

Mr. HARSHA. That is all I have.

Mr. BLATNIK. No questions.

Can we move on to the next one: Ouachita and Black Rivers. You are in opposition to that?

OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, ARK.

Colonel HALL. I have a detailed statement, Mr. Chairman.
(Statement follows:)

STATEMENT RE OUACHITA-BLACK RIVER NAVIGATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. The River and Harbor Act of 1950 authorized modification of an existing 6½-foot depth navigation project to provide an all year channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the mouth of the Black River to Camden, Arkansas. Disregarding specific features, the depth of channel was to be obtained primarily by lowering the floors and sills of six existing locks and by deeper channel dredging without affecting existing water surface elevations.

Prior to starting construction, further investigation indicated alternative means might result in an overall more economical project. In addition, construction of the earlier plan would require prolonged closure of the stream to navigation and this was objectionable to local interests. A subsequent report to the Congress compared several alternative plans to provide the same channel dimensions and the Chief of Engineers recommended that the overall most economical plan be followed. The River and Harbor Act of 1960 authorized these recommended further modifications. Disregarding specific features, the new plan provides for a substitute system of four locks and dams in lieu of the existing six locks and dams. The increased navigation depths would be obtained primarily by raising existing water surfaces rather than extensive deeper dredging.

The report (S. Doc. 112, 86th Cong.) recognized that comparatively low stream banks in the Felsenthal reach would result in a considerable land requirement if the water surface were raised in this reach. Specific economic comparison with a deeper dredging alternative showed a raised water surface in the Felsenthal pool to be more favorable. The plan as authorized by the Congress requires that all necessary lands, including the lands for the Felsenthal pool, are to be furnished by local interests. Where the existing Lock and Dam No. 6 provided a water surface at elevation 61.6 feet, the substitute Felsenthal pool would be at elevation 65.0 feet.

Local interests supported the changes of the 1960 authorization and furnished the necessary assurances of local cooperation. Construction began along the downstream Louisiana reaches, including Jonesville and Columbia Locks and Dams. During 1964 preconstruction planning of the Felsenthal Lock and Dam, local interests requested modification of this feature to provide a 5-foot seasonally higher pool for fish and wildlife purposes and offered to furnish any additional lands at no cost to the United States. Under the general authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Chief of Engineers approved modification of project structures and their operation at Felsenthal Lock and Dam to provide this seasonal fish and wildlife pool at an estimated additional Federal construction cost of \$1,590,000 (including \$250,000 for additional recreational facilities associated with this pool) provided the necessary additional land requirements were furnished without cost to the United States. Detailed preconstruction planning proceeded until lands were needed to begin construction at Felsenthal, at which time local interests indicated difficulties in fulfilling their previous assurances.

Construction is continuing along the downstream project reach where Louisiana local interests are furnishing the required local cooperation, including lands necessary for navigation. Construction has not begun along the upstream project reach within Arkansas, and these local interests have sought relief from the requirement to furnish lands. They have been informed that the such relief would violate authorized project requirements, would exceed general discretionary authorities of the Chief of Engineers, and could only be granted by the Congress.