

Y 4
.P 96/11

1024

91 Y 4
96/11
91-49

91-49

WATERSHED PROJECTS—1970

GOVERNMENT

Storage

DOCUMENTS

(91-49)

N 1 6 1970

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JULY 16, 1970

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1970

53-592

7 Y
11/28 9.
22-18

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland, *Chairman*

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota	WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois	JAMES R. GROVER, New York
JIM WRIGHT, Texas	JAMES C. CLEVELAND, New Hampshire
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois	DON H. CLAUSEN, California
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania	ROBERT C. McEWEN, New York
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma	JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, South Carolina	HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, Wisconsin
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina	M. G. (GENE) SNYDER, Kentucky
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana	ROBERT V. DENNEY, Nebraska
RAY ROBERTS, Texas	ROGER H. ZION, Indiana
RICHARD D. McCARTHY, New York	JACK H. McDONALD, Michigan
JAMES KEE, West Virginia	JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey	CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
GLENN M. ANDERSON, California	
PATRICK T. CAFFERY, Louisiana	
ROBERT A. ROE, New Jersey	

COMMITTEE STAFF

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*
LOYD A. RIVARD, *Engineer-Consultant*
LESTER EDELMAN, *Counsel*
CLIFTON W. ENFIELD, *Minority Counsel*
RICHARD C. PEET, *Assistant Minority Counsel*
SHELDON S. GILBERT, *Associate Minority Counsel*

STAFF ASSISTANTS

DOROTHY BEAM, *Executive Staff Assistant*
JOSEPH A. ITALIANO, *Editorial Assistant*

MERIAM BUCKLEY	CYNTHIA VAN SANT
STERLYN B. CARROLL	ERLA S. YOUMANS
ROSEMARI GAUGHAN	LINDA WILLIAMS
EMILY LOOSIER	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT

JIM WRIGHT, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois	ROBERT C. McEWEN, New York
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois	JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania	FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma	HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, Wisconsin
W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina	M. G. (GENE) SNYDER, Kentucky
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana	ROBERT V. DENNEY, Nebraska
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota	ROGER H. ZION, Indiana
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	JACK H. McDONALD, Michigan
RAY ROBERTS, Texas	CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
GLENN M. ANDERSON, California	
PATRICK T. CAFFERY, Louisiana	

ROBERT F. SPENCE, *Clerk*

CONTENTS

TESTIMONY

	Page
Andrews, Hon. Mark, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Dakota.....	9
Burleson, Hon. Omar, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.....	11
Conte, Hon. Silvio O., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	5
Findley, Hon. Paul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.....	7
Gettys, Hon. Tom S., a Representative in Congress from the State of South Carolina.....	3

MATERIAL RECEIVED FOR THE RECORD

Chamberlain, Hon. Charles E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, letter re Upper Maple River project.....	16
Colmer, Hon. William M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, statement re Bahala Creek project.....	13
Davis, Hon. John W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia, statement re Chattooga River project.....	15
Griffin, Hon. Charles H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, statement re Bahala Creek project.....	13
Hammerschmidt, Hon. John Paul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arkansas, statement re Upper Petit Jean River project, Upper Ouachita River project, and Spadra Creek project.....	19
Hamilton, Hon. Lee H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, letter re Lost River project.....	17
Landrum, Hon. Phil M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia, statement re North Oconee project.....	14
Wyatt, Hon. Wendell, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon, statement re McKay-Rock Creek project.....	15

ИЗВЕЩАНИЕ

О РАБОТАХ

НА УЧЕБНО-НАУЧНОМ ЗАВЕДЕНИИ

ЗА ПЕРИОД С _____ ПО _____

И ПОДПИСАНЫМИ _____

И _____

WATERSHED PROJECTS—1970

THURSDAY, JULY 16, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS:

The subcommittee met at 10:10 a.m., in room 2167, Rayburn Building, Hon. Jim Wright (chairman), presiding.

Present: Messrs. Wright, Anderson, Denney, Dorn, Kluczynski, Schadeberg, Schwengel, Zion, and Hammerschmidt.

Mr. WRIGHT. The subcommittee will be in order.

We meet this morning as the Subcommittee on Watershed Development to consider the prospectuses in watershed development plans for some 21 separate projects.

If there is no objection, I will place the lists of projects in the record at this point.

(Project lists follow:)

(1)

WATERSHED WORK PLAN

State and Watershed	Federal cost	Non-Federal cost	Total cost	Benefit-cost ratio	Drainage area	Storage reservoir	Total storage	Total cost non-Federal (percent)
Arkansas—Upper Ouachita River.....	\$1,417,000	\$718,000	\$2,135,000	1.3:1.0	29,300	2	17,079	34
Colorado—Crooked Arroyo.....	1,169,000	722,000	1,891,000	2.7:1.0	71,900	4	9,507	38
Illinois—Clear Creek.....	1,014,000	516,000	1,530,000	3.4:1.0	26,000	2	5,804	34
Maine—Fish Stream.....	572,000	273,000	845,000	2.3:1.0	17,100	1	6,020	32
Massachusetts—West Branch Westfield River.....	3,564,000	2,723,000	6,287,000	1.6:1.0	60,800	11	19,897	43
Michigan—East Upper Maple River.....	4,989,000	5,808,000	10,797,000	3.0:1.0	169,700	2	11,407	54
Mississippi—Bahala Creek.....	1,402,000	2,242,000	3,644,000	2.0:1.0	32,300	5	12,327	37
Montana—Newland Creek.....	1,356,000	1,392,000	2,748,000	2.0:1.0	51,300	1	14,030	50
Oregon—McKay-Rock Creek.....	4,790,000	6,925,000	11,715,000	3.2:1.0	76,200	2	32,500	59
Total.....	20,273,000	19,917,000	40,190,000	XXX	534,880	30	128,571	XXX
Arkansas—Sadra Creek.....	1,618,000	1,224,000	2,842,000	2.1:1.0	38,400	2	17,842	43
Arkansas—Upper Petit Jean.....	3,973,000	1,920,000	5,893,000	1.3:1.0	211,600	7	41,277	33
Georgia—Headwaters of the Chattooga River.....	2,815,000	2,377,000	5,192,000	1.3:1.0	105,400	9	18,975	46
Georgia—North Oconee River.....	2,795,000	920,000	3,715,000	1.3:1.0	47,300	9	15,043	25
Indiana—Lost River.....	4,883,000	5,043,000	9,926,000	1.4:1.0	237,700	11	43,240	51
Maryland—St. Mary's River.....	1,484,000	1,879,000	3,363,000	1.7:1.0	20,000	5	14,023	56
North Dakota—Upper Turtle River.....	2,925,000	1,769,000	4,694,000	2.0:1.0	157,800	8	16,206	21
Oregon—Pine Valley.....	1,711,000	2,544,000	4,255,000	1.7:1.0	137,360	1	27,200	60
South Carolina—Rocky Creek.....	2,285,000	795,000	3,080,000	1.8:1.0	126,300	14	27,580	26
South Carolina—Wilson Creek.....	1,833,000	958,000	2,791,000	1.6:1.0	49,900	4	13,740	34
Texas—Hog Creek.....	1,570,000	983,000	2,553,000	1.7:1.0	58,500	2	13,155	63
Texas—Upper Choloio Creek.....	941,000	727,000	1,668,000	1.3:1.0	50,360	4	13,050	44
Total.....	27,813,000	20,149,000	47,962,000	-----	1,240,720	76	249,161	-----

Mr. WRIGHT. We are happy to have with us this morning a number of our colleagues from the House. It is a great pleasure for us to hear from them and the efficacy of their respective projects in their States.

We have Congressman Tom Gettys from South Carolina, and if Tom would like to come forward and share his thoughts with the subcommittee I know the committee would be honored to receive him. It is nice having you, Tom.

**STATEMENT OF HON. TOM S. GETTYS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Mr. GETTYS. Let me express my appreciation to the committee, Mr. Chairman, for letting me appear in behalf of the Rocky Creek Watershed project in South Carolina.

I appear in support of this project which covers some 126,300 acres of land in Chester and Fairfield Counties in my Congressional District. This area covers overlying proportions of the towns of Chester, Great Falls, and Richburg with an urban population of about 6,000 people and a rural population of about 4,000 people.

The project would serve a relatively rich flood plain sector which cannot be efficiently utilized because of recurring flood damage to crops, pastures, roads, bridges, fences, and other fixed improvements. Flood water damage is aggravated by erosion and sediment buildup.

Under proposals which have already been presented in this project and proposed, there would be supplied some 5,400 acres of flood protection, 29,900 acres of conservation measures, 810 acres of critical area stabilization, and the erection of 14 floodwater retarding structures. These measures have been projected to reduce flood damage about 60 percent and overall damage in the project area by 68 percent.

I again thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for your serious and sympathetic consideration of this project.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Gettys, we appreciate your being with us and sharing these thoughts with us. I gather from your comments that this project is desired in the area.

Mr. GETTYS. It is very greatly desired, and there has been a tremendous amount of interest and work on it by all classes of citizens who are interested. The poor farmer, the rich farmer, if there is such a thing in South Carolina, and everybody is behind the project. I think you will run into no antagonism from any citizens of the communities.

Mr. WRIGHT. I observe with interest that the benefit/cost ratio assessed and recognized by the Bureau of Watershed Projects is 1.8 to 1 which is a very impressive return on the Federal investment.

Any questions?

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, just an observation and question. It is good to see you here on behalf of watersheds.

Mr. GETTYS. Thank you.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is almost a passion with me that captivates my interest more than almost anything else in the Federal investment arena. I think it is high time we take care of mother earth. I note the cost/benefit ratios, and I suggest to you, sir, the cost/benefit ratios would be much higher on the benefit side if we were to consider all of that. I am one who has pled for and restudied this whole question of

benefits to come from watersheds, and when we invest we will more dramatically present the true story of the long-range effects of completed watershed programs.

Mr. GETTYS. I thank you, gentlemen, and I agree thoroughly with your statement.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. It is more important than going to the moon when we have not taken proper care of the base that makes all the explorations in space and otherwise possible. I am a very enthusiastic supporter for this and any other watershed.

Mr. GETTYS. I might add, Mr. Chairman, supplementary to Mr. Schwengel's statements that so many of the problems of the cities emanate from our lack of taking care of the rural areas, and if we could make our rural areas more attractive places in which to live and build up projects of this kind then we would not have the ghettos in the cities of today. I believe, while we are late recognizing that fact, that your committee is doing a tremendous benefit for the people of this country.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. One question now. From what you know about your project, is there sufficient protection where you have water storage areas of those areas so that we do not have reduced silting almost—

Mr. GETTYS. That is a technical question which, of course, I cannot answer, although it is my understanding from the experts who have examined the area that those matters have been fully looked into and that the project is feasible from that standpoint.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. It could be feasible under the present rules, but it may not be advisable in my point if we do not take care of the watersheds properly, carefully and that area drains into the storage areas.

Mr. GETTYS. I understand your question. I am just not a technician enough to answer the question. But I do say that the people who are technicians in that field indicate that it is feasible from their standpoint and will be very workable.

Mr. WRIGHT. Other questions?

Mr. Denney.

Mr. DENNEY. I notice there are flood retarding structures. What is the cooperation between the Government agencies and the landowners as far as acquisition of this land for the permanent pools?

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Denney, I talked with some of the leading proponents of this project and they express—in fact, night before last I had a conversation with them—they expressed astonishment of the amount of cooperation that exists in all areas among the people who are involved and that they are willing to cooperate to do that which is necessary to get this long-range program.

Mr. DENNEY. The reason I ask this question right out is in my district they are considering some of these and the retarding structure backs up the permanent pool on some of the best land in that county.

Do you have a problem like that in your district?

Mr. GETTYS. Let me say this. Apparently that is not the case in this particular project. I have been in other projects where that is the case and, therefore, you raise objections on the part of certain landowners and tenants and others involved on that question. In this particular one I believe that all the landowners, even though in some

instances it does take some land that they would prefer not to be in it, that they are cooperative and realize the greater good to the greater number by permitting the project to go forward without any obstacle on their part in putting it away.

Mr. DENNEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you, Mr. Gettys. It has been nice having you come to be with us.

Next, Hon. Silvio O. Conte, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

We are happy to hear from you, Mr. Conte.

STATEMENT OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to address this subcommittee on behalf of the watershed proposal for the West Branch of the Westfield River.

Having seen firsthand in my district other examples of the great good that can be done through Public Law 566 watershed projects, it is natural that I should speak for another such project. But I can endorse this pending proposal with even greater enthusiasm because this is no ordinary measure. This \$6.3 million project is the best example of such small-scale, coordinated regional planning that I have seen. It will encompass some 60,800 acres in the scenic mountain areas of Berkshire, Hampden, and Hampshire Counties in Massachusetts. It will provide essential flood control structures, water recreational facilities, and environmental improvements for fish and wildlife.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, the Interior Department has been especially impressed with it. The Department has stated, and I quote:

This work plan is an outstanding example of comprehensive planning for small watershed projects. The plan sets a precedent for the integration of fish and wildlife resource preservation and enhancement and should serve as a model goal for the development of future Public Law 83-566 projects. We commend the watershed planners, project sponsors, Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources, and the Division of Fisheries and Game for this landmark plan of watershed development.

State and local officials were as much impressed with this plan as the various Federal agencies I contacted. In fact, Massachusetts has already committed, in advance, \$2.7 million or about 43 percent of the \$6.3 million needed to implement the project. Moreover, the selection of all the towns directly affected (Becket, Blandford, Chester, Middlefield, Peru, and Washington) have endorsed the program.

A look at the plan will show why it has received wholehearted approval on the Federal, State and local levels. The project calls for two single-purpose flood prevention structures, eight multipurpose flood prevention and fish and wildlife structures, and one multipurpose flood prevention and recreation structure. Also included are designs for 3,500 feet of stream channel construction and a land treatment program to reduce erosion and sediment formation.

The economic, recreational, and environmental advantages of this project are simply tremendous. The flood control structure would alleviate one of the worst problems in the region. In the past the watershed has suffered from extensive flooding, causing severe property losses. Highway and railroad traffic has been rerouted, forcing in-

dustries to close and income and production levels to falter. The project will reduce the total flood water damages by 95 percent on the average and will also keep the railroads from rerouting their traffic.

Most importantly, the multi-purpose flood control structures will stimulate tourism in the watershed. Farming and small business have been on a gradual decline there for quite some time, but the influx of summer residents and tourists would provide the economic uplift the region so badly needs. These newcomers would relieve the tax burden on year-round residents, supplement income levels, and encourage business investments.

To attract tourists, the sponsors envision picnic, camping, swimming, and fishing areas, capable of accommodating 3,750 persons daily. For the 10 million people living within a 100-mile radius of the project these recreational facilities will prove invaluable.

The project will also improve fish and wildlife resources. The area has few ponds other than temporary ones formed by beaver dams. The new reservoirs would provide much-needed habitats for trout and waterfowl and also large watering areas for wild game. Moreover, the water stored behind the dams will be used to augment low flows during the dry summer months when water has ordinarily been too low and consequently too warm to sustain most fishlife. The storage capacity of all the structures will be 19,897 acre-feet. Controlled flows would extend the stream fishing season through July. An important secondary benefit here will be the assistance of downstream industries with their water pollution problems.

You will note that the benefit/cost ratio of this model plan, 1.8 to 1, which I feel is quite good. Average annual benefits to nonagriculture improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife, and secondary effects will reach \$635,000 per year while costs will annually total \$361,669.

These are some of the reasons why I wholeheartedly endorse this plan, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, and I hope that you and your committee will share my enthusiasm and give this project your approval.

Mr. WRIGHT. This is a very excellent and comprehensive statement.

Mr. CONTE. Thank you, Jim.

Mr. WRIGHT. The committee, I am sure, will want to congratulate you on it.

Are there questions?

(No questions indicated.)

Mr. WRIGHT. If not, we appreciate your having been with us and share this information with us.

Mr. CONTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WRIGHT. We will be acting on these projects later today, we expect.

Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. We have with us the Honorable Paul Findley of Illinois in the interest of the Clear Creek watershed project, I believe.

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL FINDLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is indeed a great privilege to be here today on behalf of the Clear Creek watershed project which is located in my district in Illinois. I am grateful to you for affording me this opportunity to outline briefly the problem with which we are confronted in this area and to endorse strongly the proposal submitted to the committee to cope with it.

Clear Creek watershed is located in Cass County, Ill. Like most of my district, the area is rural in character and most of the residents depend directly or indirectly upon farming for their livelihood. Cash grain farming predominates, with corn, soybeans, and wheat being the principal crops harvested. In addition, a few cattle and hog feeding operations exist, and could be expanded if the price of meat continues strong. Some melons, fruit, and carrots are also raised.

Lumber, Christmas trees, veneer logs, poles and posts, furniture stock, and pulpwood also provide income to the local residents.

The area of the watershed is 26,000 acres and there are 2,000 residents. The farms are basically small, family-run units averaging 195 acres each.

For many years—this past week I was in the Clear Creek area and saw firsthand the damage that occurred from excessive flooding this past month—these small farmers have been plagued by damage from too much water and poor drainage. Excessive sheet and gully erosion, sediment damage, and flooding occur on a regular basis and make farming as speculative as the stock market and just about as profitable as the market is today. Yield losses caused by delayed planting and direct damage to growing mature crops, plus increased tillage costs, are a major problem each year. It is estimated that Clear Creek will flood approximately 25 times in a 10-year period, well over twice each year. And, of course, the flooding occurs generally from May to November during the peak growing season.

Proper land treatment measures are essential to watershed protection. Structural measures consisting of two floodwater retarding structures, 10 grade stabilization structures, and approximately 9 miles of stream channel improvement are called for in work plans for the watershed. The total estimated cost of the structural measure is \$1,130,740 of which \$959,015 would be covered by Public Law 566.

If the subcommittee will approve the work plan and the expenditure, the annual benefit to the residents of this area in my district will be substantial. The improvements will reduce the average annual floodwater erosion and sediment damages from \$72,530 to \$7,840, or almost 90 percent. In addition, these improvements would give peace of mind to many families who have never known it; who have lived their entire lives wondering when the river will next overflow and wash away a year's crops, a life's work, and their hope for the future.

I hope the committee will act favorably upon the Clear Creek watershed proposed work plan.

Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Findley, I am impressed with your statement. The record apparently reveals an average of 25 separate times of flooding in the 10-year period.

Mr. FINDLEY. Right.

Mr. WRIGHT. And this would make any effort to farm very hazardous and speculative at best.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. No question, Mr. Chairman, but I want to compliment the gentleman for a splendid statement. We all know Paul Findley is a very hard-working Congressman from the State of Illinois. We are very glad to have him here.

We have with us the experts, especially Mr. Hollis Williams, who has come before this committee many times, and if there are any questions we will ask Hollis Williams.

Thank you for being here.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Denney.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Findley, I think this is a perfect example of why it is always necessary for Congress to be alert and keep the ACP funds available because if you have ACP funds for the next year you are going to be able to get something done.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I welcome my neighbor almost next door. He has one advantage over Iowa from where he lives because he is situated on the east bank of the Mississippi River and can look across and see a great State.

I am aware of this area which he wants to protect with this watershed. It is very, very valuable land and a very fertile area, and, by its approval, it will be greater competition for the First District of Iowa where we breed more hogs than any other area in the world. They are very, very beautiful especially when the profits are used to raise them to eliminate mortgages on the farm.

Mr. FINDLEY. And when the price is about 20 cents they are really beautiful.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right. It is a great productive area, and again I repeat I am enthusiastic about all these programs and reiterate that the cost-benefit ratios do not reflect all the benefits on the benefit side. The people in the Department are working on this, and hopefully can give us some insights on how we can make a more honest appraisal of the total benefits that come from watersheds not only for that area but for the country.

It is good to see you, Paul.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, Paul.

The committee is also pleased to have our colleague, Congressman Mark Andrews from North Dakota.

Will you come forward, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARK ANDREWS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I welcome this opportunity to speak for a few minutes in support of the proposed Upper Turtle River watershed project located in Grand Forks and Nelson Counties in my district in North Dakota.

This 157,800-acre, \$3,694,000 project is located in the heart of the district I'm privileged to represent in Congress.

It has an adjusted cost-benefit ratio of 1.9 to 1 and all of the important details and data are included in the work plan Hollis Williams and his group has made available to the subcommittee. The economics of the project are clear and the watershed protection, flood prevention, and drainage benefits add up to compelling arguments, in my way of thinking, for approving the project.

I wish only to take a few minutes of your time to discuss two aspects of this project concerning its impact on the environmental quality in the area; specifically preservation of wildlife and development of recreational facilities.

The sponsors of the project have agreed to acquire 300 acres of brush and woodlands to help offset loss of wildlife habitat through inundation. This land will be managed over the life of the project for wildlife purposes. Habitat losses due to channel alteration will be mitigated by acquiring and developing 20 to 30 acres of habitat along the stream channels. Clearing, in an unique engineering decision will be limited to one side of the channel wherever it is feasible so that the trees alongside the channel will be left, in this case, along both sides. These are just some of the ways the sponsors are cooperating with the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife.

Construction of structure No. 9, in the fourth year of the 8-year project, will result in a 76-acre multipurpose reservoir ideal for public recreation activities just northeast of Larimore, N. Dak. Plans call for inclusion of a swimming beach, fishing, nature trails, a boat launch area, camping and picnic areas.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you and all of the members of this panel are familiar with the agricultural benefits that accrue from watershed projects such as this. Hopefully, you are all aware as well of the importance of rural development to North Dakota where, in fact, 80 percent of our economy is based on agriculture. I think I have probably the most agricultural district in the entire Congress. With this in mind, and in view of the other beneficial aspects of the Upper Turtle River watershed I have discussed this morning, I strongly recommend approval of this project as a sound and wise investment of tax money.

Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Andrews.

Are there questions?

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is good to see you here, Mark, and I bet that while you have one of the most agricultural districts in the United States, an invaluable one, and to you a watershed program to your people in that area is far more important than in most parts of the United States—

Mr. ANDREWS. It is bread and butter in the agricultural area. Let me point out one of the unique problems. We live in the bottom of a glaciated area and the old glaciers backed up the water. So we have absolutely flat lake bottoms really. The land was formed by the deposition in the lake water with the result the nonlake bottoms have dropped 3 to 4 feet per mile and that water comes rushing down and levels off. We have to retain the water back in the higher reaches and build channel improvements in the lower flat areas. We also have to maintain water in the upper reaches for wildlife habitat because we are the No. 1 duck producing area in the central flyway in this country. In fact, almost all of the ducks that are shot in that area nest in either North Dakota or in our Canadian neighbor provinces to the north. So we benefit the great outdoor sportsmen very much in the entire country.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. One further question, observation and not a question.

The environmental quality point you bring up in your testimony is so very important and points up an area that is a benefit that you are not credited with in this project, and when you have watersheds completed and every farmer uses to the fullest good land practices you are going to drive the water through the soil more and the soil is a good filter of the chemicals that are necessary today in farming, necessary for fertilizer and necessary for weed and insect control. So I cite this as another example of benefit that comes from this program that we do not get credit for.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is very true.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad you pointed this out because when these floods rush downstream unchecked they carry the silt and debris and chemicals and pollutants that raise havoc with the lower streams.

Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. Denney.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Andrews, our fact sheet shows 2.0 to 1.0 benefit/cost ratio. Did I hear you say 1.9?

Mr. ANDREWS. They gave us a 1.9 to 1.0 adjusted cost/benefit ratio, but I will yield to 2.0.

Mr. DENNEY. I wanted to know why the adjustment. Is this a rising cost in the construction of the structures?

Mr. ANDREWS. I will be glad to yield to the technical witnesses on this.

Is it 2.0 or 1.9?

Mr. LANE (Director, Watershed Planning Division). The reason for the discrepancy is that, as the interest rate changes for the evaluation of these watershed projects or any project, it changes the estimated annual costs of the project, and so both figures are right, but they used different rates or different interest rates in the computation. The 2.0 to 1.0 interest rate is the rate that was derived at the time the plan was completed. Since that time the interest rate has changed and it is now 1.9 to 1.0.

Mr. ANDREWS. I appreciate your bringing that out. I attempted to give you the latest figure. We thought this project is worthwhile enough and stands on its own two feet.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, you see how honest this Congressman is in giving us the straight dope on this thing?

Mr. WRIGHT. We would expect nothing less than that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the committee's time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Burleson, is here. We are honored that he would be with us this morning.

Mr. Burleson, come forward. You have some comment, I understand, on Hog Creek, Tex.

STATEMENT OF HON. OMAR BURLESON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. BURLESON. Thank you for the opportunity to come before your subcommittee this morning in support of the Hog Creek watershed project. Hog Creek, a tributary of the Bosque River, is part of the Brazos River Basin. It is located in central Texas and comprises an area of approximately 91.34 square miles. It heads in southeastern Hamilton County; located in my congressional district, flows across northeastern Coryell County, southwestern Bosque County, and western McLennan County and empties into Lake Waco. The project is approximately 40 percent cropland, 58 percent grassland, and 2 percent miscellaneous uses.

The principal problem in the watershed is frequent flooding and resulting erosion damage on bottomland along Hog Creek and its tributaries. Extremely serious flooding occurred from 1926 through 1965. Average annual direct damages to agricultural properties amount to \$36,399. Nonagricultural damage averages \$7,348 annually. Indirect damages are estimated to average \$4,375 annually.

The reduction in floodwater, sediment, and erosion, which the Hog Creek Watershed project will effect, will directly benefit the owners and operators of approximately 273 farms and ranches as well as all the residents of the city of Waco who depend on Lake Waco for their water supply. The ratio of the total annual benefits resulting from the installation of the structural measures to the annual cost is 1.1 to 1.0. Total average annual project benefits, including secondary benefits, will result in a benefit/cost ratio of 1.7 to 1.0.

Mr. Chairman, there is outstanding public interest in the project locally and full cooperation on the part of landowners and residents who will be directly affected.

It is a project to which I can and do give my wholehearted support, and I recommend it for your favorable consideration.

This Hog Creek project is a part of the Brazos River Watershed as the chairman well knows. He is familiar with this area, and I think at one time part of it may have been in your district, Mr. Chairman, or adjoining it. The organization, the water board, the commissioners are in my district. It heads up there as a part of the Brazos River Watershed. The greater benefit and I think the greater area actually accrues in the district of our colleague, Mr. Poage. This

part of the watershed goes through about three, well goes through three counties and part of a fourth—our counties are approximately 30 miles square—and empties into Lake Waco, which is the home of Mr. Poage, and as this committee well knows it is not only in the immediate benefits by flooding but it is also, as I think was just mentioned in response to a question, and again here I know this committee is well aware and well founded in the theory of the upstream water flood program which I think is one of the best Federal investments I know of in conservation.

We have records in this particular case of from 1919 into the mid-1920's someplace through 1966, I think, where serious flooding has occurred. A part of this, roughly 40 percent, is agriculture, about maybe the ratio of some 45 of grazing land, and then other uses, miscellaneous, with serious flooding, and it is a pollutant problem involved, of course, in the municipal water supplied to the city of Waco, Tex.

The ratio of benefits, and of course that is a thing I know you have to consider carefully, to annual cost 1.1 to 1.0. Total average annual project benefits including secondary benefits result in a benefit cost/ratio of 1.2 to 1.0.

There is a wide benefit which could accrue to having this project developed. I believe, Mr. Chairman, as you examine this proposal you will find it to measure up to the standards which are required of you in this type of program. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Burleson.

I should like to say that I am familiar with this area to which our colleague refers. I am familiar with the flood problem that occurs there and the need for a project of this type.

We appreciate your very persuasive testimony.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Chairman, I welcome my former chairman of the House Administration Committee, and I want to tell you that we miss you in the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BURLESON. I miss it too but I got out from under a pretty big chore there.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. And leaving there and your responsibilities there having been made necessary for a promotion, I think, to a much more important committee where you have a bearing on taxes in the Ways and Means.

I am impressed with your testimony and want to tell you about my enthusiasm as to watersheds and that the cost/benefit ratios are not the true benefits here for the true benefits that I think ought to be considered.

Mr. BURLESON. Thank you very much.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Burleson, on the House Administration Committee I can testify that we miss you and that Sam Friedel misses you.

Mr. BURLESON. Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Burleson.

We have statements that have been submitted for the record from a number of our colleagues, and without objection I should like to

have inserted in the record at this point a statement of Congressman Colmer, of Mississippi in support of the Bahala Creek Watershed project.

A statement of our colleague, Mr. Griffin, of the Third District of Mississippi, in support of the same project.

A statement of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Landrum, in behalf of the North Oconee Watershed project in Georgia.

One by our colleague, Mr. John W. Davis, in behalf of the Chattooga River Watershed.

And one by Mr. Wyatt of Oregon in support of the McKay-Rock Creek Small Watershed project, which according to our worksheet has a 3.2 to 1.0 benefit/cost ratio.

And without objection, the record of the hearing will be kept open for 30 days for the submission of any additional statements by Members of Congress.

(The above-listed statements follow:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to appear before your Committee in behalf of the proposed Bahala Creek Watershed Project in Lincoln, Copiah and Lawrence Counties, Mississippi.

Like many similar projects, the developments proposed herein will provide numerous benefits to the project area. The cost benefit ratio of 1 to 2.1 is highly indicative of the returns that will accrue to the residents of the area in comparison to the actual costs involved in the proposed land treatment and flood prevention measures and the recreational developments.

I, therefore, highly recommend the Bahala Creek Watershed Project and urge your approval of this very worthwhile proposal.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to present my views in support of the Bahala Creek Watershed Project. Located in Lincoln, Copiah and Lawrence Counties, Mississippi, the watershed encompasses 32,340 acres.

The major problems of the area are those being experienced by many rural communities across the country. It is an area of low income and possesses few recreational facilities. In addition, moderate to severe erosion in upland areas has had the double effect of floodwater damages to crops, pastures and fixed improvements in lower areas and increasing the difficulty in constructing and maintaining floodwater drainage ditches.

The approval and construction of the Bahala Watershed Project will mitigate many of these problems.

Their reduction will be accomplished to the extent possible by the establishment of land treatment measures, constructing four floodwater retarding structures, one multiple purpose structure and approximately 21.3 miles of channel improvements. It is anticipated that this construction will achieve the following:

- (1) Increase the income of the low-income farm families and land owners;
- (2) Reduce floodwater and sediment damages to the productive flood plain;
- (3) Reduce erosion of the uplands and stabilize eroding areas;
- (4) Maintain the agricultural lands in the flood plain in a productive condition by making it subject to less frequent floodwater damage; and,
- (5) Increase the recreational aspects of the area.

Mr. Chairman, there are presently 23,257 acres of forest lands located within the watershed, and forestry measures are proposed on 3,975 acres. Measures proposed will include critical area stabilization, hydrologic stand improvement, and acceleration of fire control activities. It is hoped that these measures will contribute to flood prevention and watershed protection by reducing runoff and

stabilizing the soil to prevent erosion. It is obvious that this treatment, if successful, will contribute considerably to the future overall economy of the watershed.

It is anticipated that it will take about five years to complete the installation of the project, but the critical area stabilization measures should be brought to completion during the first two years of the installation period. Certain technical assistance will be furnished by the U.S. Forest Service and the Mississippi Forestry Commission. The landowners themselves will bear responsibility for maintaining the land treatment measures once they are installed.

Land treatment measures and flood prevention measures will also be undertaken, both by the Soil Conservation Service. The floodwater retarding structures along with the channel improvements will be operated and maintained by the Bahala Creek Water Management District. Multiple purpose structures will be operated jointly by the Bahala Creek Water Management District and the Lincoln County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Chairman, the continued growth of Mississippi's agricultural economy is intimately connected with projects such as the one in question and is of vital importance to related industries. At present, the land use of the watershed consists of 2,710 acres of cropland; 4,405 acres of pasture and hayland; 23,257 acres of woodland; and, 1,968 acres of other miscellaneous land. Within this acreage are 900 acres of 16th section forest land and 8,470 acres of industrial forest land. The remaining forest land is in small private ownerships.

Family type farms predominate throughout the watershed. They average about 129 acres in size with an average value of approximately \$16,971 for land and buildings. From 1959 through 1964 the number of farms decreased by about 15 percent with a somewhat smaller increase in the average acreage.

Approximately 58 percent of the farm operators work off the farm as a means of supplementing their income. In 1964, the farm income was broken into 43% farm product sales and 57% nonfarm income for Lincoln County. This is representative of the whole watershed. Industrial plants located in Brookhaven, Monticello, Wesson and Hazlehurst provide some off-farm employment. The opening last year of the St. Regis Paper Mill in Monticello has contributed to the reduction of unemployment in the area of the watershed.

Mr. Chairman, the total cost of this project is \$2,242,000. I believe that this cost is small in comparison to the potential benefit to be derived by the citizens of the area.

At a time when our population is becoming increasingly concentrated in our large urban centers, it is of growing importance that our rural areas retain their appeal in order to prevent further centralization of our population. I believe this project meets all these needs and for this reason I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of this most worthwhile project.

Again, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views in support of the Bahala Creek Watershed Project.

STATEMENT OF HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, I would like to present this statement on behalf of the North Oconee Watershed Project which has been proposed for my district. In the sixteen miles of the watershed—from Lula to Hurricane Shoals—the North Oconee drops from 1,300 feet above sea level to 720 feet. Over the past 140 years most of the topsoil on the neighboring hills has washed down the North Oconee and its tributaries. Twenty percent of the topsoil in the upper half of the watershed and 80 percent in the lower half has been eroded away primarily as a result of bad cultivation and logging practices. Erosion and sedimentation have increased the frequency of floods until today the lower reaches of the watershed are flooded on an average of four times a year—mostly during the spring, summer, and fall when crops are likely to be affected.

If the proposed project is approved, the farming of row crops will be shifted from marginal upland fields to more productive bottomlands * * * and the eroded red hills will be planted with grasses and trees.

Located in the Appalachian Region, this watershed contains some 574 farms which average only 100 acres. Forty-three percent of these farms have sales of less than \$2,500 a year. About half the farmers have to work off their land to supplement incomes.

The project will cost \$2,795,000 in Public Law 566 Funds and I urge the committee to approve this project which will mean so much to the restoration of the land and people near the North Oconee. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. DAVIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement of the Chattooga River Watershed. Inasmuch as the basic details are familiar to the committee, and since others are waiting to be heard, I will keep my remarks brief.

The underlying purpose of creating a watershed is the control of flooding but when we talk about the Headwaters of the Chattooga River Watershed, we are talking not only about too much water but about too little water.

The counties of Chattooga and Walker in my district are not only subject to disastrous floods on a regular basis but are chronically short of enough stored water to serve the needs of growing industry. Both situations have already reached crisis proportions.

As to the urgency of the situation, I would like to direct the committee's attention to the study recently released on the Development of Water Resources in Appalachia. This report, by the Office of Appalachian Studies, takes in all of the water resource needs and projects in the 13 states of the Appalachian region. In making this report, the Office of Appalachian Studies set up four classes of priorities going from the most pressing needs all the way down to projects that can wait perhaps as long as five or ten years.

Only three projects in the entire State of Georgia received the top priority rating which means that they are desperately needed. The Headwaters of the Chattooga River Watershed was one of those three. As a further indication of how pressing the problem is in the area of this watershed, I want to point out that the Appalachian study lists more than 500 watershed projects. Out of that number, only 46 received a top priority rating.

The shortage of water, which this watershed would correct by means of a reservoir above the City of LaFayette, has severely damaged the prospects of attracting industry to the city. Recently industry wanting to locate in LaFayette has been forced to go elsewhere because of the limited water reserves. Not only that, but existing industry has been hampered by the same problem in their efforts to expand.

The future needs of the watershed area can only be met through providing water storage as recommended in the report you have before you.

I therefore urge the committee to act favorably on this project so that the desperate needs of the communities involved can be relieved at the earliest possible moment.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. WENDELL WYATT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. Chairman, this statement is in support of the McKay-Rock Creek Small Watershed Project in northeast Washington County and west Multnomah County.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the McKay-Rock Creek Project involves the construction of two multi-purpose reservoirs in Washington County south and west of the city of Portland. In addition, there will be pumping plants and pipe line for transporting water for irrigation and municipal and industrial use.

McKay Creek Reservoir will have a capacity of 21,500 acre feet with a full pool surface of 310 acres. The Rock Creek Reservoir will have a total capacity of 11,000 acre feet of water and a pool surface area of 700 acres.

Estimated total cost for all structural work is \$10,723,100. The ratio of benefits to cost is 3.2-1.

Because of the heavy winter rainfall in the area, runoff volumes during the winter and early spring are large and often there is heavy damage from flooding. Water volume decreases rapidly during the spring, and by summer these two streams are reduced substantially. In addition, the problem of low summer flow is compounded by the over-appropriation from existing water rights.

Because of this, irrigation is severely limited due to the lack of a dependable water supply during the growing season. Washington County is fast developing as a suburban residential area, but much of the area to be served by the reservoirs contrains some of the most fertile farmland in the state capable of yielding high value speciality crops such as strawberries, cane berries, sweet corn and others. Because of the lack of water, the principal crops at present are forage and grains which require significantly less moisture than do the truck garden varieties.

Water for industrial and municipal use is also limited. Several communities

must purchase their supplies from the City of Portland. The suburban Washington County area is the fastest growing in the state, but without a dependable source of water this growth will be limited in the future.

There also is a very significant need for water-based recreation facilities in the area. Presently some 200,000 persons reside in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development. Facilities similar to this project across Portland in the east metropolitan area have been attracting in excess of 400,000 visitors annually.

I mentioned earlier that flooding has been a serious problem. In addition, erosion from flood waters and sedimentation has caused considerable damage to crop lands, drain ditches and roads in the past. Construction of this project will go a long way toward relieving this type of damage.

A stable summer flow in the two creeks will also help ease the growing pollution problem. Presently the quality of water in both creeks is high, with some treatment required for municipal and industrial use. To maintain this quality, gasoline powered boats will be kept off McKay Creek Reservoir and extra precautions will be taken for sanitation. Because of the relative shallowness of the Rock Creek impoundment, recreation and irrigation will be the primary uses of this water, with nothing taken for domestic or industrial use. The two reservoirs will improve the fish and wildlife habitat, and a hatchery and stocking program will be maintained by the Oregon State Game Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the McKay-Rock Creek Project is not an isolated one. There are plans for ultimate development and use of the entire water resources of the Tualatin Valley. The Scoggin Dam complex on the main stem Tualatin River already is being developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the valley figures prominently in a comprehensive Willamette Valley program being developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I urge the committee to approve this project.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1970.

Hon. JOHN WRIGHT,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Watershed Development, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to the East Upper Maple River Watershed Project currently pending before the Committee on Public Works, particularly with regard to the affected areas lying within the Sixth Congressional District, which includes Shiawassee County and Bath and DeWitt Townships in Clinton County.

The declared purposes of this 169,700 acre project, calling for \$4.9 million in Federal assistance under Public Law 566, are watershed protection, flood prevention, drainage, and recreation. Its sponsors include Clinton County Soil Conservation District; Gratiot County Soil Conservation District; Shiawassee County Soil Conservation District; Maple River Drainage Board; Middlebury-Cravens Drainage District; Drain 142 Drainage District; Drain 38 Drainage District; Bear Creek Drainage District; Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

The project, whose total cost is estimated to be \$10.8 million, provides for measures to improve soil conservation practices, construction of two multipurpose flood prevention and recreation structures, 40 miles of multi-channel improvement, 9 miles of channel improvement with levees, and 1 pumping station. It is further estimated that the East Upper Maple River Watershed will realize some \$2 million a year in annual benefits to the area representing a benefit-cost ratio of 3.0 to 1.

I support the broad purposes of this project and urge favorable consideration by the Committee of this application. At the same time I wish to draw to the attention of the Committee as well as those charged with the responsibility for implementing this project the views of a number of Sixth District residents who have expressed their concern to me particularly with regard to the proposed reservoir in the Bear Creek area. In order that these views may be made a part of the record I attach copies of the correspondence I have received. While recognizing the importance of providing for recreational needs I would further urge that the Committee also give careful consideration to insuring that these are properly balanced with the other needs of the local community and will not adversely affect the natural environment.

The Committee's invitation to present testimony with regard to the East Upper Maple River Watershed Project is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1970.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, House Public Works Committee, Room 2165, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Approval of the Lost River Watershed is scheduled to come before your Committee in the near future.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I received outlining some of the local opposition to this project. I advised Mr. Foringer that I would bring his comments to the attention of the Committee and ask that they be included in the Committee's official record on this project.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON.

JOHN W. B. FORINGER,
Bedford, Ind., July 25, 1970.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
224 Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: The following is additional information pertaining to the Lost River-Springs Valley Conservancy whose desirability and need is now being questioned by 2820 opposing freeholders residing in the counties of Washington, Orange and Martin.

During the spring of 1966 petitions were circulated by Mr. Harold McBride and Mr. Henry Robinson of Orange County, Indiana and Mr. William Baker, Mr. Arthue Chastain and Willard Knapp of Washington County, Indiana and others requesting freeholders to sign a petition asking that additional territory encompassing the Lost River area be added to the already established Springs Valley Conservancy District. During the circulation period of securing freeholders signatures, the freeholders were advised that the purpose of including Lost River territory into the Springs Valley Conservancy was to clean out Lost River for the purpose of better drainage; (2) that the cost of cleaning would be borne 100% by the U.S. Government and (3) the freeholders having farms would be provided with farm ponds free of cost. The petition was then presented through the court and in the presentation there was added a method for the levying of special benefit taxes and "other taxes" to support and maintain the already existing Springs Valley project and the Lost River project. The freeholders were not informed that any tax would be imposed upon them at the time they signed the petition.

During the court proceeding at the time the petition was presented freeholders Mr. Morris Hoar and Mr. Ben Walton both of Washington County and Mrs. Lillian Douds, of Orange County, together with others objected orally to the tax. These individuals were assured by counsel for the Conservancy, Mr. James Tucker, that there would be further hearings to honor their objections. So far no further hearings have been forthcoming.

According to Burns Indiana Statutes 27-1519 entitled—Notice of Hearings must be published in the newspapers 30 days prior to the hearing. . . . etc. and in addition, the petitioners shall mail a copy of the notice at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing, first class postage, prepaid, to each freeholder who has not signed the petition, personal or corporate, shown to own land within the proposed district accordingly to the records of the auditor of the county . . . etc.

According to the Committee in Opposition to the Conservancy this section of law was not complied with since 34 freeholders did not sign the original petition and did not receive notices by mail. There were a total of 192 freeholders contacted who did not receive mailed notices. However, there was no information collected as to whether 158 of these had signed the original petition.

When the 1967 County Tax Notices were sent out a majority of the freeholders learned for the first time that a tax was imposed upon them by the Conservancy. This created the opposition to the Lost River area. The officers in Opposition to the Conservancy consisted of: Henry Holland, chairman, Washington County; Merle Chastain, treasurer, Washington County; Ruth Holland, secretary, Washington County.

Committee Members in Washington County: Isaac Drew, Herman Chastain, Noel Perkheiser, Lorin Zink, and Morris Williams.

Committee Members in Orange County: Clifford Moon, Roy Moon, Robert Martin, Anna Pinnick, Arthur Hill, Dennis Winiger, Melvin Whitfield, and George Sorrells.

The Committee started securing signatures from the freeholders who were opposed to the action taken. They then requested a meeting with the Washington County Soil Conservation Board together with the officers of the Conservancy. At this meeting they learned that a private company (Mid-West Engineers, Inc., Loogootee, Indiana) was developing a work plan to be submitted to Washington, D.C. for approval.

During the year 1969 the Committee was able to secure a copy of the proposed "Work Plan" which was to be submitted to Washington, D.C. for approval. They took the plan to a private engineering firm (Engineers Associates of Evansville, Indiana) for review and counsel. At that time they learned that Engineers Associates had already reviewed one of the Work Plans and turned it down as infeasible. It was at this time that the committee learned that the Work Plan included development for the water needs for the Town of Paoli, Indiana and also a large lake and recreation area for the Sheritan Hotel at French Lick. Such a program would destroy the homes and farms of many of the freeholders. Others in Washington County would receive little or no benefits but would still be supporting the project cost in the form of taxes.

During the year, following the knowledge learned from the Work Plan, the Committee contacted and met with Congressman Lee H. Hamilton, Rodger Zion and Senator Vance Hartke, re: Mr. Tom Brunner bringing to them the desire to discontinue the Lost River territory from the Springs Valley Conservancy and to investigate the appropriation of funds that would not properly serve the area.

On January 7, 1970 a Complaint was filed in Orange Circuit Court by the Committee in Opposition which is now pending. Appearance was entered by Chester R. Hobbs, attorney for the Conservancy on January 28, 1970 together with a Petition for Order of Dismissal, predicated upon the assumption that the plaintiff's action constituted a public law suit and that plaintiff should be required to post bond. Answer to defendants action was filed February 18, 1970. On March 20, 1970 Defendant moved for change of venue and Judge Charles R. Ratts sustained this motion; giving the names of three judges, choice of which could be made by the parties to hear argument on defendants motion. To date no hearing has been set.

In reviewing the head count of the number of freeholders desiring to have the Lost River-Springs Valley Conservancy District discontinued or to have the Lost River area freed from the Springs Valley area total 2,820. This is over 50% of the total freeholders in the whole area. I have been advised by Mr. Holland, Chairman of the opposition Committee that the total number of freeholders, holding one or more pieces of taxable real estate total 5,331. The listing is shown below:

	Number of freeholders in area	Number of freeholders opposed to grant
Washington County.....	261	229
Orange County:		
Stemper Township.....	196	110
Orleans Township.....	351	233
Town Orleans.....	627	425
Orangeville.....	189	132
Southeast Township.....	5	2
French Lick Township.....	685	266
Town of Paoli.....	1,000	525
Paoli Township.....	752	330
Northeast Township.....	156	117
Northwest Township.....	132	85
French Lick Town.....	727	266
Martin County.....	250	100
Total.....	5,331	2,820

The Committee in Opposition are presently minded to pursue this matter to conclusion either on the basis of present litigation or on the basis of misrepresentation on behalf of the activities of the petition carriers and the Spring Valley Conservancy representatives to the Supreme Court, if need be.

The majority of the freeholders in the area do not want this grant of \$4,880,000 approved by the Subcommittee of Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives.

The fact that a majority of the freeholders in this Conservancy have taken legal

steps to withdraw or abolish the unit is an indication that the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee of Public Works may not have received the proper information. Since the majority do not wish the grant they feel that their government should save this money or use it in an area where it can serve the people better.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. B. FORINGER.

Mr. WRIGHT. Now I notice there are some projects listed that have sponsorship among the members of the committee including our colleague Mr. Dorn from South Carolina and our colleague, Mr. Hammerschmidt, from Arkansas.

We would be pleased at your pleasure whatever you would like to do, gentlemen. If you want to insert statements we will certainly accept them that way.

Mr. DORN. Without taking the committee's time, I would just like to ask the committee to favorably consider those projects in South Carolina.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you, Mr. Dorn.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, normally when I have the privilege of being in the company of this distinguished group I am sitting in the main group or one of the subcommittees. But this morning it is my privilege to sit with your Watershed Development Subcommittee for a few minutes in support of three projects that are on your agenda this morning: Spadra Creek in Johnson County, Ark.; Upper Petit Jean in lower Chicot and Sebastian County, Ark., and Upper Ouachita River in Pope County.

I note that you have scheduled as one of your main witnesses this morning a distinguished former Arkansan—I guess he still calls Arkansas his home—Mr. Hollis Williams, who has served the cause of conservation and water research development so well for so many, many years, and this committee has a great witness.

And so in the interest of time I ask for permission to file statements in behalf of each of these three projects with the committee this morning.

Mr. WRIGHT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The committee will be delighted to have your statement.

(Mr. Hammerschmidt's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. Chairman, of the watershed projects being considered today, I have sponsored Spadra Creek, Upper Petit Jean, and Upper Ouachita River all of which are located in my Congressional District.

UPPER PETIT JEAN IN SCOTT, LOGAN, AND SEBASTIAN COUNTIES, ARKANSAS

The proposed project for the Upper Petit Jean River Watershed would benefit Logan, Scott, and Sebastian Counties. It is designed to alleviate floodwater and sediment damage to about 10,000 acres of bottomlands where the damage each year is estimated to exceed \$200,000. It will also provide a dependable water supply for Booneville and neighboring towns and communities. The project is sponsored by three local conservation districts and officials of the City of Booneville.

The work plan calls for the installation of 8 detention dams and one multiple-purpose water supply structure. The multiple-purpose reservoir will have a surface area of 300 acres, and will store 2,500 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water supply for immediate use. Booneville's present water system consists of a small lake of less than 300 acre-feet capacity. During some of the dry summer

periods it is necessary to secure emergency supplemental supplies from the sediment pools of the adjoining Six Mile Creek Pilot Watershed. This is not enough to satisfy the current needs or to offer any incentive for future growth.

The City of Booneville proposes to service nearby communities with water supplies. These include the communities of Waveland, Blue Mountain, Magazine, and Barber. With the cooperation of the U.S. Forest Service, water will also be piped to the recreational area of Mt. Magazine. Mt. Magazine is the highest point in Arkansas, and is within the Ouachita National Forest; it has been developed as a scenic recreational spot.

Construction is now underway on a new building for major plastics toy company, which is located in Booneville. This new industry, which is expected to employ 750 people when fully developed, was secured on the basis of the increased water supply which will be provided by this project.

The people of the area have worked for many years to secure these improvements.

UPPER OUACHITA RIVER WATERSHED PROJECT, POLK COUNTY, ARK.

I heartily endorse the plan for the Upper Ouachita. It is sponsored by the Rich Mountain Soil Conservation District and the City of Mena, and has provisions for watershed protection, flood prevention, municipal and industrial water supply, and recreation. The structural measures consist of two multiple-purpose reservoirs. One of these will be located on the Ward's Creek immediately upstream from the City of Mena. This structure will virtually eliminate damages which often occur within the Mena urban area. The reservoir will also be developed for recreation, with recreation facilities planned for construction on the 20-acre tract adjacent to the 50-acre lake. The second reservoir will include municipal storage for the City of Mena. Mena is a growth center by Economic Development Administration standards, and is experiencing an accelerated growth which will require larger water supplies by 1971.

A large pipeline along U.S. Highway 71 is planned to supply the towns of Potter, Hatfield, Cove, Wickes, and Grannis. The development of south Polk County has been limited because of the lack of municipal and industrial water supplies. Closure of a major poultry-processing plant at Grannis is threatened unless a water supply is provided.

Benefits estimated at \$142,000 annually will serve to enhance the economic and social welfare of the area's residents.

SPADRA CREEK WATERSHED, JOHNSON COUNTY, ARKANSAS

This proposed 30,400-acre watershed project is sponsored by the City of Clarksville, and the Johnson County Conservation District. It is planned to give flood protection for the urban area of Clarksville and nearby bottomlands.

A multi-purpose reservoir will provide a municipal and industrial water storage for Clarksville and the neighboring towns of Hartman, Coal Hill, Lamar, and Knoxville. This additional water supply is a prime necessity for better living standards, for the reversal of the out-migration of rural people, and for the economic well-being of the area.

I am told that at least two major industries in the area would be adversely affected should the Clarksville water supply run short; also that Clarksville has applications under consideration that would put two more communities on the water supply system. These are the Ludwig Community Water Users Association and the Town of Spadra, Arkansas.

These improvements are needed to increase employment in an economically-depressed area, raise the per capita income, and improve the standard of living for the residents of the area. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge approval of these projects. The purposes of the plans serve a real need and the annual benefits will have a far-reaching effect on the entire economy of my District.

Mr. WRIGHT. If there is no objection, at this time the committee might go into executive session for consideration of these projects.

The people from the Department of Agriculture, of course, should remain.

Before we go into executive session, are there any questions that any member of the committee wishes to pose to Hollis Williams or any of his associates with respect to any of these projects?

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any questions on the projects. But I would like to address a question to Mr. Williams to see if we are making any progress in the study of additional benefits that come from the watershed program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Schwengel, this subject is being studied in the Department by the Water Resources Council, and the last report that I have had of which we are a participant they expect to have this ready for application early in the fall.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. One further observation. Recently I had a chance to spend a number of hours in flight to a destination and return in Iowa with the Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin and, as you can imagine, we talked quite a bit about watersheds. I pointed out to him that this whole environmental problem cannot be divorced from the watershed program and in fact it should be considered a major part of it.

I ask you now in view of the great hue and cry to do something about environment, is this getting proper consideration in the watershed program in your Department and recognition?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are giving it first attention, and we have a natural situation in that our main business from the beginning is control of erosion and, therefore, prevent the silt which is the greatest pollutant into our streams. So I would say we are working at the job I hope effectively within the resources that are available.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I knew what the answer would be. You see I know these people, as we all do, as great people in a magnificent department, an important department of Government, and it is becoming increasingly important. We are fortunate to have the kind of leadership that characterizes the representatives of the Department here, especially Mr. Williams.

I yield back my time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Williams, I think you might have an announcement to make to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, good morning to you and the members of the committee. I would like to do three things.

First, I would like to introduce our very, very efficient secretary, Mrs. Linda Sargent. Mrs. Helen Donald has been here before.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would she please stand up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do this because I want to; and also to set up properly some almost grief on her part and my part that I have to announce next that our very competent Harold O. Ogrosky, who stands tall—stand up Slim—in all the work in watersheds, this will be his last meeting before the committee because he has reached what all the rest of us think we are working for—retirement.

Mr. Ogrosky started his work with the Soil Erosion Service in 1935 while we were in the Department of Interior. He has been with the Service since that time. His record is outstanding. He served in the various States of Minnesota, Missouri, and Iowa. He has been in our Washington office for a good long while. He served as chief hydrologist for our engineering division, Mr. Chairman, and received a Presidential citation for the improved techniques and procedures developed or recommended by him in saving money for the Government in connection with hydrology. He also served 3 very good years in the interest of his country in World War II with the Corps of Engineers, and I will not say much more because I might get a little bit welled up.

We are sorry to have Slim leave. He is going to leave a big gap, but we wish him well in his new, I hope, recreational activities to improve the environment and so forth.

Next we have Mr. Larson here for the first time, our colleague in the U.S. Forest Service, as part of this team in the Department of Agriculture.

I thank you for the time you have given me to make these comments.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Larson, we welcome you to the subcommittee. And, Mr. Ogrosky, we certainly will miss you as will the Nation. Your services have been outstanding.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as you all know, I was a former chairman of this Subcommittee on Watershed Development and I want the members to know that I always had full cooperation from the Department of Agriculture. If there is any question that any member of this committee wants, you will get the fullest cooperation from Hollis Williams and his staff.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think every member of the committee would want to echo those sentiments, and additionally we want to welcome you, Linda. We hope that you will accompany these gentlemen on each occasion that they come before our committee.

Without objection, the committee will go into executive session for consideration of the projects before us.

(Thereupon, at 10:50 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.)





