

other improvements will benefit the economy of the Waukegan area and of the Midwest as well as the overall economy of the Nation. In addition, it should promote a substantial increase in foreign trade and encourage greater international understanding.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I earnestly urge that you include in the omnibus rivers and harbors flood control bill authorization for deepening and widening the Waukegan Harbor in Illinois.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have Lt. Col. Lewis A. Pick, Jr., Assistant Director of Civil Works for Pacific Divisions.

Would you proceed.

**STATEMENT OF LT. COL. LEWIS A. PICK, JR., ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
OF CIVIL WORKS FOR PACIFIC DIVISIONS**

Colonel PICK. My first project, sir, is Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Calif.

HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Humboldt Bay is located on the northern California coast about 225 nautical miles north of San Francisco.

The existing Federal project provides for two jetties at the bay entrance; a 40-foot-deep bar and entrance channel; 30-foot and 26-foot channels in the north bay and a 26-foot-deep channel with a turning basin in the south bay. Present depths are inadequate for the needs of present and foreseeable waterborne commerce and there is no suitable area for vessels to anchor while awaiting favorable weather and sea conditions for departure from the harbor.

The Chief of Engineers recommends modification of the existing project in the North Bay to provide for widening the channel at two locations, mile 0.75 and mile 2.6; deepening the North Bay Channel to 35 feet from mile 0.75 to mile 5.0 in the Eureka Channel and to the end of the Samoa Channel at mile 5.84; and to provide an anchorage area a 35 feet deep and 1,200 feet square as a suitable location between the entrance and Gunther Island. The most suitable location for the anchorage area would be selected during detailed project design. The estimated total cost is \$3,043,000 of which \$2,430,000 is Federal and \$613,000 is non-Federal. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the required local cooperation. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.1.

The comments of the State of California and Federal agencies are favorable. The Bureau of the Budget would expect a reanalysis of the benefits and costs prior to any request for construction funds. Subject to consideration of this comment, the Bureau has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. That reanalysis, that is ordinary procedure, is it?

Colonel PICK. Yes, sir. They are normally reanalyzed. The comments of the Bureau of the Budget were due to the fact that an increment had a very narrow benefit-cost ratio, and they would like it reanalyzed prior to requesting construction funds.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman from California.