River. (ELR Order #4370, 106 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 889-D), May 5.

Wm. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Clermont County, Ohio. Proposed issuance of a construction permit to the Cincinnati Gas and Electric Co. for construction of the Station. A boiling water reactor will be employed to produce 2436 Mwt and a steam-turbine generator to provide 840 MWe (net). Exhaust steam will be cooled by Ohio River water circulated in a natural draft cooling tower. Non-radioactive chemical, sanitary, and other waste will be discharged to the Ohio River; 26,000 curies of radioactivity (including 20 curies of tritium) in liquid wastes will be released per year to the environment; the 479' tall cooling tower will have a visual impact upon the landscape; 280 acres of land will be lost to the project. (ELR Order No. 4485, 135 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4485D), May 17.

Aquifer Nuclear Plant, Puerto Rico. Proposed issuance of a construction permit to the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority for Plant Unit No. 1. The unit will have a pressurized water reactor with an output of 1780 Mwt and 583 MWe. A "stretch" capacity of 1860 Mwt is anticipated. The nuclear unit will supplement two existing 40 MWe oil-fired gas turbines and two under construction 460 MWe oil-fired thermoelectric generating units. Cooling water for Unit 1 will be drawn from the Bay of Jobos and discharged to the Aquifer Ship Canal at the rate of 1,000,000 gpm. Minor impact upon aquatic life is expected. (ELR Order No. 4510, 147 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4510 D), May 19.

FINAL

Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts. Proposed issuance of an operating license to the Pilgrim Edison Co. for the start-up and operation of the Station, which is on Cape Cod Bay. The Station employs a boiling water reactor with a designed thermal rating of 1998 MW to produce 655 MW net electrical power. A once-through flow of water from Cape Cod Bay will be utilized for cooling. The water will be heated to 29° F. above the ambient; a local lobster fishery and an Irish Moss harvesting industry will be adversely affected by the Station. Comments made by USDA, COE, DOC, EPA, FPC, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order No. 4444, 196 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB 206 605 F), May 11.

Elk River Reactor, Sherburne County, Minnesota. Proposed dismantling of the reactor, which was operated from 1962 until 1968 by the Rural Cooperative Power Association (RCPA). RCPA has since waived its option to buy the plant, and fuel and control materials have been removed. The site will be put to alternate use by RCPA. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, FPC, HEW, DOI, DOT, and the state of Minnesota. (ELR Order #4381, 118 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-205 234-F), May 5.

Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Manitowish County, Wisconsin. Proposed issuance of a license to the Wisconsin Power Co. for the operation of Unit 2. (The statement considers the combined impact of Units 1 and 2, of 1518 Mwt and 497 MWe each.) The system will use 700,000 gpm of Lake Michigan water for once-through cooling. Impact upon aquatic life may result from entrainment on intake equipment and from the discharge of residue chemicals. A very small increase in radiation exposure to the population will occur. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, FPC, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order #4511) (NTIS Order #EIS72 4511 F), May 19.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Contact: Dr. Sidney R. Galler, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Affairs,

Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20330, (202) 967-4335.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

1976 International Exposition, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The statement is concerned with the proposed 1976 Exposition, a project of the Philadelphia 1976 Bicentennial Corporation. Areas of Philadelphia affected by the project would include the Southwest Industrial Area Site, the Eastwick Urban Renewal Area, and sites near the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers. Attendance is estimated at 51 million; environmental impact would include increased traffic congestion, air quality degradation, noise, water and river quality effects, and possible residential relocation. (ELR Order # 4339, 149 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 828XD), May 2.

Economic Development Administration

DRAFT

Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. Proposed construction of water and sewer lines to serve a 200 acre industrial site. Increases in population density and decreases in air and water quality will occur. (ELR Order # 4372, 61 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 850-D), May 5.

Lake Charles, Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana. Proposed construction of a diversion conduit to transport raw water from the Sabine River to the Lake Charles industrial area. Approximately 227 acres of farmland and woodland will be committed to the project. The potential effects upon marine life are still being considered. (ELR Order # 4351, 65 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 728-D), May 3.

Leading Creek Conservancy District, Galia, Meigs, and Vinton Counties, Ohio. The proposed project is a rural water system which would be designed and constructed to serve residential, commercial, and educational customers, and the Gavin Power Plant. The creation of solid mine and liquid coal processing wastes, as well as sanitary wastes, will result. (ELR Order # 4529, 84 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4529 D), May 24.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Contact: Mr. Robert L. Gilliat, Office of General Counsel, Room 3E977, Department of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301. (202) OX 5-3272.

Title and description, date.

FINAL

Exercise Exotic Dancer V, Jones, Onslow, Pender, Duplin, Craven, Carteret, and Lenoir Counties, and Croatan National Forest, North Carolina. The proposed exercise is a Joint Chiefs of Staff directed military maneuver, to be conducted by the Atlantic Command. It will involve air, sea, and land forces. Increases in local ambient air and water pollutant levels, and in noise, solid waste, rubbish, sewage, and garbage production will result. The exercise will take place in May, 1972. Arrangements have been made to minimize the possibilities of forest fires. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA DOI, DOT. (ELR Order #4377, 111 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-207 741-F), 5/5.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE

Contact: Colonel Cliff M. Whitehead, Room 5E 425, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20330, (202) OX 5-2889.

Title and description, date.

FINAL

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Coffee and Franklin Counties, Tennessee. Proposed use of the Air Force facility by the Tennessee National Guard Use of tracked vehicles will damage trees; agricultural use of 200 acres will be terminated; a wild turkey flock, deer, and other wildlife will be

dislocated from the 2,500 acre tract. Comments by USDA, DOI, and other state agencies. (ELR Order #4427, 39 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-203 238-F) May 11.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF ARMY

Contact: Mr. George A. Cunney, Jr., Acting Chief, Environmental Office, Directorate of Installations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff For Logistics, Washington, D.C. 20310, (202) OX 4-4269.

Title and description, date.

FINAL

Diamond Laboratories, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland. Proposed construction (in three phases) of the Harry Diamond Laboratories on a 137 acre site in White Oak. The Laboratories are presently housed in research facilities at the National Bureau of Standards. The old facilities will be razed, beginning in May, 1972. General purpose research at the new Laboratories will generate gamma radiation. Comments made by EPA, state, and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4449, 59 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB 199 313 F), May 11.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF ARMY

Contact: Colonel William L. Barnes, Executive Director of Civil Works, Attn: DAEN-CWZ-C, Office of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20314 (202) 693-7168.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Santa Clara River, Los Angeles County, California. Proposed construction of channelization works and levees along several stream tributaries of the Santa Clara River. Natural stream habitat would be lost. (ELR Order No. 4399, 96 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 961-D), May 9.

Port Hueneme Harbor, Ventura County, California. Proposed dredging of the Central Basin and Channel A of the Harbor to a depth of 35'. Marine ecosystems will be disturbed and/or destroyed by the dredge and dumping operations. Increased use of the Harbor will increase the potential for oil spillage and leakage. (ELR Order No. 4486, 29 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4486 D), May 17.

Mission Bay, San Diego County, California. Proposed maintenance dredging of the Bay entrance, with spoil being for beach nourishment. Marine ecosystems will be damaged at the sites of dredging and dumping. (ELR Order No. 4489, 19 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4489 D), May 17.

Deermers Beach, Delaware, and Kelly Point, New Jersey. Proposed approval of a permit application by Delmarva Power and Light Company to contract an aerial transmission wire across the Delaware River. The line will have aesthetic (visual) impact and will restrict recreational boating. (ELR Order No. 4407, 14 pages.) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4407 D), May 9.

Port Everglades Harbor, Broward County, Florida. Proposed deepening and modifying of harbor dimensions in order to enable the handling of larger ships. Approximately 2,940,000 cu. yds. of material would be dredged by the action, and a submerged reef formed. Increased pollution of the harbor could result from use by larger ships. (ELR order #4375, 51 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 873-D), May 5.

Kansas River, Kansas. Proposed navigation project on 9.3 miles of the Kansas River, which would involve dredging and construction of dikes, revetments, channel works, and bank stabilization structures. Riverbank vegetation will be lost to the project. (ELR Order #4413, 46 pages) (NTIS Order #PB 209 050 D), May 10.

Atchafalaya River Channel Project, Assumption, St. Mary, and Terrebonne Counties, Louisiana. Proposed enlargement of existing navigation channels in the Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black to 20' x 400'. The purpose is to permit passage of large offshore oil rigs and related equipment. Approximately 350 acres of land would be dredged and 7000 acres covered with spoil. (ELR Order #4335, 46 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 663-D), May 1.

Bucks Harbor, Washington County, Maine. The statement is concerned with the dredging of an 11 acre anchorage (for commercial fishing boats), at the harbor. Approximately 48,000 cu. yds. of spoil will be dredged from the site and dumped offshore. Temporary turbidity will have adverse effects upon marine biota. (ELR Order #4561, 21 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4561D), May 31.

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland. Proposed dredging of the river channel to a depth of 12' and a width of 150' in order to provide a deeper channel for commercial vessels. Dredging operations will disturb and/or destroy marine life; 90 acres will be covered with spoil. (ELR Order #4490, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4490 D), May 17.

Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts. Proposed periodic maintenance dredging of the Harbor. An estimated 145,000 cu. yds. of spoil would be dumped at an approved site. (ELR Order #4433, 19 pages) (NTIS Order #PB 209 044D), May 10.

Pearl River Basin, Neshoba County, Mississippi. Proposed construction, upon authorization by Congress, of a multipurpose reservoir project on the Pearl River. The project would be constructed for purposes of flood control, water quality control, recreation, and wildlife enhancement. Approximately 16,000 acres of agricultural and wildlife lands and an unspecified amount of free-flowing stream habitat would be inundated; an unspecified number of homes would be displaced. (ELR Order # 04550, 127 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4550D), May 26.

Newington Generating Station # 1, Newington County, New Hampshire. Proposed construction of a 400 MW oil-fired fossil fuel electric generating station, along with 345 KV and 115 KV switchyards, a 410' concrete stack, and intake and discharge structures. Long term effects of the plant upon the Piscataqua River estuary site are not presently known; 3 acres of inter-tidal-subtidal habitat will be lost; the discharge of cooling water and waste chemicals will adversely affect marine life. (ELR Order # 04530) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4530D), May 24.

Hannibal Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Ohio and West Virginia. Proposed construction of a non-navigable gated dam with two lock chambers, and appurtenant structures; existing facilities would be removed. Approximately 1200 acres of riverbank area would be inundated by the project. (ELR Order # 4330, 46 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 648-D), May 1.

Alum Creek Lake, Delaware County, Ohio. Proposed construction of a dam and appurtenant facilities on Alum Creek, for purposes of flood control, recreation, water supply, and conservation. Approximately 8810 acres will be committed to the project; 18.7 miles of stream will be inundated. (ELR Order # 04509, 45 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4509D), May 23.

Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania. Proposed annual maintenance dredging of the Harbor, with the 300,000 cu. yds. of spoil being dumped in Lake Erie. (ELR Order # 4416, 7 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-209 049D), May 10.

Woodcock Creek Lake, Crawford County, Pennsylvania. Proposed construction of a retention dam and lake on Woodcock Creek. Two miles of natural stream would be lost and 775 acres inundated by the project.

(ELR Order # 4405, 37 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 962-D), May 9.

Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, Nashville, Tennessee. Proposed construction of a dam with navigation lock, a 100 MW power plant, a spillway, and a 13,920 acre reservoir. Construction is 80% complete. (ELR Order No. 4368, 24 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4368F), May 4.

FINAL

Dreamy Draw Dam, Maricopa County, Arizona. Proposed construction of a dam and detention basin, a dike, and a spillway in Dreamy Draw, for the purpose of providing flood protection for northeastern Phoenix. Riparian and upland desert habitat would be altered by the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, and DOI. (ELR Order No. 04527) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4527F), May 23.

DeQueen Lake, Sevier County, Arkansas. Construction of a 160' high earth-fill dam, dikes, a service bridge, a spillway, and recreation facilities on the Rolling Fork River northwest of DeQueen. The project is presently 46% complete. Its purposes are flood control, water supply, water quality control, fish and wildlife, and recreation. Approximately 1680 acres of land will be inundated; several families have already been displaced; 12 archeological sites and 20.5 miles of free-flowing stream will be inundated. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, DOT, state, local, and regional agencies. (ELR Order No. 04555, 263 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4555F), May 26.

Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California. Proposed construction of channel works on Lytle, Warm, and East Twin Creeks, and on the Santa Ana River. The purpose of the action is flood control. It is anticipated that rapid urbanization of the project area will result from the improvements. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order No. 04520) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4520F), May 23.

Mullet Key, Pinellas County, Florida. The project involves beach nourishment of 6,750' of shoreline. A 210' wide strip of beach would be formed, along with a 60' wide protective barrier. A 420' long anchor groin and a 1,150' long revetment would be the structural features of the project. Approximately 325,000 cu. yds. of sand would be dredged from an offshore site and placed on the beach. Marine life at both sites would be damaged. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, HEW, HUD, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4567, 32 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4567F), May 31.

Miami Harbor, Florida. The action consists of deepening a 6 mile stretch of existing 30' deep harbor to a depth of 36'-38', and the widening of the channel by 100'. Approximately 5,000,000 cu. yds. of spoil will be dredged and dumped at 2 upland diked areas and 3 open water disposal areas. Marine life at both the dredging and dumping sites will be disturbed; the upland deposit sites are bordered by mangrove which serves as habitat for osprey, herons, and egrets. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies and concerned citizens. (ELR Order 4560, 40 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4560F), May 31.

Long Hollow Creek, Lewis County, Idaho. The project involves the clearing and channelization of a 5000' stretch of the creek. The intent of the action is to provide flood control for the village of Nez Perce. Increased water velocity could result in bank erosion downstream. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 04562, 34 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4562F), May 31.

Chicago River, Cook County, Illinois. Clearing of a 12-mile stretch of the North Branch of the Chicago River of trees, ensnarlements, and other debris. Refuse would be removed to an approved disposal site. Comments made

by USDA, USCG, EPA, DOI, DOT. (ELR Order No. 04542, 33 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4542F), May 24.

St. Catherine Sound, Maryland. The project is maintenance dredging of the 6' deep, 80' wide channel of St. Catherine Sound, extending 3,300' into the Wicomico River. The area is one of commercial and recreational boating importance. Marine life (such as oysters and crabs) which is of commercial importance, may be adversely affected by the project. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, HEW, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4563, 26 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4563 F), May 31.

Mud Creek, Custer and Sherman Counties, Nebraska. Construction of channel works, levees, bin walls, erosion control elements, and bridge replacements on 15,000' of stream. The purpose of the action is the provision of flood control for the city of Broken Bow. An unspecified amount of land will be lost to the project. Comments made by EPA and DOI. (ELR Order # 04526, 30 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4526F), May 23.

Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point, North Carolina. Proposed dredging of 3.2 million cu. yds. of material every 2 years from the basins and channels at Sunny Point. The material will be deposited in dike areas on Federal property. Ninety-three acres which serve as habitat for ospreys, American alligators, and other wildlife will be lost to the project; temporary turbidity will disturb marine ecosystems; salt water may pollute nearby freshwater and local soil. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4376, 229 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-207 741-F), May 5.

Taylor Bayou, Jefferson County, Texas. The proposed project is a flood control and drainage plan for the Taylor Bayou watershed. Structural features include enlargement of 1.8 miles of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, and the outfall canal from the Bayou, a diversion channel, and appurtenant facilities. A total of 3,800 acres will be committed to the project; 1,610 acres of land will be dredged to become part of the channel; 2,190 acres will be utilized for spoil deposit. The area consists of marsh and prairie land, much of it being wildlife habitat. Rare species affected by the action include the American alligator, the river otter, and the Texas red wolf. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order 4564, 60 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4564 F), May 31.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Contact: Mr. Joseph A. Grimes, Jr., Special Civilian Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C. 20350, (202) 697-0892.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island. Proposed construction of a permanent berth for a floating dry dock. A 700' x 180' area would be dredged from its present depth of 50' to 55'. Marine life will be disturbed and/or destroyed at the sites of dredging and dumping. (ELR Order # 4404, 11 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 959-D), May 9.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Contact: Mr. Sheldon Meyers, Director, Office of Federal Activities, Room 3630 Waterside Mall, Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 755-0940.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Water Control Plant, Washington, D.C. Proposed expansion and upgrading, from secondary to tertiary treatment, of existing Water Pollution Control Facilities. Disposal of residue sludge will be made by incineration, with ash being transported to approved landfill sites. The incineration will have an adverse effect upon ambient air quality.

(ELR Order # 4478, 507 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4478 D), May 12.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Contact: Mr. Frederick H. Warren, Advisor on Environmental Affairs, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20426, (202) 386-6084.

Title and description, date:

DRAFT

Project #271, Hot Spring and Garland Counties, Arkansas. Proposed approval of an application by the Arkansas Power and Light Company for a renewal license on Project 271. Two developments are involved, the first consisting of a dam, reservoir and a 56,000 kw., 2-generator powerhouse; the second consisting of a dam, reservoir, and a 3-generator 9,300 kw powerhouse. (ELR Order #4395, 68 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4395D), 5/8.

Drum-Spalding Project #2310, Placer and Nevada Counties, California. Initiation of action to bring under license four powerhouses (with a total installed capacity of 48,000 KW), and 12 dams, all of which are constructed and operating. (ELR ORDER # 04499, 31 pages) (NTIS ORDER # EIS 72 4499D), 5/19.

Kingsford Project, Dickinson and Florence Counties, Michigan and Wisconsin. Proposed of an application by the Wisconsin Michigan Power Co. for a renewal license on its Kingsford Project. The project consists of a dam, a 3-generator powerhouse, a reservoir, and appurtenant facilities. (ELR ORDER # 04535, 65 pages) (NTIS ORDER # EIS 72 4535D), 5/25.

Green Springs, Ohio. Proposed sale by Columbia LNG Corp. of 250,000 Mcf daily of pipeline quality SNG to the Columbia Transmission Corp. A plant is under construction at Green Springs which will utilize light hydrocarbon liquids (delivered via a 16" pipeline from Alberta, Canada) in the production of the gas. The construction of the pipeline will affect land, water, and wildlife resources over the proposed route. (ELR Order #4406 60 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 957-D), 5/9.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Contact: Mr. Robert Lanza, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Room 4062 HEWN, Washington, D.C. 20202, (202) 926-2241.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Rule Making on Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB's) in Food. Proposed establishment of rules in the food processing industry in order to prevent PCB contamination of foods. The provision would require the elimination of PCB-containing materials from animal feed, food, and food-packaging material establishments. (ELR Order #4403, 53 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 960-D), May 9.

Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Washington. Proposed development of the first phase of a new community college campus. The school is intended to serve 3000 students on a 86 acre site by the year 2000. Two pond areas exist on the site. (ELR Order #4429, 41 pages) (NTIS Order #PB 209 051 D), May 11.

FINAL

National Center for Toxicological Research, Pine Bluffs, Arkansas. Proposed conversion of 29,000 sq. ft. of existing building space to animal holding and research space as the first phase of construction of the Center. First phase costs are estimated at \$3,000,000. There will be minor discharges of effluents from solid and sanitary waste disposal. Comments made by USDA, DOC, DOD, EPA, HEW, HUD, and DOI. (ELR Order # 4497, 61 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4497 F), May 19.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Contact: Mr. Richard H. Broun, Director, Environmental and Land Use Planning Di-

vision, Washington, D.C. 20410, (202) 755-6186.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Downtown Urban Renewal Area, Washington, D.C. Proposed use of redevelopment or "disposition" controls to aid redevelopment of five urban renewal sites in the retail core of the downtown urban renewal area. These controls would establish permitted uses, height, lot occupancy, floor-area ratio, off-street parking and loading regulations for the sites. The dislocation of small retail business establishments will result. (ELR Order #4402, 157 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 956-D), May 9.

Trinity River Greenbelt, Dallas County, Texas. Proposed acquisition of 2,113 acres of underdeveloped flood plain land within the levees of the Trinity River for use as park and recreation area under HUD's Open Space Land Program. (ELR Order #4363, 17 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4363 D), May 4.

Armand Bayou Park, Harris County, Texas. Proposed acquisition of 550 acres of primitive land to be preserved as a conservation area under HUD's Open Space Land Program. (ELR Order #4388, 11 pages) NTIS Order #EIS 72 4388 D), May 8.

FINAL

Public Facility Loans Program. The statement is concerned with the HUD Project Selection System for its Public Facility Loans Program. The System is designed to aid in the evaluation of applications for loans in the construction of local public works by public bodies of less than 50,000 persons. Comments made by AEC, COE, EPA, FPC, GSA, HEW, and DOI. (ELR Order #4473) (NTIS Order #PB 204 917 F), May 15.

Broomfield, Colorado. Proposed construction of a water conduit to serve Broomfield and other suburban districts north and west of Denver. Twenty-five mgd would be pumped through the system. HUD contributed funds would total \$1,500,000. The pipeline will hasten land use changes from agricultural to residential and commercial uses. (ELR Order #4532) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4532 F), May 25.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Contact: Mr. Bruce Blanchard, Director, Environmental Project Review, Room 7260, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, (202) 343-3891.

Title and description, date.

Bureau of Mines

FINAL

Scranton, Pennsylvania. Proposed construction of a demonstration project to test the feasibility of the Dowell hydraulic slurry injection process for blind backfill of dry and flooded underground mine voids. Approximately 300,000 cu. yds. of coal refuse would be used beneath 20 acres of residential area. Construction will disrupt traffic and create public safety hazards. Comments made by EPA, DOI. (ELR Order No. 4474) (NTIS Order No. PB 206 767 F), May 15.

Huntington Canyon, Emery County, Utah. A coal-burning, 430 MW thermal electric generating station is presently under construction with a 345 kV transmission line to Salt Lake City and Four Corners. It is scheduled for service in 1974. A second, similar unit is planned for service beginning in 1977; transmission lines would also be constructed for it. Ultimate plant capacity is expected to be 200MW. Estimated stack emissions for the 430 MW unit (with no controls) include 33 to 45 t.p.d. of SO₂; 36 t.p.d. of NO_x; and 0.9 to 1.4 t.p.d. particulates. Comments made by USDA, AEC, EPA, HEW, and state and local agencies (ELR Order No. 4462) (NTIS Order No. PB-198 736-F), May 15.

Federal Mine Health and Safety Academy, West Virginia. The statement is concerned

with the construction and operation of a Federal Mine Health and Safety Academy, in Beckley, West Virginia. The Academy would train mine inspectors who would assist in administering the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. A 600 student multibuilding facility is planned. Forty-four acres would be committed to the project. Comments made by DOC, EPA, HEW, HUD, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order 04608, 68 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4608F), May 31.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

DRAFT

Canyon Lakes Project, Lubbock, Texas. Proposed granting of matching Federal assistance funds for the acquisition and development of land for recreational purposes. Approximately 675 acres, located in Yellow-house Canyon, are involved. Twenty-six residences and 36 businesses would be displaced by the action. (ELR Order No. 4420, 27 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-72 4420), May 10.

Bureau of Reclamation

DRAFT

Geothermal Leasing Program. This is a supplement to the draft statement issued on October 6, 1971. The original statement is concerned with the leasing and regulation of geothermal energy sources. The supplement discusses alternatives to the action, energy alternatives, and proposed unit plan regulations. (ELR Order No. 4360, 57 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 956-D), May 8.

North Side Collection System, Frying Pan-Arkansas Project, Colorado. The project consists of an arrangement of diversion dams, conduits, and tunnels designed to intercept and transport an average annual 18,400 acre-feet of water runoff from the north tributaries of the Fryingpan River to the Arkansas Valley. The system will divert water from the Colorado River Basin to the Arkansas River Valley, increasing the salinity of the Colorado River while improving the water quality of the Arkansas; require construction of 13 miles of access roads, 11.4 miles of tunnels and conduits, and clearance of 156 acres, creating an aesthetic impact. (ELR Order No. 4394, 89 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 955-D), May 8.

Ellis Unit, Trego, Ellis, and Russell Counties, Kansas. Proposed construction of the Round Mound Dam and reservoir, as a major portion of the Ellis Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. The Dam, an 111' high rolled earth structure, would be located 5 miles west of Ellis. A 175,000 acre-foot capacity reservoir would be formed, inundating 10 miles of stream bed and 2,085 acres of land. The project is designed to furnish municipal and industrial water for the City of Hays, and flood protection downstream. (ELR Order No. 04533) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4533D), May 24.

FINAL

East Mesa, Imperial Valley, California. Proposed drilling of a 4000-8000' deep geothermal test well, in order to recover steam and brine and determine its suitability for development of desalted water and electric power. Fourteen acres of land would be cleared for an access road and drilling operations. Comments made by USDA, EPA, FPC, DOI, state, local, and regional agencies. (ELR Order No. 4357, 81 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-206 161-F), May 3.

East Greenacres Unit, Kootenai County, Idaho. Construction of wells and a buried regulating reservoir, and installation of pumps and 40 miles of distribution pipe, in order to provide water for irrigation on 5,340 acres, as well as for domestic use. Approximately 1,810 of the acres are presently irrigated, the remainder dry-farmed. Sixteen acres will be required for right-of-way. Comments made by EPA, HEW, and DOT. (ELR

Order No. 04541) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4541F), May 24.

Palmetto Bend Project, Jackson County, Texas. Proposed construction of a 12.3 mile long, 64' high earthfill dam on the Navidad River. The purpose of the project is the supply of industrial and municipal water. Approximately 18,400 acres (11,300 of which will be inundated) will be committed to the project; 40 miles of free-flowing stream will be inundated; 9 families will be displaced; fresh water inflow to the Matagorda estuary will be altered; fish and shell-fish nursery areas will be impaired; habitat for such endangered species as the Texas red wolf, the American alligator, the Southern bald eagle, the Peregrine falcon, and the Attwater prairie chicken will be lost. Comments made by USDA, COE, DOC, EPA, EPC, HEW, DOI, OEO, DOT, state, local, and regional agencies. (ELR Order 04545 86 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4545F), May 24.

National Park Service

DRAFT

Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site, Montana. The statement is concerned with a legislative proposal to establish the Ranch as a National Historic Site. The Ranch would serve as a visible interpretation of the range cattle industry, especially in its frontier aspects. (ELR Order #4374, 16 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 872-D), May 5.

Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Virginia Beach, Virginia. Proposed elimination of unauthorized motor vehicles from the Refuge. The action is intended to preserve 4.2 miles of natural beach and wildlife habitat in an essentially natural condition. (ELR Order 4337, 45 pages) (NTIS Order #208 662-D), May 1.

Fossil Butte National Monument, Wyoming. The statement is concerned with a legislative proposal to establish an 8180 acre Fossil Butte National Monument. The area is one of the largest concentrations of fossilized fresh water fish in the nation. (ELR Order #4373, 18 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 871-D), May 5.

Office of Saline Water

DRAFT

East Mesa, Imperial Valley, California. Proposed construction of a 96,000 gpd desalting test facility at a geothermal test well, along with drilling of a 6000-7000' deep brine injection well two miles away. The test facility would be operated for the desalting of geothermal brine; waste brine would be disposed of in the second well. Twenty acres would be committed to the project; small amounts of gases would be released to the atmosphere; and brine would be released to settling ponds. (ELR Order #4336, 33 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 661-D), May 1.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER

COMMISSION

Contact: Mr. T. R. Martin, ARA/Mexico, Room 3906A, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520, (202) 632-1317.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

United States and Mexico. Proposed emergency temporary delivery of up to 20,600 AF/yr. of the 1944 Treaty allocation of Colorado River water to Tijuana, Mexico. A 6,100' pipeline would be constructed to the boundary, with Mexico paying the costs for new construction and use of existing works. (ELR Order No. 4421, 33 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-209 043-D), May 10.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Contact: Mr. Paul L. Woodard, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, (202) 386-4551.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Marijuana Eradication Project, Pulaski County, Indiana. Proposed spraying of 65

acres of farm land and 65 linear miles of ditch with 2,4-D herbicide. The purpose of the action is the elimination of marijuana in Pulaski County. The loss of cover for birds and other fauna will result; 2,4-D is slightly toxic to humans and animals. (ELR Order No. 4390, 9 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 868-D), May 8.

FINAL

Marijuana Eradication Project, Pulaski County, Indiana. Proposed spraying of 65 acres of farm land and 65 linear miles of ditch with 2,4-D herbicide. The purpose of the action is the elimination of marijuana in Pulaski County. The loss of cover for birds and other fauna will result; 2,4-D is slightly toxic to humans and animals. (ELR Order 4457) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 868-F), May 15.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Mr. Ralph E. Cushman, Special Assistant, Office of Administration, NASA, Washington, D.C. 20546, (202) 962-8107.

Title and description, date.

FINAL

Skylab Program. The statement considers the environmental impact of the Skylab Program, a post-Apollo manned flight program. Three separate long-term research flights will be made, each involving 3 man crews, with space vehicles being launched from the John F. Kennedy Space Center. Saturn V and Saturn IB launch vehicles will be used. Comments made by EPA. (ELR Order # 4518, 12 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4518 F), May 23.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contact: Mr. Martin Convisser, Mr. Convisser's office will refer you to the regional office from which the statement originated. (See page 83a) Director, Office of Program Co-ordination 400 7th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590 (202) 426-4355.

Title and description, date.

Federal Aviation Agency

DRAFT

Olney-Noble Airport, Richland County, Illinois. Proposed acquisition of 40 acres and construction of a 3900' x 75' runway with turnarounds, and installation of MIRL. (ELR Order # 415, 40 pages) (PB-209 041-D—NTIS #), May 10.

Carmi Airport, White County, Illinois. Proposed acquisitions of land and construction of a new airport with a 3900' x 75' runway, hangars, a terminal, etc. (ELR Order # 4424, 54 pages) (NTIS # PB-209 039-D), May 10.

Fairmont Airport, Martin County, Minnesota. Proposed extension of the runway, additions to MIRL, reconstruction of the access road, etc. (ELR Order # 4423, 17 pages) (NTIS # PB-209 046-D), May 10.

Cincinnati Blue Ash Airport, Hamilton County, Ohio. Proposed construction of a new 3500' x 75' runway, taxiways, aprons, etc. at the Airport. (ELR Order # 4414, 46 pages) (NTIS # PB-209 042-D), May 10.

FINAL

Ft. Valley Airport, Perry, Georgia. Proposed construction of airport facilities capable of accommodating 70% of the basic transport fleet of turbo-jet aircraft weighing less than 60,000 lbs. Ten acres will be committed to the clear zone. Comments made by EPA, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 432, 43 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-207 070-F), May 10.

Dade County Airport, Dade County, Georgia. Proposed construction of a new general utility airport adequate for 95% of propeller driven aircraft of less than 12,500 lbs. Ten acres of land will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4334, 30 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-205 578-F), May 1.

Jasper Airport, Pickens County, Georgia. Proposed acquisition of land and construc-

tion as a general utility airport to handle all propeller aircraft of less than 12,500 lbs. One hundred acres of land will be committed to the project; one residence will be displaced. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4332, 66 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-204 959-F), May 1.

Greensboro Airport, Greene County, Georgia. Proposed construction of a new basic utility airport capable of accommodating 95% of propeller-driven aircraft weighing less than 12,500 lbs. Thirty acres of land would be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, and DOI. (ELR Order No. 4459) (NTIS Order No. EIS-206 575-F), May 15.

Blue Ridge Airport, Fannin County, Georgia. Proposed construction of a new basic utility airport adequate for 95% of propeller-driven aircraft weighing less than 12,500 lbs. Eighty-five acres would be committed to the project; 11 families would be displaced. Comments made by USDA, DOI, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4460) (NTIS Order No. EIS-206 864-F), May 15.

Effingham Airport, Effingham County, Illinois. Proposed acquisition of land and construction of a 3400' x 60' runway; installation of runway lights and VASI-2, etc. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, HEW, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4355, 37 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-205 790-F), May 3.

Ottumwa Airport, Wapello County, Iowa. Proposed acquisition of land for the installation of ILS and ALS. One family will be displaced by the project. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, DOI, and state agencies. (ELR Order # 4329, 18 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-207 235-F), May 1.

Fremont Airport, Newaygo County, Michigan. Proposed acquisition of land and expansion of existing facilities. A new 5500' x 100' N/S runway would be built along with a terminal building; an existing runway would be extended, VASI, REIL, and medium intensity lighting installed, and utilities relocated. Two families will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HEW, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies, and concerned citizens. (ELR Order # 4417, 60 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-206 182-F), May 10.

Schoolcraft Airport, Manistee County, Michigan. Proposed acquisition of land and construction of a new runway, extension of an existing runway, installation of a wind cone, VOR, etc. An unspecified amount of land will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPA, DOI, DOT, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4479) (NTIS Order # EIS 206 106-F), May 16.

Langdon Airport, Cavalier County, North Dakota. Proposed acquisition of land, extension and strengthening of the runway, construction of a turf landing strip, and lighting. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, DOC, EPA, FPC, HEW, HUD, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order # 4354, 50 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-206 553-F), May 3.

Golden Valley County Airport, North Dakota. Proposed land acquisition and construction of a new airport, with a 3400' x 60' runway. Comments made by USDA, COE, DOC, EPA, HUD, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order # 4431, 34 pages) (NTIS Order # PM-207 236-F), May 10.

Antler Municipal Airport, Pushmataha, Oklahoma. Proposed development of a new airport for use by light propeller-driven aircraft, including a 60' x 3300' runway. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HEW, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order No. 4419, 51 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-206 859-F), May 10.

Goldsby Airport, McClain County, Oklahoma. Proposed reconstruction and extension of an existing runway, installation of medium intensity lighting and VASI-II, etc. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HEW, DOI, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order No.

4430, 54 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-206 108-F), May 10.

Arrowhead Airport, Pittsburg County, Oklahoma. Proposed development of a new airport facility for use by light, propeller-driven aircraft. Construction will include a 60' x 3500' NW/SE runway, a taxiway and apron, installation of VASI and medium-intensity lighting. Total cost is estimated at \$270,000. A 4(f) statement has been filed as some project land would be taken from the Arrowhead Park Recreation Area. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HEW, HUD, and DOT. (ELR Order No. 4552, 73 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4552-F), May 26.

Hemphill Airport, Sabine County, Texas. Proposed acquisition of land, construction of a new N/S runway, taxiway, access road, radio beacon, etc. for a new airport which would serve light piston-powered aircraft. An unspecified amount of land will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, DOI, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order No. 4331, 50 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-206 262-F), May 1.

Garner Field, Uvalde County, Texas. Proposed acquisition of land, extension and marking of a runway, and installation of medium intensity lighting. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, EPA, HEW, DOI, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order No. 4359, 59 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-206 385-F), May 3.

Ector County Airport, Ector County, Texas. Proposed reconstruction of two runways and extension of a third; construction of a taxiway, and installation of medium intensity lighting and VASI. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HEW, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order No. 4357, 35 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-204 092-F), May 3.

Manti-Ephraim Airport, Sanpete County, Utah. Proposed acquisition of land, extension of runway, and relocation of power lines. Four acres of land will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, DOC, EPC, HEW, HUD, DOI, DOT. (ELR Order # 4333, 32 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-207-064-F), May 1.

John F. Kennedy Memorial Airport, Ashland County, Wisconsin. Proposed extension of a runway, installation of REIL, medium intensity lighting etc. Approximately 111 acres will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HEW, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4418, 29 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-205 925-F), May 10.

Federal Highway Administration

DRAFT

Federal Aid Highway and Mass Transportation Act. The state considers the Act, presently before Congress, which would continue the Federal Aid Highway Program, but with a series of fundamental changes. These changes would include the establishment, beginning in FY 1974, of an Urban Transportation Program, (which would consolidate all existing urban highway and mass transit projects), a Rural Federal-Aid System, and a Rural General Transportation Fund. The existing Interstate Highway Program would be continued as a separate category to insure completion of the system. (ELR Order # 4625, 42 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4625 D), May 31.

Noise Standards and Procedures Pursuant to Public Law 91-605. The statement considers DOT standards which would require noise studies and the incorporation of noise abatement measures into federally aided highway projects; foster cooperation between state and local officials to develop standards; and provide incentives for state and local governments to enact codes regulating noise produced by individual vehicles. (ELR Order # 4559, 41 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4559 D), May 30.

Regulatory Modernization Act of 1971. The statement analyzes the potential environ-

mental impact of bills S. 2842, and H.R. 11826, legislation which is currently before Congress. The legislation would modify the current regulatory structure covering surface transportation; in particular the abandonment of under-utilized railway lines is discussed. (ELR Order # 4371, 16 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 851-D), May 5.

State Highway 365—South, Pulaski County, Arkansas. The statement is concerned with the construction of 7.4 miles of new, 4-lane highway. The purpose of the facility is that of providing primary access to the Mammelle New Town, a planned community of 50,000 persons. An unspecified amount of acreage will be committed to the highway. (ELR Order # 4554, 15 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS-72 4554-D), May 26.

Connecticut Route 40, New Haven County, Connecticut. Proposed construction of the Boulevard Bridge over the Penn Central Railroad. Four residences will be displaced by the action. (ELR Order # 04522, 30 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4522D), May 23.

I-75 (S.R. 93), Lee County, Florida. The project involves construction of a 4-lane limited access highway of Interstate standards. Total project length is 11 miles. Of major impact will be the crossing of the Caloosahatchee River, the possible disruption of surface hydrology, and the displacement of 47 residences and 1 business. An unspecified amount of land will be committed to the project. (ELR Order # 04558, 57 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4558D), May 30.

State Road 200, Nassau County, Florida. Proposed reconstruction of 6.9 miles of S.R. 200, from the town of Yulee to the Amelia River Bridge. The 4-lane roadway will span Lofton Creek in 2, 200' bridges. (ELR Order # 4458,) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4458-D), May 15.

State Route 70, Fulton County, Georgia. Proposed relocation and reconstruction of 2 miles of S.R. 70. Depending upon the route chosen displacements will number from 11 to 40 residences and 1 church. The project is a segment of nearby airport expansion and additional future displacements could result. (ELR Order # 4361, 82 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 729-D), May 3.

F.A.P. F-0361(4), Maui, Hawaii. Proposed construction of 2.8 miles of 2-lane highway. Twenty-two residences and two businesses will be displaced; 65 acres will be committed to the project. (ELR Order # 4411) (NTIS Order # PB-209 040-D), May 10.

US 30N, Bannock and Caribou Counties, Idaho. Proposed construction of 15.6 miles of new, 2-lane highway. A 4(f) statement will be required as parkland would be crossed. (ELR Order # 4396, 33 pages.) (NTIS # 72-4396-D), May 8.

Illinois Routes 32 and 33 (US 40), Effingham County, Illinois. Proposed reconstruction, from 2 to 4 lanes, of 1.75 miles of highway. Five acres of land would be committed to the project. (ELR Order # 04516.) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4516D), May 22.

US 50, Ripley County, Indiana. Proposed reconstruction of 15.3 miles of US 50. Several alternative routes are being evaluated; each would require the filing of 4(f) statements as parcels of public land would be affected. (ELR Order # 4515.) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4515D), May 22.

US 169, Allen and Neosho Counties, Kansas. Proposed construction of 22 miles of relocated 4-lane highway. Several alternate routes are presently under consideration. (ELR Order # 4302, 58 pages.) (NTIS Order # PB-208 734-D), April 28.

21st Street, Shawnee County, Kansas. Proposed reconstruction of an intersection in urban Topeka. Nine residences would be displaced by the action. (ELR Order # 4461) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4461-D) May 15.

US 113, Worcester County, Maryland. Proposed construction of 7.3 miles of new, 2-lane highway. An unspecified number of displacements will result. (ELR Order #4426,

39 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-209 038-D), May 11.

MD. 183, Montgomery County, Maryland. Proposed reconstruction and widening of 2.91 miles of roadway, partially on new location. An unspecified number of residences will be displaced by the action; a 4(f) statement will be filed as public park land would be taken by the project. (ELR Order #04498) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4498-D), May 19.

Patuxent Freeway, Carroll, Anne Arundel, and Howard Counties, Maryland. Construction of 10.4 miles of new 2-lane highway between Maryland Route 108 at Clarksville and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway at Ft. Meade. Seventeen residences and 3 businesses will be displaced by the project. (ELR Order #4531) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4531-D), May 24.

Route 2, Massachusetts. Proposed reconstruction of 11.3 miles of 2-lane Route 2 in Lexington, Lincoln, Concord, and Acton, to freeway standards. Eighty-seven residences would be displaced by the project. Several 4(f) statements will be filed, as the highway would affect the Minute Man National Historical Park, the Walden Pond State Reservation, one town forest and two conservation areas. (ELR Order #4472) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4472-D), May 15.

I-94 Interchange, Berrien County, Michigan. Proposed reconstruction of 4 lane I-94 at its intersection with Lakeshore Drive. An unspecified number of residences will be displaced by the action. (ELR ORDER #04557,) (NTIS ORDER #EIS 72 4557D), May 26.

F.A.S. Route 6318, Hennepin County, Minnesota. Proposed construction of 3.5 miles of 4-lane divided highway, which will compose the last segment of a 15 mile connector between I-494 and I-94. Fifty persons and two businesses would be displaced by the project. (ELR Order #4369, 29 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-208 833-D), May 5.

State Route 66, St. Louis, Missouri. Proposed replacement of an existing bridge over the River Des Peres. A 4(f) statement may be required as land may be taken from a local park. (ELR Order #4362, 18 pages.) (NTIS Order #PB-208 730-D), May 3.

State Route 61, Lewis County, Missouri. Proposed relocation of 12.1 miles of S.R. 61, a 2 lane facility. Approximately 443 acres of agricultural and timberland will be committed to the project. (ELR Order #4422, 12 pages) (NTIS # PB 209-045D), May 10.

State Route 61, Lewis County, Missouri. Proposed relocation of 12.1 miles of S.R. 61, a 2-lane facility. Approximately 443 acres of agricultural and timberland will be committed to the project. (ELR Order # 4422,) (NTIS Order #PB-209 045-D), May 10.

Route 87, Howard County, Missouri. Proposed construction of 7 miles of new 2-lane highway, including bridges over two creeks. Approximately 130 acres of agricultural and wooded lands will be committed to the projects 4 residences will be displaced. (ELR ORDER #04538,) (NTIS ORDER #EIS 72 4538D), May 25.

Garden State Parkway, Middlesex County, New Jersey. Proposed construction of entrance and exit ramps on the Garden State Parkway at Metro Park in Woodbridge. A 4(f) statement will be filed as public park land would be taken by the project. (ELR ORDER #04549,) (NTIS ORDER #EIS 72 4549D), May 26.

I 684, Westchester County, New York. The statement is a supplement to the final environmental impact statement on I-684 between Katonah and Croton Falls. The project is a proposed reconstruction (from 4 to 6-lanes) of the highway and construction of a full diamond interchange with S.R. 116. The supplement reevaluates alternative actions. (ELR Order # 04523.) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4523D), May 23.

Northern Arterial, Westchester County, New York. The statement is concerned with the construction of 1.9 miles of urban high-

way, the Northern Arterial, in White Plains. Twenty-four businesses and 41 residences would be displaced by the 8-lane facility; a 4 (f) statement will be filed as the Bronx project. (ELR Order # 4569, 68 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS-72 4569-D), May 31.

Dekalb Street, Cleveland County, North Carolina. Proposed construction of 0.7 miles of roadway in urban Shelby. Forty families and one business would be displaced by the project. (ELR Order # 4398, 21 pages), May 8.

West First Street (SR 1507), Forsyth County, North Carolina. Proposed reconstruction of a 5-legged intersection in urban Winston-Salem. A 4(f) statement would be filed as a portion of a public park would be taken by the project. (ELR ORDER # 04534.) (NTIS ORDER # EIS 72 4534D), May 24.

Six Forks Road, Wake County, North Carolina. Proposed widening of Six Forks Road, in urban Raleigh, from 4 and 5 lane sections to 5 and 7 lane sections. Two businesses and 3 residences would be displaced by the action. (ELR Order # 4488.) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4488-D), May 17.

Lake Oahe, Sioux and Emmons Counties, North Dakota. Proposed construction of a bridge across Lake Oahe. The 2-lane roadway would connect US 83 and S.H. 24. Five alternative routes are under consideration. Approximate route length is 23 miles; approximate bridge length, including approaches, is 1.0 mile. An unspecified amount of land would be committed to the project. (ELR Order # 4454, (NTIS Order # EIS-72 4454-D), May 12.

State Highway 3, Pontotoc and Coal Counties, Oklahoma. Proposed relocation and reconstruction of 12.5 miles of 2-lane S.H. 3. Three residences and 450 acres will be lost to the project. (ELR No. 4353, 17 pages) (NTIS Order No. PB-208 732-D), May 3.

State Route 34, Greene County, Tennessee. Proposed construction of approximately 11.3 miles of 4-lane SR 34. An unspecified amount of land and number of residences will be lost to the project. (ELR Order No. 4228.) (NTIS Order No. PB-209 048-D), May 11.

F.M. 776, Jasper County, Texas. Proposed construction of 1.6 miles of 2-lane F.M. 776 in urban Jasper. Thirteen residences would be displaced by the action; an unspecified amount of land would be committed to the project. (ELR Order No. 4440.) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4440-D), May 11.

I 45, Harris County, Texas. Construction of 9.25 miles of new 4-lane highway in three segments (I 129, US 77, and US 20). The highways would meet at the proposed I-129 and US cloverleaf interchange at South Sioux City. Twenty-eight residences, 1 business and 4 farms will be displaced by the action. (ELR ORDER No. 04544.) (NTIS ORDER No. EIS 72 4544D), May 24.

State Highway 118, Lubbock and Hockley Counties, Texas. The project involved is a reconstruction of 19.5 miles of rural highway, from 2 to 4 lanes. Seven businesses and 25 residences will be displaced. An unspecified amount of additional right-of-way will be claimed by the project. (ELR Order No. 4553, 24 pages) (NTIS Order No. EIS-72 4553-D), May 26.

I 93, Grafton and Caledonia Counties, Vermont. Proposed construction of 6.5 miles of new 4-lane highway. Several streams and rivers will be bridged, including the Connecticut. Two residences will be displaced by the project. (ELR Order No. 04521.) (NTIS Order No. EIS 72 4521D), May 23.

State Route 193, Asotin and Whitman Counties, Washington. Proposed construction of a new bridge for S.R. 193, over the Snake River. Total length is estimated from 1500' to 1900'. Four residences would be displaced by the action. (ELR Order # 4487) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4487-D), May 17.

Project ADP-(200)25, Mercer County, West Virginia. Proposed construction of 4.8 miles of new, four-lane divided highway.

One creek will be channelized and an unspecified number of residences will be displaced by the project. (ELR Order # 4366, 58 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS-72-4366-D), May 4.

State Highway 27, Sparta, Wisconsin. Proposed reconstruction of 1.16 miles of S.H. 27. Two residences and one business will be displaced by the action. (ELR Order # 4365, 16 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS-72-4365-D), May 4.

State Trunk Highway 59, Waukesha and Milwaukee Counties, Wisconsin. Proposed construction of 8.1 miles of 2-lane S.H. 59. Thirty-one residences will be displaced by the action and an unspecified number of acres taken. A 4(f) statement will be filed as land would be taken from a local park. (ELR Order # 4456) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4456-D), May 15.

FINAL

US 98, Mobile County, Alabama. Proposed relocation and reconstruction of 13.66 miles of US 98, from 2 to 4 lanes. Eleven families would be displaced and 414 acres lost to the project. Comments made by USDA, DOD, EPA, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4343, 48 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-199 256-F), May 2.

S-5127, Montgomery County, Alabama. Proposed paving of two miles of rural gravel roadway. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, DOC, EPA, DOT, DOT, state and regional agencies. (ELR Order # 4341, 33 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-202-322-F), May 2.

Project F-FG-184(7), Baldwin County, Alabama. Proposed construction of 2 sections of highway totaling 1.96 miles in length. One family and two businesses will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, COE, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order # 04386) (NTIS Order # PB-201 566-F), May 8.

Project S-6408, Walker County, Alabama. Proposed construction of 10.901 miles of new 2-lane roadway. Approximately 225 acres of wildlife habitat will be committed to the project; 17 residences will be displaced. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, DOI, and HUD. (ELR Order # 4483) (NTIS Order # EIS 201 846-F), May 17.

Anchorage-Fairbanks Highway, Alaska. Proposed reconstruction of 22.6 miles of the 2-lane Anchorage-Fairbanks Highway. A section of the highway lies within the Mt. McKinley National Park, necessitating the filing of a 4(f) statement. Comments made by EPA, DOI, DOT, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4443) (NTIS Order # EIS 202 124-F), May 11.

Haines Highway, Alaska. Proposed reconstruction of 40 miles of 2-lane Haines Highway, from the city of Haines to the Canadian border. Comments made by USDA, DOT, HUD, DOI. (ELR Order # 4468) (NTIS Order # EIS-72 4468-F), May 16.

Mesa-Payson Highway, Gila County, Arizona. Proposed reconstruction of 26 miles of highway (the "beeline", or S.R. 87). An unspecified amount of land will be lost to the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4494) (NTIS Order # EIS 204 022-F), May 17.

US 270, Hot Spring County, Arkansas. Proposed reconstruction (partially on new location) of 3.227 miles of US 270, from 2 to 4 lanes. Twelve residences and 6 businesses would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HEW, HUD, DOI, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4517, 25 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS-72 4517-F), May 23.

Project T-3067(4), Sacramento County, California. Proposed construction of a 0.4 mile highway overpass, over the main lines of the Southern Pacific Railway. An unspecified number of displacements will occur. (ELR Order # 4392, 69 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 952-F), May 8.

Project T-3072(10), Santa Clara, California. Proposed widening of two streets (F.A.P. 65 and F.A.S. Route 1009) at their intersection, and installation of traffic signals. Two residences and 2 businesses will be lost to the project. A 4(f) statement is required as land will be taken from a city park. Comments made by DOI and regional agencies. (ELR Order # 4380, 49 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 842-F), May 8.

Pedestrian Overcross, Merced County, California. Proposed construction of a pedestrian overcrossing of State Highway 152. The facility will connect 2 portions of the City's school facilities which are severed by the existing road. A 4(f) statement would be required as the Los Banos Recreation Park would be affected by the project. Comments made by DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4452) (NTIS Order # EIS 203 812-F), May 11.

Inyo National Forest, California. Proposed reconstruction, widening, and hardening of 2.67 miles of an existing dirt road in the Forest, the Minarets Summit Route. The road leads to the Devils Postpile National Monument in the Red Meadows Area. Construction of the road will involve cuts into hillside slopes, the crossing of 3 avalanche fields, and the stabilization of 3' deep pumice soils. Comments made by USDA, COE, DOI, and state agencies. (ELR Order # 4543, 84 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS-72 4543-F), May 25.

State Highway 82, Garfield County, Colorado. Proposed widening of 2 miles of S.H. 82 from 2 to 4 lanes, beginning at its intersection with S.H. 133 and running south. Comments made by DOI and DOT. (ELR Order # 4505) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4505F), May 19.

Route A1A, Volusia County, Florida. Reconstruction of 4.1 miles of highway from 2 to 4 lanes. Two routes are under consideration. Comments made by EPA, HUD, and DOI. (ELR Order # 04507) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4507F), May 19.

Moreland Avenue, De Kalb and Fulton Counties, Georgia. Proposed reconstruction and widening of 4 miles of Moreland Avenue (S.R. 160), including the construction of 2 new bridges. An unspecified number of displacements will occur; a 4(f) statement will be filed as local park land would be affected by the project. Comments made by COE, EPA, HUD, DOI, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4442) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4442-F), May 11.

Project S-2114, Jenkins County, Georgia. Proposed construction of 5.055 miles of 2-lane State Route 17 along an existing stretch of unpaved country road. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOT, HUD, DOE, and state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4450) (NTIS Order # EIS 201 396-F), May 11.

State Route 56, Athens County, Georgia. Proposed construction of 2.6 miles of 2-lane highway, on new location. An unspecified number of residences and amount of acreage will be committed to the project; one dairy farm will be severed by the action. Comments made by EPA, HUD, DOI, and state agencies. (ELR Order # 4352, 27 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-204, 160-F), May 2.

I-75 and S.R. 5, Cobb County, Georgia. Proposed construction of 7.39 miles of 4 and 6 lane fully controlled access highway, in 3 sections. Approximately 30 residences and 2 businesses will be displaced by the action. Comments made by DOC, EPA, HEW, HUD, DOI, state and regional agencies. (ELR Order # 4514) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4514F), May 19.

Supplemental Freeway F.A. 405, (F-5), Peoria, Marshall, and Putnam Counties, Illinois. Proposed construction of approximately 36 miles of new highway. Several alternative routes are under consideration. An unspecified number of residences and amount of land will be committed to the action. Comments made by USDA, HUD, DOI, and

DOT. (ELR Order #04508) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4508 F), May 19.

F.A.P. Route 411, Vermilion County, *Illinois*. Proposed construction of an 18 mile section of 14 lane highway the entirety of which will ultimately link Chicago with southern Illinois along the east edge of the state. An unspecified number of residences and amount of land will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, COE, DOI, DOT, DOC. (ELR Order #04493) (NTIS Order #72 4493F), May 17.

FAS Route 187, Richland County, *Illinois*. Proposed reconstruction and widening of 1.5 miles of FAS Route 187. Fourteen residences and 9 businesses would be displaced by the action. A 4(f) statement would be required as land would be taken from Olney Park. Comments made by: DOI, DOT, state and local agencies (ELR Order #4495) (NTIS Order #EIS 200 005F), May 17.

F.A.S. 175, Franklin County, *Indiana*. Proposed construction of a new 2-lane bridge on F.A.S. 175 (S.R. 1), over the White River. Total length of the project, including approaches, is 1.3 miles. Two residences would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4480) (NTIS Order #EIS 203 689F), May 16.

I-380, Linn County, *Iowa*. Proposed construction of two, 3-lane roadways in urban Cedar Rapids. Total project length is 1.2 miles. Eighty families and 16 businesses will be displaced by the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4348, 30 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-200 765-F), May 2.

US 50, Ford County, *Kansas*. Proposed reconstruction of 0.7 mile of 4-lane highway, in urban Dodge City. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, USCG, EPA, HEW, DOI, and state agencies. (ELR Order #4347, 31 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-201 771-F), May 2.

US 119, Harlan and Letcher Counties, *Kentucky*. Proposed reconstruction of 6.6 miles of US 119. Sixty-three residences, 6 businesses and 3 churches will be displaced by the project; 330 acres will be permanently lost, and one stream will be channelized. A 4(f) statement will be filed as a city-owned park would be taken by the project. Comments made by DOI, DOT, OEO, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4481) (NTIS Order #PB-202 131-F), May 17.

Harlan Road, Harlan County, *Kentucky*. Proposed reconstruction of 6.05 miles of the Harlan-Cumberland-Whitesburg Road (US 119). Several streams would be crossed and/or channelized by the project; thirty residences will be displaced and 325 acres of land committed. Comments made by EPA, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4476) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4476-F), May 16.

Project I-24-1(2), McCracken County, *Kentucky*. Proposed construction of 4.072 miles of new 4 lane highway. Twenty-four residences would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, TVA, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order # 4346, 53 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 731-F), May 2.

US 11, Hagerstown, *Maryland*. Proposed relocation of 0.38 mile of highway. Fifty-nine persons will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 04585) (NTIS Order # PB-201 241-F), May 8.

Dorchester County, *Maryland*. Proposed reconstruction of 1.976 miles of Maryland Route 16, between Parsons Creek and Slaughter Creek. An unspecified amount of land would be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4469) (NTIS Order # EIS 201 565-F), May 16.

US 131, Montcalm, Mecosta, and Osceola Counties, *Michigan*. Proposed relocation and reconstruction to freeway standards, of 41 miles of US 131. Approximately 30 residences and a similar number of farms will be dis-

placed by the project, depending upon the route chosen. A 4(f) statement may be filed, as several recreation sites are located in the proposed corridor. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, DOC, EPA, DOI, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order # 4387, 209 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-200 937-F), May 8.

M-43, Kalamazoo County, *Michigan*. Proposed reconstruction of 11.5 miles of 2-lane M-43, partially on new location. Approximately 144 acres would be committed to the project; 31 residences and 11 businesses would be displaced. Comments made by USDA, COE, DOC, EPA, DOI, DOT, HUD, state and local agencies (ELR Order # 4447) (NTIS Order # 72-4447-F), May 11.

State Highway 24, Nicollet and Blue Earth Counties, *Minnesota*. Proposed construction of a new 2-lane bridge on Nicollet County State Aid Highway 24, over the Minnesota River. Total length of the bridge and access ramps is 1.02 miles. An unspecified amount of land will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, FPC, HEW, DOI, OEO, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4446) (NTIS # EIS 72-4446-F), May 11.

Route 66, Jasper County, *Missouri*. Proposed construction of 9.3 miles of 4-lane highway, much of it on new location. Eighteen families, two businesses and one farm will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Order #04513) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4513F), May 19.

Project U-515(8), Douglas County, *Nebraska*. Proposed construction of 0.8 miles of 4-lane urban roadway in South Omaha. Forty-two single family residences, 19 trailer homes, 56 flats, 2 churches and 29 businesses would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HUD, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4470) (NTIS Order # EIS 204-100-F), May 16.

US 3, Belknap County, *New Hampshire*. Proposed construction of a bridge and approaches, totaling 0.75 mile in length. Three residences and 10 businesses would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, USCG, EPA, HEW, HUD, DOI, OEO, DOT, and one regional agency. (ELR Order #4342, 50 pages). (NTIS Order #PB-203 227-F), May 2.

Route 130, Burlington County, *New Jersey*. Proposed replacement of an existing 4 lane bridge on Route 130 over Rancocas Creek with a 6-lane structure. Thirty-eight residences and 10 businesses would be displaced by the action. Comments made by HUD, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4482) (NTIS Order EIS 200 015-F), May 17.

Route 5, Herkimer County, *New York*. Proposed reconstruction of Route 5 at its intersection with County Roads 26 and 37 in the Town of Schuyler. Five residences and 1 business would be displaced by the action. Comments made by EPA, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4467) (NTIS Order # EIS 199 245-F), May 16.

US 70, Jones and Craven Counties, *North Carolina*. Proposed reconstruction from 2 to 4 lanes, of 19 miles of US 70. Comments made by USDA, COE, GSA, HEW, DOI, OEO, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4383 80 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4383) May 8.

NC 24, Cumberland County, *North Carolina*. Proposed construction of a 5-lane highway across the Cape Fear River. Eight families and five businesses would be displaced. Portions of two streams will be channelized and land will be taken from a local park, necessitating a 4(f) statement. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, GSA, HUD, DOI, and OEO. (ELR Order #4384, 48 pages.) (NTIS Order EIS 72 4384), May 8.

Tarboro Street (Sk 2564), Wake County, *North Carolina*. Proposed widening of 2.7 miles of roadway from 2 to 4 lanes. Seven families and two businesses would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, GSA, DOI, and DOT. (ELR Or-

der #04504) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4504D), May 19.

New Bern Bypass, Craven County, *North Carolina*. Proposed construction of a 4-lane US 70 Bypass at New Bern, from Clarks to James City. Two streams would be spanned by bridges along the 8.1 mile route; 33 residences and 8 businesses would be displaced. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HUD, DOI, OEO, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4475) (NTIS Order #EIS 72-4475-F), May 16.

Ward County Road No. 2, Ward County, *North Dakota*. Proposed reconstruction of 8 miles of 2-1 lane roadway. A 4(f) statement will be filed as public park land would be taken by the project. Comments made by COE (ELR Order #04502) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4502F), May 19.

State Route 60, Zanesville, *Ohio*. Proposed construction of 1.2 miles of S.R. 60, including a bridge over the Muskingum River. An unspecified number of residences and businesses will be committed to the project. Comments made by Army COE, DOC, EPA, DOI, DOT, and state agencies. (ELR Order #4344, 41 pages) (NTIS #PB-202, 425-F).

State Route 45, Columbiana County, *Ohio*. Proposed construction of S.R. 45, a 4-lane bypass of Lisbon. One farm and 7 residences would be displaced by the action; 150 acres would be taken. Comments made by EPA, HUD, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4471) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4471-F), May 16.

State Route 235, Clark and Champaign Counties, *Ohio*. Proposed reconstruction of 16 miles of 2-lane S.R. 235. Sixteen residences will be displaced by the action and an unspecified number of acres committed to it. Comments made by EPA, DOI, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4445) (NTIS Order #EIS 202 438-F), May 11.

S.R. 73, Adams County, *Ohio*. Construction of a new bridge over Ohio Brush Creek on S.R. 73, a 2-lane roadway. Total length of the project, including approaches, is 0.55 mile. Seven acres of right-of-way, plus land owned by the Ohio Historical Society at its Serpent Mount State Park, will be committed to the project. Comments made by USDA, COE, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies, and concerned citizens. (ELR Order #4548, 31 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4548-F), May 26.

U.S. 62, Grady County, *Oklahoma*. Proposed reconstruction, partially on new location, of 7.6 miles of U.S. 62. Two additional lanes will be added to the existing two. Nine families and two businesses will be displaced by the action; 120 acres will be committed. Comments made by DOI and state agencies. ELR Order #4412, 25 pages) NTIS Order #PB-200 188-F), May 10.

Diamond Lake Bypass, Douglas County, *Oregon*. Proposed construction of 5 miles of 2-lane Bypass, as Oregon FH Route 46, from the intersection of S.R.'s 138 and 230 north. Approximately 100 acres of forest land will be lost to the project. Comments made by USDA, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4477) (NTIS Order #EIS 202 802-F), May 16.

FAS Route 266, Lycoming County, *Pennsylvania*. Proposed reconstruction of 0.53 mile of 2 lane roadway, including one bridge. Comments made by EPA and state agencies. (ELR Order #4349, 58 pages) (NTIS Order #PB-202 121-F), May 2.

Legislative Route 10001, Butler and Beaver Counties, *Pennsylvania*. Proposed construction of 2.8 miles of new 2-lane highway, L.R. 10001. Twenty acres would be committed to the action; 2 families would be displaced. Comments made by ARC, HUD, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4484) (NTIS Order #EIS 202 901-F), May 17.

Legislative Route 11804, Cambria County, *Pennsylvania*. Proposed reconstruction of 1.7 miles of L.R. 11804, an existing 2-lane facility. A 4(f) statement will be filed as 14 acres would be taken from Prince Gallitzin

State Park. Comments made by USDA, EPA, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4448) (NTIS Order #EIS 202 083-F), May 11.

Memorial Boulevard, Newport County, Rhode Island. Proposed construction of a 0.6 mile connecting link between Memorial Boulevard and an interchange with S.R. 138 in urban Newport. The road will disrupt an area of significant historical importance, segments of which are on the National Register of Historic Places. A 4(f) statement will be filed. Fifth-three residences will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, USCG, EPA, FPC, HEW, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies, and concerned citizens. (ELR Order #4546, 172 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS-72 4546-F), May 26.

F.A.S. 79 (S.R. 61), Anderson County, Tennessee. Proposed reconstruction of 5 miles of 2-lane roadway. Sixteen families would be displaced by the project. Comments made by USDA, HEW, DOI, TVA, and DOT. (ELR Order #04506) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4506F), May 19.

State Highway 320, Falls and Bell Counties, Texas. Proposed reconstruction of 10.3 miles of 2-lane highway, 2.5 miles of it on new location. One business will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, EPA, HEW, HUD, and local agencies. (ELR Order # 4350, 40 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-202 719-F), May 2.

Project S-3234, Gregg County, Texas. Proposed construction of Loop 485, a 4-lane, 2.1 mile connector between US 271 and US 80. Two residences will be displaced by the project. Comments made by EPA. (ELR Order # 4340, 46 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-201 239-F), May 2.

U.S. 81-287, Wise County, Texas. Proposed reconstruction of 8.2 miles of highway from 2 to 4 lanes. Seven families would be displaced by the action. (ELR Order # 4380, 33 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-201 842-F), May 5.

US 287, Wilbarger County, Texas. Reconstruction and widening of US 287 from 2 to 4 lanes, for a total length of 10.6 miles. Five residences and one business would be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HEW, and DOT. (ELR Order # 04500) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4500F), May 19.

I-90, King County, Washington. Proposed construction of 3.08 miles of 10-lane I-90, from SR-5 to the west shore of Mercer Island, in urban Seattle. An unspecified number of residences and amount of land will be lost to the project. A 4(f) statement will be required as land would be taken from two local parks. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, EPA, HUD, DOI, DOT, state, local, and regional agencies. (ELR Order # 4379, 163 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4379F), May 5.

I-90, King County, Washington. Proposed construction of a 10-lane freeway, I-90, across Mercer Island, a large island in Lake Washington. Total project length is three miles. An unspecified number of residences and amount of land will be lost to the project. A 4(f) statement will be required as land would be taken from Luther Burbank Park. Comments made by USDA, Army COE, EPA, HUD, DOI, DOT, state, local, and regional agencies. (ELR Order # 4379, 163 pages) (NTIS Order # EIS 72 4379F), May 5.

gional agencies. (ELR Order #4378, 129 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS 72 4378F), May 5.

Campus Loop Road, Whitman County, Washington. Proposed construction of 7 miles of 4-lane Campus Loop Road, some of it on the location of existing S.R. 195. Two residents would be displaced by the action; an unspecified amount of farmland and wildlife habitat will be lost. Comments made by USDA, COE, EPA, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4466) (#EIS 199 612-F), May 16.

Project S-0487 (5), Racine County, Wisconsin. Proposed construction of 2.4 miles of 2 lane rural roadway. Comments made by EPA, HEW, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4345) (NTIS Order PB-202 426-F), May 2.

State Trunk Highway 71, Monroe and Juneau Counties, Wisconsin. Proposed reconstruction of 6.0 miles of 2 lane S.H. 71. One business and 88 acres of land would be committed to the project. A 4(f) statement will be filed as recreational land would be taken by the project. Comments made by USDA, EPA, HUD, DOI, DOT, state and local agencies. (ELR Order #4441) (NTIS Order EIS 200 384-F), May 13.

Project S-0487(5), Racine County, Wisconsin. Proposed construction of 2.4 miles of 2 lane rural roadway. Comments made by EPA, HEW, DOI, and one regional agency. (ELR Order #4345, 18 pages), (NTIS Order #PB-202 426-F), May 2.

U.S. 151, Fond Du Lac County, Wisconsin. Proposed reconstruction of a 4 mile segment of U.S. 151. Three corridors for the project are presently under consideration; each would require approximately 60 acres of land. Comments made by USDA, and EPA. (ELR Order #4503) (NTIS Order EIS 72-4503F), May 19.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION FINAL

Second Avenue Subway, Manhattan, New York. The statement is concerned with an application from the New York City Transit Authority for a \$254,000,000 loan to assist in the final design and construction of 4.7 miles of new subway under Second Avenue, in east Manhattan. One business will be displaced by the action. Comments made by USDA, DOI and one local agency. (ELR Order #4519, 92 pages) (NTIS Order #EIS-72 4519-F), May 23.

U.S. WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Contact: Mr. W. Don Maughan, U.S. Water Resources Council, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037, (202) 254-6408.

Title and description, date.

DRAFT

Red River Basin, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. The statement is a proposed comprehensive plan for the development of the Red River Basin. Flood protection, water supply, navigation, power, and wildlife needs are considered. Several dams, reservoirs, flood control structures and channelization projects are proposed. (ELR Order # 4397, 100 pages) (NTIS Order # PB-208 876-D), May 8.

NATIONAL FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATORS

Region 1: Conforms to Standard Federal Regions 1 & 2, (Conn., Me., Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt., N.J., N.Y., Puerto Rico)

Administrator: (G. D. Love, 4 Normanskill Blvd., Delmar, N.Y., 12054.

Region 3, (Del. D.C., Md., Pa., Va., W.Va.)

Administrator: August Schofer, 31 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201

Region 4, (Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn.)

Administrator: H. E. Stark, 1720 Peachtree Rd., N.W., Atlanta, Ga. 30309

Region 5, (Ill., Ind., Mich., Minn., Ohio, Wisc.)

Administrator: F. B. Farrell, 18209 Dixie Hwy., Homewood, Ill. 60430

Region 6, (Ark., La., N.M., Okla., Texas)

Administrator: J. W. White, 819 Taylor St., Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Region 7, (Iowa, Kansas, Mo., Nebr.)

Administrator: J. B. Kemp, P.O. Box 7186, Country Club Station, Kansas City, Mo. 64113

Region 8, (Colo., Montana, N.D., S.D., Utah, Wyoming)

Administrator: W. H. Baugh (Acting), Rm. 242, Bldg. 40, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo. 80225

Region 9, (Arizona, Calif., Hawaii, Nev.)

Administrator: S. E. Farin, 450 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, Calif. 94102

Region 10, (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Wash.)

Administrator: R. H. Phillips (222 Southwest Morrison St., Portland, Oreg. 97204

Conforms to Standard Federal Regions 1 & 2,

AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Appendix I contains a listing of draft environmental impact statements which the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed and commented upon in writing during the period from May 1, 1972, to May 31, 1972, as required by Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended. The listing includes the Federal agency responsible for the statement, the number assigned by EPA to the statement, the title of the statement, the classification of the nature of EPA's comments, and the source for copies of the comments.

Appendix II contains definitions of the four classifications of EPA's comments. Copies of EPA's comments on these draft environmental impact statements are available to the public from the EPA offices noted.

Appendix III contains a listing of the addresses of the sources for copies of EPA comments listed in Appendix I.

Copies of the draft environmental impact statements are available from the Federal department or agency which prepared the draft statement or from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22151.

SHELDON MEYERS,

Director, Office of Federal Activities.

APPENDIX I.—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS FOR WHICH COMMENTS WERE ISSUED BETWEEN MAY 1 AND 31, 1972

| Identifying number and title | General nature of comments | Source for copies of comments | Identifying number and title | General nature of comments | Source for copies of comments |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION | | | | | |
| D-AEC-00045-27: Midwest Fuels recovery plant..... | 2 | A | D-COE-34029-23: Cumberland River Cordell Hill Dam and Reservoir, 2 Tenn. | | E |
| D-AEC-00036-31: Los Alamos Scientific Lab. plutonium facility..... | 2 | A | D-COE-30031-24: Bank stabilization, Yazoo Basin Delta area, Missis- | 1 | E |
| D-AEC-00035-45: Rocky Flats plutonium recovery facility..... | 2 | A | ippi. | | |
| D-AEC-00030-54: Radioactive waste evaporator, Richland, Wash. | 2 | A | D-COE-35017-27: Farmers Levee and Drainage District, Mason 1 | | F |
| D-AEC-06040-00: Indian Point unit No. 2 nuclear generator plant..... | 3 | A | County, Ill. | | |
| D-AEC-00046-03: Vermont Yankee nuclear station..... | 1 | A | D-COE-05070-11: Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio River and West 1 | | F |
| CORPS OF ENGINEERS | | | Virginia. | | |
| D-COE-90030-00: TNT plant air pollution abatement report..... | 2 | A | D-COE-35022-29: Pilot sediment removal program, Ohio..... | 1 | F |
| D-COE-61043-22: Cowiee State Park Lakepoint resort, W. P. George 2 | | E | D-COE-36132-29: Portsmouth-New Boston, Scioto County, Ohio..... | 3 | F |
| Lake, Chattahoochee River, Ala. | | | D-COE-02020-35: Crude oil and natural gas along Louisiana coast..... | 2 | G |
| D-COE-35C20-18: Maintenance dredging at Military Ocean Terminal, 1 | | E | D-COE-32318-45: Russian River Basin channel improvement and 3 | | J |
| Sunny Point, N.C. | | | bank stabilization, Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, Calif. | | |
| | | | D-COE-32337-57: King Cove small boat harbor..... | 1 | K |

| Identifying number and title | General nature of comments | Source for copies of comments | Identifying number and title | General nature of comments | Source for copies of comments |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | |
| D-DOA-24032-12: Sewage sludge incorporation, Goddard Space Center, Maryland. | 1 | A | D-DOT-41232-27: I-55 rest area, Will county, Ill. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-82035-31: Mosquito control program on the Coronado National Forest, Arizona. | 3 | A | D-DOT-41205-29: Township Road No. 107 (Oregon Road), Wood County, Ohio. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-82032-01: Removal of Canada plum to control green peach aphid, Aroostock and Penobscot Counties, Maine. | 1 | A | D-DOT-41176-28: U.S. 30 (improvement) Allen County, Ind. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-36120-18: Chicod Creek watershed, Pitt and Beaufort Counties, N.C. | 2 | E | D-DOT-41159-29: State Route 52/7/607, Lawrence County, Ohio. | 2 | F |
| D-DOA-32340-24: Bowie Dam and Lake, Miss. and Ala. | 2 | E | D-DOT-40964-27: FA Route 2, Winnebago County, Ill. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-36129-20: Evans County, Ga. watershed, Evans, Candler, and Tattnal. | 2 | E | D-DOT-51140-28: Kokomo Municipal Airport, Howard County, Ind. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-36126-20: Little Creek watershed, Wheeler and Laurens Counties, Ga. | 2 | E | D-DOT-51139-27: Litchfield Municipal Airport, Montgomery County, Ill. | 2 | F |
| D-DOA-36122-31: Eagle-Tumblewood Draw watershed, Eddy and Chaves Counties, N. Mex. | 2 | G | D-DOT-51138-30: Waseca Municipal Airport, Waseca County, Minn. | 2 | F |
| D-DOA-36121-37: Dickman watershed, Little Sioux flood prevention. | 1 | H | D-DOT-51137-30: Fosston Municipal Airport, Polk County, Minn. | 2 | F |
| D-DOA-36125-37: Simon Run watershed, Pottawattamie Counties, Iowa. | 1 | H | D-DOT-51130-25: Gladwin Airport, Gladwin County, Mich. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-62015-48: Proposed timber harvest, Tonto Working Circle, Tonto National Forest, Ariz. | 2 | J | D-DOT-50093-27: Willow Springs Road Bridge replacement (FAS 119), Cook County, Ill. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-82034-55: Eis on Suislaw National Forest herbicide program. | 1 | K | D-DOT-50089-25: Highway-bridge-Tittabawassee River, Midland County, Mich. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-61048-55: Mount Ashland chairlift No. 2, Oregon. | 2 | K | D-DOT-41241-29: FAS Route 145-STH 60-STH 143 CTH "G," Washington County, Wis. | 1 | F |
| D-DOA-61041-55: Eis on Pelican Butte winter sports site, Oregon. | 3 | K | D-DOT-41191-27: La Salle County, FA Route 24, Illinois. | 1 | F |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | | D-DOT-41230-29: U.S. Route 30S and U.S. Route 68 (relocation), Harding County, Ohio. | 1 | F |
| D-DOC-89091-35: Construction of Sabine River diversion, Lake Charles, La. | 2 | G | D-DOT-41204-27: F.A. Route 45 (Mannheim Road), Lake Street to Irving Park Road, Cook County, Ill. | 1 | F |
| D-DOC-89082-54: North Greenwood West storm drain project. | 1 | K | D-DOT-41203-29: S.R. 252 (relocation) Columbia Road, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. | 2 | F |
| D-DOC-89075-65: Expo '74. | 1 | K | D-DOT-41193-25: M-21 relocation, Lapeer and St. Clair Counties, Mich. | 1 | F |
| D-DOC-81079-00: Harborview Park/parking structure, Washington. | 2 | K | D-DOT-51155-25: Marlette Airport, Sanilac County, Mich. | 1 | F |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | | D-DOT-51148-29: Cuyahoga County Airport, Cleveland, Ohio. | 1 | F |
| D-DOD-89025-00: Coal procurement policies. | 2 | A | D-DOT-51146-30: Aitkin Municipal Airport, Aitkin County, Minn. | 1 | F |
| D-DOD-84010-00: Pacific cratering experiments. | 1 | A | D-DOT-51145-27: Edgar County Airport, Illinois. | 1 | F |
| D-DOD-84009-00: Advanced ballistic reentry systems radioactive sensors. | 1 | A | D-DOT-41257-34: State Highway 360 from proposed SH121 south of Grapevine. | 2 | G |
| D-DOD-84008-00: Over the horizon radar system. | 1 | A | D-DOT-41213-32: Avery Drive in Tulsa and Sand Springs, Okla., intersection of Highways 51 and 97. | 1 | G |
| D-DOD-24035-21: Wastewater treatment facilities, Tyndall AFB. | 1 | A | D-DOT-41199-38: K-7 Johnson and Wyandotte, Kans. | 2 | H |
| D-DOD-10019-05: Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn. | 3 | B | D-DOT-41197-39: Routes J and M, Reynolds County, Mo. | 2 | H |
| D-DOD-11016-24: Keesler Air Force Base runway extension, Mississippi. | 2 | E | D-DOT-51142-36: Grant Municipal Airport, Grant, Nebr. | 1 | H |
| D-DOD-11015-21: Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. | 1 | E | D-DOT-41266-38: (SF) 54-48 F 038-2(20), Kingman County, Kans. | 1 | H |
| D-DOD-11014-40: Project Diamond Ore, Montana. | 2 | I | D-DOT-41249-36: S-126(6), Hayes Center-North, S-72(5) Trenton-N. | 2 | H |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | D-DOT-41247-37: Linn County, U.S. 151, Iowa. | 1 | H |
| D-DOI-02026-35: L972 Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas general lease sale—offshore eastern Louisiana. | 2 | A | D-DOT-41219-36: F-2(21) and F-246(19), Dawson-Falls City, Nebr. | 1 | H |
| D-DOI-61025-00: Potomac Heritage Trail. | 1 | A | D-DOT-41218-38: 89 S 1567(1), Shawnee County, Kans. | 1 | H |
| D-DOI-01016-11: Strip mined area reclamation and recreation Center. | 1 | D | D-DOT-41200-38: Johnson County, K-7 highway from I-35 north through Olathe to proposed K-10 and K-12. | 2 | H |
| D-DOI-61044-18: Eno Park area acquisition, Durham, N.C. | 2 | E | D-DOT-41165-41: Highway F6002(05)910 for 5th St., North, Grand Forks, N. Dak. | 3 | I |
| D-DOI-61047-31: Proposed master plan, White Sands National Monument. | 2 | G | D-DOT-41267-54: South 272d St., interchange, Washington. | 1 | K |
| D-DOI-36117-36: South Fork watershed, Pawnee and Richardson Counties. | 1 | H | D-DOT-41221-56: I-IG-80N-2(38)12C East, Glenns Ferry, Idaho. | 1 | K |
| D-DOI-61039-43: Proposed wilderness, Yellowstone National Park. | 1 | I | D-DOT-41220-57: Homer East Road, Alaska. | 2 | K |
| D-DOI-61038-43: Proposed master plan for Yellowstone Park. | 1 | I | D-DOT-41148-57: Fish Creek Road, Alaska. | 1 | K |
| D-DOI-61036-43: Proposed Tetons Wilderness, Grand Teton Park. | 1 | I | FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION | | |
| D-DOI-61051-43: Proposed master plan, Grand Teton National Park. | 1 | I | D-FPC-89056-12: Authority to import Algerian LNG, Cove Point, Md. | 2 | A |
| D-DOI-89077-46: Diablo Canyon desalting project, San Luis Obispo County, Calif. | 2 | J | D-FPC-07036-00: Application for new license, York Haven project No. 1888. | 1 | D |
| DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | D-FPC-05373-15: Application for new license, Dan Rivers, Inc., Virginia. | 2 | D |
| D-DOT-50088-12: Bridge across Patapsco River, Md. | 1 | A | D-FPC-07048-20: Georgia Power Co., Lloyd Shoals project, Georgia. | 2 | E |
| D-DOT-41280-00: Proposed general guidelines for the consideration of economic, social, and environmental effects of highway projects. | 1 | A | D-FPC-05350-19: Project 2534 Georgia and South Carolina, Tullulah and Tugalo Rivers. | 1 | E |
| D-DOT-41181-05: Reconstruction of Route 86, Vernon-Tolland, Conn. | 2 | B | D-FPC-05372-18: Nantahala project, Macon and Clay Counties, N. C. | 1 | E |
| D-DOT-41154-05: Interstate 84, Manchester-Bolton-Coventry-Andover, Columbia, Conn. | 3 | B | D-FPC-05371-20: Application for relicensing, Georgia Power Co., Flint River project No. 1218, Georgia. | 1 | E |
| D-DOT-41272-00: Project Manati-Ciales, relocation of highway FR-149. | 1 | C | D-FPC-05374-30: Brainerd hydroelectric project No. 2533-Crow Wing County, Minn. | 1 | F |
| D-DOT-41236-07: Second Avenue project, New York-UGT-44, Manhattan. | 2 | C | D-FPC-03022-35: Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., Lacassine project. | 2 | G |
| D-DOT-41182-07: Sunrise Highway extension Suffolk County N.Y. | 2 | C | GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | |
| D-DOT-41169-12: Maryland Route 235 0.8 mile north of Hollywood Street. | 1 | D | D-GSA-21021-5 4: Proposed disposal of Naval Supply Center, Washington. | 1 | K |
| D-DOT-41168-12: Dualization of Maryland Routes 2 and 4, Calvert County, Md. | 1 | D | DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE | | |
| D-DOT-41128-15: Route 33 proposed Lehigh Street viaduct, Richmond, Va. | 1 | D | D-HEW-84007-33: National Center for Toxicological Research, Pine Bluffs. | 1 | A |
| D-DOT-41260-11: L.R. 16059, Secaoi (Cook Forest State Park), Pa. | 1 | D | D-HEW-85046-11: Proposed construction of Community College of Delaware County, Pa. | 2 | D |
| D-DOT-41235-11: L.R. 1142, Centre County, Pa. | 2 | D | DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT | | |
| D-DOT-41172-12: Alternate Route 58 from Big Stone Gap to Appalachia Wise County, Md. | 2 | D | D-HUD-85040-16: Fort Lincoln urban renewal project. | 2 | A |
| D-DOT-51143-24: Gulf Central Airport, Stennis Field, Bay St. Louis, Miss. | 2 | E | D-HUD-85044-07: Proposed new community of Welfare Island, N.Y. | 2 | C |
| D-DOT-50091-19: Proposed Ash Slurry pipeline bridge across Edisto River, S.C. | 2 | E | D-HUD-85043-07: Proposed new community, Lysander, Onondaga County, Syracuse, N.Y. | 2 | C |
| D-DOT-41299-21: State Road 71, Jackson County, Fla. | 1 | E | NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | |
| D-DOT-41264-19: Rutherford Road to Greenville, S.C. | 1 | E | D-NAS-12011-00: Space shuttle program. | 1 | A |
| D-DOT-41214-20: State Road 95, Escambia County, Fla. | 1 | E | DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY | | |
| D-DOT-41182-22: Elmore County relocate Alabama-14, Wetumka to Talladega, Ala. | 2 | E | D-TRE-90025-00: Proposal for imposition of a tax on sulfur emission. | 2 | A |
| D-DOT-41223-18: Newton eastern urban loop, Catawba, N.C. | 1 | E | D-TRE-90026-00: Proposed approval of polyvinyl liquor bottles. | 3 | A |
| D-DOT-41217-21: State Road 516, Brevard County, Fla. | 1 | E | TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY | | |
| D-DOT-41216-21: State Road 20, Washington County, Fla. | 1 | E | D-TVA-06038-23: Watts Bar nuclear plant units 1 and 2, Tennessee. | 1 | E |
| D-DOT-41215-23: Project F-024-3(), Putnam County, Tenn. | 1 | E | APPENDIX II | | |
| D-DOT-41227-17: AP0127 (43) Pike-Letcher Counties, Ky. | 1 | E | PROPOSED FEDERAL REGULATIONS FOR WHICH COMMENTS WERE ISSUED BETWEEN MAY 1, 1972, AND MAY 31, 1972 | | |
| D-DOT-41226-18: US221 Ashe County, N.C. | 1 | E | DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | |
| D-DOT-41225-21: State Road 20 FAS Route 12, Walton County, Fla. | 1 | E | R-DOA-90047-00: Revocation and suspension of grazing permits. | 1 | A |
| D-DOT-41224-21: State Road 20 (U.S. 27), Taylor County, Fla. | 1 | E | R-DOA-90046-00: Forest Service—Use of pesticides and chemicals on national forests, national grasslands, and administered by the Forest Service. | 1 | A |
| D-DOT-51149-24: Jackson Municipal Airport, Jackson, Miss. | 2 | E | | | |
| D-DOT-51144-19: Fairfield County, Winnsboro Airport, S.C. | 2 | E | | | |
| D-DOT-41263-20: F-022-1(4) Spalding-Butts Counties, Ga. | 1 | E | | | |
| D-DOT-41243-23: Grainger County relocation of State Route 32, Tenn. | 2 | E | | | |
| D-DOT-41228-21: State Road 699, Pinellas County, Fla. | 1 | E | | | |
| D-DOT-41233-29: Interstate 280 (upgrading), Wood County, Ohio. | 1 | F | | | |

APPENDIX II: DEFINITION OF CODES FOR THE GENERAL NATURE OF EPA COMMENTS

(1) *General Agreement/Lack of Objections:* The Agency generally:

(a) Has no objections to the proposed action as described in the draft impact statement;

(b) suggest only minor changes in the proposed action or the draft impact statement; or

(c) has no comments on the draft impact statement or the proposed action.

(2) *Inadequate Information:*

The Agency feels that the draft impact statement does not contain adequate information to assess fully the environmental impact of the proposed action. The Agency's comments call for more information about the potential environmental hazards addressed in the statement, or ask that a potential environmental hazard be addressed since it was not addressed in the draft statement.

(3) *Major Changes Necessary:*

The Agency believes that the proposed action, as described in the draft impact state-

ment, needs major revisions or major additional safeguards to adequately protect the environment.

(4) *Unsatisfactory:*

The Agency believes that the proposed action is unsatisfactory because of its potentially harmful effect on the environment. Furthermore, the Agency believes that the safeguards which might be utilized may not adequately protect the environment from the hazards arising from this action. The Agency therefore recommends that alternatives to the action be analyzed further (including the possibility of no action at all).

APPENDIX III: SOURCES FOR COPIES OF EPA COMMENTS

A. Director, Office of Public Affairs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

B. Director of Public Affairs, Region I, Environmental Protection Agency, Room 2303, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203.

C. Director of Public Affairs, Region II, Environmental Protection Agency, Room 847, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10007.

D. Director of Public Affairs, Region III, Environmental Protection Agency, Curtis Bldg., 6th and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106.

E. Director of Public Affairs, Region IV, Environmental Protection Agency, Suite 300, 1421 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

F. Director of Public Affairs, Region V, Environmental Protection Agency, 1 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

G. Director of Public Affairs, Region VI, Environmental Protection Agency, 1600 Patterson Street, Dallas, Texas 75201.

H. Director of Public Affairs, Region VII, Environmental Protection Agency, 1735 Baltimore Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64108.

I. Director of Public Affairs, Region VIII, Environmental Protection Agency, Lincoln Tower, Room 916, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

J. Director of Public Affairs, Region IX, Environmental Protection Agency, 100 California Street, San Francisco, California 94102.

K. Director of Public Affairs, Region X, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 6th Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE CEQ THROUGH APRIL 30, 1972 (BY AGENCY)

| Agency | Draft 102's for actions on which no final 102's have yet been received | Final 102's on legislation and actions | Total actions on which final or draft 102 statements for Federal actions have been received | Agency | Draft 102's for actions on which no final 102's have yet been received | Final 102's on legislation and actions | Total actions on which final or draft 102 statements for Federal actions have been received |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Agriculture, Department of | 65 | 123 | 188 | International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 1 | 0 | 1 | Interstate Commerce Commission | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 40 | 43 | 83 | Justice, Department of | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Commerce, Department of | 6 | 7 | 13 | National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 12 | 11 | 23 |
| Defense, Department of | 4 | 3 | 7 | National Capital Planning Commission | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Air Force | 9 | 4 | 13 | National Science Foundation | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Army | 5 | 9 | 14 | New England River Basins Commission | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Army Corps of Engineers | 199 | 339 | 438 | Office of Science and Technology | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Navy | 5 | 9 | 14 | Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Delaware River Basin Commission | 3 | 0 | 3 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 9 | 14 | 23 | Transportation, Department of | 7 | 8 | 15 |
| Federal Power Commission | 45 | 7 | 52 | Treasury, Department of | 837 | 859 | 1,696 |
| General Services Administration | 13 | 28 | 41 | U.S. Postal Service | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| HEW, Department of | 5 | 2 | 7 | U.S. Water Resources Council | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| HUD, Department of | 10 | 24 | 34 | Veterans' Administration | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Interior, Department of | 86 | 50 | 136 | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | | | | Total | 1,381 | 1,552 | 2,933 |

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE CEQ THROUGH MAY 31, 1972 (BY PROJECT TYPE)

| | Draft statements for actions on which no final statements have yet been filed | Final statements on legislation and actions | Total actions on which final or draft statements have been taken | | Draft statements for actions on which no final statements have yet been filed | Final statements on legislation and actions | Total actions on which final or draft statements have been taken |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| AEC nuclear development | 2 | 20 | 22 | Railroads | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Aircraft, ships, and vehicles | 1 | 5 | 6 | Roads | 621 | 614 | 1,235 |
| Airports | 41 | 179 | 220 | Plus roads through parks | 153 | 48 | 201 |
| Buildings | 6 | 8 | 14 | Space programs | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| Bridge permits | 12 | 9 | 21 | Waste disposal: | | | |
| Defense systems | 3 | 3 | 6 | Detoxification of toxic substances | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Forestry | 6 | 4 | 10 | Munition disposal | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Housing, urban problems, new communities | 9 | 13 | 22 | Radioactive waste disposal | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| International boundary | 5 | 2 | 7 | Sewage facilities | 8 | 10 | 18 |
| Land acquisition, disposal | 10 | 34 | 44 | Solid wastes | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Mass transit | 1 | 4 | 5 | Water: | | | |
| Mining | 4 | 4 | 8 | Beach erosion, hurricane protection | 6 | 23 | 29 |
| Military installations | 10 | 15 | 25 | Irrigation | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| Natural gas and oil: | | | | Navigation | 70 | 116 | 186 |
| Drilling and exploration | 5 | 5 | 10 | Municipal and industrial supply | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| Transportation, pipeline | 10 | 5 | 15 | Permit (Refuse Act, dredge and fill) | 12 | 1 | 13 |
| Parks, wildlife refuges, recreation facilities | 49 | 17 | 66 | Watershed protection and flood control | 121 | 282 | 403 |
| Pesticides, herbicides | 14 | 18 | 32 | Weather modification | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Power: | | | | Research and development | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| Hydroelectric | 42 | 8 | 50 | Miscellaneous | 29 | 18 | 47 |
| Nuclear | 37 | 21 | 58 | | | | |
| Other | 14 | 8 | 22 | Total | 1,381 | 1,552 | 2,933 |
| Transmission | 8 | 12 | 20 | | | | |

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND
SAFETY ACT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration estimates that as many as 100,000 Americans may die as the result of occupationally related diseases each year—twice the number estimated by Ralph Nader's health research group.

Dr. Sidney Wolf, director of Ralph Nader's health research group, had estimated that 50,000 deaths per year were due to occupational disease. This estimate was announced at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Philadelphia last December.

Wolf's figure was based on different studies of coal mines, chemical, uranium mines and other industries and was at the time considered to be extremely high.

Now we have this startling admission by the Nixon administration which demonstrates that millions of workers literally risk their lives by entering America's plants and factories.

The administration's estimate of 100,000 occupationally related deaths a year, was contained in its annual report to the Congress on implementation of the 1970 Occupational Health and Safety Act.

On the basis of nonviolent occupationally related deaths among metal miners, smelters, and uranium miners the report estimates that 100,000 such deaths occur each year. The major conclusion of the administration's report on occupational health and safety are:

Occupationally related injuries have increased 29% during the past decade.

Some state and local governments have done nothing in the field of occupational health and safety.

During approximately 14,000 inspections in 1971 by the Labor Department for violation of occupational health and safety standards, 35,000 specific violations have been uncovered.

The goal of assuring a safe and healthful work place for the nation's workers... cannot be done quickly.

Limited funding and the administration's disinterest in the problem, are costing the lives of 100,000 workers a year.

Until the Nixon administration places human life above industry's profits, tens of thousands of Americans will continue to needlessly die.

The administration only requested \$98 million in this year's budget for enforcement of the Occupational Health and Safety Act while union leaders proposed the expenditures of at least \$166 million for the program. The labor unions and the Nixon administration have had a running battle over the adequacy of enforcement of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. The unions have charged the Federal Government has caved in to the demand of industry by delaying implementation of tough standards on the amount of asbestos contained in the atmosphere of asbestos plants until 1975.

It has been fully documented that high levels of asbestos cause asbestosis and lung cancer which takes the lives of thousands of American workers each year. But, the interests of big business are much more important to the Nixon administration than the health and even the lives of thousands of American workers.

AIR FORCE PERSONNEL IN FLOOD
RESCUE EFFORTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is self-explanatory. I am also enclosing the list of those Air Force officers and enlisted men that distinguished themselves during the recent flood in South Dakota.

These men are to be commended for their action beyond the call of duty and their efforts certainly reflect credit on themselves and the Air Force:

JUNE 21, 1972.

Representative JACK KEMP,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEMP: I have lived in Buffalo for three years and although, as an Englishman, I have not voted I hope you will not mind my regarding you as my representative and asking your help. In fact, you met my wife at a Westminster Junior Parish luncheon a year or so ago, although I don't imagine you remember.

We recently had the misfortune to be in Rapid City, South Dakota on vacation when the flood hit. We spent some time chest deep in water holding up our two children with only a small tree for protection from the force of the flood and the danger of debris. Our strength was virtually spent when six men from the nearby Air Force Base came through 200 yards of water at great personal risk to rescue us. In particular, the leadership and bravery of Captains Soll and Knutson were instrumental in bringing us to safety. All six then went back into the water and saved others.

I have written to Colonel Reed at Ellsworth Air Force Base, the men's commander, sending a check for an Air Force charity and asking some official commendation for these men; if possible, the Air Force Medal, hopefully for all six and certainly for Captains Soll and Knutson.

I am writing to you because I felt that you might be able to make some mention of this in the appropriate official places and improve the chances that these men will receive the commendation they richly deserve. I have been able to identify all six and enclose a list of names, rank, etc. Thanking you in anticipation for your help,

Yours sincerely,

NORMAN BAKER,
Associate Professor, Vice Chairman,
History.

LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEN

Captain Vincent S. Soll, Jr., Serial Number

XXXXXXXXXX

Captain Gordon R. Knutson, Serial Number

XXXXXXXXXX

Squad Sgt. Walter Andrews, Serial Number

XXXXXXXXXX

A/C Charles A. Hefner, Serial Number

XXXXXXXXXX

Airman David E. Walther, Serial Number

XXXXXXXXXX

Airman Robert B. Powers, Serial Number

XXXXXXXXXX

NIXON'S BEST YEAR: 1972

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many people have been wondering what the outlook for 1972 is until the end of the year.

J. A. Livingston, one of the outstanding financial columnists and analysts of the country, has written an article: "1972: Nixon's Best Year." I am sure that all of my colleagues will be interested in having Mr. Livingston's opinion which he has formed from a consensus of 56 forecasters who responded to his mid-year questionnaire.

[From the Washington Star, June 25, 1972]

1972: Nixon's Best Year

(By J. A. Livingston)

"President Nixon's best year."

That's what economists forecast for 1972 at the beginning of the year, and now they forecast it again—but with greater emphasis and assurance.

Records will be set in Gross National Product, industrial production, corporate expenditures on new plant and equipment, housing starts, weekly earnings, retail sales, corporate profits, and—as you might expect—in Wall Street.

The Nixon bull market, which started in May 1970, will work to new highs by December and move upward during 1973—but at a restrained pace.

That's the consensus of 56 forecasters who responded to my midyear questionnaire. Though their occupational backgrounds are diverse—the economists are associated with corporations, banks, labor unions, universities, research organizations, government, and Wall Street houses—they are unanimous in promising President Nixon "prosperity" for his electioneering.

But their unanimity doesn't extend to Nixon's other economic objectives. Only 12 expect that Phase 2 wage-and-price regulations will succeed in getting inflation down to less than 3 percent by December. Only 11 believe that year-end employment will be in the "neighborhood of 5 percent," which I construe to mean 5.2 percent or less.

So Nixon's Democratic opponent will be able to charge that the president saved Americans from the difficult choice of high unemployment versus high inflation by giving them both!

The group expects the unemployment rate, now 5.9 percent, to diminish slowly—to 5.5 percent in December and then to 5.2 percent in June 1973.

As for the cost of living, the annual rate of increase is forecast at 3.5 percent from now to December and at 4 percent from then to June 1973. Underlying assumption: The Price Commission and Pay Board will not be able to suppress the inflationary pressures generated by bumper production, employment, and wages.

At the beginning of this year, Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) forecast that the 1972 Gross National Product would rise by \$100 billion to approximately \$1147 billion.

The economists' consensus isn't far from that at \$1,144 billion. But the mix—how the

increase is attained—differs. The respondents foresee less growth and more inflation than the CEA, as you can see:

CEA and economists

[In percent]

| | | | |
|-----------|-------|------|-----|
| Growth | ----- | 6 | 5.5 |
| Inflation | ----- | 3.25 | 3.8 |

Consequently, 1973 will be another year of "prosperity with inflation." The consensus calls for the same rate of growth—5.5%—as this year, but the inflation rate will decline only a trifle—3.6% as against 3.8%!

As might be expected, improvement in business since January has emboldened the forecasters, and they boosted their 1972 projections. Examples: Housing starts from 2,060,000 to 2,200,000; automobile sales from 10.5 to 10.6 million; corporate profits after

taxes from \$52.7 billion to \$55.5 billion. Moreover, profits are expected to continue to rise, reaching \$61.4 billion in 1973.

THE HONORABLE GORDON CANFIELD

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I mourn the un-

timely passing of an old and valued friend, Gordon Canfield, who was as well a former Member of this House and dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation.

I was privileged to have known Gordon as a dear friend and as a man of ability, compassion, and courage. It was these qualities which stamped his service in the House and endeared him to his constituency.

While no words, no prayers can possibly convey the sense of sorrow of those who knew him, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sentiments and sympathy to his wife, Dorothy, and to Gordon's family.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 28, 1972

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, with Thee we begin this day and with Thee we shall end it. Watch over all who labor here. Guide our thoughts and guard our lips. Remember us even when we forget Thee. In all our toil strengthen us, in debate grant us magnanimity, in irritation give us patience, in confusion give us clear insight, in provocation restrain us, in weakness renew us, and in all our decisions give us Thy higher wisdom. May all that is done advance the cause of justice on earth and be in accord with Thy will. And when at length we rest, give us the peace of the righteous whose minds and hearts are fixed on Thee.

Through Him whose name is above every name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPONG thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 27, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Marion T. Bennett, of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of noting the confirmation of Marion T. Bennett, of Maryland, as an associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

Mr. Bennett has long been a commissioner and has had much experience in the area of Federal justice and Federal judicial administration. He is extremely well qualified. He is a former colleague of many of us in the other body.

I am delighted that he has been recognized by this nomination, and I congratulate him.

U.S. COURTS

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. courts.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR SENATE TO RESUME CONSIDERATION OF S. 3010 TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on tomorrow, following recognition of the two leaders or their designees under the standing order, the Senate resume consideration of S. 3010, a bill providing for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and that the unfinished business, S. 3390, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, be temporarily laid aside and remain in a temporarily laid aside status until disposition of S. 3010 or the close of business, whichever is the earlier.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR SENATE TO CONSIDER THE DEBT LIMITATION BILL TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on tomor-