WATERSHED PROJECTS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MARCH 17, 18, JUNE 11, 25, JULY 27, AND AUGUST 19, 1964

Serial BBB

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
38-693 WASHINGTON : 1964

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*
W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Vice Chairman*

GEORGE GRANT, Alabama
E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri
HARLAN HAGEN, California
LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
RALPH R. HARDING, Idaho
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas
JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Oregon
ALEC G. OLSON, Minnesota
ROBERT L. LEGGETT, California
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa
PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania
PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma
CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota
CATHERINE MAY, Washington
DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
RALPH F. BEERMANN, Nebraska
EDWARD HUTCHINSON, Michigan

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Clerk*
JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *General Counsel*
ROBERT C. BRUCE, *Assistant Counsel*
FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Staff Consultant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas
LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia
ROBERT L. LEGGETT, California
A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas

CONTENTS

WATERSHED PROJECTS

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Johnson of Wisconsin, Stubblefield, Duncan, Leggett, McIntire, Short, Harvey, and Dole.

Also present: Martha Hannah, staff; Hyde H. Murray, assistant clerk; and Robert Bruce, assistant counsel.

Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator, Soil Conservation Service; R. Neil Lane, Chief, Projects Branch, Watershed Planning Division; and Charles Swigart, Assistant Director, Watershed Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

We are honored to have with us today the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Cannon. We are delighted to have you with us, Mr. Cannon.

We will first take up Bear Creek watershed, and I would say that one of our colleagues on the Rules Committee, Mr. Young, is with us, and we will then take up the Hondo Creek watershed project.

It is our procedure to ask the Department to explain the project first, and as soon as they have done that, to hear from those who represent the particular project.

BEAR CREEK WATERSHED, MISSOURI

Mr. POAGE. Do you have a statement to make, Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lane of our Watershed Planning Division will present this project.

BEAR CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 33,395 acres in Scotland and Clark Counties.
Tributary to: North Fabius River.
Sponsors: Soil and Water Conservation District of Scotland County, Soil and Water Conservation District of Clark County, Scotland County Court, and Clark County Court.

Total watershed land use:	Percent
Cropland	58
Grassland	31
Woodland	8
Miscellaneous	3

Total watershed area privately owned.
Number of farms: 148.
Size of farms: About 172 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; structural measures consisting of five floodwater retarding structures, 14.6 miles of channel improvement and 10 grade stabilization structures. The storage capacity of the retarding structures ranges from 495 acre-feet to 3,123 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$36,255	80
To agricultural improvements	1,090	2
To nonagricultural improvements	1,640	4
Incidental recreation	4,105	9
Indirect	2,420	5
Total	45,510	100

Area benefited: 5,572 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of about 54 farm units.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$32,950	11	[1] $272,215	89	$305,165
Structural measures, flood prevention	840,885	91	[2] 82,234	9	923,119
Total	873,835	71	354,449	29	1,228,284

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and national programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements and rights-of-way	$70,694
Road and bridge relocations	4,650
Administration of contracts	6,890

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.21 to 1.
Prorated Public Law 566 cost per acre: $121.
Carrying out the project: The soil and water conservation districts of Scotland and Clark Counties and the Scotland and Clark County courts assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $4,399.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Lane.

Mr. LANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee; the Bear Creek watershed project is located in Scotland and Clark Counties in northeastern Missouri and it embraces an area of about 33,395 acres.

Bear Creek is a tributary to the North Fabius River which is a tributary to the Mississippi—it flows into the Mississippi opposite Quincy, Ill.

There are about 148 farms in the watershed.

The principal agricultural enterprise is the production of cattle and hogs. The principal crops grown are corn and soybeans and wheat. The farms average about 172 acres in size, with an estimated value of $25,000 per farm.

The principal problems in the watershed consist of erosion in the uplands and flooding in the bottom lands. Gully erosion is quite serious in the upland portion of the watershed, with gullys ranging from 5 to 15 feet in depth, and from 15 to 40 feet in width. The erosion that has resulted from the formation of the gulleys has caused a decrease in the channel capacity of Bear Creek, so that floods occur more frequently now than they formerly did. It is estimated, for example, that floods occurring on the average of once every 2 years now flood over one-half of the agricultural flood plain.

The most serious damages occur to the agricultural lands and the crops, but other agricultural property is also damaged, as well as the roads and bridges.

The plan proposes a combination of soil conservation and structural measures to stabilize the watershed and to reduce the frequency of flooding along the flood plain. The soil conservation measures consist of such practices as terraces, waterways, small stabilizing structures, farm ponds, and pasture planning.

The structural measures consist of 5 floodwater retarding structures, 14.6 miles of channel improvement, and 10 grade stabilization structures.

The estimated cost of the project is $1,228,000. There is about $305,165 for land treatment measures in the program, and $923,119 for structural measures.

Public Law 566 funds amount to $873,835, roughly 71 percent of the total, and other funds about 29 percent.

If we take into consideration the value of the land treatment measures already applied, which exceeds $200,000 in value, the local contribution approaches 40 percent, rather than the 29 percent.

The estimated benefit-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1, and the prorated Public Law 566 cost per acre benefited is $121.

That completes the statement.

Mr. POAGE. This seems to be a rather typical project.

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. A rather typical flood program, with a series of retention dams.

Mr. LANE. That is correct. As I explained in my testimony, the capacity of the channel has been reduced by sediment deposition and it will be necessary to go in there and clean out quite a bit of the channel in order to have an adequate level of flood prevention.

Mr. POAGE. The local people have done something.

Mr. LANE. That is supplementary to the flood water retarding structures and the channel. There is not a drainage problem in this watershed. This is entirely a flood prevention problem.

Mr. POAGE. That is one of the reasons that the local contribution is lower?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Perhaps, then usual—but I think probably that we had better ask further on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. That black line on the map, is that the river?

Mr. LANE. Right here, sir [indicating], yes.
Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Why is the breakdown shown there?
Mr. LANE. There is a reach of channel right here which is adequate.
Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. That is where you go to the channel?
Mr. LANE. That is correct, here and down here [indicating].
Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. How much channeling did you speak of?
Mr. LANE. 146 miles of channel improvement.
Mr. POAGE. Thank you.
We will now be glad to hear from you, Mr. Cannon.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLARENCE CANNON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I deeply appreciate the privilege of appearing before this subcommittee.
If I may speak briefly off the record.
Mr. POAGE. Yes.
(Discussion off the record.)
Mr. CANNON. I want to express apreciation of the recent development of this program for watershed conservation. With the explosion in population, and the rapid decline in our arable lands, conservation of soil and water is one of the most important questions the American people can consider. It will only be a question of time, if the present trend continues, when we will be unable to supply sufficient food for our own Nation, much less the world.
We have been trying to solve the problem of erosion attrition. We have spent vast sums of money building high dams and reservoirs which too often failed to accomplish the purpose and in some cases have been deleterious rather than beneficial, and which have notably failed to solve the immediate problem.
The watersheds reach the uplands, and should always be used supplementary to the huge dams on which we are spending millions of dollars. The two taken together have been most effective.
Mr. POAGE. Mr. Cannon, may I suggest that this whole watershed program we think is a good program is going to fall this next year unless we can finance it. I had the conservationist from my State in my office this morning and he pointed out that with the present budget estimates and with the present list of projects that this committee has approved, that only about one-third or less of those projects can be started next year. We are faced with an impasse. We will have to increase our financing if we continue to approve these very projects. Our approval does not mean anything unless they can be financed. We are all faced with that problem and we realize that.
Mr. CANNON. Of all of the programs which have been provided, nothing is more effective in the conservation of soil and water, nothing is more important than these watershed conservation districts.
Mr. POAGE. Thank you, sir. We believe that, too. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Cannon.
Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

(The following telegram was also submitted to the subcommittee:)

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *March 18, 1964.*

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Missouri Water Resources Board supports One Hundred and Two River watershed project, Nodaway County, Mo. Amended project expresses board desire for comprehensive multipurpose development. Extended recognized benefits to more people necessary for success of watershed program in Missouri. Request favorable action on Nodaway and Bear Creek projects. Letter follows.

CLIFFORD L. SUMMERS,
Executive Director, Missouri Water Resources Board.

HONDO CREEK WATERSHED, TEXAS

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will now pass over consideration of Bear Creek for the moment and will hear the Department explain the Hondo Creek watershed and then we will have Mr. Young make his statement. And then we will come back to the regular order.

(The summary follows:)

HONDO CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 29,408 acres in southeastern Karnes County.
Sponsors: Karnes-Goliad Soil Conservation District and Hondo Creek Watershed Improvement District.
Tributary to: San Antonio River.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	55
Grassland	42
Woodland	0
Miscellaneous	3

Total watershed area privately owned.
Number of farms: 164.
Size of farms: About 175 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of three floodwater retarding structures. Storage capacity of the structures ranges from 1,104 acre-feet to 3,874 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$7,441	48
To agricultural improvements	3,219	21
To nonagricultural improvements	1,102	7
Secondary	1,361	9
Indirect and incidental recreation	2,322	15
Total	15,445	100

Area benefited: 1,466 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of 32 farms in the watershed flood plain.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$12,900	4	[1] $323,134	96	$336,034
Structural measures, flood prevention	315,885	86	[2] 51,344	14	367,229
Total	328,785	47	374,478	53	703,263

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements, and rights-of-way	$33,124
Relocation of roads and utilities	16,720
Administration of contracts	1,500

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.3 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $103.

Carrying out the project: The Hondo Creek Watershed Improvement District and the Karnes-Goliad Soil Conservation District will assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $450.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will ask Mr. Swigart to present the departmental testimony on this project, please.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from you now.

Mr. SWIGART. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Hondo Creek Watershed is located in Karnes County, Tex., and is about 53 miles southeast of San Antonio, on highway 181, which is the Federal highway between San Antonio and Corpus Christi, Tex.

The watershed comprises some 29,408 acres.

The principal problem in this watershed is the flooding of agricultural land. You will note on the map the relatively broad flood plain going from the upper reaches here down to the San Antonio River. The Karnes-Goliad Soil Conservation District, and the Hondo Creek Watershed Improvement District have joined in formulating a project to provide an adequate level of protection to this agricultural land.

The chief farm income in the area—and it is an entirely agricultural area—comes from the production and sale of cash crops and livestock. The crops consist of flax, cotton, corn, grain sorghum for direct sale, and oats and forage sorghum for livestock.

There are 164 farms in the watershed. The majority of them are owner operated. And 116 basic plans have been prepared on those farms, with 40 percent already applied.

The average size farm is about 175 acres.

From 1935 to 1959 there were some 52 floods, 10 of which were major floods, where more than one-half of the flood plain was inundated; and 42 minor floods where less than one-half of the flood plain was inundated.

The proposed program for this watershed consists of land treatment measures over the entire area. There is some 42 percent of the area in grasslands. The cover is relatively poor. And an intensive program of rehabilitation and proper management is required which is provided for in the work plan developed by the local organizations. Also included are such measures as terracing and grass waterways and practices normally applied to cropland to assure that with continued use erosion will be reduced to a practical minimum.

In addition to the land treatment measures there are three proposed floodwater retarding structures which will control 43 percent of the watershed area above this valuable flood plain below.

The average annual damage amounts to some $18,713 which will be greatly reduced—it will be reduced 67 percent.

The benefits accruing to these measures amount to $15,445 annually, and that compared with the cost gives a benefit-cost ratio of 1.3 to 1.

There are some 1,466 acres that will be benefited. These acres represent 32 farms that have flood plain lands.

In addition benefits will accrue downstream on the San Antonio River to a number of farms in that area.

The total cost of the project is relatively modest compared to many. It amounts to $703,263. The local folks are going to contribute $374,478, or 53 percent of that cost. And from Public Law 566 funds there will be granted $328,785 or 47 percent of the cost.

In addition, considerable effort has already been put into attempting to cure the flood problem through the application of the necessary land treatment measures on the watershed. The local people have already spent about $247,000 in this effort.

Within the usual frame of reference that we judge these projects by, in appearing before this committee, the cost per acre is $103. And the flood plain values will, generally, run from $150 to $200.

The two sponsors will accept the responsibility for installing the structures and operating and maintaining them at an average annual cost of $450.

I believe that this is, on a smaller scale, one of the typical projects that we have down in this area.

That completes the statement.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you.

Now we will hear from Mr. Young, and then we will go back to the Department.

Mr. Young?

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN YOUNG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I will be very brief. I deeply appreciate your hearing me at this time, even before other members who are much senior to me, in line of tenure and in many other ways, in deference to the problem of my own committee conflict.

I want to say that I am impressed and flattered as to what the committee said about needing my vote in my committee. I am a little bit concerned about to whom they said it, because I need his vote pretty badly, too, on many projects.

I do not think that I can add much that is of a material nature after what Mr. Swigart has said in presenting this watershed program to this committee. I of course want to say that I wholeheartedly endorse the Hondo Creek project.

I will very briefly state this, I think that I could support the Hondo Creek project by relating a story in connection with another watershed project in the same county of Karnes in Texas. I refer to the Escondido pilot watershed which is just north of the city of Kennedy re-

ferred to in this report. The committee will recall that Hondo Creek originates just about 3 miles south of Kennedy. It is a town of about 10,000 population. It is affected by the Escondido Creek. And Nichols Hollow runs through the city and joins with Escondido Creek.

Sometime several years ago, 10 years or more, this program was set up as a pilot project in Escondido Creek. After midnight some 3 or 4 years ago there came a terrible torrential rain. In a matter of just a few moments the whole downtown area of Kennedy was flooded up to about 10 feet by these flood waters.

Now prior to this time the great flood problem had come from the Escondido, but nobody paid any attention to this hollow that runs through the town. All of the flood problems came from the Escondido Creek. There was not a life lost there because of the fast work and so forth of the local firemen and many courageous volunteers, but the real savior of life in Kennedy County—and when I say savior, I mean by the hundreds—was the pilot watershed that was put in in the Escondido Creek, because none of the flood water came from the creek. And the experience of this was had it not been for this pilot shed there is no question but what that the town would have been virtually wiped away and the loss of life would have been appalling.

So I want to say in addition to the many wonderful aspects of the small watershed program, here is one instance where it saved many, many lives. And I strongly recommend to the committee the Hondo Creek watershed project.

I deeply appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Now we will ask the department if they want to make any further comments on the Bear Creek watershed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have no additional comments except that we are available to answer any questions.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions on the Bear Creek watershed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is it all channel work or are there any dams?

Mr. LANE. Yes; there are five floodwater dams. The stabilizing structures are primarily to stop gully erosion but they will have some flood prevention capacity in them. They will supplement the effect of the dams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Those black marks on the map, are those the structures?

Mr. LANE. These marks here right below this colored area are the stabilizing structures. Here is a flood water retarding dam here in the headwaters [indicating]. There is another one here [indicating] and another one here [indicating] and another one on down here [indicating].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions?

What is the value of that land that is to be protected?

Mr. LANE. In my testimony, Mr. Chairman, I indicated that the present value of the farms was about $25,000, and the average size farm is 172 acres. That would be, I believe, in the order of $130 or $140 an acre on the basis of the present value.

Mr. POAGE. Obviously, that is not the value today.

This is not too far out of line, that is, the cost of the contribution, which is relatively small. We have approved many smaller than this, where there had been work done before on the part of the local people, but the contribution is not large nor is the ratio of cost-benefit large, either.

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. But I feel that both of them come within our ordinary limits.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. How long have these conservation districts been in being in those counties?

Mr. LANE. I am afraid that I cannot answer that specifically, Mr. Harvey, but I can point out that the soil conservation districts in Missouri, generally, are the newer districts, newer than in any other States, in other words, the soil conservation district program got underway at a later date in Missouri than almost anywhere else.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no further questions, we appreciate your presentation of the Bear Creek watershed project.

Mr. LANE. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We will now pass on to the Hondo Creek watershed for any further comments or questions on that. Are there any further comments on the Hondo Creek watershed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are available for questions.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions? Does any member have any question? This is Mr. Young's watershed. I would call attention to the fact that while not a large cost-benefit ratio exists, it is a little bit better than the Missouri project and shows a much larger local contribution. It is entirely, as I understand it, an agricultural area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thought from what he said about Kennedy——

Mr. POAGE. This town of Kennedy is in another watershed. He was pointing out that if there had not been this type of work done on that creek that there would have been a considerable loss of life in this town, which is not more than one-half mile from the watershed involved here. He was simply pointing out how helpful these projects are. That is what I understood Mr. Young's testimony to be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. This is strictly an agricultural project. It is a very small project. It is exceedingly small compared to the general run—much smaller both in size and in cost. If there are no further comments on the Hondo Creek watershed, we will go to the next subject.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO RIVER TRIBUTARIES WATERSHED, MISSOURI (SUPPLEMENTAL)

Mr. POAGE. We will now consider the supplemental watershed work plan, One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed. The department will present the plan, and then we will hear from Mr. Hull.

Supplemental Watershed Work Plan—One Hundred and Two River Tributaries Watershed

Size and location: 19,301 acres in Nodaway County.

Tributary to: Platte River, Missouri River.

Sponsors: Soil and Water Conservation District of Nodaway County, Nodaway County Court, and Missouri Conservation Commission.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	53.6
Grassland	35.8
Woodland	2.0
Miscellaneous	8.6

Total watershed privately owned.

Number of farms: 165.

Size of farms: 185 acres average.

Purpose of supplement: To add fish and wildlife development to flood prevention structures included in previously approved plan. In addition to planned flood protection, a 72-acre fishery lake with limited recreational facilities will be created.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of 1 multiple-purpose reservoir with recreational facilities and 10 grade stabilization structures, of which 9 have already been installed.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To land and crops	$14,799	69
To agricultural improvements	236	1
To nonagricultural improvements	450	2
Indirect	369	2
Recreation	5,700	26
Total	21,554	100

Area benefited: 4,466 acres.

Number of beneficiaries: About 51 landowners benefited directly by structural measures and about 3,800 fishermen expected to use the lake each year.

Project costs (as supplemented)

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$23,629	11	[1] $190,815	89	$214,444
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	390,308	96	15,398	4	405,706
Recreation	32,336	55	[2] 26,539	45	58,875
Subtotal	422,644	91	[3] 41,937	9	464,581
Total	446,273	66	232,752	34	679,025

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Does not include $29,600 spent by Missouri Conservation Commission for land already acquired.

[3] Consisting of—

Administration of contracts	$6,626
Construction and installation services cost for recreation	16,844
Land, easements, and rights-of-way	18,467

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.27 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $65.

Carrying out the project: The Missouri Conservation Commission is assuming all local responsibilities for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the recreational development. The other local organizations assume the responsibilities for the balance of the structural works of improvement. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance of the project is $2,299.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will ask Mr. Lane again to discuss this Missouri project.

Mr. POAGE. As was pointed out before we started this discussion, this is a supplemental project and is one of those projects which was underway at the time that we had the basic discussions before this committee and we agreed that we would review these before they went too far. This is as I understand one of those. There were five of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right. And this one was in process. You are correct.

Mr. POAGE. So that we understand that.

Mr. LANE. By way of orientation, I would like to point out that the One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed is located in northwestern Missouri in Nodaway County. The One Hundred and Two River is tributary to the Platte River, which is tributary to the Missouri River.

Mr. POAGE. Tell us why it got that name of One Hundred and Two—is it 102 miles from somewhere?

Mr. HULL. I would not have any idea. I think that we have a Triple Creek out in my area some place, too.

Mr. POAGE. What?

Mr. HULL. Triple Creek.

Mr. LANE. As the chairman pointed out, this is a supplemental watershed work plan. The original plan for this watershed was approved administratively in 1959. It provided for a combination of land treatment measures and grade stabilization structures to prevent further land loss and damage from gully erosion.

Nine of these stabilizing structures that were included in the original plan have been built. These are located in this portion of the watershed [indicating]. One of the original structures planned, this one here [indicating], is still to be built.

The supplemental plan concerns this structure up here [indicating] which replaces two of the structures and provides, in addition to flood prevention in that sector, for a recreational development.

In addition the supplemental plan provides for the Missouri Conservation Commission, which is an agency of the State government, to become one of the project sponsors. This assures that the financial commitments of the sponsors will be met with with respect to the installation of this structure and with respect to the operation and maintenance after it is installed.

In addition to the 72-acre recreational lake created by the multiple-purpose structure the supplemental plan provides basic recreational facilities, consisting of an access road, the access road leading from State Highway 27, and a parking lot for 30 cars, a boat launch, and sanitary facilities.

The estimated cost of these basic facilities is about $5,600.

The Missouri Conservation Commission expects to further develop this site as the demand warrants, and their finances permit. In other words, this will be considered a skeleton development at this time.

The primary use to be made of the development is fishing, although it is expected that picnicking and hiking will also become popular with further development.

The supplemental plan provides for Federal assistance, for the construction of the multiple-purpose reservoir and basic recreational fa-

cilities, including assistance for the purchase of 120 acres of land in this development and at a cost of $13,200.

The Missouri Conservation Commission has already acquired 200 acres in the site at a cost of approximately $29,600.

The cost of the reservoir and the basic facilities is estimated at $186,445.

The plan as supplemented has a total estimated cost of about $679,000.

With the addition of the multiple-purpose reservoir, Public Law 566 funds will provide about 66 percent of the total project cost, and other funds about 34 percent.

The estimated benefit-cost ratio for the entire project is 1.27 to 1, but for this portion of the project which we are considering this morning, the multiple-purpose reservoir and associated recreational development it is 1.5 to 1.

The prorated Public Law 566 structural costs per acre benefited is estimated at $65.

That completes the statement.

Mr. POAGE. Now would you explain to us just what these lands are that are affected by this? I suppose they are the yellow strip there on the map?

Mr. LANE. This yellow area here will be benefited by this structure. It would not have been benefited by the stabilizing structures that this structure replaces.

Mr. POAGE. How much land will be benefited by this change that would not have otherwise been benefited?

Mr. LANE. There are 187 acres that will be benefited in this area which represents new benefited acreage.

Mr. POAGE. 187 acres?

Mr. LANE. And if I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that this reservoir—this multiple-purpose reservoir—will stabilize this gully erosion in this area here so that it will protect the reservoir the same as would the stabilizing structures originally planned.

Mr. POAGE. There will be no change there?

Mr. LANE. No.

Mr. POAGE. From the original plan?

Mr. LANE. No.

Mr. POAGE. As contemplated?

Mr. LANE. That is correct. There will be no change in there.

Mr. POAGE. The only change so far as benefits are concerned then would be the 187 acres of land which will be protected that otherwise would not have been protected from flood waters, is that right?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And then there will be recreational benefits?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Now in calculating this cost per acre of $65 per acre, the benefited acreage, that is really not the cost of benefiting those 187 acres. You have taken out, obviously, substantial amounts of cost contributed to recreation, I believe.

Mr. LANE. The $65 an acre which I alluded is the cost of protecting this benefited area here (indicating). It is a composite figure for the entire project, not for this area alone.

Mr. POAGE. I want to get this information if we can. How much is it going to cost to benefit those 187 acres, if we did not include the

recreational facilities at all—what would it cost per acre be to benefit those 187 acres?

Mr. LANE. I will try to give you an approximation. If I cannot do that, we may have to provide that at a later time.

Mr. POAGE. We take the total cost of this new dam and what the two original proposed dams would have cost, and then we take the difference there and know what the cost is, do we?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is that the cost of the original one there?

Mr. POAGE. It is bound to be there somewhere. Do you know what the original plans contemplated?

Mr. LANE. I have it here. Now, speaking only of the flood prevention purpose, because I think——

Mr. POAGE. No, I am not speaking only of the flood prevention purposes. That is not all we are paying for. I am talking about what it will cost—what does the dam cost?

Mr. LANE. The dam itself will cost $180,000.

Mr. POAGE. $180,000?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Then there is a cost of the right-of-way.

Mr. LANE. That includes the cost of the right-of-way. That is the total cost.

Mr. POAGE. What was the cost of the two dams that you originally contemplated?

Mr. LANE. One dam cost $36,000 and the other dam was estimated to cost $37,000, a total of $73,000.

Mr. POAGE. That leaves $107,000 as added cost.

Mr. LANE. Right.

Mr. POAGE. For this dam. And it will benefit 187 acres. That is at approximately $600 an acre, except that it will affect this other land.

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Obviously, you did not expect this committee to approve an expenditure of $600 an acre to protect 187 acres, so you must have then attributed it to something else, for some recreational benefits. What did you attribute to recreation?

Mr. LANE. How much of the cost, sir, or how much of the benefit?

Mr. POAGE. Well, both.

Mr. LANE. The recreation benefits for the structure are estimated at $5,700 annually.

Mr. POAGE. $5,700 annually?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Well, what did you estimate the cost there for the recreational feature?

Mr. BRUCE. $68,785.

Mr. LANE. $69,000 in round figures, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. You estimated $69,000. And you estimated that 187 acres were benefited. That comes out at $65 an acre, if that is the cost, and that comes roughly to a total of 12,000 for benefiting this land. You estimated $65 an acre?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. That is the structural cost per acre benefited, the $65. And if you apply that to the 187 acres, you have $12,625 attributable to benefiting these 187 acres which still leaves for—you something like $86,000. Is that charged to recreation?

Mr. LANE. It is——

Mr. POAGE. You have about $95,000 that you have to charge to recreation.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. It is $95,000.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. You only charge $50,000 to the recreation. What do you do with the rest of the money?

Mr. LANE. The allocation of cost in the multiple-purpose reservoir is based on the relative capacity provided for recreation versus the relative capacity provided for flood prevention. It is not arrived at in the manner that you have arrived at in your figures.

Mr. POAGE. If you do not use the method I do, then your cost per acre is not $65, but it is substantially a great deal greater.

Mr. LANE. For any single element in the project I am sure that it would vary one way or the other from the $65.

Mr. POAGE. It varies only one way, and that will be instead of being $12,000 it will be $95,000, and instead of being $65 an acre it will run in the order of $500 an acre.

Mr. LANE. As I pointed out the cost allocated to recreation in this reservoir is approximately $59,000. That $59,000, if deducted from the $103,000 which represents the net difference in cost between this reservoir and the two structures it replaces, the difference, if my mental arithmetic is correct, is $48,000. Now, if we divide that $48,000 by 187 acres we get some figure substantially less than you do. How much less I would not try to guess.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. We just figured out a minute ago that the cost of the dam was $180,000 and the cost of the two other project structures which this will replace was $73,000, which left a margin there or a difference there of cost for this dam over the other two structures of $107,000.

Mr. LANE. That is correct, Mr. Harvey, and I should like to point out again that the $59,000 of recreational cost in this reservoir was not in the original plan. That is the reason why I thought that it was appropriate to take out that cost and then consider only the additional cost for benefiting this land.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Do you mean to say that this $180,000 has $59,000 in there for the recreational benefit?

Mr. LANE. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. All right, take the $59,000 away from the $107,000 and you have——

Mr. POAGE. You have $48,000 left; do you not?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Which has to be attributed to protecting the 187 acres of land. And when you do that you do not get $65 an acre, you get several times $65 an acre.

Mr. LANE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me that you have the cost of protecting this land far out of proportion to any of our usually accepted formulas. What is the price of these 187 acres?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask Congressman Hull, who is very familiar with the land values down there, more so than I am, to answer that question?

Mr. HULL. It is really difficult to determine what an acre of land is worth. In my county, one of the best farming counties in the State

of Missouri, for instance, down in my hometown of Weston a farm was sold the other day of 210 acres with no fences and the outbuildings badly in need of repair, and not a modern house, and it brought $355 an acre.

Mr. POAGE. And that did not flood?

Mr. HULL. No; not there.

Mr. POAGE. And this land is always subject to flooding, so that there would not be any benefit without protecting it.

Mr. HULL. I do not know too much land that is moving out in northwest Missouri, whether it is in the flood stage area or not. And when it does it is rather high-priced land.

Mr. POAGE. What we are trying to arrive at, Mr. Hull, is this, and I am sure that you understand, of not spending more on the land than its value. There is no purpose in spending $1,000 an acre for land that is only worth a few hundred dollars an acre when you get through with it.

Mr. HULL. This is not particularly to protect that land in itself. The land happens to be there.

Mr. POAGE. If it is not, the point we have not met here is that it seems to me if it is not to protect the land, then our figures for the cost of recreation are not correct. You have got to charge more for something else.

Mr. HULL. I was thinking in the overall structure rather than just the one phase of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think that you have made an excellent point. And I think that with Lester's help we can bring out the picture that you want. If I understand this rightly, we must try to arrive at what will be the cost to protect this land if we just had flood prevention.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we just figure on that item, the rough computation that I have made in my head, it is something—somewhere between $250 to $300 an acre. We may as well get that out on the board. And that is above what this committee generally has as a criteria. Now you have been very nice and patient in allowing that we do have some extra cost in here for that added storage for the recreation part. That is set out separate and apart as another item. If we can talk to the chairman's point, let us use around $250 to $300 an acre as the acre cost to protect these 187 acres; that is, if we just have flood prevention alone. And we know the attitude of this committee that, if there are other circumstances that warrant consideration, whether it is overall recreation or for some other purpose, they have been giving consideration to approving projects when it might be in excess of $200 per acre. Would you talk to that point a little bit to try to get this untangled for us?

Mr. LANE. Well, I would like to talk to the point right now of alternatives that are involved here. As you gentlemen well know, this is a program of the local people that is carried out with Federal assistance. It is the desire of the local people, including the Missouri Soil Conservation Commission, to modify the plans to provide for multiple-purpose developments rather than for other purposes. The Missouri Conservation Commission has gone in here and purchased 200 acres of land in anticipation of making this a multiple-purpose development.

So I seriously question whether the sites are available for the original two stabilizing structures. So what alternative can you have at the present moment? I think the alternative is not between the two strucures originally planned in this multiple-purpose structure, but between this multiple-purpose structure or, perhaps, nothing, or there may be other alternatives with which we are not familiar. So it seems to me that a fair appraisal of the cost of this structure, if we appraise it in the same setting as we would a new project, would be to take the entire area benefited and relate that against the total cost, although we could, as the chairman has done, relate it only to the additional cost; that is, to the additional area benefited, which is one way of doing it, but I seriously question that we now have that alternative of choosing between the original plan in this instance and this supplemental plan.

If we do not choose this I seriously doubt if the local people can acquire the necessary land easements and rights-of-way to install the original stabilizing structures that were planned.

Mr. DOLE. What is the commission?

Mr. LANE. It is the Missouri Soil Conservation Commission.

Mr. DOLE. Are they cooperating in this project?

Mr. LANE. I am sure that they are, but I do not believe that they have the authority to participate in a program that involves flood prevention alone; in other words, their authority is for the development of fish and wildlife resources in the State of Missouri, not in the flood prevention phases of watershed development.

Mr. POAGE. They bought $29,000 worth of land and that includes the site of one of your original gully projects or dams?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. The other one was bought for $18,000, is that right?

Mr. LANE. I am not sure that I follow you. They bought 200 acres of land.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. And you are going to buy here, I do not know how much land, but you are going to buy——

Mr. LANE. 120 acres.

Mr. POAGE. With Federal funds. That probably is one of the costs, is it not?

Mr. LANE. I do not think that land area can be identified with a specific structure, although I must admit that I cannot pinpoint the 200 acres that have been acquired or the 120 acres yet to be acquired, but in total the 320 acres are needed for this recreational development, and I would assume that the 320 acres includes the area on which these two stabilizing structures would have been built.

Mr. POAGE. I would assume so. Frankly, then we are afraid that you are doing exactly what this committee doesn't want done. I think the only way to do it is to lay the cards on the table. This committee has doubts about this recreational feature, as you know. We have accepted and supported it. And everybody in the United States, as you know, feel that we are not on too firm ground with the recreational features. I think that Mr. Cannon well expressed it, that there is widespread public approval in support of the strictly flood-prevention programs, the flood prevention features of this program. Very few people criticize that. It is widely accepted, but when you hang these other collateral benefits on it there arise questions. One of our fears was, as we expressed it and I express it again, that we thought that

there would be a tendency on the part of some, that we foresaw that tendency on the part of some to escape the burden of paying for rights-of-way by injecting what they would call recreation in these projects, and the Government pay for the additional land that is needed. If you do not call it recreation—if you just call it flood control and do not do anything but call it flood control, why then it is not recreation, and the Government does not pay anything for the land. It looks to me like that is what happens. And if you allow that to happen in this case you are jeopardizing a very highly desirable flood prevention project. That is what we are trying to protect, that is, the flood prevention projects, and we know with absolute certainty that if you abuse this program by using recreation as a means of making the Government pay for something that it should not pay for that you are going to destroy this extremely valuable flood control program. And if you do not think so, you just look at what happened in the REA.

They financed a ski lift—no matter how desirable it was—and I have no doubt that it was good business, because it is paying out, but if you do not think that has hurt the REA 10 times over, the cost of that ski lift, you just have not followed their history, and if you do not think the same thing will happen to this program if we use recreation as a means of avoiding the law, why you just cannot read—you cannot read reading. I am not saying that you have done that in this case, but I think that the burden is on you to show that you have not done it. The facts indicate that you have done it. We will be glad to hear anything to offset that.

Mr. LANE. I think that I can cite figures to indicate, at least, that this has not been done in this case. The original plan estimated the cost of the land, easements, and rights-of-way to the local people at $14,300. With the cost-sharing provided for the land in this multiple-purpose development, even despite that Federal assistance for that much of the land, easements and rights-of-way costs—the total local cost for the land, easement, and rights-of-way is now estimated at $18,500, an increase of $4,200. So I do not think that in this case——

Mr. POAGE. All right. Maybe that is just what was said a while ago. This land, like land everywhere has been going up in value. I just asked you what your experience has been over the United States on these things. Have you been able to buy rights-of-way for what you estimated over a period of years in these projects where it took several years to build them? Have you not always had an increase in the cost of the rights-of-way? You have doubled the cost in some cases. I do not think that is what we are concerned with. The value of land has gone up.

Mr. LANE. There is another feature that you did not mention in your statement, but I know that you are well aware of this. There is a different cost between a flowage easement for the land and fee title that provides complete control. That is one of the justifications I think that the committee took into consideration when it finally approved, reluctantly, perhaps, the cost-sharing on land, easements, and rights-of-way for recreational development. In other words, you recognized that there would be additional cost involved if the local organizations wanted to open these areas up to public access and use. That was the reason or one of the reasons, at least, why it was felt appropriate under limited conditions to provide assistance for land, easements, and rights-of-way for such developments.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. One of the points that impresses me about this—and I am sure that the Missouri Conservation Commission thought they were being helpful—but it seems to me that they have jumped the gun. They did it before they should have. In other words, they jumped in, bought land as I understand it, of one of the prior project structures. And now you come to us and say, "Well, we have got this—we cannot go back to where we were on the original plan." Is that not a fair appraisal?

Mr. POAGE. I think so.

Mr. DOLE. When did they buy the land, that is, the Missouri Conservation Commission?

Mr. LANE. It was sometime between 1959, when the original work plan was approved, and 1962. I cannot tell you the exact date, but it was within that period of time.

Mr. DOLE. On page 1 of your statement you state that the purpose of this supplement is to add fish and wildlife development to the flood prevention structure, including the previously approved plan. What was the cost of the previously approved plan—what was the total cost of that?

Mr. POAGE. It was a plan that would not come to the committee.

Mr. LANE. No, sir. It did not require action by the committee of Congress. It was quite a way under the $250,000 Federal cost, as I recall.

Mr. DOLE. If you take the 187 acres for the flood prevention, what justification is there for this supplemental plan?

Mr. LANE. The justification, if you take out the protection of this land, the only justification then becomes the addition of recreation as the project purpose.

Mr. POAGE. Can you tell us who owned or owns the 187 acres—is it one or two or is it divided up among several owners?

Mr. LANE. I would have to secure that information for you. I am sorry that I do not have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I was wondering about that. You say down here that the structural costs per acre is $65. It seems to me that you have got to show the committee how you get that $65 cost figure.

Mr. LANE. The difference is that the $65 represents an average for the entire project, not for the relationship between the cost of this structure and the area that it benefits.

Mr. POAGE. That does not seem to me to give us the kind of picture that we must have. We are not passing upon the entire project. That has been approved a longtime ago by the Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. It was around $250,000 to begin with and now it is just $179,000.

Mr. LANE. The $250,000 figure was the Federal cost that you are referring to, the total.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. What was the total cost of the project before you came in with the new plan?

Mr. POAGE. $107,000. Here is what he said. It is $180,000 for the cost of the dam.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I am talking about the cost of the total project.

Mr. POAGE. It is $107,000 estimated now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is that correct?

Mr. LANE. It is not exactly correct. The cost of the original plan was $593,000. The present estimated cost is $679,000. Apparently there has been some shifting of costs there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. You had $593,000?

Mr. LANE. $593,000 originally and it is $679,000 now. It does not check out with the $107,000, but it is within that range.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I think that you are incorrect. I do not think that the $107,000 is against your cost as the result of this.

Mr. LANE. We backed into the $103,000 or the $107,000, whatever the figure is, in a slightly different manner, and I think that the two answers are compatible, although they are not the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We appreciate the remarks of this committee with respect to this project, and with your permission I think that I understand perfectly here now the problem and we would like to have a little more time to break out this acre cost. If we just have flood prevention alone, Mr. Chairman, then I think that we need to explore additions to the 187 acres. Some mention was made about the fact that it prevented gullying in this upper area and there may be some basis for claiming acres protected from gullying in that area, and then we need to set aside this additional cost for the recreational development. And I can assure you that as I understand the pulse of this committee, that we are not knowingly to let the local people, by a recreation development, get a windfall in exempting them from the purchase of land, easements, and rights-of-way. We stand solid with you on that proposition. We will be very frank that in allocating so much cost for flood prevention and then allocating separate costs for recreation storage, the mathematics becomes complicated and there is a division of opinion on that, but I can assure you today that we are going to change our formula and set that recreational item aside and apart to where we can come to this committee with a clean-cut case. And with your permission we would like to refigure and present this in a little more clear-cut fashion.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, we will be glad to have you do so, but I think that we would like to have Mr. Hull make a statement today. We do not want to ask him to come back here in 2 or 3 weeks. We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Hull, and then we will go back into this case a little bit later. We are not closing the case. If you would care to make a statement we will be glad to hear you now.

STATEMENT OF HON. W. R. HULL, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this has been quite an enlightening thing to me, too, and I am delighted to appear before your committee this morning and I would like to commend you and your committee for the marvelous work you have done in all of these projects which, I think, are necessary, and I would not want to be a party to upsetting the criteria that this committee has set up, I assure you.

Northwest Missouri has no natural lakes and we are looking for some recreation up in those areas which we hope would keep some of our population in those areas.

I represent 19 counties in northwest Missouri, and of those 19 counties, 17 of them have lost considerable population through the fifties. We are continually losing our farm population.

I am also plagued by not only the One Hundred and Two River, but not far away, the Platte River, the Missouri River, the Chariton, and the Grand River that floods periodically. Of course, in the dry spell out there right now that is not true, but we never know when we will have some rain. But I do appreciate this opportunity of being here and listening to this. And I am satisfied that those people would not knowingly up there try to change the criteria of the committee nor the folks, either, from the department. And I am in hope that you will find that you may support this project whenwe get the additional information on it.

And if I may, I would like consent to insert a statement in the record at this point.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, it will be inserted at this point in the record.

Mr. HULL. Again, I want to thank you for the opportunity of being here this morning.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you. We have been glad to have you.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. W. R. HULL, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this morning to respectfully urge your approval of the supplemental watershed work plan for the One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed. This watershed project is located in central Nodaway County in northwest Missouri and in my congressional district.

The One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed project originally was approved by the Missouri State conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service in accordance with Department of Agriculture procedures.

Since that time, interest in recreation in Nodaway County prompted the local sponsors to request a revision of the watershed work plan to add recreational development.

This change in purpose, with the corresponding increase in costs, results in needed Federal expenditures in excess of the ceiling for State conservationist approval.

Therefore, this supplemental watershed work plan requires the review and approval of this committee.

The feature of the supplemental work plan is a multipurpose lake of 72.5 acres providing stabilization, flood prevention, and recreational benefits. This permanent lake would have such basic facilities as two parking lots, a boat ramp, and toilets and would be surrounded by a public use area of about 240 acres.

Recreation use for this project is estimated at about 3,800 visitors a year, with a peakload of 100 visitors a day. Based upon Missouri Conservation Commission experiences with other comparable lakes and facilities, this estimate of 3,800 user-days is a conservative figure, and the potential use may be much greater. The Missouri Conservation Commission will regulate and manage the lake for public fishing, which will probably be the principal use of the lake. Total average annual recreational benefits are estimated at about $5,700, on a recurring basis.

Total estimated costs for this project are $186,445, of which $127,570 is allocated for flood prevention and $58,875 for recreation.

Total Federal cost under Public Law 566 would be $159,132 with $27,313 in non-Federal expenditures.

This project would provide essential flood prevention benefits and would also help fill a water recreation vacuum which exists in this particular area. Only two impoundments are available to serve the estimated 234,000 persons who live within a 50-mile radius of this site and these are relatively small lakes.

This project represents a meaningful investment by the Federal Government in the welfare of our people through proper development of land and water resources.

I respectfully urge the committee to give its approval to the supplemental watershed work plan for the 102 river tributaries project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. How far is it to a lake for recreation in that area?

Mr. HULL. I would say that it would be down in the Ozarks region.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. What?

Mr. HULL. Down in the Ozarks. It is a right far piece.

Mr. GATHINGS. About 200 or 250 miles away.

Mr. HULL. I do not know whether the lakes in Iowa are closer or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be over 200 miles.

Mr. HULL. At least that.

Mr. GATHINGS. How big is the city of Pickering?

Mr. HULL. Well, I think that you can go—I am not downgrading my town, but I think that you can go through it and not know it.

Mr. POAGE. We thank you again.

Mr. HULL. We thank you very much.

VALLEY CREEK WATERSHED, KENTUCKY

Mr. POAGE. We will now hear the witnesses on Valley Creek watershed in Kentucky. And we will ask the Department to present this project first, and then we will hear from Mr. Chelf.

VALLEY CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 58,000 acres in Hardin County.

Tributary to: Nolin River.

Sponsors: Hardin County Soil Conservation District and city of Elizabethtown, Ky.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	21
Grassland	22
Woodland	43
Miscellaneous	14

Total watershed area privately owned.

Number of farms: 454.

Size of farms: About 120 acres average.

Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, recreation, and municipal water.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of three floodwater retarding structures and one multiple-purpose structure for flood prevention, municipal water supply, and recreation with associated recreational facilities. Storage capacity of the structures ranges from 425 acre-feet to 2,710 acre-feet, totaling 6,231 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$6,005	8
To agricultural improvements	175	
To nonagricultural improvements	35,842	49
Recreation	24,500	33
Municipal water	2,537	3
Indirect	4,690	7
Total	73,749	100

Number of beneficiaries: 62 farm families; owners of 140 residences and 50 business establishments in the city of Elizabethtown.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$56,750	6	[1] $943,500	94	$1,000,250
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	394,700	69	179,300	31	574,000
Recreation	59,630	40	89.630	60	149,260
Subtotal	454,330	63	[2] 268,930	37	723,260
Total (excluding municipal water)	511,080	30	1,212,430	70	1,723,510
Municipal water	0	0	78,000	100	78,000
Total project costs	511,080	28	1,290,430	72	1,801,510

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Relocation or modification of existing improvements	$92,900
Land rights and acquisition costs	167,700
Construction and installation services costs for municipal water	36,400
Construction and installation services costs for recreation	44,930
Administration of contracts	5,000

Benefit-cost ratio: 2.4 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: About 92 percent of the benefits accrue to nonagricultural beneficiaries.

Carrying out the project: The city of Elizabethtown will assume all local responsibilities for installing and operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $4,392.

Mr. SWIGART. This is the Valley Creek Watershed located in Hardin County, in north-central Kentucky and comprises an area of 58,000 acres.

The basic industry is primarily agriculture with farm income depending upon cash sales of tobacco and small grains and livestock marketing consisting of beef cattle, hogs, sheep, dairy, and poultry products.

The division between those two sources of income is about 50–50.

Valley Creek joins the Nolin River, which then flows into the Green River which flows into the Ohio River.

There are some 454 farms in the area averaging about 120 acres each. Among those farms there are 279 cooperative agreements which have been executed with the Hardin County Soil Conservation District and 100 basic plans have already been prepared.

The Hardin County Soil Conservation District and the city of Elizabethtown, Ky., have joined together to develop a multiple-purpose project which has many objectives. It is designed to provide flood protection to the agricultural land down below the city of Elizabethtown. It is also designed to provide a high degree of protection to Elizabethtown, itself. It also provides for municipal water supply and recreational development which is greatly needed in this area.

The city of Elizabethtown now depends on natural springs; two natural springs and one deep well. The town is growing rapidly and it can see a sudden end to its available water supply and is taking the opportunity under the Watershed Act to meet that impending need.

The local organizations have banded together and have proposed a plan consisting of land treatment measures on all of the watershed land in the area. They have gone a long way in attempting to meet

that need. The expenditure is estimated to date at some $831,930. In addition to the treatment measures they are proposing three flood-water-retarding structures an done multiple-purpose recreational flood prevention municipal water supply structure.

This project when installed will practically eliminate damages, except from an improbable storm, in the city of Elizabethtown and will provide protection down in the agricultural areas which will permit a firm agricultural base for some 62 farm families located or owning land in that area.

In May 1961 a major flood occurred which affected some 148 residences in the city of Elizabethtown, some 54 businesses, 2 railroads, 2 major interstate highways, numerous streets and secondary roads.

I might state that Interstate Highway 65, which is the Kentucky Turnpike in this area, goes through Elizabethtown as well as U.S. 31 West and U.S. 62. U.S. 31 West, I think, goes down to Nashville.

The total benefit accruing to the project will amount to $73,749, which will result in a benefit-cost ratio of 2.4 to 1.

The total cost, including all purposes, is $1,801,510, of which the local people will pay $1,290,430, or 72 percent, and Public Law 566 funds will contribute $511,080. If you exclude the water supply in those relationships it becomes 70-percent local contribution and 30-percent Federal contribution.

The cost-per-acre figure is not particularly applicable in this area because of the preponderance of urban-type, you might say, benefits. The city of Elizabethtown has agreed to assume all of the local responsibilities of installing, operating, and maintaining the structures.

Besides, the high local contribution it is estimated that $4,392 annually will be required for maintenance.

I believe that briefly summarizes the project, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. How big is Elizabethtown?

Mr. SWIGART. It is 8,641 people, according to the 1960 census.

Mr. CHELF. That was in 1960. I can assure you that it is a great deal larger now, because it has growing pains from the spreading and overlapping there of Fort Knox which is right to its shoulder blades.

Mr. POAGE. I am glad they are. They are only paying $78,000. And many villages of a few hundred population put out that much money for their water supply. They are getting a good deal. I am not complaining. You have a high ratio of local contribution for the project. Certainly, there is nothing to complain about there. They are getting a cheap water supply.

Mr. CHELF. Yes, Mr. Chairman. That 2.4 to 1 ratio does not include the present flood that has completely inundated and ruined the town. It is even worse now.

Mr. DOLE. Is that your hometown?

Mr. CHELF. I was born and raised in Elizabethtown, which is located on Valley Creek.

Mr. POAGE. These works would prevent such a flood, isn't that right?

Mr. CHELF. This watershed will greatly help us. Oh, my goodness, yes. It would be a terrific help, a big help to us.

Mr. POAGE. Will you make a statement on this?

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CHELF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I will be brief. First of all, I want to thank each and every one of you, from the bottom of my heart, for allowing me to come here and to tell you our story.

The gentleman who preceded me gave you all of the facts; that is, the technical data and information.

It has been my information from such information as he has come forth with here that the size and location is some 58,000 acres in Hardin County. It is on a tributary to the Nolin River, as he so aptly put it.

It has a cost-benefit ratio of 2.4 to 1.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, that does not include present flood damage of approximately $100,000. At this very moment, as I sit here talking to you gentlemen, this little town is still inundated. And to give you some idea—and I have some pictures here—let me show you these. Here is a picture of the main street. That is 31 West, which is the highway that leads from Louisville down to Elizabethtown, to Nashville, and on down south. And here is a site right over here that we just arranged for the Federal Government to acquire for the construction of a new Federal post office building. It is inundated here in this picture.

Over on the other side, this is the creek, Valley Creek, which is out of bounds, something I have never seen in my life, certainly. And, of course, this shows some of the damage. This is some of the merchandise of the merchants which has been gathered together and moved to higher ground.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I just want to read you one little line here from this little county newspaper, the Hardin County Enterprise, a very fine little paper—"over 4 inches of rain fell in Elizabethtown last week in less than a 24-hour period." And at the same time, gentlemen, in Louisville, which is just about 45 miles to the north on the Ohio River, they had a rainfall of 6.8 inches in less than 24 hours.

Here is another scene, gentlemen, from the Elizabethtown News, another fine little county paper, one of the finest county newspapers that I know of. It gives various scenes of areas that have been inundated.

And here, gentlemen, it just breaks your heart—while this is not Elizabethtown, it gives you some idea of the damage—this is the little town of Shepherdsville and this story is in the Louisville Courier-Journal. And it is absolutely, completely inundated.

We have just gotten through a short time ago doing some work there on Salt River. As my colleague from Kentucky, Mr. Stubblefield, knows we dredged the water—we cut sapling, we cut brush, and all of that sort of thing, trying our best to get the water on out and to get it away. But in spite of all that we were able to do, this was visited upon those good people there.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. That is down on the Salt River.

Mr. CHELF. Unfortunately, there is a confluence of the Salt River with the Ohio River—it is rather like the old darkie's fish trap, as they say, it catches them a'coming and a'going. If they are not being flooded by the Ohio River itself, then it is the backwater that gets them from the Salt River. Is that not right?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CHELF. And I just want to give you some idea of what rough conditions we have here.

Here is Lebanon Junction and Salt River, and here is the highway that I mentioned a while ago coming out of Louisville down the Dixie Highway, right on through Elizabethtown, which is down in the section that I indicated to you just a short time ago.

This has been pointed out. This affects, I think, 464 farms. The average size of the farm is about 120 acres.

The purpose, as has been indicated, is not only watershed protection, flood prevention, some recreation, but also a muncipal water supply.

The beneficiaries that are involved here would be 62 farm families, the owners of 140 residences, and approximately 50 business establishments in the city of Elizabethtown.

Gentlemen, as I indicated to you a while ago, we had an estimated $100,000 damage this past week. Unfortunately, back in 1961 we had $155,000 damages in the city of Elizabethtown.

I can say this to you that if we could get this show on the road here it would mean so much to the morale of my people—it would mean so much, for this reason: When I was redistricted, Mr. Chairman, as we all were who lost representation in the House of Representatives—as you know, my district was merged, my old district, which was strictly rural and agricultural, was merged with Mr. Spence's district. He saw fit to retire, and Mr. Spence's district was the old Fifth District which included Covington and Newport right across the river from Cincinnati.

There are five bridges there. It is just like being across the street, as you know, because it is all part of Cincinnati. And all of these little towns are there. You just do not know when you get out of one and into the other. Covington is inundated, Newport is inundated, Fort Mitchell is inundated, Florence is inundated, and you come right down the river. And Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, from Ludlow, Covington, and Newport across from Cincinnati clear to the line of Jefferson County in which Louisville is located, I have 100 miles of my people who are under water. And then when you skip over around Louisville I begin again with Hardin County where this watershed is involved for another additional 25 miles. So my people have been the hardest hit, I guess, of almost anybody, certainly, in the State of Kentucky—would you hazard that guess?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. There is no question about it.

Mr. CHELF. And they have lost hope. And their morale is shot. To tell you the truth, you do not know just how much good the approval of this project would mean—the morale, the psychology of the approval—it would mean so much to us to have this approved. The word would go out that Frank is not up there dragging his feet that he is in there pitching. It will help me, it will help them and it will not hurt anybody, I will tell you that.

I appreciate your courtesy and your consideration.

This situation was so bad, gentlemen, as you know, that the President of the United States flew over the whole from Pittsburgh on down, some 900 miles of the Ohio River, and 125 miles of it was in my district.

I thank you most kindly for your courtesy and your cooperation. It is an inspiration to come here to talk to you gentlemen, because you talk my language.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you. We are very glad to have had you.

Are there any questions either of Mr. Chelf or Mr. Williams?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Hardin County borders on the Ohio River?

Mr. CHELF. We are about 45 miles south of the Ohio River.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. But is floods you?

Mr. CHELF. Oh, yes, definitely.

And Nolin River is involved and Salt River is involved—all of those. Of course, that is a part of my entire area. While I no longer live in Elizabethtown, I live now over in Lebanon, another county town of about 5,000 population, naturally, I feel very close and very near and dear to these good people, because, as I say, I saw the light of day right on the edge of Valley Creek.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions on this project?

I think that we can well agree that this is a typical project to protect the valley.

The agricultural losses, I think, are not serious, isn't that right?

Mr. CHELF. Well, there have been a considerable number of farmers completely inundated. It has not been as bad as it has been in the towns, I must confess.

Mr. POAGE. That is true, because some people can get up on the high land. The farms can be inundated without a great deal of damage. This affects principally the towns. That is the basis on which the department brings it to us.

Mr. SWIGART. There are agricultural benefits, Mr. Poage. This land down below Elizabethtown is subject to flooding. And I imagine that they got messed up this time with this flood that the Congressman is talking about. There are some 880 acres down there. They are dependent upon this bottom land for their crops.

With respect to the total benefits of the project, no, they do not loom large, but they are an important factor of this project.

Mr. CHELF. That is true.

Mr. POAGE. There are no multiple-use benefits in this?

Mr. CHELF. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, it is for flood protection. As he so well pointed out, I think that we have in the entire town two wells and one deep well, is that about it?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes.

Mr. CHELF. Unless they have come through with another one since I left there in January.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that there is recreation in here which is listed as $149,000.

Mr. SWIGART. This is also a recreational development. This is a multiple-purpose structure providing for a water supply, flood prevention, and recreation. In that structure there are 680 acre-feet reserved for recreational purposes; 920 acre-feet reserved for municipal water supply; and 1,110 acre-feet reserved for sediment and floodwater control. It has a total capacity of 2,710 acre-feet.

Mr. POAGE. At some point we seem to run into what seems to be a rather excessive land acquisition cost of $167,000. What causes that cost of $167,000?

Mr. SWIGART. Which one are you referring to—the local cost? Well, that is the share of the land, easements, right-of-way cost relat-

ing to this structure, plus all the land, easements, and rights-of-way relating to the other three floodwater retarding structures.

With respect to this structure there is cost sharing on the land, easements and rights-of-way, in accordance with the provisions of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962. However, there is no sharing applicable to the water supply purpose. It is merely on that land needed for recreational development in this project.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. Actually, the Government is buying th rights-of-way there, I take it.

Mr. SWIGART. Sharing in the costs.

Mr. POAGE. Sharing with whom?

Mr. SWIGART. With the city of Elizabethtown.

Mr. POAGE. How much is the city putting in for the rights-of-way—are they putting in anything—do you have any idea how much they put in for the rights-of-way?

Mr. SWIGART. They are accepting the responsibility, sir, for the entire cost of the rights-of-way with respect to this project which amounts to $167,700, for land, rights-of-way and acquisition costs, and $92,900 for relocation and modification of the existing improvements, and then they are putting in $36,400 for the construction and installation, services costs of the municipal water, and $44,930 for their share of the recreational costs, and they are going to put in $5,000 for administering the contract necessary to install the works of improvement in this watershed area.

Mr. CHELF. May I ask a question? Is it true that the total cost is $1,801,510?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right.

Mr. CHELF. Is it also true that our local people are pledged to put up 70 percent of the entire cost and only 30 percent is by the Federal Government?

Mr. SWIGART. On the overall project, including the water supply, it is 72 percent to 28 percent. Without the municipal water it is 70–30, just as you have stated.

Mr. POAGE. Let us get this straight. I do not have it clear yet. How much of this right-of-way cost which is obviously $167,000—that is the cost to acquire the right-of-way, is it not?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. For the four?

Mr. SWIGART. For the four of them, yes.

Mr. POAGE. How much would apply to the local people and how much of that would be by the Federal?

Mr. SWIGART. The land, rights-of-way and acquisition costs that you read is $167,700 that is being put up by the local people.

Mr. POAGE. That is all local?

Mr. SWIGART. That is all local, yes, sir.

Mr. CHELF. That is part of that 70 percent, Mr. Chairman, that the local people are putting up.

Mr. SWIGART. That is footnoted under the $268,930 which is coming from other funds or local funds.

Mr. POAGE. The Federal Government pays for the rights-of-way in that area?

Mr. SWIGART. The Federal Government will contribute $48,900.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, let me say this. Mr. Swigart, tell them how much money is in here for the Federal expense for lands,

easements and rights-of-way for the recreational purposes. I believe that is what he wants to know.

Mr. POAGE. That is what it boils down to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you will give him that figure it will help. All of these others are immaterial.

Mr. SWIGART. There is $48,900 Public Law 566 funds for land, and $90,100 for other costs with respect to this particular structure.

Mr. POAGE. You mean the other costs of building the structure?

Mr. SWIGART. No. I was talking about this, the land and rights-of-way involved in this one structure, Mr. Poage. The only contribution of the Federal Government to land, for land rights is related to this structure.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. I think you said $90,000 was what?

Mr. SWIGART. That is the local contribution.

Mr. POAGE. I think you mean the reverse of what you said.

Mr. SWIGART. No, that is the local funds.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. What is the direction on that map—is the top part of it north?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes. Louisville is about 40 miles north. And Fort Knox is about 18 miles north.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to all of you. And Mr. Chelf, we are glad to have had you come here.

Mr. CHELF. You are very kind. I appreciate it very, very much, gentlemen.

BLOCKTON WATERSHED, IOWA

Mr. POAGE. We have with us our most consistent customer this morning. Mr. Jensen is with us. We are always glad to see you, Mr. Jensen. We will be glad first to have the department discuss the Blockton watershed project, and then we will hear from Mr. Jensen.

BLOCKTON WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 18,720 acres in Taylor and Ringgold Counties.
Tributary to: Platte River and Missouri River.
Sponsors: Taylor County Soil Conservation District and Taylor County Board of Supervisors.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	63
Grassland	30
Woodland	3
Miscellaneous	4

Total area watershed privately owned.
Number of farms: 124.
Size of farms: 178 acres average.
Purpose: Watershed protection and flood prevention.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; structural measures consisting of 27 grade stabilization structures, three floodwater retarding structures and 0.7 mile of channel improvement. Storage capacities of the retarding structures range from 124 acre-feet to 992 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits:		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$36,130	80
To nonagricultural improvements	1,750	4
Secondary	3,460	8
Indirect	3,740	8
Total	45,080	100

Area benefited: 3,367.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of about 86 farms.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$11,540	10	[1] $108,550	90	$120,090
Structural measures flood prevention	538,950	95	[2] 29,840	5	568,790
Total	550,490	80	138,390	20	688,880

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements, and rights-of-way	$26,080
Administration of contracts	3,760

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.9 to 1.
Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $128.
Carrying out the project: The Taylor County Soil Conservation District and the Taylor County Board of Supervisors assume all local responsibilities for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $1,150.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, yes, I have been a good customer, and your committee has been kind to my people. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We would like to have the department explain the project first.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me introduce a very important gentleman. I want to introduce Joe O'Hara, of Shenandoah, Iowa, who is, I think, next to the oldest soil conservation commissioner in the State of Iowa. He is also the president of the Iowa Soil Conservation Commissioners. He is also one of the 14 directors of the National Association of Soil Conservation District Commissioners who are meeting in Washington right at this time. It just happens that he is in District of Columbia today, so I invited him to come here.

Mr. POAGE. We are very glad to have him here.

Mr. JENSEN. He is also chairman of the Iowa Soil Conservation Commissioners, Mr. Joe O'Hara.

Mr. O'HARA. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We are very glad to have you here.

Mr. JENSEN. Joe is a good Irishman. It is St. Patrick's Day you know.

Mr. O'HARA. And it is a good day for the Irish to be here.

Mr. JENSEN. This is the first time he has ever attended a committee meeting such as this. He is greatly interested in it. And I

want you to know that Joe O'Hara really has soil conservation in his blood. He farms over 700 acres of land. He has a couple of hired men. Joe works many hours of every week, every month, every year, for the Soil Conservation Service, and he gets nothing for that service except great self-satisfaction.

Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to have Joe O'Hara here with us.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from the department now.

Mr. SWIGART. This is the Blockton watershed project in southwestern Iowa, consisting of an area of 18,720 acres. It is predominantly in Taylor County with 18,520 acres located therein. It consists of tributaries on both sides of the Platte River in southwestern Iowa.

The general economy is agriculture, devoted primarily to livestock, cattle, and hogs. There are some 124 farms in the area averaging 178 acres each.

Mr. POAGE. I never heard of the Platte River in Iowa.

Mr. SWIGART. This is the Platte River in Iowa. I think it also goes into Missouri.

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. I know that there is one in Missouri, but I did not know that it went into Iowa.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is it the same Platte River?

Mr. POAGE. It cannot be the same one.

Mr. JENSEN. This is a little Platte.

Mr. SWIGART. The structures in this watershed are really multiple purpose. One of the most serious problems is erosion. Each one of these laterals coming up from the bottom land of the Platte River is gullied up toward the head of the individual tributaries and is causing total land destruction. The gullies range from 20 to 200 feet wide and from 4 to 20 feet deep. And they are really man-sized gullies.

In addition, the debris and sediment derived from the gullies is carried down into the channels on the Platte flood plain, clogging them and creating a flooding condition in these areas delineated in yellow on the map.

The purpose of the project is to stabilize to the fullest extent possible by land treatment measures the remaining watershed area and terraces are used to a great extent in attempting to do that, plus contour farming and the associated measures for adequately treating that land.

The local folks have already spent $201,000 in an effort to control this with normal land treatment practices.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is this one river or is it several small rivers?

Mr. SWIGART. There are several tributaries on each side of this, very small tributaries on each side of the Platte River.

The proposal of the local people consists of 27 grade stabilization structures to control these gullies that are rapidly progressing headward. In addition, there are three floodwater retarding structures to provide protection to these areas, as I pointed out, that are delineated in yellow.

In addition, there will be some channel improvements to rectify the loss in channel capacity that has been occasioned by the sediment derived from this eroding land area.

The total benefits in the project will amount to $45,080, which will provide a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1.

The predominant benefit will accrue from controlling the gully problem in the area. Benefits will also accrue from reducing the flood damage below the three flood retarding structures that are incorporated in the plan.

There are some 3,367 acres to be benefited, affecting the owners and operators of about 86 farms.

The total cost of the project is $688,880, with the local folks picking up $138,390, or 20 percent, and Public Law 566 funds, $550,490, or 80 percent.

The cost per benefited acre is $128.

The Taylor County Soil Conservation District and the Taylor County Board of Supervisors will assume the responsibility for installing, operating, and maintaining them at an estimated cost of $1,150.

Mr. POAGE. This again is substantially different from what we call the typical soil conservation project. This is actually a gully control project.

Mr. SWIGART. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Is it something comparable to the project like Scotts Bluff? Is it something on that order?

Mr. SWIGART. You are thinking of the Indian Creek project, I believe—the Indian Creek project at Scott Bluff Gering Valley. No, sir. Although that is an erosion problem out there, it affects irrigated land, I believe, in the main. This is actually eating away of the fertile upland by the headward extension of this gully system.

Mr. POAGE. I have never seen much greater erosion than out there.

Mr. SWIGART. That is a gully problem. That is caused by the irrigation water, I believe, in the main.

Mr. POAGE. It is caused from the runoff from the hills. It is off the Platte River, too.

Mr. SWIGART. A differenent Platte.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. What you are saying then is that the river being in the valley, that these runoffs from the higher tableland are creating the gullies.

Mr. SWIGART. That is right.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. That is it?

Mr. SWIGART. It is hilly land, what we call the loess hills in southwestern Iowa. There are many similar projects like this, I believe, in Mr. Jensen's district. It is an extremely serious problem.

Mr. POAGE. We approved some in your district and if I understood correctly they were right along the west side of the river.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right—several of them.

Mr. POAGE. I know that.

Mr. JENSEN. And I thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We want to commend our colleague for his enthusiasm, because we feel that he has much interest in this type of work. He has been enthusiastic about it. He has worked on it. And he has been getting good progress. We think that is a good combination.

STATEMENT OF HON. BEN F. JENSEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, of course, I have soil conservation in my blood too, just as you have, Mr. Chairman. And

you are the champ. The farmers of my district took hold of this thing, and men like Joe O'Hara and a number of others went right to work. The farmers got busy and contoured their land and terraced their lands. And it was not long until most every farmer in my district was soil-conservation-minded. And they have really done the job.

The part that I have played in this is just being the Representative in Congress, working along with them, and getting a job done.

This area here, may I say, and I know it very well, because it happens that I got my wife from Taylor County, close to this watershed, so I used to visit that neighborhood quite often for many, many, years, as long as her parents lived at Clearfield, close to Blockton. This is a hilly terrain, and the gullies there, I am telling you, make you sick to your stomach when you look at them. I know that it would you, Bob, and the other members.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I certainly will.

Mr. POAGE. If Mr. O'Hara wants to make a statement, we will be glad to hear him.

There is only one way that those gullies can be healed up and that is through a watershed program such as we are requesting here today. And you know, of course, I do not have to tell you that the farmers there are contouring and terracing their lands. They hold as much water as they possibly can on their lands that falls from the heavens, but when they get a gully washer they just cannot hold the water they should, and it gets down into the lowlands and it creates bigger gullies and floods the lowlands.

And so I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that your committee will see fit to approve this project which is, in my opinion, one of the most necessary projects for a watershed program I have ever known.

That is about all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that Mr. Joe O'Hara knows this area maybe better than I; hence I am sure he will back me up on everything that I have just said.

STATEMENT OF JOE O'HARA, SHENANDOAH, IOWA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I might say that I am a little west of this area. The farmers in that area are greatly interested in it. And as Mr. Jensen has said they are doing a lot of the terracing and contouring work that is so necessary to protect this land. And this is where the watershed work comes in, where we cannot individually do the steeper slopes we need additional help, and that is where the watershed program comes in.

We are going ahead in that area. I am mighty proud to be from that area, and I hope that you will approve this project.

Mr. POAGE. It has been my observation that we have not been quite as successful with this kind of work as we have been with the strictly flood prevention project. I think that this will help tremendously, but I do not think that it will solve the gully problem.

Mr. O'HARA. Not entirely. It is certainly retarding it. It is really doing a wonderful job.

Mr. POAGE. I think there are times when they can prevent floods in a small area, but I do not think that you can prevent gullies without an exorbitant expense. It can help to do the things.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, as you know, the farmers have done about all that they can do, and now they need this extra help from their Uncle Sam.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with that. I agree that they need it.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a soil conservation and preservation program, as well as being a flood prevention project. If we can keep the floodwater from getting down in those bottoms and piling up a lot of silt, that does nobody any good, it will help. That silt is only valuable when it is kept up on the hills. I think that is about all we have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you—to you, Mr. Jensen, and we are very glad to have had you here, Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. JENSEN. We thank you.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will stand adjourned until tomorrow morning. We will have further hearings then.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the subcommittee was in recess, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 18, 1964.)

WATERSHED PROJECTS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Johnson of Wisconsin, Stubblefield, Short, Harvey, and Dole.

Also present: Martha Hannah, staff; and Robert Bruce, assistant counsel.

Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator, Soil Conservation Service; and Charles Swigart, Assistant Director, Watershed Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

The committee is met this morning for the further consideration of Cane Creek watershed plan in Meriwether County, Ga.

CANE CREEK WATERSHED, GEORGIA

We have previously considered this project and we will take up further aspects of the program this morning. We will be glad to have you proceed to present any items that you want to present, or to present any witnesses that you wish to call. You may proceed in any way that you wish.

CANE CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 40,037 acres in Meriwether County.
Tributary to: Flint River, Apalachicola River.
Sponsors: Pine Mountain Soil and Water Conservation District, county government of Meriwether County, city government of Woodbury and Georgia State Highway Department.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	19
Grassland	10
Woodland	68
Miscellaneous	3

Total watershed privately owned.
Number of farms: 263.
Size of farms: About 250 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, municipal water supply, and recreation.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of three floodwater retarding structures, one multiple-purpose reservoir with recreational facilities, 66,293 feet of channel improvement and 63 acres of critical area planting. Storage capacity of the structures ranges from 746 acre-feet to 2,690 acre-feet, totaling 6,448 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits:		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$25,144	*41
To nonagricultural improvements	1,715	3
Municipal water supply	2,738	4
Recreation	27,000	43
Indirect and secondary	5,563	9
Total	62,160	100

Area benefited: 2,076* acres.

Number of beneficiaries: About 66 landowners will be benefited by reduction in flood damage, the city of Woodbury will benefit by improved water supply, and a population of 20,000 in Meriwether County and vicinity will be served by the recreational development.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$71,675	14	[1] $452,131	86	$523,806
Structural measures:					
Flood Prevention	428,317	92	35,438	8	463,755
Municipal Water Supply			31,714	100	31,714
Recreation	134,895	56	107,419	44	242,314
Subtotal	563,209	76	[2] 174,574	24	737,783
Allocated to agricultural acreage	*(230,916)	(41)			
Allocated to other benefits	(332,293)	(59)			
Total	634,884	50	626,705	50	1,261,589

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—Administration of contracts $3,900
Construction and installation services cost for municipal water and recreation 119,749
Land, easements, and rights-of-way 50,925

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.7 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 cost per acre: $111 (derived from figures marked by asterisk).

Carrying out the project: The Meriwether County government and the city of Woodbury assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the multiple-purpose structure and recreational facilities. The Meriwether County government shares these responsibilities for all other structural measures with the Pine Mountain Soil and Water Conservation District and the State highway department.

The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $8,914.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. FLYNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gathings, and Mr. Johnson, before I take my seat and make my preliminary statement, I would like to introduce several constitutents and friends of mine who have accompanied me this morning to this hearing today.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to have you do so.

Mr. FLYNT. I will ask them to stand as I call and identify them and to remain standing until everybody has been identified.

Mr. Harrison W. Bray, chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Meriwether County, Manchester, Ga.;

Mr. Render Hill, a State representative from Meriwether County, in Greenville, Ga.;

Mr. Thomas A. Crowder, president, Cane Creek Watershed Association;

Mr. Bion Williams, Jr., mayor of the city of Woodbury, Ga.;

Mr. C. R. May, manager of the National Biscuit Co. of Woodbury, Ga.;

Mr. T. H. Carroll, a banker and businessman in Woodbury, Ga.;

And Mr. Dan Searcy, assistant State conservationist of the State of Georgia, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, who will identify himself further, but at this point in the record I would like to say that Mr. Searcy at the conclusion of my remarks will make the technical presentation of this case. He has, in addition to other duties, that of assistant State conservationist, charged with the direction of the watershed project program we now have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. And I presume that they are all in favor of the watershed?

Mr. FLYNT. Indeed, they are.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to incorporate by reference, without actually including it as a part of my remarks, the statement which I made before this committee in 1963 as it appears on pages 186, 187, 188, and 189 of that record.

Mr. POAGE. That is all incorporated by reference. We did not close the record on this matter and that is a part of the record in this case.

Mr. FLYNT. So with that statement as a background, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge approval by this subcommittee of the Cane Creek watershed as it has been prepared and approved through the local, State, and Department levels and presented to the subcommittee.

There was some question raised during the earlier presentation as to whether one of these structures in this four-structure watershed project came within the purview of the statute. I am sure that you will remember, Mr. Chairman, my statement at that time that in my opinion, based upon the knowledge that I had of this project, that the Cane Creek watershed project, as presently planned and approved, is justifiable under the statute, justifiable under the procedures and the policy of this committee.

It is my present understanding, as it was when I made my initial presentation before this committee in 1963, that all four projects which are included in this plan were originally planned and today exist on the basis of each being a floodwater retarding structure. Having made a substantial study of it since that time and having gone over the plan in detail with those who are most familiar with it, Mr. Chairman, I would like to stand on my previous statement of justification for this project as it can be applied to the applicable laws and policies which have been established; and I would like to call on Mr. Dan Searcy to make the technical presentation and the justification for the overall plan envisioned in the Cane Creek watershed, but before we call Mr. Searcy to the stand, if there are any questions which you or

members of the subcommittee care to ask me, I will be glad to answer them to the best of my ability and will, of course, be available to come back after other presentations have been made.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Flynt. We will be glad to hear from Mr. Searcy now.

STATEMENT OF DAN SEARCY, ASSISTANT STATE CONSERVATIONIST, STATE OF GEORGIA, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SEARCY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My assignment with the Soil Conservation Service of the State of Georgia has been since 1954 with the State office of the soil conservation service with the responsibility on the staff of guiding the efforts of guiding the watershed program in Georgia as far as the Soil Conservation Service assists in carrying out the responsibility of the act.

I have been familiar with this particular project for several years prior to the application being submitted, as we have worked from the State office through our area and work unit offices with the leadership in each of the watersheds in Georgia several years even prior to their submitting an application.

I went over this watershed and had meetings with the leadership and the people in this watershed prior to the application being submitted in August of 1960. I went over it several years prior to that. And their interest and their need at the time, prior to the application, was flood prevention and watershed protection of the land within the 40,000-acre area. There are approximately 2,700 acres of flood-plain land subject to flooding some three times each year within this watershed.

The application was submitted in 1960. And in 1960 we sent a technical group to study this particular watershed, to determine if it was feasible, under the provisions of Public Law 566. We found that economically it would be feasible to plan and install a flood prevention program under the provisions of the law.

The application did include several other additional objectives within the watershed area—the storage of water for industrial or municipal purposes, and the usage of one of the floodwater retarding structures as a public recreational area.

When the State soil and water conservation committee, and the State conservationist jointly determined that this particular watershed of the many that were outstanding at that time in Georgia, approaching 100, deserved, under the criteria they had developed, to have the preliminary investigation and surveys made prior to asking formal planning authority from the Washington office. It was determined in the early stages of this investigation that flood prevention was the major objective of the local people. We selected over 30 sites within these 40,000 acres that might be feasible and economical to use in a system of both floodwater retardation and channel improvement to benefit the 2,700 acres of flood plain land used agriculturally and subject to flooding.

Our final analysis came up with something like four, five, or six that should be considered structural sites, combined with several proposals of improving the channels, alternate proposals. We discussed

these proposals with the local leadership in the watershed that had made application for assistance and finally determined that four floodwater retarding structures were justified. And there was another structure that might be justified under certain conditions. The reason that I mention that is that about this time in the preliminary investigation and survey we were notified by the Mobile District of the Corps of Engineers that they had made a preliminary study of the Flint River and were proposing a multipurpose structure down the stream from this watershed where it joined the Flint River. The Sprewell Bluffs Dam was proposed. And the preliminary information which we secured from the Mobile district office was not sufficient to determine the effect of this structure on the lower end of Cane Creek. It was determined at that time in their preliminary studies of the maximum flood line, which was normally the flood line for the maximum flood record, that the water would be impounded by the structure. That posed quite a problem with both the Soil Conservation Service assisting the local people and the local people in developing this plan. We had already come up with a system of structures and channel improvement that would do the entire job of flood prevention. The system was developed entirely independently of any other usage of any of the sites, and structure No. 2 in question was one of those to be included in that system.

After we had developed a system of structural measures including floodwater-retarding structures and channel improvements, at that time we discussed with the local people these other objectives that they had included in their application. One was the inclusion of industrial water, primarily for a canning plant that canned pimento peppers, and the other, under the provisions of Public Law 566, as amended, public recreation at one of the sites.

The preliminary information that we secured from the Corps of Army Engineers did not give any firm indication of whether on that site of the reservoir there would be any area for parking purposes or whether there would be any public access other than general public access to the facilities for recreation.

This structure, No. 2, at this time that I am speaking of——

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is that the upper dam structure?

Mr. SEARCY. This is structure No. 2 that is the municipal water and separation and flood prevention [indicating]. On that structure at that time in our planning process we had completed the survey; that is, the storage survey, the site surveys and the site investigation—we had completed the engineering estimate on the cost of it—we had determined the benefits from this structure in connection with all of these structures and with the channel improvement going on to the Flint River. We could have justified that structure program at approximately 1.7-to-1 benefit-cost ratio for flood prevention alone, and then the additional features added to this particular structure would have made that better. And that is the proposed plan at that time, because that would have been in conflict with the Sprewell Bluffs Dam if it was built in the very near future, and our justification was based on a 50-year period of operation and maintenance and receiving benefits from the Public Law 566 project. We discussed with the legal sponsors the possibility of rather than submitting a work plan as we originally had developed it in draft at that time, modifying it to make it harmonious with the provisions of the Sprewell Bluffs Dam.

According to the procedures that we work under, so far as the economic justification of flood prevention in a multipurpose structure is concerned is that we need to justify a structure for flood prevention alone, and then add the additional features. If the flood storage from Sprewell Bluffs, which comes up to this section here in the maximum flood were more frequent than once in 10 years we could not have justified that as flood prevention.

When we prepared this work plan as we have it now before your committee we did not know whether that would inundate a major portion of the flood plain land below structure No. 2 more than once in 10 years. We have since determined from the Corps of Army Engineers from additional work and studies they have made on this structure that this area here below; that is, immediately below structure No. 2, some 75 acres, with six individual farmers utilizing the land according to their hydrology and study of the dam will be inundated less than once every 10 years. Now that degree of flooding is essentially good protection for the agricultural use. Many of our flood prevention work plans do not include that degree of protection. If we can furnish protection during the growing season when no more than once every 3 to 5 years——

Mr. POAGE. May I interrupt you there?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. I can readily see that one flood every 15 years would still need protection, but what is the arrangement with the Corps of Army Engineers, have they taken an easement on all of this land, and are they going to allow any crops to be grown on the land?

Mr. SEARCY. I was going to cover that. I will get right into it now.

Mr. POAGE. I wish that you would.

Mr. SEARCY. Based on past history of the operation of a similar type dam in Georgia, the Allatoona Dam, there are some 3,000 acres of land within the flood pool of the Allatoona multipurpose dam on the Coosa River system that the Corps of Army Engineers leases to private landowners. The land that I am particularly familiar with it is because I was the area conservationist at Decatur, and through my office we arranged to assist the landowners, leasing this land in developing a conservation plan on each acre of that land.

Mr. POAGE. They do not grow crops on it?

Mr. SEARCY. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. They do not expect to grow tobacco or cotton? Or corn?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, they will grow corn, but they prefer—most of them do—to have improved pastureland—highly improved pastureland.

Mr. POAGE. I realize that, that they allow it for pasturage. They allow that in our area, but they do not allow the cultivation of crops.

Mr. SEARCY. No, sir. The Mobile Corps of Engineers office has suggested that if and when they ever secure any of this land and secure money for installing the Sprewell Bluffs Dam that they will operate similar to the operation of the land that they have secured at Allatoona. They will lease to the adjacent upland landowners this land for agricultural production, such as pasture.

Mr. POAGE. And you feel that you can justify that?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Of course, can you not ultimately lease it to the former landowners?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; they do. And in this particular case the reason that this is of particular interest to us is that the six additional landowners who own the 75 acres of land will want to lease that land because it fits in with their farming operations.

Mr. POAGE. And the cover is Bermuda grass, et cetera?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; that is Bermuda. And there is some grass in clover, but it can be a high-producing pastureland.

Now, there is another point, so far as the dam itself is concerned as it is now designed, because we could not determine at the time that we developed this plan the frequency of inundation of this land down there within the Sprewell Bluffs storage area and we determined that the most economical dam to be built at that point would be to include as much of the features of the original plan as we could. This plan does include in the plan the storage of 176 acre-feet of sediment. It is expected that the sediment load from the entire drainage area above that can be trapped in this type of structure for a 50-year period. It is a 50-year storage of sediment. That will have beneficial effects both on the 75 acres of land immediately below the dam that can be leased from the Corps of Army Engineers, plus reducing the sediment load going into the Flint River prior to the construction of the Sprewell Bluffs Dam. And, of course, if Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built—in addition to that, we have 1,426 acre-feet of flood storage in the dam that is not in this plan, and the reason for that flood storage is that it was more economical to store some 4 or 5 above—that is, vertical storage of the normal pool—than it would be to put a large pipe through there to prevent too often the usage of the vegetative spillway which would be difficult to maintain. So it is included in there, the 1,428 acre-feet of flood storage as a design feature, even though it is not allocated to flood prevention as a purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. What is the total storage of the dam?

Mr. SEARCY. The total storage is 2,690 acre-feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. You have three-fourths of it that is for flood storage?

Mr. SEARCY. And 1,426 acre-feet will be flood storage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. And 1,426 acre-feet is for flood storage?

Mr. SEARCY. Flood storage; yes, sir. That is acre-feet of storage, sir. Included in those 2,696 are the 176 acre-feet of sediment storage reserved for sediment.

Mr. POAGE. That is about 1,300 acre-feet that will not be used at all.

Mr. SEARCY. That is the normal pool that will include the storage for the municipal water and other purposes.

Mr. POAGE. What about the capacity for municipal purposes, how much is for that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Did you not say that the total was 20,000?

Mr. SEARCY. 2,690 feet.

Mr. POAGE. He could not have 20,000. It was 2,000.

Mr. SEARCY. No; we could not have that much.

The storage that I am talking about—this flood storage is above the storage—the total storage up to the principal spillway. The 2,690 acre-feet of storage is to a principal spillway that is a tube going down

through there above that—and above that, actually, there is this 1,426 acre-feet of flood storage. From that point up to the emergency spillway, which is a vegetative spillway, so that the total storage as listed in here does not include this flood storage which is a design feature of the structure.

Mr. POAGE. You would have excess storage capacity there that you do not need?

Mr. SEARCY. That is right. You are using it only so far as the design feature of it is concerned to prevent the floodwater going around the vegetative spillway so often, but it is not included in this, because this total storage is set up where it goes through the principal spillway.

Mr. POAGE. You have that as a protection. In other words, the 2,600 acre-feet is protection above and beyond expected needs.

Mr. SEARCY. Actually, you do not get any protection with the 2,690 acre-feet, sir. That is permanent normal water level.

Mr. POAGE. I thought that you included the 1,400 acre-feet in the storage.

Mr. SEARCY. That is above that. I must have made a mistake, if you understood it that way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Then your total is 1,426?

Mr. SEARCY. That is correct if you consider the total storage up to your emergency spillway. We normally, on a floodwater-retarding structure, figure it up to the emergency spillway, but in this we had no allocated floodwater benefits in here and we considered it up to the principal spillway which is the tube that goes through.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. In the case of a heavy rain or a flood for a period of time you would have a total storage of 4,116 acre-feet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us make a comment here. Let us check these figures; we are a little bit confused here on these figures. We might as well get them straightened out. We have them straight now.

Mr. SEARCY. I would like to correct my statement. That figure of 2,690 does include the flood storage. We have a note on here that the 2,514 acre-feet of water supply includes 881 acre-feet for recreational purposes, 207 acre-feet of municipal water supply, and 1,426 acre-feet of temporary storage as a design feature.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, the 1,400 acre-feet that you need to protect these 75 acres of land?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; but it was not put in there for that purpose, but it does that job. It was put in there to prevent washout of the vegetative spillway.

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about the 1,400 acre-feet out of the 2,600.

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. And then you have got 1,400 acre-feet above that, I understand.

Mr. SEARCY. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. I am completely confused on this point. Let us try to determine what we have here, because I just do not understand.

Mr. SEARCY. All right.

Mr. POAGE. You have 135 feet down here at the bottom, have you not, for the sediment?

Mr. SEARCY. 176.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; 176. That is down at the bottom of the pool?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Next, what do you have above that?
Mr. SEARCY. 881 acre-feet for recreation.
Mr. POAGE. 881 acre-feet for recreation?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes.
Mr. POAGE. What goes above that?
Mr. SEARCY. 207 acre-feet for municipal water supply.
Mr. POAGE. All right, 207 acre-feet.
Mr. SEARCY. And then, sir, we have 1,426 acre-feet between the principal spillway and the vegetative emergency spillway.
Mr. POAGE. That is 1,426. Now that goes up to your spillway?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.
Mr. POAGE. That is the first spillway, is that right?
Mr. SEARCY. No, sir.
Mr. POAGE. I misunderstood, then. I thought that there was another 1,400 feet above that.
Mr. SEARCY. This is the emergency vegetative spillway here [indicating]—these 1,420 feet from here to here [indicating].
Mr. POAGE. You have something above those 2,600 feet?
Mr. SEARCY. I corrected my statement on that.
Mr. POAGE. All right, then, you keep the pool going down to here?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir, that is the normal.
Mr. POAGE. That gives you protection?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes.
Mr. POAGE. And the only part that gives flood protection?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.
Mr. POAGE. And it protects the 75 acres of land, is that right?
Mr. SEARCY. It protects the 75 acres of land for sure. And depending on the flooding on the final design of the Sprewell Bluffs Dam we know that it will protect that much, and it can protect more downstream from that.
Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Let me ask a question right there. If the dam does not go in——
Mr. SEARCY. I beg your pardon?
Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Would that protect that?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; it will protect more land, sir.
Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. How much land will it protect if the dam is not built?
Mr. SEARCY. If we had the original system it would have protected about 1,700 acres with this complete system, but we would have to put in this channeled improvement down through here which is not contemplated at the present time.
Mr. POAGE. How much land is shown in the blue on the map?
Mr. SEARCY. There was 2,700 acres of land, flood plain land in the watershed. We are protecting 1,000 acres and just a few acres above that. I will have to get the figures.
Mr. POAGE. You mean roughly 1,700 acres of land that could be covered?
Mr. SEARCY. In a maximum flood.
Mr. POAGE. I think that I understand that. And the 75 acres involved is just that little projection—that little valley that goes up toward the dam?
Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; so, in addition to having some flood protection there above what it claimed in the plan there is also some protection in here that you will get above what is claimed in the plan, sir.

Mr. POAGE. The Sprewell Bluffs Dam plan is off now?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; I understand that it is not funded.

Mr. POAGE. And there is an appropriation for it by this time?

Mr. SEARCY. Mr. Flynt, probably could answer you on that, sir. I cannot.

Mr. FLYNT. The answer to that is "No."

Mr. POAGE. Is it in the budget this year?

Mr. FLYNT. No; and at the time of the last budget preparation it was not authorized.

Mr. POAGE. But it has been authorized since then?

Mr. FLYNT. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. There is no plan for that?

Mr. FLYNT. No.

Mr. POAGE. All right.

Mr. SEARCY. Sir, that is all I have to testify on. I will be glad to answer any questions on it. I would like to repeat that your complete structure as shown in the work plan was planned and worked out with the sponsors and the people interested in this as a flood prevention plan. And after that plan has been worked out and we considered with the local people what other features they would like to add to that plan and that was feasible under the law, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Is it contemplated to go ahead and build the dam exactly as originally planned?

Mr. SEARCY. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. POAGE. What modifications have you made on the plan because of the Sprewell Bluffs Dam plan?

Mr. SEARCY. We have already made a study of it, and we could include a two-stage in that structure and raise the dam only one-half a foot and we could justify complete protection of those 75 acres of land at an annual cost of $576, and get an annual benefit of $857 on those 75 acres. That does not include any other benefits downstream that you may get, but that is on those 75 acres.

Mr. POAGE. Let me ask you this. As a general policy, do you believe it sound for the Federal Government to spend money to benefit tracts of land—and we are using the example of the 75 acres in this instance which happens to be before us, where there is a very small number of individual owners, which happens in this case to be about five or six, I believe you said, and whether it would be three or it would be one, I am not asking you to draw a line, because I do not know where the line ought to be, and I do not think that you know—but is there not a danger that when we build Federal structures to benefit so few, that we are misusing Federal funds.

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. There is bound to be a point somewhere above that, so that by the time you get to where you have 100 it is perfectly proper. There has to be a point somewhere in between where we ought not to spend Federal money.

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir; I agree.

Mr. POAGE. We are pretty close to that line here now. Are we not?

Mr. SEARCY. Except that we are restricted in this particular case to the absolute minimum over a 50-year period. If this Sprewell Bluffs Dam is not put in within the next 4 or 5 or 10 years there are additional landowners who will be benefited.

Mr. POAGE. Except for the Sprewell Bluffs Dam this would be a meritorious project, but we are faced with the Sprewell Bluffs Dam, and we have told the Soil Conservation Service to figure these things on a 50-year basis and that they prove the benefits on that basis. If they cannot prove them, why spend the money?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to have any suggestions from anybody. We do not know. Should we hold this thing up until we find out whether the Sprewell Bluffs Dam is going to be built? I think that I speak for the committee when I say that we would approve this project if it is not going to be built, but we think that it is, do we not—the probabilities are is that it will be built.

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Did I understand the witness to say that the benefit accruing to the 75 acres was incidental, that the main benefit was to save the vegetative spillway?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Thank you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. One thing that held it up the previous time was that there was no flood benefits. We were under the impression that it was all for recreation and municipal water supply. They have come in now and are proving that 1,426 acre-feet are for flood prevention in this dam, so that the picture has changed from what it was the last time it was up.

Mr. POAGE. They have not proved that. They have simply said that it will protect this land. That is what it comes down to.

Mr. SEARCY. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. It is grassland. It is 75 acres of grassland. And when we are dealing with that, when you get to analyze it you are building this dam at a cost of what—how much is the total cost of this one dam? It is a pretty expensive dam to build just to protect 75 acres of pastureland with a flood occurring once every 15 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if I am catching on here, I believe that we brought out in our previous testimony that we do have flood prevention in here for the 75 acres.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, 75 acres of pastureland.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Correct. We will hold onto that. Second, Mr. Johnson, will you not agree that we have made it somewhat easier on our spillway by this?

Mr. POAGE. Before you pass that one, let us find out this, unless the thing is justified we do not need any dam there, do we? You say that we should justify this structure because we will have a better dam and a better spillway. We are talking about whether we will build the structure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is one other point, Mr. Poage. If I understand this rightly, there is no extra Federal cost going into this extra arrangement.

Mr. POAGE. Then let us understand that right quickly, because if that is correct, I have not the slightest objection to your building 50 dams.

Mr. SWIGART. No cost allocated.

Mr. POAGE. How is that?

Mr. SEARCY. There is no cost allocated for flood prevention.

Mr. POAGE. Wait a minute. You are not coming in here and telling us that you have a right to build that dam solely for recreation purposes with Federal funds, are you? Unless you have got flood prevention purposes in it—I want to repeat, and I think that we have said this enough times—so that we ought to get it across—unless there is flood prevention purposes involved, we will not give approval to any Federal agency to go out and build recreation dams. They are not to protect recreation. Certainly, I agree that we ought to use recreation in those projects that we are building for flood prevention. We ought to get that, too. I did not understand, however, that we were building dams simply for a recreation purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Poage, may we go off the record?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. Back on the record.

As far as I can see, the difference of opinion on this is not a difference of what is desirable and what is not, but it is a question of what we are considering as the basis of our calculation. Of course, if we are going to consider that this project is going to protect 1,700 acres of land from recurring floods, I would assume that the committee would find that it was a desirable project. We have found all others of that kind desirable. And I do not see that anybody has ever raised any question about this if we knew that the 1,700 acres were not going to be taken out of cultivation by the Flint River Project, but I think that we then come to the question of whether we should consider the Flint River project or not. I think that a perfectly legitimate argument is that work will not go ahead on that project—you have no assurance that they are going to build the Sprewell Buffs Dam; (therefore, you ought to go ahead and approve this project because you can make a decision now and we cannot legislate on the other for years to come. That seems to be one line of argument. It seems that we are forced to that, but you cannot make your argument—I say that you cannot—although you can make that argument in the alternative as a lawyer would, and if you are going to build, why those 75 acres will benefit and we are going to have a contributing amount on this project. This is not going to be a structure strictly for recreation purposes. On that I challenge the validity of the argument, because I think that if this land is all covered by the Flint River project, you have got to figure the benefits according to the basis of our formula. If you assume that the Flint River project is not going to be built then, obviously, you have a good engineering project that comes within the purview of the formula of the committee, but to tell us that you can afford to spend this amount of money that this dam is going to cost, simply to protect the 75 acres is not justifiable, is that not correct?

Mr. FLYNT. We cannot make an assumption one way or the other. We cannot assume that it will not be built, any more than we can assume that it will be built; that is, the Sprewell Bluffs Dam Reservoir; but by the same token we cannot any more properly assume that it will be built than we can properly assume in this presentation that it will not be built. And I just make the analysis in this way since we are talking about certain assumptions. And if this were being tried before a court—if you were in Waco, Tex., presiding over the district court for whatever district Waco is in, and it was being tried as a

law suit before the Honorable W. R. Poage, presiding judge of the—judicial district of Texas, and the side that might be on the contrary side to the side that I am making this presentation here today were to come in and say, "Well, Your Honor, we want to make an assumption that something is going to be done," why, Mr. Poage, you would set him down so quick that if he did not sit down you would hold him in contempt of court and never let him practice in your court again. And that is exactly the way we want you to treat us today when you are presiding over this committee, with the same fairness that I know that you would if you were the presiding officer of the court.

Mr. POAGE. We can make the assumption and consider what would happen. It would depend upon whether the assumption is valid. I think that we have got to do that. What is the logical thing to expect in respect to that valley there, that part of it that is going to be inundated?

Mr. FLYNT. I wish that I could answer that question for the committee. If I answer that right here and now I would, but I know this, that as long as the three of the four Congressmen whose districts who are either astride or adjacent to Flint River are opposing and I am the junior one of those four Congressmen. We cannot make any assumption.

Mr. DOLE. I would assume that no matter how meritorious we consider the discussions to be that they either stand together or stand alone and would it not be reasonable as a compromise to approve one, three, and four. Is there any reason to hold up your project because of this question which nobody knows the answer to right now—would it not be of some benefit to you to approve three-fourths of the project and see if the other question might be resolved by the time that they were to be done?

Mr. FLYNT. If I can reply to Mr. Dole, Mr. Chairman, that question was posed by the chairman during 1963, and after consultation with my seven friends who are here today who I believe are the seven citizens of this entire area most knowledgeable on this subject, without exception I feel that the four together, including the controversial structure, is essential to the purpose for which the watershed project is planned. And if I have stated that correctly will you gentlemen all stand up?

(They all stood up.)

This is Mr. Hill, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Williams, Mr. May, Mr. Bray, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Searcy who is, of course, the technical adviser on this thing. The only answer that I can give you on that, Mr. Dole, is the same one that I have given to the chairman before, that I agree with these gentlemen, and I feel that it is of the utmost importance to the entire watershed and to the several hundred landowners who will participate in this project that the entire project be approved.

Mr. DOLE. How long will it take to complete one, three, and four?

Mr. FLYNT. We will ask Mr. Searcy to answer that question.

Mr. SEARCY. In my opinion, Mr. Williams could probably answer that better than I, but the authorization of a portion of the work plan—I would not know how to proceed with it, sir.

Mr. DOLE. They would not be completed on the same day, week, or month?

Mr. SEARCY. No.

Mr. DOLE. I am trying to help resolve this question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. In my district they will build one or two dams a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think that we all agree that we could cover it by a supplemental, if the chairman would agree to let me bring up the supplemental.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. May we go off the record?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. Back on the record.

Mr. DOLE. We might work within the confines of the policy of the committee as we understand it and still work out a compatible solution for those in Georgia. We do not want to do anything detrimental to their interests. How can we resolve it and still not be accused of preferential treatment or setting a bad precedent, because if we do it in Georgia, we will be faced with the fact that we may have to do it in Colorado, Idaho, and other States.

Mr. FLYNT. May we go off the record?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. On the record.

I want to know if their reasoning is the same as yours?

Mr. FLYNT. I asked if they thought all four were essential to accomplish the overall purpose.

Mr. POAGE. It is obvious, is it not, that it is not essential if Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built. It is not essential for present flood prevention. That is pretty clear.

Mr. FLYNT. Not to me. The reason that it is not obvious to me is that the plan was developed on the basis of four, not on the basis of three. If the structure in question, the multipurpose structure designated as structure No. 2 is removed from it I just cannot agree that the value of the other three would be as great as the value of all four would be.

Mr. POAGE. Nobody is suggesting that it would be as great as the value of all four, but it is perfectly obvious that three of the four protect the land upstream.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that I can settle it.

Mr. POAGE. It is perfectly obvious that they protect the land upstream from approximately the point where the Sprewell Bluffs Dam backs water up there—point that out—the upper part of the Sprewell Bluffs Dam.

Mr. SWIGART. Right there [indicating].

Mr. POAGE. Now, everybody knows that when the Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built it will be right there, the backwaters?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. That is the point. Now below that point if the Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built none of these projects are going to protect anything because they would be flooded, anyhow, but it is perfectly obvious, as I understand the engineering of this, when it is built or not built, that No. 2 dam in your project has not a thing in the world to do with the protection of anything below that point, has it—from that point up, upstream, back towards you—No. 2 dam has absolutely nothing to do with the project, has it? Let us have an answer to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Do you not agree to that? Look at the map. Do you not agree with what I am saying?

Mr. FLYNT. To agree to that, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that the entire plan is wrong.

Mr. POAGE. I did not ask you that.

Mr. FLYNT. I cannot admit that the plan is wrong. I think it is as good a plan as ever has been presented, and the benefits from it are just as great as the average plan approved by this committee.

Mr. POAGE. I will ask the gentleman who is the witness—am I not stating that correctly from an engineering standpoint?

Mr. SEARCY. No; you are not.

Mr. POAGE. Let us have it.

Mr. SEARCY. Because this line does not represent the normal water level of Sprewell Bluffs Dam. That is the maximum flood pool.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; we understand.

Mr. SEARCY. There will be some benefits from these just as here that will extend all the way down, even if Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built, although we did not claim them in justifying economically these structures and this channel way.

Mr. POAGE. That is not the qeustion that I asked. I think that I want to take issue about the technicalities of it. I asked you if from that point——

Mr. SEARCY. From this point [indicating].

Mr. POAGE. From that point upstream—not downstream. You talked about downstream. I asked from that point upstream whether Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built or not, if the No. 2 dam has the slightest effect upon the protection of that land back upstream?

Mr. SEARCY. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. That is the point I am making. Therefore, if it does not, then the upstream dams must be able to perform their function from that point upstream just as well whether No. 2 is built or is not built, is that not true?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. So that it is obviously a great deal of benefit that is to be had if you build the three dams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will have to be forthright—we can build three dams. This is divisible. We have precedent in the Pennsylvania case. If this committee decides to drop off this dam that is your decision.

Now we have talked to the overall benefit from another aspect, and I just go back to that, not trying to argue this one as an absolute must, with respect to these three other structures. That would be an incorrect statement.

Mr. POAGE. If the Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built, then there is certainly no economic advantage to be gained from the flood prevention aspect of the No. 2 structure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would acknowledge that.

Mr. POAGE. To justify it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the affirmative—I would contend for the other purpose.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. I know what you are contending for the other purpose. I find no fault with these gentlemen contending for the other purposes, but I think that we must have it clear so that this committee, whether rightly or wrongly, has generally

followed the practice of saying that unless a dam is justified for flood prevention, no matter how many additional benefits you can put on it, that we will not approve that dam. That is what we have tried to establish as a policy. If you can justify it for flood prevention purposes, then all of the other benefits you get we think are good—we think that the more of them you can put on there, such as municipal water, recreation, anything else that you can put on there, is fine, if you are going to build it, anyhow, but the point that we have tried to carry out in this program was to make this a program of flood prevention with additional benefits tied in with it. We thought this was a flood prevention program. If you can argue that it is still basically a flood prevention program and that you are adding a recreation feature, I think that the committee would agree with you in a moment.

Mr. SHORT. May we go off the record?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. On the record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Would it not be possible that they would start No. 1 and No. 3 and No. 4, and No. 2 would be the last dam built on the project—how about that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We can agree to that. It may not suit the sponsors. I know the thought on this municipal water part.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. It will be a matter of 2 or 3 years before the final dam is built.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be something in that range.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. You probably would not build any dams this summer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That has to be determined—it has yet to be determined.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Don't you start with the contracts first and things like that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would not be this fiscal year—it would be the next fiscal year.

Mr. GATHINGS. Why would it not be well to hear these other gentlemen who are present? They have come a long distance. I would like to hear a brief statement from each of them.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank Mr. Gathings for that suggestion. I would like to say this, that the economy of the entire watershed and the gross income to the farmers in that watershed and in the adjoining counties revolves around structure No. 2, and these gentlemen who will follow me can tell you why. Will you start off, Mr. Hill?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Hill.

STATEMENT OF RENDER HILL, REPRESENTATIVE, MERIWETHER COUNTY, GREENVILLE, GA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am from the Georgia Legislature and I am in complete sympathy with the committee's program on legislative matters, but I would like to state right here that I live 9 miles from this city of Woodbury and its proposed Cane Creek watershed. I have been interested in this watershed program for a number of years. In fact, I feel like I was primarily responsible for raising some money in the State of Georgia

to further these projects, locating these projects. Is that not what they call them?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I would like to say right here that we in Meriwether County depend to a large extent—I might be getting out of line, but I am talking——

Mr. FLYNT. You go right ahead.

Mr. HILL. To tell you this, that I raise pimento peppers. I have a contract to raise them.

May I go off the record?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. Back on the record.

Mr. HILL. I know of this plant in Woodbury. They almost have to dryclean the pepper plants when they are preparing pimento peppers, because they do not have enough water to can.

This is an agricultural community, primarily, and the overall agricultural system in my county is that. And when I say that, gentlemen, I know what we are talking about, and that we are talking here about public money, and I know that your committee—and I am sure that I know that this is the Subcommittee on Watersheds—but I think that the No. 2 dam that has been referred to is more than that. I know that in my area we will almost have to get out of the canning business of peppers unless we have some type of water system.

The city of Woodbury has six spring systems. If any one of them should run an hour it would deplete the 24-hour water supply of the city. I would like to put that in the record.

Mr. POAGE. Is it your suggestion or would you approve—let us put it this way, would you recommend to Mr. Flynt who is your Representative in Congress that he introduce legislation authorizing the Federal Government to build dams solely—solely, I am saying——

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE (continuing). To supply municipal water?

Mr. HILL. No, sir. If it is necessary to keep the agricultural region, the lifeblood of our economy, going, I would say, "Yes, sir."

Mr. POAGE. Have you ever heard of anything that was built without some justification on the record?

Mr. HILL. No, sir, I do not believe I have.

Mr. POAGE. Can you not get that justification on the record for anything that you want to build?

Mr. HILL. I thought that we had a pretty good program myself.

Mr. POAGE. We think you have got a good program, too. And the program that you have is a flood prevention program.

Mr. HILL. I am familiar with that—that is right.

Mr. POAGE. And we think that it is a good one. And we think that it could be better, and that we could have a lot of other good programs, but we wonder if it is desirable to tie a good many other good things onto a program and to lose everything that we have. That is our feeling.

Mr. HILL. We considered that.

Mr. POAGE. Let me ask you a further question. Would you advise your Congressman to introduce legislation to authorize the Federal Government to pay the entire cost of dams, which were devoted 100 percent to recreation?

Mr. HILL. No, sir, I would not.

Mr. DOLE. I appreciate your statement. This is not an adversary proceeding. We are trying to work out something. If the choice was having No. 1, 3, and 4 or having none, what would you recommend to your Congressman, Mr. Flynt?

Mr. HILL. I stood up just now, Mr. Dole.

Mr. DOLE. That was not the question I asked you. You thought it was essential. We recognize your feeling. Are you willing to forgo the whole project?

Mr. HILL. Could I answer this way? I feel like this is like baking a cake. If you leave out some of the ingredients you will not get the overall effect.

Mr. DOLE. It is like building a house and wondering before you put in all the flooring whether you should carpet some of the areas. No. 2 is a recreation project and we are primarily concerned with conservation and flood prevention.

Mr. HILL. I think that is like building a house without putting a roof on it. I think that this is an essential part of the house.

Mr. DOLE. You do not have any answer to the question then?

Mr. HILL. It is hard to turn down anything that benefits the community, but I think that three would be better than nothing, I will say that. But I do think that No. 2 is one of the most important of them.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Where is the town of Woodbury located?

Mr. SEARCY. Right here (indicating).

Mr. SHORT. What distance is that in miles?

Mr. SEARCY. It is a little less than 2 miles from the city limits.

Mr. SHORT. To the dam?

Mr. SEARCY. Yes.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Would it be feasible to secure water from some other location?

Mr. SEARCY. The city of Woodbury has consulting engineers, and they have been advised not to go to the Flint River because of the pollution of that.

Mr. HILL. I make one more statement, if I might.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. So far as pollution is concerned, the State of Georgia has a real, real problem. I introduced this past general assembly a bill on pollution. And Flint River, with the Sprewell Bluffs Dam, will tend to multiply the pollution problem in the Flint River by the stagnation of the water. This is one reason I do not see where they can go to get water, but in this general area.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Is this because of the vegetation?

Mr. HILL. It is the sewage and the industrial wastes out of the city of Atlanta.

Mr. POAGE. Is $31,000 involved in the municipal water part of the project come out of some $1,260,000. Is it very good business to spend $1 million some-odd to get $31,000 worth of municipal water?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am——

Mr. POAGE. You understand, I agree that if you justified this other expenditure for flood prevention, then it is fine to get the additional help on municipal water, but it seems to me that you gentlemen are placing the whole purpose of this on the municipal water.

Mr. HILL. So far as this one dam is concerned, I think that enters into this one dam, but not as to the picture as a whole.

Mr. POAGE. Except I know that you were not quite clear on that with Mr. Dole, but, certainly, the whole idea is that you are going to insist on spending the whole $1,250,000 so that you can get this particular municipal help on water—you would not want to cut it down any. How much does this dam cost—nobody has ever answered that?

Mr. HILL. I do not know. Do you know?

Mr. POAGE. Can anybody give us the total cost of this No. 2 dam?

Mr. SWIGART. Just a minute. It is $178,275.

Mr. POAGE. That is the entire cost, including the city's contribution?

Mr. SWIGART. That is the entire total cost including everything.

Mr. POAGE. That means that the Federal Government spends $150,000 in order to get $31,000 worth of help for the city.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. That would be about $140,000. What is the cost of the dam?

Mr. SWIGART. $178,275.

Mr. POAGE. Is that not asking the Federal Government to go a little strong to get $31,000 worth of help, to spend five times that much of Federal money?

Mr. HILL. When you are asking for a drink like some gentleman said before, where are we going to get any water if we do not get it there?

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about the Federal contribution.

Mr. HILL. That is right, I understand.

Mr. POAGE. Do we have to have the Federal Government come in to spend $5 to save us $1?

Mr. HILL. As long as we are paying our tax money, this is my feeling, if you do not mind my saying it.

Mr. POAGE. I do not mind.

Mr. HILL. I think that the $150,000 will justify itself in the agricultural area to promote this area and to help the flood control, plus, at least, multiplying our potentialities as an agricultural area. I think that the $150,000 is very little money to spend in this area for the benefits that we will get from it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. You would charge the $150,000 to the municipal water supply?

Mr. POAGE. I have admitted time after time again this morning that you have a perfectly logical project that nobody has raised any question about if you had flood prevention in it, but until they have proved the dam is going in or is not likely to go in or something of that kind, we have to assume that this dam——

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. We know that the dam is not going in for 5 or 10 years, probably. How about giving them the benefit of the 10 years?

Mr. POAGE. It is being set up on a 50-year basis.

Mr. HILL. I do not know whether Sprewell Bluffs Dam will ever be built.

Mr. POAGE. Neither does anybody else. You can make an argument on the basis that we do not know about Sprewell Bluffs Dam, but when you are working on the assumption that we are talking about now that Sprewell Bluffs Dam is going to be built, for the purpose of providing municipal water you gentlemen have all said that you do not think that the objectives of this project could be

reached without building this dam. Obviously, the flood-control problems can be solved without building this dam if Sprewell Bluffs Dam is built. And when you said that "we did not think we should build it solely for recreation," so then that just leaves the purpose for municipal water at $31,000. It seems to me to be rather exorbitant—the percentage seems to me to be so fantastic.

Mr. HILL. If you ask me, Mr. Chairman, if I thought that it should just be built for recreational, I would say no. But we have multi-purposes, recreation, and municipal water and flood control.

Mr. POAGE. Let me ask you this, do you think that this committee—you know what we are talking about—you have served in the Legislature—do you think that this committee has a proper function of approving the construction of any dam anywhere that does not have any flood prevention in it?

Mr. HILL. That is not the case here?

Mr. POAGE. I did not ask whether it was the case or not. I asked you whether you think that this committee ought to approve a dam anywhere that does not have any flood prevention in it?

Mr. HILL. Obviously, yes, sir; I do.

Mr. POAGE. You think it should?

Mr. HILL. Well, I am not telling you what to do, Mr. Chairman, but what I am saying is that if you lived in Meriwether County, Ga., like I do, and if you knew that this whole problem like we do—and I am sure that these gentlemen behind me are better qualified to talk on this subject than I—I live 10 miles farther from it than anybody in this organization, but what I am telling you is that I know—and Mr. Chairman, I hate to say this, but I know that this is the most important and worthwhile project I have ever seen since I have been living in the county.

Mr. POAGE. I do not question that. Let me put it this way: If this is a fact, I represent a district in which there is a town of 2,000 population that is presently hauling water and has been hauling water since early in October and so far as we can see until we get rains it will keep on hauling water, shipping it in there—every drop they drink and every drop they use—for a city of 2,000 people which is shipped into that town from 20 miles. I think that we do not have any more meritorious project than to supply them with water, and yet I have not come before this committee asking them to build a dam simply to take care of that. You know it. I am not going to come before this committee asking you to build a dam. If I can find one that can be justified as a flood protection dam I sure will try to put some municipal water in there, but I am not coming before you asking you to build a dam and to charge the whole cost of it to the Federal Government to supply those people with water. I think they need it just as badly as your town does.

Mr. HILL. I would vote for you if I were on this committee, and I sure hope that you will find that.

Mr. POAGE. I am not saying that I will oppose doing something to help them get the water, but I am saying, Can we tear down a good program that means a great deal to the Nation, a flood prevention program—can we convert it into some other kind of program—should we convert it into something else and if we need something else should we not try to find something by which the Federal Government would

be able to provide water to the communities? That is what you want. That is what my people want. We want municipal water down there.

Mr. HILL. I agree with you, but this is still in the overall picture. It is just like the case I have been telling you about. We have got to have all of these ingredients in there for it to operate and to be a complete unit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say this, because we have an audience here: I make a plea slightly different from your proposal. If we have a project that we can, say, get three structures for flood prevention and we satisfy the agricultural need in that area, and we can move a few miles away in communities like we are talking about and can get a municipal water supply and we can put the chamber of commerce, the county seat government officials and the agricultural officials on the same team for community development, and although I have never had an urge to run for Congress, I believe that I would make that my platform for that community, an effort for the total good of all of the people. We might take this out of the Department of Agriculture and have a department of watershed resources development. I believe that. I hope that someday I can persuade this committee to go along for this other purpose. And to strike, yes, always for this flood prevention purpose, but whenever we have a watershed where we can get the local people to buy the land, easements of rights-of-way—and I am going along with the recreation item—and we can get the State government to put in blank dollars like $200,000 that we are doing in Georgia—and this member of the legislature voted for that and——

Mr. POAGE. I do not get that. Do not misunderstand us; I do not want you to do that. I do not want you to misunderstand us. I do not think that anybody else wants that. Is the legislature going to devote $200,000 for this project?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. POAGE. They did the same thing that the State of Texas did and the State of Oklahoma did, although on a much greater scale than any of us—they have put up several times more money than the Federal Government put up for planning, have they not, and they have more projects, as you know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. But that was the point I made, that we have State participation toward community development. There is no need in my talking any further. You know what I plead for.

I would like to say that I would like to see sometime where you would allow us to have at least one structure for other purposes, if there is no need for putting in flood prevention. And if there is a need, sir, it will go first, but if it happens—if there happens to be no need, in the interests of the total good of all of the projects for all of the people, both urban and rural, I think that it is a good expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I would sell that position to the country. I may not support some of these others things you have been kind enough to go for, but for this municipal water supply to these rural areas, I think that it is better to spend Federal money tied in with a watershed, than to make an ARA grant or to get a special bill through the Congress or by other means, RFC or otherwise—I think or I believe that this committee will do the greatest service to all of the country if it will lean toward that approach. I may be in error. If I am, I apologize.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like for you to hear all of our witneses. We have the mayor of Woodbury here and also the chairman of the board of county commissioners. I would like for you to call either one of them that you would like to have next.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear them. You call the witnesses that you like.

Mr. FLYNT. This is Mr. Williams.

STATEMENT OF HON. BION WILLIAMS, JR., MAYOR, WOODBURY, GA.

Mayor WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are in the Area Redevelopment Act counties at the present time. I feel like this grant-in-aid, or whatever you might call it, for our municipal water supply would be of great help to the county. We are going to have to get Federal money in some other way to help us over the hump, otherwise.

We have the National Biscuit Co. there which is one of our largest manufacturers. And we are not able to supply water to them when they are canning pimentos in the fall of the year and at other times in the year. They have five deep wells that they have to help out with on water.

That gets back to what you were saying a while ago that you are not interested in that, but this is an agricultural product, and our need is so desperate, that is the reason I am here representing the city.

We got tied in with this when they were preparing for flood control and asked to share in the project.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Mayor, we are not questioning the desperate need of your community. I do not think that any member of the committee questions of the seriousness of your need, but is it your view now that the Federal Government should go to the various communities of the United States that have needs to do this?

Mayor WILLIAMS. I would like to say that we are sending out foreign aid money. If we were in India we would have a better chance.

Mr. POAGE. I have not voted for that yet. Let us get that in the record and get it straight.

Mayor WILLIAMS. I wish that you were in charge of foreign aid spending.

Mr. POAGE. I think that we ought to apply the same rules across the board.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will you ask the mayor would they pay for the land, easements, and rights-of-way going into the recreation development—would that help us a little bit? I believe that they will do that.

Mr. POAGE. What about that, Mayor?

Mayor WILLIAMS. My understanding is that we would share more than $31,000. I thought that we were going to put up that money, that amount. Maybe I am wrong.

Mr. POAGE. Let me ask you this, this committee has been plagued with this sort of thing since we authorized these recreational projects. We do it in some instances. I do not want to undo it, but I think that there is a great opportunity there. We provided in projects of 75,000 acres that the Federal Government would buy the rights-of-way on these recreational projects; otherwise, the local communities would have to pay for the rights-of-way and you would have to pay for these

other three dams up here for the rights-of-way. Would the community be willing to provide for the rights-of-way?

Mayor WILLIAMS. Yes; we will.

Mr. POAGE. On this dam?

Mayor WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That will help us some.

Mr. POAGE. How much is that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would be $17,113.

Mr. POAGE. That is what you mean it will cost the Federal Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that they would pick that up. In other words, we have it split here now that it would be $17,113 out of Public Law 566. You remember their part will be $18,787. Let us persuade him to pick up this land, easements, and rights-of-way item on this recreation, because I know the feeling of this committee and I know what you have done in order to make this a total multipurpose goal. And it seems to me to be logical and proper that the city, in order to get the municipal water supply and recreational development, join with the agricultural interests and ante up a little bit. And this is one place that they can do it legally. They cannot do it on flood prevention.

Mayor WILLIAMS. I might add that I have worked in Washington here for over 30 years. I am retired. I went back after retiring to this small town which is my hometown. I am trying to do something for them now without any pay whatever. I was with the Federal Aviation Agency. I retired in February of 1962. I used to know Congressman McMillan back in 1932 when he worked on Capitol Hill.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you. We will now be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HARRISON W. BRAY, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, MERIWETHER COUNTY, MANCHESTER, GA.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am H. W. Bray, chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Meriwether County. I do not come before you claiming to be an expert in soil conservation. I do know that in carrying out my duties last Sunday morning I was riding around trying to check on the damage that was done by a 3- to 5-inch rain that we had on Saturday night. I just wish that the chairman could have been with me and had the opportunity to look at Pound Creek that particular morning. It was out of its banks anywhere from 1,000 feet, I would say, to 2,500 feet. That is the creek that we are saying there are no flood prevention features in.

We have done a good deal of work on this project. We have obtained options on that land. The people in that vicinity think that this watershed project is going to be approved. They have looked forward to it with a great deal of interest. And then when this roadblock, we might say, came up and there was a real feeling of disappointment to the people who live in the area—the farmers that I am talking about.

I know that the city of Woodbury needs this water supply. Our thinking was that if we could get this watershed project approved our first dam to be built—and I have not talked to the soil conserva-

tion people about this—would have been the No. 2 dam in order that we might provide flood control for that valley running into Cane Creek and at the same time provide this water supply that Woodbury so desperately needs.

I also rode about 8 miles farther down Cane Creek and across, and Cane Creek at the point that I crossed was out of its banks approximately 2,000 to 2,500 feet on both sides. And, the reason I particularly notice that was that the man who owns this pastureland—I believe he has it in fescue—had just finished putting in about 800 to 1,000 pounds of fertilizer per acre in that particular pasture, and you can imagine where his fertilizer is today.

I have seen that particular area flooded five times since the first day of December. We have had a very drastic problem with rain since December, in January and February, up to now. And this last Saturday night, as I have stated, it was about 3 to 5 inches of rain. There was a tremendous flooding of Pound Creek, the creek we are talking about.

If you have any questions I will be pleased to answer them, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. May and Mr. Crowder might like to be heard briefly.

STATEMENT OF C. R. MAY, NATIONAL BISCUIT CO., WOODBURY, GA.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is C. R. May and I represent the National Biscuit Co. in this little town of Woodbury in Meriwether County.

In listening to you gentlemen talking here about these four projects I disagree with Mr. Dole. I think that the No. 2 project is the foundation of all four projects. So I frankly would have to say that the three other projects would do little good unless we had the No. 2 project.

Mr. DOLE. Where do you live; in Woodbury?

Mr. MAY. Yes, sir. I agree, Mr. Chairman, with your position, but if you were in our position I think if I read you right that I would vote for your problem if you have anything like the problem we have. We have no way of getting water. You have probably some way of hauling the water. We do not even have that.

Mr. POAGE. You mean that there is nothing within 20 miles of you?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. DOLE. What do they use for water now?

Mr. MAY. What are we doing for water?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. MAY. We are doing the best we can for water. We have a number of wells. We have been trying for a number of years to get water.

Mr. DOLE. Are you hauling water in there now?

Mr. MAY. No, no.

Mr. DOLE. Are you getting it locally?

Mr. MAY. We are cutting down our operations during the peak of the season, because we do not have enough water.

Mr. DOLE. You are on water rationing in Woodbury?

Mr. MAY. Not right now. During our rush pimento season time we are.

Mr. POAGE. I do not believe that you understood the situation I described. This city I mentioned has been hauling every drop of water

that they have used since early in October. And that was most of October and all of November and all of December and all of January and all of February and a good part of March and the end is not yet in sight. And yet you tell me that you are in better shape than they are.

Mr. MAY. Pardon?

Mr. POAGE. Yet I understood that you are in a better position than these people are in my section.

Mr. MAY. During our peak season, except for that; yes. We have enough water at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. These people in the winter season in our part of the country usually have water. They have not had any water during this slack season. They have hauled all of their water during this winter period.

Mr. MAY. I understand you have.

Mr. POAGE. And they will have to do so into the summer unless they get rain.

Mr. MAY. I understand that you have a place to haul from. We do not even have that.

Mr. POAGE. You have water. What do you need to haul. We have no water. We are hauling it from other places.

Mr. DOLE. That is the problem in Guantanamo.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. MAY. You need as much water then as we do. You are probably in the same port we are in.

Mr. SHORT. Just to get this picture a little better in my mind in regard to the agricultural benefits, perhaps a little bit indirectly, that would accrue from providing this town with a little more adequate water supply, how long has this plant that you operate been located in this community?

Mr. MAY. This plant was originally located there in 1927. It has been gradually increasing its capacity since that time.

Mr. SHORT. Is the reason the water supply is becoming acute because of any particular change in water supply in the community, or is it because of the operation of the plant having become larger?

Mr. MAY. I do not know. I think that the water level is lower in the last few years. That has a lot to do with it.

Mr. SHORT. What is this product that you process there?

Mr. MAY. Pimentos. It is an agricultural product. We process pimentos, peanuts, and some other canned goods products there. We deal with 400 to 500 growers in agriculture who are growing pimentos.

Mr. SHORT. Are these growers scattered all over the area covered by this entire project, including the four dams?

Mr. MAY. All over the Meriwether County area.

Mr. SHORT. How many of them are going to be displaced by this Army Engineer project?

Mr. MAY. To answer your question I think about one-half of our tonnage comes from this county.

Mr. SHORT. From the area that is going to be flooded?

Mr. SEARCY. No, sir. They normally do not grow the peppers in the flood plain. They are grown on the uplands of the watershed. There will not be any displacement of them.

Mr. SHORT. You are saying that the flood control aspects of this whole project do not necessarily affect the agricultural production that is related to this plant that needs the water supply?

Mr. SEARCY. The pimento product. There are other things.

Mr. MAY. From the production standpoint, it definitely does.

Mr. SHORT. This is the only product that is produced in the area, that is primarily the only crop that you process; is that not right?

Mr. MAY. There are some other products.

Mr. SHORT. What are some of the other products?

Mr. MAY. Cotton, peaches—crops of all kinds.

Mr. SHORT. Are peaches grown in the flood plain, and is this a cotton ginning operation and a canning operation?

Mr. MAY. We have nothing to do with the cotton. There is a cotton ginning operation in the same area.

Mr. SHORT. What I am trying to get at is the relationship of this small town that needs the water supply. Your plant, as I understand it, is located in this small town; is this right?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. And this is the only industrial plant there?

Mr. MAY. No, sir.

Mr. SHORT. There are others?

Mr. MAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHORT. Well, maybe this is something that has some relationship to this whole overall consideration here. If we are trying to build an argument for the expenditure of Federal money, this is somewhat contrary to the basic premise of this Public Law 566 program which is basically for flood control, and if we are trying to build a case for agricultural benefits I think that we should have in the record perhaps the overall agricultural economy, the number of different agricultural crops in this community that are processed in this town that is dependent upon this No. 2 dam for an additional water supply.

Mr. MAY. That is just what I am trying to speak of, Mr. Short. We need the water from the production standpoint. If we do not get the water we will have to quit doing business with the particular growers of agricultural products. We cannot use the products unless we have the proper water to process them with.

Mr. FLYNT. How many growers do you buy from, Mr. May?

Mr. MAY. Between 400 and 500.

Mr. SHORT. And these are peppers?

Mr. MAY. Pimentos.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. What other products are canned?

Mr. MAY. Peanuts—I am speaking of ourselves. We make peanut butter, salted peanuts. We also process dates. And there are other concerns there that process peaches of all kinds.

Mr. SHORT. Let me get this point clear. You have come to the conclusion that it is virtually impossible to dig more wells or that there is any other approach that might be available to you in your plant or to the community to secure additional water supply, is this right?

Mr. MAY. We have a number of dry wells right now. We have tried for the last 10 years to get water. We have dry wells right now which we have put down and have found no water.

Mr. SHORT. How deep did you go?

Mr. MAY. I do not know exactly—whatever the water level is. We have drilled from 200 to 600 feet.

Mr. SHORT. People do this in my part of the country.

Mr. MAY. You usually get the water between 300 to 500 to 600 feet.

Mr. SHORT. You are getting down to a reasonably deep water level.

Mr. MAY. That is right. We have had well people tell us that it is impossible to get any water in that particular area. We have spent a lot of money trying to get water for the last 10 years.

Mr. GATHINGS. What is your opinion of the remark made by Mr. Williams to pay for the land easements and rights-of-way, and so forth, on the part of the city of Woodbury?

Mr. MAY. I think that we can get that land easement all right. I believe that we can get the land easements all right without any cost to the Government.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any further questions from this witness?

If not, we are obliged to you.

How many more witnesses do you have?

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, there is Mr. Crowder.

Mr. CROWDER. I do not think that I can add anything.

Mr. FLYNT. I think we have just about covered it, Mr. Chairman. And we certainly thank you for your consideration.

Mr. POAGE. We are very much obliged to you. And we are very much obliged to these witnesses. And I want to say to you that although very probably we gave you the impression that we are hostile to your desires, we are not—we do not want to turn them down—we do not get any pleasure whatever in turning anybody down who comes before this committee, but we do try to carry out what we believe to be the fundamental purpose of our law. And the committee will give your project consideration. We will promise that. We are like the United States and Panama, we are not going to promise you what is going to happen as the result of this, but we are not ceasing to negotiate. We will consider your problems and see if there is any way that we can bring out something that will be helpful.

The committee is now going into executive session for a few minutes, not to consider your particular project, but to consider other projects.

Mr. FLYNT. We thank you on behalf of all of us.

Mr. POAGE. Very well.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee proceeded into executive session.)

WATERSHED PROJECTS

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 1310 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Johnson of Wisconsin, Stubblefield, Hagan of Georgia, Short, and Harvey.

Also present: Martha Hannah, staff; and Robert Bruce, assistant counsel.

Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, John H. Wetzel, Director, and Charles Swigart, Assistant Director, Watershed Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE (presiding). The subcommittee will please come to order.

The subcommittee has met this morning to consider various projects.

The first of these projects is Dunn Swamp and Cedar Branch tributaries, in North Carolina. I understand that Congressman Lennon is here, and wants to appear in connection with this project. We will be glad to have you appear, but before you appear, it is our practice to have the Department explain the project, and then we will be glad to hear from you.

Mr. LENNON. I was going to yield to them, if you recognized me, because I understand that was the committee's practice.

DUNN SWAMP AND CEDAR BRANCH TRIBUTARIES, NORTH CAROLINA

DUNN SWAMP AND CEDAR BRANCH TRIBUTARIES WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 27,300 acres in Columbus County.
Tributary to: Lumber River and Waccamaw River.
Sponsors: Chadbourn Drainage District and Lower Cape Fear Soil and Water Conservation District.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	41
Grassland	1
Woodland	53
Miscellaneous	5
	63

Total watershed privately owned.
Number of farms: 335.
Size of farms: About 65 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms, and structural measures consisting of 68 miles of channel improvement.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$94,778	100
Flood prevention	(51,275)	(54)
Drainage	(43,503)	(46)
Total	94,778	100

Area benefited: 8,461 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of 335 farms.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$171,867	20	[1] $676,321	80	$848,188
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	425,162	82	95,476	18	520,638
Drainage	224,084	51	217,640	49	441,724
Subtotal	649,246	67	[2] 313,116	33	962,362
Total	821,113	45	989,437	55	1,810,550

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Construction cost for channel improvement	$136,636
Land, easements and rights-of-way	172,480
Administration of contracts	4,000

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.7 to 1.
Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $77.
Carrying out the project: The Chadbourn Drainage District assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the channel improvement. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $17,550.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear the explanation from the Department on Dunn Swamp and Cedar Branch tributaries watershed project.

Mr. SWIGART. The Dunn Swamp and Cedar Branch tributaries watershed is included in the extreme southeastern part of North Carolina, in Columbus County.

It comprises an area of 27,300 acres of nearly level to gently sloping land. The watershed is really divided into two subwatershed areas—one, the Dunn Swamp and the other the Cedar Branch tributaries.

The Cedar Branch tributaries flow through Juniper Swamp into the Cedar Branch which joins the White River, and then into the Waccamaw River. And Dunn Swamp flows into the Lumber River.

The project is sponsored by the Chadbourn Drainage District and the Lower Cape Fear Soil & Water Conservation District.

At the present time 41 percent of the watershed is in cropland and the balance in grassland, woodland, and miscellaneous.

There are 335 farms in the watershed which average about 65 acres each, ranging in size from 20 to 500 acres.

There are 11,380 acres of cropland devoted primarily to tobacco, corn, soybeans, and small grains. These make up the major farm enterprises in the watershed. There are several dairy farms and a few sizable beef and hog enterprises.

Under present conditions, 117 soil and water conservation plans, involving 9,750 acres have been developed and there are 30 additional farmers who have cooperative agreements with the local soil and water conservation district.

The project proposed for the principal problem in the area is for excessive rainfall with inadequate channels for the overflow, a drainage problem.

The project proposed consists of 68 miles of channel improvement, a multiple-purpose channel improvement, providing a capacity for both relief of the flood problem and, also, relief of the drainage problem. They are purely multiple-purpose in character, and they will enhance the economic farming opportunities in this area.

The population in the area is 6,500, 3,500 of whom live on farms. There are 500 who are rural nonfarm residents and 2,500 who reside in the town of Chadbourn.

The annual benefits that will accrue as a result of this channel work will amount to $94,778.

The area benefited is 8,461 acres, owned and operated by 335 farmowners and operators.

The cost of the project is $1,810,550, of which $821,113 will be borne by Public Law 566 funds.

The local costs will be $989,437, or 55 percent of the total cost.

The benefit-cost ratio is very favorable, 1.7 to 1. And the costs per benefited acre, as we normally present it here in appearing before this subcommittee, is $77 per acre. That relates to a land value of $400 to $500 under present conditions and $500 to $600 under protected conditions.

Mr. POAGE. What are the crops?

Mr. SWIGART. Tobacco, corn, soybeans, and small grains.

I believe, sir, that gives a brief summary of the project.

Mr. POAGE. Now, Mr. Lennon, we will be glad to hear from you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is this close to the ocean?

Mr. SWIGART. It is very close to it. I think there is one more county southeast of Columbus County, and I believe it is Brunswick County, which borders on the Atlantic Ocean, that is, on the coast.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions?

If not, we will hear from you now, Mr. Lennon.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALTON LENNON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my statement is almost identical to that of the representative of the Soil Conservation Service, the statement made to the committee just now.

I made my statement based on the official report from the drainage district level up to the State conservation service and up to here, so

anything that I would say would be repetitious of what he has already said. In the interest of saving your time, I would ask permission of the subcommittee to put my statement in the record, and I would ask permission, too, to put in the record at this point a statement of the secretary-treasurer of the Chadbourn Drainage Commission, Mr. C. Elwyn Harris.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection that may be done.

Mr. LENNON. And then I will attempt to answer any questions that the subcommittee may propound to me, sir.

(The prepared statements of Hon. Alton Lennon and C. Elwyn Harris follow:)

STATEMENT OF HON. ALTON LENNON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to make a statement concerning the Dunn Swamp-Cedar Branch tributaries watershed project.

This watershed embraces 27,300 acres in Columbus County, N.C. It is sponsored by the Lower Cape Fear Soil and Water Conservation District and the Chadbourn Drainage District. The watershed consists of 11,320 acres of cropland, 14,400 acres of forest land, 250 acres of pasture, and 1,330 acres in miscellaneous uses—roads, homesites, and urban areas.

There are approximately 335 farms in the watershed averaging about 65 acres in size. Seventy percent are owned operated, with the remaining 30 percent being leased or farmed by sharecroppers. The population of the watershed is approximately 6,500—about 3,500 live on farms, 500 are rural nonfarm residents, and 2,500 live within the town of Chadbourn. The watershed completely encompasses the town of Chadbourn.

Flooding in this area severely damages crops, especially tobacco. There is heavy loss of crop yields, as well as lower quality of the crops not entirely lost. Of course, these damages substantially lower net income to farmers and the general economy of the area. In addition, private roads, culverts, bridges, and farm machinery are damaged. Many of the rural residences have outdoor toilet facilities, and receding floodwaters deposit human and animal excrement, creating health hazards. Water supplies are frequently contaminated, farmwork delayed, traffic hindered, and other normal functions of rural life are disrupted by the floods.

Cost of this project is estimated to be $1,810,550, of which $821,113 (45.4 percent) will be furnished from Public Law 566 funds. The remaining cost of $898,437 (54.6 percent) will be provided from other sources.

The estimated annual primary benefits of $94,778 will result in a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.7 to 1.

Thank you for every consideration of this greatly needed project.

STATEMENT OF C. ELWYN HARRIS, SECRETARY-TREASURER, CHADBOURN DRAINAGE COMMISSION

The Dunn Swamp and Cedar Branch tributaries watershed, containing approximately 27,000 acres, is located in Columbus County, N.C. The sponsoring local organizations for the watershed are the Lower Cape Fear Soil Conservation District and the Chadbourn Drainage District.

The work plan covers three watershed problems; namely, (1) inadequate conservation land treatment measures and practices on individual farms, (2) inadequtae drainage, and (3) flood damage to crops and pasture. The proposed project set forth was formulated to solve these problems in keeping with objectives of the sponsoring local organizations.

Works of improvement include the installation of vegetative and mechanical land treatment measures to increase infiltration and remove excess surface and ground water. Structural measures consist of 68 miles of channel improvement.

Total installation cost of the project, including land treatment, is estimated to be $1,810,550. of which $821,113. will be from Public Law 566 funds and $989,437. will be from other funds.

Land treatment measures will be installed, operated and maintained by landowners and operators, at their expense, in cooperation with the local soil and water conservation district, with such cost-sharing assistance as may be available through ACP or other going programs. Structural measures will be installed, operated, and maintained by the Chadbourn Drainage District.

Funds for non-Federal share of installation cost, and cost of operating and maintenance of structural measures will be provided by the Chadbourn Drainage District. The ratio of estimated primary benefits to estimated costs is 1.7 to 1.

The watershed lies in the west central part of Columbus County within the Coastal Plain physiographic province of North Carolina. Topography of the watershed is from nearly level to gently sloping in areas near the flood plain. The whole area can be described as being a "Pocosin."

Major soil series are Lynchburg, Dunbar, and Rains with smaller areas of well-drained Norfolk and poorly drained Portsmouth. The flood plains are made up of swamp and wet alluvium land.

This is a row-crop farming area. The main crops of tobacco, corn, soybeans, and cotton are used interchangeably in the cropping systems. Crop residue management has proved, for the most part, sufficient to maintain a good infiltration rate and good tilth in the soils of the watershed. Cover on the limited acreage of pasture is fair to good.

Approximately 53 percent of the watershed is in forest land. The ownership of the forest land is divided with several industrial companies owning approximately 5,000 acres and the individual farmers owning the balance. Forest soils vary from well-drained sands to poorly drained loams.

Present land use within the watershed consists of 11,320 acres of cropland, 14,400 acres of forest land, 250 acres of pastureland and 1,330 acres in miscellaneous uses such as roads, homesites and urban areas.

The damage from floodwater is more clearly shown during a "dry" year when the balance of the area is suffering from drought. In 1956 such a year resulted in the watershed area having the highest average production of tobacco, corn, soybeans, and cotton of any other area in Columbus County. The damage is also evident by the $100 per acre difference in the current market value of similar cropland in other areas of the county. Other damages, not readily evaluable in monetary terms, also exist and serve to depress the overall economy of the watershed area. Officials of the town of Chadbourn report that some industries have heretofore rejected the area as a possible location for new plants because of improper drainage and flood hazard.

Selection of structural works of improvement was guided by objectives of sponsoring local organizations, physical characteristics of the watershed, and appropriate engineering criteria. Physical characteristics of the watershed prohibited consideration of floodwater retarding structures.

Channel improvement measures were, therefore, selected to accomplish flood prevention and drainage objectives. Alternative locations, systems and capacities of channels were investigated and considered by local sponsors. The system of channel improvement proposed in this plan was selected (on the basis of desires of local people and technical information developed by the Soil Conservation Service technicians) as most practical to provide the desired extent of flood protection and drainage.

According to farm operators, no increase in total crop and pastureland within the watershed is anticipated as a result of project installation. However, it is expected that some shifts will be made in cropping systems in order to establish crop rotations that will provide for better use of land according to capabilities, and so that conservation measures may be applied according to needs of the land. No increase in acreage of allotted crops is expected. Benefits will accrue as a result of reduction in direct flood damage, reduced production costs and better quality of crop yields. Land use after project installation is estimated to be 11,320 acres of cropland, 250 acres pasture, 14,400 acres woodland, and 1,330 acres of miscellaneous land (mostly urban, roads, homesites, etc.).

Improved channels will reduce breeding places for mosquitoes. It is also expected that health hazards caused by flooding of wells, septic tanks, and outdoor toilets will be significantly lessened.

It is estimated that flood damage to private and public roads and bridges will be eliminated except for storms of great magnitude.

After installation of the watershed works of improvement, annual inspections will be made by the governing body of the drainage district and a representative

of the Soil Conservation Service. Additional inspections will be made after each major damaging storm to determine condition of channels and to estimate immediate maintenance needs.

Specific operation and maintenance agreements will be executed between the drainage district and the Soil Conservation Service prior to issuance of invitation to bid for construction.

Acreage and use of cropland—Dunn Swamp and Cedar Branch tributaries watershed

[In acres]

Crop	Without project	With project
	Acres benefited by Structural measures	
Tobacco	935	944
Corn	3,979	4,197
Soybeans	722	819
Oats	799	837
Pasture	1,235	1,269
Miscellaneous crops	418	395
Idle	373	0
Subtotal	8,461	8,461
	Remaining area	
Tobacco	337	201
Corn	1,459	1,241
Soybeans	262	286
Oats	289	246
Pasture	454	454
Miscellaneous crops	161	161
Idle	147	70
Subtotal	3,109	2,659
	Total watershed	
Tobacco	1,272	1,145
Corn	5,438	5,438
Soybeans	984	1,105
Oats	1,088	1,083
Pasture	1,689	1,723
Miscellaneous crops	579	556
Idle	520	70
Total	11,570	11,120

Explanatory remarks

Local farmers in the watershed indicate intentions to shift some of their principal crops to land in the protected area where the more fertile soil is expected to produce better quality crops at lower cost after the project is installed. This shift will contribute to utilization of all land in the watershed more in keeping with land capabilities. It will also enable farmers to reduce the total acreage of cropland, and not increase the acreage of crops in surplus supply. Of the acreage estimated to be taken out of cropland, 159 acres will be planted in permanent grasses to control erosion; 74 acres will be planted in trees; 10 acres will be developed for wildlife habitat; and 207 acres will be utilized for channels, drainage ditches, and spoil placement, with the spoil being seeded to permanent grasses.

PROCEDURES USED TO OBTAIN ASSISTANCE UNDER PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 566

Public Law 566 was passed by Congress in 1954. The law has been amended several times to include additional features. This is a locally sponsored program with Federal assistance. The sponsors must establish an organization

with authority to carry out their responsibilities. Sponsors usually include soil and water conservation districts, drainage districts, watershed improvement districts, county commissioners, municipalities, etc.

The sponsors make application to the Secretary of Agriculture for assistance. The application is first sent to the State soil and water conservation committee who approves or disapproves the applications. The State committee holds field examinations with all interested Federal, State, and local organizations. The State committee recommends priority for planning.

The Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service authorizes the project for planning. The Soil Conservation Service watershed work planning party assists the local sponsors in developing the watershed work plan to meet the sponsors' objectives.

The watershed work plan is reviewed by the North Carolina Board of Water Resources, as the Governor's representative, and all other interested agencies. It is then sent to the Budget Bureau for approval. The project work plan is then sent to the appropriate committee of Congress. Most of the plans in North Carolina are sent to the Agriculture Committee of the House.

When the committee of Congress approves the project, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service authorizes the project for operations. Funds are appropriated by Congress for these projects in a lump sum to the U.S. Department of Agriculture; then, in turn, it is allocated to the Soil Conservation Service. Funds are allocated to North Carolina in a lump sum by the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service for all projects based on programing. The State conservationist allocates the funds, project by project, within the State. These funds are for technical assistance, for accelerated land treatment purposes through the soil and water conservation districts, and the Federal share of construction cost to the contracting organization such as drainage districts. The legal organization lets and administers the contracts and pays the contractor.

When all land treatment is planned and applied and the works of improvement installed, the project is closed and documented and no more watershed funds can be spent in the project.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions on Dunn Swamp and Cedar Branch tributaries watershed project?

This does not involve any flood retention structures, does it?

Mr. SWIGART. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. It is strictly drainage?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes.

Mr. LENNON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. How much new land will be coming into production as the result of this?

Mr. SWIGART. Over the entire watershed there will be no new areas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. It will just improve the present used land?

Mr. SWIGART. It will improve it, more economic management, with increased production on the present acreages; yes.

Mr. LENNON. May I say to my friend that I have in my hand here pictures which depict accurately the conditions in this area and I will be happy to hand them up and let the members of the subcommittee look at them.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. There will be no benefit to the communities, it is just agricultural benefits?

Mr. SWIGART. It is all agricultural.

Mr. POAGE. All right. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you. We will pass on to the next project, the Lyon Swamp-White Oak Swamp watershed, in which you are also interested, along with Congressman Henderson.

We will be glad to hear from the Department on that.

LYON SWAMP-WHITE OAK SWAMP WATERSHED, NORTH CAROLINA

LYON SWAMP-WHITE OAK SWAMP WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 47,000 acres in Bladen and Pender Counties.
Tributary to: Cape Fear River
Sponsors: Lower Cape Fear Soil and Water Conservation District and Lyon Swamp Drainage and Levee District.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	20
Grassland	1
Woodland	77
Miscellaneous	2

Total watershed privately owned.
Number of farms: 215.
Size of farms: About 100 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms, and structural measures consisting of 37.4 miles of channel improvement.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$87,145	100
Flood prevention	(73,638)	(84)
Drainage	(13,507	(16)
Total	87,145	100

Area benefited: 3,920 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of 215 farms.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$88,352	25	[1] $263,695	75	$352,047
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	532,946	80	137,026	20	669,972
Drainage	61,487	50	61,421	50	122,908
Subtotal	594,433	75	[2] 198,447	25	792,880
Total	682,785	60	462,142	40	1,144,927

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.
[2] Consisting of—

Construction cost	$37,493
Land, easements, and rights-of-way	157,954
Administration of contracts	3,000

Benefit-cost ratio: 2.1 to 1.
Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $152.
Carrying out the project: The Lyon Swamp Drainage and Levee District and the White Oak-Buckle Swamp Drainage District (which is being organized) will assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the channel improvement. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $10,775.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from the Department now on this project.

Mr. SWIGART. The Lyon Swamp-White Oak Swamp watershed is likewise located in southeastern North Carolina in Bladen and Pender counties.

The county line is right about here [indicating]. It is a little more in Bladen County than it is in Pender County.

The watershed consists of the White Oak Swamp Stream and the Lyon Swamp Stream. Under normal conditions, Lyon Swamp goes down through here [indicating] and out down into the South River at this point [indicating]. The White Oak Swamp flows under normal conditions, into Buckle Swamp Creek and, likewise, flows into the South River and then into the Cape Fear River.

The watershed comprises 47,000 acres.

The project proposed is sponsored by the Lower Cape Fear Soil and Water Conservation District and the Lyon Swamp Drainage and Levee District.

The terrain is nearly level to gently sloping, with sand ridges and low, nearly level, fertile fields along the natural water courses.

The cropland represents 9,000 acres, or 20 percent of the watershed. All of the watershed is privately owned, and comprises a population of 1,600, most of whom are engaged in farming enterprises.

The number of farms is 215 which average about 100 acres each; 90 percent are owner operated.

The principal crops are corn, soybeans, tobacco, and small grain.

There are two problems existing in the watershed. One is a combination drainage and flood prevention problem on the White Oak Swamp down through here.

On the Lyon Swamp it is a flood prevention problem.

In other words, excessive rains overflow from this area and come down Lyon Swamp and flood this area in yellow along in here [indicating].

The proposed project consists of 37.4 miles of channel improvement; 11.9 miles of which is this flood prevention channel coming down through here [indicating]. The project is rather complex in a way, because it involves the diversion of water away from the protected area here [indicating]. At this point there will be an 18-inch gate and at this point there will, also, be an 18-inch gate. During normal flows those gates will be left open and the water will go down the normal drainage into the Cape Fear River through the floodgates in the levee which was constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

Similarly, at this point [indicating] the water originating in the upper watershed will flow normally down through Lyon Swamp Creek within the channel capacity that is now available in that area.

During high floods on the Cape Fear these gates will be closed and the water will be diverted through the newly constructed channel, into Colly Creek and down into the South River. Likewise, in White Oak Swamps under normal conditions in the Cape Fear River, the water will continue along the normal channels out through the floodgates into the Cape Fear. During high water it will be diverted down through here [indicating] through the newly constructed channel down into the Cape Fear River at this point [indicating].

The annual benefits from the project will amount to $87,145 benefiting 3,920 acres, owned and operated by 215 farmers.

There are storms which aggravate this condition in this area, that is, major storms, once every 3 years, which lower economic agricultural production in the area considerably.

The total cost of the project is $1,144,927 and Public Law 566 will bear $682,785 of this amount, and other funds will bear $462,142.

This has an even better benefit-cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. The cost per acre benefited amounts to $152 as compared to the land value in the area of $250.

I believe, sir, that is the general summary of the project.

Mr. POAGE. These two are evidently in the same general region of the State.

Mr. LENNON. That is true, these same general regions.

Mr. POAGE. The problems are quite similar. How do you allocate so much larger a percentage of the cost in this case to the Federal Government than you do in the other?

Do you do it by calling it flood control?

Mr. SWIGART. It is in this case, Mr. Poage, yes. You will notice that this channel here has no drainage problem involved. It is strictly a flood problem. There is not a wet problem at the present time in this area. Floods originate up here in what they call Pocosins or Carolina bays. When storms occur in this area, the area becomes saturated and overflows. The runoff comes down and floods over this area through here [indicating].

The whole purpose of this channel is to take that water away from this area [indicating]. It is classified totally as a flood prevention channel with no drainage component whatever.

Mr. POAGE. Now, wait. The Government is going to pay the entire cost of that?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right, the entire construction cost. And in the other project the cost is allocated to both flood prevention and drainage. I think that explains the difference between the two projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. One is flood prevention and the other is drainage?

Mr. SWIGART. It is multiple purpose down here. They have both. You will notice all of this white area on the map which is nonbenefited. It is a runoff area, so that the problem is not only to control the water originating there [indicating], the hurricane storm water, but also to lower the water table in this area [indicating] at the same time. It is what we call a multiple-purpose flood prevention and drainage channel.

Mr. POAGE. When you lower the water you charge that to drainage, do you not?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right; yes. That is right; but it is very difficult, Mr. Poage, in some instances to differentiate where the benefits arise—do they arise from controlling the surface runoff or lowering the water table. In effect, we say that it is an inseparable problem and allocate part to flood prevention and part to drainage.

Mr. POAGE. I know that it is a difficult problem.

Mr. SWIGART. We try to be uniform among the projects, Mr. Poage, so that no one group is differentiated against or discriminated against as opposed to another group sponsoring these same type of watersheds.

Mr. POAGE. I am not criticizing that at all. I have no reason to criticize, but I do want to understand the relationship between those

two types of projects, because you can make it unattractive or attractive to the people, just by calling it a drainage ditch or calling it a flood prevention ditch. Obviously, all of the ditches are going to have some aspects of both.

Mr. SWIGART. Down through here there is not this problem, because you see the land benefited has no outlet back to here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Your contention is that if it were not for the high level of the water it would not need that?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes; if you had no flood problem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. But in Mr. Lennon's area you would have a flood problem, because that has no high land?

Mr. POAGE. It has a drainage problem.

Mr. SWIGART. There is no drainage problem here. In other words, there will be no onfarm drainage measures necessary to realize the benefits that will be derived from this channel. Down in this area there will be.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions?

Mr. SHORT. I notice that on the other project the farms are 65 acres in size. What are the crops on those farms?

Mr. SWIGART. It is tobacco, corn, soybeans, and small grains. The smaller acreage, of course, would be tobacco, I believe. Would that not be true?

Mr. LENNON. That is true.

Mr. SWIGART. Which is a very high value crop.

Mr. POAGE. They have cotton allotments in North Carolina of just 4 acres.

Are there any further questions?

If not, we will be glad to hear from you, Mr. Lennon.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Henderson will make the first statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for giving me an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to testify on behalf of this important project.

The record will show that Lyon Swamp-White Oak Swamp watershed project is located in Pender and Bladen Counties; Pender County being one of those in the Third Congressional District which I represent, and Bladen County is in the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina, ably represented by our good friend and colleague, Alton Lennon, who is also testifying this morning.

Congressman Lennon and I have a detailed statement prepared by Mr. Nelson Squires, president of the Lyon Swamp-White Oak Swamp watershed group, and we endorse it and request that it be made a part of the hearing record.

It clearly describes the situation and the problem to be resolved. We urge favorable action by the subcommittee.

Mr. POAGE. The statement referred to by you will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The prepared statement of Nelson Squires follows:)

STATEMENT OF NELSON SQUIRES, PRESIDENT, LYON SWAMP-WHITE OAK SWAMP WATERSHED PROJECT, BLADEN AND PENDER COUNTIES, N.C.

The watershed is approximately 47,000 acres in size. Present land use consists of approximately 9,000 acres in crops; 300 acres in pasture; 2,000 acres idle; 400 acres in roads, homesites, and miscellaneous uses; and 35,300 acres in woods.

The headwater area of the watershed is made up of numerous oval-shaped swamps or bays containing deep accumulations of humus, muck, or peat. The central section of the watershed lies along the outer edge of the Cape Fear River terrace. The topography of this area is nearly level to gently sloping and is characterized by sand ridges and low, nearly level, fertile fields along the natural watercourses. Practically all of the cultivated land in the watershed is in this area. The lower portion of the watershed is flat, swampy, and heavily wooded.

The general economy of the watershed is almost entirely agricultural. A small portion of the residents are engaged in pulpwood and timber operations. There are approximately 215 farms within the watershed. The average-size farm is about 100 acres. About 90 percent of the farms are owner operated. Population of the watershed is about 2,000. A majority of the farmers have developed conservation plans with the Lower Cape Fear Soil and Water Conservation District, and have shown a real desire to improve their lands. Local farmers, in an effort to give themselves all the relief possible, have primarily exhausted their financial ability in the cleaning out of the existing Lyon Swamp and White Oak Canals. The upper section of the farming area adjoining the headwater area of the watershed is subject to frequent flooding, and when this area becomes saturated following periods of heavy rainfall, runoff is heavy and overloads the existing canals and floods a large area of the cropland, damaging and sometimes destroying the crops, especially when floodwaters are being held in the Cape Fear River.

Serious damages from flooding in the watershed area occur on an average of about once every 3 years with an average annual loss to the principal crops of corn, soybeans, and tobacco of approximately $100,000. At the same time this flooding brings on the health hazard of increased malaria, the loss of wildlife, and damage to forests.

Direct benefits of flood prevention and agricultural water management benefits will amount to more than $100,000 annually. There will be many other benefits including improvement of health and sanitary conditions and the improvement of the general economy of the watershed area.

There has been a great interest shown in this watershed project by the local residents living in the area, by the officials of both Pender and Bladen Counties, the Lower Cape Fear Soil and Water Conservation District, and forestry, wildlife, and agricultural officials of the State of North Carolina, and as a result of many meetings held at Burgaw and Elizabethtown, N.C., and principally at Kelly, N.C., in the center of the watershed project, the booklet making proper recommendations of works of improvement entitled "Lyon Swamp-White Oak Swamp Watershed Work Plan, Bladen and Pender Counties, N.C., July 1963," was prepared under the direction of the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, which shows the great need of the works of improvement and the fact that it is economically sound and of great value.

We believe this project to be most worthy and are anxious to proceed with it.

This the 29th day of May 1964.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Lennon, do you want to make a statement, too?

STATEMENT OF HON. ALTON LENNON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. LENNON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

I find again that my prepared statement is, in substance, what has been said by the technical expert of the Department.

I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this particular project is, primarily, a flood preventive protection

measure. It is in the Cape Fear River Basin, and this lower tributary is subject to annual flooding. I recall that in October of 1954, when Hurricane Hazel, the great hurricane, destroyed a great part of southeastern North Carolina, significantly enough before another year had passed we had three more hurricanes, Connie, Diane, and Ione, and they were almost as disastrous to this area.

We are in the hurricane belt, and we might as well face it. And for that reason when the upper reaches of the Cape Fear River Basin are flooded, it comes down into this area and destroys our crops and our woodlands and even does irreparable damage to our private roads and private buildings.

I want to reiterate again and say to the subcommittee that Congressman Henderson and I are grateful for the opportunity of appearing here and to tell you of the great interest that our people, our constituents and our friends have in these two projects, and to respectfully ask the subcommittee to give both of them their favorable consideration.

Mr. POAGE. We are glad to have both of you in attendance with us and appreciate your appearance.

Are there any questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you both. We are trying to move along, because the House meets at 11 o'clock this morning.

We will next take up Prairie Creek watershed project.

Again, we will hear from the Department first.

PRAIRIE CREEK WATERSHED, INDIANA

PRAIRIE CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 19,095 acres in Vigo County.
Tributary to: Wabash River.
Sponsors: Vigo County Soil and Water Conservation District.
Total watershed land use:

	Percent
Cropland	70
Grassland	16
Woodland	9
Miscellaneous	5

Watershed privately owned, 93.1 percent; Federal land, 6.9 percent.
Number of farms: 200.
Size of farms: About 213 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of three floodwater retarding structures and 4.9 miles of channel improvement. Storage capacity of the structures ranges from 289 acre-feet to 1,733 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$25,784	65
Flood prevention	(19,058)	(48)
Drainage	(6,726)	(17)
To agricultural improvements	588	2
To nonagricultural improvements	6,304	16
Indirect and secondary	6,891	17
Total	39,567	100

Area benefited: 1,587 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of 47 farms.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$36,400	19	[1] $153,990	81	$190,390
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	409,140	85	70,180	15	479,320
Drainage	9,660	58	7,050	42	16,710
Subtotal	418,800	84	[2] 77,230	16	496,030
Total	455,200	66	231,220	34	686,420

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Construction cost for drainage	$5,500
Land, easements and rights-of-way	68,580
Administration of contracts	3,150

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.7 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $172.

Carrying out the project: The Vigo County Soil and Water Conservation District will carry out its responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural works of improvement through the organization of a conservancy district under Indiana law. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $4,328.

Mr. WETZEL. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Prairie Creek watershed project is about 19,095 acres located in Vigo County, Ind.

The watershed is about 15 miles from Terre Haute, which is in this direction [indicating]. The stream itself is tributary to the Wabash River and flows into the river about 4½ miles below the town of Vigo located at this point [indicating].

There are three small towns in the watershed, Vigo, Prairie Creek, and Pimento at this point [indicating].

The problem has been that it is fairly rolling land with steep slopes in the upper watershed and in the lower reaches of the watershed. It is a fairly deep channel at the lower part of the watershed.

The agricultural land is very good agricultural land. It has a value of about $250 an acre. It has been subject to flooding about three times each year. The landowners can expect about once every 5 years that they will have a complete crop loss on the agricultural flood plain land.

The program that has been proposed has been designed to provide protection against the 5-year frequency storm for the entire agricultural flood plain lands.

The sponsors of the program are the Vigo County Soil and Water Conservation District and a Watershed Conservancy District that is now in the process of being organized under State enabling legislation to carry out the projects.

The only nonprivate land in the watershed is about 1,300 acres of land which is part of the Terre Haute Federal Penitentiary at this point [indicating]. The Federal penitentiary is a cooperator with the local soil conservation district and has been applying very fine soil conservation programs on their lands.

The program as proposed consists of three floodwater retarding structures located at these points [indicating] which will control about 64 percent of the total watershed, plus about 49 miles of channel improvement as indicated in the blue, which channel is primarily for flood protection.

There is a small allocation to drainage, in view of the fact that through this particular region, from this point to this point [indicating] the channel is very badly silted up with practically no channel at all, and much of the land outside of the flood plane has been tile drained and the tile drains have become inoperative due to the fact that they do not have an outlet, so part of the costs have been allocated to drainage in view of the fact that this flood prevention channel will provide an outlet for the tile drainage.

The Corps of Engineres have a project that starts immediately below the town of Vigo, which consists of levees and channels diversions to protect against the waters from the Wabash River itself.

No benefits have been claimed below the project.

The area benefited, as you see, is a narrow flood plain which amounts to 1,587 acres. It will benefit the owners of 47 farms who have land in the flood plain area.

So far as costs are concerned, the total cost of the project is $686,420, of which the local people will put up 34 percent or $231,220 and the Federal Government will provide $455,200, or 66 percent.

The benefit cost ratio is 1.7 to 1 and the watershed conservancy district will assume all of the costs of operating and maintaining the projects.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much.

Do you remember the area of those three lakes?

Mr. WETZEL. I can give you the actual area, sir. The capacity ranges from 289 to 1,733 acre-feet. The surface area is 40 to 260 acres.

Mr. POAGE. On this map it looks like they would be far larger than that. That is what raised the question in my mind. Look at that map. I understand the yellow area is the 1,500 acres.

Mr. WETZEL. That is right. This is roughly 1,500 acres right here [indicating].

Mr. POAGE. In just looking at the map it looks to me like those lakes must cover a thousand acres.

Mr. WETZEL. The total area covered by the lakes is 389 acres.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Where are the lakes?

Mr. POAGE. There are three lakes.

Mr. WETZEL. These blue areas right here [indicating].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thought that was where you were going to have the dams.

Mr. WETZEL. It is. It is only a lake at the time it is in flood.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, if it is 300 acres that is only one-fifth of the area benefited. That is not out of reason, but just by looking at it on the map, it looks like those lakes cover as much as one-half of the area, and when you do that, you reach a state of ridiculousness if you are going to cover up that much of the area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Except that the land below is worth a lot more than the land that is being flooded.

Mr. POAGE. That is true. This is the land cost?

Mr. WETZEL. I presume so, sir, but I do not know that I can say that for certain. Perhaps Congressman Roudebush can answer that.

Mr. POAGE. This is up in the hills?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I had an idea that it might be up in the hills.

Mr. WETZEL. This is rolling land, rather steep rolling land and it flattens out at this point [indicating]. The central section of the flood plain is relatively flat land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Are you paying those people for flood prevention?

Mr. WETZEL. We are not paying them, Mr. Johnson. The local organization is paying them. In other words, the conservancy district that is being organized will have tax authority and they will obtain all of the easements for these three reservoirs.

Mr. POAGE. You do show $68,000 in the way of land easements and rights-of-way. That certainly is very fine for that amount of land that you are buying there.

Mr. WETZEL. That is the appraised value of the area on which they will have to acquire the easements not only for the reservoirs but, also, for the channel.

Mr. POAGE. The channel certainly ought not to cost them anything.

Mr. WETZEL. I imagine that the easements will probably be largely donated for the channel.

Mr. POAGE. I would think so.

Mr. WETZEL. And I would imagine that some of the easements up in this upper end, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Where do you get this cost figure?

Mr. POAGE. Over on the second page.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Is there any problem with regard to the flood stage, that if the Wabash was in flood stage, that it would back up into the channel?

Mr. WETZEL. The work plan indicates it does not back up above the town of Vigo. The project which is installed below the town of Vigo, apparently, protects the flood plain area below the town from the backwater of the Wabash.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Thank you.

Mr. SHORT. What is the green area on the map?

Mr. WETZEL. The land treatment measures?

Mr. SHORT. What land treatment measures are used there?

Mr. WETZEL. I do not have that for the green area but for the total watershed—we can probably separate them out—there are waterway diversions, stabilization structures in the upper area, title drains that would be down in this area, in this flat area, and open drains, pasture planning, reforestation, livestock exclusion, and the like.

Mr. SHORT. What is the last one?

Mr. WETZEL. Livestock exclusion, that is, fencing it so as to exclude the livestock, a rather fancy name for it.

Mr. SHORT. One more question about these reservoirs. Are those the sort of temporary types of structures that will let the water out after a heavy rain?

Mr. WETZEL. That is right, Mr. Short. The flood runoff is stored in the reservoir and released as rapidly as it can be released on the basis of the size of the channels that it is draining into. In other words, the release rates for the reservoirs are figured on the basis of the size of the channel. There is, of course, as you know, a small

sediment pool, a permanent pool in each of the reservoirs. It is very small.

Mr. SHORT. So far as the utilization of this land in concerned, this will be flooded at the maximum and that utilization then will be practically nil.

Mr. WETZEL. Oh, no, this land can be used a great deal.

Mr. SHORT. For what?

Mr. WETZEL. For pasture. They even use it for hay. The reservoirs are designed, generally, to hold the runoff from a 50-year storm, so that, actually, the reservoirs will only be full for a short period once in 50 years.

Mr. SHORT. This would not be a situation that would develop two or three times every year?

Mr. WETZEL. Oh, no, the complete reservoir would not be full two or three times a year. The reservoir—this complete area shown in blue here [indicating] the hatched area in blue would only be covered with water once every 50 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. You take care of it for the 50-year storm, and when you show the flooded area you show the maximum that will be affected?

Mr. WETZEL. That is right. The dark blue area represents the sediment pools, the permanent water that will be in the reservoirs but in most cases, Mr. Short, this land in the flood pool is used for many purposes, primarily pasture, but many times they will take a chance on hay in there or in some cases they have even gone to some cultivated crops. They are gambling on it. And these landowners have given an easement to the local organizations saying that they have no objection to this land being flooded whenever they have the storms. However, they do have the complete use of the land if they are willing to gamble on it.

Mr. SHORT. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much. We have to move along, because the House meets at 11 o'clock.

Mr. Roudebush is here and we will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will make my statement rather brief, because as has been said previously, some of it would be repetitious of what has been presented by the Department of Agriculture representative.

I want to thank the members of the committee for their invitation to appear today in support of this very worthy project. the Prairie Creek watershed.

The Prairie Creek watershed project is proposed for Vigo County, Ind., this being the largest county, from the standpoint of population, in the Sixth District, which it is my privilege to represent.

The project is contemplated as a 5-year program, costing $685,420, of which $455,200 is Federal funds.

The project has won approval of State and Federal agencies and has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which only recently completed its examination of the plans and stamped its approval on the project.

Thus, the proposed Prairie Creek project has met the criteria of this committee from every standpoint.

As provided by law, creation of Prairie Creek Conservancy District is now in progress, and the petition is now in Vigo County Circuit Court at Terre Haute where hearings were scheduled for May 29.

The watershed area will cover 19.095 acres. The headwaters of Prairie Creek commence about 4 miles south of Terre Haute, near U.S. Highway 41. It terminates at Vigo, west of Prairie Creek, at the edge of the Wabash River bottoms.

The Federal money will be used to realine, widen, and deepen Prairie Creek, and to build three permanent floodwater-retarding structures ranging from 30 to 80 acres.

The benefits from soil conservation, eradication of erosion, flood control, and other attractive features of such a project cannot be overemphasized and this program enjoys unanimous support in the affected area where plans are already being made to supplement and augment the program with local funds if this committee approves the project.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that has something to do with the small cost on easements, because so many of the local citizens are happy to donate land and easements to help this project along.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, that is a way of raising funds.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. That is as it should be.

Complete plans for the project include the three dams; 4.9 miles of channel improvements; 1,800 acres of forest land improvement; 2,440 acres of grassland treatment of fertilization, reseeding, and brush clearing; and 13,260 acres of land treatment of cropland for terracing and waterways.

I, certainly, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, want to unreservedly recommend approval of this project which will greatly benefit the residents of Vigo County and repay many times the wise investment of a sound soil conservation planning.

May I conclude by saying that I have personally visited this area on a number of occasions. I met with the Soil Conservation people and spent 1 entire day just walking over the area. I am very familiar with the land and the area involved, and I certainly think it is a most worthy project.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Roudebush.

Are there any questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, sir, for appearing.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. May I extend my remarks in the record?

Mr. POAGE. You may, without objection.

(The prepared statement of Hon. Richard L. Roudebush follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. Chairman, please allow me to thank the distinguished members of this committee for the kind invitation to appear here today in support of this most worthy project.

The Prairie Creek watershed project is proposed for Vigo County, Ind., the largest county in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District which it is my privilege to represent.

The project is contemplated as 5-year program costing $686,420; of which $455,200 is Federal funds.

The project has won approval of State and Federal agencies and has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which only recently completed its examinations of the plans and stamped its approval on the project.

Thus, the proposed Prairie Creek project has met the criteria of this committee from every standpoint.

As provided by law, creation of Prairie Creek conservancy district is now in progress, and the petition is now in Vigo County circuit court at Terre Haute where hearings were scheduled for May 29.

The watershed area will cover 19,095 acres. Headwaters of Prairie Creek commence about 4 miles south of Terre Haute near U.S. Highway 41. It terminates at Vigo, west of Prairie Creek, at the edge of the Wabash River bottoms.

The Federal money will be used to realine, widen, and deepen Prairie Creek, and to build three permanent floodwater-retarding structures ranging from 30 to 80 acres.

The benefits from soil conservation, eradication of erosion, flood control, and other attractive features of such a project cannot be overemphasized, and this program enjoys unanimous support in the affected area where plans are already being made to supplement and augment the program with local funds if this committee approves the project.

Complete plans for the project include the three dams; 4.9 miles of channel improvement; 1,800 acres of forest land improvement; 2,440 acres of grassland treatment of fertilization, reseeding, and brush clearing; and 13,260 acres of land treatment of cropland for terracing and waterways.

I unreservedly recommend approval of this project which will greatly benefit the residents of Vigo County, and repay many times the wise investment of sound soil conservation planning.

Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. The next project is the Little Choconut, Finch Hollow, Trout Brook watershed, and I will ask the Department to give its report on this as well as the Patterson, Brixius, Grey Creek watershed.

LITTLE CHOCONUT, FINCH HOLLOW, TROUT BROOK WATERSHED AND PATTERSON, BRIXIUS, GREY CREEK WATERSHED, NEW YORK

LITTLE CHOCONUT, FINCH HOLLOW, TROUT BROOK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 12,276 acres in Broome County.

Tributary to: Susquehanna River.

Sponsors: Broome County Soil Conservation District and Broome County Board of Supervisors.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	18
Grassland	19
Woodland	25
Urban and miscellaneous	38

Watershed privately owned, 96 percent; non-Federal public, 4 percent.

Number of farms: 50.

Size of farms: About 104 acres average.

Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of seven floodwater-retarding structures having a total storage capacity of 2,870 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural improvements	$1,123	2
To nonagricultural improvements	53,390	76
Secondary	5,383	8
Indirect	9,979	14
Total	69,875	100

Number of beneficiaries: Over 700 residences and 30 commercial and industrial properties will receive flood prevention benefits.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$30,400	20	[1] $121,786	80	$152,186
Structural measures: Flood prevention	1,341,146	89	[2] 161,564	11	1,502,710
Total	1,371,546	83	283,350	17	1,654,896

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Cogress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements and rights-of-way	$141,545
Administration of contracts	20,019

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.4 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: Not computed as 98 percent of benefits are nonagricultural.

Carrying out the project: The sponsors intend to carry out their responsibilities for installation, operation, and maintenance of the project through the organization of a special purpose district under New York State law.

PATTERSON, BRIXIUS, GREY CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 8,000 acres in Broome County.

Tributary to: Susquehanna River.

Sponsors: Broome County Soil Conservation District and Broome County Board of Supervisors.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	18
Grassland	13
Woodland	15
Urban and miscellaneous	54

Total watershed privately owned.

Number of farms: 20.

Size of farms: About 100 acres average.

Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of one floodwater retarding structure having 960 acre-feet of total capacity.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To nonagricultural improvements	$16,835	77
Secondary	1,668	8
Indirect	3,368	15
Total	21,871	100

Number of beneficiaries: Owners of 141 residences and 14 commercial and industrial properties are the principal beneficiaries.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$8,000	24	[1] $25,289	76	$33,289
Structural measures: Flood prevention	405,891	94	[2] 24,408	6	430,299
Total	413,891	89	49,697	11	463,588

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements, and rights-of-way	$18,350
Administration of contracts	6,058

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.52 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: Not computed; all benefits nonagricultural.

Carrying out the project: The sponsors will carry out their responsibilities for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the project through the formation of a special purpose district organized under New York State law. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $756.

Mr. WETZEL. In the interest of conserving your time may I present these two projects at the same time?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, sir; we will be glad to have you do so.

Mr. WETZEL. They are similar projects in that the six streams that are represented in the names of the projects are all tributary to the Susquehanna River, which is at this point on this project and at this point on this project [indicating].

The two projects are located in Broome County. They are relatively small projects areawise.

The problem has been that while the Corps of Engineers has provided ample protection for the city of Binghamton, Johnson City and the city of Endicott, plus the areas in between these cities, the protection that is provided is from overflow from the Susquehanna River. They have serious floods in this area from the Susquehanna River. However, there has been no protection provided from the small direct tributaries to the Susquehanna River. And there have been a series of very severe floods that have caused extensive damage, not only to the urban areas, but also to the highly industrialized areas where a number of large industries have located.

I will point out that just to the east of this project, which is the Nanticoke Creek project, which was presented to your committee about a year and a half ago, that it is a similar project.

Mr. POAGE. That is to the west, is it not?

Mr. WETZEL. I am sorry, it is to the west, yes. That is right.

As you recall, Nanticoke is a very similar project to these two projects.

The two projects are sponsored by the Broome County Soil Conservation District and the Broome County Board of Supervisors. As soon as there is an approved project a small watershed district will be organized under New York State law to carry out the project. They may not organize a legal watershed conserving district until there is an approved project under the New York law.

Mr. POAGE. I want to ask you a question about the last part of what you have said. What is the situation with our approving a project for which there is no legal sponsor?

Mr. WETZEL. In the Indiana project, there is a legal sponsor, the Vigo Soil and Water Conservation District. However, they do not have two authorities which are desirable, but not absolutely necessary to carry out a project, one being the tax authority and the other being the right of eminent domain.

Under the New York State law, as soon as a small watershed conservancy district is organized, that district has tax authority and has the right of eminent domain. They are, also, eligible for 50-percent cost sharing from State appropriations for the necessary easements that are required for the floodwater retarding structures.

Mr. POAGE. What about our authority to approve a project where there is no presently authorized legal sponsor?

Mr. WETZEL. There must be a legal sponsor that has the complete authority to carry out the project in existence before an application may be submitted.

Mr. POAGE. That has been my understanding. I understood you to say that they could not do that in New York State until we approved the project.

Mr. WETZEL. It is a different type of district. In the way this is set up these two projects are now sponsored by the Broome County Soil Conservation District which has all of the legal authority necessary to carry out the project. However, they do not have the tax authority and right of eminent domain, neither of which are required to carry out the project, but you can carry it out much better with those authorities. They are, also, sponsored by the Broome County Board of Supervisors, which is the county government which has these authorities at the present time. However, New York State has set up this special small watershed conservancy district which has these authorities and plus is eligible for reimbursement from the State government for one-half of the cost of the needed easements. It is a special-purpose district set up to most efficiently carry out watershed projects. However, the existing sponsors can carry them out. They have legal authority.

The program proposed on the Patterson-Brixius-Grey Creek watershed project consists of land treatment measures in the upper watershed plus one floodwater retarding structure with a capacity of 850 acre-feet which will control 64 percent of the watershed.

In the Little Choconut-Finch Hollow-Trout Brook watershed project, the program proposed consists of seven floodwater retarding structures as indicated on the map, having a total storage capacity of about 2,800 acre-feet, which will control 84 percent of the total watershed.

In June 1960 a very serious flood hit this area. The damages in Patterson, Brixius and Grey Creek amounted to almost $1,500,000, just in this industrial and urban area at the mouth of the watershed. The same storm caused $868,000 damages in the lower reaches of the Choconut and Finch Hollow and Trout Brook watershed. There is a history of these flash floods that goes back to the beginning of the records. They can expect one about every 10 years. They have had other floods which have been caused by the Susquehanna being in flood stage. However, the serious floods have been caused when the Sus-

quehanna has not been in flood stage. In June 1960 the Susequehanna was far below the flood stage, with all of the damage being caused from runoff from these small tributary watersheds.

The cost involved on the Little Choconut-Finch Hollow-Trout Brook total project cost is $1,654,896, of which the local people will put up 17 percent or $283,350; and on the Patterson-Brixius-Grey Creek watershed, the total cost is $463,588, of which the local people will put up 11 percent or, roughly, $50,000.

They both have very good benefit-cost ratios. The Patterson being 1.52 to 1, and the Little Choconut being 1.4 to 1.

I believe that the committee is familiar with the type of agriculture that is being carried on in the watershed and that you have made a tour through this area, as I understand it.

It is primarily dairying. There is quite an influx of residential, you might say urban residential development in the watershed, since there is a very sizable population in Johnson City and Endicott and Binghampton. The industries that are represented here consist of the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Co. which suffered very severe damages in the flood of June 1960. The IBM, I believe, their main plant is located in the flood plain, and it was shut down for a number of days due to the 1960 flood. There are a number of other large industries that have suffered heavily from the floods from the tributary areas.

In addition, there has been substantial highway and bridge damage from each of these tributaries over a long period of time.

Mr. POAGE. I may be wrong, but I think that his map is inaccurate. Those two maps adjoin, do they not?

Mr. WETZEL. They adjoin but there is a very small tributary between them that is not included in this area. I believe that this fits up somewhat like this [indicating]. This is another small tributary that is down in this area here [indicating].

Mr. BRUCE. This is the airport and, as I remember, we went back up to here.

Mr. POAGE. Where is it on the map?

Mr. BRUCE. Right here is the airport. As I remember, we came back this way when we returned to the airport.

Mr. POAGE. I think that we must keep in mind on this whole project the two that you have just explained as well as the Nanticoke, that we have to consider them together, that is, all three of them together. Each of them have very low local contributions. I think it is 17 percent or something like that. I do not know that there is anything that can be done from the local standpoint about that, but from our standpoint, what ought this committee to do about that?

I think that it is right clear that it is something very wrong to let the Federal Government go in and pay 90 percent for this protection. Does the Department have any suggestion for us?

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROBISON. May I speak to that before he gives his answer?

Mr. POAGE. I am not blaming you for that, Mr. Robison, because I recognize that this complies with the law.

Mr. ROBISON. I think that we have to consider the fact that the reason that there is a minimum of land treatment measures—and I think that is the proper phrase for it here——

Mr. WETZEL. That is right.

Mr. ROBISON (continuing). Is that this area in upstate New York has for years, prior to this time, been most active in soil conservation work and so the farming people in the watershed we are talking about, on their own, have in past years installed and constructed land treatment measures, so I was advised by the Department back in August of 1962, valued at $515,240. This is one of the reasons, it seems to me, that the local contribution along those lines is now so low because we have already done this work. And it would strike me that it would not be fair to penalize these agricultural people because they had gone ahead and done it, whereas in other areas where soil conservation has not been so active they would now be beginning to do these things.

I hope that I did not intrude on what your answer would be, Mr. Wetzel.

Mr. WETZEL. You are entirely right, Congressman Robison. There are several reasons. First of all, as you said, these are strictly flood-prevention projects. If there had been drainage or fish and wildlife or other purposes included, the local contribution would have come up substantially, but as you know, we must pay 100 percent of the cost of flood prevention measures.

As the Congressman said the local people have already installed a very substantial amount, almost 75 percent of the land treatment measures that are needed on the watershed. Considering the three projects as one project, the local contribution on the basis of the plans as submitted would be 14 percent for the total area. And Nanticoke, I believe, was a little bit higher. If we consider the land treatment measures that have been installed on the three watersheds in the upper watershed, plus the capitalized cost for the operation and maintenance, the local contribution will be 27 percent. The additional contribution of the land treatment measures that have already been installed amounts to $273,000.

Mr. ROBISON. The dollar figure I gave you was for Nanticoke only. I do not have it for the three combined.

Mr. WETZEL. Combining these three into one project, and considering the land treatment measures that have already been installed, the local contribution would be 27 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Where does the third watershed lie in relation to these two?

Mr. WETZEL. It is right here, just directly west, adjacent to this, the adjacent watershed west of these two [indicating].

Mr. BRUCE. You will remember those tree stands that we saw up there when we were visiting in the area.

Mr. POAGE. I remember that.

Mr. WETZEL. I might point out that these three projects have been coordinated completely with the corps' program for protection against the overflow from the Susquehanna River. It is not a case where there is any conflict.

Mr. POAGE. I am just talking about the general policy. We do not want to let an agricultural program become one whereby you can provide urban flood protection without local cost. I am not talking

strictly about this project—I am talking about the program, and if the program has some loopholes in it, we want to cover those.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. You have to consider each project.

Mr. POAGE. It happens that these drainage projects we have just considered had tremendous local contributions in them. One of them was very great. So that, of course, shows up a little more right here than it would otherwise, because in the projects we have had this morning, one had a 55-percent local contribution and one had 40 percent, and one had 74 percent. Those are the projects we had earlier this morning. But that is not the fault of the people in these projects. I am merely talking about our own policy.

Mr. WETZEL. I might point out, Mr. Poage, that in the three watersheds there are 350 operating farms, largely dairy farms with quite substantial investments. Those farms are, you might say, a part of this total community. Certainly, the agricultural interests in these three watersheds will benefit very substantially from the projects and I think that the evidence of that is the interest of the farmers themselves in going ahead and following the needed programs which are primarily for the protection of the urban and industrial areas.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any further questions? We thank you, Mr. Robison. We will have to adjourn. We have another project here, Mr. Gathings' project. I wonder if it is possible we might have you give us a very brief explanation of that, so that you will not have to come back again.

I hope that we may go over this project and cover it before you leave.

LEE-PHILLIPS WATERSHED, ARKANSAS

LEE-PHILLIPS WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 83,504 acres in Lee and Phillips Counties.
Tributary to: Big Creek, White River, and Mississippi River.
Sponsors: Lee County Soil Conservation District, Phillips County Soil Conservation District, Lee-Phillips Drainage District, and Beaver Bayou Drainage District.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	76
Grassland	8
Woodland	9
Miscellaneous	7

Watershed privately owned, 99 percent; Federal, 1 percent.
Number of farms: 785.
Size of farms: About 100 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 110 miles of channel improvements.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$537,226	100
Flood prevention	(403,134)	(75)
Drainage	(134,092)	(25)
Total	537,226	100

Area benefited: 40,945 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: 785 landowners and operators.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$24,365	6	[1] $414,290	94	$438,655
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	1,034,516	84	190,152	16	1,224,668
Drainage	208,838	51	198,585	49	407,423
Subtotal	1,243,354	76	[2] 388,737	24	1,632,091
Total	1,267,719	61	803,027	39	2,070,746

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Construction costs	$135,615
Land, easements and rights-of-way	73,280
Modification of utilities	174,912
Administration of contracts	4,930

Benefit-cost ratio: 3.4 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $30.

Carrying out the project: The Lee-Phillips Drainage District and the Beaver Bayou Drainage District assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $47,450.

Mr. SWIGART. This is the Lee-Phillips watershed project in Lee and Phillips Counties in Arkansas, comprising 83,504 acres.

It is tributary to the Big Creek, White River, and Mississippi River.

The project is sponsored by the Lee County Soil Conservation District, Phillips County Soil Conservation District, Lee-Phillips Drainage District, and Beaver Bayou Drainage District.

The population of the watershed is 6,610, divided about equally between rural and town.

The land use of the watershed is 76 percent cropland, with the balance devoted to grassland and woodland.

The number of farms is 785 which average about 100 acres each.

The plan proposed for the area is to take care of the runoff from Crowleys Ridge which occupies the eastern portion of the area, and a sloping alluvial plain down at the base of the ridge which merges with a flat, nearly level area here in which there is intermingled wet and dry lands. It is not all one block here and one block there. It is intermingled.

The project proposed is 110 miles of channel improvements, multiple-purpose flood prevention and drainage channels, to alleviate both the flood prevention and the drainage problem in the watershed.

The benefits accruing from this work will amount to $537,226; 40,945 acres will be benefited, which involves 785 landowners and operators. The total cost of the project is $2,070,746, of which $1,267,719 or 61 percent will be borne by Public Law 566 funds and $803,027, or 39 percent, will be borne locally.

The benefit-cost ratio is one of the very favorable ones that we run into, it is 3.4 to 1. The cost per acre benefited is $30 as against land which is evaluated at $141 per acre.

The local organization will operate and maintain the project at an annual cost of $47,450.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Gathings.

STATEMENT OF HON. E. C. GATHINGS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. GATHINGS. I commend Mr. Swigart for his splendid explanation of the Lee-Phillips watershed project. I concur in his presentation fully. The farmers in the larger part of the territory embraced in the watershed periodically produce only about one-half of what would be harvested if the relief sought here is made available through the completion of these improvements.

The local, State, and Federal officials as well as the landowners and sponsors are all cooperating in the fullest in presenting this project. It is meritorious and needed badly.

The benefit-cost ratio is one of the highest ever presented to us—3.4 to 1. That tells the story of the need for this project.

Mr. POAGE. Is there anything further?

Mr. GATHINGS. I would just want to say that the rainfall in this area is 48.43 inches a year, and that is the principal reason for the poor drainage conditions that exist and resultant crop losses. It is very difficult to farm in the watershed, as well as costly. This is a great project, and I urge its approval.

And further, I would like to ask consent to file two telegrams from interested parties in the record.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, they will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The telegrams from Lon Mann, chairman, Lee-Phillips Drainage Commission, and Tom Gist, supervisor, Lee County Soil and Water Conservation District, follow:)

MARIANNA, ARK., *June 8, 1964.*

Congressman E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your continued support of Lee-Phillips watershed project before House Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit. Will appreciate your reiteration of our plea for approval. Strong local support for this project in both Lee and Phillips Counties.

LON MANN,
Chairman, Lee-Phillips Drainage Commission.

MARIANNA, ARK., *June 9, 1964.*

E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Your letter of June 4 was appreciated. Please convey to the House Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit our appreciation for their consideration of the Lee-Phillips watershed project which is so vital to the agricultural economy of Lee and Phillips Counties.

TOM GIST,
Supervisor, Lee County Soil and Water Conservation District.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will meet again to consider these in executive session.

We are now adjourned.

(At 11:10 a.m. the subcommittee adjourned.)

WATERSHED PROJECTS

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Johnson of Wisconsin, Stubblefield, Hagan of Georgia, McIntire, Harvey of Indiana, and Dole.

Also present: Martha Hannah, staff; Hyde H. Murray, assistant clerk; and Robert C. Bruce, assistant counsel.

Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator, Soil Conservation Service; and John H. Wetzel, Director, Watershed Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

We have Mr. William E. Towell, director of the Conservation Commission of the State of Missouri with us this morning. He wants to make a statement on the supplemental work plan for the One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed.

We ordinarily would have the report of the Department first, but in view of Mr. Towell's desiring to get away, we will hear him first, and then we will let the Department speak.

We are glad to have you with us.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO RIVER TRIBUTARIES WATERSHED, MISSOURI (SUPPLEMENTAL)[1]

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. TOWELL, DIRECTOR, CONSERVATION COMMISSION, STATE OF MISSOURI, JEFFERSON CITY, MO.

Mr. TOWELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to meet with the subcommittee.

Last week we were very fortunate in having two members of your subcommittee, Mr. Gathings and Mr. Short, visit us in Missouri, at which time we showed them the C–3 project in Nodaway County on the One Hundred and Two River watershed.

This is a joint project, Mr. Chairman, between the Soil Conservation Service, the Missouri Conservation Service, and the soil and water district, in which we are developing a multipurpose retention impoundment for both flood control and recreation.

[1] The supplemental work plan for this project, see p. 10.

This is really the first project of a joint nature between my department, the Missouri Conservation Commission and the Soil Conservation Service and for that reason we feel that it is extremely important that we develop a lake impoundment at this location.

The local people in Nodaway County have contributed some $12,000 to land acquisition costs.

My department has already spent some $44,000 for land acquisition costs and we think this is going to be a very desirable impoundment both for flood control and for recreation.

While members of the subcommittee were in Missouri, there was some expression of disappointment perhaps that greater flood control benefits would not be shown by this particular structure. And I think rightly so, because it was planned for a dual purpose, both flood control and recreation, but inasmuch as there is some question as to whether the amount of flood control benefit can justify the amount of Federal participation, I come before this subcommittee today to offer in behalf of my department, the direct agency interested, principally in recreation, to offer to pay that portion of the construction costs that are justifiable for recreation; in other words, asking the Federal Government and the Congress to pay only those portions of the construction that can be fully justified for flood control. And we, as a cooperating agency, will underwrite the additional costs that are necessary for the total project construction, that which will be charged to recreation.

Mr. POAGE. Do you have that figured out?

Mr. TOWELL. Yes, sir; we do. The total cost, as I understand it, is $180,845 and the recreational portion of that costs $58,875. This would be our contribution in addition to the $50,000 already invested in land, leaving the Federal participation; that is, the Federal Government's share of the project construction at $137,570. I am authorized by my commission to pledge to you—and we will draw up the necessary contract, if you approve this project—that we will pay 100 percent of those costs which are chargeable to recreation.

Mr. POAGE. You have the land?

Mr. TOWELL. We already have the land. This is the cost for the recreation that we would pay which would be in addition to that which we have already paid for the land.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Williams or Mr. Wetzel, what does that leave for our cost for the flood prevention?

Mr. WETZEL. On this particular structure, Mr. Chairman, the costs allocated to flood prevention would be $127,570.

Mr. POAGE. That is $10,000 off?

Mr. TOWELL. I made the mistake. My subtraction was wrong.

Mr. POAGE. What I am getting at is this, in our cost for the project, it involves a change in this project, and there will be more acreage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 187 acres.

Mr. GATHINGS. 187.

Mr. POAGE. There will be 187 more acres but we can hardly afford to justify the spending of $127,000 for the protection of that acreage, can we?

Mr. GATHINGS. The Department could answer that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WETZEL. The amount of that increase, Mr. Chairman, that is charged to flood prevention is $54,360. Of this amount 54 percent is chargeable to agricultural land and crop benefits. This 54 percent

is chargeable to the land and crops, which is used in calculating the cost-per-acre benefit figure is $29,350, or the cost per acre benefited of the 187 additional acres benefited would be $157 per acre.

Mr. POAGE. I hope that it works out that way. But you tell us that you have increased it over the original plan—over your two smaller structures, that you have increased it only $29,000 which is attributable to the other land and crop benefit.

What other benefits are there?

Mr. WETZEL. The additional benefits are the downstream benefits to the roads, bridges, and transportation facilities that are not attributable to land and crops.

Mr. GATHINGS. Just for information, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the local officials of the Soil Conservation Service will check into these benefits and report their findings.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that they will, but I do not know about those downstream benefits.

Mr. WETZEL. I believe that this summary was presented to the committee.

Mr. POAGE. I do not have it.

Mr. WETZEL. I was not here on the previous hearing on this project.

Mr. POAGE. We can go into that afterward. I do want to thank you, Mr. Towell, for coming here, and for the generous and splendid offer on the part of the local people that you have made. I do think that wherever we have problems of this kind, where it is a good project, that they should work it out together, and that that is the thing to do. We do appreciate very much the effort of the local people to try and work this out and we do want to thank you.

Mr. TOWELL. We appreciate this opportunity to make an alternative offer, Mr. Chairman, because we feel that the future of the small watershed project has great potentiality for our State; in fact, I can think of no Federal program that offers more future conservation opportunities than those which can be gained under the Small Watershed Act, Public Law 566. And since this is the first cooperative endeavor between our two agencies we think that it is extremely important that we not let this project fall by the wayside. That is why we are willing to pick up an additional portion of the cost.

Mr. POAGE. We think that is fine on the part of the State of Missouri. We agree with that since this small watershed program is one of the best programs that we have. However, we fear that if we let it get out of hand——

Mr. TOWELL. I understand your position.

Mr. POAGE (continuing). We then destroy the effectiveness of the program all over the country.

Mr. TOWELL. I wish that the subcommittee had been visiting there just about 2 days later, because we had a 5- or 6-inch rainfall right in that watershed and the whole lower valley of the One Hundred and Two River Valley was all flooded.

So, in addition to those benefits that are in the report, there are some downstream flood benefits that will make some contribution in the flood reduction.

Mr. POAGE. You understand, of course, that there must be a showing of those downstream benefits.

Mr. TOWELL. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. POAGE. In order to justify this even with your contribution.

Mr. TOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. We are very much obliged to have had you here.

Mr. TOWELL. Thank you very much.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. We looked over the projects that had already been completed. Those structures are in working condition and are in good shape. Then we flew over that area where the reclamation dam is to be constructed and after covering the full area of the watershed, we landed, and by car drove over a good part of the watershed. We drove to a point south of the town of Pickering, where the recreational project is located. We got a very good picture of the size of the lake. We talked with local interests with respect to the advantages of the project which embraces an area of some 40 miles. There is quite a lot of interest in the building of this project. Particularly, I was impressed with the cooperation that existed between the State, local, and Federal officials in regard to it.

The State commission in Missouri had three representatives at the luncheon, and among those was Mr. Towell whom we have just heard.

The 187 acres consist of 17 farms that would be benefited greatly by the recreational project.

The Department of Agriculture feels that there is an area around the recreational lake that will also be benefited, which is the yellow area on this map.

Mr. Short brought up the point that this little creek did not appear to ever overflow its banks. The stream is deep. There has been little erosion around the walls of this stream, but so far as overflowing the banks we do not know what the situation would be with regard to how far to the south flood prevention benefits accrue.

Mr. POAGE. This map does not show that.

Mr. GATHINGS. This is the very upper portion of this watershed there. We were there after a pretty good rain. Mr. Towell said that there was a 5½-inch rain later. It floods to the south of this particular watershed area. He was speaking a little while ago of the need for this project to hold back some of the water that would have caused trouble down below.

That is black soil and it is fertile. It is good land. It grows good corn and other crops.

As I undersand it from talking with the people in the Department of Agriculture, additional information, Mr. Chairman, is being sought from the local officials with respect to additional losses in the areas to the south of the project.

And the $157 cost per acre as has been mentioned here this morning should be appreciably lowered if additional benefits from flood prevention can be shown.

The State Conservation Commission of Missouri acquired this recreational land and paid $44,000 for it. Local interests donated $30,000 for their part of the work. With the payment of $58,875, the Federal funds will be reduced from $180,845 to $127,570.

The benefit-cost ratio as given to us originally here are 1.27 to 1 would go up somewhat as a result of the payment of this additional $58,875 on the part of the State. If the additional benefits could be

shown with respect to flood prevention to the south of the area, it should bring it well within the criteria that we have used as guidelines.

Mr. McINTIRE. As I undersand it, there may be additional areas which will be affected to which this will apply?

Mr. GATHINGS. The information that I get from the Department is that there is a benefit to the area down here [indicating].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Congressman Poage, whenever Mr. Short and Mr. Gathings returned, they asked me to come and talk further about the project. Mr. Short, while in sympathy with the project raised this fundamental question with me. He said to me, "This is some of the finest land I had ever hoped to see." But, he said, "This channel that they are putting this structure in is about 20 feet deep. It was clean. It was not sloping." And he said, "I just cannot imagine that ever getting out of its banks." And he said, "Are you quite sure that what we are claiming for the benefits is correct?" And I said, "Mr. Short, I can guarantee that they would not have been claimed as benefits unless there had been some flooding of that area."

The only thing that I can say here further is that as to the frequency and the extent and all of the details connected with it, that we would have to ask our Missouri State office to furnish that technical information. We do not have it here. That is what I told him.

He said, "Well, now," in Mr. Gathings' presence, "if this is overflowing" and I reminded him of that it was in the 50-inch rainfall belt, and that I could tell him that in some areas that I was acquainted with which were pretty close to this, that it was not out of order for the channels that are deep and wide to really overflow. And he said, "If that is overflowing, I think that it has been cut off, claiming benefits in too short an area—that there are benefits down beyond there."

"Well," I said, "I cannot answer that question. The only thing I can promise is that I will go back to our Missouri State office and find out whether there are other benefits, because this is a possibility," because after we justify a project, we have cautioned them about continuing to go over and beyond, because otherwise it uses up planning money unjustifiably. And Congressman Poage, it may be that in planning these first two stabilization structures they cut off the benefits and made some adjustments that would have to be clarified before we could speak authoritatively on it.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. But it seems to me that you have not given us the picture—we do not get that picture—it is not here and unless you can show that there is damage on down here, it is not very helpful. Now, if that is true, it is another thing. But just to come up here and assume, well, now, we need to show another $30,000 savings, therefore we assume that there are $30,000 savings down the river somewhere—that is something that we cannot do. You can tell us one way or the other, but I think that we have to have some information about where it is saving the United States—how we bring about these benefits, rather than simply telling us that somewhere down the river there will be some effect on the roads. I am not saying that there will not be, but let us know specifically before we claim those benefits as a reason for spending the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me clear up what I think about the claim for the roads. The roads that he mentioned to you are in those 187 acres.

ever, I do not believe that we can at present go ahead with this project. I do not think that the Department as yet knows the facts that would justify an approval of this project. I think that we have to have more facts before we can approve this project. I hope that we can approve it. It seems to me that it is one of these things that would probably have a good influence in the State of Missouri, and probably would redound to the benefit of the whole program.

On the other hand, we cannot start out and set a pattern for the State of Missouri of approving projects on the type of hearsay evidence we have before us.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. POAGE. Does anybody else have anything that they want to say on this?

Mr. GATHINGS. I just want to say this, that the report that was made here by me this morning was to the effect that the Department of Agriculture was going to check on this matter.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. Of the downstream flooding conditions. I think that we ought to give them this opportunity and not shut the door.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think that anybody has any idea of shutting the door on this.

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not understand.

Mr. POAGE. Do you ask that it be approved?

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not ask that it be approved today.

Mr. POAGE. You would not ask that it be approved yet, then?

Mr. GATHINGS. No, I did not ask that it be approved at this time. Mr. Short should be heard.

Mr. POAGE. We will pass this project over as we have so many times in the past and see if we can get something that will really stand up.

Let us see if you can come back and tell us how it will affect those things that you talk about. We want that information. I think that we all recognize there are questions that must be answered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Could this not be a low area?

Mr. POAGE. It could be a great many things, but can this committee sit here and go into this without the proper information?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will come prepared. You were very nice to accommodate Mr. Towell. You have gotten his side of it. He has made an offer. We talked to Congressmen Gathings and Short and they asked some questions which, as you know, I would have to have time to go into——

Mr. POAGE. I recognize that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we will come, with your permission, the next time, and if it meets with your approval, I would like to start over again, I will present this project with backstop help. In other words, I find there is so much confusion. We started with the little stabilization structures. They cost so much. And in discussing that with Mr. Gathings and Mr. Short, they thanked us for clearing up that difference in cost.

So with the appropriate map and with additional information, give us an opportunity to really give the total facts, because I know that the attitude of this committee is that if it is a justifiable project you

want to approve it and if not, none of us want to approve it. We will get the information.

Mr. POAGE. We are very much obliged to all of you. We appreciate the report you have made to us on this. We appreciate the action of the Department. And we will consider this matter further. I am sure that everyone hopes that we can work this thing out, because it is something which has benefits. The people are trying to help themselves, and when they are, we want to help them, but I do not want to help them to do things that should not be done.

We will now leave this and go on to further business.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 a. m. the committee proceeded to further business.)

WATERSHED PROJECTS

MONDAY, JULY 27, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m. in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Hagen of California, Johnson of Wisconsin, Matthews, Stubblefield, Hagan of Georgia, Harvey of Indiana, and Dole.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk, and Robert C. Bruce, assistant counsel.

John H. Wetzel, Director, and Charles Swigart, Assistant Director, Watershed Planning Division; and R. Neil Lane, Chief, Projects Branch, Watershed Planning Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will now take up the watershed projects. The first project is Turtle River, Ga., Mr. Tuten's district.

TURTLE RIVER, GA.

TURTLE RIVER WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 151,621 acres in Brantley, Glynn, and Wayne Counties.

Sponsors: Satilla River Soil and Water Conservation District, County Government of Brantley County, County Government of Glynn County, and County Government of Wayne County.

Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of about 108 miles of channel improvement and 10.4 miles of dikes.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$231,561	87
Flood prevention	(116,939)	(44)
Drainage	(114,622)	(43)
Secondary	34,568	13
Total	266,129	100

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$42,400	27	[1] $112,900	73	$155,300
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	1,482,984	97	51,486	3	1,534,470
Drainage	621,895	59	428,529	41	1,050,424
Subtotal	2,104,879	81	[2] 480,015	19	2,584,894
Total	2,147,279	78	592,915	22	2,740,194

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Construction cost for drainage	$388,685
Land, easements, and rights-of-way	82,730
Administration of contracts	8,600

Benefit-cost ratio: 2 to 1.

Mr. POAGE. While we are waiting for Mr. Tuten, we will let the Department explain this project.

Mr. SWIGART. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, Turtle River watershed is located in southeastern Georgia, the lower part of southeastern Georgia near Brunswick, comprising 151,621 acres, 21,000 of which are in Brantley County, 113,000 in Glynn County, and about 18,000 in Wayne County. The watershed area is relatively flat and low and joins the Atlantic Ocean down near Brunswick.

The principal economy in the area is the production of forests and forest products.

The principal problem is one of flooding from the Altamaha River and at the same time excessive precipitation through hurricanes and tropical storms. The effects of this frequent flooding and prolonged flooding have been very detrimental to the present forest growth in the area. It not only retards the growth of the forest species but it also prevents germination and survival of adequate new stands.

The Satilla River Soil and Water Conservation District and the county governments of Brantley, Glynn, and Wayne Counties have joined together in seeking assistance to resolve this very problem that is so detrimental to their economic well-being in the area.

Ninety percent of the area is in forest. There are 245 farms averaging about 230 acres each. The proposed project consists of a dike at this point, which will prevent overflow from the Altamaha, a 25-year-frequency overflow.

The channel system has been developed to take care of the excessive precipitation that falls on the area during the hurricanes and tropical storm rains. There are 108 miles of channel improvement, and this dike will be 10.4 miles long.

In addition, there will be the necessary conservation practices in association with the structural measures to accomplish a complete soil and water conservation job in the watershed area.

The average annual benefits will amount to $266,129 on 67,292 acres, which will accrue to the owners and operators of about 80 farms.

The total cost of the project is $2,740,194, of which the Federal Government, through Public Law 566, will pay $2,147,279, or 78 percent, and local and other funds will take care of $592,915, or 22 percent. In addition, the local sponsors will operate and maintain the project at an average annual cost of $29,743. There is a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 2 to 1 and the cost per acre benefited amounts to $27. That is a brief résumé of this project.

Mr. POAGE. On this new form, why are you not putting that per-acre benefit on the form?

Mr. SWIGART. Do you have the double page form?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir; I have a single page form for each of these projects. You do not show that figure. You do not give us that information which we have long received.

Mr. SWIGART. Something slipped twixt cup and lip, I guess, because you should have the two-page form that is usually made available to the committee.

Mr. POAGE. We want this information and do not want to be shortchanged.

Mr. WETZEL. This is the form that goes to the Senate Agriculture Committee that they have requested. Apparently the one- and two-page forms have been reversed. We have a copy of the two-page form here.

Mr. POAGE. I can understand as far as acreage is concerned here it is rather small cost per acre, it is not involved here, but I did wonder why we were furnished with this short form. I realize you want to give us the information and we want to receive it.

Why is this local contribution so small percentagewise? This is largely a drainage project. Normally, in a drainage project the local contribution runs better than 50 percent. A drainage project should have a large local contribution. This has a small contribution.

Mr. SWIGART. This dike here is a flood prevention measure. The entire cost of the dike is $462,321. Being a flood prevention measure, the Public Law 566 share of that is $451,986. That explains some of the higher Public Law 566 cost as related to a project where the works of improvement were all multiple-purpose, but this is a single-purpose measure here. Within the remainder, costs are allocated roughly 50–50 between flood prevention and drainage.

Mr. POAGE. How can that be simply flood prevention? Your poor drainage is the result of water coming in there; is it not?

Mr. SWIGART. It is the result of overflow from the Altamaha, which is a flood problem. This prevents the overflow. It prevents the water from spreading over that watershed area down here. Its purpose is not to drain anything, it is to keep water out. The channel will take care of the excess precipitation and also when a greater flood than one of 25 years occurs, it will also lead that water down safely to the Atlantic Ocean at the lower end of the watershed through the Turtle River.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Harvey.

Mr. HARVEY. Since we do not have the complete report here, I tried to do some quick arithmetic in round numbers on this project. It is going to cost the Federal Government about $2 million-plus. There are roughly 80 farms affected by this. That means $25,000

per farm. I believe you said the average size is about 230 acres, which means that you are going to spend in excess of a hundred dollars an acre on this.

It is primarily for growing timber. I have not been on this immediate spot, but I visited this Brunswick area. I wonder if we are justified in spending a hundred dollars an acre down there, or better than a hundred dollars per acre for timber farmers. I do not know whether we need timber that much or not, the type of timber produced there.

Mr. SWIGART. Mr. Harvey, there are 67,292 acres that will be benefited. Some of that is in other timber holdings than strictly farms.

Mr. HARVEY. What kind of timber holdings?

Mr. SWIGART. Commercial pulp and timber companies; there is one large farm in there. The individual landowners control 60,359 acres.

Mr. HARVEY. The cost per acre breakdown would not be too far off?

Mr. SWIGART. According to our calculations, the cost per benefited acre to Public Law 566 funds is $27. The value of this woodland averages out $150 per acre with a variation from $50 to $200 an acre. The open land in this area is valued at $300 per acre. But, as you state, the primary benefits are to forest and pasturelands.

Mr. HARVEY. OK.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any further questions? If not, we would be glad to hear from Congressman Tuten at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. RUSSELL TUTEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, I am grateful for the privilege of appearing in behalf of the Turtle River watershed project.

All the facts you need to thoroughly justify your favorable consideration of the Turtle River watershed are clearly stated in the work plan. Therefore, in consideration of your time, I shall be very brief. Permit me to direct your attention to the fact that this watershed area is (1) 90 percent woodland, and (2) that the average value of drained areas is $200 per acre compared to an evaluation of from $50 to $100 per acre for the excessively wet acres. The production of timber, both pine and hardwood, is an important industry for this area of Georgia.

This project is necessary in order to receive reasonable returns from this valuable land. The work plan will further reveal the fact that the benefit-cost ratio is very favorable.

I shall conclude my remarks, subject to any question you might wish to ask, by urging your approval of this important project.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. Tuten. You might give us an idea how far you think we should go in spending public funds on the improvement of this timberland. What would be your idea about the limit we ought to spend on this kind of land?

Mr. TUTEN. I am not in a position to advise you about that, Mr. Poage.

Mr. POAGE. You know this land better than we do.

Mr. TUTEN. This particular endeavor is a very important one to our area. As a matter of fact, this area of Georgia, when you get back away from the resort areas, is good for little except pastureland and the raising of timber. You are familiar with the fact that the production of pulpwood, sawmill timber, and turpentine products is possibly one of our very biggest industries in this immediate area of southeast Georgia.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. That land can be reclaimed, even some tidal swamps could be reclaimed at a figure. But at about what point would you suggest it would cease to be good business for the Government to do it? There must be some point. Obviously, you cannot afford to spend $5,000 an acre. You know the land much better than we do.

Mr. TUTEN. As stated in your work plan, some of our better timberlands down there, considered strictly from a standpoint of their timber production, are valued at approximately $300 per acre. As we pointed out here, maybe an average price is $200 per acre for well-drained and well-cared-for lands.

On the other hand, the wet areas just simply do not produce timber very well. It is difficult to harvest the timber after it is produced. This undeveloped land, in many instances, is valued at only $50 per acrea. I think those figures would give you an idea about how far you should go.

Mr. HAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HAGAN. By the way, I would like to say that my able colleague, with his background in this area, is thoroughly familiar with this problem. Through his work on the Public Works Committee he is familiar with projects on a larger scale, also. Would you not have a hard time buying some of that land in your area for $50 an acre? That land down there, regardless of the condition you outline, still would be difficult to buy as low as $50 an acre; is that right?

Mr. TUTEN. Not too much would be available for that price. I would say an average price would be $200 per acre.

Mr. HAGAN. It has been difficult for me to find any anywhere around $100 per acre. The other figure you mentioned is more in line.

Mr. POAGE. About how far do you think we can go spending money on this land? It is perfectly obvious that it is good business for the Government to make a small expenditure. We know if we spend $10 an acre to improve this, it would probably be an advantageous expenditure. We all agree if we spend a thousand dollars, it would be rather foolish. At about what point do you think we should quit spending Government money on this?

Mr. TUTEN. I will answer you like this: I believe it was just pointed out this amounts to about $27 per acre on this particular project. Those figures were used by the gentleman who talked to you a minute ago. If that is a correct cost, I think the Government would not be going beyond the bounds of reason to spend that kind of money.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. HARVEY. Have the Army Engineers done any work in the Brunswick area with regard to channeling the river?

Mr. TUTEN. A study has just been approved to determine the feasibility of deepening the Brunswick Harbor. We also have an erosion study underway relative to these beaches.

Mr. HARVEY. Would it be possible that this dike which is, I would gather, one of the more important parts of the project, would that possibly be included in your proposed engineering project?

Mr. TUTEN. So far as the Altamaha River is concerned, some studies have been made in connection with basin studies. It looks as if that project is a long-range one and probably might be some few years away from us. The Turtle River watershed is an immediate necessity. The construction of this dike is important. We do have floodwaters overflowing from this river quite frequently. There is an immediate need for this project.

Mr. HARVEY. It does drain into the Brunswick River?

Mr. TUTEN. Yes, sir; it drains over into this general area which eventually finds its way into the Turtle River Basin.

Mr. HARVEY. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any further questions of Mr. Tuten? If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Tuten.

WELLINGTON-NAPOLEON, MO.

Mr. POAGE. Next is the Wellington-Napoleon watershed project in Missouri, in Mr. Randall's district.

WELLINGTON-NAPOLEON WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 19,130 acres in Lafayette County.

Sponsors: Soil and Water Conservation District of Lafayette County and Lafayette County court.

Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 3.5 miles of channel improvement and 17 gully stabilization structures.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$29,927	91
To agricultural improvements	44	
Indirect	2,899	9
Total	32,870	100

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$19,700	10	[1] $178,100	90	$197,800
Structural measures: Flood prevention	562,328	93	[2] 45,060	7	607,388
Total	582,028	72	223,160	28	805,188

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements, and rights-of-way	$37,180
Administration of contracts	7,880

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.29 to 1.

Mr. SWIGART. The Wellington-Napoleon watershed is located in western Missouri, the northwest part of Lafayette County, just one county east of Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. POAGE. This Wellington-Napoleon Watershed, is that in Waterloo?

Mr. SWIGART. Waterloo is in the watershed with about 30 people. The watershed area is 19,130 acres. It borders on the Missouri River.

The principal economy of the area is dependent upon livestock and livestock products fed on farms. There are some corn, soybeans, and wheat furnishing a minor part of the income of the farmers.

The total watershed is privately owned. There are 161 farms in it, averaging about 130 acres each. At the present time 52 percent of those farms have basic soil and water conservation farm plans. That comprises 11,870 acres, 62 percent of the total watershed area; 33 percent of the planned measures are now installed.

The Soil and Water Conservation District of Lafayette County and the Lafayette County court have requested assistance on this project. They have a twofold problem: One, large gullies that are rapidly chewing up the watershed area. These gullies are 20 to 50 feet deep and they average in width 50 to 150 feet.

In addition to the total destruction that will eventualy occur to the upland area in the watershed, there are large amounts of sediment. This sediment is creating a problem down along the Wellington ditch here, filling it up. There are 6,700 cubic yards of sediment annually to be removed from the ditch. The problem is to control sediment, prevent destruction of lands upstream, and then provide adequate channel capacity down along the Wellington ditch to achieve floodwater damage reduction benefits that are indicated by this color here.

This other color here is the upland area that is being protected as a result of the grade stabilization structures.

The average annual damage in the watershed amounts to $38,070. That will be reduced as a result of this project to $4,830. The total benefits amount to $32,870, which will benefit 6,641 acres owned and operated by 96 farmers.

The total cost of the project is $805,188. Public Law 566 funds are proposed to bear $582,028, or 72 percent of that, and local and other funds will bear the remainder of $223,160.

In addition, the local folk will operate and maintain the constructed measure at an estimated annual cost of $1,787. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.29 to 1, and the Public Law 566 cost per benefited acre amounts to $77. The value of the land at current estimates is $178 per acre.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

If not, we will be glad to hear from Mr. Randall.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Much of the data which I have has come from the Department of Agriculture and it has already been presented to you. One additional point I would like to make is that if you look at a map of the State of Missouri the usual method of the Department of Agri-

culture to present statistics is to show these counties marked in green which have watershed projects. Until just a couple years ago there was not a single green county in all western Missouri and not too many throughout the State of Missouri.

Then if you look at the maps of the surrounding States, you will see they are dotted with green counties. Missouri sort of stands out, because the map is mostly white. That trend was reversed starting back about 1960. We had our first project in this very same county, Lafayette County, which is a rich agricultural county.

Now we have one getting started down in Johnson County to the south and the one applied for today is the third one. I mention those facts simply to pass on to you the enthusiasm of the people in this county for projects of this kind. They are highly enthusiastic about watershed projects.

I never visit Lafayette County but they inquire about the plans for this or even another one that is being proposed. All the statistics have been presented to you. I was doing a moment ago a little computing to try to anticipate a possible question from a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana, in connection with the last application on the cost-benefit ratio. As I compute it, the value of the land, that is at its present value, the land is worth $178. The overall cost, on all costs, including local costs and Federal costs of this project will be $40 per acre. The Federal cost will be less than $30, $20.70 an acre.

I cannot tell you the reason for the distribution of the Federal share and the local share. I know in other projects, including the one in this same county and one over in Johnson County, the cost was about 45 percent local to 55 percent Federal. Here the division of cost is about 30 percent local and 70 percent Federal. May I add that the type of farming is not confined to breeding and feeding of livestock, as was mentioned. In addition there are row crops down in the bottom land on the Missouri River including corn, beans, wheat, and clover. It is true the upland is devoted largely to pasture.

Very conservative people live in this area, but they are also progressive people. In spite of the names of Wellington, Waterloo, Napoleon, most of the people are of Dutch and German extraction. They are all good farmers. This is a fine agricultural county. This watershed, if approved, will make it even better.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Randall. Are there any questions?

(The statement of Mr. Randall follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the members of this subcommittee affording me an opportunity to appear in support of the Wellington-Napoleon watershed project on which the Soil and Water Conservation District of Lafayette County and the Lafayette County court as sponsoring local organizations have worked long and diligently.

This watershed has an area of 19,130 acres and is located in the northwest corner of Lafayette County, Mo., and is a tributary to Sni-A-Bar Creek, which empties into the Missouri River. Some tributaries empty directly into the Missouri River.

The principal problems are floodwater damage to crops, deposition of debris, channel filling and gully erosion damage to agricultural land. Floods occur several times annually with severe flooding occurring during the spring and fall season. Floods, in fact, have been experienced in every month of the growing

season. A storm on September 13, 1961, estimated to be of about 10-year frequency, inundated approximately 482 acres and caused floodwater damage estimated at $10,600. This includes $9,200 to crops, $320 to agricultural improvements, and $1,080 indirect damages. On August 7, 1955, approximately 306 acres were inundated by a storm of approximately a 4-year frequency. Estimated flood damage of $6,600 includes $5,800 to crops, $200 to agricultural improvements, and $600 indirect damages.

Approximately 94 farms, representing 69 percent of the area, are cooperating in installing land treatment measures with assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, and going cost-sharing programs. Basic farm plans have been developed on 62 percent of the area in the watershed.

Estimated average annual value of all evaluated damage is $38,070. The project provides for the elimination of gully erosion damage in the evaluated areas, 36 percent of the floodwater damage, 93 percent of the sediment damage, and 87 percent of the total damage. Without this project, a storm of 5-year magnitude in the area will cause flooding on 367 acres in contrast to only 14 acres if the proposed measures are installed.

Benefits of the project will have far-reaching effects on the inhabitants, land, and facilities in the watershed. Floodwater damage reduction benefits will accrue to 31 of the 161 farms. Sixty-five farms will receive benefits from reduction of gully erosion damage. Benefits from reduced maintenance and future costs of replacement will be realized for roads and bridges located in the flood plain area.

The flood damage reduction benefits annually is estimated at an average of $33,240. Of the total installation cost of $805,188, the local costs will approximate $223,160.

Land treatment measures to be installed include appropriate measures having hydrologic significance in reducing runoff and measures that will help prevent erosion and production of sediment. These include such measures as terracing, grassed waterways, pasture planting, and others.

Land treatment measures to be installed by individual landowners have an estimated cost of around $162,050. Additional technical assistance to accelerate planning and application of land treatment measures will be provided from Federal funds at an estimated cost of $19,700. These funds are in addition to technical assistance cost to be provided by the going program estimated at $16,050.

This plan provides for installation of 3.5 miles of channel improvement, and 17 gully stabilization structures. Thirteen are listed as having floodwater retarding features. Six of these provide floodwater benefits, four of which provide for silt storage which will reduce silt accumulation. These structural measures will protect 681 acres of flood plain and 5,960 acres of upland subject to erosion damage.

The structural measures in this work plan are estimated at $607,388 of which the Federal share is $562,328. The average annual operation and maintenance cost to be provided by the local sponsoring organizations is $1,787.

The ratio of average annual benefits ($32,870) to the average annual costs of structural measures ($25,395) is 1.29 to 1.

This plan meets with the enthusiastic approval of local interests who are progressive, but conservative people. Their enterprise is general livestock farming—hogs and cattle. The area is considered highly productive when treated well but the upland is subject to severe erosion. The bottomland is farmed to mostly row crops, such as corn or beans, with some wheat and clover. The upland is used for crops such as corn, small grain (wheat or oats), hay, and pasture.

It is a pleasure to appear here in support of the Wellington-Napoleon watershed project and we urge the committee to approve the plan.

MARSHYHOPE CREEK, DEL. AND MD.

Mr. POAGE. Let us take up next the Marshyhope Creek Watershed in Delaware and Maryland.

Marshyhope Creek Watershed Work Plan

Size and location: 100,600 acres in Kent and Sussex Counties, Del.; and Caroline and Dorchester Counties, Md.

Sponsors: Delaware State Soil Conservation Commission, Caroline County Commissioners, Caroline County Soil Conservation District, Dorchester County Commissioners, Dorchester Soil Conservation District, and Town of Federalsburg, Md.

Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention and drainage.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms, and structural measures consisting of about 460 miles of stream channel improvement.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$658,421	86
Flood prevention	(329,211)	(43)
Drainage	(329,210)	(43)
Secondary	106,861	14
Total	765,282	100

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$174,200	14	[1] $1,068,600	86	$1,242,800
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	3,033,930	91	313,005	9	3,346,935
Drainage	1,615,105	61	1,025,930	39	2,641,035
Subtotal	4,649,035	78	[2] 1,338,935	22	5,987,970
Total	4,823,235	67	2,407,535	33	7,230,770

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Administration of contracts	$131,700
Construction cost for drainage	810,525
Land, easements, and rights-of-way	396,710

Benefit-cost ratio: 2.6 to 1.

Mr. Wetzel. This project is located in two counties in Maryland, two counties in Delaware, and comprises an area of roughly 100,000 acres. Anyone familiar with the Eastern Shore will recognize the problems that have existed in the Marshyhope Creek watershed for a long time. There has been a great deal of controversy. There has been a tremendous need for help to the agricultural area which is roughly the upper 65 percent of the watershed area.

It is a very flat area on the Eastern Shore ranging from an elevation of about 70 feet at the upper end of the watershed to 2 feet above mean sea level at the town of Federalsburg at this point. There has been a tremendous need for flood relief and for drainage help in the upper agricultural portion of the watershed. However, the town of Federalsburg has been plagued by a number of very serious floods. A flood in 1935 caused about a half million dollars' damage in the town of Federalsburg.

The whole problem has been complicated by the fact that the project must be carried out under the drainage laws of the two States.

That is, Delaware drainage laws in the Delaware portion and the Maryland drainage laws in the Maryland portion. The town of Federalsburg, of course, has understandably been concerned that they do not want more water put into the main creek and increase their flood hazard at a time of peak runoff.

Federalsburg has a population of about 2,000. They have suffered fairly severe storms. Major floods occurred in 1889, 1919, 1933, with the worst being in 1935 when 13 inches of rain fell in 3 days. That flood caused half a million dollars' damage in the small town.

The project as proposed consists of about 460 miles of stream channel improvement. The channels are multipurpose flood prevention and drainage channels with the allocation between purposes being made on the basis of the soil types that are to be found in the various tributaries of the watershed area. There are about 780 farms in the watershed. They are primarily involved in broiler production. Actually, about 200 million broilers are produced in the Marshyhope watershed annually.

Farms average about 120 acres and have an average value of about $300 an acre.

In addition to the drainage channels and the flood prevention channels, on the agricultural land itself, the project proposes about 9,000 lineal feet of channel through the town of Federalsburg to protect against the increased flow which will result from providing adequate drainage and flood prevention of the agricultural land.

The benefits are 86 percent accruing to the agricultural land. The agricultural land that will be benefited is roughly about 26,000 acres. The owners and operators of 780 farms will benefit from this project.

The total cost of the project is $7,230,000, of which the local people, the drainage districts in the two Delaware counties, the drainage districts in the two Maryland counties, and the city of Federalsburg, will provide $2,408,000 and the Federal share will be $4,800,000.

The benefit-cost ratio is very high, 2.6 to 1, and the cost per acre benefited of the agricultural land will be $154. The town of Federalsburg has agreed to be the contracting officer and to assume operation and maintenance for the 9,000 feet of channel that will be built through the town of Federalsburg.

We have felt very encouraged in the development of this project. It has been a long time developing. As I said, back in the early 1930's it was recognized there was this serious flood problem in Federalsburg. The Corps of Engineers has studied the problem of Federalsburg. The Soil Conservation Service back in 1948 and 1949 developed a plan for the drainage and flood protection of the agricultural lands, but it could never be coordinated with the interests in Federalsburg. As far as we know, this is the first time since the problem has existed that the agricultural interests in the upper watershed and the residents in Federalsburg have been able to get together and are now in complete agreement as to the type of project they wish to carry out.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Wetzel. I believe Congressman Morton is with us. First, are there any questions?

Mr. HARVEY. Into what does Marshyhope Creek empty?

Mr. WETZEL. Marshyhope Creek becomes tidal just below Federalsburg and enters the Nanticoke River, which is tidal, and then into the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. HARVEY. How much tide is there at Federalsburg? That is the question I had in mind.

Mr. WETZEL. The report indicates the stream becomes tidal at Federalsburg. Perhaps one of the local people could better answer that.

Mr. SMITH. I am Marvin Smith, attorney for the mayor and City Council of Federalsburg. The height of tidal effect is right at Federalsburg where the tide runs out.

Mr. WETZEL. I believe there is probably no tidal range above the town of Federalsburg. The tide runs out in the town of Federalsburg. The corps does have a project below Federalsburg which has relieved the effect of any tidal action on the town of Federalsburg.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Morton.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. MORTON. I have Mr. Marvin Smith with me, attorney for the town of Federalsburg, and Mr. Harry H. Reick, president of Caroline County Soil Conservation District.

First I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear here before your subcommittee in behalf of the Marshyhope watershed project. I will not repeat the figures and statistics given by the able representatives from the Department of Agriculture, and in the interest of time I will follow the procedure followed by Congressman Tuten dealing with the project in his district.

I would like to call to your attention the fact that we have a statement, however, which I think has been distributed to you. Also you should have before you a work plan for the Marshyhope project which was made available. This is a very exciting project for several reasons. One is that this vast 157 square mile area is located approximately in the center of population of around 48 million people. The market area served by the farmers in this particular area is vast and represents an expenditure of many billions of dollars. We have on the Eastern Shore a well balanced agricultural economy in which we produce as much of our own feed grain requirements as possible but still do not produce enough.

Therefore, from the point of view of investment by the Federal Government in this project in upgrading land for agricultural production we are not contributing to the surplus in this area whatsoever. We are primarily engaged here in soybean and corn production, both these crops being used in our livestock and broiler feed program. We still have to bring into this area approximately 8 million bushels of corn annually, and this has an effect on the competitive price of our broilers, and it naturally accrues to our advantages to produce as much of our own feed as we can, which will give us the opportunity to compete more favorably with broiler areas in other parts of the country which are nearer their own source of feed or which can take advantage of cheap water rates from the feed-producing areas.

Without burdening you with any more of the figures except this, I would point out the table on page 3 of my testimony, which shows the effect of this project on yields of corn, soybeans, small grains, hay, and pasture. These figures are rather dramatic and I think quite conservative.

Without further ado, I would like to ask Mr. Rieck if he would like to speak to the project and, following him, Mr. Smith.

(Mr. Morton's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. RODGERS C. B. MORTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. Chairman, I am Rogers C. B. Morton, Representative from the First District of Maryland. I would like to express my appreciation and the gratitude of the many people in my district affected by the proposed watershed for this opportunity to appear before the Committee on Conservation and Credit in support of this project.

The purpose of the Marshyhope Creek watershed project is to solve the joint problems of flood prevention and land drainage. This would permit the increased production of corn and soybean crops that are paramount to the broiler industry, an industry that accounts for a major segment of the economy within the watershed. The project would promote farm management practices, as well.

The watershed is roughly 100,600 acres, or approximately 157.2 square miles, in size. It is estimated that 60 percent of the project lies in the State of Delaware, with 37.3 percent being in Kent County and 22.7 percent being in Sussex County. Approximately 40 percent of the project lies in the State of Maryland, with 39.7 percent being in Caroline County and about 3 percent at the lower end of Dorchester County.

As enumerated by the able representative from the Department of Agriculture, the total project cost will be $7,230,770, with Public Law 566 funds bearing $4,823,-235 of the total cost and other funds bearing $2,407,535 of the total cost.

The average combined cost of the project per acre is approximately $71.9. The average annual primary cost benefits accruing to the structural measures total $658,421 and are distributed one-half to flood prevention and one-half to agricultural water management. The average annual benefit to average annual cost ratio is $765,283/$291,189, or 2.6 to 1.0.

The economy of the watershed is based on agricultural production. There are 780 farms within the project, ranging in size from less than 50 acres to more than 250 acres, but the average farm is approximately 120 acres, with about 65 acres of woodland. These farms are mostly owner operated and have an average land value of $300 per acre.

The soil in the area is best suited for corn and soybean crops. Importantly enough, the broiler industry of the Delmarva Peninsula is located in and adjacent to the watershed and creates a growing demand for these crops, which are used as feed for the broilers. This has resulted in the expansion of acreage used for corn and soybean production and an increase in the utilization of these crops and their byproducts.

Local supplies of grain have been inadequate to meet local needs. In 1962, 12 million bushels of corn were raised within the watershed, 8 million more bushels had to be brought in to meet local feed requirements.

Farmers in this watershed do not contribute to the crop surplus. In fact, this is a feed grains deficit area.

Because of poor drainage and circumstances beyond the farmers' control, crop yields within the watershed do not provide an adequate farm profit or return on investment.

A network of county and State roads provide convenient access to major highways and railheads. A perimeter delineated through overnight trucking includes a market with a total population of 48,110,534 people with a disposable income of $110.3 billion. These figures represent roughly 28.7 percent of our Nation's population and 28.4 percent of the Nation's disposable income, and insure a continued market for broilers.

Mr. Harry H. Rieck, chairman, Board of Supervisors, Caroline County Soil Conservation District, and a member of the Maryland State Conservation Commission, is here with us today, and with the chairman's permission, would like to address the committee briefly, a little later, on behalf of the agricultural interests affected by the project.

The town of Federalsburg, Md., population 2,000, lies at the foot of the drainage area. It has a history of floods extending back to 1876 with damages reaching a high of one-half million dollars as a result of the 1935 flood.

Mr. Marvin Smith, counsel for the town of Federalsburg, is here with us also today, and with the chairman's permission, would like to address the committee briefly, a little later, on behalf of the townspeople.

Mr. Chairman, favorable consideration by this committee on the Marshyhope Creek watershed project will allow an area to develop to its fullest and enjoy the benefits that accrue with increased land use.

Land use	Acres at present	Acres with project
Cropland	39,024	42,800
Grassland	6,816	3,500
Woodland	52,600	52,900
Miscellaneous use	2,160	1,400

According to 141 areas sampled, representing about 25 percent of the project, the following figures give an indication of direct benefits resulting from the proposed amendments:

Crop	Yield without project	Yield with project
Corn—bushels per acre	35	75
Soybean—bushels per acre	15	30
Small grains—bushels per acre	20	35
Hay—tons per acre	1¼	3
Pasture—animal unit months per acre	3	6

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Marshyhope watershed is in need of a sound group approach to the control of surface and subsurface water on agricultural lands and for provision of adequate drainage outlets and relief from floodwaters.

For nearly a century, erosion, floodwaters, and sediment damages have been causing loss of life and damages to property, as well as preventing the full utilization of much land that could otherwise be highly productive.

Through extensive and excellent cooperation of the various local, county, State, and Federal agencies, this project has been developed. The construction and implementation of this project would eliminate the problems and bring greater benefits to the many people living and working within the boundaries of the watershed.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the committee's approval of this project.

STATEMENT OF HARRY H. RIECK, PRESIDENT, CAROLINE COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. RIECK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am chairman of the Soil Conservation District of Caroline County. This is an extensive wet area pertaining to the Marshyhope Creek. There are approximately 200 farmers in this area and, with this drainage project completed, the economy of the county will be materially increased. Many farmers are unable to get the crops planted at the proper time due to the fact of our oversupply of water. In particularly wet years at harvest time they are not able to harvest crops. I knew cases where farmers lost their entire soybean crop because of inability to harvest on account of the improper drainage.

We feel that it is very important to the economy of the country, both from the county angle and from individual farmer's angle, that this project be completed and give the farmers an oportunity to make a decent living which now they cannot do because of the uncertainty of the drainage problem.

Having experience my own self in the upper part of the country, it is about 1 year in 3 that you might say you have almost a failure because of weather conditions. I would like to supplement that by

saying that has not been true in the last several years because we have been in a drought area, but in years past, in normal years, you can figure about 1 year out of 3 that you are going to lose your crops. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much Mr. Rieck.

We will now hear from Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF MARVIN H. SMITH, ATTORNEY TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF FEDERALSBURG, MD.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Marshyhope Creek has overflowed its banks on a number of occasions. The town of Federalsburg is situated along this stream. It suffers from each flood. The most disastrous flood in its history was in 1935 when it reached 7.4 feet above the stage established by the Corps of Engineers as the stage at which serious flood damage begins. Many of our local people felt that Civilian Conservation Corps ditching above the town contributed to that flood. Therefore, there has been opposition in the town to drainage projects unless provisions were made for some type of flood control. As a consequence, we have been in the embarrassing position in the past of opposing our friends and neighbors of both Maryland and Delaware who saw great economic advantage to them with more adequate drainage.

The matter of draingage of the Marshyhope has been under discussion for many, many years. My own participation in such discussion goes back 17 years.

The Soil Conservation Service in its report has indicated that improved drainage above Federalsburg would increase the flow of water through the town. They have devised a plan that not only takes care of the extra water brought down by this agricultural drainage, but one which also will reduce somewhat flood levels in Federalsburg. The mayor and council are pleased and delighted with the plan. Their endorsement of it includes a willingness to spend town funds to further the project.

Now that at long last a plan has been devised which will serve the needs of agriculture and also benefit the town, we earnestly solicit your favorable consideration.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. MORTON. We are prepared to answer any questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no questions, we are very much obliged to you gentlemen. We will insert in the record at this point the statement of Congressman Carlton R. Sickles, of Maryland, and the statement of Congressman Harris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware, in support of the Marshyhope Creek watershed project, and anybody else who wants to submit a statement on this project may do so.

(The statements above referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement to the subcommittee supporting the Marshyhope Creek watershed project.

Although the area covered in the Marshyhope Creek watershed is over half in Delaware, the Maryland portion has substantial benefits especially in Caroline

County. Included in this are flood reduction and drainage on about 8,000 acres of farmland in Maryland and flood reduction in the town of Federalsburg. Substantial local contribution to the cost of the farm area channel will be supplied by local people in Maryland. Easements and rights-of-way are estimated at $112,000 and the local cost share on the Maryland ditches amounts to $270,000. In addition, the State of Maryland, Caroline County, and the town council of Federalsburg will contribute an estimated $95,600 for rights-of-way for the flood channel through Federalsburg. The town council will operate and maintain this channel at an estimated cost of $2,670 per year. In addition, many farmer-operated tax ditches in Delaware and public drainage associations in Maryland will be created to carry out the project.

As you know, this project is jointly sponsored by the Delaware State Soil Conservation Commission, the Caroline Soil Conservation District, and county commissioners of Caroline County, the Dorchester Soil Conservation District, the county commissioners of Dorchester County, and the mayor and council of Federalsburg, Md. The work plan submitted to you represents 6 years of industrious effort on the part of many private and public organizations and agencies.

This project represents an excellent example of farm people and urban dwellers in both Maryland and Delaware working together for the mutual advantage of both.

The 458 miles of multiple-purpose stream channel improvement and 9,000 feet of flood prevention channel will contribute to the development of this rural area, including several small towns. Corn and soybeans are the key crops produced in the area. Local processing plants utilize the entire local crop and import from other areas to meet the industries' requirements. The improvements will not only increase per acre yields of these crops but will also permit diversification into vegetable crop production.

Benefits from the project will accrue to the retail and wholesale suppliers of goods and services needed in the production and marketing of agricultural products as well as to the landholders and operators. Similarly the general public will benefit by maintenance of the tax base as a result of higher value farm properties with the project installed. The improved waterways will contribute to the future nonagricultural development of the area since water disposal problems are not limited to argriculture. Immediate benefits, incidental to the agricultural purposes of the project, will accrue to the State and county roads in the area.

The total cost of the project is expected to be $7,230,770 with an annual benefit exceeding $765,000. The benefit cost ratio is 2.6 to 1.

In view of the many benefits to be derived from this project, and the favorable cost-benefit ratio, I respectfully urge the subcommittee to approve it.

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate and welcome this opportunity to submit my views in support of the Marshyhope watershed project which is concerned with watershed conditions and problems in Kent and Sussex Counties, Del.

The Marshyhope Creek watershed comprises an area of approximately 157.2 square miles or 100,600 acres. Approximately 60 percent of the watershed is located in the State of Delaware with the greater portion, 37.3 percent, in Kent County and the lesser portion, 22.7 percent, in Sussex County. Approximately 40 percent of the watershed lies in certain areas of the State of Maryland.

The local sponsoring organization in Delaware is the Delaware State Soil Conservation Commission. The project is also supported by the Soil Conservation Districts of Kent and Sussex Counties, Del.

The Marshyhope Creek watershed work plan which is under review by this committee describes in detail the watershed, its problems and the appropriate proposals designed to stabilize and improve conditions affecting this watershed. The development of the instant plan has been a long and painstaking task. The application for the Marshyhope Creek watershed was initiated by the Soil Conservation District of Kent County, Del., in 1957, after considerable time and effort were exhausted in trying to resolve the watershed problems under other State and Federal programs. The Caroline and Dorchester Soil Conservation Districts assumed the leadership in the State of Maryland and thereby joined

in a coordinated approach to the two-State, four-county problem. Planning authority was granted on June 6, 1958, and after 6 years, this project plan has finally reached the Congress for review and further action.

But these past 6 years are part of the long story which spans almost three decades of intensive study and work on the part of local conservation organizations, farmers, and other citizens interested and concerned with public and private land and water management. Farmers in Delaware and in Maryland have joined to counteract floodwater damage, soil erosion, sedimentation, and other watershed problems through group facility channel projects but their efforts have been considerably diluted because these problems were approached on a piecemeal basis.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, provided the means whereby the programs proposed in the instant project can be realistically achieved through the cooperation of local, State, and Federal Governments. Recognizing the many handicaps which face the owners and operators of watershed lands, affecting almost 800 farm families in Delaware and in Maryland, the local sponsoring citizens and organizations conceived and recommended a project plan which will provide the needed improvements and from which will accrue extensive onsite and offsite benefits. It is my understanding that the ratio of average annual economic benefits to annual costs has been calculated as 2.6 to 1, that is, benefits in the amount of $765,282 as contrasted to annual costs of $291,189. In addition to the economic benefits, there are other desirable effects not measurable in dollars and cents including the prevention of loss of life, illness, and costly disruption of public and private social activities.

The magnitude of the Marshyhope watershed project tends to emphasize the importance of the planning arrangements for watershed improvements, management, and protection as required under Public Law 566. It underlines the futility of piecemeal efforts of hundreds of farm families and local groups to solve complex watershed problems which transcend county and State lines. It underscores the need for Federal, State, and local cooperation in developing and improving watershed programs aimed to prevent floods, increase the supply of usable water, and prevent soil erosion and sedimentation thereby augmenting the availability of productive and fertile farmland.

The instant project is of special significance in the Delaware portion of the watershed. As I stated earlier, about 60,000 acres of the Marshyhope Creek watershed are located in Kent and Sussex Counties, Del. Both of these counties have been designated 5b under the Area Redevelopment Act. The estimated project beenfits of $765,282 annually will contribute importantly to the agricultural economy since many of the low income farms are located within this watershed.

The instant project meets all of the requirements of a worthy project; an excellent benefit-cost ratio is anticipated and substantial local participation is expected. The local share of the construction cost is approximately 22 percent and the local share of the overall cost is 33 percent plus all of the cost of future maintenance.

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, I respectfully urge that favorable consideration and approval be given toward the further advancement of the Marshyhope Creek watershed project. I take this opportunity, moreover, to salute those citizens and organizations in the States of Delaware and Maryland and those employees of the Federal Government who cooperated in conceiving a constructive plan which is in the public interest and which promises to yield solid gains in agriculture and allied fields.

America can ill afford to surrender its fertile and precious soil to hopeless and useless desolation. The soils of our pastures must be protected, not washed away. Our meadows, fertilized by careful irrigation, must be free from waste and unproductiveness. Indeed, whatever improves the condition and the character of the farmer feeds the lifesprings of our national character, our wealth, and our power.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MILL CREEK, GA.

Mr. POAGE. The next project is the Mill Creek watershed project, Georgia.

(The data sheet on said project follows:)

MILL CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 39,652 acres in Bryan and Bulloch Counties.

Sponsors: Coastal Soil and Water Conservation District, Ogeechee River Soil and Water Conservation District, and Bryan County government.

Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 66.8 miles of channel improvement.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$44,731	76
To nonagricultural improvements	400	1
Redevelopment	5,949	10
Secondary	7,518	13
Total	58,598	100

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land-treatment measures	$18,043	25	[1] $53,105	75	$71,148
Structural measures					
Flood prevention	384,759	89	49,499	11	434,258
Drainage	169,678	54	144,817	46	314,495
Subtotal	554,437	74	[2] 194,316	26	748,753
Total	572,480	70	247,421	30	819,901

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land-treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Administration of contracts	$3,600
Construction costs for drainage	108,941
Land, easements, and rights-of-way	81,775

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.5 to 1.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Wetzel, will you proceed.

Mr. WETZEL. The Mill Creek watershed project involves 39,652 acres in Bryan and Bulloch Counties, Ga., about 1,000 acres being in Bulloch County.

Mill Creek is tributary to Black Creek, which in turn is tributary to the Ogeechee River. It is a very, very flat watershed, particularly the coastal plain area. Most of the channels have been totally inadequate to provide sufficient drainage from the high intensity rainfall that occurs in this area.

There is also a small town located in the area, Pembroke, and while it does not suffer flood damages it has very serious health problems each time there is intensive rainfall. With no opportunity for the water to run off, the septic tanks and cisterns are badly flooded before there is adequate time for the water to run off.

There are 163 farms in the Mill Creek watershed area. They average about 100 acres and the average value of the land is about $100. The primary crops are tobacco, cotton, corn, and soybeans and many

of the landowners, the farmers, supplement their income to some extent by working in Savannah, which is nearby.

Also, the timberlands that represent about 83 percent of the total area provide a vast amount of employment not only for the agricultural workers but for the full-time timber workers. This is a very important timber production area. It is a highly profitable business in this area and the protection that will be provided along with the drainage that will permit the more adequate reproduction of the timber species in the timberland will provide very substantial benefits to the timber crops.

The total area benefited is the 15,200 acres and about 120 landowners will be benefited in this area.

The total cost of the project will be $820,000, of which the local people will provide $247,000.

It is interesting that the local people have already installed land-treatment measures with a value of $178,000, so they have already put up very nearly as much as they are going to put up for the remainder of the project.

The Federal cost is $572,000.. The benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.5 to 1 and prorated in accordance with Public Law 566 the per acre benefit is $28.

Mr. POAGE. Any questions?

Mr. Hagan?

STATEMENT OF HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. HAGAN. I would like to say that, Mr. Wetzel did an excellent job of explaining this project. I would like to add one other thought.

In my area, which might not be understood by people not in the timber-growing business, timber is the same as any other crop. In my State we grow crops of timber which are very vital to the economy of that whole area, and it is vital that we have land to grow that timber on, just the same as any other crop, which is not flooded constantly. Many times I have seen after heavy rainfalls acres of yellow trees, dead young timber.

So I will not prolong my statement other than to say there is an intense interest on the part of the people in this watershed area in this project. It is very vital to the economy of this part of my district.

Mr. POAGE. Any further questions on this project?

Mr. DOLE. No questions.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO RIVER TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI (SUPPLEMENTAL)

Mr. POAGE. The next project is the One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed project in Missouri. Is there any new testimony to be submitted on this project?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, as you will remember, at the last meeting Mr. Swigart said he would completely re-present that project.

Mr. POAGE. Very well.

Mr. WETZEL. Mr. R. Neil Lane, chief of the projects branch, watershed planning division will present this supplemental statement.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to present this supplemental statement on the One Hundred and Two River tributaries watershed, Nodaway County, Mo., which I believe brings together in one package the testimony we had previously given the committee plus the additional information which the committee requested us to provide.

Previous testimony before this committee has provided an explanation of the nature of the multiple-purpose Reservoir C–3 and its relationship to the measures in the watershed work plan that was approved for this watershed in 1959.

In brief, Reservoir C–3 replaces two grade stabilizing structures, provides for floodwater detention capacity to reduce flooding downstream and creates a lake for recreation having a surface area of 72 acres.

As a result of questions raised by the committee, the Soil Conservation Service has reexamined the justification of Reservoir C–3, particularly the flood prevention component. The following consists either of a restatement of facts previously provided to the committee or new information developed by the Soil Conservation Service to provide reliable answers to the committee's questions.

As previously given, the total installation cost for Reservoir C–3 is estimated at $180,845. Of this total, $53,275 has been allocated to recreation and the balance of $127,570 has been allocated to flood prevention.

And I might add parenthetically at this time that the Missouri Conservation Commission, at the previous session before the committee, offered to underwrite the recreational cost of this project.

It is the latter figure of $127,570 that has been questioned in connection with the feasibility of the multiple-purpose reservoir. The multiple-purpose reservoir replaces two authorized grade stabilizing structures and increases the flood prevention cost by $54,360 (the difference in cost between the two grade stabilizing structures, $73,210, and the flood prevention cost of the reservoir, $127,570). The benefits that were used to justify this additional cost ($54,360) was not made clear in previous testimony and the committee properly asked for clarification including, if necessary, further field investigation.

The following information reflects additional information that has been recently collected and analyzed by our engineers and economists.

The area benefited below Reservoir C–3 not only includes the area previously delineated above the railroad (181 acres) but a larger area between the railroad and the One Hundred and Two River of 333 acres, making a total of 514 acres of land in 13 farms benefited by this structure.

Mr. POAGE. Is there a benefit below the railroad?

Mr. LANE. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. What is it?

Mr. LANE. There is a benefit to 333 acres.

Mr. POAGE. What I am getting at, your original map showed no benefits below the railroad.

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Obviously there was some reason for that. I raised the question before and was told there were no benefits below the railroad, and now why do you say there are?

Mr. LANE. The reason we did not evaluate benefits below the railroad was that in order to show economic benefits of Reservoir C–3 it was not necessary to go farther downstream than to the railroad.

We did not testify there were no benefits below the railroad. We did testify we had not evaluated any benefits below the railroad.

Mr. POAGE. How is that area benefited?

Mr. LANE. It is benefited in the same way as upstream, by reducing the frequency of overbank flooding. Under present conditions the frequency of flooding, beginning at about this point and continuing over to the One Hundred and Two River [indicating on map], is about once every 2 years at the present time. With the reservoir installed the frequency of flooding would be reduced 50 percent to once every 4 years.

Does that clarify that point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. POAGE. You may proceed.

Mr. LANE. In addition to the farmland, there are five farmsteads, one schoolhouse, fences, roads, five highway bridges and two railroad trestles in the flood plain. The trestles have ample capacity for passing moderate flood peaks unless debris lodges against the piling. The railroad removes the debris after each flood. The two grade stabilizing structures would have provided no benefit in this area. Most of this area is now flooded every 2 years on the average.

With the reservoir installed, flooding downstream will be reduced about 50 percent and the average annual benefits are estimated as follows:

Benefit	Amount	Percent
Land and crops	$1,210	52
Other agricultural property	270	12
Roads and bridges	620	26
Indirect	240	10
Total	2,340	100

The following tabulation shows that the cost per acre benfited is $55 when computed in accordance with the guidelines provided by the committee:

Additional flood prevention cost	$54,360
Percent chargeable to land and crops	52
Additional cost chargeable to land and crops	$28,270
Additional area benefited (acres)	514
Cost per additional acre benefited	$55

That is the essence of our case at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions?

Mr. HARVEY. Does this additional testimony satisfy you as to the justification for the project?

Mr. GATHINGS. It does.

Mr. LANE. I am sorry we could not get this information to you sooner, sir.

Mr. POAGE. The committee thanks you for your statement.

We will go into executive session at this time.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee went into executive session at 12:00 p.m.)

WATERSHED HEARINGS

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 1964

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Johnson of Wisconsin, Stubblefield, Hagan of Georgia, Short, Harvey of Indiana, and Dole.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk, and Robert C. Bruce, assistant counsel.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will come to order.

We will hear the justification of the Willow Swamp watershed.

WILLOW SWAMP, S.C.

WILLOW SWAMP WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 33,282 acres in Bamberg and Colleton Counties.
Tributary to: Little Salkehatchie River.
Sponsors: Edisto Soil Conservation District, Colleton Soil Conservation District, and Willow Swamp Watershed Conservation District.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	30
Grassland	15
Woodland	51
Miscellaneous	4

Total watershed area privately owned.
Number of farms: 135.
Size of farms: about 250 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 46 miles of multiple purpose flood prevention-drainage channel improvement.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$85,478	96
Redevelopment	3,410	4
Total	88,888	100

Area benefited: 14,667 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: About 70 farm families.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$20,126	11	[1] $162,285	89	$182,411
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	273,239	87	41,866	13	315,105
Drainage	114,208	53	102,062	47	216,270
Subtotal	387,447	73	[2] 143,928	27	531,375
Total	407,573	57	306,213	43	713,786

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and national programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Construction cost for drainage	$73,328
Land, easements or rights-of-way	68,600
Administration of contracts	2,000

Benefit-cost ratio : 2.4 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited : $25.

Carrying out the project: The Willow Swamp Watershed Conservation District assumes all local responsibilities for installing and operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated cost of operation and maintenance is $16,600.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to have the Department explain this project. Congressman Rivers will then be heard.

Mr. SWIGART. The Willow Swamp watershed is located in southeastern South Carolina. It consists of 33,282 acres in Bamberg and Colleton Counties. Both of these counties have been designated under ARA as more or less economically depressed counties.

The Willow Swamp flows into the Little Salkehatchie River, which flows into the Combahee River, which flows into the Atlantic Ocean south of Charleston, S.C. Bamberg, with a population of 3,081, is 13 miles north of the watershed, and Walterboro is 20 miles southeast with a population of 5,417.

The topography of the watershed is relatively flat. The periphery is made up of broad flat benchland which breaks off abruptly into a flat swampy area down below. There is about a 2-foot elevation differential in that break.

The principal problem is low capacity channels, and in many areas a relatively high water table. The drainage is dendritic. Most of the channels are imperfectly defined. Ninety percent of the total income is from agriculture. The principal crops are corn, soybeans, small grain, cotton, and tobacco. That is on the higher land. The lower land is swampy hard woods.

Most of the area is in small holdings on farms. The number of farms is 135, most of which are owner operated. The average size is about 250 acres. Flooding is serious and frequent, occurring two to three times a year. Public roads are damaged several times a year. It has been a serious problem for the people residing in this area. As a result, the Edisto Soil Conservation District, the Colleton Soil Conservation District, and the Willow Swamp Watershed Conservation District have joined together in asking the Department of Agriculture to help them in solving their serious water problem. They have de-

veloped a plan which will consist of soil and water conservation measures on the farm to stabilize the area and make efficient use of the water, and efficient control thereof, and structural measures consisting of 46 miles of multiple-purpose channels, providing for both flood prevention and drainage.

The annual benefits resulting from the project will amount to $88,888. That benefit will accrue to 14,667 acres involving about 70 farm families.

The total cost of the project is $713,786, of which $407,573, or 57 percent, will be provided from Public Law 566 funds, and $308,213, or 43 percent, from other funds.

In addition, the local people will spend $16,600 annually to maintain the work.

The benefit-cost ratio is exceptionally favorable, 2.4 to 1, and the average cost per acre as referred to in our testimony is $25 per acre.

The land is valued on the average at $100 an acre.

I believe that is a brief résumé of the project.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much.

This seems to me to have a good benefit-cost ratio. The local people are going to make a substantial contribution, 43 percent of the total cost, which is a good deal better than we have seen on some of the projects we have recently had before us.

The project intrigues me. I have never seen one like that, where there are benefits all around the edges and none in the middle.

Does it remain a swamp in the middle?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes. It is adequate to take care of the discharges from the tributaries without damage downstream.

Mr. POAGE. You simply do not try to drain the main stream?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Even when you finish it, the cultivated areas will be around the periphery?

Mr. SWIGART. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. I do not believe we have ever had a project of that type.

Mr. SWIGART. It presents a very different picture from any we have had.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from Congressman Rivers who is with us, and who represents this area.

STATEMENT OF HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RIVERS. I ask permission to insert in the record at this point the act of the South Carolina Legislature creating this Willow Swamp Watershed Conservation District.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if you would just file that rather than insert it in the record. It will just save us cost on printing.

Mr. RIVERS. I ask permission to let me extend my remarks and I will summarize for the purpose of extending time.

(Prepared statement of Congressman Rivers follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. MENDEL L. RIVERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, the matter I appear before you this morning is of the utmost urgency to my people.

If you and the members of your subcommittee were able to visit the Willow Swamp Soil Conservation District in South Carolina, you would—I am certain—be convinced of the dire need of this watershed.

As you know, South Carolina has been hard hit recently with torrential rain. This has greatly aggravated an already bad situation. My people in Colleton County face disaster, perhaps utter ruin, because of the damage to their crops, with the exception of corn. Fortunately, this crop was mature before the rains came.

If in your wisdom you see fit to approve this project, I can assure you that you have done a good service to my people.

My farmers in Colleton County are in trouble—rain has flooded their crops, their pastures, and their roads, and adequate drainage just isn't in existence.

For your information, please permit me to summarize this project. In brief, the Willow Swamp Watershed District embraces over 33,000 acres in upper Colleton County and Bamberg County.

This project would serve strictly as a flood preventive and drainage program, and, if enacted, would greatly enhance the agriculture and timber lands of the district.

This is a case, pure and simple, of helping people to help themselves.

Gentlemen, I might pause at this moment to stress that Colleton is a county lacking in industry, heavily dependent on agriculture. If my farmers hurt, the entire county suffers.

I personally can tell this committee that this project is needed. On a recent inspection, I sloughed through the mud of the district and can speak first hand of conditions in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I consider this plan feasible, economically wise, and beneficial to the entire coastal area of South Carolina. I strongly urge your favorable consideration. The people of the area want it. Solidly backing the watershed are the Edisto and Colleton Soil Conservation Districts and the Willow Swamp Conservation District.

Their goals are:

1. Reduction of flooding to a point where damaging floods would not occur more often than every 5 years.
2. Construction of multiple-purpose channels of sufficient depth and capacity for flood prevention and drainage.
3. Application of much needed land treatment measures.

I understand the program we are discussing here today will satisfy all of these objectives.

Land treatments, of course, include conservation cropping systems, cover and green manure crops, fields windbreaks, wind stripcropping, rotation grazing, pasture planting, wildlife habitat development, tile drains, drainage field ditches, and tree planting.

Structural measures will consist of installing 45.9 miles of multiple-purpose channel and two fish lagoons to mitigate damage to fish habitat by the installation of the channel system.

Mr. Chairman, the act to create the Willow Swamp Watershed Conservation District was passed by the South Carolina Legislature in February 1962. A referendum was held March 13, 1962, with only one dissenting vote. The act provides for a second referendum intended to grant the power of additional taxation to amortize the bond issue which would finance local costs of structural measures.

Furthermore, tax levies on the lands in the watershed would be graduated on the basis of the extent to which benefits from the project may be expected.

I understand installation of the planned structural measures would benefit 14,667 acres of land comprising some 70 farms. The Soil Conservation people estimate average annual primary benefits of $88,888, as compared to the average cost of the improvements at $37,254.

This is a ratio of 2 to 1 in benefit to the people, and in this investment.

I am convinced this project would make a significant contribution to needed land-use adjustments, increase farm efficiency, and contribute immensely to the

development of the county as a whole, as certainly an increase in farm produce will help local markets.

Mr. Chairman, my people are hopeful approval can be granted and construction launched before inclement weather curtails construction.

I request your earnest consideration in this matter.

If my people don't get this watershed, and if it continues raining in South Carolina, some of my people may begin building an ark.

Mr. RIVERS. This project, with which I am thoroughly familiar, embraces a part of my district. It is mostly in my district and part of it is in Watson's district. It is in the eastern part of South Carolina.

To understand the question you propounded to the gentleman from the Conservation Service, the low country of South Carolina is a vast plain, much of which is submarginal land. As the rivers come down from the mountains and get close to the ocean, the rivers are large and the swamps are vast. This is one of them.

In the center of this project is the little town of Ashton. The swamps have grown up over a period of years. We have more farm-to-market highways paved than any State in the Union. Because of this vast construction, over a period of 40 years, a lot of these streams have been cut off and the normal drainage areas have been changed over a long period of time. As a consequence, the problem has been compounded in this particular area. When you have a heavy rain, the only thing that gets filled up is the ditches and that is the extent of drainage.

I visited this project personally and spent the entire day going over it just before the floods came a month ago. I got out 1 week ahead of the floods. Already in this area I saw something I never saw before, and I was raised in the country and I know something about it. The corn was at least 5 or 6 weeks late. I have never seen this. In late July I saw green silk on the corn. Usually on the Fourth of July the corn is ready. Because of the excessive spring rains our corn was 5 or 6 weeks behind time because of the high water. They could not plant it.

The soybeans were sparse. They had to plow them up and plant over.

Just as I left, a week later, they said, "You ought to be here when the rains come." When I left it started raining and for a period of 27 days we had 26 inches. That is a lot of rain. It broke all weather records in South Carolina. It embraced Charleston and Colleton which drains to the ocean, and the rest of the low country up toward Columbia, that vast watershed. The only thing living now is the corn. The ditches are filled up and the streams are filled up. The septic tanks in the town of Ashton are a problem. The water systems in Bamberg are causing a problem.

You may have malaria and typhoid fever. We really have mosquitoes there. You have not seen them until you come there.

This is the problem. This is what we face. I do not know of anything that affects me more personally than this in my district at this time. You know I have worried you to death on this. I called to the Bureau of the Budget and I talked to everyone to please get this out. This is tragic.

They had a referendum. The act provides they have another one before the taxing provisions and bonding provisions take effect, and

this they are prepared to do. You have the cost and you know what they get from our State. It is a feasible project. These people from the Department have done a wonderful job.

This committee deserves great credit for your long-sighted vision in making these things possible. Under those enabling acts they have complied with the statute. It is feasible and it will work. The people want it and they need it.

My secretary called to my attention the other day we have only two things to do if we do not get it; either leave that country or get some amphibious craft. It is bad. In this area is the finest hunting in America.

Mr. POAGE. You will destroy that.

Mr. RIVERS. It will not destroy that. This will be controlled. It is low country. You have wonderful quail. In the spring when you have a wet season it affects the young quail. They cannot survive. They are like a wild turkey. Wild turkey cannot stand rain.

You are invited to come down there. There are the most wonderful plantations there that have been restored by people from other parts of America. They have duck and turkey and deer and small black bear. It abounds in wild game. They are seriously affected by these terrible rains.

I feel in the wisdom of your committee you will approve it and give it your serious consideration. We urge you to do it. It is vital.

I certainly thank you for your consideration. I will not take any more of your time. I can see in your heart you are going to approve it.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT W. WATSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATSON. I cannot add anything to what the gentleman has already given to you as far as the details of the Willow Swamp plan is concerned. I cannot be as persuasive as my senior colleague here.

Primarily this watershed is in his district. However, a part of it, perhaps 20 percent, is within my district, Bamberg County.

I might say, aside from the recreational and other benefits to be gained from it, I am vitally concerned about the agricultural benefits to be gained. We have a lot of submarginal farmers down in this particular area and, should we have this plan put into effect, frankly, it will enable them to do more than just sustain life. That is about all they are able to do now.

Frankly, the soil is good. However, we have to get it from under the water. Congressman Rivers told you about the serious rains we had recently. Frankly, it does not take a serious rain to flood this particular area. It is flooded perhaps two or three times a year, which results in serious crop damage, if not total destruction.

I would like to urge upon you to give it your serious consideration and approve the project. There are wonderful people down there. They are hard working. Part of this area includes the town of Erhart in my district. Likewise, they have the same problems there as they have in Ashton when the heavy rains come. They have the problem of the septic tanks.

I am sure the committee can appreciate the fact there is a health hazard involved. I can only underscore what Congressman Rivers has said and urge your favorable consideration. It will mean a lot to the people.

I believe with the content of the soil as it is, the farmers will be able to be quite productive. They are industrious people and are willing to bear an additional tax burden themselves in order to remedy this critical problem. It is a wonderful area and I will appreciate your favorable consideration and early approval.

May I have the privilege of revising my remarks for the record?

Mr. POAGE. Without objection.

Thank you both. We appreciate your appearance.

SQUIRREL CREEK, OKLA.

We will now hear testimony on the Squirrel Creek watershed.

SQUIRREL CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 16,128 acres in Pottawatomie County, Okla.

Tributary to North Canadian River.

Sponsors: Shawnee Soil and Water Conservation District and Squirrel and Lost Creek Conservancy District No. 17.

Total watershed land use:

	Percent
Cropland	42
Grassland	40
Woodland	9
Miscellaneous	9

Total watershed privately owned.

Numbers of farms: 217.

Size of farms: about 75 acres average.

Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.

Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of seven floodwater-retarding structures, 3.4 miles of stream channel improvement, 200 feet of dike, and one grade stabilization structure. The storage capacity of the retarding structures ranges from 83 acre-feet to 1,024 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$30,775	65
To agricultural improvements	5,529	12
To nonagricultural improvements	2,614	6
Secondary	4,350	9
Indirect	3,802	8
Total	47,070	100

Area benefited: 2,024 acres.

Number of beneficiaries: About 42 owners and operators of flood plain land will be benefited.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$7,266	7	[1] $98,215	93	$105,481
Structural measures: Flood prevention	380,612	78	[2] 109,195	22	489,807
Total	387,878	65	207,410	35	595,288

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements and rights-of-way	$89,195
Relocating roads and public utilities	17,600
Administration of contracts	2,400

Benefit-cost ratio: 2.1 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $122.

Carrying out the project: The Shawnee Soil and Water Conservation District with assistance from the Squirrel and Lost Creek Conservancy District No. 17 will assume all local responsibilities for the installation, operation, and maintenance of structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $3,645.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Steed is with us.

It is customary to have the Department explain the project first.

Mr. SWIGART. The Squirrel Creek watershed is located 20 miles east of Oklahoma City in Oklahoma. It comprises 16,128 acres in Pottawattomie County.

The Squirrel Creek itself flows into the North Canadian River about 1 mile southeast of Shawnee. Tecumseh is the principal town in the watershed and it has a population of 2,630. The elevations range from 980 to 1,100 feet. The topography is generally rolling to hilly and the average annual rainfall is about 37 inches.

The Shawnee Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Squirrel and Lost Creek Conservancy District No. 17 are the sponsors for carrying out the project.

Beef cattle is the main enterprise in the upland part of the watershed. In the bottom land alfalfa is the principal crop. Wheat is also grown on the flood plain.

The total watershed is privately owned. There are 217 farms with an average size of 75 acres.

The project is rather typical of those in this section of Oklahoma, consisting of seven floodwater retarding structures, 3.4 miles of stream channel improvement, 200 feet of dike, and one grade stabilization structure.

The storage capacity of the structures range from 83 to 1,024 acre-feet with a total capacity of 2,533 acre-feet. Between 1942 and 1961 there were 19 major floods and 127 minor floods, which indicates a frequent flood condition, and a serious one.

In 1945, there were four floods that flooded more than 50 percent of the flood plain. There were three floods in 1957 and 1958.

The average annual damage is $63,281, which occurs principally to agricultural crops and that mainly to alfalfa.

Normally flooding will make the local operators lose one or more cuttings of hay annually.

Mr. POAGE. You say the chief crop hurt is alfalfa. Does it happen before it is cut?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Those floods do not stand there long enough to kill the alfalfa?

Mr. SWIGART. No. They just lose a cutting. They occur frequently enough to where they lose one cutting a year on the average.

The average annual benefits amount to $47,070, which will accrue to 2,024 acres owned and operated by about 42 farmers. The cost of the project is $595,288, of which Public Law 566 will bear $387,878, or 65 percent, and the local people will bear $207,410, or 35 percent.

The benefit-cost ratio of 2.1 to 1 is very favorable for this type of project. The cost per acre is $122. In addition to the cost that the local people will put up for installing the land treatment measures, relocating roads, public utilities, and so forth, and administration of contracts, they will maintain the project at an annual cost of $3,645.

Mr. POAGE. It is not as good as it was on the last project we had. The cost per acre is considerably higher.

Mr. SWIGART. Considerably higher. These are small structures that are placed well in the uplands so they will not interfere with the good agricultural land on the bottom.

Mr. POAGE. That is what we call a classic watershed, the one you are presenting, with the reservoirs up above with the protection to the flood plains below.

Mr. SWIGART. I might point out that the local people have already put in $162,215, in attempting to solve the upland problem through the application of soil and water conservation measures. There are already basic soil and water plans on 11,095 acres with 69 percent under agreement.

Mr. POAGE. There seems to be an existing lake here. Who owns that?

Mr. SWIGART. That is the water supply lake for the city of Tecumseh, and that is located right here. That is where the channel improvement comes in, below that lake, to provide additional protection down through this area.

Mr. POAGE. They keep that lake full?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes. It was not feasible or economic to enlarge it to get capacity in it, and that is the reason for the channel improvement down below.

Mr. POAGE. This raises a rather interesting question.

If this lake belongs to local interests and requires channel improvement as a result of its impoundment——

Mr. SWIGART. That is not what I really meant. You might have had a choice of putting in flood retarding storage here, or channel improvement, and channel improvement was the more economic approach.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much.

Congressman Steed is with us. We will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM STEED, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. STEED. I have a short statement I would like to submit for the record.

(The prepared statement of Congressman Steed follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM STEED, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your consideration and that of the subcommittee in scheduling a hearing on this watershed work plan on short notice and at such a busy time. It is an honor to be with you again in behalf of this fine program which you pioneered and which has accomplished so much in the 8 years of its operation. Nowhere has it done more good than in the Fourth Congressional District of Oklahoma. Our area is peculiarly suited to it geographically, and I am proud to report that more than one-half the land in my district is in some stage of organization under Public Law 566.

The Squirrel Creek plan, which is before you today, is a 5-year program on a watershed of 16,100 acres—a little more than 25 square miles—in Pottawatomie County. Squirrel Creek rises about 8 miles southwest of Shawnee and empties into the North Canadian River a mile southeast of Shawnee.

The drainage area is a small one as Public Law 566 projects go, but damage has been extremely heavy in a potentially excellent farming and grazing region.

A Federal expenditure of $387,878 is called for by the plan, under which seven floodwater retarding structures would be installed and 3.4 miles of channel improvement.

As recently as 1957 and 1958 Squirrel Creek Valley has been the scene of three major floods in a single year. In a 20-year period 19 major floods have been rcorded, 16 of which would have been eliminated by the protection this program would provide.

At present, a total of more than 1,100 acres of land in the flood plain is limited in use. It will be protected, and the Soil Conservation Service estimates the annual flood damages will be cut by almost three-fourths, from $63,000 to $17,000. The cost benefit ratio is 2.1 to 1.

The channel improvement, which is planned along the middle stretches of the creek, is designed to carry the peak discharge for a 12-hour period. Stabilization structures will be installed in side drains and road ditches for the protection of the channel.

Road networks in this area are vulnerable as matters now stand. The valley lies between the towns of Shawnee and Tecumseh, only 5 miles apart, and highway flooding can be prevented. Approval of Squirrel Creek's work plan can be of great benefit to the inhabitants of the valley and of Pottawatomie County.

Mr. Chairman, this coming Friday hundreds of people will take part in a tour of the Bear, Fall, and Coon Creek project. Now complete, this project lies about 50 miles to the northwest of the Squirrel Creek area. Its sponsors have done a tremendous job and have completed their work without any tax lexy, a significant achievement. Their project is a bright example of what can be accomplished under Public Law 566, and in their behalf I thank the committee for its interest in this work.

Mr. STEED. Since I live in Shawnee, I think I am as familiar with this particular area as anyone can ever be. I have lived there for a great many years. I think it can be well established that this area between the two cities, which are 5 miles apart, is where the most valuable land in the State of Oklahoma exists. This is the Canadian River Valley that is world famous for its great capacity to produce alfalfa.

This land in here that is subject to this flooding—and this area, as you know, is subjected to frequent cloudburst type weather—can be, when reclaimed, added to what I think is the most productive and valuable land in the State.

In addition to that, you have a complex of State and county roads and railroads, and there is a developing residential movement in this area so there is a benefit to be realized from those factors not included in the report here. In other words, in addition to the great agricultural advantages, this small and modest project would bring, the general community being relieved from this constantly recurring situation, will also get a great deal of secondary benefit.

I have many of these projects in my district, as you know. I just do not believe I have ever had one come up that is more needed, or more deserving, or more justified than this particular one.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Steed.

Mr. GATHINGS. What is the rainfall in the watershed area?

Mr. STEED. I think it averages about 37 inches a year.

Mr. GATHINGS. When does that come? Does that come in the spring or fall?

Mr. STEED. It is very much like the climate in Arkansas. We have recurring droughts and recurring wet seasons. We will have at least one or two occasions a year when in a matter of an hour or so you will have a 4- or 5-inch rain in this area. Usually most of your rainfall comes in torrential capacities, and that is what creates this condition. It is a short watershed and the water rushes down very quickly and in a matter of no time at all this whole area can be under water.

Mr. GATHINGS. I know something about that.

Coming back from the convention in 1960, I came through Oklahoma and some of the roads were covered with water at that time. There was quite a cloudburst.

Mr. STEED. This area of the country caused Will Rogers once to say he knew they had annual rainfall of a certain amount because he was there the night it fell.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. Steed.

PENNAHATCHEE CREEK, GA.

Mr. POAGE. We will now take up the Pennahatchee Creek, Ga.

PENNAHATCHEE CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 67,197 acres in Dooly County.
Tributary to: Flint River.
Sponsors: Ocmulgee River Soil and Water Conservation District and county government of Dooly County.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	59
Grassland	8
Woodland	28
Miscellaneous	5

Total watershed area privately owned.
Number of farms: 446.
Size of farms: About 150 acres average.
Purpose: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 62.4 miles of multiple-purpose flood prevention—drainage channel improvement.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$89,897	55
Redevelopment	36,455	22
Secondary	36,619	23
Total	162,971	100

Area benefited: 7,110 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners and operators of 170 farms.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$33,040	7	[1] $432,370	93	$465,410
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	776,984	87	144,997	13	891,981
Drainage	71,422	54	61,862	46	133,284
Subtotal	848,406	83	[2] 176,859	17	1,025,265
Total	881,446	59	609,229	41	1,490,675

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Construction costs for drainage	$44,679
Land rights	78,710
Modification or renovation of bridges and culverts	49,770
Administration of contracts	3,700

Benefit-cost ratio: 2.9 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $66.

Carrying out the project: The Ocmulgee River Soil and Water Conservation District and the county government of Dooly County assumes all local responsibilities for installing, and operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost for operation and maintenance is $15,650.

Mr. POAGE. We will ask the Department to explain.

Mr. SWIGART. The Pennahatchee Creek Watershed comprises an area of 67,197 acres in Dooly County, which is in upper southwest Georgia. The Pennahatchee Creek is tributary to the Flint River, which in turn flows into the Apalachicola.

The average annual rainfall in the watershed is 47 inches. Topographically, the upstream part is nearly level to gently undulating, and as it goes downstream the relief becomes more pronounced in this instance. The elevations range from 230 to 400 feet.

The town of Vienna consisting of 2,100 people is located down in this part of the area. The Ocmulgee River Soil and Water Conservation District and the county government of Dooly County have joined together in sponsoring this project. It is strictly an agricultural area with cotton, corn, peanuts, and wheat being the main products, but they also grow vegetables, fruits, and pecans.

There are no industries in the area. Field crops make up 70 percent of the total farm sales. The total watershed is privately owned. There are 446 farms averaging about 150 acres each.

The proposed project in this area to be installed over a period of 5 years consists of the soil and water conservation practices on the upland areas, together with 62.4 miles of channels to provide both flood prevention and drainage benefits. These channels will provide a level of protection of once in 3 years. The average annual benefits from the project will amount to $162,971. These benefits will accrue to 7,110 acres owned and operated by 170 farmers. Fifty-eight percent of the landowners now have basic plans. They have made a considerable effort to solve their problems through the application of soil and water conservation measures.

The total cost of the project amounts to $1,490,675, with Public Law 566 funds bearing $881,446, or 59 percent, and the local people picking up $609,229, or 41 percent.

The benefit-cost ratio is extremely favorable, 2.9 to 1, and the cost per acre is $66. The local people will also maintain the channels at an estimated average annual cost of $15,650.

I believe that concludes the testimony.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is drainage?

Mr. SWIGART. Flood prevention and drainage. The problem is one of a high water table due to excessive precipitation in the area and overflow. The channels are designed both to take off the flood waters and provide an opportunity for the local farmers to drain their individual farms.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is that white and yellow on the map?

Mr. SWIGART. The yellow is the benefited area. That is where the benefits will accrue. The white will not be benefited from the structural measures. Of course, it will be benefited from the accelerated application of the soil and water conservation measures on the farms.

Mr. POAGE. How can that central area be benefited by the application of the measures higher up?

Mr. SWIGART. One of the really nice things about the watershed program is, it does accelerate interest in the conservation of soil and water. The inhabitants of the watershed area pitch in together and they all work toward improving each one of their individual holdings.

Mr. POAGE. I think it may develop a community interest and spirit. As a physical matter, the structures you are building are not going to physically benefit the white area.

Mr. SWIGART. No. I mean they physically benefit from the application of the soil and water conservation areas in themselves; in other words, the benefit that naturally accrues to a conservation farm versus one that is not farmed in a conservation manner.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you mean benefits from lime and fertilizer?

Mr. SWIGART. The proper management of water on the farm and prevention of erosion. That is an added benefit I am talking about.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot understand how that central part where you are not going to control any of the water will benefit.

Mr. SWIGART. There is adequate channel capacity down through here to take care of the water that will go down. This is flat up here and there is greater relief in the lower part.

Mr. POAGE. This project is unlike the rivers' project where you had a central portion which was going to remain a swamp. This is a project where the central portion already is taken care of?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right. It has adequate channel capacity in the lower part because of the topography of the area. It is flat on top and more gradient below.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it a drainage problem?

Mr. SWIGART. No, it is not. It has a flood problem also along with a drainage problem. If you just designed a project in here primarily for drainage, it would not take care of the problem. In other words, these channels not only have to have the drainage potential, but they have to be designed to take care of the excessive rainfalls and the hurricane storms that are so typical of this area.

STATEMENT OF HON. E. L. FORRESTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not want to unduly trespass on your time. As a matter of fact, I do not know much that I could add to the exhaustive statement that has been made here.

I would like to point out that the annual rainfall is 47 inches. The ratio is 2.9 to 1.

Mr. POAGE. The ratio is good, one of the best we have recently. Your local contribution is very good. Sometimes it goes higher, but sometimes a great deal lower. Your cost per acre is good.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to say to the chairman, about every 2 years they do have floods. This would be of great benefit to the people down there in the event you gentlemen see fit to recommend it.

I have a short statement here that I would like to make a part of the record.

(The prepared statement of Congressman Forrester follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. E. L. FORRESTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

The Pennahatchee Creek watershed comprises an area of 67,197 acres in the south-central part of Dooly County, Ga., within the Flint River Basin. The Ocmulgee River Soil and Water Conservation District and the Dooly County government are the sponsoring local organizations for this watershed project.

The estimated total installation cost of land-treatment measures is $465,410. The Public Law 566 share of this cost will amount to $33,040 and $432,370 will be borne by other funds.

The present land use consists of 59 percent cropland, 8 percent pasture, 28 percent woodland, and 5 percent in miscellaneous uses.

The watershed is located entirely in Dooly County, which has been designated a rural area development county because the median annual income of all families is less than $1,560 and the median annual income of farm families is less than $1,170. There is a great need for creating job opportunities that will help to alleviate the unemployment and the underemployment problems that exist in the area. There are no industries within the county or watershed that provide significent employment to people living in the area and farming is the main source of income.

There is great danger of flood hazard and this often delays the preparation and planting on farms which greatly reduces yields. Some areas cannot be planted at all due to inundation. The approval of this project will alleviate this danger and condition.

Flood prevention benefits will accrue as a result and there will be more intensive land use. There will also be increased benefits to business, wholesalers, retailers, processors, and transporters in the immediate area of influence of the project.

I earnestly solicit the approval of the watershed project.

Mr. POAGE. Tell us just where this is in relation to the project Mr. Flynt was interested in a few months ago. This empties into Flint River. Recently we had a project here by your colleague, Mr. Flynt. Is that above or below this?

Mr. FORRESTER. This is below that.

Mr. POAGE. Between this project and the Alabama line. Does the Flint River flow east?

Mr. FORRESTER. I think you might say central Georgia.

Mr. POAGE. I know you are in central Georgia. I am speaking of the direction from Mr. Flynt's project.

Mr. FORRESTER. I think you would be right about that. It would be close to the Alabama line in his case.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Flint River flow into the Gulf of Mexico?
Mr. FORRESTER. Eventually.

JEWELL BROOK, VT.

Mr. POAGE. The next project is the Jewell Brook project.

JEWELL BROOK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 5,875 acres in Rutland and Windsor Counties.
Tributary to: Black River.
Sponsors: Ottauquechee Soil Conservation District; town of Ludlow, Vt.; village of Ludlow, Vt.; and Vermont Water Resources Board.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	3
Grassland	4
Woodland	79
Miscellaneous	14

Watershed privately owned, 75 percent; State forest land, 25 percent.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and recreation.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of three floodwater retarding structures, one multiple-purpose floodwater retarding and recreation structure with associated public recreational facilities, and 665 feet of floodwater diversion channel. The storage capacity of the reservoirs ranges from 215 to 1,191 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$178	
To agricultural improvements	51	
To nonagricultural improvements	52,764	59
Recreation	19,097	21
Secondary	7,208	8
Indirect	10,598	12
Total	89,896	100

Area benefited: 127 acres of agricultural land in addition to a considerable portion of the village of Ludlow.
Number of beneficiaries: Owners of 110 residences and 54 commercial and industrial properties will receive a high degree of flood protection as well as the owners of 127 acres of agricultural lands. Recreational facilities will serve approximately 22,000 people residing within a 15-mile radius of Ludlow.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures			[1] $12,290	100	$12,290
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	$834,627	92	73,436	8	908,063
Recreation	56,971	54	47,985	46	104,956
Subtotal	891,598	88	[2] 121,421	12	1,013,019
Total	891,598	87	133,711	13	1,025,309

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.
[2] Consisting of—

Construction and installation services costs for recreation	$41,235
Land rights	61,500
Relocation of utilities	15,686
Administration of contracts	3,000

Prorated P.L. 566 structural cost per acre benefited: Nearly all of the costs allocated to nonagricultural beneficiaries.

Carrying out the project: The town of Ludlow assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The village of Ludlow and the Vermont Water Resources Board will assist the town of Ludlow with these responsibilities. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $8,132.

Mr. POAGE. We will insert this statement by Mr. Stafford in the record.

(Letter of August 19 from Mr. Stafford follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1964.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Conservation and Credit Subcommittee, House Committee on Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you and the members of the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture for the opportunity to testify in behalf of the Jewell Brook watershed propect, located almost entirely in the Windsor County township of Ludlow, Vt.

The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has presented your committee with the work plan for the Jewell Brook watershed. This 56-page plan, with accompanying charts, capably demonstrates the need for this watershed protection, flood prevention, and recreation project. I shall not take the time to duplicate all the information contained therein, as I know it will receive your careful and considered attention.

Let me merely summarize the project and state my firm support of it as the Congressman from Vermont.

The work plan for the 6,000-acre watershed of Jewell Brook proposes the construction of three floodwater-retarding dams, one dam for both flood prevention and public recreation, basic recreation facilities, and a diversion channel.

The need for flood prevention facilities on the Jewell Brook is most demanding and requires immediate attention. Five major floods in the past 36 years have created considerable damage in the area. The last of these came in June 1960, while this Member was serving as Governor of the State of Vermont. I am, thus, particularly familiar with the conditions which exist and strongly support quick approval of this plan to remedy the situation.

Project sponsors for the Jewell Brook watershed include the Ottauquechee Soil and Water Conservation District, the Vermont Water Resources Board, and the town and village governing bodies of Ludlow, Vt. The work plan, thus has the cooperation and blessing of national, State and local agencies.

I hope that you will see fit to give it your immediate attention and approval.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. SWIGART. The Jewell Brook watershed comprises an area of 5,875 acres in Rutland and Windsor Counties in south-central Vermont. Jewell Brook flows northward to the Black River in Ludlow, and the Black in turn joins the Connecticut. The watershed is located on the eastern flank of the Green Mountain Range.

The topography consists of steep, rugged, heavily wooded slopes, steep and narrow valleys, and high gradient mountain streams. The elevations range from 960 to 3,372 feet.

The principal problem is damage to Ludlow in which some 110 residences and 54 commercial and industrial properties are damaged quite frequently. About once every 3 to 5 years this small town is damaged by floods originating in the mountains bringing both water and debris down into town.

There are also 127 acres of agricultural land affected by the floods situation. The average annual damages amount to $74,684, from the Jewell Brook and Black River, dominantly from Jewell Brook.

The watershed is 75 percent privately owned and State forest land comprises 25 percent. The principal industries in Ludlow are the General Electric Co. plant and the Jewell Brook Woolen Co. Those two industries are damaged considerably by these floods and they form the backbone of the small community of 2,386 people.

On June 3, 1960, there was a flood which caused $240,000 worth of damage in this small watershed area. The General Electric plant has some complex machines in it which belong to the U.S. Government. The flood of 1960 completely ruined the swimming pool in Ludlow, as well as doing this damage to all these residences and industrial concerns.

Mr. POAGE. Who owned the swimming pool?

Mr. SWIGART. The city of Ludlow.

The project proposed for the area consists of soil conservation practices on the farms and woodland, and structural measures consisting of three floodwater-retarding structures indicated there, and one multiple-purpose structure with both floodwater retardation and recreation, and in addition, 665 feet of a floodwater diversion channel at this point here in the town of Ludlow.

Storage capacity of the reservoirs will range from 215 to 1,191 acre-feet. The average annual benefits from the project amount to $89,896, which, as I said before, would benefit 127 acres of agricultural land and the owners of 110 residences and 54 commercial and industrial properties. About 100-year level of protection will be provided to the town of Ludlow.

The recreational development will serve about 22,000 people residing within a 15-mile radius of Ludlow. It is a small recreational development consisting of a 10-acre recreation pool.

In addition, the total development will consist of 50 acres in all. The cost for that particular feature of the project—I do not have that right here. I would like to go back to the total cost of the project, $1,025,309, with Public Law 566 costs of $891,598, and a local cost of $138,711. The project has an extremely favorable benefit-cost ratio of 2.2 to 1, and the cost per acre in this particular instance is not applicable because most of the benefits are nonagricultural in nature.

The town of Ludlow will assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The annual cost of operation and maintenance is $8,132.

With respect to the recreational develoment, it provides for boating, swimming, picnicking, trout fishing, and ice skating. There will be access roads, parking areas, boat docks, swimming area, sanitary facilities, bathhouse, water supply system, electric power supply, 1 main picnic shelter, 15 picnic tables, 15 fireplaces, 10 campsites, ice skating, warming hut, and ground improvements.

The total cost of structure No. 3 which provides for both flood prevention and recreation is $223,000, roughly, of which Public Law 586 will bear $175,128, and the local people will put up $47,985.

Mr. POAGE. They are putting it up for what?

Mr. SWIGART. They are putting up 50 percent of the land cost, 50 percent of the minimum basic facilities, and 50 percent of the capacity allocated to the recreational purpose. As to the capacity in this structure, there are 233 acre-feet for flood prevention and 97 acre-feet for recreation.

Mr. POAGE. You have 13 percent which is extremely low. Of that 13 percent, about 40 percent is going to be for recreation. That will leave about 7 or 8 percent of the cost of the flood prevention project; is that right?

Mr. SWIGART. It is 8 percent of the flood prevention cost and 46 percent of the recreation cost.

Mr. POAGE. A reasonable contribution for flood prevention.

Mr. SWIGART. There really is not much opportunity to put up much cost for the flood prevention component in view of the law. The land treatment is pretty well completed or, in many instances, is not needed. You will notice the cost for the total land treatment program is $12,290, and there are no 566 costs involved. In other words, it is a job that can be accomplished under the regular going program in that area.

Mr. POAGE. How about the forest land?

Mr. SWIGART. It is rugged mountains. It is 79 percent forested.

Mr. POAGE. There is not much you are going to do to that land except try to keep it that way.

Mr. SWIGART. That is right. It is a tourist mecca even now for summer tourists, vacationists, and winter skiers.

Mr. POAGE. Is the Government going to pay half the cost of these warming sheds and these houses of various kinds that are put there for recreation purposes?

Mr. SWIGART. These are what are referred to as minimum basic facilities for making a recreational area suitable for public use, public safety, and public health.

Mr. POAGE. Let us get it clear that the Federal Government will pay half of those costs.

Mr. SWIGART. That is right. With respect to those minimum basic facilities, the Federal Government will pay $23,087. The local folks will pick up $24,088.

Mr. POAGE. You have a nice name there, "minimum basic facilities." What does that mean? In some places it means one thing and in other places it means another.

Mr. SWIGART. We have attempted to define it according to the minimum things that people would need to make full use of an area developed for recreational purposes. That is basic facilities. Other things they might want such as golf courses or motels or restaurants, that sort of thing, would not fit into the terminology of "minimum basic facilities."

Mr. POAGE. I want to understand just what those minimum basic facilities are because I always understood when I had a pond—in our country we call it a tank—I could go fishing in it or swimming, and that was a basic facility. If somebody wants to put up a resting house or boathouse there, I would pay for the use thereof if I wanted to. I would not call that a minimum facility. It is the policy now of the U.S. Government to decide that we must have dressing rooms if we are to have anybody go swimming, and the Government must pay for at least half of it; is that right? That we must have a boathouse if I want to go fishing? It is muddy around the bank; I would like to go out in my boat; I must have a boathouse there; the Government will pay half of it.

Mr. SWIGART. Not a boathouse, a boat dock.

Mr. POAGE. What do you call basic? You do not put a roof over it?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. A roof is not basic.

Mr. SWIGART. I think this interpretation is generally Government-wide to answer your original question. Only in the Federal projects Uncle Sam picks up the entire tab.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately, those I have seen generally have as basic facilities a hydrant, and they probably have a cooking facility.

Mr. SWIGART. And picnic tables.

Mr. POAGE. Some do, some do not. That seems to be the basic facilities at places I have observed. I think we are going to launch a new program. I do not contend you are giving special privilege to these people, but I want to understand if we are going to go into a program that will mean the Federal Government is going to build a housing facility, locker rooms in my county, heating rooms to go skiing when you get farther north. How far south are you going to heat these places? It gets awful cold on the plains of Texas along in January. Shall we provide heat in January? How far are we going to carry this?

Mr. SWIGART. I think we are not carrying it nearly as far as some would like us to carry it.

Mr. POAGE. I know that. If I had one of these things and wanted to develop it, of course I would like for the Federal Government to build a canopy and everything else there to develop it.

Mr. SWIGART. The minimum basic facilities would vary in accordance with the purposes intended with respect to the recreational development. In some if you only plan fishing and hunting, they would be more minimum perhaps, but where you have the broad spectrum of picnicking, camping——

Mr. POAGE. You go swimming in any water more than 3 feet deep, anywhere in the United States, I think, you will decide you need the basic facilities for swimming. I understand you decided that there must be dressing rooms. I presume there must be showers. What about it? Do you heat that water for that shower? It gets cold sometimes. Is that basic?

Mr. SWIGART. I think it would be basic for sanitation purposes. The law says minimum basic facilities needed for public health and safety, access to and use of such reservoir or other area for such purposes, such purposes being recreation, fish, and wildlife.

Mr. POAGE. I understand. I always found this matter of basic facilities is subject to a lot of interpretation. I just want the interpretation, I want to know how far we are going on this thing. I think it is running away further than most of us contemplated.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, this is the recreational aspect of watershed projects raising itself again. We have adopted the proposition of these watershed projects with the Government paying the basic costs of the original concept of the purpose of the watershed program; namely, to prevent soil erosion and prevent flooding.

When the Public Law 566 program has achieved this objective, it seems to me that we are faced with the consideration of how much further the Government should go in this program of spending Federal funds to develop recreational facilities.

I think we have all recognized and all accepted the premise that any additional amounts of money that could be spent on a water-retarding structure such as the one in this project to enhance and improve and expand the recreational opportunities on this certain structure should be borne by the local people; if they want to spend the money in development, make a bigger dam, provide the additional area that is going to be flooded or going to be needed for access roads, and so forth, fine and dandy. This is a fine combination of support in carrying out the ultimate in the benefits that can accrue to a locality from a watershed program.

I get completely disenchanted with the idea of the Federal Government, on top of all other programs we have—we have many other that are directed at providing recreational facilities and opportunities for people—I get completely disenchanted with the idea of using Public Law 566 funds for recreational purposes. I would say this very frankly. As far as I am concerned, we can put some real strong brakes on how much money we are going to use out of Public Law 566 funds for this purpose.

Mr. SWIGART. Mr. Short, about all I can say on that is that up until 1962 what you say is true. I mean until lately local folks had to bear all these costs.

However, in 1962 Public Law 566 was amended to authorize up to 50-percent payment for all these things we are talking about here. The local folks know that law, they know it was amended to provide for Federal cost sharing on these features.

Mr. POAGE. That is just the point, whether we intended to have the Federal Government pay half of all these costs. It is perfectly true we amended this bill under a good deal of pressure to provide for the Government going in there and paying for half of the costs of the right-of-way. We recognized that was necessary to build the dam. We had to have some land around it. I think it is solely a question of what is minimum basic facilities. That can be expanded to be anything. It can be a dancehall, it can be a beer garden, it can be anything you decide you want.

I think that is where we are going to have to draw the line somewhere and decide what we do consider is the minimum. Honestly, I had thought it meant to build a lake and to build a road into it and maybe clear out the brush around the edge of the lake so people could get to it. I had not thought that it included building all these extra and artificial things in manmade methods of recreation as contrasted with the lake being there. We are going to build the lake, we built it so people can use it. Just what do you have to have? You can carry this to any absurd extreme. If you have to have a bathhouse, you ought to have bathing suits. A bathhouse without bathing suits is not much good. Is that going to be part of the minimum facilities?

There is not much use telling me I can go fishing if I do not have a reel and rod in certain places. Are you going to provide a reel and rod? These things seem to be absurd, but they are no more absurd in going from where you are now than you have gone from where we started.

Mr. SWIGART. I do not think we can take credit for having defined minimum basic facilities.

Mr. POAGE. Who did?

Mr. SWIGART. I think both the corps and the Bureau of Reclamation. In other words, among the Federal agencies involved in the developing of public recreational areas there has come up a terminology of minimum basic facilities which does include these things about which we are talking.

Perhaps I should read from our own memorandum just what we consider as minimum basic facilities.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I would like to know.

Mr. SWIGART. Roads and trails providing access——

Mr. POAGE. We will buy that.

Mr. SWIGART. Roads and trails providing access from improved public highways and between different parts of the development. Parking lots. Public water supply. Sanitary facilities, including toilets and garbage disposal.

Mr. POAGE. I think both the water supply and the sanitary facilities, depending on the size of the project——

Mr. JOHNSON. For example, when you go to your parking lot, you can have a gravel parking lot or concrete.

Mr. POAGE. I think that has to depend on the services to be rendered. At some lakes you would not need anything except clearing of the brush.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are most of them concrete?

Mr. SWIGART. A lot are gravel. It varies a lot in the size, magnitude of the development, what the local organizations want, what we will agree to. It would vary with respect to the type of roads you would have and type of surfacing you would have on your parking lot.

Power facilities. Beach development. Boat docks and ramps.

Mr. POAGE. What kind of development?

Mr. SWIGART. Beach for swimming.

Mr. POAGE. What does that mean?

Mr. SWIGART. Sanding a certain portion of the shoreline, making a sand beach for the swimmers; boat docks and ramps; plantings and other shoreline or area improvements; fences, cattle guards, and other facilities to protect the development. Permanent-type picnic tables and fireplaces. Other similar or releated permanent-type facilities needed for public health and safety, access to, and use of the recreational development.

Mr. POAGE. Let us stop there because I did not catch these facilities in there. Do you have bathouse in there? I did not hear it.

Mr. SWIGART. We did not have the bathhouse. It would probably fall in this catchall item of No. 11 which is other similar or related permanent-type facilities needed for public health, safety, access, and use.

Mr. POAGE. What is similar and what is related to? You do not have those heated cabins for ski lifts in there.

Mr. SWIGART. We do not have ski lifts as a minimum basic facility.

Mr. POAGE. For ski areas?

Mr. SWIGART. Warming huts.

Mr. POAGE. You do not have them listed. What are they similar to? What are they related to? I mean by that, what you are doing to us here is giving us a list of minimum facilities that we look at and cannot very well point out anything in particular wrong with it. But then we have minimum and related facilities which may include anything on God's earth. Is that not about right?

Mr. SWIGART. You can hardly cover all the sports, outdoor water-based sports, as a listing of the things that might be covered. I do not think you would want to go to a public recreational area that was going to have a 500-person peak daily use and 14,600 visitors annually and undress in the woods. That is one thing.

If you are going out in the winter, using that lake for ice skating and that sort of thing, should not some kind of a shelter be provided rather than make the folks that are using this public development go and start their car motors and use their car heaters?

Mr. POAGE. I have found in most cases, at least those I have seen—as far as I know, outside of 566 there is not a recreational facility, as far as I know, anywhere in my area of Texas. Do you know of any?

Mr. SWIGART. Some are being proposed north of you.

Mr. POAGE. We do have a number of these engineer projects which you suggest are on a comparable basis. I do not know any of them that have any of these facilities. There are bathhouses and boathouses, but they charge for it. They give the concession to somebody to run these places. They run them and they make a charge for it and the Government is not out anything.

Mr. SWIGART. The basic facilities, Mr. Poage, are financed from Federal funds.

Mr. POAGE. I do not have the slightest objection to these people coming out from Lyndon, putting up any kind of facility they want to. You are suggesting these other agencies are all doing it. Very respectfully, I do not think they are doing it in a great many cases. I do not question that they are doing it in some places. I think I can show you more places they are not doing it than you can show me where they are.

Mr. SWIGART. I think they are doing it more with respect to their recent developments than in the past, but I think the Lake Mead area has all these facilities constructed with Federal funds, the Lake Mead recreational area.

Mr. JOHNSON. With the Park Service and their motels, were these built by the Government and turned over to private individuals?

Mr. SWIGART. I think in some instances they are. I am sure some of those motels in Yellowstone were built by the Federal Government and are run by a concessionaire.

Mr. BRUCE. We just cleared a land exchange measure to build a motel.

Mr. POAGE. I know we could go on with this.

Mr. SHORT. Let me get one more point straight. To what degree are these other reservoirs available for recreation? Is there any restriction on someone going to these other reservoirs for a Sunday picnic, or maybe the kids going in swimming?

Mr. SWIGART. They are very small water bodies.

Mr. SHORT. Is it larger than this one?

Mr. SWIGART. Only this red dot is the recreational pool. There is flood prevention also in this structure. It is not a single-purpose recreational development.

Mr. SHORT. I do not quite understand you. You say part of this reservoir is going to be available for boating and swimming and fishing, and the rest of it is not?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, sir. This structure is exactly the same as these with respect to the dashed line. It is only that the local people have

asked to increase the size of the structure so that a certain capacity can be kept full all the time for the recreational use.

Mr. SHORT. In other words, these others are just water-retarding structures? They will not stand there full of water all the time?

Mr. SWIGART. Just a very small acreage, 1 acre, something like that. These folks have increased the size up to 10 acres, which in this precipitous type country is a fair sized water body for the type of dam you can build.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much.

UPPER TRADEWATER RIVER, KY.

Mr. POAGE. We shall proceed to the next project, the Upper Tradewater River watershed in Kentucky. We will listen to the Department first.

UPPER TRADEWATER RIVER WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 60,000 acres in Christian and Hopkins Counties.
Tributary to: Ohio River.
Sponsors: Christian County Soil Conservation District and Upper Tradewater River Watershed Conservancy District.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	24
Grassland	31
Woodland	27
Miscellaneous	18

Watershed privately owned, 90 percent; State, 10 percent.
Number of farms: 494.
Size of farms: About 125 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection and flood prevention.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of eight floodwater retarding structures and 13.9 miles of stream channel improvement. The capacity of the retarding structures ranges from 285 acre-feet to 2,201 acre-feet.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$38,295	93
To agricultural improvements	1,140	3
To nonagricultural improvements	855	2
Indirect	925	2
Total	41,215	100

Area benefited: 3,913 acres.
Number of beneficiaries: About 90 farm families.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$89,150	7	[1] $1,181,950	93	$1,271,100
Structural measures; flood prevention	722,160	92	[2] 59,200	8	781,360
Total	811,310	40	1,241,150	60	2,052,460

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and National programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Land, easements, and rights-of-way	$53,740
Administration of contracts	5,460

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.4 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $172.

Carry out the project: The Upper Tradewater River Conservancy District assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $3,650.

Mr. SWIGART. The upper Tradewater River watershed comprises 60,000 acres in Christian and Hopkins Counties in western Kentucky. The watershed is located directly south of Evansville, Ind., and is closer, of course, to Hopkinsville. It is 5 miles north of Hopkinsville, a town of 21,200 people.

The watershed area consists of gently rolling farmland and steep tree-covered hills.

The Christian County Soil Conservation District and the Upper Tradewater River Watershed Conservancy District are sponsors of this particular proposal.

Beef cattle, hogs, and sheep are the main livestock enterprises in the area. The crops grown are corn, tobacco, soybeans, and small grains. They represent the major cash crop. This is basically an agricultural area with production and sale of farm products dominant.

The watershed consists of 24 percent cropland and 31 percent grassland, woodland 27 percent, and 18 percent in miscellaneous uses. The water shed is 90 percent privately owned and 10 percent State owned.

There are 494 farms averaging about 125 acres each. There are two to three floods occurring down on this fertile bottom land per year; often there are three or four.

The proposed project consists of eight floodwater-retarding structures and about 14 miles of stream channel improvement. Retarding structures will range in size from 285 acre-feet to 2,201 acre-feet. The average annual damage amounts to $13,301, and, as a result of the effectiveness of these floodwater retarding structures, this will be reduced 85 percent.

Average annual benefits will amount to $41,215 per year, benefiting 3,913 acres owned by about 90 farm families.

The cost of the project is $2,052,460 with Public Law 566 contributing $811,310 or 40 percent, and other funds $1,241,150.

In addition, the sponsors will operate and maintain the project at a cost of $3,650. The benefit-cost ratio is favorable, 1.4 to 1. The average cost per acre amounts to about $172.

Mr. POAGE. This has the lowest benefit-cost ratio we have hit this morning and the highest cost per acre, but it has a high local contribution of 60 percent against 13 percent on this project we just discussed. That is something I just cannot understand, how these people on these recreation projects get by on such a very low contribution, whereas these other people are putting in so much more of their own money.

Mr. SWIGART. Mr. Poage, of course, there is a large soil and water conservation job to be done on this watershed.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is the first flood control project we have had since I got here.

Mr. SWIGART. This is the prototype of the flood prevention program.

Mr. POAGE. This is a rather classic project with reservoirs on high land, protection along the river. This does have some drainage, channel improvements?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, it has channel improvements to supplement the structural works. You cannot get enough of the watershed behind structures to give a 5-year level of protection.

Mr. POAGE. Is not this project something where there is State-owned land? Where is that State-owned land? Does the State agree to carry out their part of the conservation practices?

Mr. SWIGART. It is dominantly in this Pennyrile Forest State Park, which is now under excellent cover, located in the lower part of the watershed. They are going to do whatever is necessary, but there really are not any needs.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Pennyrile State Park is a very fine State park. Incidentally, this park is in the Governor's home county. He is very much interested in this project and has assured me that whatever needs to be done at Pennyrile to comply with this program he will be happy to do it.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to hear from you, Mr. Stubblefield.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I might add that this watershed area lies in Christian and Hopkins Counties. Christian County is in my district and Hopkins County is in Bill Natcher's district. I have two statements.

Mr. POAGE. Did we not approve another project in Hopkins County a few weeks ago?

Mr. SWIGART. I think it was longer than that.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. We could well have. My statement I would like to present for the record, if I may, and read Bill Natcher's statement.

Mr. POAGE. Very well.

(Mr. Stubblefield's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

I am pleased to make this statement in support of the upper Tradewater River watershed project developed by the Christian County Soil Conservation District and the Upper Tradewater River Watershed Conservancy District with assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The residents of this 60,000-acre watershed have been burdened with frequent flooding on the 3,913 acres of fertile flood plains which is so important to the agricultural economy of the area. Floods occur on the average, two times a

year and sometimes three or four times. This represents a sizable loss of farm income and means the difference between financial success or failure in any given year for the farm operators.

The local people are enthusiastic in their support of the proposed project and have committed themselves to meet their commitments in carrying it out. They have agreed to contribute $1,241,150, or 60 percent, of the total cost of the project which amounts to $2,052,460. The Federal contribution will amount to $811,310.

The proposed project consists of eight floodwater-retarding structures and about 14 miles of channel improvement to alleviate the serious flood problem. In addition, the landowners and operators will install complete soil and water conseration programs on their farms to stabilize the land area of the watershed. As a result, benefits in the amount of $41,000 annually will accrue. The benefit-cost ratio will be 1.4 to 1, which is very favorable.

In my opinion, this is a meritorious project which I support fully. I sincerely request that this committee give it favorable consideration.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this is Bill Natcher's statement which I will read:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you the upper Tradewater River watershed project.

This watershed covers an area of 60,000 acres, with the area lying in two Kentucky counties. These counties are Hopkins and Christian. The work plan proposed is a project with a 5-year installation period for the development and protection of the watershed. The principal watershed problem is damage by floodwater.

There are no Federal lands or irrigation developments included in this watershed. The total cost of the project is $2,052,460, with $811,310 of this represented by Federal funds. This project has a high rate of local contribution, with 60 percent being contributed from other funds.

Mr. Chairman, I want you and the members of the committee to know that I appreciate this opportunity to appear at this time, and I sincerely request approval of the upper Tradewater River watershed work plan.

Mr. Chairman, I am not too familiar with this overall Tradewater River resources and development program, but I will ask Mr. Swigart. Is this part of the overall program in which there are some 10 projects in Kentucky, the overall basin program?

Mr. SWIGART. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. This is part of the Tradewater system. This Tradewater River has been a very troublesome stream in that the lower end of it runs into the mining section of Hopkins County. I think it has some backup from the Ohio River, and it gets into this sulfuric acid problem that we have down there.

Mr. SWIGART. That is down below.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I think you will find more benefit if you went down below with this project where it overflows into these mining pits that have been dug out, and when it overflows, it flows over the cropland. When air or moisture hits these mining operations, it forms sulfuric acid, and you know what that will do to corn or tobacco crops.

We are very much interested in this project as part of this Tradewater River problem, which the people down below are very much interested in, too, anything that will keep this overflow down.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Stubblefield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is the area in your district right above the upper end there?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. This is Hopkins County up here. Below is Christian County, which is my district. Hopkinsville is down here. This is a tributary to the Ohio River.

Mr. SWIGART. Yes; it joins the Ohio at about Elizabethtown, Ill.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Pennyrile State Park is here, a very fine State park, incidentally.

Mr. SHORT. There are eight floodwater-retarding structures. Are those all just as the terminology implies, retarding structures, not permanent reservoirs?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right. There is a small pool in each for sediment purposes, but it will be filled up during the life of the project.

Mr. SHORT. There was not any disposition on the part of anybody in this community to make a recreational facility out of any of these reservoirs?

Mr. SWIGART. No, sir. The local folks did not want to go as high as 50 percent to develop a public facility. Remember, this has to be a public recreational development before they can get help under this program.

Mr. SHORT. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Any further questions? If not, we are very much obliged to all of you.

CROOKED LAKE BAYOU, ARK.

Mr. POAGE. We will now pass to Crooked Lake Bayou watershed.

CROOKED LAKE BAYOU WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location: 18,700 acres in Mississippi County.
Tributary to: Mississippi River.
Sponsors: Mississippi County Soil and Water Conservation District and Drainage District No. 17 of Mississippi County, Ark.

Total watershed land use:	*Percent*
Cropland	96.2
Woodland	.2
Miscellaneous	3.6

Total watershed privately owned.
Number of farms: 120.
Size of farms: About 160 acres average.
Purposes: Watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage.
Principal measures: Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of one pumping plant, 37.7 miles of main and lateral ditches, 1,130 feet of levees, and two water control structures.

	Amount	Percent
Annual benefits—		
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	$111,503	84
To nonagricultural improvements	2,097	2
Secondary	16,408	12
Indirect	2,048	2
Total	132,056	100

Area benefited: 17,520.
Number of beneficiaries: 120 landowners and operators of agricultural land.

Project costs

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Land treatment measures	$11,382	4	[1] $306,880	96	$318,262
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	684,612	95	37,296	5	721,908
Drainage	287,197	57	217,795	43	504,992
Subtotal	971,809	79	[2] 255,091	21	1,226,900
Total	983,191	64	561,971	36	1,545,162

[1] This is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from Federal funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program developed each year in consideration of approved State and national programs and the annual authorization by the Congress.

[2] Consisting of—

Drainage construction cost	$191,705
Land, easements, and rights-of-way	59,164
Administration of contracts	4,222

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.6 to 1.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited: $47.

Carrying out the project: Drainage district No. 17 will form subdistrict No. 2 to carry out all of the local responsibilities for installing, operating, and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is $12,750.

Mr. SWIGART. This proposed project comprises 18,700 acres in the northeast corner of Arkansas in Mississippi County. The area is located, the entire watershed area, on the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River. Elevations range from 260 to 245 feet. The area is essentially a plain with low sandy ridges, oxbow lakes, and shallow depressions. The Mississippi County Soil and Water Conservation District and Drainage District No. 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., are the sponsors who are requesting help in developing this project.

The economy is dependent entirely on intensified agricultural production; 98 percent of the value of all farm products is produced for sale. Principal crops are cotton, soybeans, alfalfa, and wheat.

This is a joint drainage and flood prevention problem on 16,861 acres, and in addition there are some 1,300 acres subject strictly to flood damage. The flood of May 22 and 23, 1957, flooded 1,349 acres and created damage of $37,590.

The local folks have spent considerable effort on their own in attempting to solve this problem. I might say the rainfall averages in this area some 47½ inches, but some years they have 81 inches of rainfall. During those times they experience a serious flood problem. They have attempted to solve the problem and have spent over $160,000 in that effort. However, they have not been able to do it on their own and, as a result, they have requested assistance under Public Law 566.

The project will consist of soil and water conservation measures on the farms and structural measures consisting of one pumping plant, 37.7 miles of main and lateral ditches, 1,130 feet of levee, and two water control structures.

As I say, there are frequent floods occurring mainly in the late winter and spring. The one prime purpose of the project is to get rid

of the water occurring as a result of those floods as well as to provide opportunity for drainage in the area. The project will reduce flood damages about 75 percent.

Total benefits of the project amount to $132,056. It will benefit 17,520 acres in the ownership of 120 landowners.

The total cost of the project is $1,545,162. Public Law 566 will contribute $983,191 or 64 percent, and other funds $561,971 or 36 percent.

It has a favorable benefit-cost ratio, very favorable in fact, 1.6 to 1. The average cost per benefited acre is $47.

In addition to the contribution for the installation of the project, the sponsors will bear a cost of $12,750 anually to maintain it.

Mr. POAGE. There is a pumping proposition involved here, is there not?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Perhaps where you cross the levee into the river. I presume most of the year when the river is down that flows out by gravity; is that right?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, it comes out into this bayou, which is a channel improved by the Corps of Engineers some years ago.

Mr. POAGE. When the river is low, will water flow out through the levee at that point?

Mr. SWIGART. I think most of it drains out through here. When we have these heavy rains, 81 inches annual rainfall, this is not adequate to handle it and water will come down into this area and the pumps will get rid of it so they can get water off rapidly from all farms in the area.

Mr. POAGE. Are the pumps part of the project?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Who pays for the pumps?

Mr. SWIGART. They are cost shared. In other words, the local folks in this instance are putting up $217,795 as their contribution to the drainage component of the project.

Mr. POAGE. This is the first time I have noticed—maybe I have overlooked it—where we were going into a proposition of providing pumping facilities. Is that a part of the program that you will provide pumping facilities?

Mr. SWIGART. To get rid of excess water; yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Have you had some with pumps in them? There is nothing mentioned about pumps here to call our attention to it.

Mr. SWIGART. It is mentioned in the principal measures where it indicates consisting of one pumping plant. That will have three 54-inch axial or mixed flow pumps, powered by three 60-horsepower diesel engines.

Mr. POAGE. That costs a half million dollars, roughly?

Mr. SWIGART. The pumping plant has a total cost of $796,199. The local contribution to that is $134,607. But the pumping plant is just as much, well, if it were used entirely to get rid of floodwaters rather than having a drainage component in it, it would be a hundred percent Federal because it would be considered a flood prevention structural measure. That is, if it were a single-purpose flood prevention project, and pumping is the cheapest way to get rid of the water.

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me we are opening up a tremendous field here when we say we are going into the business of putting in pumps. I know the law says the local people will operate these.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Local people pay for the operation.

Mr. POAGE. I know that. This contemplates local people paying for the operation of the pumps.

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, operation and maintenance cost is $12,750 annually, which is a considerable burden that they are picking up.

Mr. BRUCE. It is very high, over a thousand dollars a month just to operate the pumps.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. We have a three-quarter million dollar plant there. I am not going to say I am opposed to it, but it is something we never discussed here before, surely.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much of that land it tillable now without this drainage?

Mr. SWIGART. 96.2 percent, sir, is in cropland.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is just when you have the heavy rains that the crops are flooded out?

Mr. SWIGART. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is the centerline of ditches draining to the lower one?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes; it comes down through here and back out through here during normal flows. They have two controls here. They regulate which way the water goes. It is a relatively complex water management problem.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is that going to take a full-time man to operate these things?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes. They have a drainage district there which would have the necessary complement of personnel, I am sure.

Mr. GATHINGS. The drainage district No. 17.

Mr. SWIGART. They have the personnel to operate this. I do not think there is any worry on that score.

Mr. SHORT. This contribution of $306,880 that is going to be spent for land-treatment measures, could you give us some idea what kind of land-treatment measures will be applied on this land that have not already been applied?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes. Some will be spent on drainage on the individual farms to take advantage of the fact that they are getting rid of the water in the watershed. That will be a large part of it. There will be some structures for water control on the farms.

Mr. SHORT. You said in your opening statement the local people had already done some work.

Mr. SWIGART. Yes, in these main ditches. They have spent considerable. They have spent $203,821 already for what they could do.

Mr. SHORT. How much have they already spent on land-treatment measures?

Mr. SWIGART. The amount I just gave you, $203,821.

Mr. SHORT. Under the ACP program?

Mr. SWIGART. I presume they got help under ACP; yes, sir.

Mr. SHORT. But they are going to spend $306,880 more and I want to know what they are going to do with that $306,000.

Mr. SWIGART. What they have already done with regard to getting adequate outlet would not permit all the work to be done on the individual farms. As a result of this work it will open greater opportunities for proper water management on the individual farms.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. When the farmer puts in tile, is that considered in the $306,880?

Mr. SWIGART. It would be tile or open ditch. I think in this case it is open ditch.

Mr. JOHNSON. What?

Mr. SWIGART. Open ditch.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is considered part of the $306,000?

Mr. SWIGART. Yes. On the individual farms there is no help for this work. They have taken all the responsibility of doing it themselves with whatever help they can get under ACP.

Mr. JOHNSON. That would be in the $306,000?

Mr. SWIGART. If he were going to do it. This $306,000 is supposed to represent what is needed on the individual farms to take advantage of the total project and make it pay out.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is there any tile in that?

Mr. SWIGART. I do not think so. I think this is open ditch.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not think there is any tile.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no further questions of Mr. Swigart, we will hear now from Mr. Gathings.

STATEMENT OF HON. E. C. GATHINGS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you. I do appreciate the very fine statement Mr. Swigart has made and the answers he has given to the technical questions propounded to him.

Mississippi County, Ark., is known as the world's largest rain-grown cotton county. Mississippi County, Ark., is the home of the national cotton picking contest each year.

This particular watershed is located just east of the city of Blytheville where the Blytheville Air Force Base is located. This project is sponsored by the Mississippi County Soil and Water Conservation District and also by drainage district 17. I have been over the watershed quite a number of times. The towns of Armorel, Huffman, and Hickman are located there as well as the little village of Barfield in this particular watershed area.

The principal crops, as Mr. Swigart has said, are cotton, soybeans, and quite a lot of alfalfa; 5.4 percent of the watershed property is devoted to alfalfa. And there is very little wheat. It is about 47 percent cotton and 53 percent soybeans.

The landowners have spent considerable money to eliminate this water damage that has been so destructive; 47.7 inches has been the average rainfall over 36 years with the maximum rainfall in 1 year of 80 inches. This pumping plant will remove 1.7 inches of rainfall in 24 hours' time. That is the most important feature of the project. You would have no project if it were not for the pumping plant. Sometimes we have a 7-inch rain in this area in a very few hours' time. The pumping plant will remove that rainfall at a rapid pace.

Out of the 18,700 acres in this project, 17,500 acres, practically all of the area, would be benefited if this project is constructed.

In addition 3,400 acres in Pemiscot County, Mo. drains into this area. This is Pemiscot County here [indicating on map]. The Mississippi River is on the east side.

In addition it is proposed that 1,100 feet of level is to be built to protect a very small acreage in this southern portion of the watershed project.

Mr. JOHNSON. What river flows on the other side?

Mr. GATHINGS. The Mississippi River.

Mr. JOHNSON. On the other side?

Mr. GATHINGS. There is no river there. That is Pemiscot Bayou that flows out of Missouri.

I want to say another word about Mississippi County. Mississippi County does not have boll weevils, and that is saying a lot because boll weevils ran us out of Mississippi in 1916. My daddy said that if Bilbo was elected Governor of Mississippi he would leave the State. Bilbo was elected and we left. Bilbo and the boll weevils ran us out of Mississippi.

My home is located just south of Mississippi County. I am very familiar with this area and the people are most cooperative.

It has been said that an awful lot of Arkansas projects have been coming to this subcommittee. That is true. A lot of them have been coming here. And why is that? That is because we are watershed-minded people. We are folks that need the protection that this Public Law 566 offers. We are farm people. This project will benefit agriculture wholly, practically all agriculture. It will benefit some roads and bridges as well.

I do appreciate the opportunity to appear here today and I hope the subcommittee will see fit to approve the Crooked project.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you.

Mr. JOHNSON. You made a very fine statement.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will now go into executive session.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee went into executive session.)

○