

Colonel, I notice that the project is around \$57 million Federal, in round numbers, and that local participation is only \$824,000. Now, this is essentially a bank stabilization project; is it not?

Colonel HALL. Bank stabilization and channel improvement for navigation.

Mr. HARSHA. Why is there such a small local participation in the bank stabilization feature of it?

Colonel HALL. Why is there such a small contribution?

Mr. HARSHA. Such a small local participation.

Colonel HALL. The local cooperation requirements are to provide the land, easements, and rights-of-way, and this is our estimate of the cost of these requirements. There is no land enhancement involved in this project, in our view.

Mr. HARSHA. No land enhancement involved?

Colonel HALL. That is right.

Mr. HARSHA. Are you replacing jetties in some cases there?

Colonel HALL. There are not any replacements of jetties or training dikes.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. THOMPSON, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Mr. THOMPSON. The proposed plan does not include replacing any existing features of that nature, no existing training dikes or any works of that nature are being replaced.

Mr. HARSHA. There are none being replaced. Do you include in your maintenance fund any work of that kind?

Colonel HALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. Is this normally done as new work, rather than maintenance work?

Colonel HALL. Not necessarily, sir. If the training dike can reduce the dredging cost of maintaining a channel, it would be more economical to do so, to maintain the channel, it is done under maintenance; this is done on the Mississippi.

Mr. HARSHA. You do not charge it up to construction costs then?

Colonel HALL. No, sir; it is maintenance with cost of maintaining dependable navigation channel to the depth that is authorized for the prospective project. This is not to say that training dikes or things of this nature would not be envisioned in the initial project in some reaches to help achieve this channel. This is the case in some projects for initial construction costs.

Mr. HARSHA. That is what had me confused. In some projects we have had the initial construction costs to take care of this particular item; but in this one we do not.

General NOBLE. It depends on the situation, sir. If the training dike is an instrument to achieve a new project depth authorized by Congress, then it would be in the initial construction cost. If it is constructed in the course of trying to maintain an authorized project depth—such as where a new training dike may be useful to maintain an already authorized project depth, then it would come under maintenance, in lieu of continued dredging.

In that case, it would be maintenance since it would be needed to maintain something already authorized.