

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER
TULSA DISTRICT
616 SOUTH BOSTON
TULSA, OKLAHOMA

ADDRESS REPLY TO
DISTRICT ENGINEER
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY
P.O. BOX 61
TULSA 2, OKLAHOMA

REFER TO FILE NO.

SWP VG

6 December 1956

Mr. Ira C. Husky, Director
Division of Water Resources
Oklahoma Planning & Resources Board
State Capitol Building
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dear Mr. Husky:

In compliance with your request made at the Public Hearing with reference to review report of the Kiamichi River, Oklahoma, held in Hugo, Oklahoma, on 4 September 1956, there is forwarded a copy of the transcript of that hearing. The list of attendance is not complete at this time, but a copy will be forwarded you upon completion.

Sincerely,

M. W. Parse

1 Incl
Transcript of
Public Hearing

M. W. PARSE
Chief, Engineering Division

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING
WITH REFERENCE TO
REVIEW REPORT OF KIAMICHI RIVER, OKLAHOMA
TRIBUTARY OF RED RIVER

HELD AT HUGO, OKLAHOMA,
SEPTEMBER 4, 1956

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY
TULSA DISTRICT
TULSA, OKLAHOMA

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING
WITH REFERENCE TO
REVIEW REPORT OF KIAMICHI RIVER, OKLAHOMA
TRIBUTARY OF RED RIVER
HELD AT HUGO, OKLAHOMA,
SEPTEMBER 4, 1956

The hearing was called to order at 9:45 a.m.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Ladies and gentlemen, the meeting will come to order, please. First I should like to introduce myself. I am Colonel John D. Bristor of the Tulsa District of the Corps of Engineers. Undoubtedly, you received one of those attendance cards as you entered the door. We should like to have you complete those, if you have not already done so. If anybody has not received a card, please raise your hand, and you will be given one.

This hearing is being conducted in accordance with the resolution adopted January 28, 1955, by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate. I will not read the notice, but I will read the resolution.

"Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under Section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports of the Chief of Engineers on Red River and tributaries, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, downstream from Denison Dam, published as House Document Numbered 602, Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session, and other reports, with a view to determining whether a substitute, or substitutes, for the authorized Hugo Reservoir with respect to flood control, water supply, and allied purposes, is advisable at this time."

Exhibit No. 1 - Notice of Public Hearing,
with Mailing List.

Before continuing, I want to introduce the members of my staff who are here with me today: Mr. Myron W. DeGeer, Mr. Howard R. Bare, Mr. John C. Dissly, Mr. Hugo H. Paapanen, and Miss Dorothy Hunt. I also have with me today Mr. Roy Penix from our Southwestern Division Office in Dallas, Texas.

Next, I should like to discuss briefly the study requested in the resolution of January 28, 1955, by the Public Works Committee of the Senate. This resolution calls for a review of the report contained in House Document No. 602 and other pertinent reports, to determine the advisability of a substitute project, or substitutes, for the authorized Hugo Reservoir for flood control, water storage, and other allied purposes.

We have two maps on display here. On my right is the map of the Kiamichi River Basin and part of the adjacent Boggy Creek and Little River and tributaries. The other map covers the Tulsa District from which the location of existing and authorized projects related to this study can be determined. You are welcome to use these maps in making your presentations.

First, I shall briefly outline the scope and findings of prior Corps of Engineers reports related to the review study of the Kiamichi River. The report on Red River and tributaries referred to in the notice of public hearing as House Document No. 602 was prepared shortly after the disastrous 1945 Red River flood and recommended construction of a plan of improvement for control of floods below Denison Dam. This plan consisted of Boswell Reservoir on Boggy Creek, Hugo Reservoir on Kiamichi River, Millwood Reservoir on Little River, and three other reservoirs on tributaries downstream therefrom, and also included modification of existing levees and bank stabilization where set-back levees are not practicable on Red River below the vicinity of Index, Texas. This plan was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946.

In 1955, the general plan for Red River below Denison Dam was modified by authority of Public Law 218, 84th Congress, substantially in accordance with a report on Red River and tributaries prepared by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and published in 1954 as H. D. 488. Among other subjects in that report, consideration was given to the economic feasibility of providing storage in upstream reservoirs in substitution for storage in the authorized reservoirs and for other purposes. With respect to Kiamichi River, no economically justified additions to or changes in the authorized plan were found. Studies of Gates Creek also resulted in unfavorable conclusions for Federal participation in the then uncompleted Fort Towson Dam and Reservoir.

Pursuant to Congressional authority contained in the Flood Control Act of 1950 and executive orders of the President, the Corps of Engineers also participated in an inter-agency study of the water and land resources of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins and their potential development. These studies are covered in the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins Report

prepared in 1955 by a committee composed of members of Federal agencies and representatives of the Governors of the eight states involved, which included the State of Oklahoma. The report of the A-W-R Inter-Agency Committee contains a long range plan for the development of the land and water resources of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins.

Studies made by the Corps of Engineers for the inter-agency report included upstream reservoirs in the Kiamichi River Basin to supplement flood control storage in the authorized Hugo Reservoir and provide for other water resource development. Upstream reservoir sites considered in the A-W-R studies are shown on the display map and included the Tuskahoma site on Kiamichi River and tributary sites of Finley on Cedar Creek, Kellond on Tenmile Creek, and Clayton on Jack Fork Creek. However, the benefit-cost relationships for potential upstream projects in the Kiamichi River Basin were unfavorable and, accordingly, were not included as part of the long range plan in the report of the Inter-Agency Committee for the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins. The A-W-R Report has been transmitted to the President and the Congress of the United States.

With further reference to past reports of the Corps of Engineers, review studies of the scope of the instant Congressional resolution for Kiamichi River, especially the water supply aspects, have not been previously requested by local interests. Accordingly, the information that you present concerning the problems and needs for improvement of Kiamichi River should be as complete as possible.

In hearings of this type, it is requested that there be a frank and full expression of the views of all interested parties. It is also suggested that as complete a statement as possible of all information pertinent to the subject of the hearing be presented. The Corps of Engineers will give full weight to all evidence and arguments presented. All pertinent material which the interested persons wish to be considered should be brought out at the hearing. While it is not desired that additional data be submitted after the hearing, supplemental information will be welcome if that material is new and applicable to this particular study of the Kiamichi River and could not be presented at this meeting.

In our studies we shall evaluate all data presented and develop the engineering features of such improvements and make analyses relative to their economic justification. We shall consider varied types of improvements, such as reservoirs, levees, channel improvement, stream diversion, and other types of structures in determining solutions to the flood problem; however, I should appreciate your opinions on the water uses which you want developed and the benefits which you consider would result from

such development. Under existing legislation, the plans of the authorized Hugo project for flood control may, at the time of preparation of detailed plans for construction, be modified at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, to provide additional storage capacity for water supply on the condition that the cost of such increased storage capacity is contributed by local agencies and that the local agencies agree to utilize the storage capacity in a manner consistent with Federal purposes. The topographic features of the Hugo site are such that the storage capacity can be increased.

As you probably know, before any improvement can be recommended for construction we must be able to show that it will produce benefits from control of floods and other water uses that will be commensurate with the cost of its construction.

It is known that there is an interest for the development of the water supply resources of the Kiamichi River Basin. The provision of conservation storage capacity in addition to that required for flood control would require that a legally constituted local organization assume the responsibility for such reservoir costs as would be appropriately charged to that purpose. Under present criteria, the cost of the flood control portion of a reservoir improvement would be shared by non-Federal interests in the proportion of one-half the change in land use benefits to the total flood damages prevented benefits and change in land use benefits.

Also, under existing Federal statutes with respect to local flood protection works, such as levees, channel rectification, and similar improvements, local interests would be required to: (1) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and perform any alterations to highways and utilities made necessary by the plan of improvement; (2) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (3) maintain and operate the project after its completion.

I wish to explain that formal assurances of local cooperation are not required at this time, but we do desire an expression of opinion as to whether such assurances would be forthcoming if justifiable improvements are developed for the Kiamichi River.

In this connection, as soon as the plans are sufficiently formulated and the probability of justification is determined, we shall request the appropriate state water resource agency to review the plans. Local interests will also be contacted to

determine their attitude with respect to probability and degree of local cooperation. In addition, the report will be coordinated with other Federal agencies interested in the resource development.

Well, you have heard me talk here long enough, and I should like to proceed with the hearing. So that we may proceed logically, certain interests will be called upon first to present their views, after which the meeting will be open to anyone desiring to make a statement. It is requested that the speakers be brief and confine themselves to the subject of improvements desired in the Kiamichi River Basin, and that they speak distinctly so that the reporter may make the record complete and without error. Also, if you have any written statements, they may be handed in over here. We ask that speakers come to the front of the room and use the microphone and that each person give his name and the town he is from and the interest he represents.

The mayor of Hugo is out at the airport right now awaiting the arrival of the Senators. He has asked that he be allowed to speak a little bit later.

We should like to hear from state, county, and city officials next. Mr. Husky, would you care to make a statement?

MR. IRA C. HUSKY (Director, Division of Water Resources, Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, fellow Oklahomans and Texans. I have a few observations that I want to make.

It is the policy of the State of Oklahoma in their water development to have it developed to the fullest extent. During the past three or four years, the need for increased municipal water has become more apparent, and we recognize the fact that when the Congress authorizes the Corps of Engineers to make a study on the development of water in a stream and they have made that report and reported back to Congress that that authorization is closed. We feel that is what happened back in 1945. We don't feel that the river was looked at close enough at that time, and only from the standpoint of flood protection. Now that Congress has spoken again, and authorized a restudy, we feel the study has been re-opened and urge that the Corps of Engineers look at the project from a standpoint of complete development.

I am sure that the speakers that follow will present to you engineering data at the other sites, the Clayton site and Tuskahoma and the others, and we urge that the Corps of Engineers proceed with the utmost speed in looking at this stream and maybe make it possible for the development of

industrial and municipal water in this area. The water is excellent. In fact, we feel it is some of the best water that can be found in Oklahoma, and the Lord only knows we need it back north and west. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: We have Mr. Daniel V. Cresap, representing the State of Louisiana.

MR. DANIEL V. CRESAP (District Engineer, Department of Public Works, Alexandria, Louisiana): Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen, I am Daniel V. Cresap, District Engineer for the State of Louisiana Department of Public Works. I was sent here by Mr. Lorris M. Wimberly, our Director, who is the representative of the Governor of Louisiana. Our interest in this Hugo Reservoir is, of course, primarily flood control, and in 1945 the disastrous flood brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States that something should be done to alleviate these flood conditions. This is one of the six reservoirs which was authorized at the time to afford the flood protection to the lower end. At the present time, Texarkana is the only one completed - Ferrell's Bridge is in the state of construction. Over a period of ten years, at the rate we are going, it looks like we may be faced with another flood before the protection is completed.

Louisiana hopes that Oklahoma gets the advantages that they are wanting, but we must request that the Corps of Engineers look at the problem from the standpoint of Louisiana and afford us all the flood protection which was authorized by Congress in its original study. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: I see that Senator Monroney is here now. Would you like to make a statement, Senator?

A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY (United States Senate): I'd rather wait a while, if it's all right with you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: All right. Are there any other representatives of Texas, Oklahoma, or Louisiana, or other States who wish to make statements at this time? If not, I should like to proceed to the county officials. Are there representatives of any counties here who wish to make statements? (No answer)

Then we'll proceed to city officials. We have present the Director of Public Works for the City of Oklahoma City, Mr. M. B. Cunningham. Would you like to make a statement?

MR. M. B. CUNNINGHAM (Director of Public Works for the City of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma): Senator Kerr, Senator Monroney, Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen. We are certainly interested

in the development of water in the State of Oklahoma and are certainly interested in the development of the Hugo Reservoir. I think sometimes it is a good idea that Congress did exactly what they did - opened the question up for further study and review, because the drought and increased water consumption in our state has certainly brought on a demand for water, and I think a lot of good can come out of a restudy.

Our interest in Oklahoma City is further shown by the action taken by the Governor and legislature, in which a water study committee has been trying to review water laws and make it possible to do a lot of things it was not possible to do in the past. I think the over-all benefits in that study will come out in the next legislature.

As far as our particular concern, yes, Oklahoma City is in the central part of the state and the area from here all the way up there, and the state as a whole, can certainly hope for a plan that will develop to a maximum our water resources - not only multiple uses, but, particularly, conservation storage. I believe, should be given consideration with the experiences that we have, and, looking into the future, I think it would be a mistake to build reservoirs without finding some way to finance and construct the maximum amount of conservation storage. Some of that storage probably wouldn't be used immediately. A lot of it will. But we don't have to look too far into the future to see that all uses of recreation and fish and wildlife are badly needed in recreation storage for the state.

Most of you are familiar with the plan of development which the Oklahoma City area has started, which includes the area immediately east of here, some on tributaries of the Kiamichi, but the project we have eventually will come into the Kiamichi area, and we hope to have a reasonable amount of water that can be used in here and the central Oklahoma City area. We look forward to working out such a plan with the people of this area, and certainly we will say we want to give consideration to all reservoirs for conservation storage. Thank you very much for letting us have an opportunity to make this statement.

Exhibit No. 2 - Statement of Morrison B. Cunningham, Director of Public Works, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mayor Fowler White of Hugo. Mayor White is our host today, and I think at this time we should ask him to say a few words.

MR. FOWLER WHITE (Mayor, Hugo, Oklahoma): Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud to see such a large attendance on the issue for discussion today. It is important to us of Hugo and Choctaw Counties, the things that are represented here today, and I am sure we will all receive a great benefit from it.

We have with us this afternoon the distinguished gentlemen from the Congress of the United States who represent us in this matter and represent us in Washington. We have Senator Robert S. Kerr, Honorable Speaker at the convention. The last time I saw him was on television. We are very glad to have you today. We have Senator Monroney, and in the center is Carl Albert.

This is Colonel Bristor. I don't want to leave him out because he is the most important when it gets to building it. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Thank you, Mayor White. Going on with the hearing, we have Mr. Frank Davis, representing the City of Fort Worth, Texas.

MR. J. FRANK DAVIS (City Manager, Fort Worth, Texas): Senator Monroney, Senator Kerr, Congressman Albert, Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen. I am J. Frank Davis, City Manager for the City of Fort Worth. I would like to introduce to you a member of our council who is here today who is also a landowner in Oklahoma, Mr. Barney B. Holland. He comes from Fort Worth and also owns land along the Red River in Idabel, Oklahoma.

Fort Worth is interested in municipal water. That is our interest today. We are appreciative of the opportunity to be here. With the Colonel's permission, I would like for Mr. Freese, Consulting Engineer for the City of Fort Worth, to give you the details.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Freese.

MR. S. W. FREESE (Consulting Engineer, City of Fort Worth, Texas): Senator Kerr, Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Stephens, the water superintendent at Fort Worth, has transmitted to Colonel Bristor a letter from Mr. Davis, which I would like to read in part:

"In order to plan an adequate water supply for our rapidly growing city and the industrial area of Tarrant County we employed the Consulting

Engineering firm of Freese and Nichols of Fort Worth to make a detail study and comprehensive report on a water supply adequate to meet the demands of the area through the year 2000. This study is now almost complete and we expect to receive the final report by the end of this year."

The City of Fort Worth and Tarrant County would like to obtain a firm yield of somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 million gallons a day from the streams in southeastern Oklahoma. Now we see the Boswell site first for this reason: that it is much nearer, or some nearer to Fort Worth. In obtaining some 300 million gallons per day, it would be more economical to build probably two 78-inch pipelines the distance from the Hugo site, as compared to the Boswell site, which is some $17\frac{1}{2}$ or 18 miles, which would cost in pipelines an additional 14 or 15 million dollars. For that reason, of course, we are interested in the nearer sites.

The City of Fort Worth and Tarrant County recognizes the fact that first priority should be given to all the water needs of Oklahoma and they would—if there is any surplus water above the needs of Oklahoma—like to obtain the necessary storage rights from the Army Engineers. They would like to obtain the water rights from the State of Oklahoma and also the right to build pipelines or to secure pipelines from the reservoirs to the Texas line.

As to the Hugo site, it is recognized that Oklahoma City has already filed for certain rights above the Hugo site and also, in obtaining a firm yield from any reservoir, it is necessary that we figure on a certain reserve being left in the reservoir at the end of the worst drought period of record. We in Texas begin to get panicky when our reserves are drawn down to a two-year supply, but by reason of the steady flow of streams up here, we think a six months' reserve would be adequate to take care of worse drought periods than ones which occurred in the past.

Three hundred million gallons would be some 330 acre-feet per annum, so we would desire a reserve of 365,000 acre-feet in addition to the 300 million gallons a day per year. We doubt, when you take care of the needs of Oklahoma, that there would be that much available in the Hugo site. We would expect to pay for that storage, and as I understood you

to say, Colonel Bristor, under the law under which you operate the city would be expected to pay the additional cost to provide the storage required. For example, if the water were obtained from either the Hugo site or the Boswell site or from any of the reservoirs further east, we would expect to provide storage capacity which would not be supplied in the absence of the demand that we might wish you to satisfy. In other words, supposing that all the requirements of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, and all of this area which is expected to develop, that we could expect only to provide conservation storage which would not be otherwise taken up or provided for the needs of Oklahoma. In other words, if the Boswell site, for example, was planned to go ahead with a certain amount of flood control storage and to provide some conservation storage, we would only expect to ask for the right to provide for conservation storage meeting our requirements in addition to that previously planned, and we would expect to pay the cost, and we would also wish to obtain from the State of Oklahoma the necessary water rights for the development of that site which would not otherwise be developed in the absence of our paying for that conservation storage. Thank you.

Exhibit No. 3 - Letter from City of
Fort Worth, Texas,
August 23, 1956, signed
by J. F. Davis, City
Manager.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Are there representatives of any other municipality who wish to speak at this time? If not, we have certain civic groups. First, I should like to call upon Mr. Guy Treat of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce.

MR. GUY B. TREAT (Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen. The Corps of Engineers has given this matter—as Senator Kerr puts it, "Land, Wood, and water"—a great deal of study. They have arrived at this conclusion: that if the water resources of the state are applied within the state we could reasonably expect the population of probably at least five million people, and the water which actually falls in Oklahoma and runs off would provide enough water for that population, together with a rate of industrial development. Approximately some 12 to 14 million acre-feet of water leaves the southeastern corner of the state through the Red River and Little River, the Kiamichi, and the Boggies. The Boggies probably contribute a third of that, the Kiamichi slightly less than a third, and Red River slightly more than a third. The population which

has been envisioned would probably use roughly 20 million acre-feet a year in its industries and in the water necessary for the irrigation and cultivation of those parts of the area which would require irrigation and for the municipal program.

Now if we take a slant at that, we also have coming up the Arkansas River a navigation canal which reaches into northeastern Oklahoma and points out slightly north and east of Tulsa. We have lots of connecting around to that canal and bringing it up towards central Oklahoma. To make that canal, we have contemplated bringing water from southeastern Oklahoma, which will be fresh water, which can be used for industry and for town and city use in the cities and communities along the route, and a limited amount of water can be used for the development of the land. That will require a considerable amount of water. All these things will have to be listed together. It will probably be a long term program, because industries are not moved in a day and people do not move in a day.

Now, our particular reason for expressing an interest in this reservoir at Hugo at this time is this: the water all starts up in the upper reaches of the terrain, which is probably around 1000 to 1200 feet high. As it comes tumbling down the brooks and streams, it reaches your proposed reservoir site at an elevation of some 300 or 400 feet. We think, for the good of the state, that as much of this water as possible should be impounded in the upper reaches, and when this water is moved to the west it will have less power, less work, less carrying capacity in your ditches, less pumping, less electricity. That is our fundamental interest in preserving these lakes at as high an elevation as it is possible. Probably an elevation 200 to 300 feet higher than your reservoir would be a great help in the consummation of ultimate movement of large quantities to the west.

I think, Colonel, that the Corps will be able to find some answers along that line. We have asked the Congress and they have responded to a request from the Chamber of Commerce and from the City to make a detailed study of the feasibility of what we have proposed. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mr. Joe Stamper, of the Pushmataha County Chamber of Commerce.

MR. THOMAS P. BUTLER (Secretary-Manager, Pushmataha Chamber of Commerce, Antlers, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, Mr. Stamper was called away to a meeting of the REA Board of Directors here and he has asked that I read this statement for him.

Exhibit No. 4 - Statement of Joe Stamper
on behalf of Pushmataha
County Chamber of Commerce.

That concludes Mr. Stamper's remarks. I have a very few brief remarks that I should like to make. We are mindful in Pushmataha County, and I am sure in our Kiamichi River Basin area, and we are duly appreciative of the interest of the Corps of Engineers and our friends from Louisiana and the other interests on various sites downstream on the lower Red River in flood control. Also, we are certainly in full realization of the need of our large municipalities, both within our state and outside our state, in the water of northeastern Oklahoma.

Too, we are mindful that our need in these large municipalities is looked to and brought about by the thought that they are going to grow industrially, and, added to the industry they already have in those areas, we feel it is certainly to our interests and of no little point of consideration in the thinking of these alternates, if any, that the potential program of the Kiamichi River Basin industrially should certainly not be overlooked in determining the so-called economic justification.

We have in southeastern Oklahoma the greatest and brightest spot in Oklahoma for industrial growth. We have the finest quality of water in the world which runs off to the east that we can develop our own area industrially, and, too, in further justifying the economic justification of this proposal, let's don't forget that we have the world's greatest potential playground if we can just get the water stopped in southeastern Oklahoma. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Thank you very much. I wish to say at this time that we certainly shall give full consideration to your plan for three reservoirs - Belzoni, Tuskahoma, and Clayton. I presume that what you have in mind is something about like what we now have recommended at Millwood. That is, for Belzoni to replace Hugo the same as the smaller Millwood replaces the bigger Millwood, and two upstream reservoirs, Clayton and Tuskahoma, act the same as the Gillham and Broken Bow reservoirs on the Millwood project.

MR. BUTLER: Colonel, I would like to state that I think our purpose in presenting this proposal was merely for consideration. We don't want to be taken as trying to tell the Engineers where to build the dam. We think they are qualified and want to leave that prerogative within their organization.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Yes. We have considered several other plans, too. This one has been worked out in some detail and we shall give it specific consideration as such.

Mr. Cecil Peters.

MR. CECIL PETERS (Choctaw County Chamber of Commerce, Hugo, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, distinguished members of the United States Senate, honored guests, citizens of Choctaw and Pushmataha Counties. My name is Cecil Peters. I have a statement that I would like to read.

Exhibit No. 5 - Statement of Citizens
of Kiamichi River Basin,
Choctaw County, Oklahoma.

COLONEL BRISTOR: I would like to say that in the A-W-R Report some consideration was given to what you call the lower Belzoni site, and it does look fairly good. That isn't any commitment on our part, but it certainly looks worthy of much further study, and it will get it within the authorization that we can receive.

I should like next to introduce the Senior Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable Robert S. Kerr.

ROBERT S. KERR (United States Senate, Washington, D. C.): Thank you very much, Colonel Bristor. Senator Monroney, Congressman Albert, representatives of the Corps, my friends in southeastern Oklahoma, and a hearty welcome to our good friends from across the Red River from Texas. We are certainly glad that they are here. We are glad our friends are here from Oklahoma City.

We regard this as one of the important meetings that we have had the opportunity to attend. It indicates the growing realization on the part of the people of this area of the tremendous value--of the tremendous available supply--of unpolluted, fresh, high-quality water arising or originating in and flowing out of southeastern Oklahoma.

I must say that it is a very happy day for me. Throughout the years of my efforts at public service, as was referred to by my good friend Guy Treat awhile ago, the highest principle that I have known of the economic welfare of the people of this state and of my purposes in connection with serving the human and economic resources of this state have been included in the slogan I have used of "Land, Wood, and Water".

When the earliest pioneer families first crossed the Appalachian Mountains and looked into the valley of the rivers between those mountains and the Mississippi and crossed the Mississippi into the fertile valleys of the Red, the Arkansas, and the Missouri, they were looking for land, wood, and water. And whenever human beings have found it and used it, they have done well. And there is no place that I know of on the earth in which there is such an abundant and valued quantity of those resources as in the area where we meet today. It not only is the secret of the future growth and economic prosperity of this area, it is the priceless storehouse from which, in my opinion, a great part of Oklahoma can draw the life-giving stream and flow of water.

I am glad to be here with my distinguished Junior colleague, Senator Monroney, whose interpretation of and dedication to the development of all of Oklahoma and all this area in the light of that principle has been unexcelled. He and I are both glad to be here with Congressman Albert. There may be other men in the Congress of the United States as able. There are none more able than Carl Albert.

Now, as you know, the Congress, back yonder in about 1945 authorized the building of Boswell, Hugo, and Millwood. They did that on the basis of a report by the Army Engineers that was directed by a Committee of the House of Representatives, dated April 19, 1945. I want to say this for the Army Engineers. That, in the development of the report, which was the foundation for that authorization, they did exactly what they were directed to do by the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress. They were directed to prepare a review and submit a plan, and I quote from the report of the Secretary of War of May 16, 1946, in which that report was transmitted back to the Congress, that they were directed "with a view to providing proper flood protection on the main stem of the river downstream from Denison Dam." When they submitted the report that they did, recommending Boswell, Hugo, and Millwood, it was in obedience to that command.

Under the law, that report had to be submitted to the governors of the states involved. It just so happened that at that time the Governor of Oklahoma was a man by the name of Kerr, and that report was submitted to me as Governor of Oklahoma with a request for my comments and recommendations. On March 19, 1946, I addressed a letter to the then Chief of Engineers, Lt. General R. A. Wheeler, in which I said some things just about identical to what has been said here today.

I referred to the fact that river planning in Oklahoma is based on the construction of reservoirs as the best means of developing the water resources of Oklahoma for the greatest need and most reasonable use. Flood control is a concurrent and inseparable phase of this development and each project is an integral part of the program. The laws of the State of Oklahoma, with respect to flowing streams, require that the capture and impounding of water begin as near as practicable at the head of the stream. Priorities of needs and uses of the waters of the state have been established by an act of the Oklahoma Legislature and have been determined therein by that act.

I refer in my letter of that date to page 3, paragraph 9 of the report, wherein the Division Engineer presents a plan for the flood control which includes a proposed reservoir on the Boggy River at the Boswell site and on the Kiamichi River at the Hugo site. These are flood control dams with very small conservation pools and no consideration is given to beneficial uses of water for domestic and municipal water supplies, irrigation, and industrial uses.

I then called attention to a resolution submitted by the Southeastern Oklahoma Development Association, comprised of Atoka, Bryan, Coal, Choctaw, Pushmataha, and McCurtain Counties, in the Red River Drainage Basin in Oklahoma downstream from Denison Dam in a called meeting assembled at Hugo, Oklahoma, dated January 24, 1946. I have here a copy of that resolution. It was signed by Geo. T. O'Neal, President, and Dwight Wolfinger, Secretary. I should like to read a paragraph or two of that resolution.

"Resolved, by the Southeastern Oklahoma Development Association comprising the six counties duly represented, That the United States Army engineers be urged to consider the laws of the State of Oklahoma with respect to flowing streams requiring that the capture and impounding of waters begin as near as practicable at the head of the streams as specified in 82 Oklahoma Statutes 1941, Section 488; be it further

'Resolved, That the said representatives duly assembled approve in general the interim report on flood protection on the main stem of Red River downstream from the Denison Dam submitted in compliance with resolution adopted by Committee on Flood

Control, House of Representatives, April 19, 1945, with the understanding that the locations of reservoirs are not permanently fixed; it being understood that dam and reservoir sites are available in the close proximity of Tupelo, McGee, Antlers, Wright City, Pine Creek, and Broken Bow sites or upstream therefrom, and, it being in the interest of the farmers and the agricultural and industrial development of the Southeastern Oklahoma Development area included in Atoka, Bryan, Coal, Choctaw, Pushmataha and McCurtain Counties to impound the flowing waters of the several streams as near as practicable to the head of the stream sought to be captured; be it further

Resolved, That said counties do hereby request the United States Army engineers to build the dams and reservoirs as described above before building the dams and reservoirs recommended by the Army engineers at the Boswell and Hugo sites; and urge that the comprehensive report on Red River which is now in preparation be expedited so as to provide a view of the whole plan. We do not feel properly informed to approve the interim flood report in particular as a part of the comprehensive report until information is available as to what the recommendations of the Army engineers will be in the comprehensive report. We request that the Division of Water Resources, Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, aid and promote the program as set forth herein."

Signed at Hugo, Oklahoma, January 24, 1946.

I want to call attention to the fact that seven reservoirs are proposed by the Southeastern Oklahoma Development Association, which includes the Durant Reservoir on Blue River, Tupelo Reservoir on Clear Boggy, McGee Reservoir on Muddy Boggy, Antlers Reservoir on the Kiamichi River (I think that's the one you now call Belzoni Reservoir), and I want to tell you right now that I was not able to pronounce this next one then and I can't pronounce it now, A-l-i-k-c-h-i Reservoir on Little River, Lukfata Reservoir on Glover Creek, and Eagletown or Broken Bow on Mountain Fork. These reservoirs may present a comprehensive program for the Boswell and Hugo Reservoirs.

In that letter to the Army Engineers, I called attention to the fact that in the proposed Hugo Reservoir, if constructed, there would be inundated 30,000 acres to protect 5,800 acres, and that by the use of the alternate reservoirs there would be only 10,000 acres inundated to protect 23,000 acres.

The first flood control act after I entered the Senate created the Arkansas, White, and Red River Study Commission to make a complete study of the soil and water resources of those three great watersheds. We got that bill passed in 1950. That Commission was appointed by the President, representing not only the Engineers, but the Reclamation Department, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Health Department, and two or three other Federal agencies, and the eight states which were included entirely or partly within the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins. That report came out in 1955. We have not yet been able to get the present powers that be in Washington to submit it officially to the Congress of the United States, but I want to say that the Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, Public Health Service, and representatives of Oklahoma and the other states in the three great basins did a tremendous job and submitted a blueprint for the development of the soil and water resources of this great state.

The information in that report was the basis, together with testimony of the Army Engineers before the Congress, for including the authorization for the change of the Millwood Reservoir to provide for the seven upstream dams, four of which would have been in McCurtain County. It has a great deal of information, as Colonel Bristor has told you, to help bring about a revised authorization for Hugo on the Kiamichi.

We secured, your great Congressman, Monroney, and I, allocation of the funds needed to make the preliminary survey, to present an alternate proposal for Hugo. I want to say to you that in my judgment you have nothing to fear insofar as the Congress is concerned on changing the bill as previously authorized. I believe we are on the road to securing the most favorable and valuable alternate. I say to you that in my judgment the difference between getting complete flood control for the Kiamichi Watershed and not getting it will be the availability of the opportunity to sell municipal and industrial water from upstream dams above the presently authorized site.

My position is that the waters should be impounded on the basis that meets the wishes of the people of the area. That is Number 1.

Number 2, that reservoirs be designed consistent with that principle, so as to completely conserve the waters that fall on this great watershed.

Number 3, that they be used first to meet the needs of the people in the area where the waters fall and where they are impounded.

Number 4, that they be used to meet the needs of the people of Oklahoma, who can secure the means or facilities by which those waters can be transferred to other people and other organizations and other municipalities within the State of Oklahoma, and, then, to the extent that additional water is available, certainly we would welcome the participation of people beyond our boundaries. We might have a little clearer concept than that as to their participation in paying for that impounding of water. It just might be that we would say, "Let them pay a little more", don't you know? We would not be adverse to that.

But I want to say this to you: that, in my judgment, there is an abundance of water. As Guy Treat told you, between 12 and 14 million acre-feet a year leave southeastern Oklahoma. That is about 12 billion gallons a day, Colonel, if my mathematics are not at fault, and if they are, I should like to be corrected before I leave this present party. About 12 billion gallons a day!

Oklahoma City today uses an average of 50 million gallons a day, so that one billion gallons is enough for 20 additional municipalities requiring what Oklahoma City now requires. I personally think that Oklahoma, southeastern and central Oklahoma, should reserve not less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 billion gallons per day of that water. But there would still be 9 or 10 billion gallons a day of water.

I know -- I think I know what you want in southeastern Oklahoma. You want flood control projects that will utilize as little as possible of your valuable land, protect as much as possible of your rich fertile valley land, provide recreational facilities that will implement the opportunity which is yours to build as attractive a recreational area as can be found in the nation, provide

your communities with all of the municipal and industrial water they may require in the foreseeable future, and then utilize as much as possible of the additional water for the economic development of the great state of which you are such an important part.

Colonel, when I ran for Governor, I told the people that if I was elected we would build Highway 70 because it was so worthy and so greatly needed. I have told many of you in the years since then that there is another highway that can be built that will be worth ten times as much to southeastern Oklahoma as Highway 70, and that is a highway on which ships can travel.

I am just as certain as I am that I am standing before you today that navigation can be developed on Red River below the Denison Dam and down to where it connects with the waters of the Mississippi. I am just as positive as I am that I am standing here today that under the program now under way navigation will be brought to northeastern Oklahoma. I am just as positive as I am that I am standing here today that navigation can be provided that will go from the Arkansas in the northeast and follow a canal from southeastern Oklahoma up through central Oklahoma so that that program can be developed into central Oklahoma.

One of your men awhile ago read from the words of Dr. A. E. Darlow at A & M College that there are no low income farmers in industrial areas. If you will look to the area of the Tennessee Valley and its development, you will find a state I believe with less than half the area of Oklahoma, Tennessee, with twice the agricultural income of Oklahoma. You will find a state with less than one-third of the fertile soil that we have that has twice the agricultural income. You will find it because they have the industrial structure that has the population within that state that need the high-priced agricultural products. Where they have an acre of land in an industrial area that is fertile and cultivatable they can produce from \$500 to \$1,000 an acre rather than from \$5 to \$50 an acre. Where the population is not present to use the product that people need, we have to produce what we can market.

This part of our state is a veritable garden for the production of fruit and berries and vegetables, provided the population is available, gainfully employed, to need, demand, and buy those products, so that when

you talk about industrial development of your area and your state you are talking about that which will be of greatest value to your farms, so that this is a program in which all of Oklahoma can benefit and prosper and contribute. The greater the industrial development of this state the greater the value both of your agricultural production and your recreational facilities. Recreational facilities have to be used by people and the larger the number of people there are the greater and the more extensive will be the use of your recreational facilities!

So I am going to say to you frankly that I am in favor of letting central Oklahoma in on this watershed, I am in favor of letting them in on paying for it and by their getting in and helping to pay for it, it will make every project that has been mentioned here today economically feasible.

In that bill which Eisenhower ill-advisedly vetoed, which carried authorization for upstream dams for McCurtain County, was a provision for the Army Engineers to make available space in which municipal and industrial water could be considered against the future demand to be regarded as part of the economics of the project. Congress can't authorize that storage unless the Army Engineers find the benefits from use exceed the cost. As of now, Colonel, you can take into account navigation, flood control, power, and what else in economic evaluation? That's about it, isn't it?

COLONEL BRISTOR: Some irrigation and actual water supply.

SENATOR KERR: Yes, irrigation, and where somebody says they are ready to pay for part of the storage to get water supply, to take that into account.

The bill presenting the water program in southeastern Oklahoma is like building a railroad. I remember when we were building Highway 70 people in Tulsa and Oklahoma City said, "You can't build that highway. They don't have the traffic." I said "If you could see those rub-boards and worn-out roads down there you can see they can't have traffic!" In the early days the railroads were not built where the traffic was, they were built where there were economic resources to develop traffic and when you have water in this modern era I want to tell you that you have just as great a potential for the development of traffic and industry as there

formerly was a potential for the development of traffic in the west that justified the building of the railroads, so we got a provision in that bill authorizing the Engineers to use the economic value of the storage space for municipal water against future demands as a part of the economic values available to a project. The President vetoed that.

For your information and his consideration, I say to you that, in my judgment, Congress will re-enact that law within 60 days after we convene in January. If he is there—which God forbid, and I am just as anxious that he be alive and hearty and that he be retired to his Gettysburg farm, Colonel, as anyone, but if he is there and vetoes it, in my judgment Congress will promptly pass it over his veto. If we have a Democratic president—and which God permit—the law will immediately be re-passed and signed and then the Engineers can take into account the economic value of the storage space of water against future demand. When that is available to them, in addition to the economic elements of flood control, navigation, irrigation and power development, every project in southeastern Oklahoma can be economically justified, and will be, and will be built. And communities both here and within central Oklahoma, and, yes, there in north Texas, will be knocking at the doors of the Army Engineers and of those able to supply that water, standing in line with the money in their hands, or the contract of purchase in their hands, saying, "We are ready to help provide economic justification and economic compensation for these reservoirs."

Now, I didn't intend to speak this long, but I rarely miss an opportunity to speak as long as this crowd will listen on such an important subject, to such a marvelous group. It's such a great opportunity that I hope you will forgive me because I could not resist the temptation to say what I have said. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Thank you, Senator Kerr. Our next speaker is the United States Junior Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable Mike Monroney.

MIKE MONRONEY (United States Senate, Washington, D. C.): Thank you, Colonel Bristor. Senator Kerr, Congressman Albert, friends of southeastern Oklahoma. I have always said that I was probably the luckiest Junior Senator in the United States Senate. I have the ambition to be the oldest Junior Senator, because I like my Senior Senator. The reason I am lucky, and as he has just proved, is that he understands water and water development perhaps more than any man in the United States Senate. These Baptists, you know, just naturally understand water.

It would be futile indeed to try to do much more than say Amen to what our Senior Senator has said, and to what your own fighting, aggressive leader you have in a key spot in the House of Representatives, the Little Giant from Little Dixie, Carl Albert, will say later.

When it comes to talking water conservation with this crowd, I feel it's like making love to an old maid; you can't overdo it. That is the way we figure on this thing.

When you study the history of flood control, which I know Bob has and Carl has, you go back to the days when it started at the sea. The job then was to build levees to rush the water to the sea, to carry water to the sea as fast as possible. Progressively since 1800, the Army Engineers have moved upward in this historic fight to prevent destruction of natural resources by destructive floods and water, and we have come now, I think, to the fruition of the task of not just flood control, but the whole broad concept of water conservation to which our Senior Senator has been a dedicated disciple since his days as Governor and which your Oklahoma delegation, working as a complete team, including the sole Republican in that delegation, have taken this concept and done our best to do something about it.

Prior to veto of the Kiamichi project, we had secured funds—and that is the green light and the signing of the contract, you might say, by the Congress after long and tedious years of work—the funds which would implement the construction of more than five hundred million dollars of water development work in Oklahoma. We secured a small amount of that which has resulted in the meeting here today, starting on another great leg of planning on not just flood control, but of a great program of water conservation.

I'd like to somewhat simplify it. When you build a house, your planning must be right or the house will not be a house you like to live in. No matter how much it costs, if the location is poor, or if it is poorly engineered and designed for living and comfort, you have wasted your money on your house. Likewise, when you build a roof on that house, you build the roof for the purpose of keeping storms from penetrating into that house. In modern living, we don't stop there. We haven't stopped putting roofs on, but modern life requires modern plumbing and modern water supply in which you take water and insert those benefits of the American standard of living in utilizing not only protection from the inside but the good that can flow from beneficial uses of water in every day life.

What we are planning and talking about here in this great meeting is getting away from a dry dam, a dam no one wants, a dam that Governor Kerr protested from the day it was suggested, and to move on as all of us who through long years have cried for more and more upstream dams and water conservation impoundments, all the way from the big type of big stream dams authorized in the Kiamichi to the smaller reservoirs on the upstream control program which the Soil Conservation Service people have done so much to bring about.

I feel we can approve, as a result of this hearing and as a result of the appropriations which Carl Albert and Senator Kerr secured for a restudy of a resolution to bring the maximum benefits to the people of southeastern Oklahoma in impoundment or in an ultimate water supply from a vast and tremendous supply of water that will not only serve the beneficial purposes of the original authorization to protect those people downstream on the main stem of the Red River, but to transform southeastern Oklahoma into a veritable gardenspot for vacationists, into an industrial location that would be second to none, and into an agricultural paradise that could well develop with development of the transference of this dam.

It not only requires the people of this area to devote serious study and cooperation based on the engineering findings of the Engineers of where the best upstream dam or dams are they can find, and I hope upstream dams, that can handle floodwaters and still yield maximum economic and individual benefits to the people of southeastern Oklahoma. I for one feel like whatever recommendation for upstream dams goes through, you people of southeastern Oklahoma in the great spirit of cooperation that you have shown when you have the facts and a program can settle on that program and let us go on with this job and get out of the blueprint stage and into the blue water stage.

Blueprints will not produce an added population and will not attract industry and vacation benefits that will bring well over \$100,000,000 a year—and I am speaking conservatively—to projects in Oklahoma as a by-product of a long range program of water conservation. With your population being as industrious as they have always been to scratch out of dry land and drought and disaster a living in agriculture -- when we can supplement that with industry and industry is looking for its factory locations not in the density of city population, but in the garden cities where agricultural and other resources help the factory workers to supplement and increase their income and they become better industrial workers because they live on their own land and they love their land and can see the God-given attractions and products of land in the time when they finish their 40-hour week.

After the people in southeastern Oklahoma finish a 40-hour stretch in industry, they are ready to do a job of selective farming on their places. That's the type of activity that industry is seeking. Give them water and low-cost electricity at rates which can result from hydroelectric facilities where you have upstream dams in rough country and with high head impoundment of water. This use of hydroelectric power has become so important to the nation that -- I was reading an ad last week - did you see that, Bob? - of the Allis-Chalmers Company that boasted of a 2,000,000-gallon-a-minute generator, in which they show how economical it is to build a dam to run water through turbines to generate electricity and then buy back off-peak power to pump water back into the dam and for their use tomorrow. Hydroelectric engineering has come that fast, when you have two million gallons of water a minute that can be impounded and use it perhaps in off-peak hours. With this, you get a picture of what you can do in power supply which would be a factor in attracting industry.

I can't add much except to say that this project in moving into the rough land of the Kiamichi Mountains with great hydroelectric potential and a great vacational field and protect 30,000 acres and make a veritable garden equal to the Imperial Valley of California and with high-grade farming, would, in my mind, be a project that startles the imagination of any progressively minded American, whether in Oklahoma or New England. It is such a good buy we will have no trouble whatever in selling it.

Let's don't worry too much about whether Fort Worth or Dallas might take some of our water, or Oklahoma City, because if these projects are built to the size I pray God we will build them -- let's think big thoughts and build them to that size -- they will be able to supply it. Within the foreseeable century, by having reservoirs to draw hundreds of thousands of people into coming here to enjoy the recreational advantages and bring millions; that income will be a part of the recreational advantages you have.

If we can justify these dams with additional storage-- they will be built in the rough upper country--you will have a project that will, in my way of thinking, make every citizen of southeastern Oklahoma who went the whole way and got the biggest possible water project, with a hydroelectric backlog built into it, and an industrial backlog, and if other people are willing to pay for additional storage, let's do it because the nearer we are to water, the better off all southeastern Oklahoma will be. You have a great opportunity, I think, in spite of the fact that we received a veto on the Kiamichi project.

You just have to move that dam or make a few multiple dams out of the original authorization. That way you can perhaps shorten the time between this meeting and the time the dirt will begin to move on the great project we are talking about today.

I will work on the dam and do everything I am big enough to do to help the big fullback of the Big Red do whatever he could. When Moses struck the rock, water gushed forth. Bob Kerr heads the Public Works Committee on this work, in his position as Chairman of the Subcommittee, and when he hits the Appropriations Committee, of which he is an ex-officio member, not only water gushes forth, but, we believe, funds to make it possible that water will gush forth. Thank you very much.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Our next speaker is your representative in the House of Representatives, Carl Albert.

CARL ALBERT (United States House of Representatives, Wash., D. C.): Colonel Bristor, distinguished Senators from Oklahoma, and my friends and constituents of southeastern Oklahoma. First of all, I want to thank Colonel Bristor and his colleagues and staff for coming down here and giving us this time, and getting the viewpoint of various interested individuals and organizations before proceeding to carry out the mandate of Congress in appropriating money for this resurvey.

Colonel Bristor is a distinguished member of the Corps of Engineers. He graduated from West Point as the Number One man in his class, the best student in his class. He has been sent to Oklahoma at the time of our greatest watershed expansion program, at a time when it looks to the Chief of Engineers like Oklahoma is really going to get down to business in the matter of developing water resources. Colonel Bristor has been sent here to do that job and we appreciate his coming to Hugo and to the Kiamichi Valley to listen to what the home people have to say about these various propositions.

Secondly, I want, of course, to thank my friends and colleagues and two of our most distinguished, if not the most distinguished members of our United States Senate, for coming down here in the light of the competition that there is for their time throughout this state. They have both had enormous interest in developing the Kiamichi River and the other rivers of Oklahoma along the lines that would be suitable to the people of Oklahoma and acceptable to the people of Oklahoma. They have both proceeded on that theory ever since they have been in the United States Senate.

I served in the House of Representatives with Mike Monroney for several years before he went to the Senate. He was one of the most respected and able members of that body. He was loved by his colleagues and his colleagues had respect for him, and unless your colleagues have respect for you and admire you, you might as well not try to serve in a body of 435 members. They respected Mike and his service there was so distinguished he received the award one year as the outstanding member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

We have the ablest team, the ablest delegation in the Senate of the United States of any state in the union, and I can prove this any time anyone wants to challenge it. Bob Kerr, in my opinion, is the most resourceful man in the United States Senate. He is worth millions of dollars to the people of Oklahoma in terms of service. He is in a strategic position on committees of the United States Senate for development of Oklahoma. He is on the Finance Committee, the Public Works Committee, and an ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee.

Public works legislation that is now on the statute books and is going on to the statute books in years to come is taking on a different hue, coming along a different line, broader lines, lines more devoted to the development of the localities where projects are being built because of the services of Bob Kerr on that committee and as chairman of the subcommittee. Public works in the future will be what it is because of Bob Kerr, just as Rome was what it was because Caesar lived there. I am telling you the truth. There is no question. We have, and we can be proud we have, the outstanding senatorial delegation in the United States Senate.

I am happy, too, that we have so many people who are interested in this matter from one standpoint or another. There is very little I can say, but I would like to pin together some of the things we are here to do, that have brought us here.

The background of authorization of Hugo Reservoir has been given you by Colonel Bristor and Senator Kerr and others. The location of that dam at the Sawyer site has not been acceptable to a number of the people of this country, if I understand local sentiment. I have letters by the thousands opposing the location of this dam at the Sawyer site, and only a handful in favor of so locating it. That alone, I think, shows the interest there is in getting another site acceptable to the people who live down here.

With that in mind, we met last fall in Tulsa—Colonel Reiff was the Tulsa District Engineer at that time—and Senator Kerr's office and Senator Monroney's office and I met, and Don McBride was there. Don has been a pillar of strength in our work.

SENATOR KERR: May I interrupt you a minute, there, Carl? He is indispensable, but if you say too much about him it gives him a hammer-hold on me and I can't live with him.

REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT: You can't live without him. We met in Tulsa and met with representatives from—some of you men are here—with this county and Pushmataha County, asking what it would take to make a resurvey of this situation, with a view to seeing whether or not an economically justifiable site could be selected - one or more sites that would take the place of the present site and would give the flood control that the present site would give and would also give a larger reservoir so we could have water for more purposes than flood control alone. Colonel Reiff suggested at that time that it would take approximately \$15,000 to make an appropriate study, so we went back to Congress and earmarked \$15,000 in the Appropriations Bill for that purpose, and that money, as I understand, has been allocated to the District, and the Corps of Engineers, through Colonel Bristol, has proceeded to make this study and this meeting is part of the over-all plan.

There are two things that must be considered so far as I am concerned in this matter. The first is the engineering problem, and none of us can do that except those with engineering skill and the men to do it, and that is why we have the Corps of Engineers. The engineering problem is to select a site where the proper kind of a dam can be built, considering each of the various sites recommended by various speakers, and I hope that everybody who has a recommendation will make his recommendation. The first thing is a favorable site. Will it do the job? Will it pay off after it is built?

The second thing—and it is indispensable—is, will it be acceptable to the people who live in southeastern Oklahoma? As long as I am the Democratic Whip of the House of Representatives, they are not going to build dams that the people down here don't want as long as I can keep them from it. Those are the two big points. With those things in mind, I hope, and I earnestly hope, and I know you hope that the Engineers find a location acceptable to the people here and beneficial to the people here.

I think Senator Kerr pointed out in a brilliant manner how our philosophy is changing, how the philosophy of the flood

control act is changing, and this act was passed before he or Monroney were in the Senate, or before I was in the House of Representatives, to protect the main stem of the Red River and we are all for that. That is not the sole consideration. It is my judgment that a county or an area which gives up the land to be flooded not once every ten years, not once every five years, not once every 30 years, but for all time to come should get some of the benefit out of the project which takes their land off the tax rolls. I think this will be a part of the philosophy of the flood control act, and I think Congress is looking in that direction, and one thing we want to be sure of is that if that dam is built and the dams that are built are not only acceptable but beneficial to the people that live in this area.

We are proud of this country down here where most of us have lived a long time. We want to see our neighbors, Texas and Louisiana, prosper, but we want to prosper also ourselves. We want to -- I don't know, I think we are very generous in being willing for any part of the water to go outside the state if we have any left over. I don't think many states would agree to that, but I think Oklahoma would. Or, to another section of the state, to Oklahoma City. We want to see our capital section develop. We want to be sure we have the things we need. If we give up land in this county and in Pushmataha County, we want to be sure that we have what we need to live left down here.

Senator Kerr mentioned our neighbor across the river down south. We could borrow a few things from our Texas friends. They think a good deal about Texas, I have found. I think most of us think a good deal about Oklahoma. That reminds me of a story I heard as a young man. A preacher came along the state line and preached a sermon and got off on the subject of Texas and got more demonstrative in extolling the virtues of Texas than when he was reading the Holy Scriptures. Finally he looked up to the sky and said to the angels in heaven, "If you are good up there, you might go to Texas when you die."

We think Oklahoma is fine, too. We have heard the Tennessee Valley mentioned. I visited the Tennessee Valley recently, and I visited the Ohio Valley. I saw great industries and I asked the president of the largest utility company in the world what there was that made those great utility companies come to the Ohio Valley to develop their plants. He said, "Only two things - water and coal." We have got both within fifty miles of where we are speaking here. We have got them. All we need to do is put them where we can use them. We need to learn to use our resources.

We have been losing population. We need to gain population. Our old system is not retaining our young people in our area. In the last census, Senator, our aged population, in proportion to the total population in southeastern Oklahoma, was higher than in most sections of the United States. That means we are not retaining our share of the younger people. We ought to do something about that. Probably there is nothing better we can do than to take advantage of the resource we have in such abundance - the natural water of Oklahoma. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mr. I. D. Hartwell, of the Red River Valley Association.

MR. I. D. HARTWELL (Red River Valley Association, Hugo, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, and staff, Senators Kerr and Monroney, Congressman Albert, members of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, members of the Red River Valley Association, and all who are interested in the development of Southeastern Oklahoma water resources. I am I. D. Hartwell, merchant of Hugo for more than 46 years, a worker in water resources for more than 20 years, one of the assistant vice presidents for Oklahoma in the Red River Valley Development Association of Shreveport, and I am speaking for many citizens of Southeastern Oklahoma and especially those who are directly affected by this program of water control. Only my deep conviction of the vital importance of our water could give me the courage to make this statement.

We have great respect for the integrity, sincerity, and ability of the Corps of the U. S. Army Engineers. We appreciate the interest and cooperation of our Senators and Congressman, and we are relying on their continued help.

We have had able direction and aid from our Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board from the time Mr. Don McBride was chairman until the present.

We have had a sympathetic, patient friend in the Red River Development Association of Shreveport, and especially in Mr. Roy Matthias, its active vice president.

We are deeply indebted to these friends and wish to thank them all and hope to merit their future cooperation and help.

It's kind of hard -- Senator Kerr has so ably expressed what I had in mind that there is not much use to try to go on with that, and also the Chamber of Commerce has covered it so there's not much use to take up any more time. I feel greatly encouraged after listening to these talks.

There was one or two things that I hoped to accomplish by this statement, and one was that we could have a reasonable, workable, and equitable plan for the development of water resources, which, after your talk, Senator Kerr, I feel sure we are going to have. Another was to clarify the situation on local thinking and local understanding. Some has been covered and some hasn't.

The presently authorized dams were the result of the very damaging 1945 flood and were passed in the stress of emergency and before the beneficial use of water was recognized. The only thought was quick downstream protection, and, acting on that order from Congress, the U. S. Engineers located the single-purpose flood control dam on the Kiamichi River at mile 19.7 near Sawyer, Oklahoma, this proposed dam to be nearly 9,000 feet long and what is known as a dry dam and dry lake. This means the pool above the dam would be a sedimentation basin, eventually filling with silt and, therefore, dry.

It was to have eight gates 25 feet long and 50 feet high. This would be capable of 850,000 acre-feet of storage and back water well above upper Belzoni, some four miles into Pushmataha County. This would take about 30,000 acres in Choctaw County alone out of production, off the tax rolls, and cut the county in two as the flood area would be from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 miles wide. This would create a man-made flood, as we have had no floods to speak of in Choctaw County since Denison Dam. Of course, this dam would be of no benefit to Pushmataha County as they would continue to have floods in the narrow valley above Antlers.

We request that this authorization be moved upstream as follows. A dam to create a permanent lake at lower Belzoni about 25 feet deep at the dam, with added height for flood control of four or five feet. This lake would create a reservoir of approximately 150,000 acre-feet and provide flood control of over 100,000 acre-feet. The lake would provide municipal water for Antlers and Hugo and water for agricultural and industrial uses. Also, the value for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes would be very great. The location we have is Section 18, T. 5 S., R. 18 East.

We suggest a flood control dam of 600,000 acre-feet near Tuskahoma, Section 16, T. 2 N., R. 21 East. This dam would give Pushmataha County flood protection and protect the Belzoni lake from flooding. Our information is that the elevation of the Kiamichi River is 352 feet at Red River, 373 feet at lower Belzoni, 394 feet at upper Belzoni, some six or seven miles north of lower Belzoni showing a drop in the river which we think would be an additional place for a permanent lake and storage of municipal and industrial water.

By the way, I was in Dallas yesterday and the day before, and was reading about this 50 cents-a-gallon water, and I think I would have given a dollar a gallon for some good Kiamichi water. You couldn't even drink the water or coffee made from the water.

We believe that Southeastern Oklahoma should have prior claim and should be given the first priority in the use of this water, but Oklahoma City and the others can have what is surplus.

I respectfully submit this proposal and urge that all haste be made in the survey in order that the Kiamichi River be included in the flood control and water resources bill to be presented to the Eighty-Fifth Congress.

For ten years we have been upset by the uncertainty of the locations and type of dams to be built, and whether we can expect a great growth or face stagnation depends greatly on your findings and recommendations. I thank you very much and look with confidence to the result of this meeting and hearing.

COLONEL BRISTOR: We shall pass on to the next speakers, representatives of the Federal agencies.

Mr. Wright, Southwestern Power Administration, do you wish to make a statement other than what is presented?

MR. WRIGHT: No.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mr. Wright has presented a statement, which I shall briefly summarize. It points out the potential of the water for water supply and also the high quality of it, and makes certain statements with respect to hydroelectric power, all of which we will study very thoroughly in our consideration of the report. He also mentions the Belzoni and Clayton sites and the Tuskahoma site.

Exhibit No. 6 - Letter from Southwestern Power Administration, August 31, 1956, transmitting statement presenting data for proposed system of reservoirs as a substitute for Hugo.

Mr. Romero, of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, do you wish to make a statement?

MR. FORREST S. ROMERO (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Tulsa, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen, who have been so kind as to hear what we have to say, I am Forrest S. Romero of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Tulsa, Oklahoma. I am here to present the statement to you which has been prepared with the Oklahoma State Game and Fish Department, and to give you one statement from the law so that you can feel encouraged in planning for wildlife in your projects in the valley. We are not proposing any particular sites at this time. We want you to feel that you can come to us in the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we will bring your proposals to the Engineers. We represent biologists and engineers, too, and we feel we can talk to their engineers about it. Here's a resume of the law.

Whenever the waters of any stream or other body of water are authorized to be impounded, diverted, or otherwise controlled for any purpose whatever by any agency of the United States, such agency first shall consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the head of the State Game and Fish Department with a view to preventing loss of and damage to wildlife resources, and their reports and recommendations, based on surveys and investigations conducted for the purpose of determining the possible damage to wildlife resources and of the means and measures that should be adopted to prevent loss of and damage to wildlife resources, shall be made an integral part of any report submitted by the agency responsible for engineering surveys and construction of such projects.

The planning agency shall make adequate provision consistent with the primary purposes of the project for the use thereof, together with any areas of land, or interest therein, acquired or administered in connection therewith, for the conservation, maintenance, and management of wildlife, resources thereof, and its habitat thereon.

The Secretary of the Interior shall make findings on the part of the estimated cost of the project which can properly be allocated to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and costs allocated pursuant to such findings shall not be reimbursable.

That means, as I see it, the proposals we can work out to maintain what the people of the state want, and we can get into the plan for fish and wildlife, may not have to be repaid.

I have entered a statement for the record, which I shall read to you at this time.

Exhibit No. 7 - Fish and Wildlife Service
Statement regarding Kiamichi
River Development.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is my message. I would be glad to talk with you separately if you have any questions. I know that some of you from the Chamber of Commerce will be interested in knowing what part the Fish and Wildlife Service will play. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mr. Allen.

MR. HARROL ALLEN (National President, Association of Soil Conservation Districts; President, O. A. S.C.D., Ada, Oklahoma): Thank you very much, Colonel. Ladies and gentlemen, you might wonder what the president of the Oklahoma Soil Conservation Service Districts is doing down here. We find a project or a series of projects in southeastern Oklahoma would fit very favorably into our thoughts on confining water. I would like very much, and I think the thinking of our association is, that we should give much more stress to the conservation of water than we have been giving. We talk about conservation of soil, and really we should be talking about conservation of water. I wouldn't expect to tell you where to build your dams, but we do find the terrain fits in very well with the scheme of doing what we think is essential.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mr. Wharton Mathies.

MR. WHARTON MATHIES (City, Clayton, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor and friends. I am Wharton Mathies and I live at Clayton. I have a statement I should like to read on behalf of the citizens of the towns of Clayton, Tuskahoma, Sardis, and other communities in the north end of Pushmataha County through which the Kiamichi River flows.

Exhibit No. 8 - Statement of Wharton
Mathies, representing
the Delegation from
Clayton, Pushmataha
County, Oklahoma.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Thank you, Mr. Mathies.

Mr. Pollard, do you wish to speak or do you want me to summarize your statement?

MR. JAMES H. POLLARD (Landowner, Route 2, Hugo, Oklahoma): I would like to speak. I am a landowner in the Kiamichi Valley in Choctaw County. I also represent some eleven landowners in

that valley, comprising ownership of some 9,000 acres of land actually fronting on the Kiamichi. We do not come as opposers of any project which we think would be of long term benefit, but we have unalterably opposed the construction of Hugo Reservoir as authorized, and we do now oppose it, and will continue to oppose it, as authorized. We do feel that a resurvey of the Kiamichi River from where it rises in the mountains along the lines that have been discussed here today will be beneficial, but we will oppose any inundation of the valley by the Kiamichi River, which would be the case with the Hugo Reservoir.

Exhibit No. 9 - Letter signed by James H. Pollard, September 4, 1956, submitting expression of views on location of a site for a proposed dam across Kiamichi River.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Mr. H. D. Wright.

MR. GLEN M. MC KENZIE (Landowner, Hugo, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Wright is unable to attend, so I am speaking in his behalf.

Exhibit No. 10 - Letter, September 4, 1956, signed by H. D. Wright, Route 2, Hugo, Oklahoma.

COLONEL BRISTOR: I have a letter signed by approximately 200 persons at Sawyer and at Hugo, and I shall read it now.

Exhibit No. 11 - Petition signed by citizens of Sawyer community favoring Sawyer site.

At this time I shall call upon Dr. J. D. Moore.

DOCTOR J. D. MOORE (Landowner, Hugo, Oklahoma): Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen, I am a landowner in this proposed water dam area. I have a little over 5,000 acres on this river, and I was awfully glad that Kerr, Monroney, and Albert were here to deliver my speech today, especially Senator Kerr. I feel like the upper dam site is justified. However, from my own personal viewpoint of selfish interest, the upper dam site would be of no great value because I have quite a number of acres which is valuable farmland. I have land there that I have picked a bale and a half of cotton per acre without irrigation. However, for the great many people benefited

by the Sawyer site, and if it does a greater amount of good up and down Red River, that is where we want to put it. We want it where it will do the greatest good to the greatest number of people. I am not selfish enough to want it for my own personal interests. I think it is located where it has the greatest value for all concerned.

I had many other things to say, but, as I say, Senator Kerr delivered my message.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Thank you, Doctor. Our cards do not indicate that anyone else wishes to make a statement. If anyone does, we will be glad to hear from them.

MR. K. F. HOEFLE (Consulting Engineer, Forrest & Cotton, Dallas, Texas): Colonel Bristor, ladies and gentlemen, I represent the consulting firm of Forrest and Cotton and the City of Dallas who has commissioned the firm of Forrest and Cotton to look into their water situation for the next fifty years. That study has not been completed yet, but we know now that the total amount of water for Dallas and Dallas County will be in the neighborhood of five million gallons a day. We know what the value of water is - not for future purposes, but for existing purposes and existing needs.

If a friendly foreigner from below the Red River could give advice to Oklahoma, I would do just what you are doing. I would look for the most conservation storage that can be provided in the entire drainage area.

The economy of any country is dependent on its water supply. You are not going to get people or industry to use water unless water is water stored in lakes and not in plans. It has to be done in advance of the uses which you expect to make of it.

After you have done that, and if you find that Oklahoma has a surplus of water to its needs and can safely export water to anyone else, Dallas would like to have the opportunity of negotiating for some of that surplus water. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Anyone else?

MR. L. W. SCOTT (Route 3, Antlers, Oklahoma): I am L. W. Scott and I live at Antlers. I had not intended to say anything. I am a member of the Pushmataha Chamber of Commerce. I told them a few nights ago the fact that we collaborated in the opinion and statement as was read here by our secretary,

Mr. Butler, that probably it would not be necessary for me to say anything, but I can't resist the temptation to say, since our friend and colleague, Mr. Mathies from Clayton, made his proposition, I cannot help but want to be included with that statement that he made - that proposition for the upper reaches of the Kiamichi inasmuch as we are in the north end of the county and I think you will find our citizenry and everybody involved up there fully in favor of the statement that has been read by Mr. Butler from the Chamber of Commerce. Thank you.

COLONEL BRISTOR: Is there anyone else? (No answer)
If not, thank you all for your interest. I would like to say that getting anything done on this project -- everybody seems to want some kind of water development on the Kiamichi. I haven't heard anybody say anything against it. The question seems to be what kind of a development.

Thus far we have been unable to come up with anything as good as the Sawyer reservoir, but that doesn't mean it's the only solution. Our investigation of Belzoni has been very sketchy and doesn't close our eyes against it or any upstream project.

If the legislation that Senator Kerr mentioned about our being able to bring in justification of water supply for future use goes through, of course, we are in a much better position. Right now we more or less need something that says, "In Oklahoma City we want so many gallons per day", "In Dallas we want so many gallons per day", "Fort Worth wants so many gallons per day", and "Here is the resolution of our city council saying that we will pay for it". If this legislation goes through, we merely say there are potential customers for this water. They don't have to sign on the dotted line, more or less, at the time it is being built.

Obviously this water is going to be used some day. There is no question about that, and the development of the area should take place in such a way that it will be used and its future use is not precluded. That is about all we have to say. Some time later, in some form or another, you will learn of the plan we come up with and the reasons why.
Thank you.

Adjourned 12:45 p.m.

TRANSCRIBED: DH