## SECOND REGULAR SESSION

## House Concurrent Resolution No. 68

## 95TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVES LOEHNER (Sponsor), NANCE, WILSON (119),

SUTHERLAND AND SANDER (Co-sponsors).	
5277L.011	
3 greatest natural resources; and	2 3 4
which have a capacity to generate over 11,000 megawatts of electricity, draw cooling water from the lower Missouri River basin;	5 6 7 8
River and its alluvium, and the State of Missouri has constructed infrastructure to support water supply in the lower Missouri River basin with the understanding that reliable navigation flows would be maintained in the future; and	9 10 11 12 13
tonnage shipments on the Missouri River, with the Port of St. Louis just downstream from where the Missouri River enters the Mississippi River, being one of the largest inland ports in the United States; and	14 15 16 17
and this valuable asset needs to be maximized in order to move freight and support our state's economy; and	19 20 21 22
Whereas, barge transport allows for significant economic benefits and cost	23

savings, since one barge can transport the same amount of freight as 16 rail cars or 70 trucks; and

H.C.R. 68 2

25 26 27	<b>Whereas</b> , river transportation is the most environmentally friendly form of transporting goods and commodities, creating virtually no noise pollution and emitting 35 to 60 percent fewer pollutants than either trucks or trains; and
28	
29 30 31 32	Whereas, barges are also the most fuel efficient method of freight transport. Barges can move one ton of cargo 576 miles per gallon of fuel compared to 413 miles per gallon of fuel for rail and only 155 miles per gallon of fuel for trucks; and
33 34 35 36	Whereas, the Missouri General Assembly recognizes that the State of Missouri is investing more of its resources to develop and improve public ports in the state, including those on the Missouri River; and
37 38 39 40 41	Whereas, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, the United States Congress authorized the construction of the Missouri River Mainstream Reservoir System for the federal purposes of flood control and navigation, as well as irrigation, power, water supply, water quality, and recreation; and
42 43 44 45	Whereas, the June 4, 2003, and August 16, 2005, decisions of the United States Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit confirmed that navigation and flood control are the two dominant functions of the Flood Control Act of 1944; and
46 47 48 49	Whereas, the Missouri River is operated in accordance with the updated Missouri River Master Water Control Manual, which contains the management plan for the River and was adopted by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in 2004; and
50 51 52 53	Whereas, the Missouri General Assembly recognizes that the United States Army Corps of Engineers utilized extensive public processes to complete the 2004 Missouri River Master Water Control Manual and worked to balance the needs and desires of many competing stakeholder groups in establishing the Manual's navigation guidelines; and

H.C.R. 68 3

55	Whereas, the 2004 Manual was finalized after 15 years of debate and litigation and
56	after the expenditure of over \$35 million in federal funds; and
57	
58	Whereas, the 2004 Manual reduced the length of the navigation season, shifting
59	a large amount of water away from navigation and other downstream uses of the Missouri River
60	to benefit upstream uses, such as reservoir recreation; and
61	
	Whomas
62	Whereas, despite the opposition of the Missouri Congressional delegation, the
63 64	Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2009 authorized the United States Army Corps of Engineers to conduct the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study at a total cost of \$25 million, which will
65	review the original authorized purposes of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and will determine if
66	changes to those purposes and existing federal water resources infrastructure may be warranted;
67	and
68	
	<b>XX</b> /1
69 70	Whereas, the United States Army Corps of Engineers began conducting the
70	Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study in October of 2009; and
71	
72	Whereas, the scope of the Study, as defined by the United States Army Corps of
73	Engineers, exceeds the scope of the congressional authority for the Study, in that, the Corps
74	intends to develop recommendations and alternatives to the authorized purposes that Congress
75	did not request; and
76	
	Whomas
77	Whereas, federal taxpayers' dollars should not be wasted to develop
78	recommendations and alternatives that Congress did not request or authorize; and
79	
80	Whereas, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 authorized the United
81	States Department of Transportation to conduct an independent and comprehensive study and
82	analysis at a total cost of \$2 million to supplement the Missouri River Authorized Purposes
83	Study and to develop a comprehensive understanding of the full value of river flow support to
84	users in the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers; and

H.C.R. 68

Whereas, the consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 also authorized the Missouri Department of Transportation to conduct a Missouri River Freight Corridor Study at a total cost of \$900,000, which will examine how to increase freight tonnage moved on the Missouri River, long-term development opportunities along the Missouri River corridor, and ways to better use Missouri waterways to relieve infrastructure stress and congestion; and

Whereas, at times, the Missouri River provides over 60% of the water in the Mississippi River that passes St. Louis; and

Whereas, if the navigability of the Mississippi River is negatively impacted between the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers and the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, barges would no longer be able to travel from the far northern portions of the Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico, which would devastate the barge industry, the agricultural industry, and the transportation industry as a whole; and

**Whereas**, it is imperative that the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study consider Mississippi River navigation when evaluating if changes to the authorized purposes of the Flood Control Act of 1944 are warranted:

**Now, therefore, be it resolved** that the members of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-fifth General Assembly, Second Regular Session, the Senate concurring therein, hereby express our continued opposition to the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study and to the alternation of the Missouri River's primary purpose of navigation and flood control; and

Be it further resolved that the Missouri General Assembly urges the Missouri Congressional delegation to actively oppose funding of the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study in future fiscal years; and

H.C.R. 68

Be it further resolved that the Missouri General Assembly urges the United
States Army Corps of Engineers to narrow the scope of the Missouri River Authorized Purposes
Study to make it consistent with congressional authority and to include Mississippi River
navigation in any evaluation of the authorized purposes under the Study; and

119

Be it further resolved that the Chief Clerk of the Missouri House of
Representatives be instructed to prepare a properly inscribed copy of this resolution for the
United States Army Corps of Engineers and each member of the Missouri Congressional
delegation.

/