

Mr. HARSHA. Yes; but you do not have that on your benefits. All you have got under the sheet I have, "Annual benefits, lower operating costs"—I did not know what that was for until I asked you; and then damage prevention.

Colonel PICK. Right, sir. Well, lower operating costs would also be lower fishing fleet operating costs. It would be lower operating costs for all boat users. My first statement was improper since I did not realize what you were referring to at that time. It does lower the operating costs of the State ferry, but that is only a small portion.

Mr. HARSHA. Can you give us some analysis or breakdown?

Colonel PICK. Yes, sir. We will be glad to provide that for the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

PROJECT BENEFITS

TANGIBLE BENEFITS

a. Delay-Time Reduction

(1) The proximity of rock outcrops to the narrow passages of both Sergius and Whitestone Narrows, when combined with strong tidal currents, create a hazardous condition for deep-draft vessels. Transits by these vessels must be made at slack tide intervals. There being approximately six hours between slack tides each, the average vessel is delayed three hours for each transit of the Narrows. In some instances arrivals at the Narrows are timed to coincide with slack water; however, the delay actually occurs in the form of intentional delay from the port of departure or reduced cruising speed while enroute to the Narrows.

(2) Vessels departing from Sitka generally take their delay at the dock and costs consist principally of crew wages and indirect costs. Vessels on their way to Sitka are under operating conditions and their delay costs accrue at the rate of the total operating costs of the vessel. Not all delays experienced by Alaska Steamship vessels would be eliminated. It estimated that their delay time will be reduced by 80% and that all delays by the other users will be eliminated by the proposed improvement. The elimination of almost all delay costs by the proposed channel improvements would reflect a benefit to the general public by permitting a reduction in transportation costs.

(3) The amount and value of delay time experienced in 1965 were approximated from information provided by three of the major users of the channel. This information and estimates for miscellaneous vessel transits of the Narrows, are shown in the following tabulation.

ANNUAL COST OF VESSEL DELAY TIME—ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES AT SITKA HARBOR, 1965

	Division of Marine Transportation	Alaska Steamship Co.	Washington Tug & Barge Co.	Other vessels	Total
Number of arrivals.....	123	51	10	200	384
Hours of delay, at 3 hours each.....	369	153	30	600	1,152
At-sea hourly cost.....	\$184	\$104	\$40	\$20	
Delay cost, subtotal.....	\$67,900	\$15,900	\$1,200	\$12,000	\$97,000
Number of departures.....	123	47	10	200	380
Hours of delay, at 3 hours each.....	369	141	30	600	1,140
In-port hourly cost.....	\$93	\$76	\$20	\$10	
Standby cost, subtotal.....	\$34,300	\$10,700	\$600	\$6,000	\$51,600
Total delay cost.....	\$102,200	\$26,600	\$1,800	\$18,000	\$148,600
Benefits.....	102,200	21,300	1,800	18,000	143,300

b. Damage Loss Reduction

In past years a number of groundings have occurred in both Sergius and Whitestone Narrows. The narrowness of these two channels combined with strong currents create an extremely hazardous condition, especially for large