

There will be no cost to the Government, and it will be a great improvement to Baltimore City. I understand that the Chief of Engineers just sent up a letter approving favorable action of the committee, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that this be made a part of the record.

Mr. BLATNIK. Without objection, it is so ordered, Mr. Chairman.
(The letter referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1968.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your informal request for our comments on the possibility of declaring a portion of Baltimore's Inner Harbor nonnavigable, in connection with the urban renewal project planned by the City of Baltimore in that area.

It is our understanding that the City proposes to fill certain areas in the Inner Harbor for use in the construction of the Inner Harbor Project I Renewal Plan. This plan is the first stage of a program which calls for the revitalization and redevelopment of one-fourth of Baltimore's downtown area. The first stage involves the construction of office space, apartments, shops, theatres, marinas, a Science Center, an International Trade Center, and recreation facilities.

The project is to be financed through the issuance of bonds, secured by a mortgage on the area to be filled. In order to obtain the necessary mortgage and title insurance, the City must be able to show clear title to the lands. Under the navigation servitude of the United States, fill placed in navigable waters is subject to removal without compensation to its owner. While the possibility of such removal is remote where substantial development has occurred, still mortgage and title insurance firms are very reluctant to insure clear title or accept as security such filled lands unless the navigation servitude is made inapplicable. The procedure which has been developed to accomplish this is a Congressional declaration of non-navigability.

There is very little commercial navigation in the area proposed to be filled, and the City project will enhance the value of the area for private recreational navigation by small craft. It would therefore appear that no adverse effects on navigation will result.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. CLARKE,
*Major General, USA,
Acting Chief of Engineers.*

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Harsha.

Mr. HARSHA. I notice on this map that you provided us, Colonel, there are a series of piers—pier 1 and pier 2 and part of pier 3 seem to be involved.

Colonel SEIDEL. We exclude pier 3.

Mr. HARSHA. Your line goes up to the corner of it.

Colonel SEIDEL. That is the limit of the area that would be declared nonnavigable, the western side.

Mr. HARSHA. And you could not use one side of that pier according to this?

Colonel SEIDEL. That is right.

Mr. HARSHA. Then you do not exclude it entirely; do you?

Colonel SEIDEL. We exclude the structure, sir. We do not exclude the channel.

Mr. HARSHA. But you also impair the right to use the left side or the west side of it?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir. It is to be nonnavigable.

Mr. HARSHA. Have the people that operate those piers raised any objection?