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CHAPTER I

THE MOVEMENT FOR TRINITY RIVER DEVELOPMENT

This thesis analyzes the movement for Trinity River improvement and describes the methods used to promote the project. The major portion of this work is devoted to the present sponsor of the project, the Trinity Improvement Association. This study also includes an examination of opposing forces and a brief look at the Trinity River Authority, a state agency possessing broad control over the water resources of the watershed.

This study is not designed to provide arguments for or against any plan of river development. No attempt has been made to determine the economic practicality of the program.

The private groups which have had some degree of success in promoting river improvement have sought assistance from the state and federal governments. The problem faced by these interest groups is how to secure government support for their goals. The question of political science which underlies this thesis is: What can be learned about politics and political behavior from the study of the experiences of private groups seeking support of government for their goals?
This thesis is divided into three parts. Part one consists of three chapters which disclose the methods employed by the various navigation companies and associations to obtain their goals. The second part of this study consists of two chapters which examine the organization, functions, and effectiveness of the Trinity Improvement Association and the Trinity River Authority.

The final part of this thesis, containing one chapter, presents generalizations and conclusions supported by this research.

The first part of this thesis examines the history of the movement for Trinity River improvement. The period of discussion is 1852 through 1964. Three stages of promotional development characterize this movement. In the first stage enthusiasts envisioned improving the river for navigational purposes only. No related watershed improvements were sought or demanded. It was not until devastating floods ripped through the Mississippi Valley in 1936 that a new stage of thinking began. Sponsors broadened goals to include soil erosion prevention and flood control protection following 1936. A comprehensive concept of Trinity River development evolved gradually after that time. Many multipurpose projects came to be considered as complementary to navigation, and in 1958, as a result of political activity on the part of the Trinity Improvement Association, Congress directed the Corps of Engineers to survey the Trinity River
and recommend needed improvements. This task was completed in 1961 and a highly favorable Corps of Engineers' report which suggested $900,000,000 of improvements began moving through channels toward Congressional consideration.

Since formation of the first navigation company in 1866, there has been continuous railroad opposition to all plans calling for development of the river as a commercial artery. Railroads succeeded in destroying the first movement and have severely crippled all subsequent attempts. The power of the Texas railroad lobby is on the decline, however. There are two reasons for this. First, railroads have advanced no new arguments against canalization since 1899; their position is old and displays no fresh thinking. Second, railroads servicing the bordering Arkansas Valley strongly urged Congress to appropriate funds to develop the rivers of that watershed.

The second part of the thesis deals with organization of interests promoting Trinity improvement. The first chapter of the second part analyzes the organization of the Trinity Improvement Association and the roles and duties of its officers and directors. The second chapter deals with the functions, organization, and accomplishments of the Trinity River Authority. These two chapters are placed in a separate section to avoid interrupting the chronology of section one.
The Constitution of the Trinity Improvement Association declares the Executive Committee to be the governing body of the organization. In spite of this fact, considerable confusion exists because of vague wording as to where the powers and duties of the Executive Committee end and those of the President begin. In theory the Executive Committee makes policy and the President carries it out or directs the General Manager to execute policy. It appears that both the President and General Manager make policy also. Because of the smallness of the organization and the obvious friendship and respect which the officers show for one another, this possible defect in structure has not damaged the effectiveness of the organization.

The Trinity River Authority of Texas is a state agency which possesses full power over the water resources of the watershed. It has been in operation since 1955 and has considerable accomplishments to its credit. The Trinity River Authority is discussed in this study because its twenty-four man governing body works very closely with the Trinity Improvement Association and the Corps of Engineers to bring about a coordinated plan of development for the watershed. In 1959 it put into operation a central sewage disposal plant in Irving. The cities of Farmers Branch, Grand Prairie, Irving, and Dallas use this facility. Since 1960 it has negotiated several contracts with the United
States Government for purchase of water storage space in federal reservoirs. Several cities have in turn contracted with the Trinity River Authority to supply them with water. This organization is both a construction and a planning agency, and in 1961 a contract was negotiated with Houston to construct a large water supply reservoir northeast of that city.

It is important to note that the Trinity Improvement Association sponsored the creation of the Trinity River Authority in the 54th Legislature. A considerable amount of financial aid is given by the Association to support operation of the Trinity River Authority. As a result a unique relationship exists between the private and the official organizations. No fewer than eight coincidental directorships have existed.

The information in this study is derived almost entirely from the following sources: E. H. Brown, Trinity River Canalization, Dallas and Fort Worth newspapers, Corps of Engineers documents, Trinity Improvement Association files, and interviews with Trinity Improvement Association officers and Corps of Engineers personnel.

This research supports several conclusions and generalizations about politics and political behavior which are contained in the final chapter. It is hoped that the concluding
summary together with the detailed explanation of the thesis as a whole may be a useful source of reference to others examining the relationships of private groups to government.
CHAPTER II

EARLY ATTEMPTS TO CANALIZE THE TRINITY

The Trinity River rises in north central Texas and flows southeasterly approximately seven hundred and sixty miles, discharging into Galveston Bay. The course which the river runs is tortuous and the river is much obstructed by snags and drifts. Nevertheless, prior to the turn of the present century the river was regularly navigated to Lockridges Bluff, three hundred and ninety-two miles above the mouth. On frequent occasions steamers daringly traveled five hundred and ten miles to Dallas (1, p. 940).

Since pre-Civil War days the Congress of the United States has shown intermittent interest in the Trinity River Basin area of the State of Texas. The first federal legislation concerning the river came on August 30, 1852, only seven years after Texas entered the Union. Pursuant to provisions of the legislation, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army dispatched Lieutenant William H. C. Whiting to Texas to make a survey of the river from its mouth to Dallas (3, p. 35).

The survey report of Lieutenant Whiting was submitted to the Chief U. S. Army Engineers, after its completion.
on January 23, the following year. Navigation was reported to be "practicable" from the river's mouth for a distance of six hundred miles at high water, which normally meant January to June, and "practicable" during low flow for a distance of one hundred miles the remainder of the year (8, p. 16).

The conclusion to Lieutenant Whiting's report described the Trinity as the "deepest and least obstructed river in the State of Texas." He said: "Its size, length, and depth and the section of country through which it runs entitle it to consideration. Its importance to this growing country will be considerable" (8, p. 16).

Lieutenant Whiting's report stirred up considerable interest in Dallas. The seven steamships navigating the Trinity, occasionally as far as Trinidad in Kaufman County and Porters Bluff in Ellis County, verified his observation. Two great natural barriers to navigation existed, however, which unless removed would make commerce on the river extremely dangerous at best (4, p. 12).

At the mouth of the Trinity, in Galveston Bay, a huge sandbar made entrance into the river a task for a skilled navigator. Thirty river miles below Dallas, where the main channel split, a large land mass existed known as Bois d'Arc Island. A gigantic raft of logs and other obstructing items surrounded the island, making passage
possible only during the wet season, and even then it was hazardous (3, p. 12).

In 1858 the state* removed the Galveston Bay sandbar but prior to the Civil War this was the only improvement made on the river since Congress took no action on Lieutenant Whiting's report of 1853 (4, p. 12).

The Formation and Activities of Navigation Companies

Enthusiasm for a project which would make the river navigable year-round survived the War and in 1866 a group of Dallas businessmen petitioned the State Legislature to charter the Trinity River Slack Water Navigation Company. This company was authorized to establish permanent navigation upon the river from Dallas to Galveston on a twelve-month basis. The company was to be compensated with grants of public lands for each mile of the river cleared of snags and other obstructions (3, p. 36).

Announcement later in the year by the Houston and Texas Central Railway Company that it would extend its line from Houston to Dallas was sufficient to kill the Trinity River Slack Water Navigation Company before it could commence operations (3, p. 36). There is little doubt that the

*Green does not reveal what state agency did this work. Brown does not mention the event. The Handbook of Texas cites the event but fails to identify the agency involved.
statement of the Houston and Texas Central Railway Company was calculated to achieve this end. This event signaled the beginning of a conflict between railroad and canal forces in Texas which has existed to this day.

The ease with which directors of the Trinity River Slack Water Navigation Company abandoned their goals did not discourage other Dallasites. In early 1867 a group of citizens attempted to draw attention to the river's potential by offering a five-hundred-dollar prize to the first captain to navigate the Trinity from Galveston Bay to Dallas (4, p. 14).

In May, 1868, Captain J. H. McGarvey brought Job Boat No. 1, a sixty-six by twenty-foot steamer weighing twenty-six tons, to the Commerce Street banks of the Trinity and collected the money (4, p. 16). The occasion provided the people of Dallas with concrete evidence of the navigability of the Trinity. The fact that the trip had taken three hundred and sixty-nine days was generally overlooked. Scant water supply and snags in the river accounted for the length of the trip. Later in the year the Sallie Haynes was built and launched in Dallas amidst wild cheering (3, p. 27).

A formal written request was presented to the constitutional convention of 1868 which asked that the state appropriate seventy-five thousand dollars to remove snags and overhanging timbers from the river (4, p. 14).
An unnamed river enthusiast said years later that the request was referred to the Internal Improvement Company under Governor E. J. Davis' administration and fell asleep in the hands of a committee (4, p. 16).

The petition of 1868 is interesting although it received no consideration because it shows exactly what improvements Dallasites considered necessary to make the river a commercial waterway. The petition alleged the Trinity "may be successfully navigated from the city of Galveston to the town of Dallas for six months annually . . . by removing obstructions between Dallas and the mouth of the East Fork (4, p. 14).

"An experienced steamboatman of twenty years' practice has proposed to citizens of Dallas County to remove all obstructions . . . so that boats of sufficient capacity to carry five hundred bales of cotton can be run . . . to Dallas for four months in the year for $5,000" (4, p. 14).

The Sallie Haynes, launched December 17, 1868, became a victim of an unseen snag a few miles south of Dallas about March, 1869 (4, p. 16). The pessimism which prevailed in that city following the Sallie Haynes' disaster thwarted attempts by river enthusiasts to regroup.

Congress authorized a second survey of the river in 1872 from its mouth to Magnolia, Anderson County. As before, no federal legislation resulted from the report (3, p. 38).
The following year the state legislature granted to a Captain Poitevant a subsidy in land certificates of ten thousand acres per mile if he would clear the river. Poitevant never completed the task but received his land for what he had done (4, p. 16).

Railroad Expansion and Public Reaction

During the 1870's Texans witnessed the first real railroad building boom in the state's history. Prior to this time there were scarcely enough miles of track in the state to plot on a map. Texas had no railroads at all until 1853, and by the outbreak of the Civil War there were fewer than four hundred and fifty miles of track. All ten of the railroad companies operating in the state in 1860 were bankrupt by the close of the Civil War, and track mileage had been reduced to three hundred and ten miles during the conflict (9, p. 287).

The Houston and Texas Central Railway Company was the first to resume operations. The line became Dallas' first railroad in 1872 (9, p. 287). The city was every bit as excited over the arrival of the Houston and Texas Central as it had been in 1868 when the Sallie Haynes was launched (3, p. 36).

By 1891 there were eight thousand, seven hundred and sixty-six miles of track in Texas, and five railroads served Dallas. Twenty years earlier there had been only eight
hundred and sixty-five track miles in the state (9, p. 288). The effect of the railroad building boom was to eliminate any significant demand for navigation throughout the Trinity River Valley. Thus the railroads obtained a monopoly over transportation.

The railroad monopoly was not obtained without strong opposition, however. During the latter half of the 1880's considerable public criticism and political protest were stirred up in the nation against monopolies and big business (9, p. 287). In Texas and throughout the nation the Farmers' Alliance was leading a fight for reform. In Cleburne, Texas, in 1886, the Alliance set forth its political program. The group demanded among other things that railroad property be taxed at full value and that Congress adopt an effective interstate commerce law. Two years later the Farmers' Alliance demanded that the State of Texas adopt antitrust laws and regulate railroad rates (7, p. 352).

Governor Lawrence Sullivan Ross (January 18, 1887-January 20, 1891), ably assisted by his Attorney-General, James Stephen Hogg, was successful in securing passage of

---

*Records of the Texas Secretary of State reveal that a group known as the Trinity River Improvement and Navigation Company was incorporated in 1873, with its principal place of business being listed as Dallas. Its right to do business was forfeited in 1895. No source of reference known to this writer takes notice of this company's activities. Apparently, therefore, the Trinity River Improvement and Navigation Company contributed little, if anything, to the movement.*
Texas' first antitrust act March 30, 1889. The act was designed to regulate "foreign corporations," that is, corporations doing business in the state but headquartered elsewhere (7, p. 352).

Hogg, the Democratic nominee for governor in 1890, ran on a platform calling for elimination of the national banking system, free coinage of silver, and creation of a state body to regulate railroads. The goals of the Farmers' Alliance were no different, and Hogg was elected with full Alliance support (7, p. 353). He took office January 20, 1891 (9, p. 338).

In April, the legislature created the Texas Railroad Commission with power to make classifications and fix railroad rates and fares. The commission was effective. Railroad rates across the state were lowered. Commissioners claimed that industry had been encouraged to move into the state as a result and that one million dollars had been saved on the shipment of cotton alone in just two years (7, p. 358).

The railroads went to court in 1892 claiming that the Commission's rates were confiscatory. Restraining orders from the courts kept the Texas Railroad Commission impotent for two years (7, p. 358).

Although Governor Hogg continued to support railroad regulation, the Alliance split with him in 1891 when he
failed to appoint an Alliance candidate to the Commission. The Alliance then joined forces with the new People's or Populist Party and through the election of 1900 was a powerful political force in Texas (7, p. 361).

The Trinity River Navigation Company

Criticism of railroads had much to do with revival of navigation interest in 1891. Dallas businessmen alleged that the five railroads servicing the city were charging exorbitant rates.* The business community hailed the creation of the railroad commission but theorized that the only means to insure fair rates was to have competing forms of transportation (3, p. 39). Positive action was taken in July. A stock company known as the Trinity River Navigation Company was organized to promote river navigation. Its purpose was not to raise funds to begin work to clear the river as the Trinity River Slack Water Navigation Company had planned in 1868, but rather to raise capital so that lobbyists could be sent to Washington to secure federal aid for the project (3, p. 40).

*The railroads servicing Dallas were the Houston and Texas Central; Missouri, Kansas and Texas; Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe; Texas and Pacific; and, the Texas Trunk. The Houston and Texas Central, Gulf, Colorado, and Santa Fe, and the Texas Trunk were incorporated under Texas law. The Texas and Pacific was chartered by Congress and had purchased many small Texas lines between 1871 and 1891. Its principal place of business was Texas. The Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad Company was incorporated in Missouri.

For a study of Texas Railroads see: A History of Texas Railroads by S. G. Reed.
At a company meeting held on February 2, 1892, Captain L. S. Plateau was selected as lobbyist and sent to Washington to seek a $500,000 appropriation from Congress. The earlier conception that the Trinity was suitable for steamboat traffic was discarded. The funds were to be used to construct locks and dams and remove snags and sandbars from the river so that barges and tow boats could safely negotiate it (3, p. 40).

A preliminary study of the river's suitability for navigation by Major Charles J. Allen, Corps of Engineers, reached Washington about the same time as Captain Plateau, however, and counteracted his efforts. The engineer's report stated that "present and prospective commerce would not justify the expense of improvement" (8, p. 16).

Failing to secure any federal support, Directors of the Trinity River Navigation Company decided to take the first step on their own. In November, 1892, the snag boat Dallas was launched (3, p. 41). Directors then turned to the state legislature for funds to make the river navigable. The legislature provided moral support only. On January 10, 1893, the following concurrent resolution was passed (10, pp. 29-30):

Effect of the Improvement of the Trinity River on the Whole State of Texas

WHEREAS, Freight and transportation charges on all incoming and outgoing commodities in Texas about equal the first cost of the same at the place of production; and
WHEREAS, The United States Government has now under construction, at heavy cost, several harbors on the Gulf Coast of Texas, and to realize the benefit of these expenditures of millions of dollars on the Texas coast it is necessary to secure cheap transportation from the interior to these ports and from these ports to the interior; and

WHEREAS, Experience has taught us that for years to come this cannot be obtained from the railroads alone, and that Texas has large rivers running through the State from the interior to the gulf that might be made navigable for cheap transportation by the expenditure of reasonable sums of money by the general government; and

WHEREAS, It is known that the Trinity River is a navigable stream, and that in 1872 as many as seventeen steamers were running on its waters, coming within thirty miles of Dallas, and that as late as 1868 one landed at the foot of Main Street, in Dallas; and

WHEREAS, It has been the policy of the United States government to improve the waterways of the land and thus afford cheap transportation to the people; and

WHEREAS, The improvement of the Trinity River so as to secure navigation for the entire year will save millions of dollars to the people of Texas; therefore be it

RESOLVED By the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be respectfully and earnestly requested as speedily as possible to secure an appropriation sufficient to open the Trinity for permanent navigation.

The Trinity River Navigation Company continued to do what it could to promote navigation without financial assistance from any governmental source. The steamer, H. A. Harvey, Jr., was purchased in March at Galveston. The vessel's arrival in Dallas on May 20, 1893, touched off
"the greatest of Trinity River celebrations" (3, p. 42). From miles around thousands came to see the Harvey. It was a big boat weighing ninety-seven tons and capable of carrying six hundred bales of cotton and one hundred and fifty passengers. A dam and a dance pavilion were constructed at McCommas Bluff, thirteen miles below Dallas. The Harvey made many voyages to the spot before sailing for Galveston and being sold in 1898 (4, p. 16).

These events occurred at a time when extension of railroad lines into Dallas and the Trinity River Basin area was proceeding rapidly. It was the design of the Trinity River Navigation Company to stir up support for Trinity improvement and discredit the attacks of powerful railroad executives and lobbies. The railroads countered by instituting rate slashing policies designed to eliminate the demands for navigation (3, p. 43). The attempt to destroy the movement was unsuccessful, however, and the railroads suffered a real setback in 1899.

Congressional Action

On March 3, 1899, new hope came to Texas navigation enthusiasts, for the Rivers and Harbors Act of that year instructed Army engineers to make a third study of the river. Captain C. S. Riche, in charge, completed the task within the year and reported to General John M. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, as follows (5, pp. 2-3):
(1) The Trinity River has a distance of five hundred and eleven miles from its mouth to Dallas.

(2) It has a watershed area of 16,500 square miles.

(3) Clearing the channel of snags and trees would, without further improvements, make it navigable at high water times by light draft vessels.

(4) Locks and dams would lengthen the navigation period.

(5) An artificial water supply of wells and lakes storing water during the wet season at the Dallas end of the river would create year-round navigation.

(6) Navigation on all-year-round basis would require thirty-seven locks and dams at an estimated cost of $4,000,000 for a four-foot navigation channel, $4,550,000 for a six-foot navigation channel.

(7) $280,000 maintenance and $120,000 interest would represent the continuing annual expenditure.

Captain Riche concluded (5, p. 7):

Now, if it can be shown that the improvement of the river will effect an annual saving to the people of Texas equal to or greater in amount than $400,000, the improvement would be justifiable; and if savings greatly exceeded this amount, then the improvement would become advisable and perhaps urgently necessary.

It is clear to me that the local traffic which the improvement will develop in the rich bottom lands of the river and in the territory immediately adjacent thereto will by itself justify the improvement. However, the chief effect of the improvement will be to lower and control charges for transporting freight.

The Dallas Commercial Club in a letter dated November, 1899, addressed to Captain Riche, estimated that a navigable Trinity River would save the people of Texas $9,830,000 in freight charges annually. This figure was computed by
comparing the transportation charges on the Erie Canal with
the freight rates charged by New York railroads (5, p. 20).
C. A. Keating, President, and S. H. Fishburn, Secretary
of the Dallas Commercial Club, believed this to be a fair
comparison, as illustrated by this excerpt from their letter
in November, 1899, to Captain Riche (5, p. 24):

Juggle with these figures as we please, cut them
down for possible over-estimation, discount them one
half, if anyone imagines they may be overdrawn, and
then you have more than enough in one annual saving
to clean out and lock and dam this river in the most
modern and improved style from Dallas to its mouth.

Colonel Henry M. Robert, Division Engineer, remarked
in a letter to Captain Riche dated January 31, 1900, that
if the reduction in freight rates equaled only one tenth
of the estimate submitted by the Dallas Commercial Club,
the entire cost of the river's development would be saved
in six years (5, p. 9). Colonel Robert enthusiastically
endorsed a Trinity River project and recommended adoption
of Captain Riche's plan of improvement to the Board of
Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington.

Captain Riche's report, with favorable assessments
submitted from the above parties and others, was forwarded
to Secretary of War Elihu Root on January 31, 1900, and thence
to Congress with the War Secretary's blessing (8, p. 19).
Dallas had reason to be happy June 13, 1902. The Rivers and
Harbors Act of that date adopted Riche's report calling for
a four-foot navigation channel with thirty-seven locks and dams (2, p. 939). An immediate appropriation of $750,000 was authorized in order that engineers could clear the river of snags and obstructions and determine where locks and dams should be placed (3, p. 45).

Members of the Trinity River Navigation Company appeared in Washington to encourage river development while Congress considered the report and its endorsements (3, p. 45). However, to assume that lobbying by representatives of the Trinity River Navigation Company was largely responsible for inclusion of the Trinity River project in the 1902 Rivers and Harbors Act has dubious validity. The project at all levels of review carried such enthusiastic endorsements that it seems more correct to say it sold itself to Congress.

The years 1903 through 1905 were consumed by the engineers in making plans and clearing the river (8, p. 1145). Funds for continuation of work were made available in each subsequent rivers and harbors act. Finally on July 17, 1906, construction of the first federal lock and dam began forty-two miles below Dallas near Ferris (1, p. 941).

Disintegration of the Trinity River Navigation Company

In December, 1909, C. A. Keating, President of the Trinity River Navigation Company, retired after eighteen
years of service as either a Director or chief executive. At this time one lock and dam had been completed within thirteen miles of Dallas and others were under construction or authorized (3, p. 49).* Every rivers and harbors act since 1902 had authorized or appropriated funds for canal construction (8, p. 23). Directors felt that there was no longer need to lobby in Washington or to launch company-owned snag boats. The canalization of the Trinity River appeared near and, therefore, it was decided by Directors to dissolve the organization. In its eighteen years from 1891 to 1909 the Trinity River Navigation Company had expended a total of $162,344 on lobbying activities and improvement of the river. These funds had been obtained largely from public solicitations (3, p. 49).**

Congressional Patchwork Brings Local Offer

By 1914, five rivers and harbors bills had authorized the construction of five locks and dams within forty-two miles of Dallas (2, p. 941). The people of Dallas were grateful for Congress' continued interest in the river, but at the same time, they were irritated by the piecemeal manner

---

*Lock and Dam One at Elam, although started after Lock and Dam Six at Farris, was completed two years earlier.

**E. H. Brown used Keating's diary to obtain this information. The diary's whereabouts is unknown. Brown does not elaborate further.
with which Congress was proceeding (3, p. 51). Legislation approving only one lock and dam at a time would mean that eighty-four or eighty-five years would pass before the canal was completed. This was too long for Dallasites to wait (6, p. 6). Thus, the Chamber of Commerce, aided by the Dallas Manufacturers' Association, appointed a Trinity River committee and sent it to Washington with a proposal to pay one half the cost of making the river navigable from Dallas to its mouth, if Congress would pass a single bill which would authorize completion of the entire project (3, p. 51). Because the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1912 had increased channel depth from four to six feet, the estimated cost of improvements had risen from four to six millions. Therefore, the Trinity River Committee was offering Congress three million dollars of Dallas' money (2, p. 1144). In 1914 the Senate rejected this almost unheard of proposition. Senator Theodore Burton of Ohio, member of the Committee on Commerce, led the fight against acceptance of this offer and advocated abandonment of the project on the grounds that the benefits to be derived would not exceed the costs. As chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1902 he had pushed the project (8, p. 19).*

*Speeches on the floor of the Senate contained in the Congressional Record of 1914 give no indication of why Burton changed his position. Senator Shephard embarrassed Burton by reading the recommendations he had made for
Abandonment of the Project

On December 6, 1916, the Army Engineers called a meeting of Dallas business leaders, at which time the results of a re-examination survey, authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 4, 1915, were made known (6, p. 2).

New projections by a board of engineers revealed that, if Congress authorized completion of the project in one bill, construction would take fifteen years and cost better than $13,000,000. The engineers frankly let it be known that they did not feel the benefits to be derived from navigation warranted such an expenditure (3, p. 52). The situation was clear; the engineers would, if politics allowed, abandon the project after the two locks and dams under construction were completed. Nevertheless, in 1920 the Dallas Chamber of Commerce appointed twenty men to raise fifty thousand dollars and organize a new navigation company. The company was unable to amass sufficient funds, and the attempt resulted in failure (3, p. 53).

Secretary of War Baker in a report to Congress in 1921 recommended that the project calling for construction of thirty-seven locks and dams to facilitate navigation on the Trinity River be abandoned (3, p. 53).

adoption of the project before the House in 1902. Rather than making a harsh personal attack, however, Shephard tried to sell the project to the Senate. No remarks of Texas' Senior Senator, Charles Culberson, are recorded.
The two primary reasons given for making the recommendation were as follows (3, p. 94):

(1) The river had an insufficient water supply,

and

(2) The estimates of tonnage were not sufficient to justify the expenditure.

Because tonnage estimates were not high, it was predicted that the railroads would not encounter adequate competition from the Trinity to effect a general rate reduction which was the avowed purpose of building the canal. The savings in freight rates from the 40,000 tons of cotton which engineers expected to be transported upon the river annually were not sufficient to make benefits of the canal exceed yearly costs. Lumbering interests were able to use the river without improvements. Coal and iron deposits along the river's course were not highly developed, and, therefore, Secretary Baker explained that the engineers were unqualified to estimate what tonnage, if any, would seek the river (7, p. 5).

The mighty Mississippi "is scarcely used at present," the Secretary of War said, and in so many words his report asked Congressmen if the potential of the Mississippi could be compared with that of the Trinity (6, p. 8).

Lieutenant Whiting observed fifty years prior to adoption of the Trinity River canal project in 1902 that the flow of the river was such that it was practicable to
navigate it only during the wet season, January to June. He was considering making the river navigable only by removing snags and overhanging timbers. The project abandoned by the War Department in 1921 had envisioned construction of lakes and a series of locks and dams along the river's course to back up and hold water to make commerce possible even during the dry season. The discharge of the Trinity River did not appreciably change in the period from 1852 to 1921. What happened to change expert opinion was not disclosed, and no apparent consideration was given to the river's value if usable only six or nine months of the year. The Erie Canal and the Great Lakes, although frozen a part of each year, have always been considered of great value.

The tonnage estimates completed by engineers were interesting in that they assumed that only those parts of the fifteen counties bordering on the river which were not within five miles of a railroad would contribute to the river's tonnage. Thus tonnage estimates were limited to include only 2,700,000 acres, one third of the total area of these counties (10, pp. 5, 7). Apparently, engineers reasoned that goods needing shipment in closer proximity to a railroad than the canal would seek the fastest rather than cheapest route. The limitations which the engineers placed upon themselves in estimating tonnage were unrealistic. A hidden reason for engineers recommending abandonment may...
well have been that the piecemeal appropriations of Congress so delayed completion of the project that obsoleteness of design was a factor. Projects under consideration during the 1920's called for a channel depth of nine feet rather than six feet, because the shallower depth was inadequate for tugs and barges constructed after 1910.

The eight locks and dams in existence on the Trinity were of no appreciable value to navigation following the abandonment of the project (3, p. 54).
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CHAPTER III

BIRTH OF THE TRINITY RIVER CANAL ASSOCIATION
AND RENEWAL OF NAVIGATION EFFORTS

The Trinity River provided Dallasites with a topic of conversation and speculation for seventy years, and abandonment of the canalization project did not destroy the desire to see the river made an artery of commercial transportation. The promotional activities of the Trinity River Navigation Company, the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, the Commercial Club, and the Manufacturers' Association had involved the efforts of a large number of people. Sizable sums of money had been contributed by these organized bodies and numerous interested citizens. Many Dallas businessmen firmly believed that the potential greatness of the city was directly related to navigation. These men did not let the movement lie dormant long.

John Carpenter, President of Texas Power and Light Company, was the key figure in rekindling interest in the movement in Dallas. Together with his good friend, Amon G. Carter, Sr., owner and publisher of the Fort Worth Star Telegram, Fort Worth business leaders were encouraged to
join Dallas in a renewed effort to promote canal trans-
portation. They accepted (39, p. 20).

Prior to 1930, Dallas had been alone in its endeavor
to secure improvement of the river. Fort Worth's desire to
become part of the movement was motivated by the realization
that a canal stopping thirty miles from its doorstep might
bring economic disaster. If there was to be a canal, Fort
Worth had to be included to ensure continued growth. Thus,
the door was opened for conferences between leaders of the
two cities. A joint session of their Chambers of Commerce
was scheduled for May 21*, 1930. At the meeting Walter B.
Scott, President of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce,
presided and Roy Miller, Vice-President of the Intercoastal
Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, delivered the
principal address (9).

The two Chambers of Commerce agreed to form an organi-
ization similar to that which Miller represented. The name
selected for the new group was the Trinity River Navigation
Association, but records of the Texas Secretary of State
revealed that such an organization already existed.* Therefore,
the word "Canal" had to be substituted for "Navigation" (10).

*The Trinity River Navigation Association was apparently
an inactive organization. Brown fails to mention its existence
and no source examined refers to its activities.
The officers of the organization were selected in August, 1930. John W. Carpenter was named President of the Association. "Mr. Fort Worth," Amon G. Carter, became Chairman of the Executive Committee and Dallas Water Commissioner John W. Fouts was named General Manager (11). These three men were listed as incorporators along with A. P. Barrett of San Antonio and Fort Worth, J. F. Lucy of Dallas, W. S. Mosher of Dallas, Frank W. Powell of Fort Worth, Hugh S. Prather of Dallas, Walter B. Scott of Fort Worth, and James G. Wilson, also of Fort Worth (8).

Each of these ten men purchased one hundred shares of stock valued at one dollar each to pay the Association's incorporation fee. No further sales were made although the Association was chartered as a stock company. The shares did not reserve voting rights to the holders and were years later made worthless by change of corporate status (8).

Trinity River Canal Association Survey and Operations

Because the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 3, 1930, instructed the Corps of Engineers to make a preliminary study of the river to determine feasibility of canalization, two consultants were employed by the Trinity River Canal Association to conduct a parallel survey. The consultants were Ed P. Byars, traffic manager of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, and Albert L. Reed, commerce counsel for the
Dallas Chamber of Commerce. Both men were members of the Board of Directors of the Association. The Reed-Byars Report was completed in October, 1930. Estimates showed that a navigable Trinity would save shippers an average of $3.10 per ton or $16,567,000 annually. The results of this highly favorable report were released to newspapers on or around October 26, 1930, and presented to Major Milo Fox who was in charge of the government survey (13).

Shortly after publication of the Reed-Byars Report the first of many annual banquets of the Trinity River Canal Association was held. Well-known proponents of river canalization were present as guests or speakers. Each lent his support to the Association and urged those present to contribute to the Association's five-year fund-raising drive to raise $300,000 which had begun in July (14).

The method of soliciting funds was not as sophisticated as the banquet speeches indicated. The method employed was simple, but highly effective. Carpenter and Carter telephoned their business associates and told them how much they were expected to contribute. Because of the influence and power of these two men in the Texas business community, the funds were obtained (38).

The Trinity River Canal Association operated more like a nonprofit organization or a chamber of commerce than a private company. Promotion and development of the Trinity
River rather than direct profit was its goal. To make the Trinity River Canal Association a household word, John Fouts, General Manager, followed a policy of giving press releases to Dallas and Fort Worth papers weekly. With Amon Carter, owner of the Fort Worth Star Telegram, as Chairman of the Executive Committee and Walter A. Dealey, Dallas Morning News President, as a Director, Fouts was always assured a ready market for the "news."

Nineteen thirty was a good year for the new Association. The fund drive was under way, the Reed-Byars Report had been exceptionally favorable, Congress had authorized a preliminary study of the river, and the Texas press had printed a profusion of complimentary articles on the Association and its work. The depression had no detrimental effect. With great confidence the Directors looked forward to 1931.

The Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District

The support enabled the Directors of the Association to go before the State Legislature in January and request that a special district be created in Tarrant and Dallas Counties with authority to negotiate with the Federal Government for the construction of a canal to the cities.

#The General Manager considered external communication of utmost importance. The files on the Trinity River Canal Association in the morgues of both papers have been thoroughly examined.
The District was to have no control over the lower reaches of the river. The forty-Second Legislature obliged the canalization enthusiasts. The bill passed the House April 21, by a vote of 78 to 45 (3). The Senate endorsed the measure May 8, with a vote of 22 to 6. Opposition in both houses was voiced by East and West Texas legislators. External pressure was applied by railroad interests (4). The Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District Act was signed by Governor Sterling Hay, May 14, 1931 (5, 20).

The law provided that the District would become operational ninety days following the Governor's signature. The legislature defined three stages of operations for the Board of Directors. The first stage of operations was termed the Pre-election Board period. The legislature named nine Directors to administer the affairs of the District for a maximum time of one hundred and eighty days following the effective date of the Act. The Pre-election Directors were required by law to schedule an election within that one hundred and eighty day period to obtain voter approval for continuance of operations through December 31, 1935. If voters approved of the District and its power to tax, it then entered into a preliminary period of operation. Prior to December 31, 1935, the Preliminary Board of Directors was instructed by the Act to call an election in which the taxpaying voters were to decide the future of the District.
The Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District would enter into a Permanent Board period or be required to cease operations as of December 31, 1935, depending upon the outcome of the election. The 1931 Act provided the following powers to be exercised by the nine Directors (33, pp. 314-315):

1. To make "surveys, investigations, and plans for construction of certain improvements to provide a navigable waterway from Fort Worth and Dallas to Galveston Bay. . . ."

2. To "enter into contract with the Federal Government to contribute the cost of said canal."

3. To "issue and sell bonds."

4. To take property for public use within the District when necessary--"eminent domain."

5. To "levy taxes not to exceed $.02 on the one hundred dollars."

The Legislature named Amon G. Carter, A. P. Barrett, Lloyd McKee, and Walter B. Scott, all of Tarrant County; and John W. Carpenter, J. F. Lucy, Karl Hoblitzelle, W. S. Mosher, and Hugh E. Prather, all of Dallas County as Pre-election Directors (33, p. 331). Pre-election Directors were sworn in on August 21, 1931. The election required to establish the preliminary period of operations was tentatively scheduled at that time for the fall of 1931.*

*In an attempt to determine when this election was held and what the returns were, the following sources were examined: The Dallas Morning News, September 1, 1931, to January 1, 1932; the Fort Worth Star Telegram, morgue file entitled, "The Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District,; Dallas and Tarrant County election books, 1931 through 1932; and the old files of the Trinity River Canal Association. No information could be found.
Two of the most important sections of the Act, 3(d) and 6(c) were written in such a manner that they appeared contradictory. Paraphrased, these sections provided (33, pp. 327, 332):

Section 3(d). In case of the construction of said canal by the Federal Government, this district shall have the power to construct, maintain, and operate lateral connecting canals or turning basins . . . and to maintain and operate, develop, regulate, and/or, by franchise control wharves, docks, warehouses, grain elevators, bunkering facilities, belt or terminal railroads, . . .

Section 6(c). Directors . . . shall serve until such time as the Federal Government shall have approved construction of said canal, under a proposed contract with the district, and said contract shall have been approved or rejected by a vote of the electors of said district.

Examined separately, each section appears clear. Viewed together, the question which presents itself, however, is whether the legislature intended the District to go out of existence when the federal government approved construction of the canal as indicated in Section 6(c) or that the District fulfill administrative and regulatory functions upon completion of the canal as clearly expressed in Section 3(d).

The Fort Worth Star Telegram informed its readers that the District would automatically go out of existence when Congress authorized the canal project (19). A spokesman for the District, corresponding with property owners in 1935, stated that "when the canal project is approved--or
rejected--by the federal government, the District and Board cease to exist." No information contrary to these statements has been found and thus the meaning of Section 3(d) has remained unexplained (36).

The creation of the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District constituted a successful move on the part of the Trinity River Canal Association to combine the advantages and legal powers of a state agency with the advantages and persuasive powers of the Association. In effect, this legislation made the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District and the Trinity River Canal Association one body because eight of the nine pre-election Directors appointed by the state legislature were original incorporators of the Trinity River Canal Association (5). Thus, lobbyists succeeded in placing themselves and their colleagues in control of the new special district—a fine piece of political maneuvering!

Government Hearings on Navigation Need

While efforts were going on in Austin to establish the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District, Major Milo Fox proceeded with the preliminary examination of the river. By June, 1931, he was ready to hear diverse viewpoints. Consequently, public hearings were scheduled (18).
The two canal bodies with assistance from the Fort Worth and Dallas Chambers of Commerce led a parade of speakers before the Army officer. Each advocate explained how a usable Trinity would provide a new outlet for products, reduce high freight rates, attract industries, and make development of the untouched natural resources lying along the river economically feasible.

The chief opposition to development of the Trinity for navigational purposes came from the railroad representatives. These spokesmen argued that since adequate transportation facilities were available in Texas, justification for an expenditure of federal tax money for the project was lacking (34, p. 2).

Representatives of the West Texas and Wichita Falls Chambers of Commerce and members of the Traffic Bureau of the San Angelo Chamber of Commerce were present and voiced opposition to the project also. In the opinion of the groups represented by these men, development of the Trinity would give Dallas and Fort Worth an unfair advantage over their localities (18). These local interests not on the Trinity River saw no favorable relationship between the growth of Dallas and Fort Worth and their own areas.

The appearance of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce representatives was, of course, an affront to the Fort Worthians since their chamber was a member of the larger
regional body. Fort Worth was, however, unable to enlist any support within the West Texas Chamber to prevent that body from taking an unfavorable stand.

The Unfavorable Report and Appeal

A year elapsed before the Division Engineer at New Orleans informed interested parties that the preliminary report of Major Fox had been submitted, reviewed, and found to be unfavorable.

Colonel Hannum, Division Engineer, explained (35):

The principal grounds upon which adverse conclusions are based are the narrow widths, low banks, tortuous course and scant water supply of the Trinity River during critically dry periods, which make it physically unsuited for canalization.

The cost of canalization to the Federal Government would be disproportionate to any benefits which might accrue to the local communities through the use of the inferior waterway which thus could be obtained.

The Colonel's letter, dated June 1932, came as a terrific shock to the two canal groups. Endorsements of the project had come from many sources: Secretary S. A. Thompson of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the Intercoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, New York Congressman Wallace Dempsey, Chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, J. J. Mansfield of Columbus, Texas, the next senior member of the committee, and Texas Senators Shephard and Connally (12, 15, 17). The State Reclamation Department had found the project feasible (16).
Reed and Byars had determined navigation to be not only feasible, but urgently necessary from an economic standpoint (21).

The damaging conclusions in Colonel Hannum's letter, if allowed to reach Congress, might have forever killed the Trinity River Canal project. John Fouts, therefore, announced that the Trinity River Canal Association would appeal the findings of Major Fox and Colonel Hannum before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington (22).

Almost an unlimited supply of sources was available to substantiate an appeal. The individuals and organizations endorsing the project were influential and the support which they offered was not withdrawn merely because of the unfavorable report. General policy of the United States Government was, itself, a working force for the Trinity River Canal Association. Since completion of the Erie Canal, the federal government had vigorously supported development of inland waterways. From 1825 to 1875, the national government had granted 4,500,000 acres of land to the states for canal construction (1, p. 96). During the twenties an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act and passage of the Denison Act assured favorable federal policy.

Section five hundred of the Interstate Commerce Act declared it to be the desire of Congress "to promote, encourage and develop water transportation services and
facilities in connection with the commerce of the United States and to foster and preserve in full vigor both water and rail transportation" (13).

The Denison Act guaranteed shippers not directly served by water carriers through routes to canals at greatly lowered rates. Cities not located on navigable waterways would not, as the West Texas and Wichita Falls Chambers of Commerce put it at the public hearings in 1932, be forced to sit back and watch others grow at their expense. The Denison Act compelled railroads to connect with waterways (13).

New Government Surveys

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in October, 1933, informed the Chief of Engineers that enough engineering data on the river was not on hand to uphold or reject the recommendations submitted by Major Fox and Colonel Hannum. The Chief of Engineers, therefore, ordered the District Engineer at Galveston to prepare a detailed engineering study on the Trinity to determine cost of canalization for various widths of channel and locks (34, p. 11).

This decision saved the Trinity River navigation movement from possible collapse. A report not passed upon by the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers could not be transmitted to Congress or published in the Annual Reports, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army.
Secretary of War Dern allotted $93,000 for the new survey in December, 1933 (23).

At the time the appeal was being considered the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce prepared for the Board of Engineers an economic and traffic survey on the river. The report showed that under 1933 economic conditions a canalized Trinity River would annually save shippers $3,060,065 in transportation costs (24, 25).

The detailed survey ordered by the Chief of Engineers in 1933 was completed in March, 1935. Once again, the river was found unsuitable for navigation. As before, narrow breadth, twisted course, low banks, and lack of water flow were cited by engineer officers as reasons for the conclusion (34, p. 11).

The only course of action open to Directors of the Trinity River Canal Association was to request the Division Engineer delay forwarding the survey report to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Petition was made on the grounds that additional information then being jointly prepared by the Canal and Conservancy District and the Association would influence a final decision and, therefore, should accompany the District Engineer's report to Washington (34, p. 11). The two groups had retained the services of Carl J. Baer, organizer of the Mississippi Barge Line
Company, and Charles W. Kutz, retired Corps of Engineers General, to assist the firm of Hawley, Freeze and Nichols, engineers for the Association, and W. S. Tanner, Dallas City Engineer, in preparing a comprehensive economic and traffic survey of the river basin (26).

The request for delay was granted and in June, 1935, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors announced that it would convene in Fort Worth to hear testimony of interested parties (27). Hearings opened on August 7. General Kutz presented the bulk of information for the canal bodies. J. G. Kerr represented the American Railroad Association and was leader of the groups opposing canalization.

Opposition forces had grown since Major Fox held his hearings in 1932. Resistance was offered by representatives of the Chambers of Commerce of Abilene, Wichita Falls, El Paso, Lubbock, Brownwood, Graham, Quana, Vernon, Pampa, and Oklahoma City. Significantly, however, no objection was voiced by any city within the boundaries of the Trinity River Basin (28).

Dissolution of the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District

The Directors of the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District realized that the public hearings would generate much interest and create an abundance of publicity.
Therefore, it was decided that Saturday, August 24, 1935, would be a good time to hold the election prescribed by law to authorize its continued operations. Section 7(a) of the Act creating the District had provided for dissolution on December 31, 1935, "unless said limit be extended by a favoring vote of the majority of the electors of said District" (33, p. 333). On Monday, August 19, 1935, a letter addressed to "Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer," was mailed to property owners urging continuation of the District. The letter, signed by Seward R. Sheldon, Chairman of the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District Campaign Committee, carefully explained that dissolution of the District would result on December 31 unless a vote was recorded favoring continued operations. The letter assured readers that a tax levy of only $.01 per $100 valuation was necessary to operate (36).

The election proved to be a painful event for Directors of the Canal and Conservancy District. Constituents voted for dissolution of the District. In Tarrant County the vote for dissolution was 3,998 compared with 3,450 for continuation of operations. Dallas County electors cast 7,237 votes for dissolution whereas only 5,358 ballots were recorded favoring continuation (7, 29). The Dallas Morning News, lamenting the election outcome, stated that quiet railroad-organized opposition was responsible for the defeat (7).
Because election judges had ruled that 3,249 of the 23,239 ballots cast were mutilated, Directors chose to conduct an unofficial canvass of the returns. This examination of votes, completed October 25, 1935, led to charges that election judges had been totally incompetent. Directors declared many of the ballots classified as mutilated by election judges were valid votes and that a fantastic total of 9,079 persons had cast votes who had been unqualified to do so.

The irregularities alleged by Trinity River Canal and Conservancy Directors to exist prompted them to declare the election of August 21 void. The legality of this action was questionable but nevertheless announcement was made that a new election would be held before the District's December 31 expiration date (30).

Examination of Tarrant and Dallas County records and local newspapers revealed no second election. Apparently, therefore, the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District ceased functioning as soon after December 31, 1935, as it had met legal obligations.

A Favorable Plan Results from a New Concept in Planning

An engineering report including a traffic study entitled "Revised Plan of Improvement" was submitted May, 1937, as the "additional information" promised in 1935 by the Trinity
River Canal Association to accompany the unfavorable District Engineer's report to Washington (2, p. 3). Former Chief of Engineers, Herbert Deakyne, and Carl F. Jeffries, Marine Engineer, Naval architect and former Vice-President of Mississippi Barge Line Company, put the finishing touches on the report (31, 32).

Upon receipt of the Canal Association's "Revised Plan of Improvement," the Board of Engineers sent it through channels back to the District Engineer for his review and analysis. On March 9, 1938, the District Engineer's analysis began its trek to Washington via the Division Engineer (2, p. 3).

At the request of the Trinity River Canal Association the detailed survey report dated March 18, 1935, and all proceedings which had transpired after that date were returned to the Galveston District office for inclusion in a flood control survey report on the Trinity River Basin. The flood control survey was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (2, p. 3).

This request resulted in another delay, although delay was not the primary motive in 1938, as it had been in 1932 and 1935. The purpose of applying for delay was to encourage the Engineers to examine navigation and flood control benefits together. The Canal Association hoped that by so doing, engineers would consider the projects complimentary and
coordinate planning. If the two projects were combined into one plan of river development, money would be saved in planning, construction, and maintenance costs. Thus, a more favorable benefit-cost ratio would result and the program would be easier to "sell" (37).

To make navigation possible, storage of water for navigation lockage in the upper reaches of the watershed was necessary. The flood control program called for construction of reservoirs in this area to hold back damaging waters and prevent destruction of soil and crops. The waters retained in these reservoirs likewise could be appropriated for agricultural, industrial, and city usages.

Although canalization had been the key force behind Trinity River Canal Association organization, the navigation and flood control projects were complementary according to the Association consultants. This factor, therefore, caused expansion of goals to encompass not only navigation, but a program of improvement for the watershed including flood control; soil, water, and forest conservation; and water storage for agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes (38).

The organization name was changed in August, 1938, to reflect the expansion of goals. The new name was Trinity Improvement Association (8).

The fate of Trinity River navigation and the Association was completely in the hands of the District Engineer following
submission of the "Revised Plan of Improvement" in 1937. If the third survey was unfavorable to navigation as the first and second surveys had been, there could be no ground for seeking delay or appeal again.

The engineers' total report on navigation, flood control, and allied purposes was completed in the fall of 1939. This survey report revealed that the total traffic which could be credited to the river amounted to 3,474,931 tons annually (34, p. 113).

The savings to shippers from that volume of tonnage was projected to be $6,904,908 (34, p. 114). By dividing the expected yearly maintenance cost of $6,715,271 into the above savings to shippers, the benefits of canalization exceeded costs 1.13 to 1. In dollars the annual savings would exceed annual costs by $189,763. Total construction costs referred to by engineers as the first cost have never been considered in computing the benefit-cost ratio (34, p. 114).

The first cost of the Trinity River navigation project was estimated by the Army Engineers to be $105,723,430--$95,735,516 being federal costs and $9,987,914 nonfederal contributions (34, p. 114). These figures were considerably higher than the $66,546,000 estimated first cost included in the 1937 "Revised Plan of Improvement" submitted by the Trinity River Canal Association. The savings figure
presented by the Association greatly exceeded the judgment of the District Engineer, also (37, p. 98). However, the tonnage and savings estimates of every survey conducted had been different. For purposes of comparison, the figures of the four principal surveys are presented below (34, p. 140).

TABLE I

CANALIZATION SURVEYS 1933-1939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey and Year</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Department, 1933</td>
<td>2,833,618</td>
<td>$3,060,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Engineer, 1935</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
<td>3,059,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity River Canal Association, 1937</td>
<td>4,751,384</td>
<td>10,126,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Engineer, 1939</td>
<td>3,474,931</td>
<td>6,904,908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of the District Engineer concerning flood control were more impressive than those relative to navigation. Fluctuations in economic conditions were, of course, less likely to affect the merits of a flood control protection program than they were navigation.

The benefits of a flood control program were determined, first, by averaging annual flood losses since 1908, and, secondly, by assuming that the worst flood which had ever occurred in the valley would take place at least once again in the sixty years following completion of the project.
The annual charges of the project were found to be $769,834; the annual benefits were set at $1,416,869. A ratio of 1.84 to 1 benefits to costs was thus calculated. The District Engineer recommended that an initial appropriation of $18,500,000 be made so that flood control work could begin (34, p. 87).

The navigation and flood control programs outlined by the District Engineer called for construction of five new reservoirs on the upper reaches of the river and improvement of Dallas and Fort Worth floodways (34, p. 3).

The Railroads React

Texas railroads, following release of the District Engineer's 1939 report, sought and received permission from the Interstate Commerce Commission to lower freight rates in the Trinity River Basin area (34, p. 8). The effect of the railroads' rate-slashing action was to eliminate the favorable benefit-cost ratio projected for the Trinity River navigation project. This, in turn, led the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to form the following opinion (34, p. 6):

Prospective benefits under existing conditions are insufficient to warrant construction of the waterway as a whole, but it [the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors] points out that the canalization of the Trinity River may be a worthy public work to be undertaken when measures for relief of unemployment become necessary.
The conclusions of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors were accepted by the Chief of Engineers as evidenced by his recommendations to Congress in September, 1941 (34, p. 6):

(1) Construction of a channel from Liberty to the Houston Ship Channel.

(2) Approval, without appropriation, of the plans for a 9' x 150' channel from Liberty to Fort Worth.

(3) Construction of five reservoirs to be located in the upper reaches of the Trinity for purposes of flood control, water supply and navigation.

(4) Modification of the Dallas and Fort Worth floodways.

These recommendations were printed as House Document 403, October, 1941.
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CHAPTER IV

POST-WORLD WAR II PROGRESS

World War II brought deferment of all new civil works projects not directly related to the national defense. Therefore, legislation relative to improvement of the Trinity River was delayed until near the close of the war (16).

Passage of the Flood Control Act of December, 1944, and the Rivers and Harbors Act of March, 1945, broke the moratorium on civil works projects. Both acts were of great importance to residents of the Trinity River Basin area.

The Flood Control Act was enacted as a result of the Agriculture Department's study on waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention. The Agriculture Department predicted that an expenditure of $60,000,000 would reduce the lands subject to flood in the watershed area by 25 per cent, reduce annual soil losses by 59 per cent, and thereby increase yields and farm income more than $14,000,000 annually (22, pp. 47, 51, 52). This project had a highly favorable benefit to cost ratio of 2.38 to 1 (22, p. 60).
In January, 1945, an omnibus public works bill was introduced into the House and Senate (2, p. 532). The measure included the Trinity River improvement plans exactly as recommended by the Chief of Engineers to Congress in September, 1941 (26, p. 18). The bill passed on March 2, 1945, and authorized two hundred and ninety-one national projects projected to cost $381,968,322. It was specifically provided, however, that no project would receive appropriations or begin construction until the end of the war unless recommended by a defense agency and the President. The Trinity projects not being vital to the war effort had to wait (19).

The Lobbying and Paper-Work Years

Carpenter, Carter, Pouts, the Association lobbyist, and consulting engineers appeared before Congress many times in the years following passage of the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act to secure design and construction funds for each authorized Trinity improvement project (24).

These lobbying and paper-work years were rewarding, for Congress appropriated construction money for Benbrook, Grapevine, Little Elm, and Lavon Reservoirs; enlargement of Garza Dam; improvement of the Dallas and Fort Worth levee systems; and construction of the canal between Anahuac and Galveston Bay.
The canal between Liberty and Fort Worth was deferred until additional economic justification could be found. Table II shows construction dates and purposes of the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act improvements (8; 21, p. 5):

**TABLE II**

**PROJECTS RESULTING FROM THE 1945 RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Construction Dates</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Lavon Reservoir</td>
<td>1948-1953</td>
<td>W.S.*** F.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Garza Dam</td>
<td>1948-1954</td>
<td>Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Little Elm</td>
<td>1948-1954</td>
<td>W.S., F.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anahuac-Galveston</td>
<td>1949-Not completed,</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Channel</td>
<td>plugged</td>
<td>waterway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fort Worth Levee</td>
<td>1950-1957</td>
<td>F.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F.C.—Flood Control.
**N.L.—Navigation Lockage.
***W.S.—Water Supply.

In the years which followed passage of the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act, speeches, ground-breaking activities, tours of construction sites, and appearances at dedications of completed projects kept the Trinity Improvement Association and Carpenter, Carter, and Fouts in public view, as disclosed by area newspapers of the period.
Construction of the reservoirs in the area brought about the realization that the lakes and shores were virtually ready-made playground areas. Consequently, a Trinity Improvement Association Recreation Committee was established in 1948 to plan such facilities (14). Since 1948 every reservoir constructed by the Corps of Engineers in Texas has provided recreation facilities (5).

Creation of the Trinity River Authority

In 1951, the longest drought in Texas history began. It continued with varying intensity until broken by the spring rains of 1957 (25, p. 344). Due to the drought, several Texas cities began to look to the Trinity as a source of water supply. There was no river authority to protect the water resources of the Trinity or ensure fair appropriation of water. Conflicts over water rights arose and the Trinity Improvement Association was called upon on several occasions to mediate disputes (23).

The drought pointed out to Texans how vital the coordinated program of river improvement sponsored by the Trinity Improvement Association was for the entire Trinity watershed. The Association used this event to approach the state legislature and request creation of a body to promote and lend technical and financial aid to projects of a similar nature.
Association officers and consultants worked throughout 1954 drafting a suitable piece of legislation to put into the hands of Dallas and Fort Worth representatives at the next legislative session (24).

In January, 1955, the Trinity Improvement Association sponsored Trinity River Authority bill was introduced. The Trinity was the only remaining major river in the state which was not protected by a state body. Association officials hoped that creation of a state agency possessing full developmental powers over the river would expedite construction of a barge canal and lend prestige to Trinity Improvement Association goals (15).

Legislators from Houston immediately made it known that they opposed the portion of the bill of greatest importance to Dallas, Fort Worth, and the Trinity Improvement Association. The Dallas and Tarrant County legislators were informed that the Houston delegation would attempt to block passage of the act unless the section relating to navigation was removed (16). Pressure exerted by the Texas Railroad Association on behalf of the roads servicing Houston was the major reason for this delegation's hostile position (24).

A secondary reason for opposition was the drought. Water resources throughout the state were being depleted at an alarming rate and legislators from the most populous
county in Texas could not support any clause which might result in depletion of fresh water for navigational purposes (24).

The Trinity River Authority, as created by the Fifty-Fourth Regular Session of the State Legislature, was empowered to promote and lend technical and financial aid to flood control programs; soil, water, and forest conservation; water storage for municipal, industrial, and recreational purposes; alleviation of stream pollution; and conservation of wild life (20, pp. 85-86).

The Forrest and Cotton Survey

The Trinity Improvement Association turned its attention to updating the 1939 navigation study and economic justification survey following creation of the Trinity River Authority. The prominent firm of Forrest and Cotton was retained for this work (13, p. 2).

The economic study conducted for the Trinity Improvement Association was completed in 1957 (13, p. 2). The estimates contained in the Forrest and Cotton report were second in dollars saved only to those of Reed and Byars of 1930. Fourteen million tons of cargo were predicted to be carried

*The Trinity River Authority is discussed in detail in Chapter VI.
on the waterway yearly. The estimated net annual savings to shippers was set at $15,000,000. A benefit-cost ratio of 2.09 to 1 was established (17).

The District Engineer in 1939 reported that canalization would cost $105,723,430 (21, p. 144). Forrest and Cotton envisioned a project costing $261,000,000 (17). A resume of survey statistics appears in Table III.

TABLE III
CANALIZATION SURVEYS, 1930-1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey and Year</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity River Canal Association (Reed-Byars), 1930*</td>
<td>5,324,645</td>
<td>$16,567,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Department, 1933**</td>
<td>2,833,618</td>
<td>3,060,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Engineer, 1935**</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
<td>3,059,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity River Canal Association, 1937**</td>
<td>4,751,384</td>
<td>10,126,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Engineer, 1939**</td>
<td>3,474,931</td>
<td>6,904,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Improvement Association (Forrest and Cotton), 1957***</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fort Worth Star Telegram, October 26, 1930.
**House Document No. 403, p. 140.
***Fort Worth Star Telegram, February 1, 1958.

The Federal Government’s First Comprehensive Survey

Using the Forrest and Cotton report, in 1958 the Trinity Improvement Association secured congressional authorization for a comprehensive survey to be made of the
Trinity River Basin by the Corps of Engineers (13, p. 2). ✓

The Corps of Engineers made preliminary preparations for a survey in October, 1957, "with the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan of improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, water supply, water quality control, fish and wild life, recreation, and allied purposes" (7, p. 1).

The first appropriation of $75,000 came in 1959 (17). That same year the Corps of Engineers began construction of Navarro Mills Reservoir, a combination water supply and flood control project near Corsicana. The Trinity River Authority and the City of Houston began planning Lake Livingston to provide additional water supply for Houston and the neighboring areas. The Trinity River Authority began its water quality control program, too, by beginning construction of a central sewage system plant at Irving. The cities of Dallas, Irving, Grand Prairie, and Farmers Branch subscribed to use the plant (13, p. 2).

Funds were made available in 1960 for continuation of the Corps of Engineers' study, and first design funds were granted for Bardwell Reservoir, a combination flood control and water supply project at Ennis (19).

Presentation of the comprehensive plan of improvement for the Trinity River Basin was given at a public hearing called at Fort Worth by the Corps of Engineers, December 20,
1961. Notices of the hearing were sent to members of the Texas delegation to Congress, members of the Congressional Committee on Public Works, Texas state officials, Texas legislators, federal, state, and local government officials, railroad associations, news media people, oil and pipeline company executives, and others. Approximately fourteen hundred interested persons attended (3, p. 5). Fort Worth District Engineer Colonel R. P. West estimated this to be the biggest meeting of its kind ever held (12, p. 6).

Three hundred and twenty briefs were submitted at the public hearing; two hundred and seventy-four favored the project; and thirty-five expressed partial opposition. Ninety speeches were made. Four attacked the navigation features of the plan (3, p. 5).

Opposition to the navigation features of the plan was led by West Texas municipalities and the Texas Railroad Association. The arguments of both groups were old. Representatives from West Texas objected to canalization on the ground that barge navigation, while reducing freight rates to Dallas and Fort Worth, would not aid their portion of the state. It would, they maintained, give North Texas wholesalers an opportunity to market goods at lower costs than their West Texas counterparts. Furthermore, the opinion was expressed that it was unfair for everyone to pay for a project assisting only one section of a state.
Texas railroad executives contended that the volume of barge traffic estimated by the Corps of Engineers was much too high. Savings in rates, said a Texas Railroad Association official, would not be sufficient to justify the expenditure of money necessary to develop navigation. Addition of another form of transportation when adequate facilities existed was somewhat ridiculous, another railroad spokesman said (3, p. 6).

Reaction of Railroads to Government Survey

The $900,000,000 comprehensive plan of improvement prepared by the Fort Worth and Galveston District Engineer offices was signed and recommended to the Chief of U. S. Army Engineers in Washington, D. C., by Southwestern Division Engineer, Brigadier General Carroll H. Dunn in September, 1962 (4, p. 1). Improvements recommended are summarized in Table IV.

The study was routed to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for consideration and review. October 26, 1962, was established as final date for submission of additional information by interested parties. The railroads, in an attempt to delay the Board's consideration of the survey, filed a request for an extension of time to submit additional information. The time limit was therefore moved to January 24, 1963 (6, p. 1).
## TABLE IV

**Improvements Recommended by Southwestern Division Engineers, 1962***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Individual Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Navigation Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Flood control along channel</td>
<td>$110,577,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Barge Canal</td>
<td>$453,438,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fish, wildlife, recreation at lakes</td>
<td>$4,723,000</td>
<td>$568,738,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$568,738,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tennessee Colony Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Tennessee Colony Reservoir</td>
<td>$94,605,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Water Quality Control</td>
<td>$84,277,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Wildlife refuge</td>
<td>$14,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$193,782,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roanoke Reservoir</td>
<td>$16,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aubrey Reservoir</td>
<td>$34,073,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lakeview Reservoir</td>
<td>$31,130,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Flood Control Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dallas-Elm Fork</td>
<td>$16,823,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Dallas-Five Mile Creek</td>
<td>$17,309,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Garland-Duck Creek</td>
<td>$5,024,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Fort Worth-West Fork</td>
<td>$14,327,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Liberty Levee</td>
<td>$2,091,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,074,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost comprehensive improvement program</strong></td>
<td><strong>900,747,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total federal cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>775,955,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total nonfederal cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,951,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Howard R. Bare, Chief of Basin Planning, Southwestern Division, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, Dallas.*
In the meantime, the railroads serving the Dallas-Fort Worth area filed a request with the Interstate Commerce Commission to lower freight rates on certain commodities (23). Their aim was, of course, to reduce the favorable benefit-cost ratio on the proposed canalization project.

Granting of the railroad's request reduced the navigation benefit-cost ratio from 1.4 to 1 to approximately 1.24 to 1 (4; 23, p. 6).

The rate reduction request was followed in April by the suit of twenty Texas railroads in U. S. District Court against the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The purpose of the suit was to force the Board of Engineers to hold a public hearing on the proposed canalization project so that railroad officials might again present their objections (9).

U. S. Attorney Barefoot Sanders on May 24, 1963, asked the Court to dismiss the action because it failed to present a claim against any of the defendants upon which relief could be granted (9).

In court August 23, 1963, Walter Caven, representing the twenty Texas railroads named in the suit, requested that the court issue a writ of mandamus to force the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the Corps of Engineers to hold public hearings on the Trinity project. The legal counsel for the Texas Association of Railroads based his
argument on the General Administrative Procedure Act, which he claimed required federal agencies to hold public hearings when requested to do so. He also stated that the railroad case was one of original jurisdiction for the District Court.

Judge Joe Estes was clearly unimpressed with the propositions offered by Caven. In his opinion, the judge concluded the following: the railroads failed to show that the Administrative Procedure Act applied to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; no claim was offered upon which relief could be granted; the court had no jurisdiction; and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors had fulfilled its function, and Congress was now the proper place for the railroads to appeal (11).

In spite of the many attempts of Texas railroads to obstruct administrative review of the project, by July 30, 1963, the Division Engineer, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers had recommended the adoption of the program with only slight modification. Subsequent to that date, copies of the report were sent to Texas Governor John Connally, the U. S. Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Federal Power Commission, the Public Health Service, and the Department of the Army. After receiving favorable review by all, the report was sent to the U. S. Bureau of the Budget (10).
By mid-1964, despite President Johnson's repeated statements that he intended to cut back on government spending, there was no reason to conclude that the Trinity project would be found incompatible with the President's economy drive. The project could not possibly be enacted in 1964. Also, it is an unwritten rule in Congress not to authorize a public works project and appropriate funds in the same session. Therefore, the problem of money could not arise until 1966 at the earliest. Furthermore, lump sum appropriations are not made for such projects. Instead it is customary for Congress to release funds annually until completion of a project.
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CHAPTER V

ORGANIZATION OF THE TRINITY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

In 1930, the Dallas and Fort Worth Chambers of Commerce established a stock corporation for the purpose of promoting Trinity River canalization. Ten men, five from Dallas and five from Fort Worth, became the incorporators. Each purchased one hundred shares of stock. No further sales of stock were made, and the Trinity River Canal Association operated from the beginning as if it were a nonprofit organization rather than a stock company. In February, 1945, upon request, a new charter was issued by the Texas Secretary of State which changed the Association's corporate status to that of a nonprofit organization (3).

In the first year of operations a five-year-fund-raising drive for $300,000 was launched. Contributions and memberships costing ten dollars annually for individuals and a minimum of twenty-five dollars for corporations provided for pay of salaried personnel and operating expenses of the Association after that time. In 1964 there were approximately 3,500 individuals and corporation representatives on the membership roles (5).
A membership analysis of the Association has never been made but it is clear from personal review that people from all walks of life have been attracted to it. Association rolls show a large number of farmers and ranchers, bank officers, newspaper officials, business executives, and professional people as members. A staggering number of members are listed in *Who's Who in America* and some are among the richest men in America. A complete listing is impossible, but the following serves as an illustration (7):

J. W. Aston, President, Republic National Bank
D. Harold Byrd, President, Byrd Oil Company
James F. Chambers, President, *Dallas Times Herald*
John B. Connally, Governor of Texas
E. M. Dealey, Chairman of the Board, Publisher, *Dallas Morning News*
Joe M. Dealey, President, *Dallas Morning News*
E. B. Germany, Founder, Lone Star Steel, President,
  E. B. Germany & Sons (Oil), Chairman, Texas Industrial Commission
Karl Hoblitzelle, President, Interstate Properties
J. Erik Jonsson, Board Chairman, Texas Instruments,
  Mayor of Dallas, 1964
Fred Korth, former Secretary of the Navy, rancher, lawyer
W. W. Lynch, President, Texas Power & Light Company
Stanley Marcus, President, Neiman-Marcus
John D. Murchison, investment banker, financier
Lester T. Potter, President, Lone Star Gas Company
John W. Runyon, Chairman of the Board Dallas Times Herald

John M. Stemmons, President, Industrial Properties Corporation, investments, real estate

Dan C. Williams, President, Southland Life Insurance Company

Toddie Lee Wynne, President, American Liberty Oil

Gerald C. Mann, former Attorney General of Texas, President, Diversa Corporation

Leo F. Corrigan, industrialist

Robert H. Stewart III, President, First National Bank, Dallas

The names of corporate members and the amounts of their contributions are held in strictest confidence. A review of the frequent advertisers in the Association’s bi-monthly magazine, Trinity Valley Progress, leaves very little doubt that the following are corporate members and heavy contributors (6, 7):

Texas Power and Light

Lone Star Gas Company

Southland Life Insurance Company

Southwestern Engraving Company
With few exceptions, chambers of commerce and banks in the watershed hold corporate memberships also.

The Constitution of the Trinity Improvement Association

The Constitution of the Trinity Improvement Association outlines the purposes of the organization and the qualifications for membership. It establishes the governing body, names officers, and grants power. The present document became effective February 14, 1956.

At the time of adoption of the present Constitution the aims of the organization had expanded from a single goal to encompass a comprehensive plan of river improvement. The objectives of the Constitution of 1956 remain unchanged. They are: to sponsor a coordinated program of improvement for the entire Trinity watershed including flood control; soil-water-forest conservation; reclamation; alleviation of stream pollution; conservation of wild life; storage of water for municipal, agricultural, industrial, and recreational

#An organization chart appears in the Appendix.
uses; and the canalization of the Trinity River for barge navigation to the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth (2).

The Governing Body

The Constitution calls for a Board of Directors of not more than one hundred fifty persons to be selected by the membership at official business meetings called by the President or Executive Committee.* The Board meets only once annually to hear the report of the year's activities from the Association's real governing body, the Executive Committee. If a vacancy on the Executive Committee exists at the time of the annual meeting, the Board of Directors elevates one of its members to the position (2, Art. III, Secs. 1, 2).

The term of office for Directors is indefinite. The title "Director" is misleading since Directors rarely make recommendations and meet but once a year to hear the annual report of the Executive Committee (5).

The organization is governed by the Executive Committee which has "full and absolute authority to manage all affairs of the Association" (2, Art. IV, Sec. 1). This is a quasi-legislative, quasi-executive body. It enacts the rules and

---

*The constitutional limitation on the size of the Board of Directors is not adhered to, as evidenced by the fact that in 1963 and 1964 the Board had two hundred and twenty-five members.
regulations necessary to conduct the affairs of the Association including setting of salaries for paid employees, purchasing of equipment and supplies, and the execution of contracts (2, Art. IV, Sec. 1). This body is composed of not fewer than nine or more than fifteen persons selected from the Board of Directors. The Executive Committee members are elected by the Board of Directors but vacancies which occur prior to the next Board meeting are filled by the Executive Committee itself. Term of office is one year (2, Art. IV, Sec. 2).

Powers and Duties of Association Officers

Because of the importance of the Executive Committee, its Chairman is one of the principal officers of the Association. He is the chief advisor to the President and should the President be unable to perform his duties, the Executive Committee Chairman assumes presidential authority until a new chief executive is chosen (2, Art. V, Sec. 2).

The President as executive head of the Association serves as presiding officer at all meetings of the membership and the Board of Directors. He is an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee and of all committees which he shall appoint and the Executive Committee approve. As President he may call the Executive Committee or any other organ of the Association into session. With the Executive Secretary the President signs all minutes and formal
documents of the organization. "The President shall . . . exercise such other powers as may be deemed by him likely to increase the usefulness of the Association" (2, Art. V, Sec. 1).

At the President's disposal are not more than ten Vice-Presidents selected from the Board of Directors by the Executive Committee. The Constitution and By-Laws assign no functions to the Vice-Presidents and they, therefore, act as the President directs (2, Art. V, Sec. 3).

The Treasurer handles the cash funds and securities of the Association and must annually retain the services of a Certified Public Accountant to audit the books (2, Art. V, Sec. 5).

The Executive Secretary, previously referred to, signs all minutes and formal documents of the Association. This officer performs any other duties that the President may choose to assign (2, Art. V, Sec. 6).

Unlike the foregoing officers, the General Manager receives compensation for his services (2, Art. V, Sec. 7).

The General Manager's position is similar to that of a city manager. He is responsible for the efficient conduct of business and affairs of the Association. His duties include the handling of official correspondence, preservation of documents and communications, preparation of a general budget and monthly financial reports (2, Art. V, Sec. 7).
The policy-making Executive Committee may direct the General Manager to perform any other function that it desires (2, Art. IV, Sec. 1). The President may likewise make assignments as he sees fit (2, Art. VI, Sec. 2).

Though the Constitution makes the General Manager subordinate to the President and the Executive Committee, the General Manager is perhaps the most important figure in the Association. All other officers are involved in their own business pursuits. Many do not live in Fort Worth. The General Manager is the sole officer who devotes his full time to Association affairs. His availability makes him key spokesman for the Association.

Because John Carpenter and Amon Carter, Sr. were involved in the building of financial empires, John Fouts assumed many executive and policy-making functions. Carpenter and Carter had full knowledge of Fouts' actions and there was no attempt to usurp power on the General Manager's part (1).

The Association might well have floundered and achieved little had a man of less ability and determination than Fouts been General Manager. Vigorous presidential leadership since 1955 has restored a more balanced division of powers.

By constitutional provision the Executive Vice-President is the personal adviser to the General Manager on all affairs.
of the Association (2, Art. V, Sec. 4). Use of the title was discontinued in 1960. Traditionally, however, this office was filled by the Association's Washington representative. Since that time the Trinity Improvement Association lobbyist has held one of the ten Vice-President positions (4).

The Staff

In addition to the General Manager, the Association employs four other staff members: an assistant general manager, one engineer, and two secretaries.

There is no limitation on the number of personnel which can be employed. Subject to approval of the Executive Committee, either the President or the General Manager may employ members of the Association's staff (2, Art. VI, Sec. 2). But as a rule, the salaried work force is kept small because it is policy to retain outside consultants to conduct research and to plan major tasks (4).

The Association's Officers
Past and Present

In thirty-four years there has been little turnover of key officer personnel. Executive Vice-President Roy Miller, Executive Committee Chairman Amon Carter, Sr., and President John Carpenter held their posts until death.
Miller died in 1946; Carter in 1954; and Carpenter in 1959. Carter and Carpenter were immediately succeeded by their sons.

The Executive Committee made these selections because the two sons, like their fathers, were capable administrators and successful businessmen. They had been raised in families where canalization and watershed development had been a dream. John Carpenter and Asaon Carter, Sr. had spent more than a quarter of a century fighting for a project. It was felt that the sons had inherited a burning desire to complete the task started by their fathers (4).

Roy Miller’s son, Dale, was made a Vice-President of the Association following his father’s death in 1946, but Fritz G. Lanham, Fort Worth’s twenty-six-year veteran in Congress was given the post of Executive Vice-President at that time and served in Washington until retirement in 1960. Since 1960 the Trinity Improvement Association has left the office vacant. The Association is represented in Washington, however, by Dale Miller who also represents the Intercoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas as well as the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

John Peuts, who was Dallas Water Commissioner prior to his appointment as General Manager of the Canal Association in 1930, served until 1955. In that year he resigned, and in June, 1956, Colonel Hubert S. Miller, a member of
the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Corps of Engineers, accepted the office.

Thus since the Association's inception there have been only two Presidents, two Executive Committee Chairmen, two General Managers, and two Executive Vice-Presidents.

Amicable relationships among the executives and staff, the smallness of the "working association," and the organizational objective are three factors which have contributed to the informal organization's structure. Long tenure, characteristic of the Association's officeholders has created organizational informality which otherwise might not have existed. This informal relationship has existed both among the officers and between the General Manager and his staff.

The President, Executive Vice-President, General Manager and his staff and the Executive Committee have made up what might be termed the "working association." This group, embracing a maximum of twenty-three persons, has been almost totally responsible for operations. Consequently, a score of persons who are close friends with great respect for one another have run the Association throughout the years.

Organizational Objectives

The Trinity River Canal Association was established in 1930 for the sole purpose of securing federal aid to make the
Trinity a commercial waterway. The Canal Association was successor to two groups, the Trinity River Navigation Company (1891) and the Trinity River Slack Water Navigation Company (1866), both having navigation as their single purpose.

It was not until passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936 that other goals came to be considered by either the government or the Association. For this reason, the 1936 Flood Control Act has stood as a landmark in Trinity River history and in congressional thinking on the role of the federal government in waterway development. Since its passage, flood control and related soil erosion retardation projects have gone unchallenged as federal functions. After 1936 a new era opened in which multipurpose projects were planned and the comprehensive concept in watershed development began. Initially, plans were limited to navigation, flood control, and soil erosion prevention. But after the Second World War, projects encompassing water and forest conservation; reclamation; storage of water for municipal, agricultural, and industrial purposes; recreation; conservation of fish and wild life; and alleviation of stream pollution were added to federal programs. The Association latched on to each goal until today a coordinated plan of improvement for the entire Trinity
Watershed involving all the above improvements has developed.

The Association expanded project goals for several reasons. First, adoption was in the interest of residents of the Trinity Watershed. Secondly, an expanded concept would bring more people concerned with water resources into the Association. Finally, inclusion of the newer goals created a higher over-all benefit-cost ratio than a navigation project alone could have done. This made the project more desirable and less subject to attack.

Effectiveness of the Association

The Trinity Improvement Association began pressing for canalization of the Trinity River in 1930. The organization suffered two defeats at the hands of Army Engineers in 1932 and 1935, but fought back, re-evaluated its position, adapted to changing concepts, and secured favorable recognition of an expanded improvement program by the Engineers in 1939. The improvements were recommended to Congress in the fall of 1941.

The Second World War caused delay of serious congressional consideration of proposed improvements until near the War's end. With victory in sight, however, Association officials launched an all-out effort to secure passage of the recommended program. The Association was the major
lobby group in Washington for the project and was chiefly responsible for authorization of the program. Every year after 1945, the Association lobby reappeared before Congress to seek the appropriations necessary to design and construct improvements. The existence of Benbrook, Lavon, Grapevine, and Garza-Little Elm reservoirs is to a large extent a monument to devoted Trinity Improvement Association efforts.

Canalization from Dallas-Fort Worth to Galveston Bay, although authorized in 1945 had not become a reality by 1964, but the $900,000,000 proposal before the Second Session of the Eighty-Second Congress was solely a result of Trinity Improvement Association research convincingly showing the need for further improvement of the watershed. The Association is likewise responsible for creation of the Trinity River Authority, to be discussed in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER VI

THE TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY OF TEXAS

In early 1955, the Trinity Improvement Association sponsored the Trinity River Authority bill in the state legislature. The Trinity was the only major river in Texas which was not protected by a state body. Association officials hoped that creation of a state agency possessing full developmental powers over the river would expedite construction of a barge canal (2). The section of the bill pertaining to navigation was stricken, however, due to the objections of the Texas Railroad Association and the City of Houston (3).

Ben H. Carpenter, son of the Trinity Improvement Association's President, was nominated by Governor Shivers to be first President of the Trinity River Authority. Amon Carter, Jr., who succeeded his deceased father in 1955, as Executive Committee Chairman of the Trinity Improvement Association, was appointed a Director. Since creation of the Trinity River Authority, no fewer than eight of its twenty-four directorships have coincided with Trinity Improvement Association directorships. At the beginning of 1963 seventeen coincidental directorships existed.*

*Comparison of the list of Directors of the Trinity Improvement Association contained in each edition of the
Characteristics of Texas River Authorities

River authorities in Texas differ from one another in four major ways: the manner of choosing directors, revenue sources, geographic area, and function.

Often in the past the legislature, when creating river authorities, named pre-election directors to avoid delay of operations. The agency and its appointees were subject to voter approval generally within one hundred eighty days. This method was used in 1931 when the Trinity River Canal and Conservancy District was created. Today all existing river authorities have directors nominated by the Governor and approved by the Senate.

The extent of taxing authority is established by the legislature and is limited, not exceeding two cents per one hundred dollars assessed evaluation. Bonds may be issued secured by tax revenue or by income to be generated by sale of services or by both.

The geographic area served by any one authority varies. Rivers such as the Trinity, Brazos, and Sabine have only one authority in control. The Colorado however, has three.

All river authorities are concerned with conservation of the water, soil, and natural resources. All strive to prevent stream pollution, erosion, and flooding. Two major

Trinity Valley Progress with the presentation of Trinity River Authority Directors found each year in the Texas Almanac permitted this observation.
differences exist among them, however. In some areas the primary emphasis is upon generation of hydroelectric power whereas in other areas water supply is of primary concern. The Colorado and Brazos River Authorities are in the former classification. The Trinity River Authority is in the latter (7).

Organization and Powers of the Authority

The Trinity River Authority of Texas comprises all of the territory within Dallas, Tarrant, Ellis, Navarro, and Chambers Counties and parts of the following counties: Anderson, Freestone, Henderson, Houston, Kaufman, Leon, Madison, Polk, San Jacinto, Trinity, Walker, and Liberty.*

All powers of the Authority are exercised by a Board of twenty-four Directors appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Three Directors are appointed from Tarrant County; four from Dallas County; two from the area-at-large; and one from each of the remaining fifteen counties. Board members serve six-year terms (4, pp. 83-84).

The Trinity River Authority, as created by the Fifty-Fourth Regular Session of the state legislature, was empowered to promote and lend technical and financial aid to flood control programs; soil, water

*A map of the Trinity River Authority is located in the Appendix.
and forest conservation; water storage for municipal, industrial, and recreational purposes; alleviation of stream pollution; and conservation of wildlife. Specifically, the Authority is empowered to do the following (4, pp. 83-95):

Section 5(a). To store and conserve the waters of the Trinity Watershed to provide water supply for cities and towns, and sell water to any person, firm or corporation, including cities and other public agencies within and outside the watershed.

Section 5(c). To conserve soils and other surface resources against erosion, flooding, sedimentation and siltation. The right to assist State and Federal agencies in conjunction with Soil Conservation Districts is granted.

Section 5(d). To provide water for irrigation and commercial and industrial enterprises within and outside of the watershed.

Section 5(f). To execute contracts with municipalities and others to construct dams, reservoirs, water supply lines and water purification and pumping facilities.

Section 5(h). To acquire land around any lakes constructed on the Trinity River to encourage recreation or protect fish and wildlife.

Section 5(j). To construct, own and operate sewage gathering, transmission and disposal services and charge for such services.

Section 7. To tax the property throughout the authority at a rate not to exceed two cents per one hundred dollars assessed valuation.

Section 8(a). To issue bonds secured by ad valorem taxes or by a pledge of net revenues accruing to the Authority or by a combination pledge of net revenues and taxes.
Section 11. To prepare a Master Plan, for complete development of the soil and water resources of the Trinity River Watershed.

Section 16(a). To make contracts with the United States, the State of Texas, its agencies, all municipalities, political sub-divisions and districts, and with private persons. To obtain loans from, and accept grants from the United States, the State of Texas and its agencies, and participate in and be the beneficiary of any plan which may be involved by the Federal or State Government for guaranteeing or otherwise subsidizing the obligations of the Authority; provided that no loans, grants or plans for purposes of encouraging, constructing or maintaining navigation canals be accepted.

Section 17. To contract with the United States Government for unsold conservation storage at the multipurpose dams constructed by the Army.

Nothing in the act which created the Trinity River Authority in any way diminished the right of any political subdivision of the state, person, or corporation from operating a water system or drilling subterranean wells (4, p. 95).

History and Accomplishments

One of the initial actions of the Directors of the Trinity River Authority was to hold a series of fifteen public meetings in the seventeen-county area to determine what residents of the watershed desired done with the water resources of the river. These meetings were conducted in a twelve-month period from September, 1956 to October, 1957.

Soon after the completion of public meetings the Directors awarded to the Dallas firm of Forrest and Cotton, Consulting
Engineers, the contract to prepare the Master Plan as directed by Section 11 of the Trinity River Authority. The Master Plan was completed in 1957 and filed with the State Board of Water Engineers in 1958 (8, p. 6).

In the meantime, the City of Grand Prairie requested Authority directors to consider construction of a central sewage treatment plant in the Dallas-Fort Worth area to process the ever-growing tonnage of waste materials. Irving, Arlington, Farmers Branch, and Dallas showed interest in the proposal and joined with Grand Prairie to encourage investigation of the proposal. Forrest and Cotton were authorized to conduct a survey to show need and economic saving to be obtained if the facility was constructed. The completed survey showed that Irving, Grand Prairie, Farmers Branch, and Arlington were in dire need of adequate sewage facilities and that the western portion of Dallas could benefit from construction of a plant (6).

Irving was a prime example of a city in need. Here sewage disposal facilities had been built in 1949, remodeled and expanded in 1951, 1953, and 1955; yet the growth of the city so outstripped treatment facilities that at the time of the study, 1956, one half of the city's sewage was being dropped into the Trinity River unprocessed in any way (1, 5).
The cities of Irving, Farmers Branch, Grand Prairie, and Dallas entered into an agreement with the Trinity River Authority in 1957 to construct the central sewage facility (5). Revenue bonds in the amount of $7,345,000 were sold in June, 1958 to finance the project. Each city bought a certain per cent of plant capacity to care for its needs (8, p. 7). Arlington entered into a service contract with Fort Worth to handle its sewage and thus was not a party to this contract (6). The plant was placed in operation in 1959 and had not met full capacity requirements in 1964.

All parties are completely satisfied. Receipts for the year ended November 30, 1963, totaled $627,137 from sewage plant operations (8, p. 15).

Prior to the break of the drought by 1957 spring rains, the City of Houston and the Trinity River Authority were involved in a long dispute concerning water rights. Houston, outside of the watershed, needed water to supplement its dwindling supply and the city fathers decided to tap the Trinity. The Authority refused to allow it. Ben Carpenter, President, announced that until a Master Plan was prepared which showed the water resources and needs of the watershed, no such appropriations would be made (7).

The hard feelings caused by this dispute were erased in 1959 when the two parties entered into a contract to share costs for construction of a huge reservoir northeast of the
city to be known as Lake Livingston. Parts of San Jacinto, Polk, and Trinity Counties were selected as the reservoir site. Houston secured contract rights to draw 840,000,000 gallons of water per day from this reservoir to be operated by the Trinity River Authority. Other cities secured the right to purchase water from the remaining storage capacity (8, pp. 7, 12).

Engineers estimated the reservoir to cost $50,000,000, $35,000,000 charged to Houston and $15,000,000 to the Authority. No federal aid was solicited. A bond issue has been planned to finance the project. The revenue generated by the sale of water is expected to retire these bonds rapidly. The City of Houston was given until October, 1965, to initiate construction of the reservoir. If the city has not taken action by that time, all its rights and title to the project are lost to the Trinity River Authority.

A salt-water barrier project below Lake Livingston was authorized by Congress in 1962 and an agreement for construction by the Corps of Engineers was executed in 1963 by the Corps, the Authority, and the City of Houston. The project, designed to prevent salt-water intrusion into the fresh-water supplies of the lower Trinity basin, could begin in 1966 or 1967 (8, p. 8).

The federal government completed construction of Navarro Mills Reservoir near Corsicana in 1963 and the
Trinity River Authority contracted with the Corps of Engineers for approximately 25 per cent of the reservoir's storage space. The cities of Corsicana and Hubbard, in turn, contracted with the Trinity River Authority for water from the reservoir (8, pp. 7, 12).

In November, 1961, the Authority sold $310,000 of revenue bonds to finance part of the cost of Navarro Mills. The eventual cost of the reservoir to the Authority has been estimated at $4,150,000. The sale of water to the City of Corsicana and the little community of Hubbard is expected to repay the Authority and provide revenue (8, p. 7).

An identical contract was drawn up in May, 1963, between the Corps of Engineers and the Trinity River Authority concerning storage in the uncompleted Bardwell Reservoir. The City of Ennis purchased water storage in this reservoir from the Authority.

Should the proposed Tennessee Colony Reservoir be built in Anderson and Freestone Counties, the Authority also laid plans to purchase storage from the federal government there.

These contracts between the federal government and the Trinity River Authority allow ten years before the Authority must pay for its purchase (8: 6, p. 12).

The Trinity River Authority has been able to accomplish several projects quickly (nine years) because financing has never been a problem. Every penny expended by the
Authority from 1955 to 1959 was given with no obligation to repay by the Trinity Improvement Association. Because the central sewage disposal plant has generated income since 1959, the per cent of backing by the Trinity Improvement Association has decreased. By 1964 the rent on office space in Fort Worth, office supplies, the salary of Robert N. Tharp, Secretary-Treasurer, and employees were provided by Trinity River Authority income. The services of consulting engineers and attorneys at that time still were too great for the Trinity River Authority to meet; thus the Trinity Improvement Association paid these bills. Revenue from the sale of water to Corsicana and surrounding towns will make the Trinity River Authority totally self-sufficient by the end of 1966 (7).

Because the Trinity Improvement Authority brought the Trinity River Association into existence and supported it in every venture there is an unbreakable bond between the two. At no time have fewer than eight coincidental Trinity Improvement Association-Trinity River Authority directorships existed. As many as seventeen have existed. Colonel H. S. Miller, Vice-President and General Manager of the Trinity Improvement Association, devotes as much as 50 per cent of his time, with no charge, on Trinity River Authority affairs. Their offices are side by side in the Trans-America Building in Fort Worth.
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CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis supports several conclusions and broad generalizations which may be applicable to other situations in which private groups seek goals which depend almost entirely on government support. The most significant of these conclusions are:

1. The Trinity Improvement Association, in seeking goals which depend almost entirely on government support, has sought to maximize political power, and the Association has accomplished that in part by compromising and broadening goals rather than adhering to narrow or rigid objectives.

2. In the Trinity Improvement Association organization power has perpetuated in family groups whenever identity of interests and ability has persisted.

3. Dominant personalities in the Trinity Improvement Association have assumed dominant positions of power despite formal structural limitations of the organization.

4. Self-interest has motivated organization and action for Trinity River Improvements.
5. Railroad opposition to canalization has been motivated by economic self-interest, and effectiveness of opposition has declined due to failure of opponents to modify arguments with changes in transportation systems.

6. Federal aid requirements have compelled employment of professional lobbyists and reliance upon traditional lobbying methods.

7. Surveys by sponsoring organizations have been utilized as the primary means of building support for Congressional action.

Goal Expansion and Maximization of Political Power

The most obvious conclusion, and perhaps the most important one to remember, especially for the unseasoned and enthusiastic member of an organization such as the Trinity Improvement Association, is that success or failure depends upon political power. Organizations which seek legislative appropriations must attract to their membership the most politically powerful individuals in their communities. The endorsement of powerful people outside of the immediate area must also be sought so that the project has broad support.

The great difference between the Trinity Improvement Association and its predecessors has been the adaptability of the Association and its ability to innovate and at times
to advance technology. The old navigation companies had a singleness of purpose, and this destroyed them. Because it is a flexible, goal-centered organization, the Trinity Improvement Association has survived and succeeded in some objectives.

One of the major reasons that Texas has no Trinity canal lies in the fact that no related improvements were considered until 1939. Now with flood control, forest-soil-water conservation, reclamation, stream pollution alleviation, water supply for municipal, industrial and recreational purposes, and navigation wrapped into one package, there is greatly increased appeal. Public support increases only so long as expanded goals harmonize with other objectives, however.

A second advantage of identifying organization goals with as many classes of people as possible is that other organized groups become identified with those goals. If goals please the business community, then local and regional chambers of commerce and manufacturers' associations are inclined to support and perhaps lobby for these goals. If they please farmers, then the Grange and various farm organizations become involved. Broadening of goals to appeal to the membership of as many organizations as possible maximizes political power. Organized groups wield the political power in the United States, and people who
have a big stake in proposed legislation finance campaigns and vote.

In Texas the three regional chambers of commerce; three of the state's four largest cities, Houston, Dallas, and Fort Worth; and the farmers' and ranchers' associations of the Trinity watershed wholeheartedly support the proposed comprehensive plan of improvement. The Governor of Texas, the two United States Senators, and members of Congress from the project area therefore must support the program, like it or not, assuming they desire to remain in office.

The power of the man on the street is not ignored, and special interest groups must spend considerable time and money "educating" the average citizen to the merits of their program. Printed and audio-visual reports are of great value, but face-to-face contact with outsiders has the greatest impact. If influential people are members of the organization, public relations are considerably easier. A major reason that the Trinity Improvement Association is successful in external communication stems from the fact that the newspaper, radio, and television executives in the valley are honored with positions on the Board of Directors. For the same reason face-to-face communications are no problem. Chambers of commerce,
bankers' associations, farm and ranch groups, soil conservation clubs, and others request more public appearances than association officials can promptly meet.

Perpetuation of Family and Organization Power

The repetition of family names in the key offices of the Trinity Improvement Association does not conclusively prove, although it does suggest, the existence of a self-perpetuating power structure. John Carpenter favored Amon Carter, Jr.'s succession to the Executive Committee chairmanship in 1954 and Amon Carter, Jr. favored selection of Ben Carpenter as president in 1959, each following in his father's footsteps. It must be recognized, however, that both individuals were distinguished businessmen who had been born into families where canalization was considered essential to development of the area. The interest of the sons continuing in their fathers' footsteps was well known. The Executive Committee members recognized this.

The fact that Dale Miller was a lobbyist of considerable reputation but was not chosen to fill his father's position in 1946 demonstrates a break in perpetuation of family power in Trinity Improvement Association affairs. However, Miller was selected as Association lobbyist in 1960. His reputation at the time was that of one of the most effective Washington lobbyists.
Dominant Personalities Exercise Power

This thesis supports the hypothesis, though it does not fully prove it, that a dominant personality often exercises power in excess of formal organizational provisions. There is considerable evidence that prior to his retirement in 1955, John Pouts exercised far greater powers than the Trinity Improvement Association Constitution conferred upon the General Manager. Pouts strongly influenced the policy decisions of the Executive Committee and had complete freedom to implement them in whatever manner he judged most appropriate. From the standpoint of publicity which he received, one might conclude that Pouts' influence exceeded that of all others.

John Carpenter assumed the leadership role following Pouts' resignation in 1955. When a new General Manager was employed the following year, wholesale delegation of authority did not result. The President remained dominant. Ben Carpenter, who was named President upon his father's death in 1959, is a strong executive and has no intention of surrendering his control.

Self-Interest in Trinity Organization and Action

Projects such as those that were sought by the navigation companies of the nineteenth century and the Trinity Improvement Association today are clothed in the public
interest, but it cannot be ignored that self-interest has motivated organization and action. As a nonprofit group, the Trinity Improvement Association has the advantage of a public interest image. Association goals are proclaimed to be of benefit to all. Nevertheless, individuals who support the organization do so because, either directly or indirectly, they stand to profit.

Those who resist feel that they will suffer economic or other damages. Opponents may become proponents and vice versa if conditions change. The fact that Houston and West Texas municipalities, long-time foes of the Trinity Improvement Association, now support its program clearly indicates that self-interest no longer warrants the former positions.

Houston, for example, relaxed its opposition after publication of the Trinity River Authority Master Plan in 1958. This report clearly showed that navigation water lockage loss resulting from a canal was nominal and did not affect the Trinity as a possible source of water supply. Congressional authorization of the Arkansas barge canal in 1961, completely brought Houston into the Trinity Improvement Association camp. This canal, scheduled for completion in 1970, would draw to the Port of New Orleans traffic normally routed to Houston. The Trinity River
Barge Canal is therefore essential to that city's economy because the Port of Houston will lose its position as the second largest port in the United States unless the Trinity offsets tonnage losses to the Arkansas (1).

West Texas chambers of commerce, with the exception of Amarillo, withdrew opposition after a series of conferences with Trinity Improvement Association officials in 1963 and 1964. These chambers of commerce publicly announced that they were convinced that West Texas business would not suffer as a result of a canal to Dallas and Fort Worth. Thus there was no longer need for opposition.

Railroad Opposition to Canalization

Texas railroads view a canal as a competing form of transportation and thus a threat to their economic well being. Their spokesmen maintain that the railroads have adequate equipment to handle considerably more freight than they are presently hauling. There is no need for another transportation system in Texas from their viewpoint. They do not oppose other Trinity improvements.

Texas railroads have fought canalization since 1866, and today their opposition is traditional. They are in the position of accusing the Trinity Improvement Association and the Corps of Engineers of exaggeration of the river's potential tonnage capacity.
Trucking interests do not view the canal as a threat to that industry. They anticipate that the canal will generate business activity for all forms of transportation. It is interesting to note that railroads serving the Arkansas Valley area hold the same view. These roads urged canalization in their area (1, 2). The railroad management in Oklahoma and Arkansas maintains that canals are not competing forms of transportation, but instead complementary. This viewpoint has merit for the following reasons:

Products demanding rapid shipment will continue to rely on land transportation;

Waterways have restricted servicing areas whereas railroads do not; and

Barges carry goods which the railroads do not transport or which railroads can carry only with difficulty and high cost.

Federal Aid and Congressional Lobbyists

Dependence upon federal aid for goal accomplishment has compelled employment of traditional congressional lobbying methods. Trinity Improvement Association lobbyists have been chosen from two sources. Roy Miller (1930-1946) and Dale Miller (1960- ) were seasoned professionals. They were considered by congressional committee members as experts in the field of navigation and basin
development. Fritz Lanham (1946-1960) was employed following expiration of his thirteenth term in the U. S. House of Representatives. Though he was not an expert in the field in which the Association sought legislation, his long tenure in Congress gave him the advantage of personally knowing the membership well.

Surveys to Justify Congressional Action

The Trinity Improvement Association has prepared many survey reports designed to show the value of a canal and related improvements. One survey, the Reed-Byars Report of 1930, contained justifications for canalization which were obviously exaggerated. Since that time outside consultants have been employed to verify staff-conducted surveys. Trinity Improvement Association projections of benefits remain in excess of Corps predictions, but they have been much more in line since the double-check procedure was instituted. In spite of this, the value of costly checking procedure probably lies more in the propaganda it generates than in verification of information. It is doubtful that a consultant, regardless of reputation, would dare to present to such a group figures which show its goals are unrealistic. Similarly, surveys conducted by opposing forces are geared to disprove favorable findings of sponsoring organizations.
The Corps of Engineers has conducted seven major surveys on the Trinity River in the period from 1852 to 1964. Four were favorable to improvement, three were not. It is significant that the favorable recommendations were submitted in years of economic growth and that the unfavorable surveys were submitted in depressed years. It would seem, therefore, that a group seeking a public improvement project but not wishing to label it a public works project is not likely to succeed unless economic conditions are favorable.

Surveys conducted by the Corps of Engineers provide Congress with the most reliable means of determining a project's value. Regulations require officers to move every four years to another state to ensure that economic or political ties are not formed. Corps of Engineers' personnel, officially at least, have no fear of losing their jobs for recommending against projects. In the period from 1946 to 1956, Congress' review agency, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, failed 51 per cent of the time to find sufficient economic justification to recommend adoption of projects. Many projects approved at this level are marred by unfavorable review later by the Bureau of the Budget or an executive department. Projects passing all levels of review are not assured of favorable congressional action.
The Executive Branch is expected to submit to the Eighty-Ninth Congress the plan which recommends the expenditure of $900,000,000 for Trinity River improvements. The outlook for authorization of the program is good if 1965 economic conditions are favorable. The long struggle to secure a river development project would not be over at that point, however. Appropriations would have to be sought in 1966 and every subsequent year until the entire improvement project was completed. The struggle of the Trinity Improvement Association is far from being completed. To predict what action a political body will take is extremely hazardous. Thus, no prediction is made.
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APPENDIX

Included in the Appendix are the following illustrations:

Map of the Trinity River Authority Showing Master Plan Reservoirs

Map of the Trinity River Watershed Showing Proposed Comprehensive Plan Improvements

Organization Chart of the Trinity Improvement Association

Organization Chart of the Trinity River Authority
TO ACCOMPANY: Report on Master Plan of the Trinity River and Tributaries

TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY
TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS

WATERSHED MAP SHOWING
MASTER PLAN RESERVOIRS

FORREST AND COTTON
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
DALLAS, TEXAS

JANUARY, 1958
ORGANIZATION OF TRINITY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate membership where applicable.
ORGANIZATION OF TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY OF TEXAS
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Educational (5)

Executive (5)

Federal Projects (5)

Finance (5)
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Pollution Abatement (4)

Projects Development (5)

Soil Conservation (4)

Operations Division

Sewage Disposal Plant

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate membership where applicable.
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