

Y4
Ag 8/1
W 31/4/
972

1010

92/4
Ag 8/1
W 31/4
972-2

WATERSHED PROJECTS

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Storage 20 1972 HEARINGS

LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

JUNE 20, 27, AND JULY 18, 1972

Serial No. 92-LL

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

KSU LIBRARIES



52T20E 0061TV
A11900 302125



1/8 AY
17/18 W
579

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

- | | |
|---|---|
| JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina,
<i>Vice Chairman</i> | PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
<i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi | CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California |
| WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia | WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia |
| FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky | GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania |
| GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas | CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio |
| THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington | ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California |
| ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas | WILEY MAYNE, Iowa |
| JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania | JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota |
| WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina | ROBERT D. PRICE, Texas |
| B. F. SISK, California | KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas |
| BILL ALEXANDER, Arkansas | WILMER D. MIZELL, North Carolina |
| BILL D. BURLISON, Missouri | PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois |
| JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana | JOHN KYL, Iowa |
| ED JONES, Tennessee | LAMAR BAKER, Tennessee |
| JOHN MELCHER, Montana | |
| JOHN G. DOW, New York | |
| DAWSON MATHIS, Georgia | |
| BOB BERGLAND, Minnesota | |
| ARTHUR A. LINK, North Dakota | |
| FRANK E. DENHOLM, South Dakota | |
| SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii | |

- Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Chief Clerk*
 LACEY C. SHARP, *General Counsel*
 HYDE H. MURRAY, *Associate Counsel*
 FOWLER C. WEST, *Staff Consultant*
 L. T. EASLEY, *Staff Consultant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky | CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California |
| ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas | GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania |
| BILL ALEXANDER, Arkansas | WILEY MAYNE, Iowa |
| BOB BERGLAND, Minnesota | |

CONTENTS

	Page
Watershed projects :	
Big Creek watershed, Kans.....	3
Lake Verret, La.....	43
North Sector, Upper Walnut River watershed, Kans.....	7
Red Lick Creek, Ky.....	24
Sweetwater Creek, Tenn.....	11
Union Creek, S. Dak.....	30
West Carroll, La.....	34
Winnebago-Bean Creek, Nebr.....	38
Statement of :	
Baker, Hon. LaMar, a Representative in Congress, from the State of Tennessee.....	22
Blackwelder, Brent, Washington representative, environmental policy center.....	61, 63
Brownell, Dr. C. R., mayor, Morgan City, La.....	50
Carter, Hon. Tim Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky.....	27
Curlin, Hon. William P., Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky.....	29
Duncan, Hon. John J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee.....	21
LaBarre, Floyd A., Napoleonville, La., representing the sponsors of the Lake Verret watershed.....	47
Long, Hon. Speedy O., a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana.....	45
McGowen, Paul O., assistant State conservationist, Alexandria, La.....	46
Passman, Hon. Otto E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana.....	36
Robert, Shelby, Baton Rouge, La., representing the Louisiana Farm Bureau.....	49
Skubitz, Hon. Joe, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas.....	2, 6, 10
Thone, Hon. Charles, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nebraska.....	39
Correspondence submitted to the subcommittee :	
Beter, Robert A., Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, letter of May 18, 1971 to Robert Murray, assistant p-r coordinator, Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission.....	55
Blackwelder, Brent, Washington representative, Environmental Policy Center, letter of Apr. 25, 1972.....	68
Carlson, C. Edward, Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, letter of Mar. 27, 1969 to J. B. Earle, State conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Alexandria, La.....	54
Glasgow, Leslie, L., Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, letter of Apr. 6, 1970 to Mayor C. R. Brownell, Morgan City, La.....	53
Grant, Kenneth E., Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, letter of May 8, 1972, to Brent Blackwelder, Washington representative, Environmental Policy Center.....	69
Graugnard, James D., president, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, telegram.....	62
Hoffpauer, Clark M., director, Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, letter of :	
Mar. 21, 1969 to Ernest C. Martin, Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of the Interior.....	55
Feb. 19, 1970 to Mayor C. R. Brownell, Morgan City, La.....	52
May 17, 1972 to Kenneth E. Grant, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.....	67

Correspondence submitted to the subcommittee—Continued

	Page
Kimball, Thomas L., executive vice president, National Wildlife Federation, letter of July 3, 1972-----	61
Wood, Roy K., Regional Director, U.S. Department of the Interior, letter of Feb. 20, 1970 to Lamar Gibson, director, Louisiana State Parks and Recreation Commission-----	53
Additional material submitted to the subcommittee:	
Resolution of the mayor and council of Morgan City, La., dated Feb. 11, 1970-----	52
Resolution of the mayor and council of Morgan City, La., dated June 22, 1972-----	57
Resolution of St. Mary Parish Police Jury-----	56

WATERSHED PROJECTS

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1972

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 1301, Longworth House Office Building, the Honorable W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Stubblefield, de la Garza, Goodling, and Mayne.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, chief clerk and Fowler C. West, staff consultant.

Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds; J. W. Bean, Assistant Director, Watershed Planning Division; K. R. Klingelhofer, Assistant Director, Watershed Planning Division; and Harris W. Judy, Soil Conservationist, Watershed Planning Division, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

Before we start this morning, I would like to make an announcement that I regret to make. This may be the last day, the last meeting, Hollis Williams will attend.

We are delighted to have you here, Hollis, and delighted to see that you are looking hale and hearty. I trust you are feeling as well as you look.

I know that Mr. Williams is fixing to retire. In fact, he told me so just this morning. He said that he is going up North.

I appreciate your giving me the information, even though I regret that it is so.

Mr. Williams has worked with us a long time. I appreciate the seriousness he has always had in this watershed area. He has been most helpful in the watershed program all over the United States and I think he has done great work in behalf of the people of our country.

The committee will certainly miss your attendance and your help. While we regret that we will not be seeing you officially, we hope that we will continue to see you. We know you are going to continue to be interested in our work, and we will continue to be interested in this work in behalf of our people as you are. We do want you to know that we have appreciated what you have done for us in the past.

Now, we have our colleague and, I might say, our best customer, present today. I used to tell Governor Thomson of Wisconsin that he was our best customer on those gully projects that he had along the Mississippi. However, Mr. Skubitz has reached the point where he and his Flint Hills are all going to have no runoff up there if we just

continue to approve projects for that part of Kansas. I just fear that Kansas will be getting more projects than the Ouachita Basin in Oklahoma if we keep approving them. But he has in the past brought us some good ones. He has two today that we will be glad to hear about.

He has to go to another meeting, so we will get started. We are going to reverse our usual procedure and hear from our colleague right now.

Mr. Skubitz, we will be glad to hear from you.

We have the two projects, Big Creek, I believe is the first one, and then we have the north sector of the Upper Walnut. I believe we have approved about two other sectors of the Walnut, have we not?

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE SKUBITZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. SKUBITZ. I believe that is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, may I add my own comments to yours with respect to the departure of Hollis Williams. I am saddened to hear that Holly is leaving us. I have spent 30 years of my life now on Capitol Hill, as an assistant to Senators and now in this House for 10 years. I have learned that one makes many acquaintances on Capitol Hill but very few close and true friends. I have always considered Hollis Williams a close and true friend—a man who has helped all of us with our projects irrespective of our political affiliations.

Holly, wherever you go, I want you to know that you carry from me the hopes and best wishes for the best of everything.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Joe.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Now I would like to say to this committee that it, too, has been kind to the State of Kansas, because it has always been kind to the farmers regardless of their States. I think one of the reasons we have been successful in securing approval of our projects is due in large part to the interest of our farmers and their willingness to go ahead with these programs. Two of them are before you today in which I am critically interested. One is the north sector of the Upper Walnut watershed; the second is the Big Creek watershed program located in Coffey, Greenwood, Lyon, and Woodson Counties. Both of these watersheds are located within the beef raising section of my State. Both of them have a favorable cost-benefit ratio. I am hopeful that the committee will pass favorably on both of them. I am sure that if you have questions, Holly is more than competent to respond; certainly more than I, to give you the details on either of them.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may submit prepared statements for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the statements on each project will be included in the record for that project. We are delighted to have had you with us, Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I would like to remain, Mr. Chairman, but we have an important executive session of the Interstate Commerce Committee. If nothing else, I make a quorum when I get there.

Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed further, I would like to add my statement of commendation to Mr. Williams for his very outstanding service for so many years.

Thank you.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I also reiterate what you have said We deeply appreciate Hollis Williams' service, and I personally am deeply grateful to him for all the help he has given to me. I have a big watershed in the State of Kentucky; and, Hollis, we deeply appreciate all the help you have extended to us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Now, we will take up the Big Creek watershed.

BIG CREEK WATERSHED, KANS.

BIG CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location.—84,100 acres in Coffey, Greenwood, Lyon and Woodson Counties.

Tributary to.—Neosho River.

Sponsors.—Coffey County Soil Conservation District, Greenwood County Soil Conservation District, Lyon County Soil Conservation District, Woodson County Soil Conservation District, Big Creek Watershed Joint District No. 48.

Total watershed land use.—

	Percent
Cropland	27
Grassland	65
Woodland	4
Miscellaneous	4

Total watershed private owned :

Number of farms—372.

Size of farms—About 370 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 9 floodwater retarding structures. The total storage capacity of the structures ranges from 623 acre-feet to 2,074 acre-feet.

Annual benefits.—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	\$64, 700	70
To agricultural improvements	2, 600	3
To nonagricultural improvements	3, 600	4
Indirect	5, 400	6
Subtotal	76, 300	83
Incidental	5, 800	6
Secondary	10, 300	11
Total	92, 400	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2 to 1. With secondary and incidental benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.0 to 1.

Area benefited.—6,438 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—All or parts of 81 farms will directly benefit from installation of structural measures.

Project costs.—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total amount
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures	\$31, 000	12	\$238, 000	88	\$269, 000
Structural measures flood prevention	978, 000	87	141, 000	13	1, 119, 000
Project administration	329, 000	99	3, 000	1	332, 000
Total	1, 338, 000	78	382, 000	22	1, 720, 000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from funds appropriated for the rural environmental assistance program may be available if included in the county program. For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$1,121,000) increases this to 53 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$109.
Carrying out the project.—The Big Creek Watershed Joint District No. 48 assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$4,100.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, WATERSHED
 PLANNING DIVISION

USDA ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT FOR BIG CREEK WATERSHED, KANS.

SUMMARY¹

1. *Name of Action*

Administrative.

2. *Description of Action*

A watershed project to be carried out by sponsoring local organizations with Federal assistance under authority of PL-566. The project located in Coffey, Lyon, Greenwood and Woodson Counties, proposes conservation land treatment over the watershed supplemented by nine floodwater-retarding structures.

3. *Summary of Environmental Impact and Adverse Environmental Effects*

Project action will reduce floodwater and sediment damages on 8,350 acres of flood plain land; reduce erosion; provide 148 surface acres of water for fishing, recreation and feeding and resting areas for migratory waterfowl at the sediment pools of planned floodwater-retarding structures; eliminate agricultural and wildlife use of 340 acres in the sediment pools; inundate about 8 miles of intermittent stream channel.

4. *List of Alternatives Considered*

- A. Conservation land treatment alone.
- B. Less intensive use of flood plain lands.
- C. Several combinations of structural works, some with channel improvement, and some without.

5. *Agencies from which Comments have been Received*

- U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Environmental Protection Agency.
- Governor of Kansas.
- Budget Division, Department of Administration, State of Kansas (Clearing-house).

6. *Date Draft Environmental Statement made Available to the Council on Environmental Quality*

March 11, 1971.

Mr. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the Big Creek watershed is an 84,100-acre watershed in east-central Kansas, 65 miles south of Topeka. Big Creek begins in northeast Greenwood County and southeast Lyon County, flows east, and enters the Neosho River 2 miles southwest of LeRoy, Kans. The South Fork of Big Creek begins in the northwest corner of Woodson County, flows east, and joins Big Creek approximately 9 miles east of Gridley, Kans. Gridley is the only town in the watershed. The Neosho River flows generally south and east to the southeast corner of Kansas.

Big Creek watershed has gently rolling to rolling topography which developed from unequal erosion of limestones and shales. There is a 300-foot range in land surface elevations. Flood plain alluvium is moderately deep in the upper reaches to deep near the confluence with the Neosho River. Upland soils are shallow to deep with surface soils being silty to silty clay loams. Average annual precipitation is 38

¹ The complete environmental statement may be found in the files of the committee.

inches, but has varied from 22 to 65 inches. Seventy percent of the yearly total normally falls within the 6-month growing season.

The population of Gridley is 330 and the total population for the watershed is about 1,140. Three hundred and seventy-two farming units or portions thereof averaging 370 acres in size are within the watershed. Approximately 85 percent of the farms are owner operated. Sixty-five percent of the watershed is grassland, 27 percent cropland, 4 percent woodland, and 4 percent other. Most of the woodland is on bottomland sites. Seventy-three percent of the watershed area is under cooperative agreement with soil conservation districts and over \$1 million worth of land treatment has been applied.

The production of beef cattle is the major farm enterprise. Predominant crops grown are alfalfa, soybeans, sorghum, corn, and small grain.

The primary watershed problems are upland erosion and flood-water damage to crops, land, other agricultural and urban property, roads, railroads, and bridges. Erosion damage of flood plain cropland is caused by scouring of the topsoil by floodwaters. Potential production on 1,100 acres has been reduced 16 to 30 percent.

Major floods of recent years have been September 1961, June 1967, September 1968, and July 1969. Average occurrence of overbank flow ranges from three times a year in lower reaches to once every year in upper reaches. The flood plain covers 6,400 acres and includes 5,700 acres of cropland valued at \$325 an acre. Crop and pasture damage due to flooding averages about \$72,000 annually and accounts for 67 percent of the total flood damage.

Project measures planned to solve or alleviate watershed problems include land treatment measures throughout the watershed. Such measures as conservation cropping systems, grassed waterways, terraces, diversions, grade stabilization structures, proper fertilizer use, stockwater developments, brush and weed control, proper use of pasture and range, tree and shrub plantings, timber stand improvement, wind-break and shelterbelt renovation, grazing control, proper timber harvesting, and fire control intensification will be included. Structural measures will consist of nine floodwater retarding structures. Floodwater retarding structures will have an aggregate capacity of approximately 10,000 acre-feet of which over 2,000 acre-feet is for sediment storage and 8,000 acre-feet is for floodwater detention storage. These structures will regulate runoff from a drainage area of about 41 square miles or 32 percent of the watershed area. Works of improvement will reduce flood damages by 53 percent over 6,400 acres of on-project agricultural flood plain land. An additional 1,900 acres will be benefited on the Neosho River flood plain downstream from the watershed district boundary.

Total project installation cost is estimated to be approximately \$1 $\frac{3}{4}$ million of which Public Law 566 funds will bear \$1 $\frac{1}{3}$ million or 76 percent.

With total evaluated annual benefits of \$92,400 and total annual costs of \$75,400, the estimated benefit-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1.

The prorated Public Law 566 structural measure cost per acre benefited is \$109.

This concludes my testimony, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. I just wonder if this is the same kind of project we passed for West Virginia some months ago? With the secondary and incidental benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio was 1-to-1.

Mr. BEAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What interest rate did you use in your calculation?

Mr. BEAN. That interest rate was the rate as of 2 years ago, which was $4\frac{7}{8}$ percent, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. $4\frac{7}{8}$ percent?

Mr. BEAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We approved the West Virginia project on some comparable interest rate. I do not remember just exactly what it was.

Mr. BEAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But it was somewhat comparable to this, based upon the average for borrowing of Government money. There was objection in the committee, but the majority voted for the project. I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that this is exactly the same kind of project. Mr. Teague felt rather strongly about that.

When he comes back, if he wants to hear this testimony, he can. We will not take action until we have heard the rest of his testimony. But I do want Mr. Teague to understand that that is what we have here. But we will see that he has that opportunity when he comes back.

Are there any questions?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. No.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, how do you happen to have 65 percent of the area in grassland?

Mr. BEAN. It is a grazing area.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the Flint Hills, isn't it?

Mr. BEAN. Yes, sir. The Hills are mostly in grass; yes, sir.

Mr. GOODLING. And you had all this damage if you had 65 percent of grassland?

Mr. BEAN. Well, actually, the flood plain is in a higher state of cultivation. The flood plain is where most of the crops are grown, while the grazing land is on the hills.

Mr. GOODLING. That is all the questions I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged.

At this point in the record we will include, if there is no objection, a statement by Congressman Joe Skubitz.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE SKUBITZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Big Creek Watershed is located in Coffey, Greenwood, Lyon, and Woodson Counties. This is east-central Kansas and about 65 miles south of Topeka. The Big Creek Watershed has an area of 84,100 acres. Big Creek is a tributary of the Neosho River.

The production of livestock for beef is the major watershed enterprise. There are 372 farming units or portions thereof in the watershed averaging 370 acres in size. Predominant crops grown are alfalfa, soybeans, sorghum, corn, and small grains. Livestock feeding programs utilize alfalfa, corn, and sorghum. The highly productive floodplain soils are used to produce livestock feed.

Gridley is the only town in the watershed. The total population of the watershed is about 1,140 people of which 331 live in Gridley.

Watershed problems consist primarily of upland erosion and floodwater damage to crops, land, other agricultural and urban property, roads, railroads, and

bridges. Floods have occurred in this watershed in every month of the year but usually occur during the growing season. The floodplain covers 6,400 acres and includes 5,700 acres of cropland. All or parts of 81 farms are located in the flood plain area. The flood of September 1961 caused an estimated one-third of a million dollars worth of damages, mostly to agricultural properties. Other major floods of recent years have occurred in June of 1967, September of 1968, and July of 1969.

A major flood such as occurred in 1961, affects everyone in the area due to damage to roads, bridges, transportation, utilities, and loss of business to those serving the agricultural community.

The project consists of conservation land treatment on watershed lands still needing treatment and the construction of nine floodwater retarding structures. Land treatment practices and the retarding structures will reduce flooding, erosion, and sediment damages; and improve soil conditions for prolonged productivity. Average annual flood damages will be reduced 53%.

The local sponsors consisting of the Coffey County, Greenwood County, Lyon County, and Woodson County Soil Conservation Districts, and the Big Creek Watershed Joint District No. 48 have planned the project with technical assistance furnished by the Department of Agriculture. The project is justified by an expected return of \$1.20 for each dollar spent. The sponsors are prepared to assume about \$144,000 of the costs for installing the structural measures and will operate and maintain them at an estimated cost of \$4,100 per year.

I consider the Big Creek Watershed project highly desirable and worthy of your favorable consideration. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you.

NORTH SECTOR, UPPER WALNUT RIVER WATERSHED, KANS.

NORTH SECTOR UPPER WALNUT WORK PLAN

Size and location.—218,506 acres in Butler and Chase Counties.

Tributary to.—Arkansas River.

Sponsors.—Butler County Soil Conservation District, Chase County Soil Conservation District, Upper Walnut Watershed Joint District No. 33.

<i>Total watershed land use.</i> —	<i>Percent</i>
Cropland -----	16
Grassland -----	79
Woodland -----	2
Miscellaneous -----	3

Total watershed privately owned :

Number of Farms.—418.

Size of Farms.—about 580 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms and woodlands; and structural measures consisting of 27 floodwater retarding structures with storage capacity ranging from 255 to 2,965 acre-feet.

Annual benefits.—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)-----	\$146, 500	60
To agricultural improvements-----	10, 000	4
To nonagricultural improvements-----	19, 500	8
Indirect-----	13, 600	6
Subtotal-----	189, 700	78
Incidental-----	2, 400	1
Redevelopment-----	34, 000	14
Secondary-----	18, 100	7
Total-----	244, 200	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3 to 1. With incidental, redevelopment and secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.0 to 1.

Area benefited.—9,980 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—An estimated 6,390 people and about 290 farms will receive direct flood reduction benefits by the installation of the project.

Project costs.—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total amount
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures.....	\$45,000	5	\$835,000	95	\$880,000
Structural measures: flood prevention....	2,301,000	87	352,000	13	2,653,000
Project administration.....	774,000	99	8,000	1	782,000
Total.....	3,120,000	72	1,195,000	28	4,315,000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from funds appropriated for the rural environmental assistance program may be available if included in the county program. For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$1,814,000) increases this to 49 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$184.

Carrying out the project.—The Upper Walnut Watershed Joint District No. 33 assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures.

The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$7,500.

USDA ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT—NORTH AND SOUTH SECTOR UPPER WALNUT RIVER, KANSAS, WATERSHED PROJECTS

(Prepared in Accordance With Sec. 102(2)(c) of Public Law 91-190)

SUMMARY SHEET²

1. Type of action

Final.

2. Agency

Soil Conservation Service.

3. Action

Administrative.

4. Description of action

A watershed project to be carried out by sponsoring local organizations with Federal assistance under authority of Public Law 566. The projects, located in Butler and Chase Counties, propose conservation land treatment over the two watersheds, supplemented by 30 floodwater retarding structures.

5. Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects

Project action will: reduce floodwater and sediment damages on 10,600 acres of floodplain land; reduce erosion; provide opportunity for fishing, recreation, and feeding and resting places for migratory waterfowl at 1,115 acres in sediment pools of planned floodwater retarding structures; improve area aesthetics; eliminate agricultural use and wildlife habitat of 1,115 acres of cropland, grassland, and woods in the sediment pools; inundate about 18 miles of intermittent stream channels; interrupt agricultural and wildlife uses of 3,349 acres in the planned detention pools; eliminate all uses of 220 acres to be in dams and spillways until these construction areas are revegeted.

6. List of alternatives considered

A. Conservation land treatment alone.

B. Less intensive use of floodplain lands.

C. Different combinations of structural measures, including channel improvement.

² The complete environmental statement may be found in the files of the committee.

7. *Agencies from which comments have been received*

U.S. Department of of the Army, Corps of Engineers.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. Department of the Interior.

Environmental Protection Agency.

Governor of Kansas.

Budget Division, Department of Administration, State of Kansas (Clearinghouse).

8. *Date draft environmental statement made available to the Council on Environmental Quality and the Public*

July 6, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Karl Klingelhofer. He is an addition to our staff. He is both a civil engineer and an agricultural engineer. He comes from the Midwest and his home State is Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Klingelhofer, and we hope to see more of you.

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Mr. Chairman, the north sector Upper Walnut watershed is located in Butler and Chase Counties in southeastern Kansas. Walnut River heads in southern Chase County and in north-eastern Butler County and flows southward to a junction with the Arkansas River just north of the Kansas-Oklahoma State boundaries. The north sector Upper Walnut watershed is a 218,500-acre area on the upper Walnut River above the town of El Dorado. The Corps of Engineers' authorized El Dorado Reservoir is near the mouth of the watershed.

The terrain is rolling with well defined drainage patterns typical of the Bluestem Hills. Elevations range from 1,550 feet in the uplands to 1,270 feet at the outlet. The upland soils are derived from limestone and shale. The alluvium in the valleys is deep, dark, silty clay soils.

The watershed is 16 percent cultivated, 79 percent in native pasture, 2 percent woodland and 3 percent other uses. The flood plain, with its better soils, is 82 percent cropland. The average annual precipitation is 32.6 inches with 73 percent occurring during the 6-month growing season.

The watershed population is about 6,387 people with 1,160 living in rural areas. There are 418 farms averaging 580 acres. The farms are predominantly owner operated. The major farm enterprise is beef cattle production using the highly productive flood plain soils to produce livestock feed and the adjacent upland to provide bluestem pastures and balance the livestock enterprise. Current agricultural land values are about \$150 per acre in the upland and about \$335 per acre for bottomland. About 9,980 acres of flood plain lands within the watershed are subject to floodwater damage as often as once each year. Average annual flood damages amount to about \$170,000 of which 71 percent occurs to crops and pastures.

Measures planned to solve these problems include land treatment measures on cropland, pastures, and woodland to retard erosion, improve infiltration and reduce runoff.

In addition, a system of 27 floodwater-retarding structures will be installed to store 23,671 acre feet of floodwater and 3,893 acre feet of sediment. This system will control the runoff from 116 square miles or 34 percent of the watershed area.

These measures will reduce the average annual flood damages by about 68 percent. All or part of 290 watershed farms will directly

benefit by the works of improvement. In addition, about 40,000 acres of flood plain land below the watershed outlet will receive benefits from the project.

The total project installation cost is estimated at about \$4.3 million of which Public Law 566 funds will bear about \$3.1 million or 72 percent and other funds will bear about \$1.2 million or 28 percent.

With total benefits of \$244,200 and total annual costs of \$184,700 the estimated benefit-cost ratio is 1.3 to 1.

The prorated Public Law 566 structural measure cost per acre benefited is \$184 per acre.

This concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to ask you about the same thing, because I am afraid this is the same sort of situation that we had just a moment ago.

When you exclude the secondary and redevelopment benefits, this ratio becomes 1 to 1, doesn't it?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is the interest rate on this one?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. This is $5\frac{1}{8}$ percent, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how is that determined? How did you get that $5\frac{1}{8}$?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. That was the applicable percentage rate when the work plan was written.

The CHAIRMAN. When the work plan was written?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the percentage rate now?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. The rate when the work plan was approved was $5\frac{3}{8}$ percent.

The CHAIRMAN. So that if you used the present rate, this would not come out 1 to 1, would it?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Not quite, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. It was .98 to 1 without the secondary.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Klingelhofer.

Without objection, we will insert a statement from Hon. Joe Skubitz concerning this watershed project.

(Representative Skubitz' prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE SKUBITZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to you on behalf of the North Sector Upper Walnut Watershed located in parts of Butler and Chase Counties, Kansas.

This area is naturally suited to raise beef cattle. The native bluestem pastures and feed grain crops on highly productive flood plain soils combine to support a balanced livestock operation. The streams overflow several times each year damaging crops, buildings, fences, and roads. Most buildings have been moved out of the flood plain to reduce damages.

Sediment and erosion damages are of continued concern to the people in the area. The Butler and Chase County Soil Conservation Districts have assisted farmers to apply over \$1.8 million dollars in conservation land treatment practices to improve the soils and reduce soil erosion and sediment damages. They plan a vigorous program of accelerated application of other needed conservation land treatment costing over \$0.8 million. The combined \$2.6 million comes from other than P.L. 566 funds.

The conservation land treatment will be supplemented by a system of 27 flood-water detention impoundments. Over 6,000 people in the project and many more outside the project area will benefit from these improvements.

The Upper Walnut Watershed Joint District No. 33 has been formed under state laws and will install and maintain the 27 impoundments. The two soil conservation districts will work with the individual landowners in applying the conservation land treatment.

Local support and interest is high, as evidenced by their willingness to contribute nearly \$1.2 million toward the project cost. The project is expected to return \$1.30 for each \$1 invested.

The installation of the proposed plan will provide great benefits to this part of Kansas. I consider it to be a highly desirable and worthy project and recommend it for your favorable consideration. It has been a pleasure for me to tell you about it.

SWEETWATER CREEK, TENN.

SWEETWATER CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location.—37,640 acres in Monroe, Loudon and McMinn Counties.

Tributary to.—Tennessee River.

Sponsors.—Sweetwater Creek Watershed District, Monroe County Soil Conservation District, Loudon County Soil Conservation District, McMinn County Soil Conservation District.

Total watershed land use.—

	Percent
Cropland	24
Grassland	51
Woodland	20
Miscellaneous	5

Total watershed privately owned :

Number of Farms.—500.

Size of Farms.—about 115 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms and woodlands ; and structural measures consisting of 9 floodwater retarding structures and about 42 miles of channel improvement. Storage capacities range from 114 acre-feet to 1,750 acre-feet.

Annual benefits.—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops).....	\$20,900	10
To agricultural improvements.....	1,200	1
To nonagricultural improvements.....	124,900	57
Indirect.....	33,000	15
Subtotal.....	180,000	83
Redevelopment.....	23,900	11
Secondary.....	14,700	7
Total.....	218,600	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8 to 1. With redevelopment and secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.5 to 1.

Area benefited.—2,500 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—About 300 farms, and 165 parcels of industrial commercial and residential properties involving about 14,000 people will directly benefit from installation of this project.

Project costs.—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total amount
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures.....	\$78,000	10	\$710,000	90	\$788,000
Structural measures flood prevention.....	1,700,000	86	280,000	14	1,980,000
Project administration.....	200,000	91	20,000	9	220,000
Total.....	1,978,000	66	1,010,000	234	2,988,000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program. For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$670,000) increases this to 46 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$76.

*Carrying out the project.—*The Sweetwater Creek Watershed District assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$6,600.

USDA ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT—THE SWEETWATER CREEK, TENN.,
WATERSHED PROJECT

(Prepared in Accordance With Sec. 102(2)(C) of Public Law 91-190)

SUMMARY SHEET³

1. *Type of action*

Final.

2. *Agency*

Soil Conservation Service.

3. *Name of action*

Administrative.

4. *Description of action*

A watershed project to be carried out by sponsoring local organizations with Federal assistance under authority of P.L. 566. The project is located in McMinn, Monroe, and Loudon Counties, Tennessee and proposes conservation land treatment measures and the installation of nine floodwater retarding structures supplemented by about 42.3 miles of channel improvement for flood control.

5. *Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects*

Project implementation will: reduce runoff and erosion and improve aesthetics over the entire watershed; protect existing urban, commercial and industrial property in Sweetwater from the 100-year flood; protect urban, commercial and industrial property in Philadelphia from the 100-year frequency flood; reduce flooding on the agricultural land of the Sweetwater Creek floodplain; create about 132 acres of water in the sediment pools of the floodwater retarding dams; inundate about 0.7 mile of intermittent stream; eliminate agricultural use and wildlife habitat of the 132 acres of sediment pools behind the dams; interrupt the agricultural and wildlife use of 226 acres in the detention pools of the retarding structures; alter the agricultural and wildlife use of the area occupied by the dams, emergency spillways, and borrow areas.

6. *List of alternatives considered*

A. No project action.

B. Conservation land treatment alone.

C. Six combinations with land treatment, structures, and channel improvement.

D. Six combinations with land treatment and structures without channel improvement.

³ The complete environmental statement may be found in the files of the committee.

- E. Convert floodplain to grassland, woodland and parks through land purchase.
- F. Floodplain management and zoning.
- G. Flood proof fixed improvements in flood-prone areas.

7. *Agencies from which comments have been received*

- (1) U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers.
- (2) Department of the Interior.
- (3) Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- (4) Governor of Tennessee.
- (5) Tennessee Valley Authority.

8. *Date draft environmental statement made available to the Council on Environmental Quality*

The Final Environmental Statement was made available to the Council on Environmental Quality on December 9, 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, it is our custom, Mr. Duncan, to let the Department explain the project and then ask the members to be heard.

Mr. DUNCAN. I understand, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. So we will ask the Department, if they will to take up the Sweetwater Creek, Tenn.

Mr. KLINGELHOFFER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the Sweetwater Creek watershed is a 37,640-acre watershed located in southeastern Tennessee, about 40 miles southwest of Knoxville. Sweetwater Creek originates in McMinn County, flowing northeasterly through Monroe and Loudon Counties to its confluence with the Tennessee River about 2 miles west of Loudon. This area is in the Appalachian region of the United States.

The topography of the watershed is flat to rolling with low ridges on either side. There is approximately a 500-foot range in elevation from the outlet of Sweetwater Creek to the rim of the watershed. The normal annual precipitation is about 50 inches.

Present land use in the watershed is 24 percent cropland, 42 percent grassland, 20 percent woodland, and 14 percent other. It is estimated that 2,700 acres of bottom land are subject to flooding by water originating from Sweetwater Creek and its tributaries. Land use in the flood plain is estimated to be 1,000 acres of row crops, 900 acres of pasture, 110 acres of small grain, 85 acres of woodland, and 650 acres in urban and miscellaneous uses. The average value of flood plain land is approximately \$400 per acre.

The watershed economy is well diversified. The agricultural economy is tied primarily to producing cultivated crops, livestock and livestock products. The population in the watershed is estimated to be 14,000. The population of Sweetwater is 5,000 and of Philadelphia about 200. There are 500 farms having an average size of 115 acres. About 40 percent of the family type farms are in the low income or economically depressed category.

About 14,000 acres in the watershed are now covered by soil and water conservation plans, with an additional 20,000 acres receiving technical assistance under the going soil conservation district programs. About 50 percent of the needed conservation treatment measures have been applied.

The major watershed problem in the Sweetwater Creek watershed is severe flood damage to farm areas and the urban areas in the towns of Sweetwater and Philadelphia. Floods large enough to be mentioned in newspapers have occurred 20 times since 1875. The largest known floods occurred in February 1875, January 1946, and March 1963. The

flood of March 1963, evaluated as a 70-year frequency storm, damaged about 2,500 acres of farmland and 232 parcels of industrial, commercial and residential property. Continued cultivation of rolling and steep uplands, inadequate cover on some grassland, and poor hydrologic condition of woodlands have contributed to the loss of topsoil in the watershed. Scouring and erosion occurs in the flood plain during periods of overbank flow. Sediment delivered to the channel system is fine textured and is carried as a suspended load out of the watershed.

The planned project consists of accelerated conservation land treatment measures and nine floodwater retarding structures supplemented by about 42 miles of channel work. The retarding dams are located upstream from Philadelphia and control the runoff from 25 percent of the watershed. The planned channel work incorporates various design features to minimize detrimental effects to aquatic life and still provide flood control. Land treatment measures will be applied throughout the watershed and include conservation cropping systems, contour farming, stripcropping, grassed waterways, drainage field ditches, diversions, drainage mains and laterals on the flood plain, pasture and hay land renovation and management, tree planting, reforestation, and stand improvement.

It is estimated that the installation of structural measures will reduce crop and pasture damage about 80 percent on the 2,500 acres of flood plain directly benefited. Other types of flood damage will be reduced about 95 percent.

Total project installation cost is estimated to be approximately \$3 million of which Public Law 566 funds will bear \$2 million or 66 percent.

With total evaluated annual benefits of \$218,600 and total annual costs of \$120,100, the estimated benefit-cost ratio is 1.8 to 1. Without secondary and redevelopment benefits, the benefit-cost ratio would be 1.5 to 1.

The prorated Public Law 566 structural measures cost per acre benefited is \$76.

This concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you, is the town of Sweetwater on Sweetwater Creek?

Mr. KLINGELHOFFER. Yes, sir. It is right there (indicating).

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

I don't believe I have any questions.

Any questions?

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I noticed that a good deal of this work is going to be what you describe as channel work. Is this work of a sort that is going to have to be defended against the claims of some groups that are attacking all channelization as being destructive to the ecology, or can we make a good defense of this on the overall benefit to be received? What kind of work is it?

Mr. KLINGELHOFFER. A good share of this channel work is clearing and snagging—removal of fallen trees and debris which has collected in the channels, causing overflow. Out of the 42 miles, 24 miles of this is clearing and snagging type operation. The balance of the 18 miles is partially enlargement but not totally. It moves from one stretch where they will do enlargement, skip an area and then another stretch

will need enlargement. The plans for this channel work were worked out very carefully with the Tennessee Fish and Game Commission and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This was recognized in the environmental statement; comments were received from other agencies. We believe we can defend this work as being important to the project and not having serious adverse environmental effects.

Mr. MAYNE. It seems that about every 6 months now, we have to defend this kind of project against the charge that channelization is ruining America. I have opposed antichannelization amendments, but I think we need all the information that we can get to bring the facts before the public and our colleagues as to just what is involved, what both sides of this question are. Now, you talk about some of it being enlargement. Is that what is referred to as channelization by the so-called environmental groups? Or is it straightening? Is there any straightening?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Many of the environmental groups will call anything that you do to a channel channelization, but certain measures are more harmful to existing conditions than others. The plans are in this project to work very closely when the final designs are prepared with this Tennessee Fish and Game Commission. In certain reaches, the channel will be excavated only from one side, and they are going to come to an agreement as to what to do with each segment of this channel before construction starts. They have the broad guidelines already established and they are in agreement.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

Mr. GOODLING. One question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOODLING. In line with what Mr. Mayne has just asked you, what provisions do you take to protect the exposed portion of the channel? That is in line with what he is talking about.

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Well, following construction, the exposed side slopes, berms, and spoil areas are leveled, fertilized, and seeded to reestablish vegetation.

Mr. GOODLING. Did you say they are seeded?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODLING. With what?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Grasses which are adapted to the area.

In the work plan here on page 38, it says "Fescue and other suitable vegetation will be established on all improved stream channels requiring excavation. Spoil material from excavation will be shaped or spread adjacent to the channel and fescue or suitable vegetation will be established as needed. Planting will be made on adequately prepared and fertilized seed beds and will be protected from overgrazing."

Mr. GOODLING. That has protected the exposed portion of the channels in the past, has it, what you are doing and what you plan to do there?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODLING. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mayne raised a question that I think we need to have some discussion on and need some information from these people. Mr. Klingelhofer, if you are not the man who can give us the information, we don't want to embarrass you with it, but I would

like to know just how much delay the efforts to meet the environmental and ecological requirements are now causing in our watershed program?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. I couldn't answer that. Possibly Mr. Williams could.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Poage, we have made some efforts in response to similar questions before the Reuss committee and Jim Wright's committee and it is from 1 to 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Causing 1 to 2 years delay?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it resulted in the actual abandonment of any of these projects?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very few, if any. It has resulted in some instances in some modifications, because when you have a contest with other institutions, whether it is the State game and fish commission or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the other organizations that come in for a contest, we have been able by some modifications to satisfy their position with no great extra expense and delay on our part except for the actual time that is required in preparing the environmental impacts.

The CHAIRMAN. That is Federal agencies you are talking about?

Mr. WILLIAMS. And State game and fish commissions and the private wildlife or conservation organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you satisfy an agency that objects to channelization on the theory that you are going to kill the fish in a stream that normally goes dry every summer?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, Mr. Poage, as you know, there are some who are against all channel work and make no exceptions, whether it is a channel in a municipal area that takes excess water from an area that is being flooded, or whether it is channel that is taking excess water from the church ground or the school ground. There has been opposition voiced against all channel work. We have taken the position that that is very unfair, as you know, and we have to consider case by case the merits of any complaint with respect to channel modification. Now, the case that I observed here, that Mr. Klingelhofer was discussing today, is actually on an intermittent stream. Take agricultural land where there is just a wetness in the field—I can recall in my youth how my father went there with a middle buster plow and opened up a furrow to take the excess water out, that is a channel. They have expressed opposition to all channel work, with no exception.

Now, in all of our testimony, with our Administrator appearing before the Reuss committee, we presented all the facts. In substance, it gets down to this, in my experience, you must consider each problem on a case-by-case basis. I have been in Mr. Stubblefield's area where we moved excess water between a railroad and a housing area because there was stagnant water and mosquitoes, et cetera, in that watershed project. Again, they have made no exception, they are against all channel improvement. That is unfortunate.

So what we try to do with the most competent help we have, which includes biologists on our own staff and other assistance, whether it is a range conservationist, or farmer, or agronomist, we have them working with our engineers, tied in with our local people who are helping finance these projects. Then with the provision you put into the law that all these projects must be cleared with our State governments,

we have an opportunity and we do invite the State game and fish commission and other units of State government to participate. As soon as we have an interest shown locally about a project, we invite them in for early participation.

You know the process then requires that all these work plans be referred to the other Federal agencies, like the Department of the Interior that involves the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Geological Survey, et cetera; the Corps of Engineers, and others.

It is through mutual discussion of how the local people feel about the need, plus the technical advice and counsel that is available through these various sources that we arrive at what we think is the best position for the good of that community and the State and, for that matter, the Nation. So, Mr. Bob, it is really a challenge on an individual case basis.

We are trying our best in the Soil Conservation Service, in the Department of Agriculture, as a result of the National Environmental Protection Act to look beyond anything we have ever considered—to be really sure—because we understand the Congress wants us to do that. Being a conservation agency from the day we were born, we have a lot of pride in trying to go forward in the development, in the conservation and the utilization of the land and water resources in that area that will be sound and good for the Nation, protecting the ecology to the maximum—considering all other factors, in other words. It is a judgment of balance between the good that will come, many times butted against any disadvantage that might arise. But a judgment has to be exercised on what is for the good of most of the people in the area with respect to these projects.

I will close by saying that I think our record demonstrates now that we are working with the varied interests to try to reach the best solutions to the problem at hand in that particular area. And it is painstaking and we have had a lot of delays. We have made many, many reviews that have been expensive. You wonder sometimes as an individual—we have environmental impact statements that are 3 inches thick as contrasted to the work plan that may be a half inch thick.

We are revising our old criteria in our watershed work plans. This is where, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should deal with the pros and the cons. I have a personal belief that the time should come, if it requires legislation, that there is really no justification for an environmental impact statement. In other words, the substance should be put in the work plan as contrasted to a separate document. But that is now the rule that we have to submit to CEO and to other agencies these impact statements. I do not want to make a sermon on that subject, but you get some thick ones from the Federal Power Commission—we are getting Encyclopedia Britannica-thick statements that require a lot of time and effort on the part of our staff and expense to the taxpayer. The review may include a highway that is going to be broadened 8 inches. The environmental impact statement will be referred to the Department of Agriculture to make comment as to what impact that might have on the programs that we are interested in.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are experiencing a lot of time and expense and effort to make the environmental impact statements to satisfy varied

interests. And it has slowed down the whole watershed program tremendously.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we wanted to get.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I made full testimony before Mr. Wright's Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the Committee on Public Works. We will be happy to make that full testimony available, because it has charts and really factual statistical data that shows pretty conclusively that we can defend as to what has been the demand on this program. It is in the published hearings of that committee. If this committee could have the time to review that, we will submit it to you in a separate way. I think it is the best accumulation of facts, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be glad to submit the testimony before that committee.⁴

The CHAIRMAN. We have no intention of criticizing the Department on this matter. I don't have any criticism to offer in connection with it. But I did have a group and they were from my State, appear in my office yesterday, wanting more money for what seemed to me to be further delay. I suggested to them that we were killing many of our good programs by delay and I think that its true of our watershed programs more than of most any of the other programs in there. Not that you don't ultimately get a program, but it has been my observation that at the time the people of any area—whether it be Sweetwater Creek or whether it be a creek in central Texas—when the people are deeply interested in a program of that type is the time when we ought to make the program available to them, and if that program drags on for several years with no action, the people lose interest, become disgusted, and the program can never be as successful. Even though it is approved at some later date and carried out, it can never be as successful as it could have been at the time that there was a maximum of local interest.

I think it is also clear that—at least I know it is in my area—that we have minimized the development of recreation of developing our ecology, of maintaining our environment by a lot of hairsplitting arguments about taking care of the fish in streams that go dry every year and about taking care of the beaver in streams where there hasn't been a beaver in the last 150 years. We have had those—I am talking about Texas, not Tennessee, now—we have had that kind of argument from State agencies in the State of Texas. In fact, I had them as lately as yesterday.

To me, these delays are killing the usefulness of our good programs. Certainly, I do not want—I do not think any of the members of this committee want, I do not think our Department of Agriculture wants to destroy the ecology. We do not want to destroy the fishing holes. But let me call your attention to the Tehuacana Creek project in my district. We have 23 dams there now and every one of them is stocked with fish. I have farmed on that creek since 1928 and I have some familiarity with the nature of the creek. I will not say that it has gone dry every summer during that period of time, but I can't recall a sum-

⁴ A copy of Mr. Williams' full statement together with charts and other material may be found in the files of the committee. See also hearings of Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, House Public Works Committee, June 16, 1971.

mer when it did not go dry—when it ceased flowing. Now, a creek does have some holes that water stands in.

And talk about a channel destroying fishing there—it seems to me to be just the reverse of all the facts. We have some pretty good fishing all up and down that watershed now in those 23 relatively large reservoirs that have been built there. Every one of them has been stocked with fish. And there is some pretty good fishing there. The creek flows a great deal more of the year now than it ever did before and I believe by the time we get through with the project, that creek will be flowing the year round. We have seen that on a good many streams. But it sure did not flow during the summer prior to the time we started this project.

To me, those are the kinds of things that are making it impossible for us to do the very things that we need to do. We can give, we can restore a lot of the early environment to Tehuacanah Creek if we get in these 50-some-odd structures it is going to have when we are finished, I believe. If we get all those dams in there, we will have restored a great deal of the ecology. We will have taken it a long way toward the goal of having fish in the stream and game along the banks. But if we are prevented from doing any of those things, if we are denied the opportunity to proceed with the project, we are not going to have any fish and we are not going to have any game, any more than we have now, and we do not have much. Or any more than we had in 1928, when I went out there and began farming on the creek and you did not have even a cottontail rabbit then. The only fish you had were mud suckers and some buffalo, I guess.

Now, that is the kind of thing that is happening to us from an ecology standpoint in the desire of some of these agencies and some of the people who are trying to restore things as they existed in the days of the Comanche Indians, trying to bring us back to that level of game, and it was much lower than it is today. The whole State of Texas did not support but 150,000 Indians, and that was everybody who could get food. There was not enough food to support any more than that. There probably was not one-tenth the number of deer in Texas 200 years ago that there are today. There was not the number of wild turkey that there is today. About the only thing that we had more of was the buffalo. We did have more buffalo. We do not have any now, except those that are on ranches.

But our game, with the exception of the buffalo, has increased, greatly increased, and I think that is true in a good many other States of the Union. Certainly our fishing opportunities are far greater than they have ever been in history, far greater. We have thousands of small reservoirs now stocked with fish. When I was a boy, you had to go to a pretty good sized stream to catch any fish. Then about all you caught was buffalo and catfish and perch.

I think that under this very program of soil conservation, we have been doing a great deal to improve the environment and to enlarge the ecology than we would do without it. We have been building. Now if we are required to stop and invite floods such as Rapid City, if we are to invite that kind of thing all over the country, it seems to me we are taking a great step backward, and I am just wondering, how much effect this sort of thing is actually having on these programs.

I was pleased when you said that it had not caused the elimination of very many flood prevention projects over the United States. I do not

know whether it is true. We were talking about it when the committee convened this morning. You have not had a new project from the 11th District of Texas for the last 5 years, have you? I do not know whether this attitude has caused it. I just wonder if that has contributed to the feeling of the people and of the Department that it is not worthwhile to try to develop any projects because they would be canceled out by those who feel that somehow or other they would change the ecology.

We just wonder about those things. I do not know just why. I know there are lots of untamed streams in my country. We have done a lot of work, but there is a lot more there to be done. I know that 10 years ago, there was lots of interest in this. We had lots of projects before you that you could not even reach because you could not get to them, you could not even survey them. You do not have that situation now.

I think it is because our people feel that it is rather hopeless. What is the use of going out there and bothering, trying to work up a project? You know it will not be approved, you know that by the time you get it done, somebody will come along and say you are killing the beaver, and there have been no beaver in my district—there never were except along the Brazos River. And there have been none in the memory of any man I have ever seen. I have never seen anybody who ever saw a beaver—a wild beaver—in our area. But that is exactly one of the things that is alleged in one of the lawsuits that is keeping you from going ahead with channelization in there. It says the project is going to destroy the beaver.

We do not want to destroy anything, but neither do we want to be denied the opportunity to develop our community because of some far fetched talk about something that does not exist.

Well, I got off too far.

Mr. GOODLING. Right on that line just for half a minute, Mr. Chairman, I think the fault lies in the fact that we have developed too many instant experts in this field of ecology.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have, too.

Mr. GOODLING. Prior to 5 years ago, 99 percent of the people never heard the word "ecology." Now everybody is an expert.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think I have gone through every varied experience you can go through with a watershed project, as Hollis Williams knows. You know, all to often, to add a point to what you have just stated, this interference and opposition comes from outsiders. It does not come from people within the watershed. I have two pending now that have been approved for years, and the opposition is not from within, it is from without. On one of them at a public hearing, the only opposition that came forth, so to speak, did not appear in person. It was a telegram just signed "Duck Hunters."

Off the record.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I think the outsiders are really the culprits in this sort of thing, not the people in the watershed. It is the people who use these areas once or twice a year.

The CHAIRMAN. But people in the watershed pretty soon get disgusted.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Of course, they do. They are still paying the watershed tax. That is what induces them to pull out. They keep paying the tax with nothing happening, you know. For one reason or another,

we have lost the watershed that I guess Hollis knows about. I think we spent about \$3 million on it; and, finally, the Soil Conservation boys just pulled out because they had so much malarkey from the people outside, not the people within the area.

We have some court cases down there. One is in west Tennessee, but it affected me because I have the tributaries. It has been pending for 2 years now. We started out the hearing in Nashville, then moved it to Memphis; and now it is at Dyersburg. We do not know where other hearings will be held. That is the kind of thing that you say wears people out.

The CHAIRMAN. And it leaves the Congressman in the position that he is not going to suggest to the people that they would help things by going out there and trying to develop a watershed, because if he does, they are probably going to wind up with a tax on them and absolutely nothing to show for it. Then the people say "that Congressman told us that he would help us get a watershed, and we just got the tax and nothing else."

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. That is the usual thing.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is not a very popular position to get into. Is there anything further on this?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you very much, Mr. Klingelhofer.

We have two of our colleagues with us who are probably both interested in this project. Mr. Duncan was with us sometime earlier.

We will be delighted to hear from you, Mr. Duncan.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of this committee. I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning in behalf of the Sweetwater Creek watershed project. The citizens affected by this project in Loudon County, Monroe, and McMinn Counties have expressed the hope that the Sweetwater project will be viewed with favor by this committee.

I might say that we have our share of the instant experts Mr. Goodling mentioned and we have heard no opposition to this project. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the main parts of my statement will be somewhat repetitious to those given by Mr. Klingelhofer, the facts and so forth. If I may, I will just ask unanimous consent that I may file my statement with the committee and save your time and not impose upon you.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Your consideration of this entire testimony will be certainly appreciated.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate your attendance and the evidence of your interest.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning on behalf of the Sweetwater Creek Watershed project. The citizens affected by this project in Loudon, McMinn and Monroe Counties have expressed their hope that the Sweetwater project will be viewed with favor by this committee.

The objective of this proposal is to reduce floodwater damage and its corollary effects through the use of conservation land treatment techniques and the installation of nine floodwater retarding structures supplemented by about 42.3 miles of channel improvement. The plan to fulfill this objective closely conforms to the requirements of P.L. 566 (the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954) and the standards developed by this committee for such watershed projects.

First, the Sweetwater Watershed is primarily an agricultural area consisting of 500 privately owned farms which average 115 acres in size.

The owners of these farms are hard working, loyal Americans. Their economic success or failure is tied directly to the prevailing condition of their land.

At present the farmers of this area are not enjoying the full potential of their land due to the nagging fear of severe, periodic flooding. This fear is well founded in fact since the area has witnessed 20 major floods in the last 97 years. The most recent flood caused damage and financial loss unparalleled in the history of the Sweetwater Valley.

The proposal created to reverse this trend is based on local initiative along with Federal technical and cost-sharing assistance. This partnership between citizens and the various governmental agencies involved is predicted to reduce flood damage by at least 80 percent in farm areas and from 95 to 100 percent in the nearby towns of Sweetwater and Philadelphia.

The Sweetwater Creek Watershed project represents a sound financial investment for the Federal government. The people directly affected are not asking the Federal government to throw good money after bad. The \$76 per acre Federal government structural measures investment will insure the improved and continued productive use of farm land valued at \$400 per acre. Clearly this expenditure to save \$17.5 million worth of farm land is in the public interest.

The citizens of Loudon, McMinn and Monroe Counties are not looking for a handout. They are interested in participating in a cost-sharing program of which they are willing to carry approximately 35 percent of the total financial burden. The projected 1.8-to-1 benefit-cost ratio will mean that this project will give all concerned a fair return on every dollar spent.

In conclusion, the Sweetwater Creek Watershed project will help the citizens of my district to gain control of their land and water problems while at the same time offering an opportunity for economic growth. I urge this committee to approve this proposal as it represents a responsive governmental reply to the flood problems encountered by many farmers in my district.

Your consideration of my testimony is greatly appreciated. I am most grateful for the assistance which the members of this committee have given to my district in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baker, do you want to be heard on this?

STATEMENT OF HON. LAMAR BAKER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

MR. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in behalf of this project before my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee. I might note that until 2 months ago, two of the three counties involved in this project have been in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee. They have now been assigned to the Second Congressional District, ably represented by our colleague and my good friend, John Duncan. Nevertheless, this watershed project will have a positive effect on areas of our mutual interest—economically and environmentally.

I would ask unanimous consent to file the balance of my statement, Mr. Chairman. It is repetitious, as Congressman Duncan has remarked on his statement.

I would like to recognize the presence of Hollis Williams, who is unequaled in his knowledge of channelization and objections which have been raised. You will note that if you ask Hollis a question, you will get an answer. We saw a project over in Princeton, W. Va., where

channelization, in my judgment, was a necessity in carrying out the aims of a project where they had a summer dry stream which raged at other seasons of the year, going right through the town of Princeton. Now those areas where the channelization occurred have become productive commercial-industrial areas that provide substantial stability to the community. So often, we seem to be making a choice between human life and comfort and some animal life which I consider God has given them the ability to compensate for a variety of different conditions.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the committee this morning. This in my judgment is a good project, good cost-benefit ratio, and has every element that would commend it to the consideration of the subcommittee.

(Prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. LAMAR BAKER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear this morning during your consideration of the Sweetwater Creek Watershed project.

I might note that until two months ago, two of the three counties involved in this project have been in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee. They have now been assigned to the Second Congressional District, ably represented by our colleague and my good friend, John Duncan. Nevertheless, this watershed project will have a positive effect on areas of our mutual interest—economically and environmentally.

Mr. S. F. Owen, president of the Sweetwater Creek Watershed District and others in the Loudon, McMinn and Monroe County Soil Conservation Districts have worked to develop this project to control flooding of the cities of Sweetwater and Philadelphia and the hundreds of acres of rich farm lands by overflow waters from the Sweetwater Creek for more than ten years now.

They have worked with the Department of Agriculture, State and local conservationists and technical experts and others in developing this effective watershed program which proposes conservation land treatment measures and the installation of nine floodwater retarding structures supplemented by about 42.3 miles of channel improvement for flood control.

The cost-benefit ratio is certainly respectable.

The environmental statement shows that the proposed works of improvement in the watershed are indeed necessary, will enhance the environment in a number of positive ways, and will be a harmonious element in the overall economic development program for these three counties and the Appalachian Region.

I know little about the technical aspects of these matters, but I am advised by top flight soil conservation people that this is a good plan—the best they can come up with—and that it is badly needed. Indeed, I know from talking with the residents of this three-county area that it is badly needed and has been needed for many years.

I believe the merits of this proposal are overwhelmingly evident, and I highly and respectfully commend it to you for your favorable consideration.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Baker. We appreciate your coming up. We are glad for you to sit with us at any time. Under our rules, as a member of our full committee, you have a perfect right to sit with this subcommittee.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are always glad to have you.

Without objection, your statement will be made a part of the record. Is there anyone else who wants to be heard on this project?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If not, we thank you gentleman very much. We will go back to the Kentucky project.

RED LICK CREEK, KY.

RED LICK CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location.—44,660 acres in Estill, Jackson and Madison Counties.

Tributary to.—Kentucky River.

Sponsors.—Estill County Soil and Water Conservation District, Jackson County Soil and Water Conservation District, Madison County Soil and Water Conservation District, Red Lick Creek Watershed Conservancy District.

Total Watershed Land Use.—

	Percent
Cropland -----	10
Grassland -----	18
Woodland -----	70
Miscellaneous -----	2

Watershed privately owned, 98 percent ; Federal, 2 percent :

Number of farms.—329.

Size of farms.—about 125 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed Protection Flood Prevention and Municipal Water Supply.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms and woodlands; and structural measures consisting of 4 floodwater retarding structures and one multiple-purpose floodwater retarding structure with municipal and industrial water supply. Storage capacities range from 228 acre-feet to 3,591 acre-feet.

Annual benefits.—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)-----	\$15,200	17
To agricultural improvements-----	4,200	5
To nonagricultural improvements-----	10,200	12
Indirect-----	2,900	3
Municipal water supply-----	35,600	40
Subtotal-----	68,100	77
Incidental recreation-----	2,000	2
Redevelopment-----	10,600	12
Secondary-----	8,100	9
Total-----	88,800	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4 to 1. With secondary, redevelopment and incidental recreation benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.1 to 1.

Area benefited.—2,303 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—About 70 farm operating units will benefit from structural measures. Municipal water will be provided for a projected population of 20,000 people in Berea and surrounding areas.

Project costs.—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total amount
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures-----	\$36,000	12	\$271,000	88	\$307,000
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention-----	591,000	79	195,000	21	786,000
Municipal water supply-----	21,000	-----	230,000	100	251,000
Project administration-----	91,000	98	6,000	2	97,000
Total-----	739,000	51	702,000	² 49	1,441,000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from funds appropriated for the rural environmental assistance program may be available if included in the county program. For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$175,000) increases this to 56 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$53.

Carrying out the project.—The Red Lick Creek Watershed Conservancy District assumes all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$3,385.

USDA ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT FOR RED LICK CREEK WATERSHED, KY.

SUMMARY⁵

1. *Name of Action*

Administrative.

2. *Description of action*

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention (PL-566) Project includes an acceleration of the on-going land treatment program and the installation of four floodwater retarding structures and one multiple purpose structure for floodwater retardation and beneficial water storage. The multiple purpose structure will provide 2,000 acre-feet of water for the City of Berea, Berea College and the surrounding rural areas.

3. *Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects*

Environmental impact.—Project installation will (a) reduce floodwater, sediment, erosion and indirect damages by about 55 percent, (b) provide an additional municipal water supply for Berea, Berea College and adjacent rural areas, (c) make over 200 surface acres of water available for waterfowl use, (d) improve the hydrologic conditions of the soil, (e) necessitate relocating 10 families from the reservoir and dam site areas, and (f) utilize 484 acres of land now used for agriculture, forestry and wildlife purposes.

Adverse environmental effects.—The project will (a) interrupt or require foregoing agricultural, forestry and wildlife uses on 484 acres of land, (b) create a potential inconvenience to 10 families to be relocated, and (c) inundate about six miles of stream channel.

4. *List of alternatives considered*

(a) Alternate locations and combinations of structures, (b) one large structure, (c) combination of structures and channel, (d) an accelerated land treatment program alone, (e) alternate sources of municipal water, and (f) taking no action, which would mean foregoing an estimated net monetary benefit of \$24,790 annually.

5. *Agencies from which comments have been received*

Comments were received from the U.S. Departments of Army, Health, Education and Welfare, and Interior; Appalachian Regional Commission; and the Kentucky Division of Water for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

6. *Date draft environmental statement was made available to the Council on Environmental Quality*

October 14, 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Carter, it is our practice to hear the explanation of the project from the Department and then hear our colleagues. In that way, we will understand more about it, we think.

Mr. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the Red Lick Creek Watershed is a 44,600-acre area in Estill, Jackson, and Madison Counties in central eastern Kentucky along the western edge of the Appalachian region. Bighill, a small trade center, is the only built-up area in the watershed. Berea, the home of Berea College, is located 5 miles to the west.

Red Lick Creek originates from two main forks which merge a short distance downstream from Bighill and flows east-northeasterly about 15 miles to its outlet in Station Camp Creek, a tributary of the Kentucky River. Upland topography ranges from undulating on the ridge

⁵ The complete environmental statement may be found in the files of the committee.

tops, where elevation may reach 1,600 feet, to steep on the side slopes of the valley. The valley floor is narrow near the headwaters and relatively wide near the outlet where elevation is as low as 600 feet.

There are about 329 watershed farms averaging 125 acres in size. Land values range from \$40 in the upland to \$500 in the bottomland, averaging about \$200. The upland soils are well drained and generally low in natural fertility while the bottomland soils range from poorly to well drained and are more fertile and more suitable for the production of a variety of crops. Land use is divided 10 percent cropland, 18 percent grassland, 70 percent forest, and 2 percent miscellaneous. All the land is privately owned, except 751 acres in the Daniel Boone National Forest. Berea College, a private institution, owns 3,000 acres.

The primary economic activities are devoted to the production and marketing of agricultural products. Most of the farm income is derived from the sale of tobacco, corn, timber, and livestock. Off-farm income is provided by small industries and service-type businesses located in nearby population centers. The average per capita income of the area is well below the State and national average. The unemployment rate is about 7 percent compared to a State average of 5.1 percent.

Floodwater and sediment damages occur on 2,303 flood plain acres in Red Lick Creek and 980 acres on Station Camp Creek. Damages are to crops, pastures, stream channels, roads, bridges, fences, and other fixed improvements. Indirect floodwater and sediment damages result from the disruption of traffic, loss of income or wages, and similar constraints on farmers, businesses, and individuals. The estimated total annual flood damages are \$51,110.

Additional municipal and industrial water is needed for the city of Berea, Berea College, and adjacent areas.

The project includes accelerated land treatment measures to retard erosion and improve infiltration. The installation of four floodwater retarding structures and one multiple-purpose floodwater retarding and water-supply structure will control the runoff from 21.8 square miles or 31 percent of the watershed.

These measures will reduce floodwater, sediment, and scour damages by 55 percent on 2,303 acres of flood plain. Seventy farms will receive damage reduction benefits. About 338 acres can be managed more efficiently for crop production.

Multiple-purpose structure 1 will provide 2,000 acre-feet of water for Berea, Berea College, and adjacent areas to meet current and projected needs. Floodwater-retarding structure 13 will create a lake attracting 4,250 visitor-days of fishing per year.

The total installation cost is estimated at \$1.4 million, of which Public Law 566 funds will bear just over \$739,000 or 51 percent, and other funds will bear about \$702,000 or 49 percent.

The total annual benefits of \$89,500 when compared to the total annual cost of \$64,700 provide a benefit-cost ratio of 1.4 to 1. With secondary, redevelopment, and incidental recreation benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.1 to 1. The prorated Public Law 566 structural measure cost per acre benefited is \$53.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bean, I am just wondering about this 1.1-to-1, benefit-to-cost ratio. Of course, that meets the statutory requirement, but on what interest rate is that calculated?

Mr. BEAN. That is the rate, Mr. Chairman, at 5 $\frac{3}{8}$ percent, which is the rate that the Water Resource Council has given us for use in the

current fiscal year. We have also computed this benefit-cost ratio in accordance with the instructions the committee gave us at the time we considered holdover plans at the last hearings. It would be 1.4 to 1 at the current rate at which the Federal Government borrows money.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. GOODLING. One question, Mr. Chairman.

I notice 70 percent of the area is in woodland. What do you do; what is your practice in woodland?

Mr. BEAN. We get the practices on the woodland from the Forest Service. I will look up and see what they are in this plan.

The forest land treatment program for private land is aimed at improving hydrologic conditions by excluding livestock through a fencing program of 1,800 acres to protect the existing timber stands. They will have—they already have and will continue—a cooperative fire control program providing assistance valued at \$8,300 during the installing period. Those are the basics. It is not a large conservation program on the forest land. There is not a great deal you can do other than manage the forest and prevent grazing and control fires on the forest land.

Mr. GOODLING. Do you control grazing and do not allow it to graze to the extent that you are going to have a lot of erosion?

Mr. BEAN. Yes, sir. Of course, this is a recommended practice that not only the Forest Service, but the Soil Conservation Service promotes in all of our work with landowners, to keep the cows out of the woods that are being managed for timber.

Mr. GOODLING. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions of you, Mr. Bean, we are very much obliged to you.

Now we have our colleague, Mr. Carter, with us.

We will be delighted to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. TIM LEE CARTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of this subcommittee. I want you to know that it is good to be before such a distinguished group of people who have done so much for our country.

I am here, of course, in support of the Red Lick Creek watershed project. This would greatly benefit the people in the Kentucky counties of Estill, Jackson, and Madison. These are all fine people in this area and let me say at the outset that these good citizens support this project very strongly. There is no opposition that I know of. This project contains 44,660 acres, as my friend just stated, and it will also provide a much needed water supply for the city of Berea, for a portion of Madison County, and for portions of Jackson and Estill Counties.

In the city of Berea is Berea College, which was established in 1855 for poor mountain boys and girls from all through the Appalachian chain. Every student who goes there is required to work a certain amount every day. The school has been of great help to the people of that area and to the United States. This watershed project would pro-

vide water for the college and for the city of Berea. I would like to invite the members of this committee to visit Berea and see what a wonderful school they have there.

I would like to invite them to be my guests at Boone Tavern. This is a famous old hotel and restaurant. By the way, the name "tavern" does not mean that they serve hard liquor. They do not, or any kind of alcoholic beverages. But it is just a wonderful hotel, manned by the students of Berea College, serving the best food, old fashioned food, in the United States. I would like for you just to come to see this wonderful area and the wonderful school there.

Gentlemen, this project is necessary to the economy of this area. Berea is on Interstate Highway 75 and is a growth area. The water is badly needed. There is no opposition from anyone that I know of. I strongly urge approval.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that in listening to what you said concerning ecologists and environmentalists and so on, I was born on a small farm in Kentucky. In early life, I obtained the ownership of a farm there, and with a conservation agent, I started practices consistent with the teachings of the Department of Agriculture. One of the first things we did was to terrace eroded areas to protect the farm according to guidelines set down by members of this committee and the Department of Agriculture. Something which the ecologists and environmentalists should know is, with the approval and with the advice of the conservation agent, we set out multiflora rose over a large area of the farm to protect the bird life and wild animal life of all kinds. These are some of the things that you people have done for the ecology and for the environment and to beautify our country and to turn it green.

Furthermore, your assistance in building reservoirs and small lakes throughout our area, you have improved the recreation for that area. Fishing has been improved and these reservoirs serve as a supply of fish to streams in the area when they overflow. I think there is a plus to all of your actions and not a negative effect on your environment.

I trust you will forgive my going into this area, but I felt impelled to by your remarks.

I want to thank you for the opportunity of being before you and urge your approval of this project.

(Prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. TIM LEE CARTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of this subcommittee, I appreciate having the opportunity to appear before this distinguished body today. I am here to express my support for the Red Lick Creek Watershed Project, which would greatly benefit the people in the Kentucky Counties of Estill, Jackson, and Madison. These are all fine people in this area and let me say at the outset that these good citizens support this project very strongly. The Red Lick Watershed contains 44,660 acres in the three county area and the approval of this project would directly and indirectly benefit 329 farms.

As with most other watershed projects which you have considered, the Red Lick project would provide badly needed flood control and soil conservation. In this area of Kentucky, we are faced with severe erosion on the steep slopes and many of the bottom lands are badly in need of drainage correction.

Additionally, a much needed water storage facility would be provided for the City of Berea and southern Madison County. Pure water supplies are a great problem throughout my entire district. I believe that, as with the flood control,

this project will prove to be a great boon to the inhabitants of the area by providing an adequate supply of water.

It is my belief that the establishment of this watershed project on the Red Lick Creek, which is a tributary to the Kentucky River, will help to reduce the tragic toll from flooding that occurs on an almost yearly basis. I submit that the Cost-Benefit ratio of 1.4 to 1 will be even more favorable because of the positive effects this project will have on areas downstream on the Kentucky River.

Watershed projects are badly needed to improve the life of the good people who derive their well-being from the soil. I believe that this project is another step in the right direction. I respectfully urge your approval of the Red Lick Watershed Project.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Carter. We are always glad to have you come visit our committee. We would like to have you any time.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Our colleague, Mr. Curlin, has asked to have a statement inserted at this point in the record. Without objection, that will be inserted.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM P. CURLIN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to express my support for a project before you this morning: the Red Lick Creek Watershed. This is a multiple-purpose project with a substantial number of benefits and almost no detrimental effects, save the relocation of ten families. It has been my experience, and I am sure it has been yours, that while any family is reluctant to move from its home or farm, these changes have a way of working out well after they take place. So I would say to you that the supposed detrimental effect might not be so detrimental after all.

The positive aspects of this watershed project include much-needed flood control and an absolutely essential water storage facility for the growing community of Berea, Kentucky, and Berea College which is located there. These benefits are beyond the agricultural benefits which naturally accrue from all such projects as this. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.4:1, which translates in money to an annual plus of \$24,790.

Mr. Chairman, I want to especially commend the planners of this project for designing it in a number of small units instead of asking for a high dam downstream. This proposal has a minimum adverse impact on agriculture and the environment: it achieves the goals of flood control and water storage without disrupting the ecology of the valleys and at the same time it opens flood plain to stable agriculture.

The planners were also able to provide one impoundment on Owsley Fork where water storage for Berea can be taken care of without extensive disruption. I believe most Americans at some time have heard of Berea College—founded in 1855 to provide higher education for the children of the mountain. No tuition was required, but the students all worked for their keep, a tradition that continues today. There are a hundred buildings on the Berea Campus, and its water needs are growing. The adjacent town of Berea, lying as it does alongside Interstate 75, is growing very swiftly and new industry is seeking to locate there. This new water source would insure its future.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this hard-work college and this independent mountain town are the very sort of institutions that this committee hoped to encourage in the Rural Development Act we passed earlier this year. I believe that we can give this movement some encouragement right here with this small watershed project.

In its documentation of the effects of the impoundments the Soil Conservation Service addresses itself to local flood control benefits. Let me tell this committee that any flood control along the Red Lick Creek is going to be appreciated by hundreds of thousands of people downstream on the Kentucky River. A few months ago the Kentucky River went out of its banks causing millions of dollars of damage and prompting the designation of a number of our counties as disaster areas. If these impoundments can reduce that threat even a little the benefit-cost ratio moves up substantially.

8 Mr. Chairman, it should be brought to the attention of the committee that in the congressional redistricting of this year Madison County—the chief beneficiary of this project—was transferred to the Fifth Congressional District, which is ably served by our colleague, Dr. Tim Lee Carter. Because of our past association with this project and the future benefits downstream and the petitions for support which have come to me from the residents of Madison County, I offer this statement of my support at this time. I hope that this committee will be able to give Dr. Carter an ongoing watershed development.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Off the record.
(Off-the-record discussion.)

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I want to join the good doctor in inviting the subcommittee down to Berea. It is a real useful school of national repute. You have to work to get through it.

The CHAIRMAN. It might be the only place in the United States where you have to work.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. It is really a successful operation.

Mr. CARTER. I want to thank my distinguished colleague. He is one of the men I admire most in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the distinguished gentleman for his eloquent statement. The obvious care with which he has prepared his testimony and the personal experience that he has had in this field—I refer now to the field of conservation—certainly adds a great deal of value to it. I think his appearance here today has been characteristic of the excellent service that he always gives the people of his district.

Thank you.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you. If I might say, Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman. I feel very humble.

The CHAIRMAN. We are delighted to have had you, Mr. Carter.

Is there anyone else to be heard on the Red Lick Creek?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If not, we will pass to Union Creek, S. Dak.

UNION CREEK, S. DAK.

UNION CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location.—30,300 acres in Union County.

Tributary to.—Big Sioux River.

Sponsors.—Union Creek Watershed District, Union County Conservation District.

Total watershed land use—

	<i>Percent</i>
Cropland	77
Grassland	18
Miscellaneous	5

Total watershed privately owned:

Number of Farms.—128.

Size of Farms.—about 240 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed protection and flood prevention.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of 4 floodwater retarding structures, 13 grade stabilization structures and about 1.6 miles of channel improvement. The total storage capacities range from 203 acre-feet to 1,147 acre-feet.

Annual benefits.—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops).....	77,900	86
To agricultural improvements.....	2,100	2
To nonagricultural improvements.....	3,000	3
Indirect.....	3,400	4
Subtotal.....	86,400	95
Secondary.....	4,400	5
Total.....	90,800	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8 to 1. With secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.7 to 1.

Area benefited.—7,440 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—About 41 landowners will benefit directly from installation of structural measures.

Project costs.—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total amount
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures.....	\$36,000	16	\$241,000	84	\$287,000
Structural measures: Flood prevention...	627,000	81	145,000	19	772,000
Project administration.....	117,000	98	2,000	2	119,000
Total.....	790,000	67	388,000	33	1,178,000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from funds appropriated for the rural environmental assistance program may be available if included in the county program. For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$239,000) increases this to 44 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$86.

Carrying out the project.—The Union Creek Watershed District assumes all local responsibilities for installing operating and maintaining the structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$2,700.

USDA ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT—UNION CREEK WATERSHED

(Prepared in Accordance with Sec. 102(2)(C) of Public Law 91-190) Summary Sheet⁶

1. *Type of action.*

Final.

2. *Agency Soil Conservation Service.*

3. *Name of action.*

Administrative.

4. *Description of action.*

The Union Creek Watershed for flood control and land stabilization is located in Union County, South Dakota.

5. *Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects*

The conservation land treatment and land stabilization measures will reduce the erosion rates, protect 4,800 acres of upland from land destruction and depreciation. Floodwater and sediment damages will be reduced by 80 percent. The sediment entering Lake Nixon will be reduced 18,700 tons annually and the sediment leaving the Watershed will be reduced 80 percent. The floodwater retarding and grade stabilization pools provide recreational opportunities and

⁶ The complete environmental statement may be found in the files of the committee.

increase the habitat for waterfowl and aquatic furbears. The increased and improved vegetative cover will provide more and better upland wildlife cover.

The increased net income of the owners and operators in the Watershed will improve the economy of the area and enhance standard and quality of living in the rural area.

The adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided are about 5 miles of intermittent stream channel, 40 acres of cropland, and 55 acres of grassland which will be inundated by the sediment pools. Agricultural and wildlife use will be periodically interrupted in the floodwater detention pools. The use of 50 acres of land in dams, spillways, and grade stabilization structures will be temporarily lost to agriculture and wildlife until the areas are re-vegetated.

6. *Alternatives considered*

The following alternatives were considered: Less intensive use of the land such as grassland, use of more and larger floodwater retarding structures, channel enlargement in lieu of floodwater retarding structures, install only conservation land treatment and land stabilization measures.

7. *The following federal and state agencies provided written comments*

The Department of Army, Corps of Engineers, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Department of the Interior, South Dakota Water Resources Commission, acting on behalf of the Governor.

8. *Date draft environmental statement made available to the Council on Environmental Quality*

April 8, 1971.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Klingelhofer, I believe you will present this.

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Union Creek watershed contains 30,300 acres and is located in Union County which is in the extreme southeastern corner of the State. It is about 30 miles north of Sioux City, Iowa, and about 35 miles south of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Union Creek is a direct tributary to the Big Sioux River which in turn is tributary to the Missouri River.

The economy of the area is almost completely dependent upon agricultural enterprises with livestock feeding and cash grain crops the major source of income. Soybeans is the principal cash grain crop. There are 128 farms in the watershed averaging about 240 acres in size. Land values range from about \$275 per acre in the uplands to about \$325 per acre in the bottomlands. All of the land is in private ownership.

Damages occur nearly every year from floods caused by either summer storms or from snowmelt. In addition to damages to crops, land and fixed improvements, the intensity of use of much of the flood plain is below its capability because of the flood hazards.

Erosion is also a serious problem in the watershed. Sheet erosion rates are as high as 43 tons per acre annually on cropland, and gullies are extremely active in many parts of the watershed. It is estimated that 59,000 tons of sediment are delivered to the Big Sioux River each year from this watershed.

The plan proposed an intensive land treatment program to reduce erosion and retard runoff. This will include such conservation practices as terracing, contour farming, minimum tillage, permanent grass cover and crop residue use. In addition, the project proposes the installation of four floodwater retarding structures, 13 grade stabilization structures and about 1.6 miles of channel improvement.

Installation of the project measures will reduce average annual floodwater and sediment damages by about 80 percent. In addition to

the reduction of damages on the 2,600 acre flood plain, about 4,840 acres will receive protection from land voiding and depreciation caused by the advancing gullies. The sediment delivered to the Big Sioux River will be reduced to about 1,200 tons annually. Forty-one farm owners and operators will be directly benefited by the structural measures.

The total project costs are estimated to be \$1,178,000 with Federal assistance amounting to about \$790,000 or 67 percent. The prorated structural cost per benefited acre is \$86. Benefits resulting from the project are estimated to be \$90,800 annually, with a resultant benefit-cost ratio of 1.8 to 1. With secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.7 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions on this Union Creek?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This project seems to be almost entirely for agricultural benefit, does it not?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYNE. At least, from what I heard in your presentation and from what I know of that general area which is, of course, immediately bordering on the Sixth District of Iowa, it would seem to me that that would be true, that it would be entirely pointed toward the preservation of the agricultural economy there.

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYNE. Are these principally earthen structures, grass structures? I did not hear any reference to any creek dams or large retention structures. What is the situation as to that?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. Well, there are four structures which are the more or less conventional floodwater retarding structures, earth dams with pipe principal spillways. There is one here, one there (indicating).

Mr. MAYNE. But it is principally use of soil and grass terracing to achieve this result?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. It is a combination of the land treatment measures which are terracing and contour farming and so forth, and then these structures to control gullies and to retard the flood runoff from the drainage areas. This one structure right here (indicating) on this main branch is a little different from the rest in that it is primarily a concrete structure, strictly grade control, in the main channel here. It passes the water through about as fast as it comes down the stream and drops it safely to the channel below. The others are all earth dam structures.

Mr. MAYNE. Have you seen this area personally?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. I have been through the general area, but not in this particular watershed. I worked in Minnesota for 5 years.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, from your description of it, I cannot see how there could be any reasonable protest from any ecological group to this kind of activity, can you?

Mr. KLINGELHOFER. No.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Mayne.

If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Klingelhofer.

We will pass to the next project, which is West Carroll, Louisiana.

WEST CARROLL, LA.

WEST CARROLL WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and Location.—248,900 acres in Richland and West Carroll Parishes.

Tributary to.—Boeuf River.

Sponsors.—Richland Parish Policy Jury, West Carroll Parish Police Jury, Northeast Soil and Water Conservation District, Boeuf River Soil and Water Conservation District.

Total Watershed Land Use.—

	Percent
Cropland	71
Grassland	9
Woodland	14
Miscellaneous	6
Total	100

Watershed privately owned, 100 percent; Non Federal-Public Land, 115 acres.

Number of farms.—1,700.

Size of farms.—about 145 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed Protection, Flood Prevention and Drainage.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms and woodlands, and structural measures consisting of about 360 miles of stream channel improvement and approximately 16 grade stabilizing structures.

Annual benefits.—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops)	\$1, 635, 200	86
To nonagricultural improvements	46, 800	2
Subtotal	1, 682, 000	88
Redevelopment	39, 300	2
Secondary	184, 700	10
Total	1, 906, 000	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.8 to 1. With secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 4.4 to 1.

Area benefited.—172,400 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—About 1,000 landowners will be directly benefited from installation of structural measures.

Project costs.—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total amount
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures	\$445, 000	12	\$3, 348, 000	88	\$3, 793, 000
Structural measures:					
Flood prevention	2, 190, 000	64	1, 223, 000	36	3, 413, 000
Drainage	702, 000	34	1, 369, 000	66	2, 071, 000
Project administration	632, 000	88	85, 000	12	717, 000
Total	3, 969, 000	40	6, 025, 000	60	9, 994, 000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program.

For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$2,230,000) increases this to 68 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$18.

Carrying out the project.—The Richland and West Carroll Parish Police Juries assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures within their respective parishes.

The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$60,800.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT—WEST CARROLL WATERSHED, LOUISIANA

1. *The probable impact of the project on the environment*

Watershed protection for 224,600 acres of farm land in the watershed will be provided by conservation land treatment. The average yearly loss of more than 18,000 tons of soil from the watershed will be significantly reduced.

Structural measures consist of approximately 360 miles of channel improvement with appurtenant erosion control and maintenance access structures and 16 grade stabilization structures. These measures will provide improved drainage and flood protection to about 172,400 acres. The installation of the erosion control measures will prevent the creation of small lateral gullies which occur throughout the watershed where a concentration of water enters a deeper channel. The placement of grade stabilization structures in the outlet ends of channels tributary to Boeuf River will contribute to the reduction of channel erosion and serve as sediment traps to reduce sedimentation and turbidity in Boeuf River.

Damaging out-of-bank floods occur three or four times a year in the watershed and affect more than 1,000 farms. After project installation, the major part of the flood plain will be protected from flooding more often than once in about four years. This level of protection will reduce flood damages by about 90 percent.

2. *Adverse Environmental Effects*

Construction of the channels in the watershed will cause a temporary loss in vegetative cover which will result in some loss to the wildlife resources. Re-vegetation will be accomplished immediately after construction, and will minimize the wildlife losses.

No other adverse environmental effects of the project have been identified.

3. *Alternatives to the proposed action*

There is no apparent alternative to agricultural production as the major economic enterprise in the watershed nor are there many alternatives for solving the floodwater and drainage problems. Diversion of flows from one outlet to another, supplemented by earthen plugs was considered as an alternative solution, but would be more costly and less effective in channel stabilization.

4. *The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity*

The lands in this watershed are dedicated primarily to agricultural production with cropland occupying more than 70 percent of the watershed. This pattern is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. Future developments by urban and industrial interests are expected to be minimal, with the watershed remaining primarily agricultural. The project will preserve land for future use as well as enhance present production.

5. *Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources*

The action proposed in this project is not expected to cause any change in the commitment of resources, since land uses will remain essentially unchanged and no mineral or other natural resources are known to be affected.

6. *Problems and Objections Raised by Other Federal, State and Local Agencies*

Interested agencies have reviewed the work plan for this project in accordance with prescribed procedures and regulations. The Department of the Interior has expressed concern over the extensive channel construction and the consequent intensive agricultural operations. They are primarily fearful that increased nutrients, sediment, and pesticides transported in waters of the area will cause a degradation of water quality. To protect water quality during construction of channels, all contractors will be required to adhere to guidelines for minimizing soil erosion and water and air pollution as set forth in Soil Conservation Service, "Engineering Memorandum-66". The Soil Conservation Service, through the local

Soil and Water Conservation Districts will place emphasis on the proper management and use of pesticides and fertilizers by farmers of the area. Finally, the movement of fertilizers, sediment and pesticides from the area will decrease as soil and water are conserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Our colleague, Mr. Passman, has asked to submit a statement in that connection and without objection, Mr. Passman's statement will be made a part of the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, I am deeply grateful for your courtesy in permitting me to submit a statement in behalf of the West Carroll Watershed located in West Carroll and Richland Parishes, Louisiana, in my Congressional District.

The West Carroll Watershed includes 248,900 acres in these two Parishes. Seventy-one percent of this area is cropland, nine percent pasture and grassland, fourteen percent woodland, and six percent miscellaneous. No federal lands are located within the watershed, and 115 acres are public lands. There are 1,700 farms in the West Carroll Watershed area with an average acreage of 145. The economy is based primarily on farming, with the major sources of farm income coming from cultivated crops, chiefly soybeans, cotton, and truck.

The purposes of the project are flood protection, erosion control, and drainage of farmland. Structural improvements consist of about 360 miles of stream channel improvement, erosion, and flood control.

This project was first submitted on July 29, 1970. Since that time it has been held by the Office of Management and Budget for study of its environmental impact.

On this aspect, to quote from a resolution of the West Carroll Parish Police Jury, "[this project] will do nothing but help the environment by greatly reducing the vast flooding conditions which [have] consistently created erosion problems * * *" (Police Jury of West Carroll Parish, January 4, 1972.)

Over one-half of the farms in the area are small, less than fifty acres in size, and the average annual gross income of all households in the area is \$7,624. The Work Plan submitted states that flooding and inadequate drainage, which decrease efficiency and prevent expansion of farm operations, are major factors contributing to the low income within the watershed.

The proposals set forth in the Work Plan were prepared by the Boeuf River Soil and Water Conservation District, the Northeast Soil and Water Conservation District, the Richland Parish Police Jury, and the West Carroll Parish Police Jury with technical assistance furnished by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The benefit-cost ratio of the West Carroll Watershed is extremely favorable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge your committee's favorable action on this project, and may I say again that I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded me to present my views in favor of this worthy project.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bean, you may proceed.

MR. BEAN. The West Carroll Watershed is a 248,900 acre area in northeastern Louisiana, adjoining the Arkansas State line. About 90 percent is in West Carroll Parish and the remainder in Richland Parish. The city of Monroe, La., is about 40 miles to the southwest. The watershed is bounded on the east by Bayou Macon and on the west by Boeuf River. Drainage is generally from north to south.

The topography is nearly level to rolling. There are no perennial streams in the watershed. About 50 miles of Big and Colewa Creeks are below the water table, with permanent water of significant fishery habitat. Big and Colewa Creeks are these channels right here (indicating). Soils tend to be somewhat poorly drained but are highly productive. About 80 percent of the area is in crops and pasture. The average annual rainfall is about 52 inches.

The Boeuf River is entrenched as much as 20 feet below the level of adjacent land. Channels leading into it generally have severe channel erosion problems. Other deep channels in the watershed have similar problems to a lesser degree.

The watershed economy is based primarily on farming. The largest town is Oak Grove, the parish seat, population 1,800. About 8,000 people live in other rural towns and communities and about 6,400 people live on farms. There are about 1,700 farms averaging 145 acres, the majority being family farms. All land is privately owned except 115 acres owned by the Tensas Basin Levee District. Farmland is valued at about \$325 per acre, while the average of all land is about \$230 per acre.

The major source of farm income results from the growing of cultivated crops, chiefly soybeans, cotton and truck crops. Tomatoes and sweet potatoes are grown on the higher, better drained soils. Soybeans elevators, cotton gins, sweet potato processing, storage and canning plants, and fresh vegetable markets are located along Highway 17. Soybean acreage has increased at a rate of over 7,200 acres per year for the past 7 years, with a corresponding decrease in woodland.

Flooding and inadequate drainage are major factors contributing to low income within the watershed. Both West Carroll and Richland Parishes qualify for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Floodwater and drainage problems affect nearly 75 percent of the watershed, with some areas being flooded three or four times a year. About 200 miles of secondary roads are subject to flooding, adding to the cost of road maintenance and farming operations, and disrupting transportation for schoolchildren and commuting workers. Channel erosion and sedimentation add to the problems. The total annual damages are estimated at more than \$1 million.

Measures planned to solve these problems include land treatment measures to improve drainage and infiltration and reduce excess runoff and sheet erosion. Typical practices to be installed are crop residue management, land grading and smoothing, drainage mains and laterals, ditch bank seeding, erosion control structures, woodland management, and fire protection.

Structural measures consist of about 360 miles of channel improvement with appurtenant erosion control and maintenance access structures and about 16 grade stabilization structures.

These measures will provide direct benefits to about 172,400 acres on 1,000 farms. Soybeans and rice produced between May 15 and November 15 will be protected from flooding more than once in about 4 years on the average. The duration of floods will be reduced even in greater floods. More efficient use of labor, capital, and management can be expected. It is estimated that overall net annual farm income will increase about \$940 per farm.

Total project installation cost is estimated at about \$10 million, of which Public Law 566 funds will bear about \$4 million or 40 percent, and other funds will bear about \$6 million.

With total benefits of \$1,906,000 and total annual costs of \$394,000, the benefit-cost ratio is 4.8-to-1.

The prorated Public Law 566 structural measure cost per acre benefited is \$18.

This concludes my testimony, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions of Mr. Bean?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no questions, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Bean.

We will take up the next project, which is the Winnebago-Bean Creek Watershed.

WINNEBAGO-BEAN CREEK, NEBR.

WINNEBAGO-BEAN CREEK WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location.—12,100 acres in Richardson County.

Tributary to.—Missouri River.

Sponsors.—Richardson County Soil and Water Conservation District, Winnebago-Bean Creek Watershed Conservancy District.

<i>Total watershed land use.</i> —	<i>Percent</i>
Cropland	80
Grassland	14
Woodland	2
Miscellaneous	4

Total watershed privately owned :

Number of farms.—50.

Size of farms.—About 240 acres average.

Purposes.—Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention.

Principal measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms and woodlands; and structural measures consisting of 16 grade stabilization structures.

Annual benefits.—

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percent</i>
To land	\$27, 800	91
Indirect	600	2
Subtotal	28, 400	93
Secondary	2, 300	7
Total	30, 700	100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1 to 1. With secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.0 to 1.

Area benefited.—2,750 acres.

Number of beneficiaries.—About 29 farms will receive direct benefits from the installation of the project.

Project costs.—

	<i>Public Law 566 funds</i>		<i>Other funds</i>		<i>Total Amount</i>
	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Amount</i> ¹	<i>Percent</i>	
Land treatment measures	\$35, 000	12	\$250, 000	88	\$285, 000
Structural measures: Flood prevention	378, 000	93	28, 000	7	406, 000
Project administration	57, 000	95	3, 000	5	60, 000
Total	470, 000	63	281, 000	² 37	751, 000

¹ For land-treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land-treatment measures by landowners. Cost-sharing from funds appropriated for the rural environmental assistance program may be available if included in the county program.

For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

The value of measures already installed (\$329,000) increases this to 57 percent.

Prorated Public Law 566 structural cost per acre benefited.—\$144.

Carrying out the project.—The Winnebago-Bean Creek Watershed Conservancy District will assume all local responsibilities for the installation, operation and maintenance of structural measures. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$1,280.

USDA ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT FOR WINNEBAGO-BEAN CREEK WATERSHED,
NEBRASKA

(Prepared in accordance with Sec. 102 (2) (C) of Public Law 91-190)

SUMMARY SHEET ⁷

1. *Name of action*

Final.

2. *Agency*

Soil Conservation Service.

3. *Action*

Administrative.

4. *Description of action*

A watershed project to be carried out by sponsoring local organizations with Federal assistance under authority of Public Law 566. The project, located in Richardson County, proposes conservation land treatment within the watershed supplemented by 16 grade stabilization structures.

5. *Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects*

Project action will: reduce erosion and sediment delivery to the Missouri River from this watershed; reduce gully development in 16 problem areas; project 2,570 acres from depreciation or destruction by gully development; reduce damages to roads and bridges; create about 74 acres of water surface that can be used for fishing and other water-based recreation activities, and as a feeding and resting place for migratory waterfowl; eliminate agricultural use and wildlife habitat on 74 acres in the sediment pools; eliminate agricultural and wildlife use in the 19 acres of construction areas until the areas are revegetated after construction; inundate about six miles of intermittent stream channels.

6. *List of alternative considered*

- A. Conservation land treatment alone.
- B. Converting all cropland in the 16 problem areas to grass.
- C. Several combinations of different types of structural measures.

7. *Agencies from which comments have been received*

U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers.
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
U.S. Department of the Interior.
Environmental Protection Agency.
State of Nebraska.

8. *Date final environmental statement made available to the Council on Environmental Quality and the public*

January 5, 1972.

The CHAIRMAN. Our colleague, Mr. Thone, has asked permission to submit a statement, and without objection, his statement will be included in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES THONE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

This opportunity to express my interest in the Winnebago-Bean Watershed project is very much appreciated. This watershed contains 12,000 acres and is

⁷ The complete environmental statement may be found in the files of the committee.

approximately four miles wide and seven miles long and is located in Richardson County in the southeastern corner of the State of Nebraska. Gully erosion is the major problem in the watershed. 16 grade stabilization structures and soil conservation practices on farm and woodlands are the principal measures to be used in this project. It has been estimated that 5 years will be required to complete this project at a cost of \$751,025. The Federal Government to provide \$469,500 and the local interests to provide \$281,525. In addition to the benefits accruing to farmland in the area, erosion damages will be eliminated to roads and bridges at five locations. Sediment movement is rather high in this watershed. It has been estimated that an average of 102,000 tons are delivered to the Missouri River annually under present conditions and you can see what the problem is where dredging is necessary to maintain a navigable channel. The pollutants such as fertilizer and other chemicals used on farmland in the watershed add to our already existing environmental problems and all these can be practically eliminated with the structures I spoke about earlier.

In my experience, the small watershed projects have been very worthwhile in correcting many problems associated with gully erosion, flooding, drainage and sediment control. Additionally, these projects benefit the rural economy in many other ways including the providing of employment over quite a period as the structures are being built.

This project is yet another effort as we strive to improve the rural economy and approval of it is urged.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Judy is representing the Department with regard to this. We are glad to have him with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, let me introduce Harris W. Judy, who is a new staff member in Washington. He comes to us well qualified as a hydrologic and agricultural engineer and we are indeed proud that he has now transferred to our office. His native State is West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have you with us, Mr. Judy.

Mr. JUDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

The Winnebago-Bean watershed is a small watershed project consisting of 12,100 acres in Richardson County, which is in the southeastern corner of Nebraska. No municipalities are located within the watershed. Falls City, 10 miles southwest of the watershed is the principal marketing center for the area and Omaha is located about 80 miles north of the watershed. It is a direct tributary to the Missouri River, and the topography varies from moderately sloping to relatively steep.

Agriculture constitutes the main source of income for residents in the area. The principal crops grown are corn, milo, wheat, and alfalfa. Livestock production is common on most of the 50 farming units in the watershed. The average farm is 240 acres in size. Land values range from \$250 to \$400 per acre. All of the land is in private ownership.

Gully erosion is the major problem in the watershed. Numerous overfalls have occurred on the main water courses and tributaries which vary in height from a few feet to as much as 40 feet. If these advancing gullies are not stabilized, many roads, bridges, and farm wells will be destroyed and about 2,750 acres of land will be lost or its use severely impaired.

The gullies also contribute large amounts of sediment to the stream system annually. It is estimated that 102,000 tons of sediment are delivered to the Missouri River each year from this watershed.

The planned project consists of installing land treatment practices supplemented by 16 grade stabilization structures. The land treatment practices consist of such measures as conservation cropping systems, contour farming, diversions, terraces, and grassed waterways.

Installation of the project measures would reduce the annual sediment delivered to the Missouri River by about 50 percent. This would result in considerably reduced maintenance costs of the navigation channel in the Missouri River. Also, the threat of destruction or depreciation of the 2,750 acres of land would be virtually eliminated.

The total project costs are estimated to be \$751,000, with Federal assistance amounting to \$470,000 or about 63 percent. The prorated cost per benefited acre is \$144.

Benefits resulting from the project are estimated to be \$30,700 annually, with a resultant benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 to 1. With secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 1.0 to 1.

That concludes my testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you the same question I have asked the others about the calculation of this interest. At what rate did you figure it when you were calculating the benefit-cost ratio?

Mr. JUDY. The interest rate in the plan is $5\frac{1}{8}$ percent, but at the current rate of $5\frac{3}{8}$, both of those figures would be identical—1.1 to 1 and with secondary excluded, 1 to 1. The secondary benefits are extremely small in this project. It still has a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't see how they could be the same if you change the interest rate by how much, did you say? Six-tenths of a percent?

Mr. JUDY. By a quarter of a percent, from $5\frac{1}{8}$ to $5\frac{3}{8}$, but with the nature of the benefits, this change was extremely small and when we round the figures off, they are identical and they do exceed unity, even at the higher interest rate.

Mr. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could also add that as the committee suggested, the last time we had hearings, we obtained the current rate at which the Federal Government was borrowing money on June 1 and at that rate, this project would have a benefit-cost ratio of 1.3 to 1 under the committee's criteria.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. MAYNE. I would like to ask Mr. Bean about the borrowing of the Federal Government funds to which he refers. What length time and interest rate?

Mr. BEAN. We looked at the various borrowing devices that are used and the lowest rate on that date was on 90-day bills and the rate was 3.8 percent.

Mr. MAYNE. So that is the figure that you have given us, that for 90-day loans?

Mr. BEAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYNE. I would like to ask Mr. Judy what secondary benefits there are at all here. You said they were small. What are they?

Mr. JUDY. The secondary benefits would be those that come from the construction as it takes place, the people that are moved in to do the construction work, staying at a local motel, eating at a local restaurant: the generation of this type of benefit.

Mr. MAYNE. Just a temporary profit arising out of this construction?

Mr. JUDY. That is correct. It is of a temporary nature.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Mayne.

Are there other questions?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. It not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Judy.

Is there anything else to be heard on this Winnebago-Bean Creek project?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. If not, that will close the hearing. The committee will go into executive session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a short statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. First, I would like to tell you how proud I am that the Agriculture Committee gave birth to the small watershed program.

Second, I would like to say that in the last conversation I had with the Honorable Cliff Hope, he told me that of all his tenure in Congress he was proudest of his association with the legislation which authorized the small watershed program. The next thing he told me was that actually, the present chairman, Bob Poage, should be considered as the father of such legislation.

Next, I would like to thank this committee for the fine bipartisan support it has given to the small watershed program and the total work of the Soil Conservation Service. I realize that I enjoy an association with this committee on a first-name basis. I will say that it was my privilege to become acquainted with this chairman when I went to Texas in 1936. I consider the chairman a personal friend and all members of this committee. I will continue to reside at 218 North Columbus Street, in Arlington, Va.

And Bob, I want you to know that if I can be of any help any time without cost to this fine committee, I will be available.

I thank you for everything that has been said and done. I go, leaving the Government, with the pride that you always gave me the authority to disagree objectively and ask my thoughts with respect to watershed projects and legislation.

In closing, I want to thank Christine Gallagher and Fowler West and the general counsel for the time and patience that they have demonstrated. I will be available at any time to continue to work with, for, and in any way possible with this committee.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Hollis, we know you will be ready to help us at any time and we appreciate it. We know you are deeply interested in this program and we know you are our friend. To me, the greatest evidence of that is the fact that we can disagree about a lot of these things and recognize that the other fellow is making a sincere presentation of his views.

Goodness, we have disagreed publicly lots of times, but we have never had any fundamental disagreement about what we were trying to achieve; we have just been disagreeing about what might be the most effective way of doing it. We have always appreciated your real good help in promoting what I still believe is one of the best programs we have ever started in agriculture. You have played an important part in it, a part that you should be proud of and we are proud of. We thank you a great deal.

The committee will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee went into executive session.)

WATERSHED PROJECTS

TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1972

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:45 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Abbitt, de la Garza, and Teague.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, chief clerk; Lacey C. Sharp, general counsel; and Fowler C. West, staff consultant.

Mr. POAGE. The meeting will please be in order.

We are meeting this morning to hear testimony on the Lake Verret watershed project in Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville Parishes in Louisiana.

LAKE VERRET, LA.

LAKE VERRET WATERSHED WORK PLAN

Size and location—246,000 acres in Ascension, Assumption and Iberville Parishes

Tributary to—Gulf of Mexico (Through Lake Verret and a series of lakes and bayous)

Sponsors—Lower Delta Soil and Water Conservation District

Ascension Parish Police Jury

Assumption Parish Police Jury

Iberville Parish Police Jury

<i>Total Watershed Land Use:</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Cropland -----	33
Grassland -----	8
Woodland -----	51
Miscellaneous -----	8

Watershed privately owned—99.5% ; State school land—9.5%

Number of Farms—473

Size of Farms—about 500 acres average

Purposes—Watershed Protection, Flood Prevention and Drainage

Principal Measures.—Soil conservation practices on farms; and structural measures consisting of about 230 miles of multiple purpose flood prevention and drainage channels.

Annual Benefits—

	Amount	Percent
To agricultural acreage (land and crops) -----	\$611, 300	83
Redevelopment -----	21, 700	3
Secondary -----	102, 100	14
Total -----	735, 100	100

Benefit-Cost Ratio—2.8 to 1. With secondary benefits excluded, the benefit-cost ratio is 2.4 to 1.

Area Benefited—123,000 acres

Number of Beneficiaries—About 470 landowners and operators will be directly benefited from installation of structural measures.

Project Costs—

	Public Law 566 funds		Other funds		Total dollars
	Amount	Percent	Amount ¹	Percent	
Land treatment measures.....	\$329, 000	11	\$2, 736, 000	89	3, 065, 000
Structural ² measures:					
Flood prevention.....	1, 454, 000	79	380, 000	21	1, 834, 000
Drainage.....	775, 000	42	1, 059, 000	58	1, 834, 000
Project administration.....	524, 000	87	75, 000	13	599, 000
Total.....	3, 082, 000	42	4, 250, 000	58	7, 332, 000

¹ For land treatment measures this is primarily the cost of applying land treatment measures by landowners. Cost sharing from funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program may be available if included in the county program. For structural measures this is the cost of land rights and project administration. It may also include costs for construction or engineering services for purposes other than flood prevention.

² The value of measures already installed (\$3,162,000) increases this to 71 percent.

Prorated P.L. 566 Structural Cost Per Acre Benefited—\$19

Carrying out the Project—The Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville Parish Police Juries assume all local responsibilities for installing, operating and maintaining the structural measures within their respective parishes. The estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance is \$37,600.

LAKE VERRET WATERSHED, LOUISIANA

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

I. *The environmental impact of the planned project*

All essential land treatment will be applied on 214,900 acres of land during the project installation period. This will reduce erosion and the resultant sediment entering streams and lakes by an average of more than 43,000 tons each year. Land treatment measures to be installed include—conservation cropping systems, crop residue use, land grading and smoothing, drainage mains, laterals and field ditches, pasture planting, hayland renovation and fish and wildlife practices.

Approximately 3,100 acres of wildlife habitat will be created or improved by establishing plants for wildlife food and cover. This includes 800 acres of wetlands which will also be improved by diking and installing water control structures.

Approximately 230 miles of channel improvement with appurtenant grade control and maintenance access structures will be installed for flood prevention and drainage. These measures will provide flood protection and adequate drainage outlets for about 123,000 acres. Flood damage to about 473 farms will be reduced by more than 85 percent.

II. *Adverse environmental effects*

Possible adverse effects of the project on downstream areas have been studied to determine if flooding, sedimentation and turbidity will be increased. The effect on fish and wildlife resources has also been considered.

During the unusually severe storm of February 1966, 8.29 inches of rain fell in 6 days. The water surface on Lake Polourde rose to elevation 3.03 feet mean sea level. If the project had been installed the lake level would have risen 3.09 feet, an increase of less than three fourths of an inch. The effect on more frequent floods would be even less. As indicated in I, above, sediment leaving the watershed will be reduced after the project is installed. Since essentially all sediment leaves this watershed in the suspended state, turbidity will be reduced as total sediment transport is reduced. No fish and wildlife losses were verified.

III. *Alternatives to the proposed measures*

The economy of this watershed is based primarily on agriculture and forestry products. There are definite trends toward industrial and urban expansion and toward developing oil and gas resources. This project has been formulated on the basis of an expanding agricultural, industrial and urban economy. Alternatives

to the project, as planned, are limited. Flood protection to and drainage of watershed land are essential to this expansion. One alternative, outside the scope and authority of PL 566, is land purchase and dedication of the flood prone and poorly drained areas to wildlife and fishery resources. This alternative would allow for some preservation and enhancement of these resources but would retard or stop economic development and expansion. In addition to the land acquisition cost, this alternative would involve costs of \$468,000 annually in net benefits foregone (project benefits minus project costs). The close proximity of this watershed to the urban centers of Baton Rouge and New Orleans makes this project an essential part of regional development.

IV. The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity

This project has been formulated on the basis of agricultural and forestry productivity. Flood protection and drainage outlets will be provided to flood prone areas in order to increase and stabilize the net return from agricultural and forestry enterprises. The project works of improvement will also provide the nucleus for the greater degree of flood protection that may eventually become necessary as industrial and urban expansion begins in some parts of the area.

V. Irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources

Consideration has been given to possible ways in which the project works of improvement might permanently curtail the range of beneficial uses of watershed resources, but none have been identified.

VI. Problems and objections raised by reviewing Federal, State and local agencies

Federal, State and local agencies interested in this project have reviewed the work plan in accordance with prescribed procedures and requirements. The Department of the Interior expressed concern regarding possible effects of the project on stream fishery resources. Their comments stated that they knew of no feasible means of reducing the "project occasioned damages." Their comments further recommend that the "Soil Conservation Service through the local soil and water conservation districts place special emphasis upon the proper management and use of fertilizers and pesticides by farmers in the area." This recommendation is in keeping with policies of the Soil Conservation Service and soil and water conservation districts. Landowners and operators will be urged to properly use fertilizers and pesticides.

Some residents and officials downstream from the watershed have asked for further consideration of the project. They were primarily concerned with increased flooding and turbidity downstream as a result of project installation. The facts described above have been explained at informational meetings and by correspondence and appear to have satisfied most of the concern.

Mr. POAGE. I have a note from our colleague. I did want to express the request of our colleague, Judge Rarick, who is a member of this committee and who asked me to express his regret at not being able to be here in person. We are pleased that Congressman Speedy Long is here. He represents a portion of the area at least, but I do not want it understood and want it in the record that Judge Rarick had hoped to be here to introduce one of his constituents who is with us. We will be glad to have him introduce his witnesses. Normally, we would proceed to hear the presentation of the project first. It has been our custom always in these watershed projects to hear the Department. I understand Mr. McGowen, assistant State conservationist, is going to speak for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. However, Mr. Long, if you want to proceed at this time, we will be glad to waive our rules and will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. SPEEDY O. LONG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, of course Mr. McGowen is also one of my constituents, but all I wanted to do this morning, if you please, was

just to introduce him, let Mr. McGowen stand, introduce Mr. McGowen, who will speak for the Department. He is from Alexandria, La., and also Mr. Floyd LaBarre of Napoleonville, La., which is also in my congressional district. In fact, Mr. Chairman, this Lake Verret Watershed, Assumption, Ascension and Iberville Parishes are all in my congressional district. I want Mr. LaBarre to stand. He will be the spokesman for the local people in the area who are concerned about this project. All I wanted to do is just present them to you, and to urge your favorable consideration of this watershed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Long. We are glad to have you with us. We are glad to have you bring your friends. We will hear from Mr. McGowen, who is representing, as I understand it, both the local area and the United States.

STATEMENT OF PAUL O. MCGOWEN, ASSISTANT STATE CONSERVATIONIST, ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Mr. MCGOWEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

The Lake Verret watershed contains 246,000 acres in southeastern Louisiana. It borders the Mississippi River and is located about 15 miles south of Baton Rouge. The watershed is nearly equally divided between Assumption and Iberville Parishes, with less than 10 percent or about 22,000 acres in Ascension Parish.

The watershed is generally low flatland ranging from about 20 feet above mean sea level in the north to only slightly above mean sea level in the south. The higher land adjacent to the Mississippi River and the ridges formed by natural levees along the many streams are highly developed agricultural land. Drainage is generally to the west and south through a system of bayous and canals which have Lake Verret as a common outlet. Storm runoff from Lake Verret is through a series of lakes and bayous eventually connecting with the Gulf of Mexico.

The principal soil types in the higher elevations along the eastern half of the watershed are silt loams, nearly all used for cropland. The lower elevation soils along the western boundary are poorly drained clayey soils. The average annual precipitation is about 59 inches.

Plaquemine, White Castle, Donaldsonville, Napoleonville and Labadieville are the principal trading centers in the watershed. There are 473 farms averaging about 500 acres in size. Present land use is 33 percent cropland, 8 percent pasture, 51 percent woodland, and 8 percent miscellaneous. All land is privately owned except for two sections of public school lands. Land values for agricultural purposes range from \$300 to \$400 per acre.

Agriculture is the major income producing industry. Sugarcane is the principal product, with beef cattle second. Sugarcane is grown on practically all farms and furnishes 93 percent of the farm income. Small acreages also are used to produce corn, soybeans, small grain, and truck crops.

Most of the watershed has serious flooding and drainage problems. Damaging floods occur on an average of at least twice each year. An extensive system of surface drainage is needed to permit efficient farm operations and to reduce crop spoilage. Floodwater damages to crops and pastures is estimated at nearly \$320,000 per year.

Land treatment measures to be installed throughout the watershed will include those to decrease runoff and improve water management, such as crop residue use, land grading and smoothing, drainage mains and laterals, pasture and hayland renovation, and water control structures. Structural measures include about 230 miles of multiple-purpose stream channel improvement for flood prevention and drainage. These will provide adequate outlets for on-farm drainage systems and will reduce average annual floodwater damages about 86 percent.

Approximately 123,000 acres will directly benefit from installation of the structural measures. The frequency of replanting and cultivation of crops such as soybeans will be reduced, saving up to \$1.38 per acre. The harvesting cost of sugarcane will be reduced as much as \$5 per acre and sugarcane quality will be much improved.

The total project installation cost is estimated at about \$7.3 million. Public Law 566 funds will bear about 42 percent of this cost with other funds bearing the remaining 58 percent. With annual benefits of \$735,100 and annual costs of \$266,800, the estimated benefit-cost ratio is 2.8 to 1.

The prorated Public Law 566 structural measures cost per acre benefited is \$19.

That concludes my presentation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. McGowen. We are greatly obliged to you.

We will next hear from Mr. LaBarre.

STATEMENT OF FLOYD A. LaBARRE, NAPOLEONVILLE, LA., REPRESENTING THE SPONSORS OF THE LAKE VERRET WATERSHED

Mr. LaBARRE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Floyd A. LaBarre. I am a member of the police jury of Assumption Parish, La. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee in support of the Lake Verret watershed project.

With me today are representatives of each of the sponsoring political bodies and a number of officials from Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville Parishes. We represent the people within this watershed. We have come here to offer our support to this project and to encourage this committee to consider it in a favorable light.

There are 45,000 people within the area to be served by this proposed project. Lake Verret watershed is in the flat southern portion of Louisiana. Our average annual rainfall is about 60 inches. We have only one means of disposing of this rainfall, and that is through channels. At present, heavy rains occur two or three times a year which cause numerous buildings, homes, streets, rural roads, and countless acres of rich farmlands to flood. Schoolchildren are prevented from attending school for as much as 2 days when schoolbuses cannot travel the flooded roads.

Sugarcane is the major crop, and because of poor drainage about 475 farms do not realize today their maximum potential for providing a high standard of living for the thousands of people who depend upon farming as their means of livelihood.

Water now stands around homes in both rural and urban areas for as long as 2 weeks after heavy rains. This creates a breeding ground for mosquitoes, and in general, an unhealthy environment for ourselves and our neighbors.

There are no large gullies or eroded hillsides, but erosion is taking its toll, leaving the farm poorer and the water downstream filled with sediment.

The Lake Verret watershed work plan is a coordinated plan, which has been prepared by us, and effectively offers a solution to all our water and related land problems. This plan will alleviate flooding and correct drainage problems while also reducing erosion and sediment. It provides for a more comprehensive use of our land through improved conservation practices.

This plan proposes improvement of 230 miles of channels. Practically all of this is a rehabilitation of an existing network of channels which have been dug by the people of this area for the purpose of removing excess rainfall. Less than 4 miles of these canals are new and only 8 miles of work is scheduled on natural drainageways that have not previously been dug by man.

I would like to impress upon this committee the fact that our only method of disposal of floodwater is through channels. There is no other way. The land is so flat that no upstream flood detention is possible. If the residents of this area are to enjoy flood-free living, if the farms which provide the support for practically the entire 45,000 persons living in the watershed are to produce profitably, and if the children of our area are to grow up in a healthy environment, then this project must become a reality. Through this project sedimentation will be reduced, flooding will be curtailed, crop losses will be lessened, and the entire countryside will become a showcase of conservation. This will not be done at the expense of any downstream residents.

With the installation of this project, there will be a 40,000-ton reduction in sediment delivered downstream during the first 10 years.

There has been some concern expressed that the installation of this proposal will increase flooding downstream. This is not the case. Hydraulic engineers of the Soil Conservation Service, Louisiana Department of Public Works, and the Corps of Engineers have evaluated the effects of this project on downstream flood conditions. They all agree this project will not cause any significant increase in flood stages on residents living below the Lake Verret watershed. In fact, a particularly severe storm occurred in February 1966. During this storm 8.29 inches of rain fell in 6 days. Lake Palourde, near Morgan City, rose to a stage of 3.03 feet mean sea level. Had this project been complete and functioning during the passage of this storm, the engineers mentioned above advised us, this lake would have risen to 3.09 feet; an increase of less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch as a result of even so severe a storm. This amply demonstrates that no additional flood damages will be suffered by downstream residents.

Because of the fact that this proposed watershed encompasses no additional acreage there should be no fear of added pollution downstream. Concern has also been expressed that the sugar factories and petrochemical plants within the watershed may cause added pollution. This may have occurred in the past but will not in the future. All the sugar factories within this project now confine their process water until chemical analysis indicates it is suitable for discharge. The petrochemical plants are also required by recent State and Federal laws to confine their waste.

With reference to possible pollution of Lake Palourde as a result of the Lake Verret watershed project I would like to quote from a letter dated April 6, 1970, written to the mayor of Morgan City. The letter, written by Dr. Leslie Glasgow, who was then Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, served as director of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, and is now assistant director for the School of Forestry and Wildlife at Louisiana State University. He is recognized as an authority and a friend of sportsmen. I quote, "Since you are primarily concerned with water quality as related to your city water supply from Lake Palourde, the matter was discussed with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in Dallas, Tex. Based on their knowledge of similar projects, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration personnel were of the opinion that the proposed project would have limited adverse effect upon your water supply. They pointed out that increased drainage and more intensive agricultural practices with the project would result in drier conditions on the agricultural lands upstream from Lake Verret."

"Pesticides would then remain on the lands longer, permitting some degradation before they move into Lake Verret. Lake Verret will serve as a sediment trap where an additional portion of the pesticides from the area will be detained and subjected to further degradation before passing on to Grassy Lake and Lake Palourde. In addition, it is expected that more rigid controls of pesticides and their application will be in effect before the project becomes operable," end of quote.

Approximately 50% of the watershed area is swampy woodland. This project will not change this feature. We propose to clean out only the existing channels where needed. This will allow deer and rabbit as well as other wildlife to seek out the lush vegetation that flourishes on spoil and berm. Wildlife will seek these spoil areas for refuge during periods of highwater. The rehabilitation of these existing channels will cause the woody swamp area to be more accessible to sportsmen.

In conclusion, may I ask the help of this committee? We have severe water and related land resource problems. We pledge our best to solve them, but we need help. We have prepared a watershed work plan. We are convinced this plan best provides for the orderly use, development, and conservation of our natural resources. We ask that you give it your approval.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. LaBarre. If there are no questions, we appreciate your attendance.

I believe our next witness is Mr. Shelby Robert. Mr. Robert, we will be glad to hear from you.

**STATEMENT OF SHELBY ROBERT, BATON ROUGE, LA.,
REPRESENTING LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU**

Mr. ROBERT. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen: It is a real pleasure to be here today to represent the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and have an opportunity to appear before this committee as a farmer from Ascension Parish in Louisiana. I am a member of the board of directors of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation which is the largest gen-

eral farm organization in the State and which has 35,500 member families.

We are 100 percent in favor of the Lake Verret watershed project in Ascension Assumption, and Iberville Parishes, and are in support of the work being done by the Soil Conservation Service on channelization. We feel that this project will be of tremendous value not only to agricultural production but also to the rural development of this area when this project is completed. We feel that it will have a great impact on the economy of this three-parish area, and we strongly urge your favorable report in support of this project.

Now, let me tell you just a little about my personal experience with a watershed project that was completed 3 years ago. I operate a 2,400-acre soybean, sugarcane, and cattle farm on the Bayou-Conway-Panama Canal watershed project which was completed about 3 years ago. I have very strong feelings about this project, and I cannot think of a single person in the area of the project who has not benefited since its completion. It has contributed greatly to rural development in the area. Prior to the completion of the project, during rainy seasons or after heavy rains thousands of acres in the area would go underwater, causing many crops and a great number of livestock to be lost. Wild game would become vulnerable to hunters when seeking refuge on higher grounds. Fish would be trapped in sloughs and low areas, leaving a dead fish odor for several weeks. Since completion of this project, many acres of land that were only marginal pastureland have been placed in production of sugarcane and soybeans, and this, of course, has affected the economy of the area to a great extent. Also, fishing has improved in both canals year round and there is more game than before the project was completed. There was one small country town in the area that flooded badly and even homes in the area were affected with the flooding. This flooding does not occur any more.

As I said before, I cannot think of a single person who has not benefited by the Bayou-Conway-Panama Canal watershed project. We feel that the Lake Verret project will result in the same improvements.

In closing, I would like to say that as a representative of Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation we seek your favorable report in support of the Lake Verret watershed project.

It has been a pleasure being here today. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Robert. We are delighted to have you and hear your testimony.

If there are no questions, we thank you very much.

We will call our next witness who I believe is Dr. Charles Brownell, mayor of Morgan City, La.

STATEMENT OF DR. C. R. BROWNELL, MAYOR, MORGAN CITY, LA.

Dr. BROWNELL. Gentlemen, I am the mayor referred to, the mayor of Morgan City, who was referred to in the past speaker's correspondence. I am from Morgan City. I have been mayor for 22 years. I would like to forgo any further statement. I have offered a written statement and also certain correspondence and other documents, such as the resolutions from our city opposing this plan.

I want to say, on behalf of the people of our area, I feel that we have something to demonstrate here and I can do it better if you will permit me to put on these slides. I will go as fast as I can. I would like to

show you conditions as they occur. That is the only way I can do it. If I talk here, it will be nothing but words.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to see the slides. You understand the slides will not appear as a part of the printed record, but we will be glad to have your comments. Without objection, your statement and attachments will be made a part of the record.

(The information follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. C. R. BROWNELL, MAYOR, MORGAN CITY, LA.

I, Dr. C. R. Brownell, as Mayor of the City of Morgan City, Louisiana, am submitting this report with the hope that this Committee will understand the scope and gravity of the present situation and the detrimental effect the Lake Verrett Watershed project will have on the area to the south of its boundaries. This area is one of the most dynamic areas in our country with a tremendous growth rate (the fastest in the State) largely due to the great expansion of the offshore oil industry. This enormous population increase has posed many problems both in the present and future.

Since Morgan City supplies the water to this whole area, both within and outside the City, my office has the responsibility of securing the source of this water supply. The threats to this water supply are not supposition, but are based on real experiences with siltation, pollution, and flooding, under present day conditions. The present water supply comes from Lake Palourde, a body of water just south of the watershed which receives the Lake Verrett flow on its way to the Gulf, thus passing this flow from the Lake Verrett Watershed area through this water supply of the Morgan City area.

These pollution conditions are brought out in the slide presentation. Our apprehensions are based on projections of the tremendous expansion plans of this project with anticipation of worsening conditions. No plans or concrete assurances have been offered to bypass our area water supply and we have only been offered generalities that the pollution problem would be cleared up in the future which we can only regard as supposition with no basic plans. In fact, since these adverse conditions are occurring under what the proponents regard as conservation measures now in practice for the past 10 years at a cost of over \$3,000,000 we are skeptical for good reason.

The proponents mention and give assurances in their report that the water supply of the people in this Watershed district receive their water from wells, the Mississippi River, and Bayou LaFourche, and there is no interchange of the watershed discharge in their water supply which makes them totally independent of their discharge and pollution problems.

Since we have become the victims of a tremendous siltation problem having lost all our lakes in the Atchafalaya flood way, we are aware we have only one lake left as a water reservoir and that is Lake Palourde. We surely make our appeal not for an improvement of a better way of life, but an appeal for survival, since water is one of our greatest necessities.

Since the Federal Government has championed the cause for conservation, protection of the environment and ecology, we feel it would be ironic to use public funds to contaminate and pollute another area and contribute to adverse situations.

Our opposition to the project is based upon the detrimental effect it will have on our area and the indifferent attitude to our appeals for protection of our survival and future.

I have included a number of reports from experts and authorities who share many of our views. Also, reports and correspondence throughout the years expressing our apprehensions and our appeals which we hope will give credence to our cause.

Dr. C. R. BROWNELL,
Mayor, Morgan City, La.

FEBRUARY 11, 1970.

Mr. Provost offered the following Resolution, who moved for its adoption:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Mayor and Council, the governing authority of the Mayor and Councilmen of Morgan City, Louisiana have become aware of a proposed watershed encompassing Parishes of Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville, Louisiana, and

Whereas, the sponsors of this project, which is called the Lake Verret Watershed, are proposing a program without due regard to the effects this watershed will create on adjacent Parishes, their lakes and navigable streams, and

Whereas, the usefulness and existence of these bodies of waters and the possibility of their being threatened by pollution from farming, human, natural and industrial sources, and

Whereas, the unprecedented formation of this watershed has caused considerable concern among public officials and business leaders in the areas adjacent to the proposed watershed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Mayor and Council, the governing authority of the Mayor and Councilmen of Morgan City, Louisiana, that the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Director of the Soil Conservation Service, Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, Director, United States Bureau of Reclamation, Director, Louisiana Department of Public Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, Louisiana Congressional Delegation and State Delegation, Lower Delta Soil and Water Conservation District, Ascension Parish Police Jury, Assumption Parish Police Jury, Iberville Parish Police Jury, St. Mary Parish Police Jury, and St. Martin Parish Police Jury become cognizant of the present and future effects that the proposed Lake Verret Watershed may ultimately have on the environment of the Parishes named above and those adjacent thereto: Now, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That the above named agencies, through which the proposed Lake Verret Watershed must be created, designate a time, date, and place for a Public Hearing, whereby all interested parties may express their views relative to the establishment of the above named project and that all public bodies, all civic associations, and chambers of commerce be given sufficient notice in order that intelligent briefs may be prepared for or against this proposed watershed.

Mr. Giroir seconded the Resolution.

The vote thereon was as follows:

Ayes: Provost, Giroir, Lee, Guarisco, Domino.

Nays: None.

Absent: None.

Approved and adopted this 11th day of February 1970.

C. R. BROWNELL, *Mayor*.

Attest:

EMILE LEHMANN, *Secretary*.

LOUISIANA WILD LIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Baton Rouge, La., February 19, 1970.

C. R. BROWNELL, M.D.,
Mayor, Morgan City, La.

DEAR MAYOR BROWNELL: Reference is made to your letter of January 29, 1970 concerning the Lake Verret Watershed project. We appreciate your letter expressing concern that the Lake Verret Watershed project might have detrimental effects on Morgan City's water supply. We wish to advise you that we are just as concerned about the problem as you are.

Members of my staff were present in Donaldsonville and were, in fact, the ones who expressed their concern over the effects of the additional siltation, increased fertility and increased slugs of pesticides, insecticides, or herbicides. You probably heard Mr. Paul McGovern of the Soil Conservation Service explain that there should actually be a reduced amount of turbidity entering the Lake and also that the amount of water entering the Lake probably would not cause any undesirable elevation in Lake Verret. Mr. Gerald Berret of the Iberville Parish Police Jury made the statement that any pesticides and herbicides entering the watershed would drop out with the silt.

As to whether or not this is true, we are skeptical; however, as is usually the case we are faced with the problem of opposing a plan that a few of the local people are in favor of and the local police jury is sponsoring. In any instance this puts the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission in an unenviable position. We are forced to state our views from a biological standpoint and make the local people aware of the potential hazards and damages these projects may cause. Then if the local people or police jury still decide to undertake this project the responsibility and consequences of the project should be borne by the local sponsors and citizens.

We have no specific knowledge that increase in fertility, turbidity and pesticides will occur; however, we strongly suspect that they will, especially until the project is completed.

Since the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission has no authority to veto any small watershed projects and can only act in an advisory capacity when invited to participate, we feel that by pointing out the possible detrimental effects of the Lake Verret Watershed we have fulfilled our obligation and that the responsibility of continuing with the project rests with the people of the area, the project sponsors and the Soil Conservation Service.

If we can be of further assistance, please notify us.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK M. HOFFPAUER, *Director.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Atlanta Ga., February 20, 1970.

Mr. LAMAR GIBSON,
Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission, Louisiana National Bank Building, 150 North Third Street, Baton Rouge, La.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: Thank you for your letter of January 16, 1970, enclosing a summary and map of the Lake Verret Watershed Project in Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville Parishes, Louisiana.

You state that this project will drain 246,000 acres of land and stimulate the clearing of more than 123,000 acres of bottom land hardwoods—an area of prime wildlife habitat. In addition, the increased silt load as a result of the drainage works would detrimentally affect future outdoor recreation use in the project area.

I share your concern as to the effects of the proposed stream channelization on recreation values and environmental quality. The issue of stream channelization is receiving national attention and much concern is being expressed over the contribution of stream channelization projects to the degradation and destruction of our natural environment.

About 6 months ago, I adopted a policy in this office that no water development projects involving stream channelization should be recommended for Federal assistance except where it has been demonstrated that there are no other alternatives to obtaining a reasonable degree of flood control.

I believe that flood-plain management and zoning are alternatives that must be given more consideration in the future. Furthermore, any direct or incidental recreation benefits claimed for watershed projects should be balanced against any losses to outdoor recreation and environmental quality resulting from stream channelization.

I hope you will continue to voice your concern for protection of environmental quality and recreation resources. Only when enough people realize the serious problems we face with our degrading environment, will corrective action be demanded.

Sincerely yours,

Roy K. Wood, *Regional Director.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1970.

Hon. C. R. BROWNELL,
*Mayor of Morgan City, Louisiana,
Morgan City, La.*

DEAR MAYOR BROWNELL: This is in further response to your letter of February 4 on the Lake Verret small watershed project near Morgan City, Louisiana.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife reported on this project on March 27, 1969 (copy enclosed). That Bureau is authorized to comment on small watershed projects as they affect fish and wildlife resources. The Soil Conservation Service was advised that siltation and turbidity associated with channel excavation could be expected to result in fishery damage in the waters downstream from the project.

Since you are primarily concerned with water quality as related to your city water supply from Lake Palourde, the matter was discussed with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in Dallas, Texas. Based on their knowledge of similar projects, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration personnel were of the opinion that the proposed project would have limited adverse effect upon your water supply. They pointed out that increased drainage and more intensive agricultural practices with the project would result in drier conditions on the agricultural lands upstream from Lake Verret.

Pesticides would then remain on the lands longer, permitting some degradation before they move into Lake Verret. Lake Verret will serve as a sediment trap where an additional portion of the pesticides from the area will be detained and subjected to further degradation before passing on to Grassy Lake and Lake Palourde. In addition, it is expected that more rigid controls of pesticides and their application will be in effect before the project becomes operable.

Examination of a map of the watershed indicates that the change in drainage pattern will not be great. However, it is expected that the volume of water and rapidity of run-off will increase with the project. This could increase siltation and water levels in the areas downstream from the watershed. The projected increases in agricultural production would also be expected to result in greater use of fertilizers and could contribute to increases in concentrations of these materials. The control of agriculture-related pollution is being given increased attention by all concerned with conservation and pollution control.

Prior to authorization of the project, the Department of Agriculture will make the work plan available to other governmental agencies, including the Department of the Interior, for their review. Your concern has stimulated further inquiry into the project. If our review of the work plan indicates the probability that pollution will affect your water supply, rest assured that it will be called to the attention of the Department of Agriculture.

If you have not already done so, we strongly recommend that you contact the Louisiana Health Department, Civic Center, P.O. Box 60630, New Orleans, Louisiana 70160, for specific information which they may have on this or similar projects. The obtaining of assurances from the project sponsors that they will require land treatment measures and pesticide application practices which will forestall any increase in pollutants in the Morgan City water supply should be pursued.

We understand your concern in this matter and hope that the above information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE L. GLASGOW,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE,
Atlanta, Ga., March 27, 1969.

Mr. J. B. EARLE,
State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Alexandria, La.

DEAR MR. EARLE: The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, in cooperation with the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, has reviewed your preliminary plan for the Lake Verret Watershed in Iberville, Ascension, and Assumption Parishes, Louisiana. This letter constitutes our report, prepared and submitted in accordance with the provisions of Section 12 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1008). This 246,000-acre watershed is situated in the Lower Atchafalaya River drainage, and has elevations ranging up to 25 feet m.s.l. The tentative plan includes investigation of the need and feasibility for 366 miles of channel work primarily involving improvement of previously constructed channels. The plan also includes 1,400 miles of onfarm drainage ditching, and land treatment measures applied to 24,160 acres for improved cover conditions and 3,100 acres for wildlife habitat preservation and development.

Wildlife habitat will be diminished as a result of clearing for channel work and conversion of woodland to other uses. Fishery resources will be adversely affected as a result of 366 miles of excavation along previously constructed channels. However, siltation and turbidity associated with channel excavation will cause fishery damages of greater consequence in waters downstream from the project. We request that boat access to existing waterways not be blocked by spoil deposits. Additional boat launching ramps may also be feasible features that could be included in the work plan. Wildlife habitat may be preserved, to some extent, by applying land treatment measures on 3,100 acres. However, the net effect of project construction on both fish and wildlife resources will be detrimental.

This report has been reviewed and concurred in by the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission and a copy of Director Hoffpauer's letter is attached.

Please advise us of any changes in project plans, so that we can reevaluate the effects of the project on fish and wildlife resources, if needed.

Sincerely yours,

C. EDWARD CARLSON,
Regional Director.

Attachment.

LOUISIANA WILD LIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Baton Rouge, La., March 21, 1969.

Mr. ERNEST C. MARTIN,
Assistant Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Peachtree-Seventh Building, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: Reference is made to your letter of March 7, 1969 concerning the Lake Verret Watershed project in Louisiana. Members of my staff have reviewed your proposed draft and concur with the statements contained therein. It is unfortunate that more measures cannot be taken to prevent our diminishing fish and wildlife habitat.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and offer comments on your proposed report.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK M. HOFFPAUER, *Director.*

LOUISIANA WILD LIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION,
New Orleans, La., May 18, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT MURRAY,
*Assistant P-R Coordinator, La. Wild Life & Fisheries Comm.,
Baton Rouge, La.*

DEAR ROBERT: A few comments other than on purely biological lines are in order concerning the nearly completed Bayou Folsé Watershed Project and the planned Lake Verret Watershed Project of the Soil Conservation Service.

One of the primary considerations in projects of this type is the benefit-cost ratio. It appears that with both of these projects both logic and fact have been cast aside in order to create a favorable ratio.

The Bayou Folsé Watershed was initially determined to cost \$392,000 of Public Law 556 funds, but currently it has exceeded \$517,000 with an additional \$50,000 to \$100,000 being required to finish the project. This makes a total of \$567,000 to \$617,000 of Public Law 556 funds being necessary to finish a \$392,000 project. This is an overrun of 45 to 57%. A similar overrun in matching local funds is also expected. Using the projected annual benefits from planned structural measures of \$105,119 and the average annual equivalent cost of (\$40,655 expanded by 57%) to \$63,844, the benefit-cost ratio drops from the projected 2.6 to 1. Large overruns such as occurred in the Bayou Folsé Project are the results of the unrealistic practice of computing cost when the project is first planned with no regard to increases due to inflation which will occur during the period necessary for implementation of the project.

The Bayou Folsé Project includes five areas with elevations below sea level that are protected by levees, and pumping is necessary to prevent inundation. Subsidy for the development of submarginal land which is valuable as wildlife habitat should not be the business of the Soil Conservation Service. Projects of this nature were tried 30 to 40 years ago in other areas of the state for agricultural purposes and were later abandoned as a result of oxidation of the soil and sinking of original land levels. This same problem has occurred in the Bayou Folsé Watershed area and as a result of requests from local landowners

through the police jury, the Soil Conservation Service has come back at the present time to further heighten the levees.

The Soil Conservation Service figured total annual benefits as \$735,100 and average annual cost as \$266,820 for a cost benefit ratio of 2.8 to 1 for the Lake Verret Project. When the average annual loss to fish and wildlife resources above and below the project area of \$306,281 is added to the average annual cost of structural measures and maintenance, the benefit-cost ratio is reduced to 1.3 to 1. Several other factors could also serve to lower this ratio. One of the primary areas of benefit is an increase in sugar cane production, but the projected increase has already been partially achieved without the project. Inflation since this project was planned in 1969 has probably made the cost figures outdated. The computation of the amortized cost is questionable as a 20 year period was used for channels in the Bayou Folsé Project but a 50 year period was used for the Lake Verret Project.

A total of three million dollars has been spent in the Lake Verret Watershed with Soil Conservation Service assistance over the past 10 years without achieving the desired results. What guarantee is there that an additional seven million plus dollars will solve the problem?

The full benefits of both projects are dependent on the implementation of land treatment measures by farmers in the benefited area, but there are no guarantees that these measures will be installed. The projects violate current Soil Conservation Guidelines (Memorandum 108) in that they subsidize already profitable agricultural endeavors on floodplains. They also fail to meet guidelines on preventing adverse affects to wildlife resources and providing adequate mitigation of habitat losses when these occur.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BETER.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, at the request of the Lower Delta Soil and Conservation District of the Police Juries of Ascension, Assumption and Iberville Parishes, a watershed work plan for Lake Verret has been prepared by the above named group known as the "Sponsoring Local Organization" with the assistance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, and the Louisiana Department of Public Works, said plan data November, 1969, and

Whereas, Lake Palourde is a vital source of fresh water, present and future, for this heavily populated area and certain pollution damage to this source already exists, and the proposed plan which encompasses two hundred forty-six thousand acres of land in southeast Louisiana would seriously aggravate the conditions in Lake Palourde by increasing the runoff of human waste, pesticides and other chemicals into the lake, and

Whereas, the area is now a tremendous natural recreation area used by thousands of persons in South Louisiana, has unlimited potentialities, and

Whereas, the plan submitted by the improvements to the Lake Verret Watershed would have harmful effects on said area bordering the sponsoring parishes, depriving commercial fishermen of their incomes and sport fishermen of their pleasures, and destroying wildlife, and

Whereas, the St. Mary Parish Police Jury is distressed that their political subdivision which borders Lake Verret was officially ignored when the plan was prepared and to this time, has never received any materials to convince them that the plan is to the best interest of all concerned,

Whereas, the St. Mary Parish Police Jury further agrees that no response was forthcoming to a resolution adopted by the City of Morgan City on February 11, 1970 in which the proponent parishes and those in State and Federal authority were asked to name a time, date and place for a public hearing, at which proponents and opponents of the plan might submit intelligent briefs for and against the plan; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the St. Mary Parish Police Jury, governing body of the Parish, after due consideration, that the "Sponsoring Local Organization," State of Louisiana, the Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House of Representatives are urged to study further every facet of the proposed improvements to the Lake

Verret Watershed before any action is taken, the health, welfare, and livelihood of thousands of people being dependent upon the right decision .

Thus done and approved on this 23rd day of June, 1972.

JOE C. RUSSO,

President, St. Mary Parish Police Jury.

Attest:

MARTHA SIMONTON,

Assistant Secretary, St. Mary Parish Police Jury.

JUNE 22, 1972.

Mr. Provost offered the following Resolution, who moved for its adoption.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, at the request of the Lower Delta Soil and Water Conservation District and the Police Juries of Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville Parishes, a Watershed Work Plan for Lake Verret has been prepared by the above named group, known as the "Sponsoring Local Organizations" with the assistance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service and the Louisiana Department of Public Works, said plan dated November, 1969, and

Whereas, Lake Palourde is a vital source of fresh water, present and future, for this heavily populated area and certain pollution damage to this source already exists and the proposed plan which encompasses 246,000 acres of land in Southeast Louisiana would seriously aggravate the condition in Lake Palourde by increasing the runoff of human wastes, pesticides, and other chemicals into the lake, and

Whereas, the area involved is now a tremendous natural recreational area used by thousands of persons in South Louisiana and has unlimited potential, and

Whereas, the plan submitted for improvements to the Lake Verret Watershed would have harmful effect on said area bordering the sponsoring parishes, depriving commercial fishermen of their incomes and sport fishermen of their pleasure, and destroying wildlife, and

Whereas, the Mayor and Councilmen of Morgan City are deeply distressed that their political subdivision, which borders Lake Verret was officially ignored when the plan was prepared and to this date they have not received any material to convince them that the plan is to the best interest of all concerned, and

Whereas, the Mayor and Councilmen are further aggrieved that no response was forthcoming to a resolution adopted by this body on February 11, 1970 in which the proponent parishes and those in State and Federal authority were asked to name a time, date, and place for a public hearing at which proponents and opponents of the plan might submit intelligent briefs for and against the plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Mayor and Council, the governing authority of the municipal corporation of the Mayor and Councilmen of Morgan City, Louisiana, in special session convened, that the "sponsoring Local Organizations," the State of Louisiana, the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House of Representatives are urged to study further every facet of the proposed improvements to the Lake Verret Watershed before any action is taken, the health, welfare, and livelihood of thousands of people being dependent upon the right decision.

Mr. LaFleur seconded the Resolution.

The vote thereon was as follows:

Ayes: Provost, LaFleur, Domino, Guarisco, Kahn

Nays: None

Absent: None

The resolution was therefore declared approved and adopted this 22nd of June, 1972.

C. R. BROWNELL, M.D., *Mayor.*

Attest:

EMILE J. LEHMANN, *Secretary.*

Dr. BROWNELL. Gentlemen, I would like to narrate these slides and tell you the story, the story of an area that has grown tremendously, one of the fastest growing areas in Louisiana due to the impact of the offshore oil industry. At one time, and this was in 1935, we had tremendous lakes and water reservoirs. This is an example of Grand Lake. The lake was 30 miles long, 10 miles wide. They had another lake 6 miles below that and a number of other lakes. This was in the Atchafalaya Spillway. I want to point out, this furnished a water reservoir for this whole area, which now represents around 70,000 people.

As time has gone on we have noticed the result of siltation that has happened throughout the years, and I want to show you the next slide to show you what has happened. This was 1935. You can see the lake. This is 1948. As you can see, it is filling up with siltation. This is 1959, which is 10 years ago or more. You can see it is completely obliterated. Today we have lost that lake. We have lost a tremendous reservoir.

Here again it shows you what siltation can do. That is one of our apprehensions, that we can lose lakes through siltation, which will have some bearing on conditions.

This is a result of the sandbars and the siltation that has built up. This shows an airplane view of how it was lost.

These are people standing in the middle of what was once a big lake 10 miles across.

This shows what we have today in that lake. While all these cities have had to move inland with their water supplies, because there is no more water there, it is nothing but one stream, the Atchafalaya channel, and this has all been filled in.

This is a graph of a map showing cities dependent on this. This was at one time the north fork of Linda Lake. These are the cities that depend on this water. What happened was they had to retreat to these little closed-off bayous here that are stagnant at this time. You can see the plight of those people.

This is where they get their water from. This, as you can see, is a very poor example of a reservoir for getting water.

Gentlemen, we are down to our last lake, which is Lake Palourde. This has all been filled in. We have lost it through the spillway. This is our only water reservoir that we have to turn to, which is Lake Verret right above. As you can see, this is the situation where we are looking for some type of survival, some type of future. This is the watershed we are talking about.

This map is very plain. We understand and they understand the need for flood protection and so do we, but this is their project that we are trying to put the various types of aspects in to protect us.

This is what they are trying to say, the watershed people. This is their plan, that everything will drain into this lake, but what happens at the end of this lake? It has to get out. That is what we are trying to show here.

This is the complete story of the watershed. It doesn't stop here just because man made a line across there and limited its boundaries. Here is the rest of it as it goes to the gulf. We are bottled up down here. Here is the city that supplies water to this whole area. We are at this time bound up by everything that gives us no way to get out.

This demonstrates our area below the watershed, as you can see. The only place that this water can escape out of this lake is through

this bayou. It has to go through this small channel. It comes into our lake. This is our water supply and that is what we are talking about, because here is the city that supplies this whole area in and outside of the city with water. That is where our future water supply will come from.

I want to point out, these pictures show it. I am not talking about something that isn't so. This is the levee that is going across our lake that bottles us up due to the spillway, and the Corps of Engineers planning.

This is another blockage, a completed levee and a dam with another drainage affecting the water from our lake. What we are talking about is a complete drain down here, with these people down here who are below the watershed who are going to receive all this water and everything that goes with it. Being down there at the bottom, it is like a funnel, where they are going to receive any adverse effects from this whole drainage area.

Mention was made of the type of flooding. We lost the only source to the city several times from the back, not the front where the floodway is. The water accumulated in the back. These are examples of the tremendous amount of water that was held behind in those lakes behind the city. The next couple of slides will show the flooding. These are sandbags we had to put up. We have done this many times to fight storms and any unusual amount of rain.

This is something that is constantly in our area in the lowlands. In their own parishes they have this, in Assumption Parish, St. Martin Parish, in our parish. People who live a little above the water, a few inches means a lot. Sometimes this water lies there for months, and we surely understand what water means and what flooding does. I feel with the amount of water we are going to receive, these conditions can only become worse, if we receive this water so fast that it can't get out.

Here is another example of what happened down there due to flooding. This remained down there for months. The water was over everything, and we have been subjected to these types of floods for long periods of time. It is a wet area, it is going to give us this water faster and it can't get out, commonsense tells us that the water will rise and flood.

I want to talk water and give you some idea as to what has happened to our water supply. This is on the Atchafalaya River. You can see the tremendous siltation. This is our water intake. This is not only for the city but for the area. We had to leave there because of the type of siltation. At times it got so bad you couldn't wash your clothes in it. It couldn't be filtered. It was very costly, and we were looking for water so we had to turn to another place to look for water to the west.

This shows another hazard which we have, the navigation route along the Atchafalaya River, with all this oil coming in from boats going by which also gives us trouble. This is what we installed in the lake at a cost of a quarter of a million dollars. Several years ago we put this installation out there to draw this good clean water, and having a supply of water for the reservoir to supply the people of this area. As you can see, the people of this area have surely got to look to the future in order to get that type of water.

The following pictures that I am going to show you indicate some of the things that have occurred recently down in this area. As it

enters below the area here that is shown, these canals here and a few up here show the quality of water, siltation, and pollution. These are recent pictures, but I could show you hundreds of them if I wanted to.

This shows one of the canals. This is a polluted canal coming from the sugar mills and from the plantations. These white things are fish floating belly up as a result of the pollution that has taken place. This is another drainage canal leading from the fields. This is 4 or 5 miles long. You can see the type of water that is coming out of there. I would like to compare that with the water we have. These are fields that have been drained, and there are any number of these small canals draining into these large ones which drain right into our water supply.

After a rain this is the type of debris you get, which indicates the type of drainage that comes in and enters our water supply. Of course this drains the industrial area along the Mississippi River. There again I can show you the type of siltation we get after a rain. It goes right down into our area.

This is the area along the river. Of course, the industrial areas that they are building up, as indicated by the watershed people, I know progress is a fine thing, and we wish them luck, but there is still a drainage problem. This drainage has got to come to our area.

I want to make these observations. Where a drainage canal enters our natural bayous, it goes out into the lake, and you can see the type of water in the wake of that boat. It is full of silt. This is a little bit above it where the natural water comes in which has preserved our area all these years, our bayous and lakes. There is little siltation. Here again this shows the water coming down the canals and through the swamp areas.

This is a comparison of samples taken out of different drainage canals. This is swamp water and here you see the natural water in our lakes and bayous. It is very clear, devoid of the places where canals drain.

Here is a comparison of the regular natural water and the water that comes out of these canals. You can see the amount of siltation in the bottle after sitting 24 hours. You can understand how much silt we can amass that will eventually take away our last water reservoir.

This is an example of some of the pollution entering our lake. These are all dead fish, fish kill, and debris. Here again is another picture of the same thing. This is another instance of fish kill. We have any number of those.

These fish are very hard to kill. When you kill those it takes a lot of poison. It even kills turtles and reptiles. Here is the debris coming down.

When they say it doesn't enter the lake, this shows it flowing out into our lake with debris. From the lake this shows the amount entering our lake which will not get out. It is going to settle there and give us trouble.

For those who are interested, this is a picture of the last eagle. Eagles have disappeared according to our scientists because they eat the fish that are poisoned by insecticides and the eagles cannot hatch any more.

Gentlemen, I can show you a lot more on recreation, on how valuable this lake is, but the thing I am trying to point out at this time is that we are a people making an appeal for survival. We have got to have water reservoirs. All over the country, every city, every area is looking for water reservoirs. That is all we are making an appeal for,

some type of water reservoir. We are not up here asking for improvements, that you come up with anything to improve our way of life, but to help us survive. When I say this area is one of the fastest growing areas in Louisiana, I mean that because we have people moving in there, offshore industry is growing enormously. Mr. Hoffpauer here is in full accord with this. We are trying to say we are coming on to a collision course. The more water we get down there, the more silt and these practices that put this material into our area, the bigger is our demand for water in our area. The Wildlife and Fisheries report brings that out which I do not have time to go into at this time, but I have brought it up here, and I have incorporated it and I hope this can be put into the minutes of your meeting. If any further record is needed, I think you will find that their views are concurrent with ours, that there is pollution and danger, and while it affects wildlife and fish, we are looking at the human consumption of water.

Mr. POAGE. We thank you very much, Mayor Brownell. We are delighted to have had your appearance and your statement has been placed in the record.

We have one further witness, Mr. Blackwelder. Do you have a statement for the record? If you do have a statement for the record, we will be glad to include it.

STATEMENT OF BRENT BLACKWELDER, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. I have a number of submissions, letters, and reports.

Mr. POAGE. We will be glad to receive any statements that you care to place in the record. Without objection, they will be included.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. I would like a chance to speak directly with the committee members on the project.

Mr. POAGE. We can't do it now, but the committee will try to arrange to hear Mr. Blackwelder at such time as it can be done. I don't know when it can be done. We can't do it today. We will hold the record open and ask Mr. Blackwelder to appear at a later date.

The committee will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. (Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the subcommittee recessed.)

(The following communications were also received by the subcommittee:)

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., July 3, 1972.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Conservation and Credit Subcommittee, House Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of other commitments, the National Wildlife Federation was unable to accept your invitation to testify at the recent hearings before your subcommittee on several proposed Small Watershed Projects. Therefore, we want to use this means to make our views a matter of public record.

It is our understanding that the following Small Watershed Projects are being considered for authorization: Union Creek, South Dakota; Winnebago-Bean Creek, Nebraska; Red Lick Creek, Kentucky; Big Creek, Kansas; North Sector, Upper Walnut, Kansas; West Carroll, Louisiana; Sweetwater Creek, Tennessee; and Lake Verret, Louisiana.

Of the eight proposed projects, the Federation has comments on the last two projects only, namely: Lake Verret, Louisiana and Sweetwater Creek, Tennes-

see. We are opposed to both of these projects because we consider them unnecessary and because of the great damage to wildlife and fish habitat and other natural resource values that will inevitably follow the implementation of the projects. With some 230 miles of "channel improvement" included in the Lake Verret project, we are concerned that valuable hardwood bottomland and wildlife habitat will be drained for agricultural purposes of a controversial nature. We are opposed to the Sweetwater Creek Project for the same general reasons.

The National Wildlife Federation urges that adequate mitigating measures be taken to protect all natural resource values, should the Congress approve any of the eight Small Watershed Projects mentioned above.

It is requested that this letter be made a part of the public record on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Vice President.

[Telegram]

Congressman W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, 35,000 members strong, supports Lake Verret watershed project in Ascension, Assumption, and Iberville Parish. Please include this notice of support in the hearing record. Thank you.

JAMES D. GRAUGNARD,
President, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation.

WATERSHED PROJECTS

TUESDAY, JULY 18, 1972

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 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Stubblefield, de la Garza, Bergland, and Mayne.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, chief clerk, and Fowler C. West, staff consultant.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will please be in order.

We are met this morning for the purpose of hearing Mr. Brent Blackwelder, who is the Washington representative of the Environmental Policy Center.

Mr. Blackwelder, we will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF BRENT BLACKWELDER, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY CENTER, ON BEHALF OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY CENTER, THE LOUISIANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION, THE DELTA CHAPTER OF THE SIERRA CLUB, THE CONSERVATION COUNCIL OF LOUISIANA, AND THE ORLEANS AUDUBON SOCIETY

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am today also, in addition to representing the Environmental Policy Center, speaking in behalf of the Louisiana Wildlife Federation, the Delta Chapter of the Sierra Club, the Conservation Council of Louisiana, and the Orleans Audubon Society. Unfortunately, they could not be here from Louisiana, to spend the money to come up to testify, so I am representing their views and their feelings on this project.

We are opposed to the Lake Verret project on three grounds in its present form. First, the Soil Conservation Services (SCS) has not properly complied with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Second, the project will have adverse environmental effects on fish and wildlife resources, which might in part be avoided by a redesign of the project.

Third, the economic losses occasioned by the damage to fish, wildlife, and recreation resources have not adequately been considered.

I have some other things in my statement which I will just summarize.

First, in connection with the environmental impact statement, I have a letter from the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission to the Soil Conservation Service, dated May 17, 1972, inquiring about the availability of draft impact statements which they would like to comment on, but which have not been circulated. Comments by C. Edward Carlson, transmitted in a letter to the State conservationist of Louisiana, seem to conflict with some of the assertions made in the environmental impact statement. I have quoted these in my statement here.

It is because of some of these conflicts that we believe that a thorough reevaluation and reexamination of the project should be made, and we hope this committee will direct such a study.

Turning to the environmental effects, we are submitting for the record a full report from the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission which was made at the same time the SCS watersheds memorandum 108 review was being conducted.

Mr. POAGE. Just one minute.

We are perfectly willing to put in the file with our record a report from the Louisiana Wildlife Commission. Ordinarily, we don't—what is this report?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. This is just a six-page report on the project indicating some of the adverse effects that they believe the project will have.

Mr. POAGE. This sort of stuff that we are putting in costs the Government several hundred dollars a page. We are always willing to hear from anybody, but we are not willing to fill this record up with a great deal. We will take ordinary letters, but we are not willing to take and file a voluminous report, I mean to include in our report voluminous reports from other agencies.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Right. I believe it is just six pages long and might be of interest to anybody wishing to review the record.

Mr. POAGE. We will include it with our own files, but we will not necessarily print it.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. All right, Mr. Chairman.

(The document referred to may be found in the files of the committee.)

Mr. BLACKWELDER. This report indicates that snagging, clearing, channelization, and destruction of natural cover will result in increased velocity, turbidity, sedimentation, and toxic chemical levels. These increases, the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission believes, will cause damage to spawning sites for fish, fresh water sources for Lake Verret, Lake Palourde, and other bayous, rivers, and canals below the watershed area, and recreational opportunities such as boating.

In addition, there will be 2,000 acres of forest lost as a result of this project and at a time when the hardwood forests in the area are rapidly dwindling in number, we don't believe this would be a wise use of taxpayers' dollars, to further contribute to the clearing of forest lands, especially the tupelo and cypress hardwoods. All of these aspects are discussed more fully in the report.

Turning to the discussion of economics, the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission reports that serious losses will occur due to

pesticides, turbidity, and loss of spawning sites as a result of the project.

Mr. MAYNE. What was that word after pesticides?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Turbidity.

Mr. MAYNE. Oh, turbidity. Thank you.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. This will occur as a result of excavation and the rapid runoff from water downstream. So, we hope that you will look quite closely into these losses, because if they were adequately taken into account, the cost-benefit ratio would be considerably reduced.

To summarize, in view of the anticipated damage to fish and wildlife resources and the economic losses that would follow as a result of this construction, we urge this committee to direct the Soil Conservation Service to restudy this project fully and to coordinate and consult with the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission in the restudy. If the restudy results in a project being recommended to Congress, then the Soil Conservation Service should proceed to prepare a full and complete impact statement on the project, following all the guidelines provided by the Council on Environmental Quality.

In addition, I want to emphasize to this committee that this particular project illustrates the fact that certain important groups and individuals who will be affected by this project have been excluded from the planning process, particularly the mayor of Morgan City. The resolution which he and the city adopted indicates that they have not been consulted in the planning process. This illustrates a fact which conservationists have been trying to point out, that in a number of cases, adequate consultation with interests which will be affected downstream has not occurred. We hope that in this case, the committee will direct a restudy in full consultation with all those parties which are going to be affected.

Also we are submitting for the record two letters concerning the filing of environmental impact statements by the Soil Conservation Services. We had hoped that the Soil Conservation Service would declare that it will prepare environmental impact statements on all projects which will comply with the guidelines contained in the National Environmental Projection Act. Unfortunately, it is still not clear whether it is going to do this or not. We certainly hope that the SCS will, but the list is not available at the time. SCS maintains that as the projects are ready for construction and thus ready to be funded, then it will prepare a statement on that. However, the guidelines in the watersheds advisory 12 and 17 are not clear on this matter of whether impact statements will be filed on all projects which were originally classed in groups 2 and 3 under advisory memorandum 108.

Just to make a general comment on the whole watersheds program, we hope that the committee will look into the possibility of such alternatives as greater cost sharing for land treatment practices, more aid in flood insurance programs, greater funding for the Water Bank Act, all of which have support from the environmentalists. We think by implementing other methods besides channelization, the small watersheds program can draw support from those who have been raising serious criticisms about the program as it now exists.

In particular, what we are concerned about is the cost sharing for such measures as channelization and dams must be very high—90 or 100 percent Federal in some cases. Therefore, there is an inherent bias

in looking toward these solutions rather than others that will have a much broader range of support and would be less environmentally destructive.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

(The full statement with attachments follows:)

STATEMENT OF BRENT BLACKWELDER, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY CENTER, SPEAKING IN BEHALF OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY CENTER, THE LOUISIANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION, AND THE DELTA CHAPTER OF THE SIERRA CLUB

We are opposed to the Lake Verret Project in its present form on three grounds. First, the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) has not properly complied with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Second, the project will have adverse environmental effects on fish and wildlife resources, which might in part be avoided by a redesign of the project. Third, the economic losses occasioned by the damage to fish, wildlife, and recreation resources have not adequately been considered.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The environmental impact statement is inadequate in several respects. First, it is a very short and superficial document. No thorough discussion is given to the alternatives to the project or to various modifications of certain channel locations within the project. Second, no comments from other agencies have been appended to the statement, thus indicating that the SCS has not properly complied with the provisions of NEPA. We submit for the record a letter from the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission to the SCS dated May 17, 1972, inquiring about the availability of draft impact statements for comment by appropriate agencies. The failure of the SCS to comply with NEPA suggests that environmental interests have not been given adequate consideration in project planning. Third, comments by C. Edward Carlson, Regional Director of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife (BSFW), transmitted in a letter of March 27, 1969, to J. B. Earle, the State Conservationist of the SCS in Louisiana, seem to conflict with some of the assertions made in the environmental impact statement. Mr. Carlson asserts:

"Wildlife habitat will be diminished as a result of clearing for channel work and conversion of woodland to other uses. Fishery resources will be adversely affected as a result of 366 miles of excavation along previously constructed channels. However, siltation and turbidity associated with channel excavation will cause fishery damages of greater consequence in waters downstream from the projects."

Yet in the impact statement we find no real discussion of the possible effects of the project on fish and wildlife resources. Instead, we encounter the statement, "No fish and wildlife losses were verified." This statement appears to be in sharp contradiction with comments made by the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission and BSFW. The SCS is evidently attempting to sidestep the issue and is in clear violation of both the letter and spirit of NEPA. Before any additional Congressional consideration is given to the project we hope this Committee will direct the SCS to comply with the law and prepare a full and complete impact statement accompanied by comments from appropriate agencies.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Lake Verret Project can be expected to have a series of harmful environmental impacts. We are submitting for the record a report from the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission which was prepared on the Lake Verret Project at the time the SCS was conducting the review of channelization projects under Watersheds Memorandum 108. The report indicates that "snagging, clearing, channelization, and destruction of natural cover will result in increased velocity, turbidity, sedimentation, and toxic chemical levels. These increases will cause damage to: a) Spawning sites for fish; b) fresh water source for Lake Verret, Lake Palourde, and other bayous, rivers, and canals below the watershed area; c) recreational opportunities such as boating." (p. 5)

Approximately 2,000 acres of forest will be lost as a result of this project, thus reducing existing wildlife habitat. At a time when hardwood forests are rapidly dwindling in numbers in the delta areas serious questions should be raised as to the wisdom of using taxpayer dollars to promote more clearing.

Piling of dredging spoils along existing or newly created channels could impair the natural flow of water in and out of the cypress-tupelo swamps. The danger from pesticide pollution will be heightened by the more intense agricultural developments and accelerated run-off made possible by the project.

All these adverse impacts are discussed more fully in the report. The SCS should restudy the entire project, provide answers to the questions raised by the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, and modify the project design so as to eliminate or mitigate some of the destructive effects.

ECONOMICS

The Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission reports that due to turbidity, pesticides, and loss of spawning sites the potential estimated annual losses to fisheries is \$172,921 in the project area and \$101,940 below the area. In the area there will be 6,000 days of fishing and 3,752 days of hunting lost due to damage to game and fish populations in the area. If these losses were really taken into account, the project would not have such a favorable benefit/cost ratio.

SUMMARY

In view of the anticipated damage to fish and wildlife resources and the economic losses which would follow construction of the project, we urge the Committee to direct the SCS to restudy the project thoroughly and to coordinate and consult with the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission in the restudy. If after restudy a project is to be recommended to Congress, the SCS should proceed to prepare a full and complete impact statement on the project, following all the guidelines provided by the Council on Environmental Quality.

GENERAL COMMENTS

We wish to call to the Committee's attention what we believe to be inadequate and incomplete compliance by the SCS with the provisions of NEPA in connection with small watershed projects. Instead of attaching to the draft and final environmental impact statements the comments by other agencies, the SCS summarizes these comments in the copies it furnishes to the general public. This suggests that the SCS does not wish the public to have the opportunity to see the exact comments which other agencies have made on its projects.

In Advisory WS-12 the SCS has been vague and ambiguous in stating what its policy will be on preparing impact statements for projects which predate the passage of NEPA. We submit for the record two letters which give an indication of the attitude of the SCS on these matters. In the first letter I asked Kenneth Grant, Administrator of the SCS, for a list of projects on which the SCS intended to file impact statements under Advisory WS-12, pointing out that at the very minimum we expected the SCS to prepare statements for all projects which any reviewing agency had recommended for Group 2 or Group 3 under Watersheds Memorandum 108. Mr. Grant replied that such a list was not available at the time. The list is still not available as of June 26, 1972. The unwillingness of the SCS to state affirmatively that it will prepare impact statements on all Group 2 and Group 3 projects indicates that these projects have not been wisely planned and cannot withstand public scrutiny.

We are concerned that there is a failure on the part of the SCS to look fully into the alternatives to channelization projects. Such alternatives as greater cost sharing for land treatment practices, more aid in flood insurance programs for crops, and greater funding for the Water Bank Act would have the support of environmentalists. We urge the Committee to take steps to insure that a full and thorough consideration is given to these and other alternatives by the SCS.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
WILD LIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION,
New Orleans, May 17, 1972.

Mr. KENNETH E. GRANT,
Administrator, Soil Conservation Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: I am in possession of statements entitled "Lake Verret Watershed, Louisiana and West Carroll Watershed, Louisiana" which were transmitted to me by letter of April 2, 1971 from State Conservationist, J. B. Earle. The statements are undated.

We have had several inquiries recently concerning the validity of these statements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190. I would appreciate your assistance in answering the following.

1. Were drafts circulated for review prior to publication of the final statements?
2. Which agencies commented on these drafts?
3. How can a copy of the comments be obtained?
4. Were comments included in final statements as required by Council of Environmental Quality guidelines?

If no drafts were prepared and circulated before release of final statements, we would appreciate having drafts of environmental statements on each of these projects as specified by Watershed Advisory 12.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK M. HOFFPAUER, *Director.*

APRIL 25, 1972.

Mr. KENNETH E. GRANT,
Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: I am writing about the Soil Conservation Service's Advisory WS-12 which the Environmental Policy Center believes to be entirely inadequate. We think that NEPA requires impact statements for all PL-566 projects regardless of whether they were planned and initiated prior to the passage of the law.

At the very minimum we would hope that the SCS would prepare impact statements for all projects which any reviewing agency has recommended be placed in Group 2 or Group 3 under the Memorandum 108 review. In addition, many PL-566 projects involve impoundments. Whether the effect of impoundments is beneficial or harmful, an impact statement should be filed on such projects.

If PL-566 projects are as claimed very beneficial to the environment, then there should be no reluctance on the part of the SCS to prepare a statement describing all the good effects. The failure of the SCS to prepare impact statements on all its projects suggests that the SCS has something to hide, something that cannot withstand public scrutiny.

Many aspects of the Advisory are disturbing such as the limitation to construction activities in fiscal 1973 and should be corrected, but the SCS will still fall far short of its environmental mandate and founding purposes as long as it refuses to file environmental impact statements on all of its PL-566 projects.

Finally, we would like to obtain a list of all projects on which the SCS now intends to file impact statements in light of Advisory WS-12.

Sincerely,

BRENT BLACKWELDER,
Washington Representative.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1972.

Mr. BRENT BLACKWELDER,
Washington Representative,
Environmental Policy Center, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLACKWELDER: This is to acknowledge your letter of April 25, 1972.

We are glad to be advised of your reaction to our Advisory WS-12.

We do not have at this time a list of specific projects on which we intend to file environmental statements. The 1973 schedule for construction will not be determined until later in the fiscal year.

We intend to file environmental statements on all projects called for in Advisory WS-12.

Sincerely,

KENNETH E. GRANT,
Administrator.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. Blackwelder.

Any questions?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I would just like to ask if the Environmental Agency submits an alternative plan? I mean a detailed plan like the Soil Conservation people do. Do you submit an alternative plan? I mean in detail?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Not a detailed plan.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Who does? Does Fish and Wildlife submit one?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. They would certainly hope for a restudy and I think with a restudy, working closely with the Soil Conservation Service, that an alternative plan or an alternative project could be arrived at. There are considerations which involve the number of ditches to be dug, the number of channel modifications to take place. All of these could be redesigned with some full cooperation from the proper agencies.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Would they come up with this detailed plan?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. They have not at the present time.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. You know, it is easy to criticize; but you need to offer some alternative in detail as to what is your thinking. The Soil Conservation people have already come up with a plan.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. In the first place, as things stand now, it would be preferable not to have any project at all because of the serious threat to downstream users. What you are essentially saying here is while you would be able to benefit the economic interests in the watershed area, it would be at the expense, indeed, as Mayor Brownell of Morgan City said, the very survival of downstream communities and the loss of other fish and wildlife opportunities for people who may not be direct economic beneficiaries.

So, it is this sort of tradeoff. If you had to take any choice, I would say it would be better not to have any project at all than to benefit some economically at the expense of the livelihood of others. That is the way things stand now.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I understood you to say that you wanted to have the Service file environmental impact statements on projects that predate the regulations and law which require them to do so.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Yes, specifically on all group 2 and group 3 projects.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, we have had testimony from some of the officials of the Service showing the great expense and delay which the filing of these environmental impact statements have occasioned the Government in those instances where such statements are required. There has been testimony that in fulfilling these requirements, in some instances, it takes about as much time to prepare the environmental impact statement, with all of their ramifications, as it does to have done the full planning work itself.

Don't you think that the Service would be very severely criticized and subject to congressional reprimand if they were to go ahead and voluntarily incur this expense in projects which are not required by law to have such a statement filed?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, there are several points that I could make.

First, in light of the recent court decision in North Carolina the Chicod Creek, environmental impact statements are required on projects which predate NEPA. From my conversation this morning, the cost may be \$7,000 to \$7,500 per project. That does not seem to be too much on a project which may run into several million dollars.

All the National Environmental Policy Act says is put down in writing all the alternatives to the project, the commitment of resources involved, and those considerations which should have gone into any wise decisionmaking and wise long-range planning.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, we have testimony in other projects of great expense having been incurred by the Service in preparing these statements, and I gather from your testimony in chief here this morning that you feel that the environmental statement filed in this case is not adequate, that you wanted additional things added which would require more expense. Whether you would on the others, I do not know. But I cannot see how the agency would have authority to go ahead and incur this additional expense when it does not have directions from Congress to do so on these earlier projects.

Now, I realize that is not vital to this particular discussion, but you did introduce the subject, and I was rather puzzled by it, that you would think they should go ahead, and, without congressional authorization, incur that expense.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, in the first place, I reemphasize the court decision in North Carolina on the Chicod Creek.

Mr. MAYNE. Is that the district court?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Yes, U.S. District Court for Eastern North Carolina.

Mr. MAYNE. Is that a—

Mr. BLACKWELDER. It is a channelization project in eastern North Carolina on the Chicod Creek, which predated the passage of the NEPA. The Soil Conservation Service indicated that an environmental impact statement was not required on that project. Judge Larkins in his decision said it was.

Mr. MAYNE. As you know, that would be applicable only within the jurisdiction of that particular court. You can't extend that all over the United States until there has been judicial ruling by higher authority.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. We believe that it is a precedent-setting decision.

Mr. MAYNE. You may very well be right, but you could just as well be absolutely wrong.

Well, I do not want to unduly prolong this, but I would say this, that I certainly support the effort to preserve the ecology. What I am going to say now does not apply just to the environmental protection thrust in this country, but to other attempted reforms as well. Sometimes I won-

der if the people who are espousing these reforms fully realize the nature of the legislative process. We have to fight long and hard here in the Congress with opposing views on many of these issues, and after long hearings and debate and discussions back and forth and great pressure from the lobbyists on both sides, finally, in good faith, we try to work out legislation which is passed and represents the best that we can do. If the President signs it, it then becomes law. It just does not seem to me that it is in good faith, after we arrive at that decision, which is the best that the American system can produce under our rules and procedures, then for one side to come forward and say, "Well, we were a part of this process and we agreed to this result, but now we are going to tell the agencies that this is a very inadequate result, and we must insist that you go much farther than the compromise worked out in the Halls of Congress." This just does not seem to me to be in good faith. It discourages those of us who want to give our support to these movements from doing so when we find that, when we have done our best, then we are told "that is a lousy result; we will not give it our support and we insist that the Government go much farther, because we think we would like to have had a stronger result."

It seems to me that attitude is counterproductive to true reform.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, the reason that we have asked that impact statements be filed on projects which predate NEPA which involve channelization is that it is not too late to correct some mistakes that have been made in the past. I am sure you will agree that if at some point, looking back, you decide, well, maybe we have made a mistake, we didn't realize what the effect of channelization is going to be, now we are going to look back and decide there are certain modifications that could be made in this project—it may be worth this initial investment to avoid damage that might occur and to promote instead redesign of the project. It would be better than saying, well, let's go ahead now with these projects, even though they are not the best projects that could have been planned. It does not seem unreasonable in the slightest to take that attitude.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Any questions? Mr. de la Garza?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. No.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Bergland?

Mr. BERGLAND. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. I would like to inquire personally about these reports, these environmental statements—whom do they help? How do they help? That is what I have not understood.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. In the first place, they allow individuals concerned about what is happening, whether in the local area or nationally, to see what is going on, to make some comments. For example, it has been the case in the past that you have various agencies planning or managing something. Other agencies who have expertise in a particular area and are able to make some contribution have not been con-

sulted. This applies not only to the Soil Conservation Service but to every single department of the Government.

What we have now is a very fine example of agencies broadening their consideration of alternatives, consulting with other agencies which have expertise in various areas, and you are coming up with much finer long-range planning, and a much wiser planning process.

Mr. POAGE. Now, if I understand it, what you mean is that possibly the Environmental Protection Agency is in a better position to pass upon these phases of these projects—that is, the environmental phases—than is the Soil Conservation Service?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, the Environmental Protection Agency would have certain expertise, for example, in the area of water quality, which the Soil Conservation Service might not have.

Mr. POAGE. I am just trying to get to language I can understand. This expertise and all that stuff—I have read the dictionary, but just in common language, what you are telling us is—and I am not finding fault with that at all, but I did want to be sure that I understood it. What you are telling us is that the Environmental Protection Agency is in a better position to pass upon the environmental phases of this thing than is the Soil Conservation Service. You would agree, of course, that the Soil Conservation Service is in a better position to determine how fast land will erode or something of that kind, but you think the other agency is in a better position to give a judgment upon the environmental impact?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Right. Of course, it is not in the case of the Environmental Protection Agency's comments that they have the authority. They are more or less commenting on certain things, providing their expertise.

Mr. POAGE. But the Environmental Protection Agency has the right to file a statement and must be consulted before the Department of Agriculture brings us these projects now. That is right, is it not?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Right. According to the procedures prescribed by the Council on Environmental Quality, yes.

Mr. POAGE. I don't mean that they had to do it before they were created. They have not been in existence but a few years, and they did not have to do it back in 1776, but they have to do it now. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. So, they have to give a statement as to what they conceive to be environmental impact.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Only on certain particular phases.

Mr. POAGE. How, now?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. The Environmental Protection Agency would comment only on certain particular phases.

Mr. POAGE. Any phase they wanted to?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Fisheries and Wildlife would comment on other phases.

Mr. POAGE. They would comment on any phase they wanted to, would they not?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. No; they would be restricted by the guidelines to comment on certain phases.

Mr. POAGE. Let's get those guidelines. I want to know what guideline restricts them from commenting on the weather if they want to.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. The guidelines promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality specify for all agencies of the Government when and on what they shall comment. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to comment on water quality, on air quality; the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in Interior will comment on effects on fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. POAGE. I understand they have all that authority. I understand that. But I am asking you—of course, honestly, I do not know of it. Maybe it exists, but do you know of any law or any regulation that prohibits them from commenting on anything they want to? They can comment on my health if they want to.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. According to the administrative guidelines, that is all they would be violating—the administrative guidelines. If they commented on the weather—

Mr. POAGE. It tells them what they shall comment on, does it not? Where in the administrative guidelines does it say they shall not comment on the weather?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, I don't know.

Mr. POAGE. It does not say it, I think. I am asking you, I think it is perfectly clear that they have the right to comment on anything in the world they want to.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Oh, I disagree with that. They are confined by the guidelines under any reasonable reading to comment on those areas on which they have expertise. And these are specifically spelled out in the guidelines. EPA has authority on water quality, air pollution, solid waste; the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has the authority on fish and wildlife resources, and so on.

Mr. POAGE. We at least are agreed, though, that this agency or bureau, the Environmental Protection Agency, has the right to comment on any of these environmental impacts.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. They do not comment—well, yes, you could generally say they comment on the variety of the—

Mr. POAGE. On the environmental impact of any of these projects?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Right. Of course, there are other agencies which should comment also on fish and wildlife.

Mr. POAGE. I know, but I am just trying to make this plain.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. You are in agreement with me that there is nothing in the present law that would prohibit the Agency—

Mr. BLACKWELDER. The Environmental Protection Agency—

Mr. POAGE. Yes, from commenting on any environmental aspect of any of these flood prevention projects?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. I would have to doublecheck the guidelines. They are fairly comprehensive, and I believe that is correct.

Mr. POAGE. All right. And you believe that the agency is in a better position to comment on them than is the Soil Conservation Service. On the environmental aspects I am talking about only.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Do you include soil erosion, for example?

Mr. POAGE. No; I said the environmental aspect.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. All right, that would be environmental.

Mr. POAGE. Then if it is environmental, I would include the whole thing.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. They would have expertise, for example, that the Soil Conservation Service might not have.

Mr. POAGE. That would put them in a better position to comment, would it not?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. That would.

Mr. POAGE. If they have expertise that the other fellow does not have, then they are in a better position to comment, are they not?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Then you would rather accept their comments than to accept those from the Department of Agriculture on this environmental—

Mr. BLACKWELDER. In those areas in which they have more expertise.

Mr. POAGE. On the environmental aspects?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Now, then, you now have the comments of the Environmental Protection Agency, and we have agreed that they are in a better position to comment.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. I do not have the comments now. I do not think they have commented on this project.

Mr. POAGE. Well, they have the right to comment, do they not? In fact, they have the duty to comment.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Unfortunately, that is the reason I am here today, that in the process of consultation with other agencies, all I have is this very meager three-page environmental impact statement, with no agency comments appended.

Mr. POAGE. You are just talking about this project?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. I thought we were talking about the whole fundamental basis. I understood you to tell Mr. Mayne that you felt it was important—

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Right.

Mr. POAGE (continuing). That the Department of Agriculture file comments on these projects on the environmental aspects. And Mr. Mayne wondered why you needed to spend that money, and I did, too.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. The current projects.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. You are going to have the advantage of seeing an environmental statement from the Environmental Protection Agency. What you are asking is to have the Department of Agriculture also to spend the money to do the same thing. And you are telling us at the same time that the departmental agency is in a better position to give us a better report than the Department of Agriculture can. And I am asking you why you need the Department of Agriculture's comments at all on this?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Here is the way it is now. The Department of Agriculture has a project. Along with that project for this committee's use and for all others will be appended an environmental impact statement. And along with that statement will be the comments by the other agencies—State game and fish agencies, EPA, Bureau of Sport Fisheries—

Mr. POAGE. I know, but I am asking you now what good the Department of Agriculture's environmental statement is when you are getting—I am talking about the present not the past—when you are getting the comments of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, in the first place, that will enable this committee to look through and say, well, this project seems to have the full support not only of the Environmental Protection Agency, but the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the State game and fisheries have made this fine statement here.

Mr. POAGE. That is not the point I am trying to make at all. I don't make myself clear, I am sure. What I am asking you is why do you need the Department of Agriculture to give us one of these reports when you are going to get that from the agency that you conceive to be much better qualified.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. You are not going to get it from them. I am sorry, I didn't make that clear. The agency whose project it is is the one responsible for making the environmental impact statement and appending the comments from other agencies.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that that is the law, but I am asking you why is it necessary to continue to require the Department of Agriculture to make an environmental statement when you are going to get a better one, as you see it, from these other people?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. OK; I didn't make myself quite clear.

The Environmental Protection Agency would not be in the position that the Soil Conservation Service would be in to investigate the variety of projects that might benefit a particular area. They would not be in a position to know what commitment of resources would be made. They would not be in a position to evaluate the commitment of resources.

Mr. POAGE. I know that. I am not asking about that. I am just asking about this environmental statement. Why would you require one from the Department of Agriculture when you are going to get a better one from—

Mr. BLACKWELDER. No, no, you are not going to get—you are going to get an impact statement from EPA. Rather, an environmental statement from SCS that is much more comprehensive than containing, say, merely comments by EPA on water pollution, on water quality, on solid waste disposal.

Mr. POAGE. I am not proposing to relieve the Department of Agriculture of their responsibility of giving us the kind of statements they have always given us. But I am suggesting, why require an environmental impact statement from the Department of Agriculture, and then turn around and require another environmental impact statement from the other agency?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, in the first place, there are really two different types of statements involved there. One is, you might say, the comprehensive environmental impact statement prepared by the Soil

Conservation Service. The other is merely in the form of a comment by a particular agency on certain aspects.

Mr. POAGE. Well, would you object to putting the burden on the environmental agency in the beginning and relieving the Department of Agriculture of the burden of commenting on something that you suggest they are not competent to comment on anyhow? Would you object to transferring all that responsibility to the Environmental Agency and require them to make a full comment on it?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, it seems that they are not in a position to say in certain cases what the full range of alternatives is. For example, they do not have expertise in land treatment—

Mr. POAGE. I am not asking them to make any comments about land treatment, I am not asking them to make any comments about alternatives. I am asking them simply to make the environmental impact statement.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, the question of land treatment and its environmental effects would be discussed in the impact statement and the Soil Conservation Service would be the agency that would comment on that. EPA would not have the expertise to do that particular type of comment.

Mr. POAGE. The Soil Conservation Service will continue to make, as they always have made, statements as to what a project will cost us, what the benefits will be, how many will be benefitted, the type of soil, the amount of water that can be withheld the type of rains that they can protect against, and that sort of thing. But when it comes to the environment, you do not like their statements, you think they do not have the expertise to make a competent statement. I am just asking you why you want their statement at all. You have discredited it, you feel that it is not worth anything. Now, why do you want to make them go to that bother? Why not let the other agency make the environmental statement?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. In the first place, let's just take two types of impact statements that have been filed. If you look at the statement filed on the Lake Verret project with the one that was filed after the lawsuit on Chicod Creek, you will discover that in the first place a good deal of difference in thickness. In Chicod Creek, there is an effort being made to go into more alternatives. This is the type of thing that only the Soil Conservation Service is in a position to do and they have not done this in the past, reading through the watershed plans. They have not gone into the full range of environmental impacts of alternative plans. This is the position that only the planning agency can be in.

And that is why—I do not see the point that you are trying to make—shifting to EPA the job of having to prepare a full environmental impact statement—it would not be in a position to do so. What we have is a major agency, the Soil Conservation Service, doing the planning, other agencies commenting and providing advice, and these statements are appended on. But the main thrust still has to be from the agency which knows what the planning is all about, which is familiar with small watersheds and how they work and what they do. So, I would be reluctant to have any kind of shifting of the preparation of an environmental impact statement to EPA.

Mr. POAGE. Let me try again to see if I can ever find what your views are on these matters.

Am I correct in assuming that you do want to insist that the Department of Agriculture continue to file environmental statements?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. We believe that—

Mr. POAGE. You believe that both the Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Agency should file an environmental statement?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. No, the Soil Conservation Service should file environmental impact statements on its projects and, in so doing, other agencies are required under the guidelines to comment on these statements and to provide their expertise in the planning process.

Mr. POAGE. I think you have pretty well made clear what I have in mind, but you are a good enough lawyer not to get it on the record.

I think it is perfectly clear that what the gentleman wants to do is require the Department of Agriculture to file a statement so he and the other agencies can pick it apart rather than to get anybody any information, because he says that the other agency has the expertise and has the knowledge and can do a better job than the Department of Agriculture. He wants the Department of Agriculture to do something that he can pick apart and criticize.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. No, I disagree with that.

Mr. POAGE. You can criticize somebody if you have required them to do something of this kind. So, I think it is perfectly clear, although the gentleman is a good lawyer and is not going to say anything and he has not said anything.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a completely unfair statement. What I have said here is, if we had a full and complete statement, you would not have had the Mayor of Morgan City coming up here and saying, "You are taking away our very livelihood." You would not have the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission filing such a report. If it had been fully consulted in the planning for this project, you would not be having the opposition to the project that we now have.

It is not that we want to sit up here and ride shotgun and pick apart any environmental program. We want sound long-range planning and that is what we do not think we have here in the Lake Verret project.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. de la Garza?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I want to follow up on the expertise part of it.

Mr. Blackwelder, leaving aside the meaning of "expertise"—I am sure we both understand it—do you think you can legislate expertise?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. How do you mean that?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You establish an agency and you give it the name of Environmental Protection Agency, and they are experts.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Presumably, the people that they hire—for example, if we establish the Environmental Protection Agency and give them authority to work with water quality and air quality, then presumably, they hire the top people in those areas to examine the project—scientific experts. And it is not a matter of legislating expertise. It is rather they are given a legislative responsibility and they go out and find the people who are most qualified in those areas, who know the most about the subject.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Do you assume that was done?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. I hope it was done.

MR. DE LA GARZA. You don't know?

MR. BLACKWELDER. In some areas, certainly it was done, and in other areas, we believe there could be a strengthening of personnel. I believe this is the case with all Government agencies.

MR. DE LA GARZA. I did not want to leave it in the record that we assume—how long has EPA been in operation?

MR. BLACKWELDER. Since 1970, I believe. Two years.

MR. DE LA GARZA. And the Council on Environmental Quality?

MR. BLACKWELDER. That was established by the National Environmental Policy Act the first day of 1970, January 1.

MR. DE LA GARZA. I have seen some of the people who work for the CEQ, for example. That is why I did not want to let it go in the record—here is a young man, I do not know where he came from, but I think his political affiliations were such that he got a job. He became an instant expert on this. I did not want you to sit here and say that the civil servants on soil conservation, who I doubt any of them has been in the service less than 20 years, are not as interested in the environment or in the effects of projects on the environment as a young man who had a little political influence and he was hired and became an instant expert on the environment.

MR. BLACKWELDER. Well, in the first place, I should make the point that EPA was established by putting together some already existing agencies, such as the Federal Water Quality Administration people, who had been in existence over the past decade, working with the growing problems of water pollution. So it is not an instant creation, overnight.

In the second place, we ourselves have raised some serious questions about personnel at the Council on Environmental Quality and the way the Council has been used by the Administration recently to justify decisions that it wants to make.

MR. DE LA GARZA. You know the fluctuations of Federal hiring practices, I am sure.

MR. BLACKWELDER. Somewhat.

MR. DE LA GARZA. Are you satisfied that this puts the best man in the best spot always?

MR. BLACKWELDER. No; I am not. I can think of agency after agency where there are other people who, from our point of view, we would like to see in a higher position, other people who, we think, should not be there at all.

MR. DE LA GARZA. And this applies to CEQ and EPA and every agency?

MR. BLACKWELDER. Yes.

MR. DE LA GARZA. So it stands by reason that the longer an agency has been established, it is conceivable if by nothing at all but the law of averages, the more qualified people have survived?

MR. BLACKWELDER. Not necessarily. That could be the case that some very poor ones have gotten firmly entrenched. It could go both ways. So you could have that.

MR. DE LA GARZA. So, because it is called the Environmental Protection Agency, by your own statement, does not necessarily mean that

they have the expertise or they have the interest or are qualified more so than any other agency? That is a statement you just made?

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Well, in the first place, I think maybe we have gotten off the track in talking about the Environmental Protection Agency and all the work that they have done on Soil Conservation Service projects. It is not the Environmental Protection Agency which has had the major input. It has been the State game and fish agencies and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the Interior Department, all of which have been in existence as long or longer than the Soil Conservation Service.

I am not concerned right here with comments by the Environmental Protection Agency. So, I think our whole discussion in talking about their comments may have been a little out of line.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Well, I do not think so. If we go into that, yes; I agree with you. But the Soil Conservation, to my knowledge, goes into all of this. Because you call it an environmental impact statement by somebody else does not necessarily mean that the agency has not looked into this matter. Whether the mayor of Morgan City was consulted or not, I do not know. I assume the mayor of Morgan City had ample opportunity to make his views known.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. In a resolution that I have here, he claims that he and the city officials were excluded from the hearing and planning process.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I cannot understand and leave unchallenged in the record that he had no opportunity at any time. They have to have a public hearing.

Mr. BLACKWELDER. Unfortunately, it has been my experience that the hearings do not always go the way they are supposed to. In the first place, many interests in an area outside the watershed, as in the case of Morgan City, do not realize that a planning process is going on in an upstream area. Then when they finally come in, they realize that a project is already well underway in planning and it is going to have an adverse effect on their area. And they are put in a position of saying, "Well, we didn't have anything to say. If we could have known about it and been in on it from the start, we could have had something different."

Mr. DE LA GARZA. This always seems to be the case when something doesn't go as the wishes of a group that opposes the project.

But I did want to clarify that because I did not want it to stay on the record that they have the expertise. They have the expertise, question mark, is what I would like to leave on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you.

Anything further?

Mr. MAYNE. No.

Mr. POAGE. If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Blackwelder. I believe that completes our public hearing.

We will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 10:50 a.m., the subcommittee went into executive session.)

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and a list of the names of the persons who have been engaged in the work.

The second part of the report deals with the financial statement of the year. It shows the total amount of the grant received from the Government and the total amount of the grant received from the public. It also shows the total amount of the grant received from the private sector and the total amount of the grant received from the foreign countries. The report also shows the total amount of the grant received from the other sources.

The third part of the report deals with the accounts of the various projects. It shows the total amount of the grant received for each project and the total amount of the grant received for each project. It also shows the total amount of the grant received for each project and the total amount of the grant received for each project.