

during periods of low streamflow and salinity conditions in the estuary are often harmful to the oyster industry. Population growth in the region indicates a need for additional water supply, recreation, and power.

The previous project was authorized for flood control and power by the Flood Control Act of 1946; however, the authorization contained a provision that the maximum power pool elevation be limited to 220 feet, mean sea level. The Chief of Engineers had recommended a maximum power pool elevation of 240 feet, mean sea level. In 1952, following authorization, more preconstruction planning studies indicated that the project would be economically marginal and construction was not considered justified at that time. In 1955, the House passed a bill to remove the restriction on the power pool elevation from the authorizing act. The Senate requested further information before acting on the proposal, and the Senate Public Works Committee then adopted a resolution calling for a review of the prior report. This report is in response to that resolution.

The project recommended consists of a multipurpose dam and reservoir at the Salem Church site and a small downstream afterbay for flood control, power, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, water quality control, and water supply. The maximum power pool elevation would be 240 feet, mean sea level, the same as previously recommended. Total cost is estimated at \$79,500,000, of which \$67,067,000 would be Federal after allowing for local reimbursements towards water supply and recreation. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.1. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to meet all requirements of cooperation and all interested Federal and State agencies favor the project. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report to Congress but considers that costs of salinity control should be allocated to the enhancement of commercial fisheries rather than to water quality control. The Secretary of the Army recognizes that salinity control will benefit commercial fisheries; however, he also notes that the Bureau's suggested allocation would have no significant effect on cost sharing.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my statement.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Clausen?

Mr. CLAUSEN. I will yield to some of my colleagues.

Mr. JONES. This proposition has been pending in the House of Representatives for how many years, Colonel?

Colonel SEIDEL. It was first authorized in 1946.

Mr. JONES. I think I remember it 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I yield to Mr. Harsha.

Mr. JONES. Let me ask one question first.

How does this affect the authorization for 1946?

Colonel SEIDEL. The authorization in 1946, sir, placed a limitation on the elevation of the power pool. It was raised from 220 feet to 240 feet.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Harsha, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Colonel, I have here the reservoir will provide the flood protection for only about 44 percent of the size of the standard project flood; is that correct?

Colonel SEIDEL. That is correct, sir.