

tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 507, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$63,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Pecatonica River, Illinois and Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 539, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$850,000.

The project for flood protection on Rock River at Rockford, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 142, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,228,000.

The project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Illinois, to mile 300, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 564, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,289,000.

The project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Illinois, to Cassville, Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 450, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,350,000.

The project for the Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$15,570,000.

The project for flood protection on the Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 449, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$972,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection on the River Rouge, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,659,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sandusky River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 136, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,300,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for the Camelsback Reservoir, Gila River, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,770,000.

The project for flood protection on the Gila River below Painted Rock Reservoir, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 116, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$18,255,000.

The project for flood protection on Pinal Creek, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 512, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,300,000.

TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,385,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Alameda Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 128, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,680,000.

The project for Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 545, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,534,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall contribute in cash 3 per centum of the Federal construction of the Rose Valley unit with a contribution presently estimated at \$158,000.

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

The New Melones project, Stanislaus River, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$113,717,000: *Provided*, That upon completion of construction of the dam and powerplant by the Corps of Engineers, the project shall become an integral part of the Central Valley project and be operated and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, except that the flood control operation of the project shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That the Stanislaus River Channel, from Goodwin Dam to the San Joaquin River, shall be maintained by the Secretary of the Army to a capacity of at least eight thousand cubic feet per second subject to the condition that responsible local interests agree to maintain private levees and to prevent encroachment on the existing channel and floodway between the levees: *Provided further*, That before initiating any diversions of water from the Stanislaus River Basin in connection with the operation of the Central Valley project, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the quantity of water required to satisfy all existing and anticipated future needs within that basin and the diversions shall at all times be subordinate to the quantities so determined: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army adopt appropriate measures to insure the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife in the New Melones project and shall allocate to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, as provided in the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), an appropriate share of the cost of constructing the Stanislaus River diversion and of operating and maintaining the same: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, in connection with the New Melones project, construct basic public recreation facilities, acquire land necessary for that purpose, the cost of constructing such facilities and acquiring such lands to be non-reimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That contracts for the sale and delivery of the additional electric energy available from the Central Valley project power system as a result of the con-

58 Stat. 901.

Fish and wild-
life preservation.16 USC 661-
666c.

struction of the plants herein authorized and their integration with that system shall be made in accordance with preferences expressed in the Federal reclamation laws except that a first preference, to the extent as needed and as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, but not to exceed 25 per centum of such additional energy, shall be given, under reclamation law, to preference customers in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties, California, for use in that county, who are ready, able, and willing, within twelve months after notice of availability by the Secretary of the Interior, to enter into contracts for the energy and that Tuolumne and Calaveras County preference customers may exercise their option in the same date in each successive fifth year providing written notice of their intention to use the energy is given to the Secretary not less than eighteen months prior to said dates: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army give consideration during the preconstruction planning for the New Melones project to the advisability of including storage for the regulation of stream-flow for the purpose of downstream water quality control.

The Hidden Reservoir, Fresno River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 37, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,338,000.

The Buchanan Reservoir, Chowchilla River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,585,000.

The project for flood protection on Mormon Slough, Calaveras River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 576, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,960,000.

RUSSIAN RIVER BASIN

The project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 547, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$42,400,000.

REDWOOD CREEK BASIN

The project for flood protection on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 497, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,580,000.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,700,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles River Basin approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

ROGUE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Rogue River, Oregon and California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 566, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$106,700,000, subject to the conditions of local cooperation specified in said report: *Provided*, That the project is to be located, constructed, and operated to accomplish the benefits as set forth and described in the report and appendixes: *And provided further*, That in the years of short water supply all

water users will share the available water in the same proportions that they would share the total full supply when it is available, and that no further water-use allocations will be made from the authorized storage so as to retain the maximum possible benefits to authorized uses during the periods of adversity when storage shortages occur.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent Acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, September 3, 1954, July 3, 1958, and July 14, 1960, are hereby modified to include the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That the depth and width of the authorized channel in the Columbia-Snake River barge navigation project shall be established as fourteen feet and two hundred and fifty feet, respectively, at minimum regulated flow.

52 Stat. 1222;
64 Stat. 177, 178;
68 Stat. 1264;
72 Stat. 315;
74 Stat. 499.

Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Washington;
Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clearwater River, Idaho;
Strube Reregulating Dam and Reservoir, South Fork, McKenzie River, Oregon;
Gate Creek Dam and Reservoir, Gate Creek, Oregon;
Fern Ridge Dam and Reservoir modification, Long Tom River, Oregon;
Cascadia Dam and Reservoir, South Santiam River, Oregon.

The project for the Ririe Dam and Reservoir, Willow Creek, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 562, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,027,000.

The project for the Blackfoot Dam and Reservoir, Blackfoot River, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 568, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$829,000.

WYNOOCHEE RIVER

The project for the Wynoochee River, Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 601, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,211,000: *Provided*, That the installation of the power-generating facilities shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall submit a reexamination report to the Congress for authorization.

Reexamination
report to Congress.

COOK INLET, ALASKA

The project for Bradley Lake, Cook Inlet, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 455, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,750,000.

Sec. 204. (a) For the purpose of developing hydroelectric power and to encourage and promote the economic development of and to foster the establishment of essential industries in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct and the Secretary of the

Alaska.
Hydroelectric
power develop-
ment.

Interior is authorized to operate and maintain the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau, Alaska. The works of the division shall consist of pressure tunnels, surge tanks, penstocks, a powerplant, transmission facilities, and related facilities, all at an estimated cost of \$41,634,000.

Sale of power
and energy.

(b) Electric power and energy generated at the division except that portion required in the operation of the division, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery of the costs of producing and transmitting the power and energy, including the amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years, with interest at the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this Act and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. In the sale of such power and energy, preference shall be given to Federal agencies, public bodies, and cooperatives. It shall be a condition of every contract made under this Act for the sale of power and energy that the purchaser, if it be a purchaser for resale, will deliver power and energy to Federal agencies or facilities thereof within its transmission area at a reasonable charge for the use of its transmission facilities. All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy generated at said division shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Contract author-
ity.

(c) The appropriate Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and enter into such agreements as may be appropriate for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this Act into full force and effect, including the acquisition of rights and property, and the Secretary of the Army, when an appropriation shall have been made for the commencement of construction or the Secretary of the Interior in the case of operation and maintenance of said division, may, in connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of such division, enter into contracts for miscellaneous services for materials and supplies, as well as for construction, which may cover such periods of time as the appropriate Secretary may consider necessary but in which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being made therefor.

Small projects.
64 Stat. 183;
70 Stat. 522.

SEC. 205. Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701s), is amended (a) by striking out "\$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000", (b) by striking out the term "small flood control projects" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "small projects for flood control and related purposes", and (c) by striking out "Provided, That not more than \$400,000 shall be allotted for this purpose at any single locality from the appropriations for any one fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "Provided, That not more than \$1,000,000 shall be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality and the amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete Federal participation in the project".

Flood emergency
preparation.
69 Stat. 186.

SEC. 206. The first sentence of section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701n), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That there is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$15,000,000 to be expended in flood emergency preparation, in flood fighting and rescue operations, or in the repair or restoration of any flood control work threatened or destroyed by flood, including the strengthening, raising, extending, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the work for flood

control; in the emergency protection of federally authorized hurricane or shore protection being threatened when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such protection is warranted to protect against imminent and substantial loss to life and property; in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure for hurricane or shore protection."

SEC. 207. Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944, as amended by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, and by section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities at water resource development projects under the control of the Department of the Army, to permit the construction of such facilities by local interests (particularly those to be operated and maintained by such interests), and to permit the maintenance and operation of such facilities by local interests. The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, at water resource development projects for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a project area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, and other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance, and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such projects shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such areas along the shores of such projects shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Public park and recreational facilities.

68 Stat. 1266.
16 USC 460d.

Public use of water areas.

Protection of fish and game.

Utilization of
public roads.
33 USC 701r-1.

SEC. 208. Section 207 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 501) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. (a) When used in this section—

"(1) The term 'Agency' means the Corps of Engineers, United States Army or the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, whichever has jurisdiction over the project concerned.

"(2) The term 'head of the Agency concerned' means the Chief of Engineers or the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, or their respective designees.

"(3) The term 'water resources projects to be constructed in the future' includes all projects not yet actually under construction, and, to the extent of work remaining to be completed, includes projects presently under construction where road relocations or identifiable components thereof are not complete as of the date of this section.

"(4) The term 'time of the taking' is the date of the relocation agreement, the date of the filing of a condemnation proceeding, or a date agreed upon between the parties as the date of taking.

"(b) Whenever, in connection with the construction of any authorized flood control, navigation, irrigation, or multiple-purpose project for the development of water resources, the head of the Agency concerned determines it to be in the public interest to utilize existing public roads as a means of providing access to such projects during construction, such Agency may improve, reconstruct, and maintain such roads and may contract with the local authority having jurisdiction over the roads to accomplish the necessary work. The accomplishment of such work of improvement may be carried out with or without obtaining any interest in the land on which the road is located in accordance with mutual agreement between the parties: *Provided*, (1) That the head of the Agency concerned determines that such work would result in a saving in Federal cost as opposed to the cost of providing a new access road at Federal expense, (2) that, at the completion of construction, the head of the Agency concerned will, if necessary, restore the road to at least as good condition as prior to the beginning of utilization for access during construction, and (3) that, at the completion of construction, the responsibility of the Agency for improvement, reconstruction, and maintenance shall cease.

Substitute
roads.

"(c) For water resources projects to be constructed in the future, when the taking by the Federal Government of an existing public road necessitates replacement, the substitute provided will, as nearly as practicable, serve in the same manner and reasonably as well as the existing road. The head of the Agency concerned is authorized to construct such substitute roads to design standards comparable to those of the State, or, where applicable State standards do not exist, those of the owning political division in which the road is located, for roads of the same classification as the road being replaced. The traffic existing at the time of the taking shall be used in the determination of the classification. In any case where a State or political subdivision thereof requests that such a substitute road be constructed to a higher standard than that provided in the preceding provisions of this subsection, and pays, prior to commencement of such construction, the additional costs involved due to such higher standard, such Agency head is authorized to construct such road to such higher standard. Federal costs under the provisions of this subsection shall be part of the nonreimbursable project costs."

Flood control
surveys.
Authorization.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated

by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Valenciana River, Puerto Rico.

Waccasassa River (Levy County and Gilchrist County), Florida.

Lake Pontchartrain, North Shore, Louisiana.

Peytons Creek and tributaries, Texas.

Clear Creek, Texas.

San Bernard River, Texas.

Arkansas River Basin, with reference to the effect of the Eufaula and Keystone Reservoirs, Oklahoma, on the water supply facilities of the cities of McAlester and Yale, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the replacement of the cities' water supply facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, with reference to the effect of the Barkley Dam project, on the water supply and sewage treatment facilities of the cities of Cadiz, Kuttawa, and Eddyville, Kentucky, and the State penitentiary at Eddyville, Kentucky, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the replacement of their water supply and sewage treatment facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

Missouri River Basin, with reference to the effect of Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs, North Dakota and South Dakota, on the sewage treatment facilities of the cities of Bismarck and Mandan, North Dakota, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the sewage treatment facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

All streams in Santa Barbara County, California, draining the Santa Ynez Mountains, except Santa Ynez River and tributaries.

Sacramento River Basin and streams in northern California draining into the Pacific Ocean for the purposes of developing, where feasible, multiple-purpose water resource projects, particularly those which would be eligible under the provisions of title III of Public Law 85-500.

Battle Creek, Sacramento River, California.

Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois; review of requirements of local cooperation.

Puget Sound, Washington, and adjacent waters, including tributaries, in the interest of flood control, navigation, and other water uses and related land resources.

Harbors and rivers in Hawaii, with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power development, water supply, and other beneficial water uses, and related land resources.

72 Stat. 319.
43 USC 390b.

1198

PUBLIC LAW 87-875—OCT. 24, 1962

[76 STAT.

Waimea River, Kokee Area, Kauai, Hawaii, for multiple purposes.
Waipio River, Kohala-Hamakua coast, Island of Hawaii, for multiple purpose development.

Iao River, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

Chicot County,
Ark.
Bridge replacement authorized.
58 Stat. 894.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers is hereby authorized to replace with adequate floodway capacity the bridge over Boeuf River, Chicot County, Arkansas, approximately three miles north of the county line, and the bridge over Big Bayou, Chicot County, Arkansas, approximately two miles upstream from its confluence with the Boeuf River which were altered as part of the project for Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and which were recently destroyed by floods, at an estimated cost of \$115,000.

W. Kerr Scott
Dam and Reservoir.
Designation.
60 Stat. 645.

SEC. 211. The Wilkesboro Reservoir flood control project, Yadkin River, North Carolina, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, shall hereafter be known and designated as the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir, in honor of the late Senator W. Kerr Scott of North Carolina. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir.

Short title.

SEC. 212. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1962".

Approved October 23, 1962.

Public Law 87-875

AN ACT

October 24, 1962
[H. R. 8517]

To grant emergency officers retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929.

Veterans.
Officer's retirement benefits.
72 Stat. 1263.
38 USC prec.
pt. 1 notes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of Public Law 85-857 is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 11."; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Any individual who, upon application therefor before May 25, 1929, would have been granted emergency officer's retirement pay based upon 30 per centum or more disability under the Act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), and who would have been entitled to continue to receive such pay under section 10 of Public Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, or under section 1 of Public Numbered 743, Seventy-sixth Congress, and who upon being placed on the emergency officer's retired list would have been paid retired pay at a monthly rate lower than the monthly rate of disability compensation then payable, shall, upon application made therefor after the date of enactment of this subparagraph to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be placed upon the appropriate emergency officer's retired list, and thereafter shall be entitled to all rights, privileges, and benefits of retired emergency officers of World War I."

48 Stat. 10.

54 Stat. 760.

72 Stat. 1216.

38 USC 1901-1905.

The limitations of time contained in section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, are hereby waived in favor of Walter J. Johnson (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C-6048500), and his application for benefits under chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such chapter if he applies for such benefits within the six-month period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

Approved October 24, 1962.

HQ AR005505

HQ AR005506-HQ AR005553

87TH CONGRESS } 2d Session	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES {	REPORT No. 2557
-------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL
ACT OF 1962

OCTOBER 12, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 13273]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: Provided, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

2 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

NAVIGATION

Narraguagus River, Maine: House Document Numbered 530, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$500,000;

Carrers Harbor, Vinalharen, Maine: Senate Document Numbered 118, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$205,000;

Searsport Harbor, Maine: House Document Numbered 500, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$700,000;

Portland Harbor Maine: House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,340,000;

Kennebunk River, Maine: House Document Numbered 459, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 482, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000;

Gloucester Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 341, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,100,000;

Marblehead Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 516, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,752,000;

Chelsea Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 350, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,843,000;

Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Massachusetts: Senate Document Numbered 126, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,050,000;

Plymouth Harbor, Massachusetts: Senate Document Numbered 124, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,200,000;

Pawtuxet Cove, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 236, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$210,000;

Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, New York: River and Harbor Committee Document Numbered 20, Seventy-third Congress, for the further partial accomplishment of the approved plan there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to sums previously authorized, \$1,000,000;

Little Neck Bay, New York: House Document Numbered 510, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,185,000;

Flushing Bay and Creek, New York: House Document Numbered 551, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,695,000;

Buttermilk Channel, New York: House Document Numbered 483, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,226,000;

Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, New Jersey (channels to Port Elizabeth): Modification of the existing navigation project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (Public Law 780, Eighty-third Congress), House Document Numbered 252, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of such plans by the Secretary of the Army and the President;

Raritan River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 455, Eighty-sixth Congress, maintenance;

Lynnhaven Inlet, Bay, and connecting waters, Virginia: House Document Numbered 580, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,068,000: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing reimbursement to local interests for the Long Creek-Broad Bay Canal Bridge;

James River, Virginia: House Document Numbered 586, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$39,000,000: Provided, That

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 3

this authorization shall expire after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time: And provided further, That prior to construction, there will be submitted to the Congress a feasibility report which takes account of possible adverse effects of the project on seed oyster production;

Rollinson Channel and channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 457, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$652,000;

Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina: Senate Document Numbered 114, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,370,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: Senate Document Numbered 115, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$605,000;

Canaveral Harbor, Florida: Senate Document Numbered 140, Eighty-seventh Congress, at the estimated cost of \$5,076,000;

Key West Harbor, Florida: Senate Document Numbered 106, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$820,000;

Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channels, Florida: House Document Numbered 529, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$997,000;

Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 109, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$500,000;

Pensacola Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 528, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$424,000;

Holt lock and dam, Alabama: The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause an immediate study to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers with a view to providing hydroelectric power generating facilities in said dam, and his report on such study shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army within the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Eighty-eighth Congress;

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi: House Document Numbered 560, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,870,000;

Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana: Senate Document Numbered 36, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$357,000;

The project, Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, barge channel through Devils Swamp, Louisiana (Baton Rouge Harbor), authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 321, Eightieth Congress, as amended by the Flood Control Act of 1948, is hereby further amended to provide for the provision as required, of suitable dikes and other retaining structures at a Federal cost of \$299,500, for the construction and future maintenance of the project, in order to provide additional industrial sites with water frontage which are now needed to permit the normal development and expansion of the industrial and commercial activities of the locality: Provided, That local interests contribute the sum of \$100,500 toward the cost of the work;

Bayous Terrebonne, Petit Caillou, Grand Caillou, Du Large, and connecting channels, Louisiana, and Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to Gulf of Mexico: House Document Numbered 583, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,000;

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana and Texas: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$25,540,000: Provided, That the authority to make such modifications as in the

4 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, as set forth in House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-seventh Congress, shall be interpreted to apply to, but not limited to, the improvement of the existing channels at proposed channel relocation sites in lieu of such relocations;

Calcasieu River salt water barrier, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 582, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,310,000: Provided, That the Corps of Engineers is directed to study the question of cost sharing taking into account that measures for mitigation of damages from navigation improvements will be a Federal responsibility and enhancement effects will be shared on the basis of a 50 per centum Federal and 50 per centum non-Federal; such cost sharing is hereby authorized as determined to be feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army within the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the report is submitted to it unless such report is disapproved by the Congress;

Mississippi River at Clarksville, Missouri: House Document Numbered 552, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$103,300;

Sandy Slough, Lincoln County, Missouri: House Document Numbered 419, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$195,000;

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: House Document Numbered 553, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,830,000;

Trinity River, Wallisville Reservoir, Texas: House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,162,000: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir;

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Palacios, Texas: House Document Numbered 504, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$818,000;

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Victoria, Texas: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,590,000;

Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana: House Document Numbered 31, Eighty-sixth Congress, is approved and there is hereby authorized the sum of \$40,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project;

Kaskaskia River, Illinois: Senate Document Numbered 44, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$58,200,000;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minnesota: House Document Numbered 513, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,205,000;

Ontonagon Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,741,000;

Muskegon Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$609,000;

Leland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 413, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$485,000;

Little Bay De Noc, Gladstone Harbor and Kipling, Michigan: House Document Numbered 480, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$350,000;

Green Bay Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 470, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,270,000;

Kenosha Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 496,

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 5

Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$673,000;
Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 479,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$719,000;
Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 134,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,029,000;
Chicago Harbor, Illinois: House Document Numbered 485, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,505,000;
Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana: House Document
Numbered 581, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$11,-
464,000;
New Buffalo Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 481,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$667,000;
Caseville Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 64, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$327,000;
Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 544, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,780,000;
Rouge River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 509, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$257,000;
Huron Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-seventh
Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,557,000;
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 527, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$888,000;
Conneaut Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 415, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,179,000;
Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 340, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$671,000;
Buffalo Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 451, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,797,000;
Great Sodus Bay Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 138,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$765,000;
Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 471, Eighty-
seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,180,000;
Dana Point Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 532,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,730,000;
Santa Barbara Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 518,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000;
Oakland Harbor, California, Fruitvale Avenue Bridge: Senate Docu-
ment Numbered 75, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of
\$1,750,000;
Oakland Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 353,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,775,000;
Noyo River and Harbor, California: Senate Document Numbered 121,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,231,000;
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oregon and Washington:
House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated
cost of \$493,000;
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Washington,
and Portland, Oregon: House Document Numbered 452, Eighty-seventh
Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,100,000;
Tacoma Harbor, Port Industrial and Hylebos Waterways, Washing-
ton: Senate Document Numbered 104, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an
estimated cost of \$2,460,000;
Kingston Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 417,
Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$428,000;

6 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

Swinomish Channel, Washington: House Document Numbered 499, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$887,000;

Kaunakakai Harbor, Molokai, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 484, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,919,000;

The project for Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, authorized by Public Law 645, Eighty-sixth Congress, is hereby modified to provide for adjustment of the cash contribution required of local interest in accordance with recommendations by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

BEACH EROSION

State of New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 416, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$88,000;

Fire Island Inlet and shore westerly to Jones Inlet, Long Island, New York: Modification of the existing beach erosion control project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), House Document Numbered 411, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans which will include a sand bypassing system at Fire Island Inlet, being prepared by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of such plans by the Secretary of the Army and the President;

Clark Point, New Bedford, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 584, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$60,000;

Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered 382, Eighty-seventh Congress, periodic nourishment.

Fort Macon, Atlantic Beach and vicinity, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 555, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$194,000;

Palm Beach County from Martin County line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward County line, Florida: House Document Numbered 164, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$128,800;

Virginia Key and Key Biscayne, Florida: House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$220,000;

San Juan and vicinity, Puerto Rico: House Document Numbered 575, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,400;

Lake Erie shoreline from the Michigan-Ohio State line to Marblehead, Ohio: House Document Numbered 63, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$658,500;

Sheffield Lake community park, Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$100,300;

Ventura-Pierpont area, California: House Document Numbered 458, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$515,000.

Orange County, California, House Document Numbered 602, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,845,000.

SEC. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, and in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: Provided, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: Provided further, That such

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 7

reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. (a) The Act approved August 13, 1946, as amended by the Act approved July 28, 1956 (38 U.S.C. 426e-h), pertaining to shore protection, is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) the word "one-third" in section 1(b) is deleted and the word "one-half" is substituted therefor;

(2) the following is added after the word "located" in section 1(b):
 "except that the costs allocated to the restoration and protection of Federal property shall be borne fully by the Federal Government, and, further, that Federal participation in the cost of a project for restoration and protection of State, county, and other publicly owned shore parks and conservation areas may be, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, not more than 70 per centum of the total cost exclusive of land costs, when such areas: Include a zone which excludes permanent human habitation; include but are not limited to recreational beaches; satisfy adequate criteria for conservation and development of the natural resources of the environment; extend landward a sufficient distance to include, where appropriate, protective dunes, bluffs, or other natural features which serve to protect the uplands from damage; and provide essentially full park facilities for appropriate public use, all of which shall meet with the approval of the Chief of Engineers";

(3) the following is added after the word "supplemented" in section 1(e): "or, in the case of a small project under section 3 of this Act, unless the plan therefor has been approved by the Chief of Engineers"; and

(4) sections 2 and 3 are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for work done by them, after initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for the project, on authorized projects which individually do not exceed \$1,000,000 in total cost: Provided, That the work which may have been done on the projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the authorized projects: Provided further, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to undertake construction of small shore and beach restoration and protection projects not specifically authorized by Congress, which otherwise comply with section 1 of this Act, when he finds that such work is advisable, and he is further authorized to allot from any appropriations hereafter made for civil works, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for any one fiscal year for the Federal share of the costs of construction of such projects: Provided, That not more than \$400,000 shall be allotted for this purpose for any single project and the total amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete the Federal participation in the project under this section including periodic nourishment as provided for under section 1(c) of this act: Provided further, That the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 1 of this Act shall apply: And provided further, That the work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation, except for participation in periodic beach nourishment in accordance with section 1(c) of this Act, and as

8 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of survey reports."

(b) All provisions of existing law relating to surveys of rivers and harbors shall apply to surveys relating to shore protection and section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended (38 U.S.C. 426), is modified to the extent inconsistent herewith.

(c) The cost-sharing provisions of this Act shall apply in determining the amounts of Federal participation in or payments toward the costs of authorized projects which have not been substantially completed prior to the date of approval of this Act, and the Chief of Engineers, through the Beach Erosion Board, is authorized and directed to recompute the amounts of Federal contribution toward the costs of such projects accordingly.

SEC. 104. The project for aquatic plant control authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300) is hereby modified to provide that research costs and planning costs prior to construction shall be borne fully by the United States and shall not be included in the cost to be shared by local interests.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey 17.94 acres of land located at old lock and dam numbered 7, Ohio River, to the city of Midland, Pennsylvania, after November 1, 1962, for public park and recreation purposes, without monetary consideration but subject to reversion to the United States if not utilized for public park and recreation purposes and further subject to such flowage rights as may be necessary in the operation of the New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio River.

SEC. 106. Section 110(f) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is amended by changing the period to a comma and adding the following: "and upon completion of transfer to the said State of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal in accordance with the agreement executed December 14, 1960, between the Chief of Engineers and the representatives of said State, the additional sum of \$800,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to be expended by the Corps of Engineers, or by said State, for the repair and modification of any canal properties and appurtenances, notwithstanding the provisions of section 110(b) hereof."

SEC. 107. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to prepare and transmit to Congress, at the earliest practicable date, a compilation of survey and review reports on river and harbor and flood control improvements, similar to that prepared in accordance with the Act of March 4, 1913, revised in accordance with the Acts of July 3, 1930, August 30, 1935, and May 17, 1950, and printed in House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

SEC. 108. The Chief of Engineers is authorized to perform such work as may be necessary to provide for the repair and restoration of lock and dam numbered 3 on the Big Sandy River: Provided, That the work authorized herein shall have no effect on the condition that local interests shall operate and maintain the structure and related properties as required by the Act of Congress approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1062): And provided further, That there is hereby authorized to be expended from appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, such funds as may be necessary for the repair and restoration of lock and dam numbered 3 on the Big Sandy River, not to exceed \$200,000.

SEC. 109. The body of water designated as the Redondo Beach Harbor, California, shall be known and designated hereafter as the Redondo Beach

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 9

King Harbor, California. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such body of water is referred to shall be held to refer to it as the Redondo Beach King Harbor, California.

SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Falmouth Harbor, Maine.

Channel between Point Shirley and Deer Island, Massachusetts.

Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey.

Brigantine Inlet, New Jersey.

Corsons Inlet, New Jersey.

Kings Bay Deepwater Channel, Georgia.

Auglaize River at Wapakoneta, Ohio.

Surveys of the coastal areas of the United States and its possessions, including the shores of the Great Lakes, in the interest of beach erosion control, hurricane protection and related purposes: Provided, That surveys of particular areas shall be authorized by appropriate resolutions of either the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate or the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 111. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1962".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: Provided, That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: Provided, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: Provided further, That the projects authorized

10 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: And provided further, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Wareham-Marion, Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 548, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,811,500.

The project for navigation and hurricane-flood protection at Point Judith, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 521, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,414,000.

The project for navigation and hurricane-flood control protection at Narragansett Pier, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 195, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,152,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at New London, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,401,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Westport, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 412, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$217,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Mystic, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 411, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,490,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Naugatuck River at Ansonia-Derby, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 437, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,620,000.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Rondout Creek and Wallkill River and their tributaries, New York and New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 113, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,111,000.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 11

NEW JERSEY-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control on Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,097,000.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project for construction of the Fall Brook and Ayleworth Creek Reservoirs, and local flood protection works on the Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 141, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,596,000.

The project for the Juniata River and tributaries, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 565, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$32,150,000: Provided, That installation of the power generating facilities shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall submit a reexamination report to the Congress for authorization.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The project for the comprehensive development of the Delaware River Basin, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 522, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$192,400,000.

POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

The project for the North Branch of the Potomac River, Maryland and West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$50,965,000.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Norfolk, Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 354, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,537,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 511, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$345,600.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Carolina Beach and vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 418, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$739,000.

12 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA

The project for the West Point Reservoir, Chattahoochee River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 570, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$52,900,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection of West Palm Beach Canal is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 146, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,220,000.

The project for flood protection on Boggy Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 125, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,176,000.

The project for South Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 138, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,388,000.

The project for Shingle Creek, Florida, between Clear Lake and Lake Tohopekaliga, for flood control and major drainage is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 139, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,250,000: Provided, That no obligation shall be incurred for development of the Reedy Creek Swamp as a wildlife management area unless the State or one or more other non-Federal entities shall have entered into an agreement in advance to assume at least 50 per centum of the cost associated with that feature of the project.

The project for flood protection in the Cutler drain area, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 123, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,063,000: Provided, That local interests shall receive credit in the Contributed Fund Account of the project for moneys shown to have been spent after March 1, 1960, for construction of units of the authorized plan for Cutler Drain: Provided further, That such completed work must be inspected and accepted by the Chief of Engineers as constituting useful parts of the authorized plan: And provided further, That the credit established shall be in accordance with cost sharing arrangements for the central and southern Florida flood control project in an amount not to exceed \$124,000.

GREEN SWAMP REGION, FLORIDA

The project for the Four River Basins, Florida, namely the Hillsborough, Oklawaha, Withlacoochee, and Peace Rivers, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 585, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$57,760,000: Provided, That the cost sharing shall be as recommended by the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 585, Eighty-seventh Congress: And provided further, That

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 13

planning and construction on the Lowery-Mattie Conservation Area and its appurtenant works is deferred until additional studies are made thereon, and a further report submitted to the Congress.

PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Chunky Creek, Chickasawhay and Pascagoula Rivers, Mississippi, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 549, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,740,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent Acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following item:

(a) Monetary authorizations heretofore and hereafter made available to the project or any portion thereof shall be combined into a single sum and be available for application to any portion of the project.

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928, as amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include construction of certain improvements in Gin and Muddy Bayous, Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi, substantially in accordance with plans on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of such plans by the Secretary of the Army and the President, at an estimated cost of \$150,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Mississippi River Delta at and below New Orleans, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 550, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,502,000.

The project for flood protection on Red River in Natchitoches and Red River Parishes, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 476, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,293,000.

The lower auxiliary channel, Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi, a unit in the Mississippi River and tributaries project, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Will M. Whittington Auxiliary Channel in honor of the late Member of the House of Representatives from the Third District of Mississippi, and former chairman of the House Public Works Committee. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is hereby authorized and directed to erect appropriate markers along the auxiliary channel designating the project "The Will M. Whittington Auxiliary Channel". Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to under the name of lower auxiliary channel, Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi, shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of "Will M. Whittington Auxiliary Channel".

14 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

BUFFALO BAYOU

The project for flood protection on Vince and Little Vince Bayous, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 441, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,224,000.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Port Arthur and vicinity, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 505, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$23,380,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Freeport and vicinity, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 495, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,780,000.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 554, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$23,760,000.

The project for extension of the Fort Worth Floodway, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 454, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,148,000.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The project for the San Gabriel River, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 591, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Clear Fork of the Brazos River at and in the vicinity of Abilene, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 506, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$31,200,000.

TULAROSA BASIN

The project for flood protection at Alamogordo, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 473, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,040,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection at Las Cruces, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 117, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,350,000.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 15

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas River, Arkansas, is hereby modified to provide for construction of a sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville, Arkansas, substantially in accordance with plans of said city, approved by the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$1,400,000.

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause an immediate study to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers of bank erosion on the Arkansas River between about river mile 455, near Muskogee, Oklahoma, and about river mile 495, near Coweta, Oklahoma. Such project or projects, because of its or their emergency nature, are hereby authorized as determined to be feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army with the approval of the President unless within the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the report is submitted to it such report is disapproved by the Congress: Provided, That the requirements for cooperation shall include provisions that local interests shall furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate after completion; and make a cash contribution in recognition of any special benefits: And provided further, That with respect to any work found justified in the vicinity of Wybark, Oklahoma, local interests shall meet the requirements as stated and shall make a cash contribution of not less than \$150,000 which shall include the value of all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required to be furnished, and the value of goods and services provided for purposes of project installation on a basis acceptable to the Chief of Engineers: Provided, That the cost to the Federal Government shall not exceed \$2,000,000.

The project for improvement of the Verdigris River and tributaries, Oklahoma and Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 563, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$62,400,000.

The project for flood protection on Big Hill Creek, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 577, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,785,000.

The project for the Kaw Reservoir, Arkansas River, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 143, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$83,230,000: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

The project for flood protection on Cow Creek, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,560,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Dodge City, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 498, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,133,000.

16 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The flood protection project for Village Creek, Jackson and Lawrence Counties, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,968,000.

The project for flood protection on Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts, Arkansas, is hereby modified to provide for construction of a pumping plant, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 577, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$1,018,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

That the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River below Denison Dam is hereby modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the local cooperation requirements of the McKinney Bayou, Arkansas and Texas, Maniece Bayou, Arkansas, and East Point, Louisiana, projects so as to bring such requirements in accord with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and approval of the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$16,100,000, subject to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and approval of the President.

The project for Lake Kemp, Wichita River, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 144, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,410,000.

The modification of the Broken Bow Reservoir, Mountain Fork River, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 137, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$23,800,000.

The project for the Clayton and Tuskahoma Reservoirs, Kiamichi River, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 145, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$29,748,000.

The project providing for the construction of two experimental water quality study projects in the Arkansas-Red River Basins, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 105, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$300,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

(a) The Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Osage River, Missouri, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 578, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$43,245,000; Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

(b) The project for the Kansas River, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recom-

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 17

mentations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$88,070,000: Provided, That the authorization for the Woodbine Reservoir on Lyons Creek is deferred at this time, subject to submission of a new feasibility report to the Eighty-eighth Congress, which shall take into account the water and related land resource development plans of the Soil Conservation Service, the Kansas Water Resources Board, and Lyons Creek Watershed Joint District Numbered 41, and preparation of said report is hereby authorized.

The project for flood protection on White Clay Creek at Atchison, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 151, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,495,000.

The project for flood protection on Papillion Creek and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 475, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,122,000.

The project for flood protection on Indian Creek, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 438, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,270,000.

The project for Grand River and tributaries, North and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 574, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,670,000: Provided, That the project shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army.

The requirements of local cooperation on the project for flood control on the Floyd River, Iowa, authorized by Public Law 85-500, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 417, Eighty-fourth Congress, is hereby modified to read as follows: "Provided, That responsible local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will (a) furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; (c) make without cost to the United States all necessary road, highway, highway bridges other than those required to carry Interstate Highway 29 over the relocated Floyd River, and utility alterations and additions; (d) contribute in cash 0.84 per centum of the estimated first cost of the work for which the United States would be responsible, a contribution presently estimated at \$65,000; (e) upon authorization of the project, to take all possible action under Iowa law, short of actual purchase, to prevent additional developments within the right-of-way that might increase the overall cost of the project; and (f) maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army."

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Kokosing River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 220, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,438,000.

18 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The project for flood protection on the Wabash River at and in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 573, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,417,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mad River above Huffman Dam, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 439, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,930,000.

The project for the Kentucky River, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$26,020,000.

The project for Twelvepole Creek, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 520, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$11,000,000.

The project for the Guyandot River and tributaries, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$60,477,000.

The project for flood protection on the Buckhannon River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,206,000.

The project for flood protection on Crab Creek at Youngstown, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 440, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,268,000.

The project for the Scioto River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$55,307,000: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a wildlife refuge in this project.

The project for flood protection on the Allegheny River at Salamanca, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,390,000.

The project for French Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 95, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$23,102,000.

The project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500) is hereby modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the cash contribution required of local interests to such amount as is recommended by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for the Illinois River and tributaries, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 19

Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 472, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$71,465,000.

The project for Rend Lake, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 541, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$35,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of Guttenberg, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$729,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River between Sainte Genevieve and Saint Marys, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 519, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,500,000.

The project for the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District Numbered 2, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 542, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,112,000.

The project for the Columbia Drainage and Levee District Numbered 3, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 543, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$986,000.

The project for the Prairie DuPont Levee and Sanitary District, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 540, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$921,000.

The project for flood protection on Richland Creek, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 571, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,995,000.

The project for the Joanna Reservoir, Salt River, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 507, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$63,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Pecatonica River, Illinois and Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 539, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$850,000.

The project for flood protection on Rock River at Rockford, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 142, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,228,000.

The project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Illinois, to mile 300, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 564, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,289,000.

The project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Illinois, to Cassville, Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 450, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,350,000.

20 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The project for the Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$15,570,000.

The project for flood protection on the Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 449, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$972,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection on the River Rouge, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,659,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sandusky River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 136, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,300,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for the Camelsback Reservoir, Gila River, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,770,000.

The project for flood protection on the Gila River below Painted Rock Reservoir, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 116, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$18,255,000.

The project for flood protection on Pinal Creek, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 512, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,300,000.

TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,385,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Alameda Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 128, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,680,000.

The project for Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 545, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,534,000; Provided, That local interests shall contribute in cash 3 per centum of the Federal construction of the Rose Valley unit with a contribution presently estimated at \$158,000.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 21

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

The New Melones project, Stanislaus River, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$113,717,000: Provided, That upon completion of construction of the dam and powerplant by the Corps of Engineers, the project shall become an integral part of the Central Valley project and be operated and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, except that the flood control operation of the project shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army: Provided further, That the Stanislaus River Channel, from Goodwin Dam to the San Joaquin River, shall be maintained by the Secretary of the Army to a capacity of at least eight thousand cubic feet per second subject to the condition that responsible local interests agree to maintain private levees and to prevent encroachment on the existing channel and floodway between the levees: Provided further, That before initiating any diversions of water from the Stanislaus River Basin in connection with the operation of the Central Valley project, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the quantity of water required to satisfy all existing and anticipated future needs within that basin and the diversions shall at all times be subordinate to the quantities so determined: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army adopt appropriate measures to insure the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife in the New Melones project and shall allocate to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, as provided in the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), an appropriate share of the cost of constructing the Stanislaus River division and of operating and maintaining the same: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, in connection with the New Melones project, construct basic public recreation facilities, acquire land necessary for that purpose, the cost of constructing such facilities and acquiring such lands to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: Provided further, That contracts for the sale and delivery of the additional electric energy available from the Central Valley project power system as a result of the construction of the plants herein authorized and their integration with that system shall be made in accordance with preferences expressed in the Federal reclamation laws except that a first preference, to the extent as needed and as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, but not to exceed 25 per centum of such additional energy, shall be given, under reclamation law, to preference customers in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties, California, for use in that county, who are ready, able, and willing, within twelve months after notice of availability by the Secretary of the Interior, to enter into contracts for the energy and that Tuolumne and Calaveras County preference customers may exercise their option in the same date in each successive fifth year providing written notice of their intention to use the energy is given to the Secretary not less than eighteen months prior to said dates: And provided further, That the Secretary of the Army give consideration during the preconstruction planning for the New Melones project to the advisability of including storage for the regulation of stream-flow for the purpose of downstream water quality control.

The Hidden Reservoir, Fresno River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 37, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,338,000.

22 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The Buchanan Reservoir, Chowchilla River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,585,000.

The project for flood protection on Mormon Slough, Calaveras River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 576, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,960,000.

RUSSIAN RIVER BASIN

The project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 547, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$42,400,000.

REDWOOD CREEK BASIN

The project for flood protection on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 497, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,580,000.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,700,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles River Basin approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

ROGUE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Rogue River, Oregon and California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 566, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$106,700,000, subject to the conditions of local cooperation specified in said report: Provided, That the project is to be located, constructed, and operated to accomplish the benefits as set forth and described in the report and appendixes: And provided further, That in the years of short water supply all water users will share the available water in the same proportions that they would share the total full supply when it is available, and that no further water-use allocations will be made from the authorized storage so as to retain the maximum possible benefits to authorized uses during the periods of adversity when storage shortages occur.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent Acts of Congress, including Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, September 3, 1954, July 3, 1958, and July 14, 1960, are hereby modified to include the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 23

Congress: Provided, That the depth and width of the authorized channel in the Columbia-Snake River barge navigation project shall be established as fourteen feet and two hundred and fifty feet, respectively, at minimum regulated flow.

Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Washington;

Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clearwater River, Idaho;

Strube Reregulating Dam and Reservoir, South Fork, McKenzie River, Oregon;

Gate Creek Dam and Reservoir, Gate Creek, Oregon;

Fern Ridge Dam and Reservoir modification, Long Tom River, Oregon;

Cascadia Dam and Reservoir, South Santiam River, Oregon.

The project for the Ririe Dam and Reservoir, Willow Creek, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 562, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,027,000.

The project for the Blackfoot Dam and Reservoir, Blackfoot River, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 568, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$829,000.

WYNOOCHEE RIVER

The project for the Wynoochee River, Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 601, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,211,000: Provided, That the installation of the power-generating facilities shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall submit a reexamination report to the Congress for authorization.

COOK INLET, ALASKA

The project for Bradley Lake, Cook Inlet, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 455, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,750,000.

SEC. 204. (a) For the purpose of developing hydroelectric power and to encourage and promote the economic development of and to foster the establishment of essential industries in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to operate and maintain the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau, Alaska. The works of the division shall consist of pressure tunnels, surge tanks, penstocks, a powerplant, transmission facilities, and related facilities, all at an estimated cost of \$41,634,000.

(b) Electric power and energy generated at the division except that portion required in the operation of the division, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery of the costs of producing and transmitting the power and energy, including the amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years, with interest at the average rate (which rate

24 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this Act and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. In the sale of such power and energy, preference shall be given to Federal agencies, public bodies, and cooperatives. It shall be a condition of every contract made under this Act for the sale of power and energy that the purchaser, if it be a purchaser for resale, will deliver power and energy to Federal agencies or facilities thereof within its transmission area at a reasonable charge for the use of its transmission facilities. All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy generated at said division shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The appropriate Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and enter into such agreements as may be appropriate for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this Act into full force and effect, including the acquisition of rights and property, and the Secretary of the Army, when an appropriation shall have been made for the commencement of construction or the Secretary of the Interior in the case of operation and maintenance of said division, may, in connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of such division, enter into contracts for miscellaneous services for materials and supplies, as well as for construction, which may cover such periods of time as the appropriate Secretary may consider necessary but in which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being made therefor.

SEC. 205. Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701s), is amended (a) by striking out "\$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000", (b) by striking out the term "small flood control projects" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "small projects for flood control and related purposes", and (c) by striking out "Provided, That not more than \$400,000 shall be allotted for this purpose at any single locality from the appropriations for any one fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "Provided, That not more than \$1,000,000 shall be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality and the amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete Federal participation in the project".

SEC. 206. The first sentence of section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701n), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That there is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$15,000,000 to be expended in flood emergency preparation, in flood fighting and rescue operations, or in the repair or restoration of any flood control work threatened or destroyed by flood, including the strengthening, raising, extending, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the work for flood control; in the emergency protection of federally authorized hurricane or shore protection being threatened when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such protection is warranted to protect against imminent and substantial loss to life and property; in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure for hurricane or shore protection."

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 25

SEC. 207. Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944, as amended by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, and by section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities at water resource development projects under the control of the Department of the Army, to permit the construction of such facilities by local interests (particularly those to be operated and maintained by such interests), and to permit the maintenance and operation of such facilities by local interests. The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, at water resource development projects for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: Provided, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: Provided further, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a project area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: And provided further, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, and other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance, and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such projects shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such areas along the shores of such projects shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 208. Section 207 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 501) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. (a) When used in this section—

"(1) The term 'Agency' means the Corps of Engineers, United States Army or the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, whichever has jurisdiction over the project concerned.

26 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

"(2) The term 'head of the Agency concerned' means the Chief of Engineers or the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, or their respective designees.

"(3) The term 'water resources projects to be constructed in the future' includes all projects not yet actually under construction, and, to the extent of work remaining to be completed, includes projects presently under construction where road relocations or identifiable components thereof are not complete as of the date of this section.

"(4) The term 'time of the taking' is the date of the relocation agreement, the date of the filing of a condemnation proceeding, or a date agreed upon between the parties as the date of taking.

"(b) Whenever, in connection with the construction of any authorized flood control, navigation, irrigation, or multiple-purpose project for the development of water resources, the head of the Agency concerned determines it to be in the public interest to utilize existing public roads as a means of providing access to such projects during construction, such Agency may improve, reconstruct, and maintain such roads and may contract with the local authority having jurisdiction over the roads to accomplish the necessary work. The accomplishment of such work of improvement may be carried out with or without obtaining any interest in the land on which the road is located in accordance with mutual agreement between the parties: Provided, (1) That the head of the Agency concerned determines that such work would result in a saving in Federal cost as opposed to the cost of providing a new access road at Federal expense, (2) that, at the completion of construction, the head of the Agency concerned will, if necessary, restore the road to at least as good condition as prior to the beginning of utilization for access during construction, and (3) that, at the completion of construction, the responsibility of the Agency for improvement, reconstruction, and maintenance shall cease.

"(c) For water resources projects to be constructed in the future, when the taking by the Federal Government of an existing public road necessitates replacement, the substitute provided will, as nearly as practicable, serve in the same manner and reasonably as well as the existing road. The head of the Agency concerned is authorized to construct such substitute roads to design standards comparable to those of the State, or, where applicable State standards do not exist, those of the owning political division in which the road is located, for roads of the same classification as the road being replaced. The traffic existing at the time of the taking shall be used in the determination of the classification. In any case where a State or political subdivision thereof requests that such a substitute road be constructed to a higher standard than that provided in the preceding provisions of this subsection, and pays, prior to commencement of such construction, the additional costs involved due to such higher standard, such Agency head is authorized to construct such road to such higher standard. Federal costs under the provisions of this subsection shall be part of the nonreimbursable project costs."

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: Provided, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless author-

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 27

ized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: Provided further, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Valenciana River, Puerto Rico.

Waccasassa River (Levy County and Gilchrist County), Florida.

Lake Pontchartrain, North Shore, Louisiana.

Peytons Creek and tributaries, Texas.

Clear Creek, Texas.

San Bernard River, Texas.

Arkansas River Basin, with reference to the effect of the Eufaula and Keystone Reservoirs, Oklahoma, on the water supply facilities of the cities of McAlester and Yale, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the replacement of the cities' water supply facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, with reference to the effect of the Barkley Dam project, on the water supply and sewage treatment facilities of the cities of Cadiz, Kuttawa, and Eddyville, Kentucky, and the State penitentiary at Eddyville, Kentucky, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the replacement of their water supply and sewage treatment facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

Missouri River Basin, with reference to the effect of Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs, North Dakota and South Dakota, on the sewage treatment facilities of the cities of Bismarck and Mandan, North Dakota, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the sewage treatment facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

All streams in Santa Barbara County, California, draining the Santa Ynez Mountains, except Santa Ynez River and tributaries.

Sacramento River Basin and streams in northern California draining into the Pacific Ocean for the purposes of developing, where feasible, multiple-purpose water resource projects, particularly those which would be eligible under the provisions of title III of Public Law 85-500.

Battle Creek, Sacramento River, California.

Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois; review of requirements of local cooperation.

Puget Sound, Washington, and adjacent waters, including tributaries, in the interest of flood control, navigation, and other water uses and related land resources.

Harbors and rivers in Hawaii, with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power development, water supply, and other beneficial water uses, and related land resources.

Waimea River, Kokee Area, Kauai, Hawaii, for multiple purposes.

Waipio River, Kohala-Hamakua coast, Island of Hawaii, for multiple purpose development.

Iao River, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

28 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers is hereby authorized to replace with adequate floodway capacity the bridge over Boeuf River, Chicot County, Arkansas, approximately three miles north of the county line, and the bridge over Big Bayou, Chicot County, Arkansas, approximately two miles upstream from its confluence with the Boeuf River which were altered as part of the project for Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and which were recently destroyed by floods, at an estimated cost of \$115,000.

SEC. 211. The Wilkesboro Reservoir flood control project, Yadkin River, North Carolina, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, shall hereafter be known and designated as the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir, in honor of the late Senator W. Kerr Scott of North Carolina. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 212. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1962".

And the Senate agree to same.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT S. KERR,
PAT McNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the Senate amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate amendment did not delete any of the projects for navigation contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment did modify certain of these projects and it also authorized projects not contained in the House bill.

(1) The Senate amendment authorized further partial accomplishment of the project for the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, N.Y., at an estimated cost of \$1,000,000 additional.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(2) The project for Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N.J., contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment to require approval of the plans of the Chief of Engineers by both the Secretary of the Army and the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(3) The Senate amendment authorized the project for the James River, Va., at an estimated cost of \$39,000,000, with the condition that the authorization expire after 5 years unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time and a further requirement that there be submitted to Congress a feasible report which takes account of possible adverse effects of the project on seed oyster production.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

30 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

(4) The Senate amendment authorized the project for Canaveral Harbor, Fla., at an estimated cost of \$5,076,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(5) The project for Holt lock and dam, Alabama, as authorized in the House bill, required a report of the Chief of Engineers to be submitted to Congress within the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the 88th Congress. The Senate amendment extended this period to 90 days.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

(6) The Senate amendment authorized the modification of the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico Barge Channel through Devils Swamp, La., for dikes and retaining structures, at a Federal cost of \$299,500, with local interests to contribute \$100,500.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(7) The Senate amendment authorized the project for Bayous Terrebonne, Petit Caillou, Grand Caillou, Du Large, and connecting channels, Louisiana, and Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to Gulf of Mexico, at an estimated cost of \$45,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(8) The project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, La. and Tex., contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment to provide that the authority to make such modifications as the Chief of Engineers deems desirable, as set forth in House Document No. 556, 87th Congress, shall be construed to apply to, but not be limited to, the improvement of the existing channels at proposed channel relocation sites in lieu of such relocations.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(9) The project for the Calcasieu River salt water barrier, Louisiana, contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment through the inclusion of a proviso requiring a study by the Corps of Engineers of the question of cost sharing and authorizing such cost sharing as is determined feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army within the first period of 60 calendar days of Congress after the date on which the report on cost sharing is submitted to the Congress, unless Congress disapproves such report.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(10) The project for Trinity River, Wallisville Reservoir, Tex., as contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment through the addition of a proviso that nothing in the act shall be construed as authorization for the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the Reservoir.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(11) The project for the Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind., was authorized in the House bill at an estimated cost of \$114,652,000. The

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 31

Senate amendment reduced that figure to \$40,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(12) The Senate amendment modified the project for Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, to provide for adjustment of the cash contribution required of local interests in accordance with the recommendations by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President.

The House bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the adjustment is required to be made at the earliest practicable date.

BEACH EROSION

The Senate amendment did not delete any of the beach erosion projects which were contained in the House bill.

The Senate amendment did modify certain of these projects and it also authorized projects not contained in the House bill.

(1) The project for Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, Long Island, N.Y., contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment by requiring that the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers be approved by the Secretary of the Army and the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(2) The Senate amendment authorized a project for Clark Point, New Bedford, Mass., at an estimated cost of \$60,000.

This project is not in the House bill.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(3) The Senate amendment authorized a project for Palm Beach County from Martin County line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward County line, Fla., at an estimated cost of \$128,800.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(4) The Senate amendment authorized a project for San Juan and vicinity, Puerto Rico, at an estimated cost of \$65,400.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(5) The Senate amendment authorized a project for Orange County, Calif., at an estimated cost of \$2,845,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SHORE PROTECTION MODIFICATIONS

Section 103 of the Senate amendment amended the act of August 13, 1946, which relates to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property by increasing the Federal contribution from one-third to one-half, by requiring that when the property is Federal property all of the cost will be borne by the Federal Government and by requiring that up to 70 percent of the cost

32 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

exclusive of land costs shall be borne by the Federal Government when it is a project for restoration of State, county, and other publicly owned shore parks and other conservation areas under certain circumstances. It further authorizes the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done by them on authorized projects which individually do not exceed \$1,000,000 in total cost after initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for the project, if the work is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the project; however, the reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority. It further authorizes the Chief of Engineers to undertake small shore and beach restoration and protection projects not specifically authorized by Congress if he finds it advisable and permits him to spend not to exceed \$3,000,000 in any one fiscal year for such projects, except that not more than \$400,000 shall be allocated to any one project and the total amount allotted shall be enough to complete Federal participation in the project. Local cooperation is required and the work on the small project must be complete in itself and not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation.

Subsection (b) of section 103 of the Senate amendment provides that all existing law relating to surveys of rivers and harbors shall apply to surveys related to shore protection.

Subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment provides that the cost sharing provisions of this act shall apply to authorized projects not substantially completed before the date of enactment of this act and directs the Chief of Engineers to recompute Federal contributions to such projects accordingly.

The bill as passed by the House contained no comparable provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL

Section 104 of the Senate amendment modifies the project for aquatic plant control authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to make research costs and planning costs prior to construction entirely borne by the United States.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL

Section 106 of the Senate amendment amends section 110(f) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to authorize the appropriation of an additional sum of \$800,000 to be expended by the Chief of Engineers or by the State of Illinois for the repair and modification of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, notwithstanding subsection (b) of such section 110, upon transfer to the State of Illinois of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal in accordance with an agreement of December 14, 1960.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 33

COMPILATION

Section 107 of the Senate amendment directed the Secretary of the Army to prepare and transmit to Congress as soon as practicable a compilation of survey and review reports on river and harbor and flood control improvements similar to compilations which have been prepared in the past.

The House bill did not contain this requirement.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SURVEYS

In addition to the surveys authorized in the House bill the Senate amendment authorized the following surveys to be made: Falmouth Harbor, Maine, Little Egg Inlet, N.J., Brigantine Inlet, N.J., and Corsons Inlet, N.J.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided general authorization for surveys of the coastal areas of the United States and its possessions including the shores of the Great Lakes in the interest of beach erosion, hurricane protection, and related purposes with a requirement that surveys of particular areas shall be authorized by resolutions of either the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or of the House.

The House bill contained no such general authorization.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

The Senate amendment contained all of the projects for flood control contained in the House bill. It modified certain of these projects as passed by the House and added certain others. The following projects were either modified or added by the Senate and are contained in the proposed conference substitute:

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$5,000,000 for the project for the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for the Fall Brook and Ayleworth Creek Reservoirs on the Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pa., at an estimated cost of \$3,596,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The project for the Juniata River and tributaries, Pennsylvania, contained in the House bill specifically exempted the power features of such project from authorization and permitted the Chief of Engineers to submit a reexamination report on those features if he deems it desirable.

34 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The Senate amendment did not specifically exempt the power features of the project from authorization but did provide that their installation shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall have submitted a reexamination report to Congress.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Delaware River Basin, N.Y., N.J., Pa., and Del., was authorized in the House bill at an estimated cost of \$224,000,000.

The Senate amendment reduced the authorization to \$192,400,000.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The Senate amendment authorized a project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Wrightsville Beach, N.C., at an estimated cost of \$345,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment contained a project for Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., at an estimated cost of \$25,143,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GA.

The House bill authorized a project for the West Point Reservoir, Chattahoochee River, Ga., in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$52,900,000.

The Senate amendment deleted the "Secretary of the Army and the".

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for Flint River, Ga., at an estimated cost of \$151,820,000, with the proviso that this authorization is without prejudice to consideration by the Federal Power Commission of non-Federal development of power.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

The Senate amendment provided an additional \$30,000,000 basin authorization for central and southern Florida.

The House bill did not contain this authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

WEST PALM BEACH CANAL

The Senate amendment authorized a project for flood protection of West Palm Beach Canal, at an estimated cost of \$3,220,000.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 35

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

BOGGY CREEK, FLA.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for flood protection on Boggy Creek, Fla., at an estimated cost of \$1,176,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SHINGLE CREEK, FLA.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for Shingle Creek, Fla., at an estimated cost of \$3,250,000, with the proviso that no obligation shall be incurred for the development of the Reedy Creek Swamp as a wildlife management area unless the State or another non-Federal entity agrees in advance to pay at least half the cost of that feature of the project.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

CUTLER DRAIN AREA, FLORIDA

The project for the Cutler drain area, Florida, contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment through the inclusion of a proviso that local interests shall receive credit for moneys spent after March 1, 1960, for construction of units of the authorized plan for Cutler drain if that work is acceptable to the Chief of Engineers and if that credit does not exceed \$124,000.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, with a clerical amendment.

GREEN SWAMP REGION, FLA.

The project for the Four River Basins, Fla., authorized by the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment by a proviso that cost sharing shall be as recommended by the Secretary of the Army in House Document No. 585, 87th Congress. The Senate amendment also deferred the planning and construction on the Lowery-Mattie conservation area until a further report is made to Congress.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment modified the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and subsequent acts to provide that monetary authorizations heretofore and hereafter made available to the projects shall be combined into a single sum and shall be available for application to any portion of the project.

The House bill contained no such modification.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

36 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

GIN AND MUDDY BAYOUS, YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MISS.

The authorization contained in the House bill for improvements in Gin and Muddy Bayous, Yazoo River Basin, Miss., were modified by the Senate amendment to provide that the plans for such improvements be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Army and the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$21,000,000 for the Brazos River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$182,000,000 for the Arkansas River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

ARKANSAS RIVER BETWEEN MUSKOGEE, OKLA., AND COWETA, OKLA.

The Senate amendment authorized and directed the Secretary of the Army to make a study of bank erosion on the Arkansas River between Muskogee, Okla., and Coweta, Okla., and authorized such projects as the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, and the President approved, unless within 60 days after the submission of the report thereon to the Congress such report is disapproved by Congress.

It provided the usual requirements for cooperation by local interests, except that with respect to any work found justified within the vicinity of Wybark, Okla., local interests shall make a cash contribution of not less than \$150,000 which shall include the value of all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required to be furnished, and the value of goods and services provided for purposes of project installation on a basis acceptable to the Chief of Engineers.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the language has been modified to make it clear that the advance authorization of the bank erosion projects has been adopted because of their emergency nature. The conference substitute also limits to \$2,000,000 the Federal costs under this authorization.

BIG HILL CREEK, KANS.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for flood protection on Big Hill Creek, Kans., at an estimated cost of \$3,785,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 37

KAW RESERVOIR, ARKANSAS RIVER, OKLA.

The project for the Kaw Reservoir, Arkansas River, Okla., authorized by the House bill, was modified by the Senate amendment to include a proviso that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$11,000,000 for the White River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

RED RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment modified the general plan for flood control on the Red River below Denison Dam to permit the Chief of Engineers to adjust local cooperation requirements of the McKinney Bayou, Ark. and Tex., Maniece Bayou, Ark., and East Point, La., projects to bring them into accord with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the approval of the President.

The House bill contained no such modification.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except that the adjustment is required to be made at the earliest practicable date.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Tex., at an estimated cost of \$16,100,000, subject to the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army, and approval by the President.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$140,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin.

The House bill contained no such additional authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for flood protection on White Clay Creek, Atchison, Kans., at an estimated cost of \$3,495,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for Grand River and tributaries, North and South Dakota, at an estimated cost of \$2,670,000, with the requirement that the project be constructed, operated and maintained by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army.

38 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment modified the requirements of local cooperation on the project for flood control on the Floyd River, Iowa, to require that local interests (1) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way, (2) hold the United States free from damages due to construction, (3) make without cost to the United States all necessary road, highway, highway bridges (other than those required to carry Interstate Highway 29) over the relocated Floyd River, and utility, alterations, and additions, (4) contribute in cash 0.84 percent of the estimated first cost of the work (approximately \$65,000), (5) take all possible action to prevent increase of the overall cost of the project, and (6) maintain and operate the completed work in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Army.

The House bill did not modify these requirements of local cooperation on this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$120,000,000 for the Ohio River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized the project on the Wabash River near Mount Carmel, Ill., at an estimated cost of \$1,417,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., at an estimated cost of \$151,000,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

SCIOTO RIVER, OHIO

The House bill authorized the project for the Scioto River, Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of \$55,847,000.

The Senate amendment authorized this project in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of \$55,307,000 with a proviso that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a wildlife refuge in this project.

The proposed conference substitute follows the House bill with respect to the authorization, follows the Senate amendment limiting the cost to \$55,307,000, and adopts the proviso in the Senate amendment.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 39

SALINE RIVER, ILL.

The House bill modified the project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, to eliminate the requirement that there be a cash contribution by local interests and to provide that other items of local cooperation heretofore recommended by the Chief of Engineers still be applicable.

The Senate amendment modified that project to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the cash contributions required of local interests to such amount as is recommended by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the adjustment is required to be made at the earliest practicable date.

— UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized an additional \$31,000,000 for the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized a project on the Rock River at Rockford, Ill., at an estimated cost of \$7,228,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Ill., to mile 300 at an estimated cost of \$9,289,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Camelsback Reservoir, Gila River, Ariz., at an estimated cost of \$9,770,000. It also authorized the project on the Gila River below Painted Rock Reservoir, Ariz., at an estimated cost of \$18,255,000. It further authorized the project on Pinal Creek, Ariz., at an estimated cost of \$1,300,000.

The House bill contained none of these projects.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

— SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The authorization of the project Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, Calif., contained by the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment by the addition of a requirement that local interests contribute in cash 3 percent of the Federal construction of the Rose Valley unit (approximately \$158,000).

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

40 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment authorized a modification of the New Melones project, Stanislaus River, Calif., at an estimated cost of \$113,717,000. In addition, the House bill contained certain requirements with respect to this project which were eliminated by the Senate amendment. These requirements were as follows:

1. Upon completion, the project would become a part of the Central Valley project and be operated and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with reclamation laws, except flood control operations.

2. The Stanislaus River Channel from Goodwin Dam to the San Joaquin River would be maintained by the Secretary of the Army to a capacity of at least 8,000 cubic feet per second, subject to local interests maintaining private levees.

3. Before diverting any water from the Stanislaus River Basin in connection with the operation of the Central Valley project, the Secretary of the Interior would determine water requirements to meet all present and future needs in that basin and subordinate diversions to the quantities so determined.

4. The Secretary of the Army would take necessary action to ensure preservation of fish and wildlife on the project and allocate to that project an appropriate share of the construction costs which would be nonreimbursable.

5. The Secretary of the Army would construct basic public recreation facilities including necessary land acquisition, and the cost thereof would be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

6. Contracts for the sale and delivery of electric energy available from the Central Valley power system as a result of the plants authorized by this section and their integration with the Central Valley system would be made in accordance with preferences set forth in the Federal reclamation laws, except that a first preference of up to 25 percent of the additional energy would be given under the reclamation laws to preferred customers in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties, Calif., for use in those counties if such customers are ready, able, and willing within 1 year of notice of availability by the Secretary to enter into contracts for such energy, and such preference customers may exercise their option on the same date in each successive fifth year if written notice of such intention to so use the energy is given to the Secretary at least 18 months before such date.

7. The Secretary of the Army would give consideration during preconstruction planning of the project to the advisability of including storage for the regulation of streamflow for the purposes of downstream water control.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill except that requirement No. 4 relating to costs of fish and wildlife preservation is revised to eliminate the nonreimbursable provision and requirement No. 6 relating to preferential sales of electric energy is revised to provide that such first preference shall be given to the extent needed and fixed by the Secretary of the Interior but not to exceed 25 percent of such energy shall be given first preference.

The Senate amendment authorized a project on Mormon Slough, Calaveras River, Calif., at an estimated cost of \$1,960,000.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 41

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

The House bill authorized an additional \$3,700,000 for the Los Angeles River Basin.

The Senate amendment provided an authorization for the Los Angeles River Basin of \$38,000,000.

The proposed conference substitute follows the House version.

ROGUE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Rogue River, Oreg. and Calif. authorized by the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment (1) to require that the authorization be subject to the conditions of local cooperation specified in the report of the Chief of Engineers published as House Document No. 566, 87th Congress, and (2) by the elimination of the requirement in the House bill that water for all purposes shall be released in the quantities and qualities at the points described in the district engineer's report and its appendixes.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment provided an additional authorization of \$226,000,000 for the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin and modified those projects and plans to include the following listed projects:

- Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.;
- China Gardens Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Oreg.;
- Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Wash.;
- Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clearwater River, Idaho;
- Strube Reregulating Dam and Reservoir, South Fork, McKenzie River, Oreg.;
- Gate Creek Dam and Reservoir, Gate Creek, Oreg.;
- Fern Ridge Dam and Reservoir modification, Long Tom River, Oreg.;
- Cascadia Dam and Reservoir, South Santiam River, Oreg.

The Senate amendment also provided that the depth and width of the Columbia-Snake River barge navigation project channel be established as 14 feet and 250 feet, respectively, at minimum regulated flow.

It further provided that Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation and authorizes \$50,000,000 for partial accomplishment of that project.

The House bill authorized the project for the Asotin Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, at an estimated cost of \$99,818,000 and the project for the China Gardens Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, at an estimated cost of \$74,777,000. These projects were within the larger group authorized by the Senate amendment.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except: (1) the additional authorization of \$226,000,000 for proj-

42 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

ects and plans for the Columbia River Basin is omitted; and (2) the following listed projects contained in the Senate amendment are deleted:

Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; and China Gardens Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Oreg.

In taking its action authorizing Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clear Water River, Idaho, the conferees were aware of the objections that have been made to this project by numerous groups interested in fish and wildlife conservation. It is the intention of the conferees that the Secretary of the Army shall adopt appropriate measures to insure the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife affected by this project, and shall allocate to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), an appropriate share of the cost of constructing this project and of operating and maintaining the same.

The Senate amendment authorizes the project for Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho, at an estimated cost of \$52,000,000.

The House bill did not authorize this project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

WYNOOCHEE RIVER

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Wynoochee River, Wash., at an estimated cost of \$40,211,000 with the requirement that the power generating facilities shall not be installed until a re-examination report has been submitted to Congress. The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

COOK INLET, ALASKA

The House bill authorizes a project for Bradley Lake, Cook Inlet, Alaska, at a cost of \$45,750,000.

The Senate amendment modified this authorization to require that the operation and maintenance of the project shall be through the Secretary of the Interior.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

SNETTISHAM PROJECT

The House bill did not contain an authorization for the Snettisham project.

Subsection (a) of section 204 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct, and the Secretary of the Interior to operate and maintain, the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau, Alaska, at an estimated cost of \$41,634,000.

Subsection (b) of section 204 of the Senate amendment directs the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of electric power and energy so as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. It requires rate schedules to be so drawn as to have due regard to the recovery of costs

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 43

of producing and transmitting the energy; including amortization of capital with interest. Preference in the sale of power and energy is to be given Federal agencies, public bodies, and cooperatives, and it is to be a condition of every contract of sale to a purchaser for resale that such purchaser will deliver power and energy to Federal agencies within its transmission area at a reasonable charge for the use of its transmission facilities. All receipts are to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Subsection (c) of such section 204 authorizes the appropriate Secretary to make necessary rules, regulations, and agreements, and otherwise do such things as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of the provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

WAURIKA PROJECT

The House bill did not contain any provision authorizing the Waurika reclamation project.

Section 205 of the Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; provided for allocation of the cost of this project among a number of purposes; authorized transfer to a water users' organization the care, operation, and maintenance of certain works; authorized construction of certain recreational facilities; and authorized an appropriation of \$25,019,500 for construction, and a continuing authorization for operation and maintenance.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

SMALL PROJECTS

The House bill amended section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the scope of application of that provision of law. The House bill, among other things, increased from \$400,000 to \$2,000,000 the ceiling upon the amount authorized to be allocated to a project in any one locality and provided that no construction should be undertaken under this section on a project with a Federal cost in excess of \$1,000,000, unless that project had been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively.

The Senate amendment reduced to \$1,000,000 the amount which can be allocated to a project for any one locality and eliminated completely the provisions relating to approval by resolutions of the committees of the Congress.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

EMERGENCY FUND

Section 207 of the Senate amendment amends section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, to extend the application of the emergency fund authorized in that section to emergency conditions relating to federally authorized hurricane or shore protection necessary to protect against imminent and substantial loss of life and property, and for the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure damaged or destroyed by wind,

44 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature when necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the structure for hurricane or shore protection.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Section 208 of the Senate amendment amends section 4 of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended, to revise existing law relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Army to construct, maintain, and operate public parks and recreational facilities.

This revision is essentially the same as existing law, except that—

1. Existing law is expanded to include recreational facilities not only in reservoir areas but also in any water resource development project under the control of the Army.

2. The construction, maintenance, and operation of recreational facilities is authorized to be carried out by local interests (particularly those to be operated and maintained by such interests).

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

IMPROVEMENT, RECONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ROADS

Section 209 of the Senate amendment amends section 207 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 to substitute a revision of existing law relating to utilization, construction, and relocation of public roads in connection with the construction of flood control, navigation, or multiple-purpose projects for the development of water resources.

This revision is essentially the same as existing law except that it has been expanded to include irrigation projects constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and a provision has been added that whenever a substitute road is to be constructed, if a State or political subdivision thereof requires that it be constructed to a higher standard than would otherwise be applicable and the requesting State or political subdivision pays, before the beginning of construction, the additional necessary costs, then such road is authorized to be constructed at the requested higher standard. Federal costs under section 207(c) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 are to be part of the nonreimbursable project costs.

The House bill contains no provision on this subject.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SAVANNAH RIVER

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment grant to Duke Power Co. authority to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Savannah River between Anderson County, S.C., and Elbert County, Ga.

The proposed conference substitute deletes this authorization.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 45**TROTTERS SHOAL RESERVOIR**

Section 210(b) of the Senate amendment authorized the project for Trotters Shoal Reservoir on the Savannah River at an estimated cost of \$78,700,000 subject to the approval of the President.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

FLOOD CONTROL SURVEYS

Section 211 of the Senate amendment authorized the same surveys for flood control as were contained in the House bill, and added other surveys.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for flood control of the Arkansas River Basin, with reference to the effect of Eufaula and Keystone Reservoirs, Okla., on the water supply facilities of the cities of McAlester and Yale, respectively, to determine the extent of Federal participation in the replacement of such facilities in equity without regard to other limitations.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, but changes the phrase "the extent of Federal participation" to read "the extent, if any, of Federal participation" in order to make it clear that this legislation does not constitute a commitment that there will necessarily be any such Federal participation.

CUMBERLAND RIVER

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for flood control of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., with reference to the effect of the Barkley Dam project, on the water supply and sewage treatment facilities of Cadiz, Kuttawa, and Eddyville, Ky., and the State penitentiary at Eddyville, Ky., with a view to determining the extent of Federal participation in replacement of such facilities in equity without regard to existing limitations.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, but changes the phrase "the extent of Federal participation" to read "the extent, if any, of Federal participation" in order to make it clear that this legislation does not constitute a commitment that there will necessarily be any such Federal participation.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for flood control of the Missouri River Basin, with reference to the effect of Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs, North and South Dakota, on the sewage treatment facilities of Bismarck and Mandan, N. Dak., respectively, with a view to determining the extent of Federal participation in the sewage treatment facilities without regard to existing limitations.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

46 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, but changes the phrase "the extent of Federal participation" to read "the extent, if any, of Federal participation" in order to make it clear that this legislation does not constitute a commitment that there will necessarily be any such Federal participation.

KASKASKIA RIVER LEVEES

The Senate amendment authorized with respect to the Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois, a review of requirements of local cooperation. The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON

The Senate amendment authorized a survey of Puget Sound, Wash., in the interest of flood control, navigation, and other water uses and related land resources.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

HARBORS AND RIVERS IN HAWAII

The Senate amendment authorized a survey of harbors and rivers in Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

WAIMEA RIVER, KOKEE AREA, KAUAI, HAWAII

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for multiple purposes of Waimea River, Kokee area, Kauai, Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

WAIPIO RIVER, ISLAND OF HAWAII

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for multiple purpose development of Waipio River, Kohala-Hamakua coast, island of Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

IAO RIVER, HAWAII

The Senate amendment authorized a survey of Iao River, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Section 212 of the Senate amendment authorizes an additional \$100,000,000 for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT 47

undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the act approved December 22, 1944.

The House bill did not contain such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

CHICOT COUNTY BRIDGES

Section 213 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army to replace the bridge over Boeuf River, Chicot County, Ark., approximately 3 miles north of the county line, and the bridge over Big Bayou, Chicot County, Ark., approximately 2 miles upstream from its confluence with the Boeuf River which were destroyed recently by floods at an estimated cost of \$115,000.

The House bill did not authorize these bridges.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

WILKESBORO RESERVOIR

Section 214 of the Senate amendment designates the Wilkesboro Reservoir as the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir in honor of the late Senator Scott of North Carolina.

The House bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE III—WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

The Senate amendment contained a title III which establishes the Commission to be known as the Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

Subsection (a) of section 302 recites the necessity for a full and complete investigation and study and survey of land and water resources within the Wabash River Basin consisting of the watershed of the entire Wabash River and its tributaries, located within the States of Indiana and Illinois.

Subsection (b) of section 302 provides the Commission will be the principal agency for coordination of Federal, State, and local plans for this basin, will prepare and keep up to date the comprehensive integrated joint plan for such basin; will recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in the basin; and will foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the basin.

Section 303 provides for the composition and appointment of the Commission.

Section 304 provides for the organization and administration of the Commission.

Section 305 provides the functions and duties of the Commission. These are as follows: (1) to engage in such activities, and make such studies and investigations necessary or desirable to carry out section 302, (2) to submit annually to the President, Congress, and other interested agencies a report on its work, and (3) to submit, after

48 OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

proper clearance with interested agencies, to the President, a comprehensive integrated joint plan for water and related resources development in the Wabash Basin.

Subsection (b) of section 305 provides for periodic reports by individual members of the Commission to the agencies or States or other commissions from which he was appointed.

Section 306 provides the necessary authority to hold hearings, take testimony, print and distribute proceedings and reports, acquire space, and other necessary authority to carry out the provisions of this title, including the appointment of personnel.

Section 307 provides that members of the Commission appointed from agencies of the Federal Government shall receive no additional compensation and that certain other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of \$75 per day but not more than \$7,500 in any 1 year.

The House bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this title.

EARLY HEARINGS

The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika Reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr.

Managers on the Part of the House.



HQ AR005554-HQ AR005803

87th Congress, 2d Session

House Report No. 2504

RIVER AND HARBOR, BEACH EROSION,
AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
ON

H.R. 13273

A BILL AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR,
AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON
RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD
CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES



OCTOBER 1, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1962

90048

HQ AR005554

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland	JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
OLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee	GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota	WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi	FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois	EDWIN B. DOOLEY, New York
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana	HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia	PERKINS BASS, New Hampshire
JIM WRIGHT, Texas	WALTER L. McVEY, Kansas
W. R. HULL, Jr., Missouri	CARLETON J. KING, New York
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois	WILLIAM H. HARSHIA, Jr., Ohio
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania	JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma	JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania
JOHN J. McFALL, California	LOUISE G. REECE, Tennessee
GRACIE FFOST, Idaho	
JOHN YOUNG, Texas	
FRANK W. BURKE, Kentucky	
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	
ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland	JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
OLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee	WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia	EDWIN B. DOOLEY, New York
JOHN J. McFALL, California	PERKINS BASS, New Hampshire
JOHN YOUNG, Texas	WALTER L. McVEY, Kansas
FRANK W. BURKE, Kentucky	WILLIAM H. HARSHIA, Jr., Ohio
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio	
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

OLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee, *Chairman*

FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi	JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana	HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
JIM WRIGHT, Texas	CARLETON J. KING, New York
W. R. HULL, Jr., Missouri	WILLIAM H. HARSHIA, Jr., Ohio
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois	JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania	LOUISE G. REECE, Tennessee
GRACIE FFOST, Idaho	
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	

MARGARET R. BEITER, *Chief Clerk*
 JOSEPH R. BRENNAN, *Engineer-Consultant*
 RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*
 CLIFTON W. ENFIELD, *Minority Counsel*

INDEX

PROJECT OR ITEM	Page
Rivers and harbors:	
Big Sandy River, Ky., lock and dam No. 3.....	231
Buffalo Harbor, N.Y.....	75
Buttermilk Channel, N.Y.....	20
Calcasieu River, La.....	37
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.....	61
Carvers Harbor, Maine.....	5
Caseville Harbor, Mich.....	65
Chelsea Harbor, Mass.....	13
Chicago Harbor, Ill.....	62
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.....	71
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg.....	86
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.....	87
Conneaut Harbor, Ohio.....	72
Dana Point, Calif.....	79
Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.....	14
Erie Harbor, Pa.....	74
Flushing Bay and Creek, N.Y.....	18
Gladstone Harbor and Kipling, Mich.....	55
Gloucester Harbor, Mass.....	11
Great Sodus Bay Harbor, N.Y.....	76
Green Bay Harbor, Wis.....	56
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Palacios, Tex.....	43
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Victoria, Tex.....	44
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, La., Tex. section.....	35
Holt lock and dam, Alabama.....	32
Huron Harbor, Ohio.....	69
Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind.....	46
Kaskaskia River, Ill.....	47
Kaunakakai Harbor, Hawaii.....	92
Kennebunk River, Maine.....	8
Kenosha Harbor, Wis.....	57
Key West Harbor, Fla.....	28
Kingston Harbor.....	90
Leland Harbor, Mich.....	53
Little Neck Bay, N.Y.....	17
Lynnhaven Inlet Bay, Va.....	23
Manitowac Harbor, Wis.....	58
Marblehead Harbor, Mass.....	12
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.....	60
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico.....	34
Mississippi River, Clarksville, Mo.....	38
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri.....	48
Muskegon Harbor, Mich.....	52
Narraguagus Harbor, Maine.....	4
Newark Bay, Hackensack, and Passaic Rivers, N.J.....	21
New Buffalo Harbor, Mich.....	64
Noyo River and Harbor, Calif.....	84
Oakland Harbor, Calif.....	82
Oakland Harbor, Fruitvale Avenue Branch, Calif.....	81
Ontonagon Harbor, Mich.....	51
Oswego Harbor, N.Y.....	77
Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.....	32

III

IV

INDEX

Rivers and harbors—Continued	Page
Pawtuxet Cove, R.I.	16
Pensacola Harbor, Fla.	31
Plymouth Harbor, Mass.	15
Portland Harbor, Maine	7
Portsmouth Harbor, N.H. and Maine	9
Port Sutton and Ybor Channel, Tampa Harbor, Fla.	29
Raritan River, N.J.	22
Rollinson Channel, N.C.	24
Rouge River, Mich.	68
Sabine-Neches Waterway	40
Saginaw River, Mich.	67
Sandy Slough, Mo.	39
Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.	80
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	27
Searsport Harbor, Maine	6
Swinomish Channel, Wash.	91
Tacoma Harbor, Wash.	88
Trinity River, Wallisville, Tex.	42
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	30
Wilmington Harbor, N.C.	26
Beach erosion:	
Fire Island Inlet and shore westerly to Jones Inlet, Long Island, N.Y.	95
Fort Macon, Atlantic Beach, N.C.	97
Ohio shore of Lake Erie, Marblehead, Ohio	100
Ohio shore of Lake Erie, Sheffield Lake	101
Shore of New Hampshire	93
Ventura, Pierpont Area, Calif.	102
Virginia Beach, Va.	96
Virginia and Biscayne Keys, Fla.	98
Flood control:	
Alameda Creek, Calif.	210
Alamogordo, N.M.	153
Allegheny River at Salamanca, N.Y.	186
Arkansas, Red River Basin, Okla.	166
Arkansas River, Dodge City, Kans.	157
Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Wash.	227
Blackfoot Dam, Idaho	226
Bradley Lake power project, Cook Inlet, Alaska	229
Broken Bow Reservoir, Okla.	167
Buchanan Reservoir, Calif.	216
Buckhannon River, W. Va.	180
Burns Creek, Idaho	224
Carolina Beach, N.C.	132
Chattahoochee River at West Point, Ga.	133
China Gardens Dam, Idaho, Oreg., and Wash.	228
Chunky Creek, Chickasaway and Pascagoula Rivers, Miss.	139
Clear Fork of the Brazos River at Abilene, Tex.	152
Columbia Drainage and Levee District No. 3, Ill.	196
Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, Calif.	212
Cow Creek, Kans.	156
Crab Creek, Ohio	183
Cutler Drain Area, Fla.	136
Dade County, central and southern Fla.	135
Delaware River, Pa., N.J., Del., and Md.	122
East Fork of Trinity River, Texas	147
Fort Worth Floodway, Tex.	149
Four River Basins, Fla.	137
Freeport and vicinity, Tex.	146
French Creek, Pa.	187
Guyandot River, W. Va.	181
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing, Ill.	195
Hidden Reservoir, Calif.	214
Hugo Reservoir, Kiamich River, Okla.	169
Illinois River and tributaries	189
Indian Creek, Iowa	175
Juniata River, Pa.	120
Kansas River Basin	172
Kaw Reservoir, Okla.	161

INDEX

v

	Page
Flood control—Continued	
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo.....	170
Kentucky River, Ky.....	179
Kickapoo River, Wis.....	203
Kokosing River, Ohio.....	176
Lake Kemp, Wichita River, Tex.....	165
Los Angeles River Basin, Calif.....	220
Mad River, Ohio.....	178
Mississippi River Delta at and below New Orleans, La.....	140
Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa.....	193
Mississippi River, St. Genevieve-St. Marys, Mo.....	194
Mississippi River upper urban areas from Hampton, Ill. to Cassville, Wis.....	202
Mystic, Groton, and Stonington, Conn.....	114
Narragansett Pier, R.I.....	110
Natchitoches and Red River Parishes, La.....	142
Naugatuck-Ansonia-Derby, Conn.....	115
New London, Conn.....	111
New Melones Reservoir, Calif.....	213
Norfolk, Va.....	130
Papillion Creek, Nebr.....	174
Pecatonica River, Ill. and Wis.....	201
Point Judith, R.I.....	108
Port Arthur and vicinity, Texas.....	145
Potomac River, North Branch, Md.....	128
Prairie Dupont Levee and Sanitary District, Illinois.....	197
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, N.J.....	118
Redwood Creek, Calif.....	219
Rend Lake Reservoir, Ill.....	191
Richland Creek, Ill.....	199
Rio Grande at Las Cruces, N. Mex.....	154
Ririe Dam and Reservoir, Idaho.....	225
River Rouge, Mich.....	206
Rogue River, Oreg.....	222
Rondout Creek and Walkkill River, N.Y. and N.J.....	116
Russellville, Ark.....	155
Russian River, Calif.....	218
Saline River, Ill.....	188
Salt River, Mo.....	200
Sandusky River, Ohio.....	207
San Gabriel River, Tex.....	150
Scioto River, Ohio.....	184
Trinity River, Fort Worth, Tex., part II.....	147
Truckee River, Calif. and Nev.....	208
Twelvepole Creek, W. Va.....	182
Verdigris River, Okla.....	158
Village Creek-White River-Mayberry, Ark.....	163
Vince and Little Vince Bayous, Tex.....	144
Wareham and Marion, Mass.....	106
Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek, Minn.....	205
Westport, Conn.....	112
White River, Village Creek, Ark.....	164
Will M. Whittington auxiliary channel, Mississippi.....	144
Yazoo River-Gin Bayou, Miss.....	140
Section 101. Project authorizations.....	2
Section 102. Beach erosion control.....	231
Section 103. Old lock and dam, Ohio River.....	103
Section 104. Beach erosion control reimbursement.....	104
Section 105. Redondo Beach, King Harbor, Calif.....	232
Section 106. Surveys.....	104
Section 107. Title I designation.....	104
Section 201. Provisions of local cooperation.....	104
Section 202. Procedure for submitting reports.....	104
Section 203. Project authorizations.....	104
Section 204. Small flood control project authorization.....	230
Section 205. Savannah River, Ga.....	231
Section 206. Surveys.....	231
Section 207. Title II designation.....	231

87TH CONGRESS 2d Session	}	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	}	REPORT No. 2504
-----------------------------	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------

RIVER AND HARBOR, BEACH EROSION CONTROL, AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, 1962

OCTOBER 1, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, from the Committee on Public Works,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 13273]

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The committee amendments are shown in linetype and italic in the reported bill.

The River and Harbor Subcommittee and the Flood Control Subcommittee have taken testimony on all the matters contained in the bill, beginning on May 8, 1962. Both subcommittees and the full committee have met in executive sessions for discussion of these matters.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

H.R. 13273 is similar to the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bills of 1960 and preceding years, which have been considered at intervals of 2 to 4 years.

The purposes of the bill are to authorize construction of certain projects for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and other purposes, on which favorable recommendations have been made by the Chief of Engineers; authorize an increase in the monetary authorization for one comprehensive river basin plan previously approved by the Congress; authorize surveys of problems on streams and at other localities, to be carried out by the Corps of Engineers; provide for reimbursement to local interests for work done on authorized beach erosion control projects, and other matters.

2 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

The bill is divided into two parts. Title I covers river and harbor works, including navigation and beach erosion control projects and matters related thereto. Title II covers flood control works, hurricane protection works, multiple-purpose works including and related to flood control and hurricane protection, and matters related thereto. The monetary amounts for authorization in each title are summarized in the table following these introductory paragraphs.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

A full explanation of the committee amendments is given starting on page 231.

NEED FOR BILL

Over the years, the Congress has evolved a body of legislation establishing the Federal interest in civil works projects for many purposes. As a result of a number of authorizing acts, a considerable Federal program of such projects has been developed. However, many other problems and meritorious projects still await study and consideration. Continuing study and revision of the program in keeping with current and prospective needs are essential to sound regional and national development and to efficient use of the Nation's financial and natural resources. The projects contained in this bill are the results of such study, completed almost entirely since the authorization act of July 14, 1960. The bill is necessary to provide authorization for their undertaking, and for effective continuing undertaking of certain comprehensive river basin plans and programs previously authorized by the Congress.

The committee urges passage of this bill.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Monetary summary of bill

TITLE I

	Number	Amount
Navigation projects.....	71	\$406,930,000
Beach erosion.....	8	1,775,800
Total, title I.....	79	408,705,800

TITLE II

Projects.....	86	\$1,595,313,500
Basin authorization.....	1	3,700,000
Total, title II.....	87	1,599,013,500
Grand total.....	167	2,307,719,300

ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

SECTION 101

This section summarizes the project authorizations for navigation and beach erosion control works in title I. The initial table lists the projects, project document numbers, and estimated Federal costs. Pertinent information follows for each project.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

3

TITLE I. RIVERS AND HARBORS

Navigation projects

Projects	Document No.	Federal cost of new work
Big Sandy River, Ky., lock and dam No. 3.....		\$200,000
Buffalo Harbor, N.Y.....	H. 451, 87th Cong.....	2,797,000
Buttermilk Channel, N.Y.....	H. 483, 87th Cong.....	2,228,000
Calcasieu River, La.....	H. 582, 87th Cong.....	3,310,000
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.....		11,464,000
Carvers Harbor, Maine.....	S. 118, 87th Cong.....	205,000
Caseville Harbor, Mich.....	H. 64, 87th Cong.....	327,000
Chelsea Harbor, Mass.....	H. 350, 87th Cong.....	2,843,000
Chicago Harbor, Ill.....	H. 485, 87th Cong.....	1,505,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.....	H. 527, 87th Cong.....	888,000
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg.....	H. 203, 87th Cong.....	493,000
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash. and Oreg.....	H. 452, 87th Cong.....	20,100,000
Conneaut Harbor, Ohio.....	H. 415, 87th Cong.....	6,179,000
Dana Point, Calif.....	H. 532, 87th Cong.....	3,730,000
Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.....	S. 126, 87th Cong.....	7,050,000
Erie Harbor, Pa.....	H. 340, 87th Cong.....	671,000
Flushing Bay and Creek, N.Y.....	H. 551, 87th Cong.....	1,695,000
Gladstone Harbor and Kipling, Mich.....	H. 480, 87th Cong.....	350,000
Gloucester Harbor, Mass.....	H. 341, 87th Cong.....	1,100,000
Great Sodus Bay Harbor, N.Y.....	H. 138, 87th Cong.....	765,000
Green Bay Harbor, Wis.....	H. 470, 87th Cong.....	4,270,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Palacios, Tex.....	H. 504, 87th Cong.....	815,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Victoria, Tex.....	H. 288, 87th Cong.....	1,590,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana and Texas section.....	H. —, 87th Cong.....	25,540,000
Holt lock and dam, Alabama.....		
Huron Harbor, Ohio.....	H. 165, 87th Cong.....	8,557,000
Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind.....	H. 31, 86th Cong.....	114,052,000
Kaskaskia River, Ill.....	S. 44, 87th Cong.....	58,200,000
Kaunakakai Harbor, Hawaii.....	H. 484, 87th Cong.....	7,919,000
Kennebunk River, Maine.....	H. 459, 87th Cong.....	270,000
Kenosha Harbor, Wis.....	H. 406, 87th Cong.....	673,000
Key West Harbor, Fla.....	S. 106, 87th Cong.....	820,000
Leland Harbor, Mich.....	H. 413, 87th Cong.....	485,000
Little Neck Bay, N.Y.....	H. 510, 87th Cong.....	2,185,000
Lynnhaven Inlet Bay, Va.....	H. —, 87th Cong.....	1,068,000
Manitowoc Harbor, Wis.....	H. 479, 87th Cong.....	719,000
Marblehead Harbor, Mass.....	H. 516, 87th Cong.....	1,752,000
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.....	H. 134, 87th Cong.....	4,029,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico.....	S. 36, 87th Cong.....	357,000
Mississippi River, Clarksville, Mo.....	H. 552, 87th Cong.....	103,300
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.....	H. 513, 87th Cong.....	1,205,000
Muskegon Harbor, Mich.....	H. 474, 87th Cong.....	609,000
Narraguagus Harbor, Maine.....	H. 530, 87th Cong.....	500,000
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N.J.....		
New Buffalo Harbor, Mich.....	H. 481, 87th Cong.....	687,000
Noyo River and Harbor, Calif.....	S. 121, 87th Cong.....	13,231,000
Oakland Harbor, Calif.....	H. 353, 87th Cong.....	6,775,000
Oakland Harbor, Fruitvale Avenue Bridge, Calif.....	S. 75, 87th Cong.....	1,750,000
Ontonagon Harbor, Mich.....	H. 287, 87th Cong.....	4,741,000
Oswego Harbor, N.Y.....	H. 471, 87th Cong.....	1,180,000
Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.....	H. 560, 87th Cong.....	4,870,000
Pawtuxet Cove, R.I.....	H. 236, 87th Cong.....	210,000
Pensacola Harbor, Fla.....	H. 528, 87th Cong.....	424,000
Plymouth Harbor, Mass.....	S. 124, 87th Cong.....	1,200,000
Portland Harbor, Maine.....	H. 216, 87th Cong.....	8,340,000
Portsmouth Harbor, N.H. and Maine.....	H. 482, 87th Cong.....	7,500,000
Port Sutton and Ybor Channel, Tampa Harbor, Fla.....	H. 529, 87th Cong.....	997,000
Puget Sound-Kingston Harbor, Wash.....	H. 417, 87th Cong.....	428,000
Raritan River, N.J.....	H. 455, 86th Cong.....	Maintenance
Rollinson Channel, N.C.....	H. 457, 87th Cong.....	652,000
Rouge River, Mich.....	H. 509, 87th Cong.....	257,000
Sabine Neches Waterway.....	H. 553, 87th Cong.....	20,830,000
Saginaw River, Mich.....	H. 544, 87th Cong.....	4,780,000
Sandy Slough, Mo.....	H. 419, 87th Cong.....	195,000
Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.....	H. 518, 87th Cong.....	3,000,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga.....	S. 115, 87th Cong.....	605,000
Searsport Harbor, Maine.....	H. 500, 87th Cong.....	700,000
Swinomish Channel, Wash.....	H. 409, 87th Cong.....	887,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash.....	S. 104, 87th Cong.....	2,460,000
Trinity River, Wallisville, Tex.....	H. 215, 87th Cong.....	3,182,000
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia.....	S. 109, 87th Cong.....	500,000
Wilmington Harbor, N.C.....	S. 114, 87th Cong.....	6,370,000
Total.....		406,930,300

4 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Beach erosion projects

Projects	Document No.	Federal cost of new work
Fire Island Inlet and shore westerly to Jones Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.		
Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach, N. C.	H. —, 87th Cong.	\$194,000
Ohio shore of Lake Erie:		
Marblehead, Ohio.	H. 63, 87th Cong.	658,500
Sheffield Lake.	H. 414, 87th Cong.	100,300
Shore of New Hampshire.	H. 416, 87th Cong.	88,000
Ventura-Pierpont area, California.	H. 468, 87th Cong.	515,000
Virginia Beach, Va.	H. 382, 87th Cong.	(1)
Virginia and Biscayne Keys, Fla.	H. 561, 87th Cong.	220,000
Total.		1,775,800

1 Periodic nourishment.

NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, MAINE

(H. Doc. 530, 87th Cong.)

Location.—In northeastern Maine about 35 miles east of Bangor.*Authority.*—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 27, 1956.*Existing project.*—Provides for a channel 200 feet wide and 11 feet deep from deep water in the bay to the original location of lower steamboat wharf, thence 9 feet deep to the anchorage known as Deep Hole; a total distance of 1.5 miles.*Navigation problem.*—The present shallow depths hamper movement of loaded fishing craft to the canneries and there is a need for sheltered anchorage areas in the locality.*Recommended plan of improvement.*—Provides for a channel 11 feet deep and 150 feet wide from deep water in Narraguagus Bay to Wyman; thence 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide to Milbridge, with widening opposite Milbridge for an anchorage; and thence 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the proposed town landing downstream from the highway bridge, with widening near the landing for an anchorage.*Estimated cost (price level of March 1962).*—

Federal	\$500,000
Non-Federal	5,000
Total	505,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	\$14,400	\$300	\$14,700
Maintenance	7,900		7,900
Total	22,300	300	22,600
Annual benefits:			
Increased fish catch			14,400
Reduced fish spoilage			21,600
Total			36,000

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

5

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for initial dredging and subsequent maintenance of the improvement and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvements; provide and maintain without cost to the United States a suitable public landing at Milbridge with adequate supply facilities open to all on equal terms, in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States adequate docking facilities at the terminals, including depths in berthing areas commensurate with the related project depths. They have indicated willingness to meet the requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maine: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objections.

CARVERS HARBOR, VINALHAVEN, MAINE

(S. Doc. 118, 87th Cong.)

Location.—On the southwest side of Vinalhaven Island at the mouth of Penobscot Bay, about 15 miles southeast of Rockland, Maine.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted January 18, 1949.

Existing project.—Consist of dredging to a depth of 16 feet an area of 23 acres in the central part of the inner harbor; and to a depth of 10 feet two adjoining areas on the southeast, totaling 7 acres.

Navigation problem.—The principal difficulties are the maneuvering and docking of boats in the harbor at low tide.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for deepening to 10 feet the area extending northwest from the present 23-acre anchorage to a line generally 50 feet from the existing wharves; and a channel 6 feet deep from the anchorage extension to the northeast part of the harbor, 75 feet wide for a distance of 325 feet, thence increasing to a width of 150 feet for a distance of 175 feet to form a basin.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1962).—

Federal.....	\$205, 000
Non-Federal.....	
Total.....	205, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$6, 100		\$6, 100
Maintenance.....	1, 200		1, 200
Total.....	7, 300		7, 300
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....			16, 100

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for initial dredging and subsequent maintenance of the improvement upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas as may be determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvement; provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States a suitable public landing at the northeast end of the harbor open to all on equal terms and with adequate supply facilities and access to the dredged channel, in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maine: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

SEARSPORT HARBOR, MAINE

(H. Doc. 500, 87th Cong.)

Location.—On the west side of Penobscot Bay about 30 miles from the entrance.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 3, 1959.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project at Searsport Harbor.

Navigation problem.—Shallow approach depths and limited turning areas of adequate depth require that larger vessels proceed to their berths at high tide and limit the size of vessels that may use the port.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for the construction of an access channel 500 feet wide, 35 feet deep to the deepwater piers at Mack Point, Searsport Harbor, Maine, with a turning basin of the same depth and a maximum width of 1,500 feet.

Estimated cost (price level of March 1962).—

Federal.....	\$700, 000
Non-Federal.....	
Total.....	700, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$20, 300		\$20, 300
Maintenance.....	6, 200		6, 200
Total.....	26, 500		26, 500
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....			474, 000

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

7

Benefit-cost ratio.—17.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project, and for construction and maintenance of aids to navigation, on request of the Chief of Engineers; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths commensurate with the project depth in the berths and berth access channels of the two deep-draft wharves.

Comments of the State and Federal Agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maine: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

PORTLAND HARBOR, MAINE

(H. Doc. 216, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Portland Harbor is at the southwest end of Casco Bay on the Maine coast, 100 miles northeast of Boston, Mass.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 20, 1957.

Existing project.—The Federal navigation project provides for two anchorages, one 35 feet deep northwest of House Island, the other 30 feet deep east of the city; a channel 35 feet deep from the sea to the Boston & Maine Railroad Bridge with a turning basin 35 feet deep; a channel 30 feet deep from the anchorage of that depth to the mouth of Back Cove, thence 14 and 12 feet deep within the cove; removal of obstructing rock ledges from the 40-foot channel; a breakwater 900 feet long at Spring Point, and one 2,000 feet long south of the inner harbor entrance; and maintenance of Soldier Ledge Channel in Hussey Sound to a depth of 40 feet.

Navigation problem.—Existing shoals in the outer harbor seriously restrict, or prevent, maneuvering of large tankers, and existing harbor depths are inadequate.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing project provides for an entrance channel 1,000 feet wide and 45 feet deep, from deep water in Casco Bay to a line about opposite Fort Gorges, and for a 45-foot depth in the House Island anchorage.

Estimated cost (September 1960 price level).—

Federal.....	\$8, 340, 000
Non-Federal.....	0
Total.....	8, 340, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$303, 700		\$303, 700
Increased maintenance.....	4, 100		4, 100
Total.....	307, 800		307, 800
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings.....			1, 464, 000
Elimination of tidal delays.....			366, 700
Total.....			1, 830, 700

8 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Benefit-cost ratio.—6.0.

Local cooperation.—Requires that local interests agree to, hold, and save the United States free from damages due to construction and subsequent maintenance, and provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required including spoil-disposal areas and bulkheads, dikes, and embankments necessary thereto. Local interests have indicated willingness to cooperate in the desired improvements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maine: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection; however, they consider that, if the project is authorized by Congress, funds to initiate construction should be requested only upon a determination that the economic justification for the project is not significantly impaired in light of Canadian oil policy as it may appear at that time.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the project should be authorized at this time.

KENNEBUNK RIVER, MAINE

(H. Doc. 459, 87th Cong.)

Location.—The Kennebunk River is located in southwestern Maine and discharges into the Atlantic Ocean about 30 miles southwest of Portland.

Authority.—Resolution, House Public Works Committee, adopted June 3, 1959.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel 4 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and about 1 mile long from the ocean to Kennebunkport; three stone jetties, one 550 feet long on the east side of the river mouth, another 290 feet long on the west side, and a third of no specified length on the east bank.

Navigation problem.—Inadequate depths and insufficient anchorage areas result in lost fishing time and boat damage to the existing fishing and pleasure boat fleet.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide, extending 1,700 feet from deep water to the town landing, thence 6 feet depth over a width of 100 feet for a distance of 2,300 feet, and a width of 75 feet for the remaining 2,000 feet to the project limit; an anchorage, 4 acres in area, on the west side of the channel, and an anchorage 2 acres in area on the east side, each 6 feet deep; and extension of the west jetty by about 300 feet, supplemented by construction of a sand fence.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

9

Estimated cost (price level of September 1961).—

Federal.....	\$270, 000
Non-Federal.....	90, 000
Total.....	360, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$8, 000	\$3, 250	\$11, 250
Maintenance.....	4, 300		4, 300
Total.....	12, 300	3, 250	15, 550
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented.....			3, 800
Commercial fishing.....			29, 830
Recreational boating.....			27, 230
Total.....			60, 860

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.9.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 25 percent of the first cost of construction due to recreational boating benefits, such contribution presently estimated at \$90,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvements; and improve and maintain the existing public landing, including access to the dredged channel, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have expressed a willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maine: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, MAINE AND N.H.

(H. Doc. 482, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Portsmouth Harbor is located 45 miles northeast of Boston Harbor and 37 miles southwest of Portland Harbor at the mouth of the Piscataqua River. The river is about 13 miles long and forms a portion of the boundary of the States of Maine and New Hampshire.

Authority.—The report is in partial response to resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives on November 18, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing project for Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H., completed in 1956, provides for

10 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

the removal of ledge rock areas in the vicinity of Gangway Rock, southwest point of Badgers Island, and Boiling Rock to a depth of 35 feet.

Navigation problem.—High velocity current flows and a tortuous channel with sharp bends and submerged ledges makes navigation for deep-draft vessels hazardous.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for improvement of the river channel from Henderson Point to Newington by widening and deepening to 35 feet below mean low water the bends at Henderson Point, Gangway Rock, and the southwesterly point of Badgers Island; widening the channel between Badgers Island and Nobles Island; widening the bend east of the Maine-New Hampshire interstate bridge to provide a better approach to the bridge; removing the 26-foot shoal at the south edge of the channel west of the Maine-New Hampshire interstate bridge; widening the bend at Boiling Rock including removal of the pinnacle of Boiling Rock; providing a 950-foot-wide turning basin immediately upstream; and improving the channel from Boiling Rock to Newington to a depth of 35 feet, generally 400 feet wide, and providing a turning basin 850 feet wide by dredging shoals.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962).—

Federal.....	\$7, 500, 000
Non-Federal.....	0
Total.....	7, 500, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$214, 000	0	\$214, 000
Maintenance dredging.....	10, 000		10, 000
Maintenance on navigation aids.....	600		600
Total.....	224, 600		224, 600
Annual benefits: Savings in transportation costs.....			482, 000
Total.....			482, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have agreed to furnish the required items of local cooperation.

Comments of the States and Federal Agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maine: Favorable.

State of New Hampshire: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 11

GLOUCESTER HARBOR, MASS.

(H. Doc. 341, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Gloucester Harbor, Mass., is at the southern end of Cape Ann, about 25 miles northeast of Boston Harbor.

Authority.—Two similar resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on March 30, 1955.

Existing project.—Provides in general for a rubblestone breakwater 2,250 feet long; removal of three ledges in the inner harbor and five ledges in the outer harbor; removal, to a depth of 15 feet, of ledges and boulders obstructing the approach to the wharves; and dredging, to 15 feet below mean low water, of the channel leading past the wharves; and dredging Harbor Cove to a depth of 10 feet at mean low water. It also provides for an 8-foot channel through Annisquam River.

Navigation problem.—Greater channel dimensions and the removal of rock obstructions are needed for safe navigation. Additional anchorage areas also are needed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for an entrance channel into the inner harbor, 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep, with a turning basin 600 feet wide; an access channel, 200 to 250 feet wide and 20 feet deep, along the waterfront to the northwest of the Gloucester fish pier; an access channel, 200 feet wide and 20 feet deep, along the waterfront southeast of the Gloucester fish pier; an access channel, 650 to 300 feet wide and 16 feet deep extending into Smith Cove; an access channel varying from 500 to 100 feet wide and 18 feet deep, along the waterfront west of Harbor Cove and into Harbor Cove; an anchorage of about 5 acres, 15 feet deep; east of the entrance to Harbor Cove; an anchorage of about 10 acres, 16 feet deep, opposite the entrance to Smith Cove; and removal of the isolated rock shoal adjacent to the entrance channel south of Harbor Cove, to a depth of 24 feet.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1960).—

Federal.....	\$1, 100, 000
Non-Federal.....	0
Total.....	1, 100, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$40, 700	0	\$40, 700
Increased maintenance.....	14, 300	0	14, 300
Total.....	55, 000	0	55, 000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented.....			14, 000
Elimination of tidal delays.....			133, 600
Total.....			147, 000

12 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.7.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction of the project, and for construction and maintenance of aids to navigation, upon the request of the Chief of Engineers; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; provide and maintain depths in berthing areas and local access channels, commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas; and provided further that, if it is determined in detailed studies that spoil-disposal areas are needed, local interests agree to furnish, upon request of the Chief of Engineers, and without cost to the United States, any such areas required including such dikes, bulkheads, and embankments as may be necessary for the initial dredging and subsequent maintenance. Local interests are willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Massachusetts: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

MARBLEHEAD HARBOR, MASS.

(H. Doc. 516, 87th Cong.)

Location.—North of Boston about halfway between Boston and Gloucester, Mass.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 2, 1949.

Existing project.—The Federal navigation project provides for a 13-acre anchorage area 20 feet deep; a 16-acre anchorage area 9 feet deep; and repair to the seawall.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for additional anchorage area and greater protection for present and future fleets using the harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for construction of a stone breakwater 1,200 feet long and that the existing project be abandoned.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1961).—

Federal.....	\$1, 752, 000
Non-Federal.....	648, 000
Total	2, 400, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and mortization.....	\$50, 140	633, 460	\$73, 600
Maintenance and operation.....	18, 750		18, 750
Total.....	68, 890	633, 460	702, 350
Annual benefits:			
Commercial fishing.....			55, 400
Recreational boating.....			66, 100
Total.....			121, 500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 27 percent of the first cost of construction due to benefits to recreational boating, such contribution

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 13

presently estimated at \$648,000 to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and maintenance of the project when and as required, including access for a contractor and his equipment to construct the breakwater from land; hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; and provide assurances that the existing public landings or their equivalent will be adequately maintained during the life of the project and will be open to all on equal terms. Local interests have provided assurances that the requirements of local cooperation will be met.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Massachusetts: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

CHELSEA RIVER (BOSTON HARBOR), MASS.

(H. Doc. 350, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Chelsea River is a coastal stream emptying into Boston Harbor, Mass.

Authority.—Resolution of the Public Works Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, adopted February 1, 1946.

Existing project.—The Federal navigation project consists of a channel 30 feet deep and generally 200 feet wide from the mouth of the river, upstream for a distance of 2.0 miles; thence 8.4 feet deep and 150 feet wide for a distance of 0.5 mile to the head of navigation.

Navigation problem.—Inadequate depths make navigation hazardous and result in delays to deep-draft commercial traffic using the harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a channel in Chelsea River 35 feet deep from the Boston Harbor main ship channel to the Chelsea Street Bridge generally 225 to 250 feet in width; a channel 35 feet deep varying in width from 250 to 430 feet above the Chelsea Street Bridge; a maneuvering basin 35 feet deep with 800 feet average width and 1,000 feet average length; and deauthorization of the 30- and 8.4-foot channels lying in the waterway outside the presently recommended 35-foot project limits for Chelsea River.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1960).—

Federal.....	\$2, 843, 000
Non-Federal.....	2, 140, 000
Total.....	4, 983, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$103, 400	\$91, 200	\$194, 600
Maintenance and operation.....	2, 600		2, 600
Total.....	106, 000	91, 200	197, 100
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings.....			531, 350
Towboat savings.....			66, 000
Reduction in tidal delays.....			184, 000
Total.....			782, 250

14 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.0.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements and rights-of-way required for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and maintenance; provide and maintain berthing areas; relocate Northeast Petroleum Corp. wharf as needed; and accomplish alterations in gas siphon, water tunnel, submarine cable, and other utilities as needed. Local interests have indicated willingness to cooperate.

Comments of the State and Federal Agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Massachusetts: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

DORCHESTER BAY AND NEPONSET RIVER, MASS.

(S. Doc. 126, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Dorchester Bay and Neponset River are located in the southern part of Boston Harbor.

Authority.—Senate Committee on Public Works Resolution adopted October 15, 1957.

Existing project.—The Federal project provides for a channel 18 feet deep and 175 feet wide from the main ship channel to Commercial Point, and 15 feet deep and 100 feet wide in Neponset River to the Neponset Highway Bridge.

Navigation problem.—Proposed steam-electric plant of Boston Edison Co. at Squantum Point depends upon 35-foot depth channel and appropriate turning basin.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provide a channel 35 feet deep and 300 feet wide from the Boston Harbor to the vicinity of Squantum Point, with a turning basin of the same depth.

Estimated cost (1961 price level).—

Federal.....	\$7, 050, 000
Non-Federal.....	315, 000
Total.....	7, 365, 000

Project economics (100 year analysis basis).—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$201, 000	\$12, 800	\$213, 800
Maintenance and operation.....	10, 000		10, 000
Aids to navigation.....	1, 000		1, 000
Total.....	212, 000	12, 800	224, 800
Annual benefits: Savings in oil costs.....			659, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.9.

Local cooperation.—Construct the first 250,000-kilowatt unit of proposed powerplant; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way needed for the project; provide an approach channel and berth with depths commensurate with recommended project; and hold and save the United States free from damages.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: No objection.

State of Massachusetts: Favorable.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 15

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection subject to the understanding that, prior to a request for funds to initiate construction of the project, if authorized, more definite evidence be presented to show that other industries would utilize the deep-draft channel, in order to assure that Federal funds are not expended solely for the benefit of a single user.

PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MASS.

(S. Doc. 124, 87th Cong.)

Location.—On the coast of Massachusetts about 45 miles south of Boston.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted April 20, 1948.

Existing project.—Existing Federal navigation project provides for an 18-foot channel from deep water to the State pier, a distance of about 2.5 miles; a channel 15 feet deep from the State pier for a distance of 0.3 mile terminating in a 300-square-foot turning basin of the same depth; an 18-foot anchorage adjacent to the 18-foot channel; maintenance of the area in the vicinity of the State pier dredged by Commonwealth; and riprap protection for sections of Long Beach and restoration of Eel River to its former course. Local interests have provided various navigation and waterfront improvements.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for additional anchorage area and greater protection for present and future fleets using Plymouth Harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a rubble-stone breakwater extending 1,400 feet easterly from a point north of the town wharf, and thence southeasterly for a distance of 2,100 feet; an anchorage 8 feet deep and 60 acres in area inside the breakwater; and elimination of the authorized 18-foot anchorage from the existing project.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1961).—

Federal.....	\$1, 200, 000
Non-Federal.....	300, 000
Total.....	1, 500, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$43, 880	\$12, 800	\$56, 680
Maintenance.....	10, 000		10, 000
Maintenance, navigation aids.....	120		120
Total.....	54, 00	12, 800	66, 800
Annual benefits:			
Storm damages prevented.....			12, 000
Commercial fishing.....			68, 800
Recreational boating.....			41, 000
Total.....			121, 800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 20 percent of the first cost of construction due to benefits to recreational boating, such contribu-

16 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

tion, presently estimated at \$300,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; maintain existing public landings open to all on equal terms and provide without cost to the United States all necessary mooring facilities in the anchorage; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and of aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project. Local interests have provided assurances that the requirements of local cooperation will be met.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: No objection.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Favorable.

*Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—*No objection.

PAWTUXET COVE, R.I.

(H. Doc. 236, 87th Cong.)

*Location.—*At the mouth of the Pawtuxet River, a tributary of the Providence River which empties into Narragansett Bay.

*Authority.—*Resolution by the House Public Works Committee adopted April 5, 1949.

*Existing Project.—*No Federal project.

*Navigation problem.—*Navigation is hampered by shallow depths in the entrance channel and in the channel inside the cove. There is no available anchorage area where boats can moor without grounding at low tide. Boat damages result due to these conditions.

*Recommended plan of improvement.—*A channel 100 feet wide and 6 feet deep from deep water to the head of the cove, with a turning basin near the upper end; and an anchorage of about 14 acres, 6 feet deep, south of the entrance channel, with a sheltering dike, 2,200 feet long, constructed to 12 feet above mean low water, on the east side of the anchorage.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1960).—

Federal.....	\$210, 000
Non-Federal.....	210, 000
Total.....	420, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$8, 300	\$6, 000	\$17, 300
Maintenance.....	8, 400		8, 400
Total.....	16, 700	9, 000	25, 700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented.....			1, 200
Small-boat harbor.....			25, 000
Land fill.....			2, 000
Total.....			28, 200

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 17

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities, such contribution, presently estimated at \$210,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and of aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities, including two public landings with suitable supply facilities, open to all on equal terms; regulate the use of the harbor facilities with the understanding that the facilities will be open to all on equal terms; and, remove or relocate locally constructed navigation aids. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

LITTLE NECK BAY, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 510, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Little Neck Bay is on the north shore of Long Island at the westerly end of Long Island Sound, about 17 miles northeast of the Battery, New York City.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted November 14, 1957, and July 16, 1958, respectively.

Existing project.—There are no Federal improvements for navigation in the bay.

Navigation problem.—Difficulties arise from insufficient depth in the southerly part of the bay. Larger vessels are forced to moor in less sheltered areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provide improvement by dredging to a depth of 7 feet an area of 350 acres in the southern part of the bay, and dredging an entrance channel thereto, 200 feet wide and 7 feet deep, from deep water to the north.

Estimated cost (price level January 1961).—

Federal.....	\$2, 185, 000
Non-Federal.....	2, 185, 000
Total.....	4, 370, 000

18 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$79,600	\$101,700	\$181,300
Maintenance.....	44,000		44,000
Navigation aids.....	200		200
Total.....	123,800	101,700	225,500
Annual benefits:			
Recreational benefits.....			394,000
Reduction of damages.....			10,000
Total.....			404,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of construction due to recreational boating benefits, presently estimated at \$2,185,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including public landings with suitable supply facilities and public parking areas open to all on equal terms; and establish a competent and properly constituted public body to regulate the harbor facilities, open to all on equal terms. The city of New York has indicated willingness and ability to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal Agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 551, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Flushing Bay is on the north shore of Long Island, opening into the East River, 12 miles northeast of the Battery.

Authority.—Resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, adopted on June 7, 1961.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel 12 feet deep from East River through Flushing Bay and in Flushing Creek to Main Street Bridge with widths varying from 160 to 200 feet; a branch channel 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the bay channel to a maneuvering area of the same depth outside the municipal boat basin at the south end of the bay, with an anchorage basin 8 feet deep and approximately 700 feet wide west of the branch channel; and for the repair and reconstruction of 3,739 feet of dike. The work remaining to be done under the existing project consists of deepening the channel in the creek to 12 feet and the repair and reconstruction of the dike.

Navigation problem.—Existing project is inadequate for existing and prospective recreational craft, excursion boats, and commercial barge traffic.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 19

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for: a bay channel 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide from deep water in East River to the maneuvering area, a distance of 1.8 miles; a creek channel 15 feet deep and 200 feet wide to 170 feet at a point 50 feet downstream of the proposed Van Wyck Expressway Bridge, a distance of about 1.1 miles; a branch channel 15 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the bay channel about 0.1 mile to the maneuvering area; an irregularly shaped maneuvering area 2,000 by 750 feet with a depth of 15 feet, except the approach to the west side of the municipal boat basin which would remain at 12 feet deep; an anchorage basin about 2,100 by 1,800 feet with a depth of 6 feet; a steel sheet-pile breakwater on the east side of the anchorage, west of the remains of the existing dike, 1,400 feet long with a top elevation of 15 feet; abandonment of the portion of the creek channel of the existing project from Van Wyck Expressway Bridge to the Main Street Bridge, a distance of 0.3 mile; abandonment of the repair and reconstruction of the remainder of the existing dike; and completion of the existing project primarily in the creek channel to authorized depth of 12 feet. The uncompleted part of the work authorized in 1925 is recommended be combined with the additional work recommended herein and the whole be treated as a single item.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962).—

	Existing project	Modification	Total
Federal.....	\$622,000	¹ \$1,695,000	\$2,317,000
Non-Federal.....	295,000	2,189,000	2,484,000
Total.....	917,000	3,884,000	4,801,000

¹ Amount of additional authorization required.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$85,000	\$115,700	\$200,700
Maintenance.....	54,100	2,000	56,100
Total.....	139,100	117,700	256,800
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings.....			211,200
Recreational boating.....			625,800
Harbor of refuge.....			5,000
Total.....			842,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.3.

Local cooperation.—Provides that prior to construction local interests contribute 50 percent of the first cost of construction for widening the bay channel from 200 to 300 feet, a distance of 1.8 miles, for dredging the recreational anchorage and for constructing the breakwater, presently estimated at \$1,154,000, the final amount to be determined after final costs are known; and provided that prior to construction local interests agree to provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers; hold and

save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction and maintenance of the improvement; provide and maintain without cost to the United States adequate approach channels and berths and modify existing facilities at the terminals which would permit use of the waterway to secure full advantage of the deeper channel; accomplish without cost to the United States removal or relocation of pipelines, cables, and other utilities, and all necessary protective measures to bridges and other structures adjacent to or crossing the waterway; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities for recreational boating including public landings with suitable supply facilities and public automobile parking areas open to all on equal terms; and assign to a competent and properly constituted public body the power to regulate the use, growth, and free development of the waterway facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to furnish local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 483, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Buttermilk Channel is part of the New York Harbor joining Red Hook and Bay Ridge Channels to form a continuous deep-draft waterway along the Brooklyn waterfront.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 20, 1957.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Buttermilk Channel provides for a 40-foot channel over the easterly half and a 35-foot channel over the westerly half, for suitable widening at the junctions with East River and Red Hook and Anchorage Channels. Private and municipal interests have made intensive terminal and industrial improvements along the Brooklyn waterfront.

Navigation problem.—Navigation is unsafe and time consuming and widening is needed to alleviate difficult turns vessels must now make.

Recommended Plan of Improvement.—Provides for minimum clear width of 2,100 feet at the junction of Buttermilk Channel with Anchorage and Red Hook Channels; dredging to a project depth of 35 feet a triangular area on the north side of the Buttermilk Channel and an irregular area on the south side.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1960).—All Federal, \$2,226,000.

Project economics.—

Annual charges (all Federal):

Interest and amortization.....	\$81, 000
Maintenance.....	17, 000
Total.....	98, 000

Annual benefits:

Damages prevented to vessels.....	12, 000
Savings in transportation.....	230, 000
Total.....	242, 000

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 21

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.5.

Local cooperation.—None required.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of Interior: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, N.J. (CHANNELS TO
PORT ELIZABETH)

Location.—Newark Bay is an estuary extending southerly from the confluence of the Hackensack and Passaic Rivers to the New York and New Jersey channels. Hackensack River rises in Rockland County, N.Y., and flows generally south about 45 miles into Newark Bay. Passaic River rises in northeastern New Jersey and flows about 80 miles east and south into Newark Bay.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Public Works Committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives adopted June 14, 1960 and July 31, 1957, respectively.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project for channels to Port Elizabeth on the west side of Newark Bay. The existing Federal project channels in Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers connect directly or indirectly with all major channels and water routes within the port of New York as well as all inland coastal and ocean routes served by the port. Approach from the Atlantic Ocean is afforded through Ambrose and Anchorage Channels which have controlling depths of 45 feet and the New York and New Jersey Channels which have controlling depths of 35 feet.

Navigation flood problem.—Local interests request that the channels to Port Elizabeth be incorporated in the Federal navigation project for Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers and assumption by the Federal Government of maintenance of the channels to Port Elizabeth.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing project for Newark, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N.J., to provide for Federal maintenance to a depth of 35 feet of the channels to Port Elizabeth which have been or are planned to be dredged by the Port of New York Authority or other responsible agency.

Costs and project economics.—Based on data in the district engineer's report there are no Federal construction costs for the project. Federal cost for maintenance of the channels is estimated at \$230,500 annually. Benefits, based on anticipated savings over a 50-year period have not been completely evaluated; however, since the commerce to the port is anticipated to exceed 8 million tons annually, savings in the order of 2½ cents per ton would be required for its justification. Benefits resulting from provision of the improvement are expected to exceed this figure. The studies made of this project to date indicate that the benefit-cost ratio will be in the order of 2 to 1.

Status.—The review report of the district engineer was submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for consideration in accordance with existing law. The Board returned the report to the reporting officers for reconsideration relative to the benefit analysis. Accordingly, the report has not been completed and reviewed in accordance with established procedures.

22 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Remarks.—The committee has noted that maintenance of the general navigation channels to Port Elizabeth is needed to meet the growing needs of existing and prospective deep-draft commercial traffic moving into the port. Federal assumption of the maintenance cost is justified and is in keeping with that provided in similar projects throughout the Nation.

RARITAN RIVER, N.J.

(H. Doc. 455, 86th Cong.)

Location.—Raritan River is formed by the junction of its North and South Branches about 18 miles above New Brunswick, N.J., flows generally southeastward 30 miles to Raritan Bay, which is about 25 miles southwest of the Battery, New York City.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted November 1945.

Existing project.—Provides for a depth of 25 feet and 300 feet wide in the main channel, together with various widths and depths to the Delaware and Raritan Canal entrance at New Brunswick; and a depth of 25 feet and 300 feet wide, together with varying widths and depths to the upper junction with the main channel at Crab Island.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire the reconsideration of the item of local cooperation under the existing project regarding spoil disposal areas. They indicate that there has been a rapid decrease in available areas for that purpose.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing project for Raritan River, N.J., to provide for maintaining the South Channel to a depth of 15 feet from the upper limit of the 25-foot project to the dock of the Middlesex County Sewerage Authority, a distance of 2,200 feet.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1959).—

Federal: Maintenance only.

Non-Federal: None.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$280	\$640	\$920
Maintenance.....	30,000	14,000	44,000
Total.....	30,280	14,640	44,920
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....			180,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.0.

Local cooperation.—In addition to meeting requirements of local cooperation for the existing project; furnish spoil-disposal areas and necessary dikes, bulkheads and embankments therefor; required for maintenance of the improvement when and as required; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to maintenance of the improvement. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to meet requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 23

LYNNHAVEN INLET, BAY, AND CONNECTING WATERS, VIRGINIA

(H. Doc. 580, 87th Cong.)

Location.—On the south shore of Chesapeake Bay, 5 miles west of Cape Henry, and 10 miles east of Norfolk, Va.

Authority.—Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945.

Existing project.—No Federal navigation project.

Navigation problem.—There is a need to improve the entrance and inner channels to accommodate existing and prospective commercial and recreational craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—An entrance channel from Chesapeake Bay through Lynnhaven Inlet, 10 feet deep, 150 feet wide, and approximately 3,500 feet long; a mooring and turning basin in Lynnhaven Bay, 10 feet deep, 1,100 feet long, and 750 feet wide; a channel 9 feet deep, 90 feet wide, and approximately 10,000 feet long from the mooring and turning basin to Broad Bay via the Long Creek-Broad Bay Canal; and a channel through the Narrows, 6 feet deep, 90 feet wide, and approximately 2,000 feet long.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962).

Federal.....	\$1, 147, 000
Non-Federal.....	312, 000
Total.....	1, 459, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$52, 000	\$19, 800	\$71, 800
Maintenance.....	61, 500	2, 000	63, 500
Total.....	113, 500	21, 800	135, 300
Annual benefits:			
Increased oyster production.....			103, 000
Commercial boating.....			21, 400
Recreational boating.....			72, 200
Total.....			196, 600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Contribute, in cash, 15 percent of the first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at \$203,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements and of aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from property damages, including shellfish interests, that may result from construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; secure releases for damages from shellfish interests to permit the Corps of Engineers to accomplish the initial dredging and the subsequent maintenance of the project, when and as

24 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

required; provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, a marina for the use of recreational and sport-fishing craft, such facilities to include at least 400 feet of berthing space with adequate shore and water access thereto, and with such services as may be required for full utilization of the improvement by the public on equal terms; provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, a public terminal for commercial vessels, including those operated by commercial fishermen, oystermen, clammers, and crabbers, such facilities to include at least 300 feet of berthing space with adequate shore and water access thereto, and with such services as may be required for full utilization of the improvement by the public on equal terms; assure the control of pollution in the waters of Lynnhaven Bay and its eastern and western branches, Long Creek, Broad Bay, and Linkhorn Bay; and establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to regulate the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, due to the lack of policy clarification concerning principles to be developed on the basis of overall review of bridge replacement and clearance problems, the Bureau therefore recommends, without prejudice to reconsideration in the light of further policy clarification, that the proposed net cost to the Federal Government be reduced by \$79,000.

Remarks.—The committee notes the Bureau of the Budget's objection to crediting local interests for work already undertaken by them on the Long Creek-Broad Bay Canal highway bridge, and concurs therein. The authorization provides that nothing in this bill shall be construed as authorizing reimbursement to local interests for the Long Creek-Broad Bay Canal bridge.

ROLLINSON CHANNEL AND CHANNEL FROM HATTERAS INLET TO HATTERAS, N.C.

(H. Doc. 457, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Hatteras, N.C., is on the Pamlico Sound side of the barrier beach, about 4 miles northeast of Hatteras Inlet. The inlet is a natural opening through the barrier beach about 13 miles southwest of Cape Hatteras, N.C.

Authority.—Resolutions of Public Works Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955, July 31, 1957, and July 16, 1958.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel 100 feet wide and 6 feet deep from that depth in Pamlico Sound to and including a basin of the same depth at Hatteras, and rubble-mound breakwaters at harbor entrance.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 25

Navigation problem.—Present channels are inadequate for vessels now serving Hatteras Harbor and if channels were improved the larger fishing vessels could use the harbor as a permanent or temporary base of operations. A harbor of refuge in the vicinity is also needed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for deepening Rollinson Channel to 12 feet over its present 100-foot width; deepening the existing Hatteras Harbor to 12 feet; and a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Hatteras Inlet Gorge to Hatteras, N.C.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1960).—

	Rollinson Channel	Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, N.C.	Total
Federal.....	\$416,000	\$236,000	\$652,000
Non-Federal.....	8,000	8,000	16,000
Total.....	424,000	244,000	668,000

Project economics.—

	Rollinson Channel	Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, N.C.	Total
Annual charges:			
Federal:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$15,300	\$3,900	\$24,200
Operation and maintenance.....	9,000	13,000	22,000
Navigation aids.....	200	100	300
Total.....	24,500	22,000	46,500
Non-Federal:			
Interest and amortization.....	370	370	740
Replacement and maintenance.....	1,130	1,130	2,260
Total.....	1,500	1,500	3,000
Total.....	26,000	23,500	49,500
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings.....	16,800	21,500	38,300
Reduction in damages.....	10,500	3,900	14,400
Increased catch.....		7,100	7,100
Total.....	27,300	32,500	59,800
Benefit-cost ration:.....	1.05	1.4	1.2

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands and rights-of-way, also bulkheads and embankments for spoil area, if needed; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain public terminal and transfer facilities. Local interests are willing to comply with the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

WILMINGTON HARBOR, N.C.

(S. Doc. 114, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Wilmington Harbor, serving the port of Wilmington, is located in the lower reaches of the Cape Fear River along the southern part of the Atlantic coast of North Carolina.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted April 18, 1957.

Existing project.—The applicable portion of the Wilmington Harbor project under this investigation consists of a ship channel 35 feet deep and 400 feet wide across the ocean bar, then 34 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the upper end of the anchorage area at Castle Street, Wilmington.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire a deeper and wider channel in the main channel of Wilmington Harbor for larger petroleum vessels.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended modification of the existing project for Wilmington Harbor, N.C., would provide a channel 40 feet deep and 500 feet wide through the ocean bar to Southport, N.C., thence 38 feet deep over the existing 400-foot width in the channel to Castle Street and deepening the existing turning basin to the same depth; and that dredging shall not be done by the United States within 50 feet of any pierhead line, wharf, or structure.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1960).—

Federal.....	\$6, 370, 000
Non-Federal.....	100, 000
Total.....	6, 470, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$231, 000	\$5, 000	\$236, 000
Maintenance and operation in addition to that now required.....	10, 000		10, 000
Maintenance of spoil areas.....		15, 000	15, 000
Total.....	241, 000	20, 000	261, 000
Annual benefits: Transportation savings for petroleum products.....			440, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.7.

Local cooperation.—Local interests are required to provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way including spoil areas and necessary retaining dikes; hold and save the United States free from damages. The State of North Carolina stated it would fulfill all items of local cooperation that local government agencies are unable to meet.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: No objection.

State of North Carolina: No objection.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 27

SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA., TURNING BASIN

(S. Doc. 115, 87th Cong.) --

Location.—Savannah Harbor, located on the Atlantic coast at Savannah, Ga., comprises the lower 31 miles of Savannah River and estuary.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted December 3, 1958.

Existing project.—The existing project provides for an entrance channel 36 feet deep by 500 feet wide across the ocean bar for 9.7 miles; then 34 feet deep and varying 550 to 400 feet for 18.9 miles with two turning basins 34 feet deep and then a channel 30 feet deep and 200 feet wide for 2.4 miles with two turning basins 30 feet deep.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire enlargement of the turning basin at Kings Island.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for modification of the Savannah Harbor project to enlarge the turning basin near Kings Island to a width of 900 feet and a length of 1,000 feet.

Estimated cost (price level 1961).—

Federal.....	\$605, 000
Non-Federal.....	78, 500
Total.....	683, 500

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$22, 000	\$3, 500	\$25, 500
Maintenance and operation in addition to that now required.....	5, 000	2, 500	7, 500
Total.....	27, 000	6, 000	33, 000
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....			40, 235

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.22.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way for construction and maintenance including spoil areas and dikes; hold and save the United States free from damage; and provide terminal facilities. Chatham County, Ga., Board of Commissioners will act as local assurer in meeting the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Georgia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

28 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

KEY WEST HARBOR, FLA.

(S. Doc. 106, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Key West is an island off the southern tip of Florida, 130 miles southwest of Miami and 230 miles south of Tampa, Fla.

Authority.—Resolution of Public Works Committee, U.S. Senate, adopted March 15, 1951.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel 300 feet wide and 30 feet deep, about 6.8 miles, from Key West to deep water to the south; widening of the channel opposite wharves to a width of 800 feet and a depth of 26 feet; and a channel 17 feet deep and of sufficient width for navigation, about 10.4 miles, from Key West to the northwest, with jetties at the northwest entrance. In 1942–43, the U.S. Navy extended the 30-foot channel to a deepwater basin at the Key West Naval Operating Base.

Navigation problem.—Present channel inadequate for shrimp fleet and protection is needed for the fleet from damaging waves.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet from the 30-foot ship channel to Key West, a distance of about 3,000 feet; an irregularly shaped turning basin in the bight of the same depth; and a granite-mound breakwater 800 feet long along the north side of the bight.

Estimated cost (price level, June 1961).—

Federal.....	\$820, 000
Non-Federal.....	23, 500
Total.....	843, 500

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$30, 200	\$800	\$31, 000
Increased maintenance.....	3, 500		3, 500
Aids to navigation.....	800		800
Economic loss for lands.....		800	800
Total.....	34, 500	1, 600	36, 100
Annual benefits: Reduction in damages and savings in operation time.....			52, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands and rights-of-way, also spoil disposal areas and retaining dikes; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain public terminal and transfer facilities; and provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with related project depths. Local interests are willing to comply with the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of the Navy: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS 29

PORT SUTTON AND YBOR CHANNEL, TAMPA HARBOR, FLA.

(H. Doc. 529, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Tampa Harbor serves the city of Tampa located on the west coast about midway of the Florida Peninsula. Port Sutton Channel and Ybor Channel are branch channels in the northerly section of the harbor.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted November 18, 1958, and January 5, 1959, and two resolutions of the House of Representatives adopted on April 15, 1959.

Existing project.—Existing Tampa project features pertinent to this report include channels from the Gulf of Mexico to Tampa, 36 feet deep by 600 feet wide at the entrance, then 34 feet deep over a 500-foot width in Mullet Key Cut and over a 400-foot width in Tampa and Hillsborough Bays to Ybor Basin; turning basins 34 feet deep at Ybor Channel entrance and channels 30 feet deep over widths of 480 and 500 feet in Ybor Channel.

Navigation problem.—Local interests dredged a channel at Port Sutton, in 1955, 150 feet wide and a turning basin 500 by 1,300 feet to a depth of 30 feet. They desire that this work be incorporated in the authorized Tampa Harbor project for maintenance. Local interests also desire deepening Ybor Channel from 30 to 34 feet.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for modification of the authorized Tampa Harbor project to include maintenance of Port Sutton Channel 150 feet wide and about 3,000 feet long and a turning basin 500 by 1,300 feet; and deepening Ybor Channel to a depth of 34 feet over a width reduced from 500 to 400 feet.

Estimated cost.—

	Ybor Channel	Port Sutton Channel
Federal.....	\$997,000	(1)
Non-Federal.....	18,000	(1)
Total.....	1,015,000	(1)

¹ Maintenance only.

Project economics.—

	Ybor Channel	Port Sutton Channel
Annual charges:		
Federal:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$36,600	\$1,500
Maintenance and operation (in addition to that now required).....	1,500	5,500
Additional navigation aids maintenance.....		1,500
Total Federal.....	38,100	8,500
Non-Federal.....	700	100
Total.....	38,800	8,600
Annual benefits:		
Transportation savings.....	117,000	266,000
Land filled by dredged material.....	4,000	
Elimination of terminal costs.....		20,000
Total.....	121,000	286,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3.1	3.2