



CITY OF SUFFOLK

P. O. BOX 1858, SUFFOLK, VIRGINIA 23434. PHONE 934-3111

CITY MANAGER

April 17, 1986

The Honorable Paul S. Tribble, Jr.
United States Senate
SH-517 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Paul:

The City wishes to express its extreme concern over Senate Bill 1567 which contains language that sets new policies for Waterway development.

Section 202 of this legislation requires for the first time, non-Federal project sponsors to share significantly in the cost of harbor improvement projects. Any water resources project currently not under construction is subject to the new cost-sharing policy outlined in the this legislation. These projects will be initiated only after non-Federal project sponsors contract to pay all of the operation and maintenance costs of the project, plus contract to share the construction cost.

Previously, the Army Corps of Engineers was responsible for a portion of the original dredging costs for projects and was responsible for all maintenance costs. The non-Federal sponsor was responsible for all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, sediment relocations costs, and for a portion of the original dredging costs for project development.

Under proposed Senate Bill 1567, the non-Federal sponsor in addition to the above mentioned responsibilities, must also pay for maintenance costs which in the case of recreation projects require a 100% contribution payment by the non-Federal sponsor.

These new policies have affected a most important project in Suffolk. In relation to the dredging of Bennetts Creek, increased cost to the non-Federal sponsor(s) amounts to an additional \$20,250 for initial construction and an additional \$147,400 every five years for channel maintenance. Given that Senate Bill 1567 is still under consideration in the Congress, and is not yet law, the Corps of Engineers needs to explain its position on how it is suddenly advising the City of new requirements relating to cost-sharing formulas. The Corps position can be considered rather presumptuous in establishing new cost-sharing policies prior to the enactment of legislation requiring the same.

The City urges your strong opposition to this and any similar legislation that imposes higher costs on such projects. In addition, the City requests that you prevail upon the Corps of Engineers to not implement any such new cost-sharing policies until legislation is passed and signed into law.

As always, the City is willing to be responsible for all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations for project development, and to pay the proposed increased portion of the original construction costs. However, the City does feel that the entire burden of maintenance costs for recreational portions of such projects should not have to be borne by the non-Federal sponsor.

These proposed changes will have very serious impacts on important economic development efforts that involve new construction and the creation of new employment opportunities. If I can provide you with more specific details on the adverse effect of the proposed policy on Suffolk, please contact me directly.

As always, your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,



John L. Rowe, Jr.
City Manager

JLRJr:kdw