

Dr. James H. Gilford, Frederick, Maryland.  
 Dr. Kenneth Bromfield, Frederick, Maryland.  
 Mr. Grant Conway, Brookmont, Maryland.  
 Mr. Edwin F. Wesely, Chevy Chase, Maryland.  
 Mr. John C. Frye, Gapland, Maryland.  
 Mr. Rome F. Schwagel, Keedysville, Maryland.  
 Mr. Justice Douglas (Special Consultant).

The matters to be discussed at this meeting include:

1. Report on Environmental Assessment/General Plan.
2. Status of Land Acquisition.
3. Potomac River Committee Reports.
4. Revised Repair Priorities List.
5. Superintendent's Report.
6. Interpretation Policy Committee Report.
7. Report on C&O Canal Association Annual Reunion Hike and Announcement of New Officers.
8. County, State, and D.C. Reports.
9. Field Trip—Ferry Hill Inn.

The meeting will be open to the public. However, facilities and space for accommodating members of the public are limited and it is expected that not more than 30 persons will be able to attend the sessions. Any member of the public may file with the committee a written statement concerning the matters to be discussed.

Persons wishing further information concerning this meeting, or who wish to submit written statements, may contact Richard L. Stanton, Associate Director, Cooperative Activities, National Capital Parks, at Area Code 202-426-6715. Minutes of the meeting will be available for public inspection 2 weeks after the meeting, at the Office of National Capital Parks, Room 208, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW., Washington, D.C.

Dated: April 10, 1975.

JOHN A. TOWNSLEY,  
 Acting Director,  
 National Capital Parks.

[FR Doc. 75-10196 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

#### INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION

##### Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act that a meeting of the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission will be held at 10:30 a.m. on May 8, 1975, at 313 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Commission was established by Pub. L. 80-795 to render advice on such matters relating to the park as may from time to time be referred to them for consideration.

The members of the Commission are as follows:

Mr. Arthur C. Kaufmann (Chairman),  
 Mr. John P. Bracken,  
 Hon. Michael J. Bradley,  
 Hon. James A. Byrne,  
 Mr. Filindo B. Masino,  
 Mr. Frank C. P. McGlinn,  
 Mr. John B. O'Hara,  
 Mr. Howard D. Rosengarten,  
 Mr. Charles R. Tyson.

The matters to be considered at this meeting include:

1. Closing of Chestnut Street.
2. Park Operating Deficiencies.
3. Promenade of the States and Signers Walk.
4. Superintendent's Progress Report.

The meeting will be open to the public. Any person may file with the Commission an oral or written statement concerning the matters to be discussed. Persons desiring further information concerning this meeting, or who wish to submit statements, may contact Hobart G. Cawood, Superintendent, Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, at Area Code 215, 597-7120.

Minutes of the meeting shall be available for inspection two weeks after the meeting at the office of the Independence National Historical Park, 313 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Dated: April 11, 1975.

CHESTER L. BROOKS,  
 Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic  
 Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 75-10199 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

#### SOUTHEAST REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

##### Cancellation of Meeting

The meeting of the Southeast Regional Advisory Committee, originally scheduled for April 24 and 25, 1975, the notice of which was previously published on page 15105 in the FEDERAL REGISTER on Friday, April 4, 1975 (FR Doc. 75-8748), has been cancelled, and will be rescheduled.

Dated: April 14, 1975.

ROBERT M. LANDAU,  
 Deputy Associate Director, Leg-  
 islation, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 75-10197 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

#### WEIN CONSOLIDATED AIRLINES, INC.

##### Intention To Extend Concession Contract

Pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Act of October 9, 1965 (79 Stat. 969; 16 U.S.C. 20), public notice is hereby given that on or before May 19, 1975, the Department of the Interior, through the Director of the National Park Service, proposes to extend the concession contract with Wein Consolidated Airlines, Inc., authorizing it to provide concession facilities and services for the public at Katmai National Monument for a period of one (1) year, from January 1, 1975, through December 31, 1975.

An assessment of the environmental impact of this proposed action has been made and it has been determined that it will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, and that it is not a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act and the guidelines of the Council on Environmental Quality. The environmental assessment may be reviewed in the Office of the Regional Director, Pacific North-

west Region, Fourth and Pike Building, Seattle, Washington 98101.

The foregoing concessioner has performed its obligations under the expired contract to the satisfaction of the National Park Service, and therefore, pursuant to the Act cited above, is entitled to be given preference in the renewal of the contract and in the negotiation of a new contract. However, under the Act cited above, the Secretary is also required to consider and evaluate all proposals received as a result of this notice. Any proposal to be considered and evaluated must be submitted on or before May 19, 1975.

Interested parties should contact the Assistant Director of Concessions Management, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 20240, for information as to the requirements of the proposed contract.

Dated: April 10, 1975.

JOE BROWN,  
 Acting Associate Director,  
 National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 75-10198 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

#### Office of Hearings and Appeals

[Docket No. M 75-100]

#### ISLAND CREEK COAL CO.

##### Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. 861(c) (1970), Island Creek Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 77.213 to its Tioga Preparation Plant, Tioga, West Virginia.

30 CFR 77.213 provides:

When it is necessary for a tunnel to be closed at one end, an escapeway not less than 30 inches in diameter (or of the equivalent, if the escapeway does not have a circular cross section) shall be installed which extends from the closed end of the tunnel to a safe location on the surface; and, if the escapeway is inclined more than 30 degrees from the horizontal it shall be equipped with a ladder which runs the full length of the inclined portion of the escapeway.

In support of its petition to secure a waiver of § 77.213, Petitioner states:

(1) The subject silos were constructed approximately 15 years prior to the enactment of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

(2) The walls of the silos are made of staves which are laid in layers with steel bands wrapped around them at small intervals to prevent the staves from falling out.

(3) In order to provide a second escapeway, the outer wall made of staves needs to be punctured. It is Petitioner's considered opinion that if this wall is punctured the silo will collapse. Should such a collapse occur, personnel in the area could be injured or killed.

(4) Petitioner asserts that the application of the mandatory standard will result in a diminution of safety of the miners at the subject mine.



Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before May 19, 1975. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,  
Director, Office of  
Hearings and Appeals.

APRIL 14, 1975.

[FR Doc. 75-10114 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

[Docket No. M 75-101]

#### WESTMORELAND COAL CO.

#### Petition for Modification of Application of Mandatory Safety Standard

Notice is hereby given that in accordance with the provisions of section 301(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, 30 U.S.C. 861(c) (1970), Westmoreland Coal Company has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.807 to its Hampton Nos. 3, 4 and 6 Mines and its Ferrell Mine, located in Clothier, West Virginia. 30 CFR 75.807 provides:

All underground high-voltage transmission cables shall be installed only in regularly inspected air courses and haulageways, and shall be covered, buried, or placed so as to afford protection against damage, guarded where men regularly work or pass under them unless they are 6½ feet or more above the floor or rail, securely anchored, properly insulated, and guarded at ends, and covered, insulated, or placed to prevent contact with trolley wires and other low-voltage circuits.

Petitioner requests that § 75.807 be modified to permit the use of its existing underground high-voltage transmission cable at the subject mines without further additional guarding. As grounds for its request Petitioner states:

1. Petitioner has installed underground high-voltage transmission cables in the subject mines. These cables far exceed the electrical and mechanical characteristics of cables approved by the United States Bureau of Mines and accepted by the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration (MESA).

2. The cables installed in the subject mines comply with the requirements of the above quoted part of § 75.807 of the regulations and no additional guarding is required.

3. MESA has taken the position that § 75.807 is complied with by wrapping the cable with brattice cloth, when, in fact, wrapping high-voltage transmission cable with brattice cloth creates a potential safety hazard.

4. The high-voltage transmission cables in the subject mines, without additional guarding, will at all times guarantee to the miners in these mines no less than the same measure of protection sought to be accomplished by additional guarding and, in fact, will eliminate cer-

tain hazards which would be created if additional guarding were mandated.

Persons interested in this petition may request a hearing on the petition or furnish comments on or before May 19, 1975. Such requests or comments must be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Hearings Division, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Copies of the petition are available for inspection at that address.

JAMES R. RICHARDS,  
Director, Office of  
Hearings and Appeals.

APRIL 14, 1975.

[FR Doc. 75-10115 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

#### Office of the Secretary

[INT DES 75-28]

#### ANADROMOUS FISH PASSAGE IMPROVEMENTS—SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM

#### Availability of Draft Environmental Statement

Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Department of the Interior has prepared a draft environmental statement on improvement measures for anadromous fish migration at Savage Rapids Dam on the Rogue River in southwestern Oregon. Written comments may be submitted to the Regional Director (address below) on or before June 2, 1975.

Copies are available at the following locations:

Office of Assistant to the Commissioner—Ecology, Room 7620, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. Telephone (202) 343-4991.

Office of Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, P.O. Box 043, 550 W. Fort Street, Boise, Idaho 83724. Telephone (208) 342-2711, Ext. 2110.

Salem Planning Field Branch, Bureau of Reclamation, 1775 32nd Place, NE, P.O. Box 7395, Salem, Oregon 97303. Telephone (503) 399-5771.

Single copies of the draft statement may be obtained on request to the Commissioner of Reclamation or the Regional Director. Copies will also be available for review in public and university libraries in southwestern Oregon. Please refer to the statement number above.

Dated: April 15, 1975.

STANLEY D. DOREMUS,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 75-10225 Filed 4-17-75; 8:45 am]

#### CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, ARIZONA Proposed Allocation of Project Water for Indian Irrigation Use

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by the Act of June 17, 1902, as amended (32 Stat. 388 (43 U.S.C. 391)), and the Colorado River Basin Project Act of September 30, 1968 (82 Stat. (885, 43 U.S.C. 1501)), certain Secretarial decisions made on

December 15, 1972, concerning the priorities for water use and the allocation of irrigation water between Indian reservation lands and non-Indian lands within the Central Arizona Project, were published on December 20, 1972, 37 FR 28082. That publication also announced Secretarial execution on December 15, 1972, of a contract with the Central Arizona Water Conservation District for delivery of project water and repayment of project costs.

The Secretarial decisions of December 15, 1972, and the concurrently executed contract with the District contemplated a future Secretarial allocation of irrigation water from the Central Arizona Project for Indian use within established reservation boundaries. Pursuant to the authorities cited above, I propose to make such an allocation, in the form set forth below.

Written comments with respect to an allocation of project water for Indian irrigation use have already been received from the Indian tribes affected and their representatives, officials of the State of Arizona, and representatives of Arizona water users; and face-to-face meetings with these groups have been held by me and members of my staff. Nevertheless, it is the policy of the Department of the Interior to afford the public an opportunity to participate as fully as possible in the decision-making process. Accordingly, interested persons may submit written comments, suggestions, or objections regarding the proposed allocation to the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. All relevant material received before June 17, 1975, will be considered.

To facilitate public review and comment, an administrative record of significant meetings, correspondence, and factual data relied upon in making the allocation proposed below has been assembled in the Arizona Projects Office of the Bureau of Reclamation, 135 North Second Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85003—telephone number (602) 261-3106. This administrative record can be inspected by the public on the premises of the Arizona Projects Office during regular business hours, where arrangements can be made to have specified portions copied upon payment of reasonable charges.

Dated: April 15, 1975.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,  
Secretary of the Interior.

#### CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, ARIZONA ALLOCATION OF PROJECT WATER FOR INDIAN IRRIGATION USE

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by the Act of June 17, 1902, as amended (32 Stat. 388, 43 U.S.C. 391), and the Colorado River Basin Project Act of September 30, 1968 (82 Stat. 885, 43 U.S.C. 1501), certain Secretarial decisions made on December 15, 1972, concerning the priorities for water use and the allocation of irrigation water between Indian reservation lands and non-Indian lands



within the Central Arizona Project, were published on December 20, 1972, 37 FR 28082. That publication also announced Secretarial execution on December 15, 1972, of a contract with the Central Arizona Water Conservation District for delivery of project water and repayment of project costs.

The Secretarial decisions of December 15, 1972, and the concurrently executed contract with the District contemplated a future Secretarial allocation of irrigation water from the Central Arizona Project for Indian use within established reservation boundaries. Pursuant to the authorities cited above, I propose to make such an allocation, in the form set forth below.

Before describing the procedure used to determine the allocations set forth below to the five central Arizona Indian tribes for irrigation use within the boundaries of their respective reservations, a critical feature of the Central Arizona Project should be understood. The project was not planned to—nor did Congress intend in authorizing it that it would—provide a total solution to the water requirements of central Arizona.

This is characteristically arid country with a limited surface supply of water, and both agricultural and municipal and industrial uses have to depend on groundwater pumping. However, the groundwater level has been dropping at an alarming rate, so that the expense of pumping may soon make irrigated farming in this region uneconomical. Moreover, the groundwater supply is not expected to be adequate to support the demand for municipal and industrial water accompanying estimated future population growth and industrial development.

The Central Arizona Project is designed to alleviate the agricultural drain on the groundwater supply in the early years of the project and to provide a dependable supply of municipal and industrial water on a permanent basis. The early years of the project are about the first 20 years during which time waters surplus to the other Colorado River Basin States will be diverted through the project to central Arizona and used in lieu of or to replenish the groundwater supply. It is during this period of time that the project will make its greatest contribution to irrigation. At the end of the first 20 years, two developments will converge to significantly reduce the water available from the project for irrigation. One will be the increasing utilization of the Colorado River by the other Basin States, and the other will be the increasing demand in central Arizona for municipal and industrial water.

Hydrologic studies of the Bureau of Reclamation show that about half of the years from the 20th to the 50th year of the project the water available for delivery canalside will be limited to about 360,000 acre-feet, and this will be very costly water. To bring it to central Arizona it is necessary to build a steam generating plant to provide power to pump the water from the Colorado River and convey it in aqueducts more than

300 miles to the Phoenix and Tucson areas, at a total project cost of about \$1.2 billion based on January 1973 prices. Of this amount about \$1 billion is allocated to the water function, both irrigation and municipal and industrial. Over a 50-year period this represents an average annual capital cost for the water function of \$20 million. When the total supply would be limited to about 360,000 acre-feet, the computed capital cost for delivering that water would be about \$56 an acre-foot, based on January 1973 costs, to which must be added interest and operating and maintenance expenses.

It is clear to me based on the legislative history, the hydrologic studies, and the financial realities, that the Central Arizona Project was not intended by Congress to be used primarily for irrigation after the first 20 years, nor would it be reasonable to use such costly water for that purpose. That was the reason we assigned municipal and industrial uses a first priority in our decisions of December 15, 1972, 37 FR 28082.

After the first 20 years all irrigators in central Arizona, Indian and non-Indian alike, will have to look to other sources than the water supply which is now being allocated between Indian and non-Indian irrigation to supplement their groundwater supply. The authorizing legislation contemplates that such future water needs of Arizona and other arid States in the West will be met by augmentation of the natural flows of the Colorado River. I am hopeful that by the time the need becomes critical, the technical means for accomplishing augmentation will have been developed.

Therefore, with the understanding that the water supply from the Central Arizona Project which I am hereby allocating between Indian and non-Indian irrigation will not be a total solution to their respective needs, I have determined to make the allocation in two successive time frames. One will cover the project water that will be available during the first 20 years, and the other will cover that to be available thereafter.

During the deliberative process, my representatives and I met with the Indian tribes and their representatives and

with officials of the State of Arizona to explore Indian expectations and needs and to sort out the conflicting claims and facts. During these meetings a consensus developed as to an acceptable approach for determining the amount of water to be allocated to Indian irrigation use during the early years of the project. As a result thereof, it is my determination that sufficient project water should be made available to the Indian tribes so that 100 percent of lands presently developed for irrigation on the Indian reservations can be irrigated. The amount of project water that would be made available would take into account the estimated available surface water and the estimated current groundwater yield for irrigation without overdrafting. I requested the Bureau of Reclamation to make a technical study of this data in cooperation with the Indian tribes and the State officials and to provide me with a report. I have reviewed the Bureau's findings and the supporting technical material and am persuaded of their reliability and accuracy.

In outline, the Bureau of Reclamation used the following procedure: (1) The total acreage of presently developed lands on each reservation was determined. (2) The total water requirement for each reservation was computed on the basis of 4.59 acre-feet per acre. (3) The number of acre-feet of non-project surface and groundwater available to each reservation was estimated. (4) The number of acre-feet of project water required for each reservation was then obtained by subtracting the available surface and groundwater from the total water requirement. (5) The number of acre-feet to be delivered to each tribe at the turnout points on the project canals (canalside) was the amount as determined in No. 4 multiplied by 1.176 (which is the same as dividing by 0.85) to allow for a 15 percent loss in the distribution systems from the amount delivered canalside.

A summary of the Bureau of Reclamation's findings are presented in the following table (units in 1,000's of acres or acre-feet):

Reservation	Presently developed acreage	Multiply by 4.59 for total on-farm acre-feet required	Subtract available water		Multiply by 1.176 for acre-feet of project water, canalside
			Surface	Ground	
AK Chin.....	10.8	49.6	0	0	58.3
Gila River.....	62.1	285	77.3	60.6	173.1
Papago.....	1.7	7.8	0	1.0	8.0
Salt River.....	13.0	59.7	33.6	14.8	13.3
Fort McDowell.....	1.3	6	0	0	0
Total.....	88.9	408.1	116.9	76.4	252.7

There were one or more respects in which the tribes' figures and the State's figures were in disagreement with those of the Bureau of Reclamation. In general, the tribes' figures tended to increase the amount of project water which should be allocated to them, as compared with the amount supported by the Bureau of Reclamation's figures, and the State's figures to diminish such amount.

To give an illustration of the range, the respective totals of the amounts of project water which should be allocated to the tribes were as follows (1,000's acre-feet):

State .....	194.3
Bureau of Reclamation.....	252.7
Tribes .....	395

A principal area of disparity between the three groups was in the estimate of



the groundwater supply available for irrigation use. The State's groundwater estimate, for example, would have credited the Gila River Tribe with 114.8 thousand acre-feet of groundwater to be deducted from the tribe's total water requirement; whereas the Bureau of Reclamation's estimate was 60.6 thousand acre-feet and the tribe's 28.3 thousand acre-feet. The State used a least-cost analysis (cost of groundwater pumping vs. cost of project water) which would not, in my opinion, be appropriate for Indian irrigation water, since such water will be made available to the tribes on a nonreimbursable basis.

I also rejected the tribe's estimate because it would have eliminated from the groundwater available for irrigation use an amount which the tribe plans to use in the future for municipal and industrial purposes. Under the Bureau of Reclamation's estimate, which I have adopted, deductions from the groundwater available for irrigation use would be permitted for present municipal and industrial uses but not for anticipated municipal and industrial uses because of their speculative nature.

The Papago and the Salt River Tribes each similarly claimed less groundwater available for irrigation use than that estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation, but I find no convincing support for their claims.

There were also differences in the respective estimates in other matters than groundwater. The Gila River Tribe, for example, requested water for the irrigation of the same number of acres of reservation lands that had figured in litigation involving a claim by the Tribe for water rights on the Gila River (29 Ind. Cl. Comm. 144, Docket No. 236-C). Those lands have not, however, been developed for irrigation and were not, therefore, taken into account under the foregoing approach. Moreover, we understand that the Tribe is now pursuing a remedy for money damages against the United States in connection with those Gila River water rights.

The Salt River Tribe, on the other hand, claimed a water duty of 6.25 acre-feet per acre instead of the normal water duty of 4.59 acre-feet. This claim was predicated on a more intensive use of water due to double cropping and other practices. However, such intensive use would in due course exhaust the available groundwater supply. Since the tribe could not reasonably expect to persist in such use, it would not be fair to the other tribes to measure the Salt River Tribe's entitlement to project water on the basis of the larger water duty. If such variations from the procedure were to be allowed for one tribe, they could justifiably be demanded by each of the others.

It is for the latter reason that I have determined that the Fort McDowell Tribe is not entitled to any project water. This reservation has an ample supply of surface water to satisfy all of its on-farm requirements.

Accordingly, I intend to make my allocation on the basis of the Bureau of

Reclamation's findings. The total of 252,000 acre-feet annually for Indian irrigation use which is supported by those findings represents slightly less than 20 percent of all irrigation water estimated to be available in a normal year during the early years of project operation. To facilitate administration of this allocation in the later years when the Indian share of irrigation water will have to be computed each year on a percentage basis, I have decided that the 252,000 acre-feet should be rounded out to 20 percent of all irrigation water estimated to be available in a normal year during the early years. This would amount to about 257,000 acre-feet annually. I have determined, accordingly, that for the first 20 years the tribes will receive a fixed amount of 257,000 acre-feet annually.

Such an allocation for Indian irrigation will give the tribes an advantage which they would not otherwise have were the allocation made solely on the basis of population (one percent) or presently-developed acreage (10 percent) on the reservations. Moreover, whereas such deliveries to the tribes would amount to sufficient project water when used with estimated available surface and groundwater supplies to irrigate 100 percent of their presently-developed lands, non-Indians would be receiving only enough when used with estimated available surface and groundwater supplies to irrigate slightly more than half of their lands with a recent irrigation history. (Section 304(a) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act precludes delivery of project water for irrigation of non-Indian lands not having "a recent irrigation history as determined by the Secretary." In applying the "presently-developed" criterion to the Indian lands, the showing of a recent irrigation history was not required, thus allowing a greater allocation of project irrigation water to the Indians.)

Adjusted on the basis of the rounding-out to 257,000 acre-feet annually, each tribe will be entitled to the following canal-side delivery of irrigation water in acre-feet annually for the first 20 years:

AK Chin	59,300
Gila River	176,000
Papago	8,200
Salt River	13,500
Fort McDowell	0
	257,000

As a further advantage to the tribes, I have determined that the delivery of the foregoing amounts to the tribes will be on a guaranteed annual basis; whereas the irrigation water deliveries to non-Indians will fluctuate from year-to-year, depending on hydrologic conditions. However, because of the combination of hydrologic and other factors described earlier, it will not be possible to continue these deliveries after the year 2005. As the project is expected to be operational in 1985, this will allow for a full 20 years, but if the project is unduly delayed, the guaranteed amount may be available for less than 20 years through the year 2005.

After the year 2005, there will still be water available in some years for the irrigation of Indian and non-Indian lands after meeting municipal and industrial needs, but it will not be in such dependable annual quantities as to allow me to guarantee the delivery of water in the specific amounts determined above. However, irrigation water shall continue to be delivered to the tribes on the basis of 20 percent of the total irrigation water available each year, to be pro rated among them in proportion to their entitlements during the first 20 years, as follows:

	Percent
AK Chin	23.1
Gila River	68.5
Papago	3.2
Salt River	5.2
Fort McDowell	0
	100.0

Under the priorities set out in the December 15, 1972 decisions, water used for municipal and industrial purposes would have priority over irrigation.<sup>1</sup> Since it is presently estimated that more than 360,000 acre-feet annually will be sold by the Central Arizona Water Conservation District for M&I purposes, no water would be available in half or more of the years from the 20th to the 50th year to be delivered to the tribes for irrigation. To avoid such a possibility, I have determined to allocate at least 10 percent of all project water supply to the tribes following the year 2005, so that the tribes will have either 20 percent of all irrigation water or 10 percent of all project water each year, whichever is to their advantage. Although this water is to be used by the tribes for irrigation, it will have the same priority as M&I water under the decisions of December 15, 1972. As such, during the years of minimum project water supply, the tribes will receive 10 percent of all project water annually for irrigation; whereas non-Indians will receive no irrigation water. In normal years based on present estimates, the tribes can expect to receive from 150,000 to 200,000 acre-feet.

Water allocated for Indian use to each tribe by this decision is required to be used on the reservation of the tribe to which it is allocated. This restriction is consistent with section 304 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act. If water allocated to a tribe by this decision is used for the irrigation of Indian lands on the reservation, the capital costs of the project attributable to such water shall be nonreimbursable by the tribe, pursuant to section 402 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act.

The allocation of project irrigation water made to the tribes by this decision is not intended to preclude their right to contract for project M&I water like any other entity in central Arizona. Such

<sup>1</sup> This priority is, of course, subject to the statutory "first priority" in section 304(e), 43 U.S.C. § 1524(e), for water users who have yielded water from other sources in exchange for project water.



contracts may be made through me so long as such water has not been contracted to other users. Since it is the purpose of this decision to enable the Central Arizona Water Conservation District to proceed expeditiously to enter into contracts for such water for terms of up to 50 years, the tribes should express their interests to me on a timely basis.

[FR Doc.75-10292 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

#### Office of the Secretary

**ROBERT L. HUFMAN**

#### Statement of Changes in Financial Interests

In accordance with the requirements of section 710(b) (6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10647 of November 28, 1955, the following changes have taken place in my financial interests during the past six months:

- (1) No change.
- (2) No change.
- (3) No change.
- (4) No change.

This statement is made as of February 21, 1975.

Dated: February 21, 1975.

**R. L. HUFMAN.**

[FR Doc.75-10188 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

**HERBERT H. HUNT, JR.**

#### Statement of Changes in Financial Interests

In accordance with the requirements of section 710(b) (6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10647 of November 28, 1955, the following changes have taken place in my financial interests during the past six months:

- (1) No Change.
- (2) Solid—Fidelity Mortgage Investors, 100 shares, 12/30/74; Add—Atlas, Syntex—small amount in Investment Club.
- (3) No Change.
- (4) No Change.

This statement is made as of March 26, 1975.

Dated: March 26, 1975.

**HERBERT H. HUNT.**

[FR Doc.75-10189 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

**MODESTO IRIARTE, JR.**

#### Statement of Changes in Financial Interests

In accordance with the requirements of section 710(b) (6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10647 of November 28, 1955, the following changes have taken place in my financial interests during the past six months:

- (1) No change.
- (2) No change.
- (3) No change.
- (4) No change.

This statement is made as of March 10, 1975.

Dated: March 10, 1975.

**MODESTO IRIARTE, JR.**

[FR Doc.75-10190 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

**JOHN H. KLINE**

#### Statement of Changes in Financial Interests

In accordance with the requirements of section 710(b) (6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10647 of November 28, 1955, the following changes have taken place in my financial interests during the past six months:

- (1) No change.
- (2) No change.
- (3) No change.
- (4) No change.

This statement is made as of February 27, 1975.

Dated: February 27, 1975.

**JOHN H. KLINE.**

[FR Doc.75-10191 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

**CLIFTON F. ROGERS**

#### Statement of Changes in Financial Interests

In accordance with the requirements of section 710(b) (6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10647 of November 28, 1955, the following changes have taken place in my financial interests during the past six months:

- (1) No change.
- (2) No change.
- (3) No change.
- (4) No change.

This statement is made as of March 3, 1975.

Dated: March 3, 1975.

**CLIFTON F. ROGERS.**

[FR Doc.75-10192 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

**STANLEY M. SWANSON**

#### Statement of Changes in Financial Interests

In accordance with the requirements of section 710(b) (6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10647 of November 28, 1955, the following changes have taken place in my financial interests during the past six months:

- (1) No change.
- (2) No change.
- (3) No change.
- (4) No change.

This statement is made as of March 10, 1975.

Dated: March 10, 1975.

**S. M. SWANSON.**

[FR Doc.75-10193 Filed 4-17-75;8:45 am]

[ORDER NO. 2973]

#### MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT Plebiscite

Whereas, the United States as administering authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has undertaken an obligation under the trusteeship agreement and under Article 76 of the United Nations Charter to give the peoples of the trust territory the right to choose freely their own political future; and

Whereas, the people of the Mariana Islands District repeatedly have requested that the United States negotiate an arrangement whereby the Northern Mariana Islands would become a part of the United States upon termination of the trusteeship agreement between the United States and the United Nations; and

Whereas, a covenant to establish a commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in political union with the United States of America, has now been negotiated and signed by the duly authorized representatives of the Marianas District and the United States and received the unanimous approval of the Mariana Islands District Legislature on February 20, 1975;

Now, therefore, pursuant to Executive Order No. 11021 of July 1, 1962, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Sec. 1. Purpose.** The purpose of this order is to establish the authority and the administrative responsibility for the holding of a plebiscite on June 17, 1975, in the Mariana Islands District as an exercise by the people of that district of their right of self-determination.

**Sec. 2 The Plebiscite Commissioner.** A plebiscite commissioner designated by the President of the United States shall be responsible for the planning, the preparations for and the holding of the plebiscite in the Northern Mariana Islands. The Commissioner shall:

(1) Ensure that an impartial Plebiscite Education Program is conducted throughout the Northern Mariana Islands;

(2) Appoint a Plebiscite Voter Registration Board, designate its chairman and establish procedures for the registration of voters;

(3) Establish an official plebiscite register on the basis of the final voter registration list as certified by the Voter Registration Board, to include qualified absentee voters;

(4) Oversee the administrative plans for and supervise the holding of the plebiscite; and

(5) Appoint an Executive Director who shall be responsible to him for the execution and coordination of all activities in support of the plebiscite.

**Sec. 3 Responsibilities of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands Administration.** (a) The High Commissioner shall provide the Plebiscite Commissioner administrative support and shall assure the implementation of policies and programs related to the plebiscite