

and \$600,000 will be required under the delayed plan. Funds for these studies are now included in the project estimate, but the studies are planned to be made during the preconstruction and coordination phase of the work rather than taking five more years for study before requesting authorization by Congress. Florida requests the committee to authorize the project for construction under normal procedures of Congress applicable for all other rivers and harbors projects, including other waterways.

Metropolitan-Dade County is completing this year a \$23,000,000 improvement program for the Miami Port that will provide a modern passenger terminal, marginal wharves, transit sheds, warehouses, utilities, and other facilities needed for an efficient and modern port. A second phase development of the port is now in the planning stage for a longer range plan to meet future requirements. The existing channel depth of 30 feet for the Miami Harbor is inadequate to meet current requirements and will practically close out use by ships now under construction which are planned for future operations. The population and growth demands of the Miami area dictate consideration of improving the navigation facilities to meet at least the minimum demands of water transportation. Deepening of the main ship channel and turning basin to 36 feet is fully justified at this time. Authorization of this channel improvement is requested by Florida.

Port Sutton is served by a side channel in Tampa Harbor. The Port Sutton channel and related port facilities were constructed with local funds. It was constructed to meet the growing industrial demands of the Florida west coast area. The Federal Government maintains all other channels of Tampa Harbor, but since the Port Sutton channel was developed at private expense, it is not presently maintained by the Federal Government. The purpose of this request is to seek Federal authorization for maintenance of this channel, the same as for other channels in the Tampa Harbor.

There are two beach erosion control projects in Florida recommended for construction to protect important areas of our shoreline, one in the Cape Canaveral area and the other along the heavily built-up Miami Beach. Local interests have agreed to pay the major share of cost of both of these projects. These beaches are important recreational and public use areas, essential to the economy of the region served. Details of these projects are contained in the statement for the record submitted to your committee. We request your favorable consideration for authorization of these two beach erosion control projects.

A hurricane protection project for Hillsborough Bay, an arm of the Tampa Bay, is designed to protect the expensive and highly developed urban and industrial developments along the bay front at Tampa. Hurricanes passing over or near Tampa Bay have generated tides exceeding 14 feet at Tampa. Such tidal waves would cause serious flooding today and extremely heavy property damage along the bay front. Much of the bay front development is constructed only four to five feet above sea level. The project would be extremely valuable as a protection in Hillsborough Bay and is recommended by the State for authorization, subject to review by the Public Works Committee after preconstruction studies are made to determine wave effect on other areas of Tampa Bay and the effects of the project on pollution in the waters of the bay.

We realize that reports on some of the projects for which we request authorization may not have been processed by all Federal agencies and their comments may not have been available in time for the Chief of Engineers to submit the reports to Congress in final form. However, all of these projects have been studied by the Corps of Engineers and favorably reported by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. If any of the reports discussed have not reached your committee before the hearings are completed, we hope that you may call up any interested agency to present their comments so the committee may consider the project before mark-up of the Omnibus Bill.

We hope that these project reports having cleared the Board, will be favorably considered by your committee for inclusion in the Omnibus Bill for 1968.

Thank you for giving us this opportunity of presenting our program requirements to your committee.

Mr. CRAMER. We have a continuing problem relating to continuing authorization on central and southern. We have discussed this many times. For the purpose of the record, you recommend, as I see, \$32 million for the 2-year basin authorization, 1969 and 1970. I understand it is your position, as it has been, that you would much prefer a 2-year authorization, to provide greater continuity. Is that correct?