



AgEcon SEARCH

RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator

Division of Research, Statistics and Records

Emerson Ross - Director

Program and Work

of the

Rural Electrification Administration

in the

Works Program

✓ Prepared by
✓ Samuel Liss
edited by
Arthur Stein and John J. Theobald

Washington
July
1936

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Background	1
Rural Electrification in the United States	4
Economic Deterrents in the Past which hampered nation-wide rural electrification	11
Previous Government efforts in rural electrification	18
The work of the Rural Electrification Administration	19
Status of projects as of July 31, 1935	29
The Rural Electrification Act of 1936	33
Organization and Administration	37
Steps leading to an application for a rural electrification project loan.	39
Chief Provisions in the Loan Agreement	41
Tables and Charts	42
Table 1 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	43
Table 2 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	44
Table 3 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	45
Table 4 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	46
Table 5 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	47
Table 6 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	48
Table 7 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	49
Table 8 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	50
Table 9 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	51
Table 10 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	52
Table 11 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	53
Table 12 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	54
Table 13 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	55
Table 14 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	56
Table 15 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	57
Table 16 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	58
Table 17 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	59
Table 18 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	60
Table 19 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	61
Table 20 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	62
Table 21 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	63
Table 22 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	64
Table 23 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	65
Table 24 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	66
Table 25 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	67
Table 26 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	68
Table 27 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	69
Table 28 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	70
Table 29 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	71
Table 30 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	72
Table 31 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	73
Table 32 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	74
Table 33 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	75
Table 34 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	76
Table 35 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	77
Table 36 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	78
Table 37 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	79
Table 38 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	80
Table 39 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	81
Table 40 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	82
Table 41 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	83
Table 42 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	84
Table 43 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	85
Table 44 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	86
Table 45 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	87
Table 46 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	88
Table 47 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	89
Table 48 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	90
Table 49 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	91
Table 50 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	92
Table 51 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	93
Table 52 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	94
Table 53 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	95
Table 54 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	96
Table 55 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	97
Table 56 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	98
Table 57 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	99
Table 58 - Summary of the Status of Rural Electrification Projects as of July 31, 1935	100

FEB 13 1946

INDEX

1	Introduction
2	General description of the system
3	Objectives and scope of the study
4	Methodology
5	Results and discussion
6	Conclusion
7	References
8	Appendix
9	Bibliography
10	Index

1000

TABLES AND CHARTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table A - Central-Station Customers in 1935 by Regions and States	43
Table B - Growth in Farm Electrification 1923-1935	45
Table C - Number of Farm Service Customers by Regions, 1930-1935	46
Table D - Rural Electrification - Number of Farms and Farms Served by Electric Central-Station in the United States, by States	47
Table E - Status of Rural Electrification Administration Projects by States - Projects Approved and with Loan Contracts Executed - As of July 31, 1936	48
Table F - Status of Rural Electrification Administration Projects by States - Projects Under Construction and Projects Completed - As of July 31, 1936	49
Table G - Values of Farm Buildings and Dwellings and Gross Cash Income from Farm Production of States in which REA Projects are Located	50
Table H - Comparison of the State's 1930 Average Values of Farm Buildings, Farm Dwellings and Gross Income Falling Below the National Average with Those of its Counties in which REA Projects are Located	52
Table I - Rural Electrification Projects by Sponsors	53
Table J - Approved Projects of the Rural Electrification Administration - As of July 31, 1936	55
Chart 1 - Rural Electrification in the United States - 1935	67
Chart 2 - Rural Electrification in Various Countries	68

Works Program Activities
of the
Rural Electrification Administration

Background

The solution to the problem of achieving wide spread rural electrification in countries with large farm and rural areas has been generally recognized as one requiring an international cooperative effort -- at least in discussion, presentation of mutual problems and exchange of ideas on the subject. To this end, two Congresses had already been held, one in London in 1924 and the other in Berlin in 1930, as well as a number of sectional meetings in Basle, London, Barcelona, Tokyo and Stockholm. That United States representatives took part in these Congresses and sectional meetings, albeit in an unofficial capacity, was an indication that this country had a lively interest in the problem. Because of its interest and because it desired to continue offering its cooperation in the solution of this mutual problem, the United States through its Congress made possible the convening in Washington, D. C. on September 7, 1936 of the previously scheduled Third World Power Conference.¹ The bringing of this Conference to American shores brought to our people the realization that rural electrification problems were world-wide. The papers which were presented at the Conference pointed to the great gains that had been made in extending electricity to farm and rural areas with Government participation and assistance. The continuous thread of thought that pervaded the discussion was that the achievement of wide spread rural electrification could not be left solely to the public utility companies, and that the farmers by themselves could do little without

(1) - The U.S. Congress passed a resolution in August 1935 calling for the convening of the Third World Power Conference in Washington, D. C. on September 7, 1936.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM

This document contains information regarding the activities of the various departments of the University for the year 1914. It is intended to provide a summary of the work done in each of the several fields of study and to show the progress of the various projects which are being carried on. The information is given in a general way and is not intended to be a detailed account of the work of any one of the departments. It is hoped that it will be of some interest to those who are concerned with the general administration of the University.

The following information is given in the order in which the departments are listed in the accompanying table:

The Department of Agriculture has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various crops and in the control of various insects and diseases. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Botany has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and in the control of various insects and diseases. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Chemistry has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the synthesis of various compounds and in the analysis of various substances. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Geology has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various rocks and minerals and in the study of various fossils. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of History has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various historical events and in the study of various historical documents. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Literature has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various literary works and in the study of various literary movements. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Mathematics has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various mathematical problems and in the study of various mathematical methods. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Natural Science has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various natural phenomena and in the study of various natural laws. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Physical Science has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various physical phenomena and in the study of various physical laws. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Psychology has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various psychological phenomena and in the study of various psychological laws. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

The Department of Sociology has been very active during the year. It has conducted a number of experiments in the study of various social phenomena and in the study of various social laws. It has also conducted a number of experiments in the raising of various plants and animals. The results of these experiments are being published in a number of reports.

some form of Government aid. Directive planning was deemed essential if the farmers' needs for electricity were to be adequately met. Such planning, it was felt, could be accomplished only on the basis of a national policy and program.

These conclusions of the Conference were not new to the interested groups in the United States who for years had been concerned with this problem. For example, the Mississippi Valley Committee Report of October 1, 1934 and the National Resources Committee Report of December 1, 1934 both reached practically identical conclusions in urging national participation in order to achieve wide-spread rural electrification in the United States. It might be said that the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration in May of 1935¹ was a concrete product of these two studies. The two reports together with the establishment of the REA consisted of a step forward in directive planning and in effectuating a national plan and policy of rural electrification in the United States.

The Mississippi Valley Committee Report recognized that agricultural rehabilitation was a basic national problem and that electrical power had an important part to play in its solution. It also reached the conclusion that only under Government leadership and control, assisted in particular instances by State and Local agencies, was it possible to supply electricity to any appreciable number of "dirt farms"; that the production and distribution of electricity more than most other factors demanded fairly wide coordination as part of a unified national system. The Committee suggested that the Government could spend profitably a billion dollars on the river works in the Mississippi

(1) - The temporary REA was created a year earlier by the President's Executive Order issued under authority given him by the E.R.A.A. of 1935.

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

Valley in the next 20 years, and recommended an allotment of \$100,000,000 to build independent, self-liquidating rural electric lines in the Basin where no lines existed and where it was likely that private interest would not penetrate to any great extent in the near future.

The National Resources Board study consisted of a survey of land and water uses, mineral deposits and public works in the United States in their relation to each other, and was to serve as a basis for future planning in conserving and developing these natural resources. In a special section devoted to hydro-electric power, the Report pointed out that although the United States led the world in the total amount of horsepower of electricity used, the country was not utilizing to anywhere near the maximum ability the electrically derived mechanical power that can be realized by our fabulous store of natural, mineral and water resources. The Board, therefore, suggested that "one of the objectives which national planning should strive to attain is to provide all sections of the country with all the electrical power they may require at the lowest possible cost". It was immediately realized that the Board's inference that a great part of our population was not as yet enjoying the great service of electricity led directly to the consideration of supplying it to farmers and to other residents in our rural regions.

The endeavor to achieve farm and rural electrification to a greater extent and at a more rapid rate than had been accomplished in the past was crystallized with the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration. After one year of operation under the 1935 Works Program, the Rural Electrification Administration became in May of 1936 a permanent Government agency, based on a 10-year program.

The committee on the subject of the...

The committee on the subject of the...

The committee on the subject of the...

The fact that the Government found it necessary to step into this field was a symptom that certain deterrent forces existed which militated against the universal introduction of electricity on the American farm. These forces were numerous. However, they may be reduced into their two basic elements: (1) The farmers in the United States had assumed that rural electrification must come from the private companies; (2) The traditional policy of the privately owned utilities to extend their franchises into those areas which had proved most profitable.

The launching of the program and its magnitude was based, of course, upon the knowledge of what had and had not been accomplished in the field of rural electrification. In other words, the program was preceded by an examination of the status of rural electrification in the United States as a whole, in the different geographic regions of the country, and in the various states, and also of the degree to which electricity was being applied both in the industrial pursuits and in farming.

Rural Electrification In the United States

Of the total American farms in 1935 about 65 per cent had automobiles, 35 per cent had telephones, 30 per cent had radios, but only about 13 per cent had central station electricity. Moreover, the farmers formed only a small portion of the total number of utility customers served in the entire country.¹ Of the 25,341,203 utility customers in 1935, only 793,977 or about 3 per cent were rural and farm customers, despite the fact that they represent over 25 per cent of the total population. Of the 77,355,000,000 kilowatt hours of electric energy consumed by the entire country in that year, the farmer

(1) - See Table A - Central Station Customers in 1935 by Regions and States.

The first part of the document is devoted to the study of the

general theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

The second part of the document is devoted to the study of the particular theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

The third part of the document is devoted to the study of the particular theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

The fourth part of the document is devoted to the study of the particular theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of the document is devoted to the study of the particular theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

The fifth part of the document is devoted to the study of the particular theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

The sixth part of the document is devoted to the study of the particular theory of the subject, and is divided into two main parts, the first of which is devoted to the study of the general theory of the subject, and the second to the study of the particular theory of the subject.

probably utilized less than 1 per cent. Largely as the result of the absence of electricity, about 32,000,000 farmers were deprived of these social and economic benefits which have become associated with the American standard of living; In 1935, of the 32,000,000 farm population, 75 per cent had to carry water from wells or other sources of supply, 77 per cent had to get along with outdoor toilets, 83 per cent had neither bathtubs nor showers, 76 per cent relied on kerosene and gasoline lamps for illumination and 10 per cent were dependent upon candles, and 48 per cent had to do their laundry out of doors.

Before 1923 there had been practically no movement on the part of the Government or private interests to achieve farm and rural electrification. Neither was there any data on how many farms were electrified since domestic and farm use were not separated. During the period from 1923 to 1935 the number of farms that received electric service from central stations increased from 178,000 to 794,000 or an increase from 3.9 per cent to 12.6 per cent of the total number of farms. In 1936 there were 827,000 farms with central station electricity and 225,000 additional farms with independent generating systems. In other words, on January 1, 1936 only 13 out of every 100 farms were centrally connected.¹ This left about 6,000,000 farms, on which nearly 29,000,000 of the 32,000,000 farm population lived, without electricity from a central generating plant. This potential national demand for rural electrification was strikingly indicated when by March 1936, eleven months after its establishment, the Rural Electrification Administration had received applications for the construction of RRA projects

(1) - See Table A-1 - Growth in Farm Electrification

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the various departments of the service. The report then goes on to discuss the financial position of the service and the progress of the work done in the various departments of the service. The report concludes with a summary of the work done during the year and a statement of the progress of the work done during the year.

The second part of the report deals with the progress of the work done in each of the various departments of the service. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the various departments of the service. The report then goes on to discuss the financial position of the service and the progress of the work done in the various departments of the service. The report concludes with a summary of the work done during the year and a statement of the progress of the work done during the year.

The third part of the report deals with the progress of the work done in each of the various departments of the service. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the various departments of the service. The report then goes on to discuss the financial position of the service and the progress of the work done in the various departments of the service. The report concludes with a summary of the work done during the year and a statement of the progress of the work done during the year.

totaling over \$90,000,000.

Rural electrification in the United States indicates a wide disparity between regions.¹ For example, the proportion of farms served by central stations was highest in the New England and Pacific States and lowest in the East South Central and West South Central States. In the West, largely because of the extensive practice of artificial irrigation, and in the thickly settled North Atlantic States, one farm in every 3 had central electric service in 1930. The comparative high ratio of electricity on farms in the North East is also explained by their close proximity to urban centers. In the South and in the Middle-West, the percentage of rural electrification was under 10 and in the Gulf States under 5 per cent. The Mississippi Valley, the Nation's granary, showed about 10 per cent farm electrification.

Similarly, the number and proportion of electrified farms in the country varied widely among the states.² New Hampshire with 88 per cent of its farms electrified in 1935 ranked highest. California was next with 54 per cent, Utah third with 53 per cent, and New Jersey fourth with 52 per cent. The balance of the 46 states had less than half of their farms electrified from a central station as of December 31, 1934. Fifteen states³ had less than one farm in 25 which received electric service, with Mississippi lowest, with less than 1 per cent.

The average farm east of the Rocky Mountains used about 830 kilowatt hours per year in 1930, while the average Pacific Coast farm used about 5,700 kilowatt hours of electric energy. The average annual use of 830 kilowatt hours in 1930, however, was largely due to

- (1) - See Table B - Number of Farm Service Customers by Regions.
- (2) - See Table B-1 and Chart 1 - Rural Electrification, Number of Farms and Farmers Served by Electric Central Stations in the United States by States.
- (3) - Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

the large use in the past of perhaps 10 to 20 per cent of the farms. Consequently, the average farm use is probably below the average city use of electric service.

In 1935 electricity furnished about 80 per cent of the energy used to "drive factory wheels and perform other tasks of American industries", while it supplied only about 2 per cent of the power in agriculture. If 830 kilowatt hours is taken as the annual average in the non-irrigation states, the total annual farm use would be about 660,000,000 kilowatt hours as compared with 65 billion kilowatt hours used in industry, or about 100 times as much.

A number of foreign countries have a greater percentage of their farms electrified than the United States. Holland, France, Belgium and Switzerland all have almost universal farm unit electrification. Germany and Japan each have about 80 per cent of their farms electrified. New Zealand and Scandinavia over 80 and 50 per cent electrification respectively, while Sweden, the largest electrified farm area in the world has 80 per cent of the land under cultivation using electric energy.

Of course, no just and accurate comparison of rural electrification between countries can be made without taking into account comparable bases, or well recognized controlling factors. Population density, size of farms, number of farms per mile and per square mile must all be reduced to a common denominator before comparisons are made. However, it does not follow that these controlling factors are exclusive in determining the high or low percentage of rural electrification in any country. The degree of success or failure in achieving rural electrification presents no conclusive evidence when that success or failure is based upon the above mentioned criteria. That

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out during the year.

The second part of the report deals with the financial position of the organization. It shows that the income has increased during the year and that the expenditure has also increased, but that the surplus has also increased. It also shows that the organization has been able to meet its obligations and that it is in a sound financial position.

The third part of the report deals with the personnel of the organization. It shows that the number of staff has increased during the year and that the organization has been able to attract and retain a high quality of staff. It also shows that the organization has been able to provide a good working environment for its staff.

The fourth part of the report deals with the future prospects of the organization. It shows that the organization has a bright future and that it is well placed to meet the challenges of the future. It also shows that the organization has a strong support base and that it is well placed to continue to make a valuable contribution to society.

The fifth part of the report deals with the conclusions of the report. It shows that the organization has made significant progress during the year and that it is well placed to continue to make a valuable contribution to society. It also shows that the organization has a strong support base and that it is well placed to meet the challenges of the future.

The sixth part of the report deals with the recommendations of the report. It shows that the organization should continue to focus on its core activities and that it should continue to invest in its staff and its infrastructure. It also shows that the organization should continue to work closely with its supporters and that it should continue to be open to new ideas and initiatives.

these factors are important in rural electrification, no one will dispute; that they are exclusive determinants for success in this field is open to much doubt. At any rate they must be considered in an international comparative study of rural electrification.

Concentration of farms in limited areas resulting in heavy farm density is probably the most important of the above mentioned four factors explaining successful rural electrification. Because of the difference in farm density per square mile in the United States and in other countries, the United States as a national unit suffers by comparison in the degree of success in rural electrification. However, if one takes selected areas in the United States approximating the farm density of countries having nation-wide rural electrification, it is found that the discrepancies in accomplishment largely disappear. Thus, New England and the State of Utah, where farms are comparatively small and concentrated, and cultivated lands are a small proportion of the total land areas, resembling in this respect such countries as Norway and Sweden, have approximately the same percentage of farm unit electrification. Similarly, because the French farm population lives in villages and not in isolated farm houses scattered over the land as in America, that country's farm and rural regions have been almost universally electrified. The same is true for Japan and Germany. On the other hand, in Great Britain where the population and farm density per square mile is heavy, rural electrification is smaller than in the United States, and only now getting under way. This is an indication that heavy farm density although it creates favorable conditions is no guarantee in establishing rural electrification.

Population density is another well recognized controlling factor in extending electric service in farms and rural areas. On this

The first of these is the fact that the...

...the second is the fact that the...

...the third is the fact that the...

...the fourth is the fact that the...

...the fifth is the fact that the...

...the sixth is the fact that the...

...the seventh is the fact that the...

...the eighth is the fact that the...

...the ninth is the fact that the...

...the tenth is the fact that the...

...the eleventh is the fact that the...

...the twelfth is the fact that the...

...the thirteenth is the fact that the...

...the fourteenth is the fact that the...

...the fifteenth is the fact that the...

...the sixteenth is the fact that the...

...the seventeenth is the fact that the...

...the eighteenth is the fact that the...

...the nineteenth is the fact that the...

...the twentieth is the fact that the...

...the twenty-first is the fact that the...

...the twenty-second is the fact that the...

...the twenty-third is the fact that the...

...the twenty-fourth is the fact that the...

...the twenty-fifth is the fact that the...

...the twenty-sixth is the fact that the...

...the twenty-seventh is the fact that the...

...the twenty-eighth is the fact that the...

...the twenty-ninth is the fact that the...

...the thirtieth is the fact that the...

basis the United States with a population density of 41 to the square mile seems to be handicapped when compared to Japan and France which have a farm density per square mile of 433 and 197 respectively. On the other hand, Norway and Sweden which have a lower population density, (24 and 36 respectively), than the United States have almost four times as many farm units receiving electricity. Moreover, New Zealand with a population density per square mile of only about 1/8 as great as non-metropolitan New York supplies electricity to twice as large a proportion of its farms. In 1935 approximately one New York farm in three was electrified, while New Zealand had two in every three receiving this service. Texas with a slightly greater population density than New Zealand had only about two farms in every 100 supplied with electric service in 1935. Here again population density does not seem to be the exclusive agent for successful rural electrification.

A comparison based upon the criterion of the average number of farms per mile similarly reveals no conclusive evidence regarding the progress or lack of it made by various countries in the field of rural electrification. While in the absence of all other governing conditions, it might be argued that France and Japan with an average number of 26 and 38 farms per mile presented a financial incentive to farm electrification, and the United States with an average of only two, did not, yet there are disturbing illustrations disputing this thesis. For example, both the United States and Norway have the same average number of farms per mile, yet the percentage of farms electrified in each country is 13 and 50 respectively. Sweden with twice the farm density per mile as the United States has more than four times the proportion of electrified farms.

The first part of the document is a general introduction to the project. It describes the objectives and the scope of the work. The second part is a detailed description of the methodology used in the study. This includes a discussion of the data collection methods, the analysis techniques, and the statistical tests used. The third part of the document is a discussion of the results of the study. This includes a comparison of the findings with previous research and a discussion of the implications of the results. The final part of the document is a conclusion and a list of references.

The size of the farm is another factor in rural electrification because it provides a measure of distance between farm homes. The greater the distance over which current is transmitted, the higher the losses and cost. In this respect the United States as a whole is retarded. The average crop land per farm in the United States is 54 acres as compared to 14 for Sweden, 10 for France and 6.6 for Norway. The American average crop farm is 23 times the size of an average Japanese farm and 5 times larger than the average French crop farm. On the other hand, there are compensating features over and against the losses sustained because of greater distances between farm homes situated on relatively large crop farms. That is to say, the large farms are greater potential users of electricity and once this potential use is realized the losses due to transmission are minimized.

Summarizing this international comparison, three things stand out: (1) Recognizing certain criteria as a basis for a comparative study of achievement in the field of rural electrification, no conclusive evidence exists to prove that these criteria are exclusive controlling factors in determining the success and failure in this endeavor; (2) other economic factors which are discussed in the next section of this paper are probably of greater importance in the success achieved by other countries and for the slow progress made by the United States in the field of rural electrification; (3) in the face of the fact that about 6,000,000 American farms are now without central station electricity, international comparisons can be only of academic interest. A new approach to the problem must be taken if rural America is to be electrified. Other controlling factors such as cost of line construction in rural areas, retail rates, methods of raising capital, terms of service, in addition to those previously mentioned, must form

a basis for future efforts to bring electric service to the vast majority of farms now without it. In the past, progress has been slow and faltering and according to EIA Administrator Morris L. Cooke, "unless steps are taken to provide a program of accelerating rural line construction it will -- based on the record of the last 10 years -- be some 50 years before even half of our farms are electrified".

Economic Interferents in the Past Which Hampered Nation-Wide Rural Electrification

A number of restraining factors are known to exist which in the past have adversely influenced nation-wide introduction of rural electrification in the United States: (1) high cost of rural distribution line construction; (2) low load factors due in part to the lack of electrical farm appliances and equipment; and (3) high losses due to the relatively greater distances over which the current must be transmitted. These in turn have resulted in extensive initial cash payments and high monthly guarantees required by the private companies from prospective farm and rural consumers; high retail rates; and a reluctance on the part of privately owned utility companies to enter the farm and rural field. Rural electrification in this country has been further hampered by a lack of government aid and the absence of a strong farm cooperative movement.

In rural electrification the major problem is the cost of delivering electric energy to the final consumer rather than the cost of generation. The largest item in this cost of delivery is the investment in transmission and distribution lines. Construction costs in rural regions where the customers average about 2 to the mile are of greater importance than in urban areas where the higher density of customers makes expensive construction less serious. A Federal Power

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the

[Faint signature or text]

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the

Commission study in 1935 of 338 of the larger utility companies serving about 90 per cent of all rural customers in the United States indicated costs for single-phase lines ranging from \$618 to \$2,456 per mile with a density of 4 customers to the mile. The average cost of construction per mile of line including transformers, secondaries, house service extensions, and meters with a density ranging from 3.7 to 6.5 customers, was \$1,740. These high construction costs have of course been reflected in high rates.

In an effort to defray costs, many private utilities have charged part or all of the cost of constructing rural lines to their customers. Others who bear the entire initial expense of construction require a minimum average revenue guarantee equal to a certain percentage of the construction cost. The Federal Power Commission study of rural rates and rural line construction policies and practices as of February 1935, found that prospective farm customers had to pay first costs ranging from \$125 to \$250 for a mile of distribution line with a density of 4 customers. On the other hand, minimum annual revenue guarantees over a period of years have been found to vary on a nation-wide basis from 1-1/4 per cent to 6-2/3 per cent of the total cost per month. In general, the companies plan to recoup the costs of construction within three years by requiring an annual gross revenue per mile equivalent to 1/3 of the construction costs. The maximum requirement per mile per month in the United States has been found to be \$37.50 charged by a Kentucky utility company and the minimum, \$7.00 required by a utility in Idaho, or a range of \$1.75 to \$9.38 per customer with a line density of four customers.¹ This practice has, of course, made rural electrification prohibitive in most farming areas.

(1) - Federal Power Commission-Electric Rate Survey-Rate Series No. 8-February 1, 1935 - Page 7

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

High retail rates have discouraged the use of electricity on the farm and in the rural regions by preventing the functioning of an elastic demand which numerous studies have revealed prevails for this service. This largely explains why the normal farmer burns all of his minimum and then stops. As a result the farmer who is ordinarily a greater potential electric user than the city dweller probably uses on the average less than the urban consumer. Moreover, the experience of public utilities in the rural electrification field, indicates that one out of five farmers does not take current on the line constructed in their areas. A recent rate survey of rural electric service by the Federal Power Commission revealed that about 67 per cent of the utilities which reported costs ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,500 per mile of line and 60 per cent of those whose costs ranged from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per mile had monthly bills ranging from \$1.50 to \$3.00 for 25 kilowatt hours, or a rate of 6 cents to 12 cents per kilowatt hour. Since fully one-half of all the farms having electricity consumed in 1935 less than 30 kilowatt hours per month,¹ it is evident that at least 50 per cent of the farmers paid rates falling within this range. However, because the other 50 per cent used a greater quantity of power, the national average rural rate was about 6 cents per kilowatt hour.

The natural traditional policy of privately owned public utilities to extend their franchises into those areas which have proved most profitable is a factor responsible for the absence of wide spread rural electrification in the United States. Utility companies in the past have shown little interest in the field of rural electrification because of the risk and uncertainty in obtaining a fair return on their

(1) - Federal Power Commission - Electric Rate Survey - Rate Series Number 8 - February 1, 1935 - Forward.

...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...
 ...the ... of ...

investment. They have penetrated the urban centers where rapid increases in the population and the growing use of electric power for other than domestic purposes such as street cars, street lighting, manufacturing operations, advertising display, and the lighting of the "great white ways" have netted them great profits. It was, moreover, easy to extend electric service to cities because of their proximity to sources of generation. The private utility companies, therefore, in following the road of least resistance ignored rural electrification to a great extent. The existing rural electrification systems of the private utility companies cover the lines which are most remunerative, but, according to RRA Administrator M. L. Cooke, do not include all districts in which the farmers could afford the service. This phenomenon is explained by the lack of interest shown by private utility companies in rural electrification. When cooperatives and public bodies have taken the initiative and entered such rural areas, the private companies were then made to realize their last opportunities and often considered such extensions as threats to the investors' profit. This was an admission of the economic feasibility of such projects.

From the experience of foreign countries which have been successful in achieving rural electrification, it appears that Government planning and financial assistance has played an important role. Rural Electrification Administrator Cooke in expressing his appreciation for the methods used by foreign countries said that "there is one rule that runs through all this farm electrification and that is that those nations which have made progress in the matter of rural electrification apparently have done it because they had a plan".

Conversely, from the experience of the United States in

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out, and a summary of the results achieved. The report concludes with a statement of the views of the Committee on the progress of the work and the prospects for the future.

The Committee has been pleased to note the progress made during the year, and particularly the success of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out. It is satisfied that the work done during the year has been of a high standard, and that the results achieved are of a high quality. It is confident that the work done during the year will be of great benefit to the country, and that the progress made will be maintained in the future.

The Committee has also been pleased to note the success of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out, and particularly the success of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out. It is satisfied that the work done during the year has been of a high standard, and that the results achieved are of a high quality. It is confident that the work done during the year will be of great benefit to the country, and that the progress made will be maintained in the future.

The Committee has also been pleased to note the success of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out, and particularly the success of the various projects and schemes which have been carried out. It is satisfied that the work done during the year has been of a high standard, and that the results achieved are of a high quality. It is confident that the work done during the year will be of great benefit to the country, and that the progress made will be maintained in the future.

failing to achieve any nation-wide rural electrification, the lack of educational and financial assistance from the Government has been an important reason for this failure. For example, the United States with little or no Government assistance during the 12-year period (1922-1934) was able to increase the number of electrified farms from 150,000 to about 750,000 or an increase from 2 to 12 per cent of the total American farms. This still left 88 per cent of the farms and 23 per cent of the entire population without central station electric service. France, however, during the same 12-year period embarked upon a program of rural and urban electrification involving an expenditure of about \$355,000,000 which brought the service to about 90 per cent of the communities and increased electrification from less than 20 per cent to over 97 per cent of the population. The program definitely installed universal electrification on the French farms. The execution of the program was made possible by Government financial assistance. Public grants-in-aid by both the National Government and the smaller political sub-divisions consisted of about 2/3 of the investment and the balance was raised through Government loans. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether the Province of Ontario, despite its greater density of farms compared to the entire Dominion, could have achieved rural electrification for almost twice as many of its farms as the rest of Canada, had it not been for Government subsidy. Czechoslovakia also has subsidized its 1,200 cooperatives with grants amounting to from 50 to 75 per cent of construction costs and has made loans on the balance at low rates of interest. That the consideration of subsidies is bound to become a paramount importance in the future may be gauged from the opinion of Administrator H. A. Cooke of REA who believes that "some day the United States has got to come to subsidies as we

rise to higher and higher levels of percentage of electrification".

Because the farmers in the United States on the one hand, have assumed that rural electrification, which they have urgently wanted, must come from private companies, and because, on the other hand, private utilities controlling 95 per cent of the power industry have been reluctant to supply the service to the farms, no considerable progress has been made in this direction. This failure of the farmers to go out and get electricity for themselves through the only possible way open in an industry of high investment cost, namely through cooperative action, has been another factor retarding rural electrification in the United States. Ignorance regarding cooperative principles played an important part in this failure. Where the farmers realized the value of cooperatives, laws permitting their formation did not exist or the private companies opposed their formation. Where cooperatives were formed, private utility companies either controlled the sale of wholesale power and charged high wholesale rates or dominated the management to the detriment of the cooperative. Where reasonable maximum rates have been fixed by a State power commission and consumer operation proved successful, the utility companies have attempted to gain control of the association by buying members' stock at a premium. After obtaining control, the tendency has been to discontinue the less profitable secondary lines and to increase retail rates generally.

Countries like Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland and Czechoslovakia owe much to the farm cooperative associations in achieving rural electrification. Rural electrification in Sweden is accomplished almost entirely through cooperative societies made up of consumers

The first part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the State Department to the Secretary of the War Department. The letter is dated August 1, 1945, and is addressed to the Secretary of the War Department, Washington, D. C. The letter is signed by the Secretary of the State Department, George C. Marshall.

The letter discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority (WRA) to the War Relocation Administration (WRA). The letter states that the WRA is currently a part of the War Relocation Authority, but it is proposed that it be transferred to the War Relocation Administration. The letter also discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority's assets to the War Relocation Administration.

The letter is followed by a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the War Relocation Authority to the Secretary of the War Relocation Administration. This letter is dated August 1, 1945, and is addressed to the Secretary of the War Relocation Administration, Washington, D. C. The letter is signed by the Secretary of the War Relocation Authority, John H. Tamm.

The letter discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority's assets to the War Relocation Administration. The letter states that the War Relocation Authority has a large amount of assets, including land, buildings, and equipment. The letter also discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority's liabilities to the War Relocation Administration.

The letter is followed by a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the War Relocation Administration to the Secretary of the War Relocation Authority. This letter is dated August 1, 1945, and is addressed to the Secretary of the War Relocation Authority, Washington, D. C. The letter is signed by the Secretary of the War Relocation Administration, John H. Tamm.

The letter discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority's assets to the War Relocation Administration. The letter states that the War Relocation Administration has a large amount of assets, including land, buildings, and equipment. The letter also discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Administration's liabilities to the War Relocation Authority.

The letter is followed by a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the War Relocation Authority to the Secretary of the War Relocation Administration. This letter is dated August 1, 1945, and is addressed to the Secretary of the War Relocation Administration, Washington, D. C. The letter is signed by the Secretary of the War Relocation Authority, John H. Tamm.

The letter discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority's assets to the War Relocation Administration. The letter states that the War Relocation Authority has a large amount of assets, including land, buildings, and equipment. The letter also discusses the proposed transfer of the War Relocation Authority's liabilities to the War Relocation Administration.

of electric power. These cooperatives consume a substantial volume of the State's production of electric energy. Most of the rural electric installation in Finland has been accomplished by the Electric Department of the Cooperative Wholesale of Finland. Growth of farmers' cooperatives after the World War is largely responsible for the high proportion of electrified farms in Germany.

The consumption of electricity on the farm, as elsewhere, is dependent upon the number of uses to which it could be applied. In this respect rural electrification in the U.S. has suffered from at least five shortcomings: (1) The inability of farmers to finance first costs of wiring their homes and barns; (2) their inability to purchase electrical equipment and appliances of which it is estimated there are about 200 suitable uses on farms and in farm homes; (3) the fact that about 60 per cent of the farms in the United States in 1930 had farm dwellings valued at less than \$1,000 has made it impractical to connect these low valued homes; (4) the reality of forty-two per cent of our farms being tenant operated in 1930 has introduced the difficult problem of cooperation between landlords and tenants to obtain this service; and finally, (5) the absence of electrical farm equipment which could be applied to the basic agricultural functions of plowing, sowing, harvesting, and hoeing has limited the field for rural electrification in the United States.

Since the last mentioned factor militating against wide spread rural electrification is a universal one and not peculiar to the United States, it must be treated separately as a long-time factor. The problem is one of flexible transmission of electric energy which has not as yet been solved by mechanical and electrical engineers. Particularly, does this factor affect agriculture in the United States

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in approximately 25 horizontal lines across the page.

with its emphasis on grain and fiber farming. This type of farming presents greater obstacles to the application of electricity than such types as dairying, fruit raising, poultry, and the like.

Previous Government Efforts in Rural Electrification

Besides the previous efforts at directive planning suggested in the Mississippi Valley Committee and the National Resources Board Reports, the Works Division under FEHA carried on a rural electrification survey in 48 states and in many districts of those states. These surveys made under FEHA auspices were primarily work relief jobs carried on without any idea of a construction follow-up.

On July 24, 1935 these surveys were stopped at the request of Rural Electrification Administrator Cooke in a letter to Jacob Baker of FEHA. It was realized at that time that only a small percentage of those who wanted electricity were likely to get it under this effort. It seemed, therefore, to be unwise to continue such surveys except in selected territory.¹

However, all the information collected in the survey was sent to the office of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in Washington and later turned over to the Rural Electrification Administration which undoubtedly made use of it before embarking on its program.

- (1) - The surveys consisted of information which came on three forms: (1) schedules drawn up by FEHA; (2) supporting data of a narrative character, and (3) State reports made by FEHA Administrators. The number of schedules collected and sent in from forty states has not been determined. Eight states sent in complete reports, 16 states forwarded semi-complete reports, an equal number transmitted meager reports. Eight states did not send in any at all. The following fundamental principles were followed in ascertaining which projects would eventually become eligible for construction: (1) Project feasibility from the viewpoint of an isolated or regional construction existence; (2) Relative merits of projects with energy consumption per mile and variations in construction; operation and maintenance costs as indices of the merit of feasibility; (3) Determination of sponsors and ownership of projects to the end that maximum efficiency and economy in operation and maintenance would result.

Addressed to the... (faint text)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

Reference is made to... (faint text)

It is noted that... (faint text)

The Work of the Rural Electrification Administration

Of the \$4,000,000,000 direct appropriation for the prosecution of the Works Program during the fiscal year 1935-1936 the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 earmarked the sum of \$100,000,000 for Rural Electrification. In September of that year this fund was reduced to \$10,000,000 with the understanding that it would be augmented if and when the need arose. In accordance with the Act, an Executive Order dated May 11, 1935 established the Rural Electrification Administration "to initiate, formulate, administer and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission and distribution of electric energy in rural areas". Actually, however, the REA is confining its activities to electric distribution systems rather than high voltage transmission lines and the construction of generating plants. In rare instances where there is no nearby source of power for a project, a short transmission line and sub-station or even a small generating plant may be included as part of a project. Up to date REA has not built a mile of transmission line and is not contemplating a single new generating system.

The fundamental purposes of the REA are: (1) To take, as it can, electricity in the shortest time possible to as many farms and farm houses which at present are not served by any other lines; (2) To initiate and activate sound policies upon which rural electrification may proceed in the United States. Thus, the immediate objective is to bring the economic benefits and living comforts of electricity to about 2,000,000¹ of the more than 5,000,000 farmers

(1) - The Mississippi Valley Committee estimated in 1934 that from one to three million farmers could economically be given the service.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

DATE: 10/15/54

TO: SAC, NEW YORK

FROM: SA [Name], NEW YORK

SUBJECT: [Subject]

Reference is made to [Subject]

On [Date], [Name] advised that [Subject]

[Name] stated that [Subject]

[Name] further stated that [Subject]

[Name] also stated that [Subject]

[Name] advised that [Subject]

[Name] stated that [Subject]

[Name] further stated that [Subject]

[Name] also stated that [Subject]

[Name] advised that [Subject]

[Name] stated that [Subject]

[Name] further stated that [Subject]

[Name] also stated that [Subject]

[Name] advised that [Subject]

[Name] stated that [Subject]

[Name] further stated that [Subject]

[Name] also stated that [Subject]

[Name] advised that [Subject]

[Name] stated that [Subject]

[Name] further stated that [Subject]

[Name] also stated that [Subject]

[Name] advised that [Subject]

[Name] stated that [Subject]

[Name] further stated that [Subject]

[Name] also stated that [Subject]

[Name] advised that [Subject]

who have heretofore been denied them. At the same time it is a start in completely electrifying rural America by giving the movement an impetus to adopt new policies and new techniques in order to enable it to proceed on its own momentum. As a farm welfare program, therefore, it aims to reduce the drudgery of farm life and increase its comforts, increase farm production and lower unit costs, and insure against farm desolation by insuring the continued occupancy of such farms.

In this effort to improve the economic and social conditions of American agriculture, REA is cognizant of its limitations. Rural electrification alone will not make for a prosperous American agriculture. The productivity of the soil, type of farming and farm products, the state of the national and international markets, supplementary sources of income, changes in population and in diet are more vital factors in successful farming. However, rural electrification has one contribution to make to American farms and rural life which once achieved will go a long way towards placing it on an equal basis with industry and urban life.

From the point of view of the Works Program, REA accomplishes two things: (1) It provides directly useful jobs to persons at present unemployed, with special emphasis on relief employables; (2) It tends to promote national recovery and reemployment by creating new and profitable business for producers of electrical and plumbing equipment and appliances. It has been estimated that 75 per cent of the money spent for rural electrification will go into industry for poles, wire, insulators, transformers, meters, and other manufactured products. It has also been estimated that for each dollar spent for the construction of lines \$3.00 will be expended for house wiring and electrical appliances.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and schemes undertaken, and a summary of the results achieved. The report concludes with a statement of the resources available and the plans for the future.

The second part of the report deals with the financial position of the organization. It gives a detailed account of the income and expenditure for the year, and shows how the funds have been applied to the various projects. It also shows the balance sheet at the end of the year, and the amount of funds available for the future.

The third part of the report deals with the personnel of the organization. It gives a list of the staff employed during the year, and shows the progress of their work. It also shows the results of the various schemes and projects undertaken, and a summary of the results achieved. The report concludes with a statement of the resources available and the plans for the future.

The REA is a finance organization which lends money on equal terms to private utility companies, state and local public and semi-public bodies and farm cooperatives for the purpose of constructing electric distribution lines and for the wiring of farm buildings and dwellings. Loans are made on a 20-year amortization basis at a 3 per cent rate of interest. No loans are made to public utility non-operating companies. No grants have been made, and no grants are contemplated in its program. Under suitable conditions, the REA lends the entire cost for the construction of electric power and light distribution lines in areas now without electric service. This includes service lines to the farm house usually not more than 150 feet from the main road, and the customers' meters. It does not finance projects situated in sub-marginal agricultural areas nor does it finance construction of competing lines or the rehabilitation of existing lines. No part of REA funds loaned is permitted to be spent for promotion activities or for a professional promoter. The borrowers are carefully selected with an eye to their ability to liquidate the advances. Loans are well secured. In the case of public bodies, the security provided is a lien upon the line constructed and the revenue bonds based on anticipated collection of taxes. Farm cooperatives pledge the line and its revenue. Loans to privately owned utilities are secured by the general credit of the borrower. In all cases, loans are protected against loss by a stipulation in the loan contract providing that one year's debt service is to be set aside by the borrower out of profits from the revenue of the line constructed. This is in addition to the pledge of the physical property after the line is completed.

Moreover, because there are no tangible assets at the outset, REA is exercising the utmost care in judging the self-liquidity of all projects. This is especially true of cooperatives which are building entirely new lines and not extensions to existing ones. For this reason, preliminary analysis is made of projects to obtain all pertinent data having a bearing on the cost of construction, cost of operation and maintenance, cost of power, together with all available information concerning tax rates and the economic status of the territory to be served. Investigation is made of the ability of the prospective consumers to use and pay for electricity in their homes and on the farms. In making the application for the loan, the applicant is requested to state what amount he can afford to spend each month for electric service and what additional amount he can afford to pay each month on installment payments for electric appliances. This information is checked against Census Bureau Publications and other available material concerning the economic status of the particular community, county, and state in which the project is located. This analysis is made to determine the wisdom of the loan by ascertaining what the balance between expected income and expected expenditures will be.

The REA does no building or planning of the actual construction. It, however, suggests standards and specifications and exercises such supervision and inspection of the progress of the work as may be helpful and necessary. These specifications for a type of line construction best suited for rural needs are drafted by REA engineers with the object of reducing construction costs to a minimum consistent with satisfactory performance and operation. Thus by

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

... the ... of ...

determining specifications and by guiding the progress of construction, REA has estimated that rural lines can be built in most localities for about \$1,000 per mile on the basis of 3 customers to the mile. This will include 3 transformers, service lines from the road, and meters. Moreover, REA engineers have found that an electric distribution system which is to be owned and operated independently by a farmers' cooperative or non-profit corporation can probably not be operated on a sound financial basis unless it embraces at least 25 to 30 and preferably more miles of line to serve an average of not fewer than three customers per mile. The policy of REA tends to larger projects than this, and if an otherwise feasible project falls fully to serve an unserved area, REA will require that it be enlarged to include as much of the unserved area as is economically possible.

REA has discouraged the requirement of initial cash contributions and high minimum monthly guarantees to defray the cost of line construction. It has suggested: (1) That for an areas having between 3 and 4 customers to the mile, rural extensions should be built without customers' contributions; (2) That a customer's contract for rural service which provides for a monthly guarantee should have a definite termination period; (3) That rates be adjusted to yield annually a gross income per mile equal to 1/5 of the construction costs. Such provisions are usually incorporated in the loan agreement made between the REA and the borrower.

Although REA is not a rate regulatory body -- such regulations being more properly a function of the State Public Service Commissions -- low rates to promote consumption is one of its major considerations. In considering an application for a loan, an informa 1

consideration of the rates is made. A proposed project whose rates do not seem reasonable on the basis of its financial and engineering structure does not receive a loan. REA has suggested that the minimum retail charge is not to exceed \$2.50 to \$3.75 per month to include 40 to 50 kilowatt hours of current.¹ Moreover, service and transformer charges as well as any demand or other fixed charges which do not include current is to be avoided. Rates and charges based on room and areas criteria are likewise not to be practiced. REA recommends a simple system of block rates to include minimum charges and varying levels of blocks (price per kilowatt hour dropping in the second and following blocks of the schedule) so that on the one hand the principles of varying costs may receive application, and, on the other hand, the recognized existence of elastic demand for electricity be given free play. According to REA standards, wholesale rates to be paid by REA financed lines are to range from less than 1 cent to 2 cents per kilowatt hour.

REA's attitude towards the private utilities as component parts in the execution of the program has been one of consideration and cooperation. On May 20, 1935, REA Administrator M. I. Cooke, requested the Committee of Utility Executives representing privately owned plants to make a national survey to ascertain the approximate extent to which further development of rural electrification may be affected promptly in cooperation with REA. This Committee submitted a report to Administrator Cooke on July 24, 1935 which proposed a program of rural electrification for 1935-1936 amounting to \$238,000,000 "to serve and equip a total of 351,000 rural prospects of which 247,000" would be farmers. This survey had served as a

(1) - The average monthly bill, however, must be higher than this minimum for the project to be self-liquidating.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and schemes undertaken, and a summary of the results achieved. The report concludes with a list of recommendations for the future.

The second part of the report deals with the financial statement of the organization for the year. It shows the income and expenditure, and the balance sheet at the end of the year. It also includes a statement of the assets and liabilities of the organization.

guide for the rural electrification program of the RRA, although the latter has not adopted all of the principles upon which rested the Committee's suggested program.

The private utility companies, with minor exceptions, have reacted favorably to the RRA program and its methods. In most cases private utility companies have come in voluntarily to take advantage of the easy lending terms. Others have entered the rural field because of the activities of the farm cooperative associations. Many private companies have been content to permit farm cooperatives and public bodies to construct distribution lines because they see in them an increased market to absorb their generated power. This expectation of a new market for the power generated by the private utilities is justified because of the fact that in 99 out of a 100 cases farm cooperatives are going to buy current from existing private or municipal generating plants. All construction thus far will take current from existing power generating plants, and all developments have been on the basis of using the current of private companies and other existing plants.

Although RRA is extending loans on equal terms to all public and private groups which manifest a willingness to undertake to supply farmers with electricity and who demonstrate an ability to operate these lines successfully and to repay loans, special consideration is given to loan applications of public, semi-public bodies, farm cooperatives, non-profit and limited dividend corporations. This special consideration is RRA's general policy of selection of loan applicants is based upon the study of forces which had operated in the past and which had adversely affected successful nation-wide introduction of electricity in farm and rural areas.

The first part of the document discusses the general principles of the law of contract, which are based on the idea of freedom of contract. This means that individuals are free to enter into agreements with each other, provided that the agreements are not illegal or against public policy.

The second part of the document discusses the formation of a contract. A contract is formed when there is an offer, acceptance, and consideration. The offer must be clear and definite, and the acceptance must be made in response to the offer. Consideration is the price paid for the promise.

The third part of the document discusses the performance of a contract. A contract is not complete until the parties have performed their obligations under the contract. If a party fails to perform, the other party may be entitled to damages.

The fourth part of the document discusses the discharge of a contract. A contract may be discharged by agreement, performance, or frustration. Frustration occurs when an unforeseen event makes the performance of the contract impossible or illegal.

The fifth part of the document discusses the remedies for breach of contract. The most common remedy is damages, which are intended to put the injured party in the position they would have been in had the contract been performed. Other remedies include specific performance and injunction.

The sixth part of the document discusses the law of tort. A tort is a wrongful act that causes harm to another person. The most common torts are negligence, intentional torts, and strict liability torts. The law of tort provides a remedy for the injured party in the form of damages.

The seventh part of the document discusses the law of property. Property is a legal right that can be owned, transferred, and enforced. The law of property distinguishes between real property (land and buildings) and personal property (movable goods).

The eighth part of the document discusses the law of succession. This is the law that governs the distribution of a person's property after their death. It distinguishes between testate succession (where the testator has left a will) and intestate succession (where the testator has not left a will).

The ninth part of the document discusses the law of trusts. A trust is a legal arrangement where one person (the settlor) transfers property to another person (the trustee) to hold for the benefit of a third person (the beneficiary). Trusts are used for a variety of purposes, including estate planning and asset protection.

For example, large overhead and operating cost, due to a large extent to piece-meal construction, has tended to increase construction costs of private utility companies and has resulted in their charging prohibitive retail rates. Moreover, the private utilities in building lines sporadically have covered comparatively small mileages which not only contributed to high cost but led to insufficient coverage. In contradistinction to these methods, cooperatives have built large mileages in the past and are building longer lines under the REA program. Thus large scale planning and mass construction is more likely to be carried on by the cooperatives than under the initiative of private utility companies. Also, where equal mileages are involved, overhead and operating costs promise to be lower under cooperative operation and management.

Another reason why REA has been particularly concerned with electric farm consumers' cooperative associations is their economic ability to operate successfully on lower rates charged to the consumer. A study made in May 1935 of "Cooperative Consumer Associations for Rural Electrification" covering 12 cooperatives, organized in three states during the 20-year period from 1914 to 1934 which have constructed over 600 miles of line and serving over 2,000 customers, revealed rates considerably lower than those charged by the private utility corporations. Retail rates ranged from one to 4 cents per kilowatt hour for the first 100 kilowatt hours of current and declined thereafter. Only one cooperative in this group which had 24 members charged a higher rate than 4 cents. As a result of these low rates, consumption increased. The Algernon County Cooperatives in Mississippi, for example, had reached an average of 120 kilowatt hours per month

after 18 months of operation. This was an increase of about 250 per cent. Similar increases occurred in Portage County in the same State and in many other counties in the Tennessee Valley. Moreover, the cooperatives have demonstrated a financial soundness and ability to "pay-out". A group of 11 cooperatives¹ in Hamilton County, Iowa, which were formed during the period between 1919 and 1926, have during all the years of the 1930 depression maintained their lines, paid all obligations incident to their operation, have not lost one customer, and are financially sound today. These lines have 200 miles of line and serve 400 farmers. There are in all about 30 such electric cooperatives which have come into existence in the United States and have maintained themselves without Government loans or other help. This has warranted the conclusion that what these existing cooperatives have been able to do without Government help, many groups can achieve with it. On the other hand, lack of funds or hard terms on borrowed capital has been the chief reason for the failure of cooperatives. Whatever the Federal Government could do to help finance rural electric construction easily amortized over a period of years would help considerably in providing electric service, that through another medium could not be accomplished.

Also, the policies and practices of the Tennessee Valley Authority have to no small extent influenced TVA in its attitude towards cooperatives. TVA which is engaging in the generation and transmission of electric energy in the Tennessee Valley is selling, for the most part, power at wholesale to municipalities and county cooperative associations. For this reason, TVA has been anxious to en-

(1) - See Rural Electrification News - March 1933 - Page 10

encourage the formation of the cooperatives in the South.

Finally, public ownership of rural lines by cities or counties has not provided a solution to the problem of rural electrification. Often it has been impossible and economically unfeasible for municipally owned plants to include rural areas in a power district. In addition, areas in need of rural electrification are often not confined within the county limits in which such plants are located. Similarly, state ownership of rural lines is not easily achieved since the number of people to be served is comparatively small and their problems are of little interest to the voters of a State as a whole.

The logical outcome of these considerations for the farm and rural population unable to obtain electricity at reasonably low rates from private or public power distributing agencies, is to have the potential beneficiaries organize themselves into some form of cooperative association by which they can obtain and distribute power to themselves at rates covering all necessary cost but not loaded with a tribute of profits to extraneous stockholders or holding companies. The cooperatives offer a practical solution to the rural electrification problem; in many instances even the only feasible solution.

REA has maintained also that electricity on the farm must be used for more than lighting purposes if rural power and light projects are to be successfully established and operated. The use of electricity for lighting alone will not yield a sufficient return to warrant building a project and will not result in rural electrification. "The cost of installing the lines and house wiring is an item too large to be undertaken for the sake of a water spigot in the bathroom and a waffle iron on the table. If utilized only for its (electricity) own

The first part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the State to the Governor, dated the 10th of the month. It contains a report on the state of the treasury and the public debt, and a list of the names of the members of the Council of State. The letter is signed by the Secretary, and is addressed to the Governor.

The second part of the document is a report on the state of the treasury and the public debt, dated the 10th of the month. It contains a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, and a list of the names of the members of the Council of State. The report is signed by the Secretary, and is addressed to the Governor.

The third part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, dated the 10th of the month. It contains a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, and a list of the names of the members of the Council of State. The list is signed by the Secretary, and is addressed to the Governor.

The fourth part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, dated the 10th of the month. It contains a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, and a list of the names of the members of the Council of State. The list is signed by the Secretary, and is addressed to the Governor.

The fifth part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, dated the 10th of the month. It contains a list of the names of the members of the Council of State, and a list of the names of the members of the Council of State. The list is signed by the Secretary, and is addressed to the Governor.

comfort, the non-electrified farm would not be a prospect worthy of REA attention", remarked Administrator Cooke. For this reason, REA has certified that for a project to be economically sound and self-supporting, each household on the line, as a general rule, must have a minimum number of electrical appliances sufficient to consume about 100 kilowatt-hours per month. It has been estimated that on a basis of this monthly consumption, the farm will need about \$350 worth of appliances and equipment. That this consumption is possible has been demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley where members of farm cooperative associations have reached an average residential consumption of 120 kilowatt hours per month by December 1935.

The realization that the consumption of electricity on the farm is dependent upon the number of uses and the number of appliances to which it could be applied, has led the REA to incorporate as an integral part of its program, the financing, on easy terms, the wiring of individual farm buildings and dwellings as well as the purchase of appliances, equipment, and supplied. The REA, therefore, is supplementing its financing of new power line construction by also making farmstead wiring loans. Two other Federal agencies, the Electric Home and Farm Authority and the Federal Housing Administration are financing loans for electric appliances and plumbing fixtures respectively. Finally, REA has established a Utilization Section to encourage larger and more effective use of electricity, and to educate its users to the value of a wide variety of home and farm appliances and equipment. The work of this section is to make rural America electricity conscious.

Status of Projects as of July 31, 1936

Through July 31, 1936 net allocations for the construction

The following information is for the use of the personnel who are assigned to the project. It is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents. It is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents. It is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents.

The project is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents. It is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents. It is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents. It is intended to provide a general overview of the project and its objectives. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the detailed information provided in the project plan and other documents.

of 89 rural electric distribution line projects¹ in 28 states² amounted to \$14,960,728. The average allocation per project was equivalent to \$168,098. In addition to the above total allocations the sum of \$179,000 had been made for the purpose of financing the wiring of customers' premises. The distribution line projects will when completed provide 13,588 miles of line and will serve 52,629 customers.

Of these total allocations, loan contracts for distribution line construction have been executed to a total amount of \$10,441,728 and one loan contract of \$30,000 has been executed in the State of Ohio for financing the wiring of customers' premises.³ The average loan made as of July 31 was \$183,188, with loans ranging from \$5,616 for Iowa 6 Dallas to \$600,000 for Minnesota 25 McLeod. The 57 projects on which loan contracts have been executed will provide about 9,360 miles of line and when completed will serve 36,076 customers who have not previously been provided with central station power.

On July 31, there were 14 projects under construction employing 473 persons of whom 124 were of relief status. These projects involving total allocations of \$3,620,076, will provide 3,321 miles of line and serve 14,622 customers.⁴ As of the same date, four projects had been fully completed involving allocation of \$173,616 and providing approximately 128 miles of line to serve 825 customers.⁵

- (1) - See Table C - Approved Projects of the Rural Electrification Administration as of July 31, 1936.
- (2) - See Table D - Status of Rural Electrification Administration Projects By States - Total Projects Approved
- (3) - See Table D - Status of Rural Electrification Administration Projects By States - Projects With Loan Contracts Executed
- (4) - See Table D-1 - Status of Rural Electrification Administration Projects By States - Projects Under Construction
- (5) - See Table D-1 - Section on Projects Completed

On these completed projects the estimated employment involved 128,971 man-hours of labor.

In addition to these fully completed projects, work had been fully completed to energize in whole or in part lines on 12 projects involving allocations of \$1,561,050 and providing a total length of 1,487 miles designed to serve 9,545 customers. The recapitulation as of July 31, 1936 is as follows:

1. Approved Projects

a. Total number of projects	--	89
b. Total net allocations	--	\$14,960,728
c. Total number of miles	--	13,588
d. Total number of new customers		52,629

2. Projects for which loan contracts have been executed

a. Total number of projects	--	57
b. Total value of the contracts		\$10,441,728
c. Total number of miles	--	9,850
d. Total number of new customers		34,076

3. Projects Under construction

a. Total number of projects	--	14
b. Total net allocations	--	\$5,620,075
c. Total number of miles	--	3,320
d. Total number of new customers		14,623

4. Projects completed

a. Total number of projects	--	4
b. Total net allocations	--	\$173,616
c. Total number of miles	--	128
d. Total number of new customers		625

Because of the fact that a great proportion of the expenditure in the construction of REA projects will be on equipment, materials and supplies, the man-year cost will be considerably higher than for the average WPA project. The estimated man-year cost on all approved projects as of July 31 was found to be \$3,878, while the estimated man-year cost for projects with loan contracts executed was equivalent to \$2,738. Projects under construction showed an estimated man-year cost of \$2,390, and for those projects completed it

The first section contains the general provisions of the law.

The second section contains the provisions relating to the organization of the courts.

CHAPTER I	
1.	General provisions
2.	Organization of the courts
3.	Competence of the courts
4.	Procedure in the courts
5.	Appeals
6.	Execution of judgments
7.	Administrative provisions
8.	Final provisions

The following provisions apply to the courts of first instance.

equaled to \$2,042.

The estimated average cost per mile for the 89 projects approved as of July 31 equaled about \$1,100, with costs ranging from \$538 to \$3,109. These variations in costs are largely explained by the differences in local conditions of terrain, required amount of tree trimming, number of customers per mile, etc. The estimated average cost per mile for projects with loan contracts executed was equivalent to \$1,115, while projects under construction showed an estimated average cost of \$1,090 per mile of line. The actual average per mile cost for the four projects completed is unavailable as yet, but there are indications that the figure will be very close to \$1,000.

As analysis of the distribution of projects among the 28 states indicates a positive relationship between the number and value of projects on the one hand, and the ability of the states to finance them on the other. This is, of course, in line with RRA's practice of operating on a self-supporting basis and to insure self-liquidity of the project before loans are made. Outside of an individual examination of each project showing the number of customers and their ability to pay for the service on a project, the three basic criteria which can be used for determining the ability of a state to successfully finance rural electrification projects on its farms and in its rural areas, are the value of farm dwellings, other farm buildings and the average income per farm. The following picture throws some light on the economic causes motivating the geographical distribution of RRA projects:

As of July 31, 1936, 53 projects representing about 60 per cent of the total number and 69 per cent of the total allocations

The following section will discuss the various aspects of the curriculum process, including the role of the teacher, the role of the student, and the role of the community. It will also discuss the importance of assessment and evaluation in the curriculum process.

In order to be successful in the curriculum process, the teacher must be able to assess the needs of the students and the community. This requires a deep understanding of the students and the community, and the ability to communicate effectively with them. The teacher must also be able to design and implement a curriculum that is appropriate for the students and the community.

were located in states which had an average value for farm buildings and farm dwellings above the 1930 national averages of \$2,059 and \$1,126 respectively. Moreover, 59 projects representing about 67 per cent of the total number and about 73 per cent of the total allocations were located in states which had an average farm income above 1935 national average of \$1,020. Even those counties, with REA projects, which were located in states falling below the national average valued of farm buildings, dwellings and income, indicate, with few exceptions, higher average values for these three items than for the states as a whole.¹ In a number of cases these county averages not only approached the national averages very closely, but were even higher. Cases in point are New Hanover county in North Carolina, Pinellas and Orange counties in Florida and Rockingham and Prince William counties in Virginia.

In examining the logic behind the location of REA projects from another angle, it is found that the lowest 10 states in which rural electrification projects are located, on the basis of average value of farm buildings and dwellings, had 27 per cent of the projects with 23 per cent of the total allocations, while the 10 highest had 51 per cent of the projects with 64 per cent of the total allocations. Similarly, the lowest 10 states on the basis of 1935 average farm income had 31 per cent of the projects with 22 per cent of the allocations, while the 10 highest had 50 per cent of the projects with 48 per cent of the allocations.

The special consideration that the cooperatives, public bodies and other non-profit making groups have received is apparent

(1) - See Table F - Comparison of the State's 1930 Average Values of Farm Buildings, Farm Dwellings and Gross Income Falling Below the National Average, with Those of Its Counties in Which REA Projects are Located.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and schemes which have been undertaken, and a summary of the results achieved. The report concludes with some observations on the work done during the year and some suggestions for the future.

The second part of the report deals with the financial position of the organization. It gives a detailed account of the income and expenditure for the year, and shows how the various projects and schemes have been financed. It also gives a summary of the assets and liabilities of the organization at the end of the year.

The third part of the report deals with the personnel of the organization. It gives a detailed account of the staff employed during the year, and shows how the various projects and schemes have been carried out. It also gives a summary of the work done by the staff during the year.

from the following: As of July 31, 1936, these groups were sponsoring about 85 per cent of the total number of projects and 92 per cent of the total allocations. They also receive 92 per cent of the loans. The cooperatives, taken separately, received allocations and loans amounting to over 77 per cent of the total. Moreover, the farm cooperative associations combined with the public bodies receive allocations sufficient to build about 90 per cent of the mileage to be provided under the REA program as of July 31, 1936.¹ This mileage will serve over 90 per cent of the total number of customers.

A comparison of the size of the average project sponsored by cooperatives, public bodies and private utilities reveals significant differences, which confirm the analysis made earlier in this paper regarding advantages of economy and greater coverage when rural line construction is undertaken by non-profit making groups. The average value per project sponsored by the cooperatives equaled \$184,612 for an average project length of 165 miles. This is about the same as the average project value and mileage of public bodies with \$180,452 and 168 miles respectively. On the other hand, privately owned utilities' projects showed an average value of only \$54,683 and an average mileage of only 85. Thus, the average project sponsored by the cooperatives and public bodies was larger in terms of dollars and mileage than the average project sponsored by private utility corporations. Practically similar results are obtained when the size of the loan contract and the average project mileage are examined for each of the three sponsoring groups. As of July 31, the public sponsors received the highest average loan of \$251,376 for an average project of 229

(1) - See Table G - Rural Electrification Projects by Sponsors

miles. The private sponsors were the recipients of the lowest average loan of \$93,096 for an average project mileage of 92. The average loan to the farm cooperatives equaled \$185,865 and the average size of project was 164 miles.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936

On May 20, 1936 the President approved the Norris-Rayburn or the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 which made the Rural Electrification Administration permanent. The Act provides for the appropriation of \$410,000,000 over a 10-year period beginning July 1, 1936. Thus, a long-term program was established to achieve rural electrification on a nation-wide scale to the end that a balance of urban and rural standards of industry and living be reached.

The principles enunciated by the Emergency REA are being followed by the permanent organization: (1) To supply electricity to farmers not receiving it; (2) to make no loans for the construction of competing lines; (3) to make loans only and not grants; (4) to finance parallel line construction only when it becomes absolutely necessary, and then only on condition that no current is to be taken off the line already in existence; (5) to make all electric distribution lines constructed with REA funds self-liquidating; and (6) to give preference in lending to public and semi-public bodies, cooperative associations, and other non-profit or limited dividend associations.

However, the terms and conditions of loans under the new set-up were changed so as not to exceed a maturity of 25 years, and at interest rates equivalent to an average rate of interest payable by the United States Government on those of its obligations having a maturity of 10 years or more. Moreover, no loan is to be made for the con-

... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

struction, operation or enlargement of any generating plant", unless the consent of the state authority, having jurisdiction in the premises, is first obtained.

For a period of one year, ending June 30, 1937, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make loans to the REA Administrator upon the latter's request provided of course that they have first received Presidential approval. The aggregate of such loans is not to exceed \$50,000,000 with interest at 5 per cent amortized over a 25-year period. Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans are to be secured by the obligations of the borrowers of the Rural Electrification Administration. Although the Act does not specify the conditions of the loans made by the RFC to REA, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as a general rule, makes no loans exceeding 85 per cent of the amount of the collateral presented by a borrower. This arrangement will apply to the Rural Electrification Administration acting in the capacity of a borrower. Consequently, the REA will have to supply, at least in the first year, \$15 from its own resources for every \$100 loan that it makes. This is expected to be obtained from the approximately \$15,000,000 of collateral that the Rural Electrification Administration had purchased during its emergency regime.

Beginning with the fiscal year July 1, 1938 and running through the fiscal year June 30, 1946, authorization has been given for an annual sum of \$40,000,000 to be appropriated by the United States Treasury to the Rural Electrification Administration. This annual sum is to be apportioned in the two following ways: (1) Fifty per cent is to be made available or apportioned "for loans in the several states in the proportion which the number of their farms not

... of the ...
... the ...
... the ...

The ... of ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...

... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...
... the ...

receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service"; and (2) "The other 50 per cent is to be made available for loans in the several states and in the territories" in "such amounts for each state and territory as in the opinion of the Administrator may effectively be employed for the purpose of the Act", with the limitation that not more than 10 per cent of this sum may be employed in any one state or in all of the territories.

Projects financed through allocations from the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 will be completed with those funds, while in the future, funds secured from the EFC and direct Government appropriations will be utilized on new allocations, loan contracts and operations.

Organization and Administration

The administration of the Rural Electrification Administration is completely centralized. The direction for its activities comes from Washington, and all correspondence relating to inquiries involving authorization of projects and loans is sent there. The Administration has no State or Regional offices, although it employs traveling field representatives most of whom are engineers. In the field, REA cooperates with any interested parties such as State agricultural colleges, state public utility commissions, state and county electrification authorities, farm organizations, etc. These groups usually assist farmers in taking advantage of the opportunities to achieve rural electrification in their districts.

The Rural Electrification Administration has been divided into four operating divisions, each in charge of a Director who is responsible to the Administrator, Morris L. Cooke. The Engineering

The first part of the report deals with the general situation in the country. It is noted that the economy is still in a state of depression and that the government has not been able to carry out its programme of reforms. The second part of the report deals with the situation in the various provinces. It is noted that the situation is generally similar in all provinces, with the exception of the capital, where the situation is somewhat better. The third part of the report deals with the situation in the various sectors of the economy. It is noted that the situation is generally similar in all sectors, with the exception of the agricultural sector, where the situation is somewhat better.

The fourth part of the report deals with the situation in the various social sectors. It is noted that the situation is generally similar in all sectors, with the exception of the health sector, where the situation is somewhat better. The fifth part of the report deals with the situation in the various cultural sectors. It is noted that the situation is generally similar in all sectors, with the exception of the education sector, where the situation is somewhat better.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The report concludes that the situation in the country is generally similar in all sectors, with the exception of the capital, where the situation is somewhat better. It is recommended that the government should continue to carry out its programme of reforms and that it should pay particular attention to the agricultural sector, the health sector, and the education sector. It is also recommended that the government should pay particular attention to the situation in the various provinces and that it should pay particular attention to the situation in the various social sectors and the various cultural sectors.

The report is signed by the author and is dated the 1st of January 1960. It is submitted to the Commission for the Development of the Congo.

Division, under the direction of Willard E. Herring, reviews and analyzes projects, supervises construction and service operations, makes rate analyses and conducts special studies. Melvin O. Swanson is the chief engineer. The Management and Finance Division, under the direction of Perry E. Taylor, is in charge of procurement, pay-rolls, vouchers, auditing and accounting. The Legal Divisions, under the direction of Vincent D. Nicholson, General Counsel, studies state statutes, decisions and regulatory procedures bearing on construction projects. It drafts loan contracts, attends to legal matters arising during construction and reviews legal opinions concerning the agency's activities. The Information and Research Division under the direction of M. L. Ramsey, is in charge of information and program development, research and statistics. In addition, the Administration employs persons who act as consultants and do special assignments.

Steps Leading to an Application for a Rural Electrification
Project Loan

In order to facilitate the organization of rural electrification projects, the REA has issued instructions to all organizers and sponsors of such projects. These instructions are primarily intended for organizers of projects to be owned by cooperatives or other non-profit organizations. However, they also apply to municipally and privately owned plants sponsoring rural electrification projects.

The instructions suggest several preliminary steps to be taken prior to the application for a loan. Among these are included the planning and launching of an educational campaign, a mass meeting of prospective customers and the set up of an organization to effectuate the program for a project.

- 2 -

The subject of this report is the investigation of the effects of the
 various factors mentioned in the preceding report on the growth and
 development of the plant. It is believed that the results of this
 investigation will be of value to the plant breeder and the
 agriculturist generally.

The first part of the report deals with the general characteristics
 of the plant and the results of the various experiments conducted
 with it. It is shown that the plant is a very hardy one and
 capable of growing in a wide range of soils and climates.

The second part of the report deals with the effects of the
 various factors mentioned in the preceding report on the growth and
 development of the plant. It is shown that the results of these
 experiments are in general in accordance with the results of the
 preceding report.

The third part of the report deals with the practical application
 of the results of this investigation. It is shown that the results
 of this investigation can be used to guide the selection of
 plants for breeding and for the selection of soils and climates
 for the growth of the plant.

It is believed that the results of this investigation will be of
 value to the plant breeder and the agriculturist generally.

THE EFFECTS OF THE VARIOUS FACTORS ON THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLANT

It is shown that the results of these experiments are in general
 in accordance with the results of the preceding report.

The first part of the report deals with the general characteristics
 of the plant and the results of the various experiments conducted
 with it. It is shown that the plant is a very hardy one and
 capable of growing in a wide range of soils and climates.

The second part of the report deals with the effects of the
 various factors mentioned in the preceding report on the growth and
 development of the plant. It is shown that the results of these
 experiments are in general in accordance with the results of the
 preceding report.

The third part of the report deals with the practical application
 of the results of this investigation. It is shown that the results
 of this investigation can be used to guide the selection of
 plants for breeding and for the selection of soils and climates
 for the growth of the plant.

It is believed that the results of this investigation will be of
 value to the plant breeder and the agriculturist generally.

The first part of the report deals with the general characteristics
 of the plant and the results of the various experiments conducted
 with it. It is shown that the plant is a very hardy one and
 capable of growing in a wide range of soils and climates.

The second part of the report deals with the effects of the
 various factors mentioned in the preceding report on the growth and
 development of the plant. It is shown that the results of these
 experiments are in general in accordance with the results of the
 preceding report.

The third part of the report deals with the practical application
 of the results of this investigation. It is shown that the results
 of this investigation can be used to guide the selection of
 plants for breeding and for the selection of soils and climates
 for the growth of the plant.

If the vote at the mass meeting is feasible, a Temporary Committee¹ is suggested to be formed. The task of this body is to arrange and supervise a survey of the project areas which will supply information on the number of unserved farmers and other rural or town and village residents in the project area who will buy electricity if it is made available and the quantities they will probably consume. It will also be the duty of this Committee to supply the REA with a large consolidated map on which will be plotted data describing the physical, geographical and economic environment of the project area bearing on the feasibility of the project.

After REA has studied this material and its Engineering and Legal Divisions have ascertained the engineering feasibility, the economic soundness and the legality of the project, the sponsors are advised to apply for a loan. Upon approval of the loan application, the REA requests an allocation from the Bureau of the Budget. The President may then authorize the allocation after the Bureau of the Budget advises him by means of a treasury warrant that the funds are available. The countersignature of the Comptroller General re-

-
- (1) - The Temporary Committee is to include one representative from each township, school district and all other major county subdivisions. It is to serve as the contact agency between the project and REA in the earlier stages of negotiation. The Committee or sub-committees or to be sufficiently large to visit all the prospective customers in each township, school district, etc. Members of these committees are to be furnished Project Survey Blanks in a form suggested by REA as well as maps of the area covered by them on which to jot down data for a large consolidated map to be eventually drawn up. Every prospective customer will be asked to fill out and sign the Project Survey Blank as an indication of his intention to join in the project and take electricity when available. The Blanks, among other questions, will carry queries asking the prospective customers to promise to grant rights of way and easements. Additional items reported by the Temporary Committee to REA will be as follows: (a) total number of miles

leasing the funds is usually followed by the execution of the loan contract between the borrower and REA.

Finally, both the signed and unsigned Project Smvey Blanks together with the data collected, to be used for making the consolidated REA map as well as the extra plotted map of each town or village are to be turned over to the REA. After the loan contract has been executed, the borrower is ready to enter into a construction contract which is consummated only after a prior examination of it has been made and approved by the Rural Electrification Administration. Subsequent to the making of the construction contract, the United States Treasury places specified sums, which are usually portions of the loan, in local banks acting as depositories. Each requisition subsequent to the first will be made after information on the physical progress and financial status is submitted to REA. When the borrower is ready to proceed with construction, he notifies the REA in Washington, D. C., which in turn informs the Treasury and the local banks to meet payments at the request of the borrower.

-
- (1) (continued from preceding page)
in the proposed project; (b) total number of signed customers; (c) number of these signed customers who can be served from the proposed lines drawn on the map; (d) the total number of unsigned probable customers; (e) the number of these unsigned probable customers who could be served from the proposed lines shown on the map; (f) the rate of state and county taxes which would have to be paid on the proposed lines; and (g) all possible sources of supply of wholesale energy including joint municipal plants and private power companies.

The large consolidated REA map will be plotted to show the following information: (a) a county name; (b) county subdivisions (townships, school districts, section, etc.); (c) highways; (d) railroads; (e) streams; (f) farm and other rural residences; schools, churches, filling-stations, industries, store and garages; (g) names of towns and villages; (h) point of connection with source of power; (i) existing power lines; (j) proposed lines; (k) "ground return" telephone lines where they parallel proposed lines; (l) points of compass; (m) scale of miles; (n) location of each signed customer.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation from a remote spot on the western coast of a distant continent. The story begins in the early years of the 17th century when a few brave men first set foot on the shores of North America. They came in search of a new world, a place where they could build a better life for themselves and their families. Over the years, the number of settlers grew, and they began to establish permanent communities. These communities were at first small and isolated, but as time went on, they grew and multiplied. The settlers brought with them the customs and traditions of their European homes, but they also adapted to the new environment. They learned to work the land, to hunt, and to live in harmony with the native Americans. The story of the United States is a story of growth, of struggle, and of triumph. It is a story of a people who have overcome many hardships and who have built a great nation that stands as a beacon of hope and freedom to all people.

- (1) The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation from a remote spot on the western coast of a distant continent. The story begins in the early years of the 17th century when a few brave men first set foot on the shores of North America. They came in search of a new world, a place where they could build a better life for themselves and their families. Over the years, the number of settlers grew, and they began to establish permanent communities. These communities were at first small and isolated, but as time went on, they grew and multiplied. The settlers brought with them the customs and traditions of their European homes, but they also adapted to the new environment. They learned to work the land, to hunt, and to live in harmony with the native Americans. The story of the United States is a story of growth, of struggle, and of triumph. It is a story of a people who have overcome many hardships and who have built a great nation that stands as a beacon of hope and freedom to all people.
- (2) The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation from a remote spot on the western coast of a distant continent. The story begins in the early years of the 17th century when a few brave men first set foot on the shores of North America. They came in search of a new world, a place where they could build a better life for themselves and their families. Over the years, the number of settlers grew, and they began to establish permanent communities. These communities were at first small and isolated, but as time went on, they grew and multiplied. The settlers brought with them the customs and traditions of their European homes, but they also adapted to the new environment. They learned to work the land, to hunt, and to live in harmony with the native Americans. The story of the United States is a story of growth, of struggle, and of triumph. It is a story of a people who have overcome many hardships and who have built a great nation that stands as a beacon of hope and freedom to all people.
- (3) The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation from a remote spot on the western coast of a distant continent. The story begins in the early years of the 17th century when a few brave men first set foot on the shores of North America. They came in search of a new world, a place where they could build a better life for themselves and their families. Over the years, the number of settlers grew, and they began to establish permanent communities. These communities were at first small and isolated, but as time went on, they grew and multiplied. The settlers brought with them the customs and traditions of their European homes, but they also adapted to the new environment. They learned to work the land, to hunt, and to live in harmony with the native Americans. The story of the United States is a story of growth, of struggle, and of triumph. It is a story of a people who have overcome many hardships and who have built a great nation that stands as a beacon of hope and freedom to all people.
- (4) The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation from a remote spot on the western coast of a distant continent. The story begins in the early years of the 17th century when a few brave men first set foot on the shores of North America. They came in search of a new world, a place where they could build a better life for themselves and their families. Over the years, the number of settlers grew, and they began to establish permanent communities. These communities were at first small and isolated, but as time went on, they grew and multiplied. The settlers brought with them the customs and traditions of their European homes, but they also adapted to the new environment. They learned to work the land, to hunt, and to live in harmony with the native Americans. The story of the United States is a story of growth, of struggle, and of triumph. It is a story of a people who have overcome many hardships and who have built a great nation that stands as a beacon of hope and freedom to all people.
- (5) The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation from a remote spot on the western coast of a distant continent. The story begins in the early years of the 17th century when a few brave men first set foot on the shores of North America. They came in search of a new world, a place where they could build a better life for themselves and their families. Over the years, the number of settlers grew, and they began to establish permanent communities. These communities were at first small and isolated, but as time went on, they grew and multiplied. The settlers brought with them the customs and traditions of their European homes, but they also adapted to the new environment. They learned to work the land, to hunt, and to live in harmony with the native Americans. The story of the United States is a story of growth, of struggle, and of triumph. It is a story of a people who have overcome many hardships and who have built a great nation that stands as a beacon of hope and freedom to all people.

Chief Provisions in the Loan Agreement

For each project the RRA Administrator is given exclusive authority to approve and to execute with the borrowing agency a loan contract in which "RRA agrees to lend not greater than the sum or "sums" approved for the project. The execution of a loan contract is conditioned upon several factors which are incorporated in the loan agreement; (a) The borrower agrees to construct or cause the project to be constructed in accordance with specifications determined or approved by RRA; (b) the RRA Administrator is to determine and authorize the borrowing agency as to the method for the prosecution of work - that is, either on force account or under contract with or without competitive bids; (c) bids for contract work must be advertised and awarded to the lowest bidder; (d) the contractor is to perform directly and without sub-contracting not less than 25 per cent of the construction calculated on the basis of the total contract price; (e) all construction contracts for work to be done and entered into by the borrowing agency with contractors and sub-contractors must conform to specifications approved by RRA; (f) RRA reserves the right to supervise the performance of the construction, and the right to inspect all work and materials; (g) all construction contracts and sub-contracts shall contain such provisions as the RRA Administrator may determine for effectuating the purposes

(1) -- (Continued from preceding pages)

To the above RRA map should be attached an extra plotted map of each town or village showing the town streets along which the proposed line would run, and the location of each residence or other building occupied by a signed customer or an unsigned prospect. The approximate population of each town and village should also be stated.

The first part of the dissertation is devoted to a study of the... (The text is extremely faint and largely illegible, appearing to be a standard academic introduction or early chapters.)

... (Continuation of the faint text from the previous block.)

... (Final section of faint text at the bottom of the page, possibly a conclusion or appendix.)

of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 and the applicable provisions of the Executive Orders, Rule and Regulations issued thereunder, and the Administrative policies of the REA; (h) not less than 35 per cent of the total amount made available from Federal funds is to be expended in payment of wages for labor employed on the site of the project; (i) borrower not to take any steps for re-organization, consolidations or merger into any other corporation, or to sell, lease, transfer, mortgage or pledge the property without written consent of REA.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly a header or introductory paragraph.

Main body of faint, illegible text, appearing to be several paragraphs of a document.

TABLE A

Central-Station Customers in 1935
By Regions and States

Region and State	Total Number	Farms Served	Percent that farm customers are of total customers
UNITED STATES	25,341,208	793,977	3.13
NEW ENGLAND	2,269,343	61,547	2.71
Maine	196,111	14,346	7.32
New Hampshire	123,672	11,367	8.93
Vermont	80,787	8,084	10.01
Massachusetts	1,206,023	14,490	1.20
Rhode Island	190,018	1,980	1.04
Connecticut	467,731	11,350	2.43
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	7,249,625	123,070	1.77
New York	3,895,015	64,900	1.67
New Jersey	1,205,923	15,800	1.31
Pennsylvania	2,158,687	47,370	2.19
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	5,946,823	196,624	3.31
Ohio	1,580,252	53,100	3.36
Indiana	701,089	25,178	3.59
Illinois	1,869,389	30,877	1.65
Michigan	1,131,446	46,490	4.11
Wisconsin	664,547	40,979	6.17
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	2,413,404	99,032	4.10
Minnesota	499,511	13,947	2.79
Iowa	469,236	33,570	7.15
Missouri	692,702	22,340	3.23
North Dakota	72,179	2,122	2.94
South Dakota	86,323	2,940	3.40
Nebraska	241,480	9,854	4.08
Kansas	351,968	14,262	4.05
SOUTH ATLANTIC	1,960,532	58,558	2.99
Delaware	51,189	2,270	4.43
Maryland	358,064	7,095	2.01
District of Columbia	145,307	63	0.04
Virginia	287,013	15,995	5.57
West Virginia	214,894	4,335	2.02
North Carolina	278,344	10,245	3.68
South Carolina	117,777	3,906	3.32
Georgia	241,617	6,416	3.49
Florida	271,927	6,233	2.29
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	356,160	33,352	3.90
Kentucky	289,862	8,995	3.10
Tennessee	257,562	11,871	4.44
Alabama	196,929	9,968	5.06
Mississippi	101,307	2,518	2.47

GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF THE
 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of Birth	Place of Birth	Race	Sex
1912-01-15	Chicago, Ill.	White	Male
1915-03-22	St. Louis, Mo.	White	Male
1918-07-10	Philadelphia, Pa.	White	Male
1920-09-05	New York, N.Y.	White	Male
1922-11-18	Los Angeles, Cal.	White	Male
1925-02-01	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1928-04-14	Washington, D.C.	White	Male
1930-06-27	Boston, Mass.	White	Male
1932-08-11	San Antonio, Tex.	White	Male
1935-10-24	Portland, Ore.	White	Male
1938-12-07	Seattle, Wash.	White	Male
1940-01-20	Denver, Colo.	White	Male
1942-03-03	Phoenix, Ariz.	White	Male
1945-05-16	San Diego, Cal.	White	Male
1948-07-29	San Jose, Cal.	White	Male
1950-09-11	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1952-11-24	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1955-01-07	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1958-03-20	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1960-05-03	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1962-07-16	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1965-09-29	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1968-12-12	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1970-02-25	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1972-04-08	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1975-06-21	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1978-08-04	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1980-10-17	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1982-12-30	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1985-01-13	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1988-03-26	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1990-05-09	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1992-07-22	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1995-09-05	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
1998-11-18	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2000-01-31	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2002-03-14	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2005-05-27	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2008-07-10	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2010-09-23	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2012-11-06	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2015-01-19	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2018-03-02	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male
2020-05-15	San Francisco, Cal.	White	Male

TABLE A
(Continued)

Region and State	Total Number	Phones Served	Percent that farm customers are of total customers
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	1,256,379	24,694	1.93
Arkansas	122,503	3,563	2.90
Louisiana	220,913	3,003	1.45
Oklahoma	232,805	5,848	2.07
Texas	730,078	12,080	1.55
MOUNTAIN	663,245	50,594	7.64
Montana	93,795	2,591	3.08
Idaho	85,490	14,880	17.20
Wyoming	32,882	574	1.75
Colorado	208,051	7,319	3.52
New Mexico	38,512	1,374	3.56
Arizona	74,594	5,133	6.84
Utah	113,415	16,575	14.62
Nevada	18,500	947	5.09
PACIFIC	2,625,673	141,403	5.39
Washington	435,306	43,387	9.65
Oregon	246,455	18,356	7.45
California	1,940,909	80,748	4.16

Source: "Electrical World" - January 4, 1936 - Page 64

Date	Description	Debit	Credit
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959

Total ...

TABLE B

GROWTH IN FARM ELECTRIFICATION

(Figures on electrified farms do not include those with individual lighting plants)

Year	Total number of farms	Electrified farms (Dec. 31)	Per Cent of Total
1900	5,737,372		
1910	6,361,502		
1920	6,448,343		
1921		
1922		
1923	177,561	2.8*
1924	204,720	3.2*
1925	6,371,640	246,160	3.9
1926	309,125	4.9*
1927	383,321	6.2*
1928	506,242	8.0*
1929	576,158	9.2*
1930	6,288,648	649,919	10.4
1931	698,755	11.1*
1932	705,075	11.3*
1933	715,535	11.4*
1934	743,954	11.8*
1935	6,812,350	793,977	11.7

* - Percentage estimates since the Bureau of the Census reports total number of U.S. farms only every five years.

Source: Electrical World - January 4, 1935 - Page 62

STATE OF NEW YORK
 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS
 STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Year	Number of Employees	Number of Positions	Ratio
1930	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1931	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1932	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1933	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1934	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1935	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1936	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1937	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1938	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1939	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1940	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1941	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1942	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1943	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1944	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1945	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1946	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1947	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1948	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1949	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000
1950	1,234,567	1,234,567	1.000

Total number of employees in the State employment service is shown in the
 column on the left and the number of positions in the column on the right.

The ratio of employees to positions is shown in the column on the right.

TABLE C

NUMBER OF FARM SERVICE CUSTOMERS
BY REGIONS

1930-35

(As Of December 31)

Region	1935	1934	1933	1932	1931	1930
United States	793,977	743,954	713,558	705,075	698,786	649,919
New England	61,547	58,006	55,725	52,923	52,237	48,996
Middle Atlantic	128,070	118,169	109,001	106,759	104,911	96,342
East North Central	196,624	181,261	172,467	170,421	166,893	151,113
West North Central	99,035	91,398	89,460	89,652	89,717	82,263
South Atlantic	58,558	53,307	50,558	49,080	47,958	42,539
East South Central	33,352	32,062	30,311	31,947	31,513	29,949
West South Central	24,694	22,883	22,371	22,653	22,170	21,438
Mountain	50,694	47,876	46,516	45,026	44,308	42,536
Pacific	141,403	138,992	137,149	136,614	139,079	134,723

Source: "Electrical World" - January 4, 1936 - Page 62

2-1980
 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
 FORM NO. 204
 (Rev. 1-25-60)

DATE	TIME	LOCATION	AGENCY	PERSONNEL	DESCRIPTION	REMARKS
10/15/79	0800	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	0900	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1000	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1100	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1200	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1300	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1400	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1500	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1600	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1700	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1800	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	1900	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	2000	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	2100	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	2200	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	2300	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]
10/15/79	2400	MEMPHIS	FBI	SA [Name]	Interview of [Name]	[Details]

Approved: _____
 Special Agent in Charge

TABLE D

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Number of farms and farms served by electric central stations
in the United States,
by states

	Number of farms Jan. 1, 1935 1/	Rank	Number of farms served Sep. 31, 1934 2/	Rank	Percent of farms served	Rank
UNITED STATES	6,812,360	---	743,984	---	11.0	---
Alabama	273,455	7	11,053	22	4.0	33
Arizona	18,834	45	5,577	35	29.6	12
Arkansas	253,013	9	2,943	38	1.2	47
California	150,360	24	81,093	1	53.9	1
Colorado	63,544	33	7,143	30	11.2	25
Connecticut	32,157	39	10,133	27	31.5	10
Delaware	10,381	46	1,791	43	17.3	20
Florida	72,867	30	5,700	36	7.6	26
Georgia	259,544	10	5,926	31	2.3	41
Idaho	43,123	34	13,433	19	30.8	11
Illinois	331,312	11	33,379	9	10.1	23
Indiana	300,833	13	23,476	10	11.7	24
Iowa	321,933	12	32,047	8	14.4	22
Kansas	174,569	21	13,324	20	7.6	28
Kentucky	275,293	5	8,400	28	3.0	39
Louisiana	170,216	22	2,323	40	1.7	46
Maine	41,907	36	13,939	17	33.2	8
Maryland	44,412	35	5,725	32	12.9	21
Massachusetts	35,094	38	14,424	15	41.1	7
Michigan	196,517	18	42,152	5	21.4	17
Minnesota	303,232	14	13,733	13	4.5	37
Mississippi	311,533	3	2,803	41	0.9	43
Missouri	273,454	4	17,933	11	6.4	21
Montana	50,564	32	2,753	42	5.4	32
Nebraska	133,515	23	9,544	25	7.1	29
Nevada	3,595	48	945	47	26.4	15
New Hampshire	17,593	44	5,493	37	31.2	3
New Jersey	39,375	41	13,132	14	33.4	4
New Mexico	41,369	37	1,330	45	3.2	37
New York	177,025	20	57,825	2	32.7	9
North Carolina	309,957	6	9,672	26	3.1	38
North Dakota	34,606	37	1,933	44	5.6	34
Ohio	255,145	8	43,043	3	16.8	19
Oklahoma	213,323	15	5,043	34	2.4	42
Oregon	64,825	31	17,339	12	27.8	14
Pennsylvania	191,234	19	45,132	4	23.6	16
Rhode Island	4,327	47	1,973	43	45.6	5
South Carolina	105,504	25	3,735	39	3.5	44
South Dakota	33,303	39	2,933	39	8.8	35
Tennessee	273,733	5	9,727	24	3.6	34
Texas	501,017	1	11,403	21	2.3	45
Utah	30,595	40	16,130	13	52.8	3
Vermont	27,061	42	7,945	39	29.4	13
Virginia	197,532	17	14,334	15	7.3	27
Washington	34,381	28	40,000	6	47.5	6
West Virginia	104,747	26	3,547	37	3.4	36
Wisconsin	199,877	16	32,306	7	16.2	18
Wyoming	17,427	43	327	48	1.9	40

Sources: 1/ 1935 Census of Agriculture; 2/ U.S. I. Statistical Bulletin No. 2 - P. 29

No.	Title	Author	Date	Volume	Page
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

STATUS OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS
BY STATES

Projects approved and projects with loan contracts executed
as of July 31, 1936
(Compiled by the Works Progress Administration)

State	Total projects approved A/			Projects with loan contracts executed A/		
	No. of projects	Miles of line provided	Customers served	No. of projects	Miles of line provided	Customers served
TOTAL	90	13,588.0	53,622	57	9,560.5	35,076
Alabama	1	58.4	257	1	58.4	267
Arkansas	2	48.0	522	-	-	-
Colorado	1	104.0	427	-	-	-
Florida	2	244.1	696	1	164.5	455
Georgia	7	725.9	4,148	7	483.0	2,499
Iaaho	2	75.0	320	2	75.0	320
Illinois	3	207.0	549	2	167.0	484
Indiana	4	797.0	3,060	3	762.0	2,979
Iowa	10	804.8	3,681	4	482.6	1,623
Kansas	1	60.0	241	-	-	-
Kentucky	2	191.7	1,424	1	71.7	291
Maryland	1	66.0	492	-	-	-
Minnesota	7	1,379.2	4,717	6	1,196.2	4,275
Mississippi	1	55.3	361	1	55.3	361
Montana	1	110.0	447	-	-	-
Nebraska	7	1,931.1	5,036	5	1,597.7	3,799
North Carolina	4	587.4	3,356	4	357.1	2,217
North Dakota	1	51.0	265	-	-	-
Ohio	7	1,381.0	7,631	6	1,711.0	6,850
Oklahoma	2	166.0	515	1	61.0	515
Pennsylvania	1	375.0	1,343	1	67.0	250
South Carolina	3	623.0	2,548	3	623.0	2,548
South Dakota	1	67.0	320	-	-	-
Tennessee	3	252.1	1,547	2	239.9	1,600
Texas	2	483.0	1,365	2	330.0	1,422
Virginia	4	646.4	2,743	1	405.0	1,511
Washington	2	81.0	401	-	-	-
Wisconsin	8	1,648.5	5,246	5	624.0	2,010

A/ In addition to the projects listed the sum of \$179,000 has been allocated for the financing of wiring of customers' premises. Of this sum one loan contract in the amount of \$30,000 has been executed in Ohio.
B/ Excludes \$1,650,680 rescinded on Presidential Letter No. 1795, dated July 27, 1935, but not acted upon by Comptroller General as of July 31, 1936. Rescinded projects to be prosecuted with RFC Funds.

TABLE V

STATUS OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS
BY STATES

Projects under construction and projects completed
as of July 31, 1936
(Compiled by the Works Progress Administration)

State	Projects Under Construction				Projects Completed			
	No. of projects	Allo- cations	Miles of line pro- vided	Cus- tomers served	No. of projects	Allo- cations	Miles of line pro- vided	Cus- tomers served
TOTAL	14	\$3,620,076	3,520.2	14,622	4	\$173,616	127.9	825
Florida	1	164,800	184.6	455	-	-	-	-
Georgia	1	109,200	99.1	663	-	-	-	-
Idaho	-	-	-	-	1	54,000	40.0	248
Illinois	1	81,500	98.0	300	-	-	-	-
Indiana	1	667,936	637.0	2,200	-	-	-	-
Iowa	-	-	-	-	1	5,616	2.6	50
Kentucky	1	71,700	58.7	291	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	-	-	-	-	1	81,000	55.3	361
North Carolina	1	143,250	126.5	1,000	-	-	-	-
Ohio	4	1,424,000	1,118.0	4,430	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma	1	70,000	81.0	315	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	1	530,000	500.7	2,128	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	1	92,300	78.6	1,279	-	-	-	-
Texas	-	-	-	-	1	33,000	30.0	166
Virginia	1	365,800	406.0	1,511	-	-	-	-

DATE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	CHECK NO.	BANK	BALANCE
1/1/58	Balance	100.00			100.00
1/15/58	Check #101	25.00	101	Bank of America	75.00
2/1/58	Check #102	15.00	102	Bank of America	60.00
2/15/58	Check #103	10.00	103	Bank of America	50.00
3/1/58	Check #104	5.00	104	Bank of America	45.00
3/15/58	Check #105	5.00	105	Bank of America	40.00
4/1/58	Check #106	5.00	106	Bank of America	35.00
4/15/58	Check #107	5.00	107	Bank of America	30.00
5/1/58	Check #108	5.00	108	Bank of America	25.00
5/15/58	Check #109	5.00	109	Bank of America	20.00
6/1/58	Check #110	5.00	110	Bank of America	15.00
6/15/58	Check #111	5.00	111	Bank of America	10.00
7/1/58	Check #112	5.00	112	Bank of America	5.00
7/15/58	Check #113	5.00	113	Bank of America	0.00
7/31/58	Balance				0.00

Prepared by: [Name]

Date: 1/1/58

Checked by: [Name]

[Signature]

[Text]

TABLE 8

VALUES OF FARM BUILDINGS AND DWELLINGS AND GROSS CASH INCOME FROM FARM PRODUCTION* OF STATES IN WHICH REA PROJECTS ARE LOCATED

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
STATE	SPECIFIED FARM PROPERTY VALUES (1930)			CASH INCOME (1935)			REA ACTION		
	AVERAGE VALUE OF FARM BUILDINGS (DOLLARS)	B/RANK	AVERAGE VALUE OF FARM DWELLINGS (DOLLARS)	B/RANK	AVERAGE INCOME PER FARM (DOLLARS)	B/RANK	NUMBER OF PROJECTS	ALLOCATIONS (AS OF JULY 31) (DOLLARS)	REA ACTION
UNITED STATES	2,059	---	1,126	---	1,020	---	89	14,960,728	
ALABAMA	576	27	403	26	381	28	1	65,000	25
ARKANSAS	677	26	321	27	446	25	2	43,900	26
COLORADO	1,975	14	1,074	16	1,673	5	1	105,000	18
FLORIDA	1,195	18	807	18	1,224	13	2	213,000	15
GEORGIA	714	25	483	25	509	23	7	773,200	7
IDAHO	1,848	16	1,117	15	1,857	3	2	89,750	21
ILLINOIS	3,641	6	1,803	5	1,571	6	3	183,500	16
INDIANA	2,516	11	1,338	11	1,229	12	4	781,526	6
IOWA	4,827	1	2,212	1	2,103	1	10	625,416	5
KANSAS	2,329	13	1,271	13	1,520	8	1	65,000	25
KENTUCKY	1,122	19	664	20	479	24	2	261,700	13
MARYLAND	3,651	5	2,051	2	1,313	10	1	90,000	20
MINNESOTA	4,623	2	1,704	7	1,375	9	7	1,451,000	4
MISSISSIPPI	504	28	377	28	424	26	1	81,000	22
MONTANA	1,783	17	910	17	1,936	2	1	130,000	17
NEBRASKA	3,449	7	1,719	6	1,696	4	7	2,136,900	2
NORTH CAROLINA	967	22	653	21	681	20	4	645,250	10
NORTH DAKOTA	2,964	9	1,408	16	1,219	14	1	96,000	19
OHIO	3,013	8	1,619	8	1,028	17	7	2,424,200	1
OKLAHOMA	1,037	21	620	22	801	19	2	130,000	17
PENNSYLVANIA	3,905	4	2,038	3	1,107	16	1	400,000	12
SOUTH CAROLINA	754	24	519	24	556	21	3	649,328	8
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,595	10	1,432	9	1,138	15	1	77,000	23

Table with multiple columns and rows, containing data that is extremely faded and illegible. The structure appears to be a ledger or data table with several columns and approximately 15 rows of data.

Date	Account		Description		Amount		Balance	
	Debit	Credit	To	By	Balance	Forward	Balance	Forward

This account is not to be used for any purpose other than the one specified in the original contract.

TABLE B (CONTINUED)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TENNESSEE	926	23	602	23	385	27	2	260,000	14
TEXAS	1,079	20	708	19	883	18	2	488,000	11
VIRGINIA	1,887	15	1,226	14	530	22	4	646,800	9
WASHINGTON	2,231	12	1,318	12	1,562	7	2	70,400	24
WISCONSIN	4,104	9	1,888	4	1,257	11	8	1,766,600	3

* RECEIPTS FROM SALE OF PRINCIPAL FARM PRODUCTS PLUS RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS FROM A.A.A.

A/ INCLUDES FARM DWELLINGS

B/ RANK DESIGNATED IS THE RANK AMONG THE 26 STATES IN WHICH SEA PROJECTS ARE LOCATED.

SOURCES: U.S. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE 1930;
U.S. CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE 1935

1. The first of the following items
 is the most important in the history of the
 world.

2. The second of the following items
 is the most important in the history of the
 world.

3. The third of the following items
 is the most important in the history of the
 world.

4. The fourth of the following items
 is the most important in the history of the
 world.

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. The first of the following items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. The second of the following items	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1
3. The third of the following items	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2
4. The fourth of the following items	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3
5. The fifth of the following items	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4
6. The sixth of the following items	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5
7. The seventh of the following items	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The eighth of the following items	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. The ninth of the following items	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. The tenth of the following items	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

TABLE II

Comparison of the State's 1930 Average Values of Farm Buildings, Farm Dwellings, and Gross Income falling Below the National Average, With Those of its Counties in Which NMA Projects are Located.

Only for those States in which projects are located in two or more counties of that State

State and County	Average value of farm buildings per farm (dollars)	Average value of farm dwellings per farm (dollars)	* Average gross income per farm (dollars)
UNITED STATES	2,059	1,126	1,335
Arkansas	576	408	988
1. Craighead	741	465	1,508
2. Izard	516	359	764
Georgia	714	483	1,011
1. Crisp	790	515	1,262
2. Lowndes	844	552	1,362
3. Wilkes	579	419	666
4. Catoosa	883	612	946
5. Toombs	550	373	1,230
6. Troup	930	666	995
7. Newton	726	527	892
North Carolina	967	653	1,040
1. Wilson	946	594	1,394
2. New Hanover	2,339	1,624	3,544
3. Johnston	974	682	1,304
4. Edgecomb	1,018	623	1,673
Oklahoma	1,037	620	1,615
1. Oklahoma	1,295	1,051	1,706
2. Comanche	1,159	694	1,853
South Carolina	754	519	935
1. Richland	955	601	779
2. Calhoun	550	385	656
3. Greenwood	807	556	719
Tennessee	926	602	945
1. Meigs	895	484	1,203
2. Rhea	972	635	1,176
Florida	1,195	807	1,696
1. Pinellas	2,453	1,696	4,059
2. Orange	2,527	1,783	2,323
Virginia	1,837	1,226	1,252
1. Caroline	1,466	1,011	838
2. Rockingham	3,829	2,076	1,809
3. Prince William	3,610	2,090	1,918
4. Lancaster	1,258	944	691

* Value of farm products sold, traded or used by operator's family plus receipts from boarders, etc.

Source: Computed by the Works Progress Administration from the 1930 Census of Agriculture.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
 5 EAST COLUMBIA STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607
 (312) 837-0600

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
 5 EAST COLUMBIA STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607
 (312) 837-0600

Title	Author	Editor	Price
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95
THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES	BY JOHN F. STANTON	EDITED BY JAMES M. SMITH	\$12.95

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
 5 EAST COLUMBIA STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607
 (312) 837-0600

TABLE I

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS BY SPONSORS

ALL APPROVED PROJECTS

CHARACTER OF THE APPLICANT OR BORROWER	TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	PER CENT OF TOTAL	VALUE OF PRO- JECTS (DOLLARS)	PER CENT OF TOTAL VALUE (DOLLARS)	MILES OF LINE PRO- VIDED	PER CENT OF TOTAL MILEAGE	AVERAGE MILEAGE PER PROJECT	NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS ON PRO- JECTS	PER CENT OF TOTAL CUSTOMERS	AVERAGE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS PER PROJECT
PRIVATELY OWNED UTILITIES	14	16	1,195,565	8	1,100	10	85	5,000	9	357
PUBLIC OR SEMI-PUBLIC BODIES	17	20	3,067,586	21	2,859	20	158	8,823	17	519
FARM CO- OPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER NON- PROFIT MAKING BODIES	58	64	10,707,476	71	9,541	70	165	36,601	74	669
TOTAL x	89	100	14,950,728	100	13,908	100	153	52,629	100	592

SOURCE: COMPUTED BY THE WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

REAL ESTATE FINANCIAL PROJECTS BY SPONSOR

PROJECTS WITH LEASE CONTRACTS EXECUTED

CHARACTER OF THE SPONSOR	TOTAL NUMBER OF PRO-JECTS	PER CENT OF TOTAL	VALUE OF LEASES	PER CENT OF TOTAL LEASES	AVERAGE LEASE PER PROJECT	MILES OF TRAIL PRO-VIDED	PER CENT OF TOTAL MILEAGE	NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS ON PRO-JECTS	PER CENT OF TOTAL CUSTOMERS	AVERAGE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS PER PROJECT
PRIVATELY OWNED UTILITIES	8	14	744,760	8	93,095	732	8	1,374	8	422
PUBLIC OR SEMI-PUBLIC AGENCIES	9	16	2,322,300	21	257,370	2,850	22	6,362	19	740
FARM COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER NON-PROFIT BANKING INSTITUTIONS	40	70	7,439,576	71	185,965	6,558	70	25,140	73	634
TOTAL - ALL PROJECTS	57	100	10,441,220	100	182,190	9,350	100	36,076	100	633

Source: Computed by the Works Progress Administration

Table 1. Summary of the results of the regression analysis.

Variable	Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	t-Statistic	Probability > t
Constant	Intercept	1.234	0.123	10.03	0.0001
	Slope	0.567	0.045	12.60	0.0001
	Intercept	0.890	0.089	10.00	0.0001
Variable X	Intercept	0.123	0.012	10.17	0.0001
	Slope	0.456	0.034	13.41	0.0001
	Intercept	0.789	0.078	10.12	0.0001
Variable Y	Intercept	0.234	0.023	10.17	0.0001
	Slope	0.345	0.027	12.82	0.0001
	Intercept	0.678	0.067	10.12	0.0001

Source: Author's calculations based on data from the regression analysis.

TABLE J

APPROVED PROJECTS OF THE RURAL ELECTRICITY ADMINISTRATION
AS OF JULY 31, 1936

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
NAME OF PROJECT	O.P. NUMBER	NO. OF MILES	PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST	ESTIMATED COST PER MILE	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	ESTIMATED MAN-YEARS COST	NO. OF NEW RURAL CUSTOMERS LINE WILL SERVE	CHARACTER OF THE APPLICANT OR BORROWER	STATUS OF PROJECT (AS OF JULY 31, 1936)
1) ALABAMA 9 CLARKDASH- HATCHER	57-42	50.4	\$ 55,000	\$ 1,113	13.3	\$ 1,922	267	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/5/36
2) ARKANSAS 1A CRAIGHEAD	57-126	16.	3,400	230	5.3	1,010	74	PRIVATE COR- PORATION	NO FURTHER ACTION
3) ARKANSAS 3 IZARD	57-151	32.	30,300	1,203	13.0	2,932	248	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
4) COLORADO 7 MESA	57-172	104.	105,000	1,010	37.5	2,378	427	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
5) FLORIDA 7 PINELLAS	57-50	134.6	164,500	891	61.3	2,684	455	PRIVATE COR- PORATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 1/13/36 DATE WORK STARTED 2/23/36
6) FLORIDA 12 WAGNER	57-152	59.40	46,500	616	22.1	2,155	247	PRIVATE COR- PORATION	NO FURTHER ACTION
7) GEORGIA 2 CRISP	57-9	60.	60,000	1,000	25.1	2,310.4	200	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED FOR ONLY \$50,000 ON 5/12/36

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
9) GEORGIA 15 LAWRENCE	57-89	99.1	100,000	1,100	33.0	2,300	600	PRIVATE COMPOR- ATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 1/24/36 DATE WORK STARTED 4/10/36
9) GEORGIA 6 TILNER	57-89	11.2	12,000	1,071	5.7	2,165	50	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 2/14/36
10) GEORGIA 7 CATOCHA	57-127	353.9	375,000	1,000	105.2	2,067	2,074	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXEC- UTED FOR ONLY \$157,000 ON 6/25/36. THIS PROJECT COMBINED WITH CA. 70 CATOCHA AND CA. 70 CATOCHA.
11) GEORGIA 42 YOUNG	57-129	50.	53,000	1,050	16.2	3,135	206	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/9/36
12) GEORGIA 20 TRUMP	57-135	76.7	74,000	905	25.7	1,879	400	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/23/36
13) GEORGIA 51 HESTER	57-136	75.	90,000	1,200	24.7	3,044	550	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/23/36
14) GEORGIA 4 JONES	57-14	40.	54,000	1,350	23.5	2,110	248	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 12/13/35 WORK STARTED 3/21/36 WORK COMPLETED AND LINE CANCELLED 7/11/36

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)

15) IOWA 0 BANNER	57-55	30.	37,750	1,107	15.3	2,103	72	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 12/13/35
16) ILLINOIS 4 FERRIS	57-34	04.	21,300	822	25.4	2,122	300	PRIVATE CORP- PORATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 12/1/35; WORK STARTED DURING WEEK ENDING 5/1/36
17) ILLINOIS 9 ST. CLAIR	57-423	40.	40,000	1,000	14.7	2,557	105	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION
18) ILLINOIS 7 HENRY	57-103	69.	60,000	360	12.5	3,173	104	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/29/35
19) IOWA 6 ROUSE	57-3	567.	57,400	300	250.2	1,200	2,200	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/4/35; WORK STARTED 1/7/36
20) INDIANA 2 WELLS	57-25	15.	37,100	1,140	4.7	3,000	27	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION
21) INDIANA 7 BUTLEY	57-137	60.	34,050	1,000	21.0	3,000	202	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/9/36
22) INDIANA 14 SHELBY	57-136	115.	112,000	975	87.1	3,000	517	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/31/36
23) IOWA 2 STOK	57-119	150.	127,000	600	44.4	2,170	302	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION

DATE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
1952							
1953							
1954							
1955							
1956							
1957							
1958							
1959							
1960							
1961							
1962							
1963							
1964							
1965							
1966							
1967							
1968							
1969							
1970							
1971							
1972							
1973							
1974							
1975							
1976							
1977							
1978							
1979							
1980							
1981							
1982							
1983							
1984							
1985							
1986							
1987							
1988							
1989							
1990							
1991							
1992							
1993							
1994							
1995							
1996							
1997							
1998							
1999							
2000							
2001							
2002							
2003							
2004							
2005							
2006							
2007							
2008							
2009							
2010							
2011							
2012							
2013							
2014							
2015							
2016							
2017							
2018							
2019							
2020							
2021							
2022							
2023							
2024							
2025							
2026							
2027							
2028							
2029							
2030							

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
24) IOWA 6 DALLAS	57-25	2.59	5,616	2,168	1.2	4,660	50	PRIVATE CORPOR- ATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED WEEK ENDING 11/4/35; WORK STARTED 11/16/35; WORK COMPLETED AND LINE ENERGIZED 12/15/35
25) IOWA 9 SCOTT	57-53	260.6	260,000	996	79.3	3,279	500	COOPERATIVE	JOINT LOAN CONTRACT EXE- CUTED FOR THIS PROJECT AND FOR IOWA 29 MUSCATINE ON 7/20/35
26) IOWA 29 MUSCATINE	57-150	69.2	70,000	1,012	20.7	3,362	200	COOPERATIVE	SEE IOWA 9 SCOTT
27) IOWA 11 WEBSTER	57-120	26.	26,000	1,000	22.5	1,150	76	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION
28) IOWA 13 WRIGHT	57-115	40.	45,000	1,125	13.3	3,363	118	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 6/12/36
29) IOWA 19 ADAMS	57-121	110.	120,000	1,091	35.4	3,297	335	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 6/4/36
30) IOWA 20 BRENER	57-122	79.3	79,300	1,000	26.3	3,015	254	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION
31) IOWA 12 IOWA	57-139	11.9	37,000	3,109	6.3	5,873	246	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
32) IOWA 5 CARROLL	57-171	35.	55,000	1,000	16.4	3,354	160	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
33) KANSAS 2 SULLY	57-151	66.	65,000	1,000	12.3	3,435	241	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
34) KENTUCKY 1 JEFFERSON	57-27	36.7	71,700	1,000	10.9	3,000	201	PRIVATE CORP- FORMATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 12/13/35 WORK STARTED DURING WEEK ENDING 5/12/36
35) MICHIGAN 14 HONOLAND	57-129	153.	100,000	1,241	66.1	2,074	1,160	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
36) MICHIGAN 2 SALVARY	57-174	65.	100,000	1,324	22.1	4,072	422	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
37) MINNESOTA 5 STERN	57-39	100.	100,000	1,500	60.3	1,955	320	PRIVATE CORP- FORMATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 2/5/36
38) MINNESOTA 3 MEEKER	57-409	420.	650,000	1,071	116.9	4,010	1,400	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/12/36
39) MINNESOTA 25 SULLY	57-110	520.	600,000	1,140	210.	2,257	2,074	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/1/36
40) MINNESOTA 4 LAKE	57-141	60.	60,000	1,000	12.3	3,109	200	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 6/17/36
41) MINNESOTA 19 SULLY	57-184	50.	30,000	1,000	37.5	2,257	100	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/1/36
42) MINNESOTA 15 FARIBAULT	57-33	32.25	30,000	902	10.5	1,705.7	55	COOPERATIVE	JOINT LEASE CONTRACT COVER- ING THIS PROJECT AND MINN. 158 FARIBAULT EXECUTED 7/9/36

APPROX
DATE OF THE PROJECT WAS 1961
THE PROJECT WAS 1961

1. [Faint text]

2. [Faint text]

3. [Faint text]

4. [Faint text]

5. [Faint text]

6. [Faint text]

7. [Faint text]

8. [Faint text]

9. [Faint text]

10. [Faint text]

REFERENCES

1. [Faint reference text]
2. [Faint reference text]
3. [Faint reference text]
4. [Faint reference text]
5. [Faint reference text]
6. [Faint reference text]
7. [Faint reference text]
8. [Faint reference text]
9. [Faint reference text]
10. [Faint reference text]

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
43) MINNESOTA 37 JACKSON	57-176	190.	171,000	900	57.	3,000	442	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
44) MISSISSIPPI 1 MONROE	57-19	55.3	81,000	1,465	40.8	1,965	361	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/6/35; WORK STARTED AND COMPLETED ON FORCE ACCOUNT ON A 3 MILE SECTION DURING WEEK ENDING 1/17/36, THE BALANCE OF THE PROJECT STARTED UNDER CONTRACT DURING WEEK ENDING 4/3/36.
45) MONTANA 9 YELLOWSTONE	57-162	110.	130,000	1,182	40.7	3,194	447	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
46) NEBRASKA 1 SCOTT BLUFF	57-21	226.5	310,000	1,369	162.6	1,907	839	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/4/35
47) NEBRASKA 2 SCOTT BLUFF	57-23	47.2	65,000	1,377	33.1	1,964	143	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/4/35
48) NEBRASKA 7 GAGE	57-57	450.	440,000	978	150.7	2,920	1,117	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 12/6/35
49) NEBRASKA 24 LANCASTER	57-22	354.	396,000	1,119	122.0	3,246	900	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/8/36
50) NEBRASKA 44 GAGE	57-125	320.	365,000	1,141	107.0	3,411	800	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/20/36
51) NEBRASKA 26 PLATTE	57-124	354.3	391,000	1,104	105.0	3,724	815	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION
52) NEBRASKA 52 PLATTE	57-177	179.1	171,900	960	48.1	3,574	422	PRIVATE COR- PORATION	NO FURTHER ACTION

1. The first part of the report is a general introduction to the project. It describes the objectives of the study and the methods used to collect and analyze the data.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed description of the data. It includes a table of the data and a discussion of the characteristics of the data.

3. The third part of the report is a discussion of the results of the study. It compares the results with the objectives of the study and discusses the implications of the findings.

4. The fourth part of the report is a conclusion. It summarizes the main findings of the study and provides recommendations for further research.

The following table shows the results of the study. The data is presented in a table with columns for the different variables and rows for the different groups.

The results of the study show that there is a significant difference between the two groups. This difference is most pronounced in the first part of the study.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										

The results of the study are consistent with the findings of previous research. This suggests that the findings of this study are likely to be generalizable to other studies in this area.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
53) N. CAROLINA 3 HAYWOOD	57-36	126.	161,500	1,232	47.9	3,418	650	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 6/2/36
54) N. CAROLINA 8A HAYWOOD	57-37	126.5	142,220	1,107	46.3	2,885	1,000	PRIVATE COOP- ERATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 2/12/36; WORK STARTED DURING WEEK ENDING 5/15/36; SUB- PONDED BECAUSE OF FIRE DURING WEEK ENDING 6/27/36, AND RESUMED WORK 7/10/36
55) N. CAROLINA 13 JEROME	57-165	226.3	310,000	1,040	105.6	2,885	1,200	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT FOR ONLY 63 DOLLARS EXECUTED 6/29/36; THIS PROJECT A CONSOLIDATED NORTH CAROLINA 13A JOINTLY W. N. CAROLINA 13T JOINTLY
56) N. CAROLINA 16 LORRAINE	57-166	35.	32,000	517	12.0	2,481	163	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/18/36
57) N. CAROLINA 8 HAYWOOD	57-167	51.	96,000	1,022	22.1	4,344	265	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
58) OHIO 1A MARIETTA	57-15	173.	254,000	1,316	132.7	1,914	3,620	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/4/35; WORK STARTED 1/11/36 THIS PROJECT CONSOLIDATED WITH OHIO 21 SHELBY AND OHIO 20A CHARLETON WARE COMBINED TOTAL CUSTOMERS 16 ESTIMATED TO BE 3,620
59) OHIO 21 SHELBY	57-17	270.	350,000	1,296	184.4	1,908	---	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/5/35 WORK STARTED 1/11/36; SEE OHIO 1A MARIETTA

THE 1950
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)

50) OILS 20A CHEMICALS	57-112	485.	550,250	1,352	140.7	4,850	---	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 2/27/36; WORK STARTED DURING WEEK ENDING 6/27/36; SEE OILS 1A REMARK
61) OILS 20 FINE	57-04	170.	253,200	1,480	65.2	3,000	701	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
62) OILS 31 POLYMER	57-00	221.	200,000	1,217	60.0	4,400	750	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 4/21/36
63) OILS 50 LUBRIC	57-03	375.	470,500	1,204	124.0	3,040	1,044	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/20/36; THIS PROJECT COMPLETED BY OILS 50A LOAN
64) OILS 71 LUBRIC	57-02	270.	220,000	1,047	64.0	3,400	000	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED DURING WEEK ENDING 1/4/36; WORK STARTED DURING WEEK ENDING 5/20/36
65) OKLAHOMA 0 OKLAHOMA 03 OKLAHOMA 03 OKLAHOMA	57-01	01.	70,000	004	24.4	2,000	015	PRIVATE COR- PORATION	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 12/13/35; WORK STARTED 2/23/36; WORK COMPLETED ON THIS SECTION DURING WEEK ENDING 6/20/36; OKLA. 03 OKLAHOMA IS AN ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENT FOR WHICH A LOAN CONTRACT WAS EXECUTED 6/2/36, BUT WORK ON THIS ADDITIONAL SECTION HAS NOT STARTED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1962-10-12
DEPT. OF CHEMISTRY
5408 SOUTH DIVISION ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY
RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1962-10-12
DEPT. OF CHEMISTRY
5408 SOUTH DIVISION ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY
RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1962-10-12
DEPT. OF CHEMISTRY
5408 SOUTH DIVISION ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY
RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1962-10-12
DEPT. OF CHEMISTRY
5408 SOUTH DIVISION ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY
RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1962-10-12
DEPT. OF CHEMISTRY
5408 SOUTH DIVISION ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY
RESEARCH REPORT
NO. 1962-10-12
DEPT. OF CHEMISTRY
5408 SOUTH DIVISION ST.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18

11/11/62

(1)----- (2)----- (3)----- (4)----- (5)----- (6)----- (7)----- (8)----- (9)----- (10)----- (11)-----

66) INDIANA 7 CRAWFORD	57-143	85.	60,000	750	22.5	2,800	200	PRIVATE COR- PORATION	NO FURTHER ACTION
67) PENNSYLVANIA 4A CRAWFORD	57-144	87.5	400,000	1,000	137.4	2,011	1,340	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT FOR ONLY 02 FILES WAS EXECUTED 7/1/36
68) S. CAROLINA 9 RICHLAND	57-24	90.7	530,000	1,000	200.0	1,900	2,120	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/6/35; WORK STARTED 5/4/36; THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN COMPLETED WITH SOUTH CAROLINA 1 BALMAIN
69) S. CAROLINA 1 CALHOUN	57-7	10.3	12,320	1,197	5.2	2,371	---	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/6/35; SEE S. CAROLINA 9 RICHLAND
70) S. CAROLINA 10 SHERBORN	57-130	112.	100,000	946	23.7	3,091	400	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/29/36
71) S. CAROLINA 3 CLAY	57-168	67.	77,000	1,149	23.0	3,253	320	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
72) TENNESSEE 1 KEFEE	57-4	201.	212,200	1,000	60.3	2,400	1,270	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/2/36; WORK STARTED NEAR CENTER 5/29/36
73) TENNESSEE 2 CHESA	57-0	131.1	40,000	640	22.5	2,135	260	PUBLIC AGENCY	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 11/4/35; WORK STARTED ON FIRST SECTION ON 11/15/35 AND COMPLETED 1/14/36 LOAN CONTRACT FOR SECOND SECTION FOR WHICH \$10,000 HAS BEEN AL- LOCATED HAS NOT BEEN EXECUTED.

1. The first part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1954. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954 1. 1954

2. The second part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1955. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955 2. 1955

3. The third part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1956. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956 3. 1956

4. The fourth part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1957. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957 4. 1957

5. The fifth part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1958. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958 5. 1958

6. The sixth part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1959. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959 6. 1959

7. The seventh part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1960. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960 7. 1960

8. The eighth part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1961. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961 8. 1961

9. The ninth part of the document
is a list of the names of the
persons who have been
admitted to the school
in 1962. The names are
given in alphabetical order
of their last names.

9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962 9. 1962

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)

74) TEXAS 7 SELL TEXAS 7B SELL	97-10	50.1	35,000	775	17.5	2,257	165	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED FOR TEXAS 7 BELL ON 11/4/35; WORK STARTED ON 1/8/36 AND COMPLETED 7/4/36. LOAN CONTRACT FOR TEXAS 7B BELL FOR WHICH \$3,000 HAS BEEN ALLOCATED HAS NOT BEEN EXECUTED.
75) TEXAS 21 WILLOW	57-117	300.	482,000	1,507	95.3	4,743	1,230	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 7/30/36
76) VIRGINIA 22 DANVILLE	56-107	485.	356,000	903	140.0	3,620	1,511	COOPERATIVE	LOAN CONTRACT EXECUTED 1/24/36; FORCE ACCOUNT WORK STARTED 1/25/36 AND CONTRACT WORK STOPPED 2/19/36
77) VIRGINIA 11 ROCKINGHAM	57-120	120.	155,000	1,000	41.1	3,001	243	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
78) VIRGINIA 20 PRINCE WILLIAM	57-121	22.3	30,000	1,345	0.2	3,520	110	PRIVATE CORPORATION	NO FURTHER ACTION
79) VIRGINIA 10 LANCASTER	57-130	10.1	125,000	1,343	40.7	3,071	570	PRIVATE CORPORATION	NO FURTHER ACTION
80) WASHINGTON 7 WARON	57-53	66.	57,400	644	22.4	2,540	340	PUBLIC AGENCY	NO FURTHER ACTION

12
L
1948
10/15

11

10

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

10/15/48

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
51) SACRAMENTO 14 TINIA	57-145	10.	13,000	1,000	4.7	2,700	61	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION	
52) SACRAMENTO 31 SALAZAR	57-131	291.	254,000	1,041	60.3	2,944	101	COOPERATIVE	LEAD CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/25/30	
53) SACRAMENTO 35 SALAZAR	57-132	231.	220,000	1,052	60.2	2,904	732	COOPERATIVE	LEAD CONTRACT EXECUTED 5/16/30	
54) SACRAMENTO 36 SALAZAR	57-133	150.	150,000	1,057	60.9	3,200	427	COOPERATIVE	LEAD CONTRACT EXECUTED 1/20/30	
55) SACRAMENTO 38 SALAZAR	57-147	414.	430,000	1,059	137.8	3,118	804	COOPERATIVE	THIS PROJECT IS A COM- MUNICATON OF SACRAMENTO IN SACRAMENTO AND SACRAMENTO SACRAMENTO. NO FURTHER ACTION.	
56) SACRAMENTO 19 SALAZAR	57-146	60.	50,000	1,000	26.0	3,500	371	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION	
57) SACRAMENTO 37 SALAZAR	57-170	424.	445,000	1,048	140.6	3,160	1,273	COOPERATIVE	THIS PROJECT IS A COM- MUNICATON OF SACRAMENTO IN SACRAMENTO AND SACRAMENTO SACRAMENTO 37A SACRAMENTO. NO FURTHER ACTION.	

Date	Description	Debit		Credit		Balance
		Dr	Cr	Dr	Cr	
1912	Jan 1					
	Jan 2					
	Jan 3					
	Jan 4					
	Jan 5					
	Jan 6					
	Jan 7					
	Jan 8					
	Jan 9					
	Jan 10					
	Jan 11					
	Jan 12					
	Jan 13					
	Jan 14					
	Jan 15					
	Jan 16					
	Jan 17					
	Jan 18					
	Jan 19					
	Jan 20					
	Jan 21					
	Jan 22					
	Jan 23					
	Jan 24					
	Jan 25					
	Jan 26					
	Jan 27					
	Jan 28					
	Jan 29					
	Jan 30					
	Jan 31					
	Feb 1					
	Feb 2					
	Feb 3					
	Feb 4					
	Feb 5					
	Feb 6					
	Feb 7					
	Feb 8					
	Feb 9					
	Feb 10					
	Feb 11					
	Feb 12					
	Feb 13					
	Feb 14					
	Feb 15					
	Feb 16					
	Feb 17					
	Feb 18					
	Feb 19					
	Feb 20					
	Feb 21					
	Feb 22					
	Feb 23					
	Feb 24					
	Feb 25					
	Feb 26					
	Feb 27					
	Feb 28					
	Feb 29					
	Feb 30					
	Feb 31					
	Mar 1					
	Mar 2					
	Mar 3					
	Mar 4					
	Mar 5					
	Mar 6					
	Mar 7					
	Mar 8					
	Mar 9					
	Mar 10					
	Mar 11					
	Mar 12					
	Mar 13					
	Mar 14					
	Mar 15					
	Mar 16					
	Mar 17					
	Mar 18					
	Mar 19					
	Mar 20					
	Mar 21					
	Mar 22					
	Mar 23					
	Mar 24					
	Mar 25					
	Mar 26					
	Mar 27					
	Mar 28					
	Mar 29					
	Mar 30					
	Mar 31					



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
88) WISCONSIN 10 WASHINGTON	57-183	29.5	31,000	1,051	8.9	3,483	93	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
89) WISCONSIN 16 DOUGLAS	57-182	96.	100,600	1,048	32.0	3,144	315	COOPERATIVE	NO FURTHER ACTION
TOTAL	89	13,588	\$14,960,728	\$1,101	5,190.9	\$2,878	52,620		

