

Mr. CLAUSEN. This type of coordination is certainly excellent. I know in my own congressional district we did this with the Klamath project and the mutual benefits to local, State and Federal interests are certainly going beyond what we had hoped for.

I think this is a similar philosophy, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Thank you very much, Colonel.

At this point we will hear the comments of Congressmen Van Deerlin and Wilson on the Sweetwater project.

**STATEMENT OF HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee. The case for construction of the Sweetwater River Flood Control Channel, in my congressional district, has already been solidly established by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Rather than repeat the points that have already been made in support of this project, I will simply endorse them. The need for a flood control channel in the Sweetwater River Basin has been amply demonstrated; as matters now stand, this particular flood plain, located in the heart of one of the most rapidly growing sections of the San Diego metropolitan area, is entirely without protection.

But instead of dwelling on the generally acknowledged desirability of this project, I would like to take this opportunity to make a suggestion which I believe is in the public interest and which I know would facilitate the timely completion of the project.

My proposal is simple: An amendment in the authorization legislation providing that State and local interests be reimbursed or credited for project expenses incurred in advance of a regular congressional appropriation.

There are several good reasons for adding this type of assurance to the authorization bill. Perhaps the most salient point is that more than \$4 million will be saved if the flood control channel can be developed in conjunction with two highway projects, the construction of State Route 54 and the widening of Interstate Route 5.

The California State Division of Highways is ready to begin work on both highway undertakings. But since the State route would parallel the flood control channel, and the interstate road would cross it, our California highway agency can do little until it knows the exact design of the flood control channel.

The situation on Interstate 5 cries out for relief, which could be provided in large measure by a reimbursement clause in the legislation you are preparing. At present, this highway, San Diego's major north-south artery, narrows abruptly from eight to four lanes in the vicinity of the proposed flood control channel, creating a traffic hazard of major proportions. Obviously, the State would like to carry out the necessary remedial work; but effective planning is not possible until the flood control channel has at least been designed.

In fact, the flood control channel is quite literally the key to both highway projects. Obviously, the State highway construction must be very carefully coordinated with the flood control work. And improvements on Interstate 5 cannot proceed without foreknowledge of the precise routes of both the flood control channel and the State route with which it will connect.