

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir. It is a matter of the Federal Government paying for the collection and local interest paying for disposal.

Mr. GRAY. There again I do not see how——

Colonel ANDERSON. You have to figure it out, the two costs would have to be figured out. In this project, on an annual cost basis, the Federal share would be about \$29,000 and the local share about \$11,000.

Mr. GRAY. It is still going to boil down to the same thing, that each project is going to have to stand on its own merits as far as benefit-cost ratio is concerned?

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRAY. If you are going to assess the local people one part of the project cost and Federal Government with the other, you are still going to have to figure out what those specific costs are as they relate to each specific project. I do not see why they would want to hold these two projects up if they know what the formula is. It looks like they could give it to us now on these projects.

Mr. HARSHA. Has the problem not been that the Army Corps of Engineers has heretofore looked upon drift removal as a local problem rather than a Federal problem?

Colonel ANDERSON. There are some exceptions to this; but in general it has been considered to be a local problem.

Mr. HARSHA. You feel that with overall legislation then that you could accept it as a Federal problem?

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. And then subject to your cost-sharing basis go ahead?

Colonel ANDERSON. There would not be a requirement to come back to the Congress for authorization and funding of each separate drift removal project and it would not be necessary to present a report on the costs and benefits for each project if the general legislation were passed.

Mr. HARSHA. Do you not have authority now under \$100,000 to remove—clear and remove—snag and clear and remove drift——

Colonel ANDERSON. Snag and clear the specific Federal channel that is designated, if it is for navigation, or to snag and clear if it happens to be flood control; yes, sir. But actually we get outside of the navigation channel in some respects in this collection of drift too. The idea is to try to get the stuff before it gets into the channel. The snagging and clearing authority is for a one-time job, not for an annual maintenance program.

Mr. HARSHA. Now let me ask you this: I have been contacted by several sources on the problem with dredging and clearing debris from the Cuyahoga River from up around Kent, Ohio, down to Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, and this is a similar project in the sense that there is no flood control or apparently no navigation involved. It would remove debris, clean up the trash and pollution and increase low-flow augmentation of it. But apparently the corps has raised the same question, that this is a local project rather than Federal project.

Colonel ANDERSON. The Buffalo District has considered the Upper Cuyahoga River in the vicinity of Cuyahoga Falls to see whether there can be an economically justified project. Our preliminary look indicates that it is not economically justified, and we are looking at it from the standpoint of flood control, recreation, and esthetics. In