

Recommendations

I find that the requirements for modification of existing projects established by Section 216 of the 1970 Flood Control Act and implemented by ER 1105-2-100 and ER 1165-2-119 are not met by the existence or conditions that may be created by the logjam in the Neosho River at John Redmond Reservoir. Other than the loss of boating access at the Jacobs Creek Landing, there are no significant water resources impacts at the John Redmond Reservoir. There are no anticipated significant effects on storage or flood control operations. There is no evidence that conditions created by the logjam will cause increased flooding on real estate interests outside of project lands. Environmental conditions in the river and floodplain are anticipated to be altered, but these changes will be consistent with other naturally occurring logjams and are not considered to pose a human health risk. Therefore, the long-term alternatives considered herein are not appropriate for recommendation to Congress for modification of the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir in regard to the Neosho River or Eagle Creek logjams under Section 216 of the 1970 Flood Control Act.

I find that the Kansas Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy for watershed planning and management is consistent with the Corps' environmental operating principles and doctrine. I recommend that this and other state programs are considered in our activities, studies, and projects to minimize or avoid future water resources impacts, including logjams in Kansas.

I find that the maintenance measures described herein are within the authority of the project. I have prioritized the maintenance measures as follows:

- Maintenance Measure 3 – Construct and maintain a public access and boat ramp in the vicinity of Neosho Rapids. The loss of Neosho River access from the Jacobs Creek Landing and temporary Eagle Creek boat ramp leaves the Hartford ramp as the only public access to the fishing and recreation resources of the Neosho River within the John Redmond project lands managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as the Flint Hills National Wildlife Refuge. Future logjams could continue to close the Jacobs Creek Landing and Eagle Creek access to the Neosho River. Construction of a Neosho Rapids access point will provide long-term access to the Neosho River with a relatively low risk of impact from logjams. The preliminary estimated cost is \$70,000, plus \$25,000 for annual maintenance.
- Maintenance Measure 1 – Remove the logjam in the vicinity of the Jacobs Creek Landing boat ramp. Clearing the logjam at this location will allow recreation access to the Neosho River and Refuge. There is a significant risk that the ramp will again be closed by additional debris. The preliminary estimated cost is \$370,000 initially, plus \$25,000 for annual maintenance.
- Maintenance Measure 2 – Remove the logjam at the mouth of Eagle Creek and construct a permanent boat ramp on Eagle Creek to restore recreation access to the Neosho River and Refuge. An expansion of the Neosho River logjam to a point upstream of the mouth of Eagle Creek would preclude further clearing of the Eagle Creek logjam. Continued maintenance of the Eagle Creek access point would provide fishing and hunting access to

the Refuge. The preliminary estimated cost is \$180,000 initially, plus \$25,000 for annual maintenance.

- Maintenance Measure 4 – Develop and implement a long-term Neosho River debris and sediment removal plan for water resources and environmental management, regional economic development, preservation and/or restoration of water supply and flood control storage, and regional recreation resources. The preliminary estimated cost is \$3.3 million initially, plus \$50,000 for annual maintenance starting at the end of construction.

I recommend that the District's budget preparation for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2012 include Maintenance Measure 3 for implementation. Annual program maintenance and fiscal priority decisions made at the national level may not allow these efforts to be included in the Corps' approved budget.



Miroslav P. Kurka
Colonel, U.S. Army
District Engineer

The recommendations contained herein reflect the information available at this time and current Departmental policies governing formulation of individual projects. They do not reflect program and budgeting priorities inherent in the formulation of a national Civil Works program nor the perspective of higher review levels within the Executive Branch. Consequently, the recommendations may be modified before they are transmitted to the Congress as proposals for authorization and implementation funding. However, prior to transmittal to the Congress, the sponsor, the States, interested Federal agencies, and other parties will be advised of any modifications and will be afforded an opportunity to comment further.