

Mr. HARSHA. And it would reduce the flow of the largest flood of record back in October 1942 from 140,000 cubic feet per second to 59,000 cubic feet per second.

Colonel SEIDEL. It would take a flood about 90 percent of the maximum flood of record.

Mr. HARSHA. Well, in order to avoid the flood damage, would it not have to be included in some 35,000 cubic feet per second?

Colonel SEIDEL. The maximum, nondamaging flood below the dam will be 35,000 cubic feet per second. This will be exceeded only once in every 100 years.

Mr. HARSHA. I am sorry, I do not understand you. You say the flow below the dam?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir; as we fill the dam we would control the flow below the dam and we would restrict the flow to the 35,000 feet per second.

Mr. HARSHA. What is the meaning of this statement in the report that says it will provide flood protection for only about 44 percent of the standard flood projects?

Colonel SEIDEL. Sir, the flow of the standard project flood greatly exceeds the figure we are discussing. The standard project flood has a flow of 278,000 cubic feet per second below the dam.

Mr. HARSHA. You have a spillway design flood of 707,000 cubic feet per second, that your outflow from design flood is 552,000 cubic feet per second.

Colonel SEIDEL. The standard project flood, sir, would peak at 278,000 cubic feet per second and the spillway design flood would peak at 552,000 feet per second under present conditions.

Mr. HARSHA. But in order to prevent flood damage you would have to reduce that to 35,000 cubic feet per second, would you not?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir; the nondamaging flow of 35,000 cubic feet per second, will be exceeded on the average of once every 100 years.

Mr. HARSHA. To what extent would the 1942 flood be reduced?

Colonel SEIDEL. Ninety percent, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. Well, what would 100 percent be reduced to?

Colonel SEIDEL. There would be no damage if the flood were 90 percent or greater than the 1942 flood.

Mr. HARSHA. What damage would result from 100 percent flow of the 1942 flood? In other words, another 1942 flood, what would the damage be?

Colonel SEIDEL. The damages, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. What would that amount to in dollars?

Colonel SEIDEL. About \$40,000.

Mr. HARSHA. Well, then, what would the flow be reduced to?

Colonel SEIDEL. At Salem Church it would be reduced to 59,000 cubic feet per second versus the 140,000 cubic feet per second that occurred during the 1942 storm.

The damage would be \$40,000 with the project in place. That is with a recurrence of the 1942 flood.

Mr. HARSHA. All right, now, according to Senate Document 37, estimates of annual cost of the project are based on 1965 prices. Are your costs here in this report based on 1965 prices?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. And, you also provide for a 100-year amortization.