

did not, as opposed to, in the next 4 or 5 years, \$3.7 million to keep dredging it out; right?

Colonel SEIDEL. We would have a gradual decrease in the dredging costs as the channel stabilized. We would have to have additional maintenance money to purchase the power.

Mr. HARSHA. But the point is this, you are claiming now that you have \$2.5 million annual dredging cost. That is going to go up to \$3.8—\$3.7, whatever it is; and continue to get worse?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. Now, if you stopped the silting, by stopping the power, the flow through the power dam, then you eliminate that cost altogether of dredging?

Colonel SEIDEL. It would go down to \$1.2 million. We will always have that residual cost.

Mr. HARSHA. You will always have that?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir; even after the project we are recommending.

Mr. HARSHA. Well then, you are only talking about the difference, are you not?

Colonel SEIDEL. The \$2.5 million figure. This is the difference between the cost of dredging without the project and beyond the year 1976, and the cost of dredging with the project.

Mr. HARSHA. Well, at any rate, if you eliminate the silting down the Cooper River and have to buy power, then you are going to have about the same amount of money invested in power each year as you would have in dredging?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir. It is a trade from one pocket to the other.

Mr. HARSHA. In other words, you would not have to spend the \$35 million to build the new project if you did it this other way?

Colonel SEIDEL. This is a solution, yes, sir; up to 1976, because we are limited, as has been suggested.

Mr. HARSHA. If you limit it to that particular period, but if the permit is renewed after that, it will continue the same way, will it not?

Colonel SEIDEL. We cannot predict what the Federal Power Commission will do under new licensing.

Mr. HARSHA. What is this route B diversion that you have got up there?

Colonel SEIDEL. This was an alternative that was studied that would divert the flows from a point below the dam and would have no impact on the Pinopolis operation. It would reduce the siltation.

Mr. HARSHA. What would that cost?

Mr. McEWEN. Would the gentleman yield?

That would be a new dam on that route B, where it indicates lock and dam? That would be a new dam constructed in relation to this new route B diversion?

Colonel SEIDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. And a new powerplant?

Colonel SEIDEL. No, sir. That would not have an impact on the powerplant.

Mr. DORN. What would that cost, Colonel?

Colonel SEIDEL. Sir, this cost was estimated to be \$40 million.

Mr. DORN. That is more than the plan for the—

Mr. HARSHA. That is more than the other one.

Colonel SEIDEL. The B-C ratio was unfavorable, 0.9.