

CIRCULATING COPY
Sea Grant Depository

THE PORTS AND WATERWAYS VIEW

TAMU-SG-70-114

August 1970

Photo Credits: p. iv, Port of Port Arthur; p. 2, Port of Houston; p. 4, Port of Corpus Christi (Texas Highway Department photo); p. 7, Port of Houston; p. 8, Port of Galveston.

CIRCULATING COPY
Sea Grant Depository

TEXAS MARINE RESOURCES

THE PORTS AND WATERWAYS VIEW

A Consensus Report of
"MARINE RESOURCES: TEXAS PORTS AND WATERWAYS"
A Workshop for Texas Marine Transportation Users and Developers
Port Arthur, Texas
May 27-28, 1970

Partially supported by the National Science Foundation
Sea Grant Program
Institutional Award GH 59 made to
Texas A&M University

FOREWORD

This report represents a summary statement of the Sea Grant Workshop "Marine Resources: Texas Ports and Waterways" held May 27-28, 1970, in Port Arthur, Texas. The workshop was co-sponsored by the Sea Grant Program and the Industrial Economics Research Division, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, of Texas A&M University.

We acknowledge the assistance of the Port Arthur Chamber of Commerce, the Port of Port Arthur Navigation District, and the Texas Ports Association for their valuable cooperation in this workshop effort.

The statement issued here is one of consensus. It should not be assumed that all the ideas were unanimously voiced by all participants or that each individual subscribes to every detail.

It is hoped that this statement may stimulate interest in marine resources and port development in the state. Comments and discussion on the material presented here are always welcome.

JOHN C. CALHOUN, JR.
Director, Sea Grant Program
Texas A&M University

August 1970



INTRODUCTION

"Texas Marine Resources: The Ports and Waterways View" represents one of a continuing series of publications capsuling the events and recommendations of a Sea Grant Workshop. On May 27-28, the Texas A&M University Sea Grant Program sponsored a workshop for Texas marine transportation users and developers in Port Arthur, Texas. The Industrial Economics Research Division of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University, served as co-sponsor of the meeting in cooperation with the Port Arthur Chamber of Commerce, the Port of Port Arthur Navigation District and the Texas Ports Association.

The workshop was part of a series of working sessions directed toward identifying needs and problems of specific user groups in the Texas Gulf coastal zone. Other workshops have been conducted for marine industrialists, college and junior college teachers and researchers, recreation and tourism specialists, attorneys and public administrators, and coastal land developers. The purpose of these workshops has been to achieve a better understanding of the needs of the Texas coastal region and the manner in which the Sea Grant Program can serve those needs.

Fifty-five representatives from Texas port authorities, navigation districts, and major port facility users, as well as representatives from Texas A&M University, governmental agencies, and the National Science Foundation, chief funding agency for the Sea Grant Program, attended the meeting.

The summary presented here represents a consensus statement of the participants at the workshop. The conclusions and recommendations formulated by the group will form the basis for additional discussions relative to ports in Texas. The meeting represented the first time a major university program has attempted to assist port directors and planners in identifying common goals and recommendations for action by state government.

Workshop Sessions

Participants were assigned to small groups to consider three broad questions relating to port, navigation, and associated industrial development:

1. What are the current needs of Texas ports that can be served by the Sea Grant Program?
2. What are the major problems hindering the development of Texas ports?
3. What actions by federal, state, or local governments would be most helpful in stimulating the growth of Texas ports?

The development of deep water ports has been a major factor in the economic growth of Texas.

These questions, as well as more specific ones submitted by workshop invitees, were submitted to the participants several days before the workshop. Also included in the pre-workshop information booklet were background papers on the National Science Foundation and the Texas A&M University Sea Grant Program, The Texas Interagency Natural Resources Council, the American Association of Port Authorities, selections from the report of the Commission on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and other items.

Each small group addressed themselves to all of the broad workshop topics. Discussion relative to each topic was led by workshop moderators. They were Dow Wynn, General Manager and Port Director, Port of Port Arthur; John D. Winder, Port of Port Lavaca; and Richard P. Leach, Director of Engineering and Planning, Port of Houston.

The Luncheon Speaker

Harry C. Brockel, former Milwaukee, Wisconsin, port director, was the featured speaker for the meeting.¹ He is currently on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin's Center for Great Lakes Studies and a member of the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners.

He urged port directors to be sensitive to the rapidly changing times and pointed out the need for comprehensive planning and long-term projection. He called the workshop "history in the making" and said that Texas was far ahead of other coastal states in recognizing the need for coordination of port and coastal zone activities.

"We are entering a new generation in port and marine transportation," he said. "The Sea Grant Program and the National Science Foundation have an important role to play in bringing together the elements to work in the coastal zone."

Among special problems for port development he cited the growth of public awareness and the need to improve it, the maintenance of dredging and disposal of spoils, vessel sanitation and the need to acknowledge recreation and park lands and vistas as seaside needs.

¹Mr. Brockel has been a leader in port and waterway development for more than 40 years and was a key figure in the long legislative struggle to achieve the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway. He was appointed by President Eisenhower and reappointed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson as a member of the advisory board, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and served 15 years at that post. He also served as Milwaukee port director from 1942 until his retirement last year. He is currently involved as a project leader in the University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Program in addition to his responsibilities in the Center for Great Lakes Studies.



PORT OF HOUSTON

SWISSKOOLOS

S

CURRENT NEEDS

Workshop discussions into the question of the current needs of the state's ports were preceded by a discussion of coastal zone management. Participants were asked to react to the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) position paper on the proposed federal coastal zone management bills. The statement of the AAPA is included in the appendix of this report. In general, participants were in agreement with the national association. They felt that legislation dealing with the coastal zone must recognize the right of existing public agencies to determine their own development. It was also the consensus that coastal zone authorities should rest with the state rather than with the federal government.

State Actions

In attempting to identify the mechanism by which the state might take on the responsibility for coastal zone authorities, members of the Texas Port Association in attendance at the workshop pointed out that no single state agency at the present time is generally responsive to the specific and overall needs and problems of the state's ports. Major regulatory actions are now vested in the Texas Water Quality Board (TWQB) and the Texas Railroad Commission. Port and dock development is overseen by the TWQB as far as it relates to water pollution and the Railroad Commission is responsible for rate regulating on intrastate commerce only. Regional interstate authorities for port development were discussed briefly by participants. It was pointed out, however, that port development in neighboring Louisiana is a function of the state government as contrasted to Texas ports which are locally autonomous political subdivisions of the State of Texas. Such differences make interstate compacts extremely difficult, if not impossible, and generally impractical.

The need for long-range planning by the state for its coastal zone activities was recognized by the group, however, as being critical. Participants were in agreement that all Texas port authorities should have strong representation on such a planning group. The group recognized the need for ports to have a stronger voice in state government and recommended the formation of a coordinating agency or commission for ports at the state level. The agency might be formed of representatives from each port and navigation district and would serve essentially as a coordinating, educational and promotional entity. The proposed Texas Ports Coordinating Board would make recommendations for state action to assist in port planning and development but should not have regulatory controls over ports and navigation districts.

Whatever type of state organization may be forthcoming, members of the Texas Ports Association in

attendance at the meeting were firm in their belief that ports should maintain their autonomy without state subsidization or control.

Some participants could see the Interagency Natural Resources Council taking on the additional function of a state advisory commission for port promotional efforts and for continuous policy direction in coastal zone management. If this plan were to be developed, the Texas Ports Association might serve as an ex-officio member of the Council.

The role of the Texas Industrial Commission (TIC) was discussed and greater cooperative effort between this agency and Texas ports was urged. The TIC is primarily responsible for attracting new industries to the state through promotional efforts. The promotional needs of Texas ports could perhaps be integrated with the TIC function. It was pointed out that the TIC is opening an overseas office in Mexico City to sell Texas manufactured products for export to Mexico and South and Central America. A representative from the ports of Texas might also occupy this office to attract imports to Texas ports.

A state-wide planning agency was suggested as a possible means of dealing with questions raised by the problem of facility duplication. For example, to what extent should Galveston spend money raised through public sources on loading facilities which duplicate those available in nearby Houston, or conversely?

Planning and Development

Development of deep water ports along the Texas coast has been a major factor in the rapid economic growth of the state. These ports accounted for 170.6 million short tons of cargo in 1968. Although liquid cargoes—petroleum and chemical products—account for the majority of port tonnage, Texas ports are also important in the transport of grains, cotton, and sulphur. When tonnage figures are translated into cargo values, the significance of the state's ports is more apparent. For example, the value of cargo at Texas deep-draft ports based on 1968 tonnage is estimated to be \$1.4 billion for 1970. Estimated cargo values by port and commodity are given in the following table. In addition, shallow-draft ports are expected to handle \$149.3 million in cargo during 1970.

To assure adequate facilities and handling mechanisms, plans must be made now for future cargo needs. The group agreed that the Texas A&M University Sea Grant Program could provide a valuable service to port and transportation needs by conducting investigative studies to establish the basis for a long-range state-wide transportation plan, including port development.

Long-range studies of the state's transportation system, including port development, are needed.



**VALUE OF CARGO TO PORT ECONOMIES, DEEP-DRAFT TEXAS PORTS
1970***

PORT	GENERAL CARGO	TANKER CARGO	GRAIN	ORE	TOTAL
Brownsville	\$ 11,154,305	\$ 16,925,598	\$ 3,944,289	\$ 63,042	\$ 32,087,234
Port Isabel	408,097	1,351,947	63,401	1,823,445
Corpus Christi	63,230,233	74,189,466	9,582,944	10,252,941	157,255,584
Freeport	76,522,670	2,937,710	79,460,380
Galveston	24,790,178	309,955	6,121,138	2,766	31,224,037
Houston	460,009,998	118,901,015	50,240,028	3,681,751	632,832,792
Texas City	91,523,278	54,562,463	36,021	146,121,762
Sabine Pass	334,330	549,743	884,073
Port Arthur	29,581,440	95,632,245	1,189,325	126,403,010
Beaumont	104,391,615	110,316,335	8,955,100	223,663,050
Orange	24,711,302	712,202	666,248	8,398	26,098,150
TOTAL	\$886,657,446	\$476,388,679	\$80,762,473	\$14,044,919	\$1,457,853,517

*1970 estimates of value of cargo based on 1968 tonnage figures.

SOURCE: John Miloy and E. Anthony Copp, *Economic Impact Analysis of Texas Marine Resources and Industries*, Industrial Economics Research Division, Texas A&M University, June 1970, TAMU-SG-70-217, p. 77.

An analysis of port user needs was cited as an activity which might be undertaken through the Sea Grant Program.

Other university studies might be conducted in the areas of commodity projections for the state, economic analyses, and the increasingly important role of port authorities in the development of a total state transportation system.

Commodity projection studies of the export and import trade through Texas ports should cover the coming twenty-year period. Because markets are constantly changing, such studies are required to serve as a basis for sound long-range planning. One of the examples of needed commodity research deals with oil imports, because it is not clear now how important it will be for Texas to be able to handle oil imports from supertankers. These kinds of questions are critical to future port planning.

The use of a Sea Grant Advisory Specialist to work with the Texas Ports Association and with individual port authorities was recommended. Participants agreed that such a specialist could provide a valuable service to them by serving as a "watch dog" on legislation, both state and federal, which pertains to port and navigation responsibilities. The advisory specialist could also help stimulate cooperative studies and efforts through the TPA. Another suggested activity for the advisory specialist would be to develop a codification of laws and regulations pertaining to regulatory authorities over port and navigation development. Such a specialist could also serve as a focal point for information exchange.

One of the topics for discussion dealt with educational programs for port personnel. It was pointed out that the Texas Maritime Academy graduates were hired by some Texas ports for future managerial positions. Educational courses are already being offered at both the undergraduate levels and the masters levels which are useful for port personnel. The need for better trained engineers was cited. Continuing education through short courses and seminars for specific port problems is already being conducted through the American Association of Port Authorities.

Participants did point out that an analysis of the manpower requirements for technician level personnel is needed. Tug and tow boat personnel and marine equipment operators need better training which could perhaps be provided through junior college technician training programs. Requirements for licensing such personnel need to be developed to insure better quality personnel. For example, it was pointed out that harbor master requirements do not apply in Texas.

Major Problems

The workshop was also concerned with the question "What are the major problems hindering the development of Texas ports?"

One of the most critical issues in port and harbor development is the limited availability of spoil disposal areas. Conflicting land use demands along the Texas coast, the high costs of spoil disposal alternatives, the governmental bottlenecks experienced, and the current emphasis on ecology were

An issue facing Texas ports is related to oil imports and the need for supertanker handling facilities.

major issues cited during the workshop. Harbors and waterways cannot exist without dredging. Hence, the importance of spoil areas cannot be overemphasized so far as waterways are concerned.

Port and harbor officials noted that scarce land on the waterways and the competing demands for land formerly available as spoil disposal areas have forced the industry to consider more distant land areas for spoil disposal. It was noted that a maximum distance of five (5) miles was considered currently satisfactory depending on the characteristics and quantity of the material, but rising costs for larger dredges thus required make closer spoil beds increasingly more desirable.

The issue of spoil disposal was tied to the long run master development plans of ports and harbors. Several port districts have attempted to make acquisition of spoil disposal areas to cover their needs for 50 year periods. Other ports have not experienced success in acquiring spoil areas for their port development needs due to problems with governmental approval. Long range planning was considered difficult due to fluctuating government emphasis and the "red tape" structure. It was argued that both the ports and the Corps of Engineers had "lost considerable control" of their planning capabilities since the Department of Interior could veto a desired spoil area for wildlife preservation and other ecological considerations while state agencies could claim that archaeological and other artifacts were present and therefore the land could not be used.

Planning for spoil disposal is encumbered with the complexity of state permit mechanisms. It was noted that no less than four State agencies had to be consulted for clearance on spoil areas although none of the agencies had the authority to guarantee results. It was suggested that some agency in Austin should be created to handle requests for permits in order to coordinate the Federal and State paperwork on spoil disposal areas.

Officials from the Corps of Engineers present at the workshop noted that their policy of using cost-benefit analysis to assess the need for new port and harbor requirements was changing to allow for wider considerations of ecology. They noted that the Corps was generating a study of spoil areas in Texas.

Workshop participants felt that the spoil disposal issue could no longer be approached in isolation from long run industrial development considerations. Some of the areas available as spoil zones are marshlands currently used to raise cattle. The acquisition of these and other areas may hinge on the alternative development plans for spoil areas.

It was suggested that studies were necessary to investigate the possibilities and problems of early reclamation and industrial development of spoil areas. For example, the complementary use of spoil areas with recreational activity or even providing new fish breeding grounds could add fuel to the arguments for spoil area acquisition. It was suggested that Sea Grant could conduct such a study to look into the problem of complementary uses of spoil areas and joint development of these areas for recreational and/or industrial uses.

The issue of the cost to the ship versus value of the goods as the basis of overland freight rates was discussed. Participants noted that both facilities available and freight rates are key factors affecting the volume of traffic to ports. Many other factors besides distance are also involved in rate making. The balance of traffic at a port was also noted as a factor affecting freight rates. Port officials noted that no severe competitive disadvantages presently exist between East and Gulf Coast ports, but that a major portion of their staff effort is involved in traffic management activity (through the various freight and regulatory bureaus, agencies, and the courts) to secure equal rates for different commodities. A study to assess the extent and impact of changing rates on Texas ports was suggested. Cost savings in terms of better handling procedures at ports and the unit train basis of rates has given some ports a freight rate advantage but rising labor costs have sometimes tended to offset these advantages.

Means of financing of port developments was also discussed by this workshop session. Participants noted that as long as the tax-free status on municipal-type bonds can be maintained, costs and sources of financing of new port facilities will be feasible and available.

Another issue was raised concerning the advisability of having use taxes for waterways. Present practices do not provide for the accumulation of funds for the purpose of maintaining waterways, as is the case with public roads. The idea of making assessments for the use of public facilities has won wide acceptance for roads, parks, and similar areas where public funds are allocated to build and maintain the facility. It may be time to explore this concept for providing funds through which waterways can be maintained more adequately.

New ventures such as expensive offshore terminals may require more direct government participation due to the scale of investment involved. As alternatives to the heavy investment required for port expansion, private firms, port authorities

or other users could either build and own and jointly use the necessary facilities, or they could lease these facilities to user companies or port organizations. This may involve to some extent new state legislation for dock building, land acquisition, and other activities.

Perhaps the most important problem hindering port development today is that of labor. Participants cited an immediate need for overhauling existing labor laws. Complaints were raised as to the lack of "policing power" to keep unions from having wildcat strikes and jurisdictional stoppages on construction. It was suggested that a way to halt unwarranted stoppages was by special agreements between the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) and the port industries backed by mutually agreed-upon financial penalties. These agreements would fine or prevent interest payment to any group violation agreements. One company official noted that they had dropped out of the dry cargo field altogether due to rising labor costs and delays. It was noted that a worldwide tendency for equalizing labor costs may reduce some of the advantages of other world ports. Cited as serious labor issues facing ports were the elimination of

featherbedding and the guaranteed (2,080 hours) annual wages. It was noted that the West Gulf Coast is usually the last area to return to work following an ILA strike.

The need for deepdraft offshore terminal facilities for Texas was discussed by industrialists at the workshop. The current revolution in the shipping industry, the problem of reducing shipping costs, and the use of larger ships made possible by such offshore loading terminals are important developments. None of the currently-used or planned giant bulk commodity ships can enter Texas ports. A terminal has been proposed in the Gulf off the Freeport-Galveston area where the 100-foot depths required are close to the coast line. It was suggested that such a terminal could also handle other bulk commodities in addition to oil.

Sea Grant participation in the feasibility study of such an offshore system was suggested. It was pointed out that the Regional Export Expansion Council is actively engaged in an offshore terminal study. Permission from the Corps of Engineers and permission under the Offshore Continental Shelf Act would be necessary to build an offshore facility.



The effects of containerization on Texas port development have added greatly to the need for long-range planning.



SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Actions to be initiated on two broad fronts—state government and port research—were specifically recommended by workshop participants.

Governmental Actions. Port leaders expressed the need for greater assistance from state government along the following lines:

- A long-range planning group, at the state level, should be organized for the development of coastal zone resources. Port and navigation districts should have representation in this group.
- A port development or coordinating agency should exist at the state level which would have representation from each port. The commission should not have regulatory controls but should serve as an educational and promotional office and assist in coordination of port development activities.
- A state agency should be provided with the mechanisms for handling permit requests on spoil disposal areas and to coordinate the implementation of state and federal regulations.
- Through such agencies or state efforts, the public should be kept better informed of the importance of Texas ports to the state's total economy.

Research Needs. Studies to assist port developers and planners were major recommendations from the workshop including the following specific ideas.

- Investigative studies into various aspects of port planning and development—commodity projections, economic analyses, the role of ports in the total state transportation system, and port user needs—should be conducted.
- A Sea Grant advisory specialist should be named to work with individual ports and to assist in information exchange through the Texas Ports Association.
- An analysis of manpower needs at the technician level is needed.
- The Sea Grant Program should conduct a study to determine the possibilities for complementary uses of spoil areas such as joint development of those areas for recreational and/or industrial uses.
- Sea Grant should also participate in a feasibility study for an offshore loading terminal which could handle bulk commodities in addition to oil.
- A comprehensive land use study and development which would include soil mechanics and land reclamation should be undertaken.

Commodity projection studies for the next twenty-year period are needed for both export and import trades.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT AUTHORITIES ON COASTAL MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION to the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Senate Committee on Commerce

April 29, 1970

The American Association of Port Authorities appreciates this opportunity to submit this statement of its views on the coastal zone management bills now being considered by this Subcommittee.

The American Association of Port Authorities is a corporate body whose membership includes all of the principal port agencies, and numerous marine terminal operators, civic and other groups concerned with the planning, development, operation and maintenance of the seaports along the coasts, bays and rivers of the United States, its insular possessions and the Great Lakes. The Association's member ports handle all of the oceanborne foreign trade of our Nation as well as all of the deep water domestic trade along all our coasts. In their efforts to accommodate this flow of commerce, which included 440 million tons in foreign trade in 1968, valued in excess of \$41 billion, the ports have invested more than \$2 billion in terminal and cargo handling facilities since the end of World War II. This flow of ocean commerce is basic to the areas in which the ports are located. A study by the Maritime Administration released a few years ago reported that 2.5 million workers were employed in export related industries in States having port facilities. This is over 80% of the total number of American workers reported employed in export industries. The study further estimated that almost one million additional workers were employed in activities related to United States imports.

In presenting these comments, we should like to note that they are directed specifically to the potential impact that the bills now before the Subcommittee will have on port planning and development and on the activities of the public agencies now responsible for the planning, development and administration of all our seaports.

S-2802, S-3183 and S-3460, introduced by Senators Magnuson, Boggs and Tydings respectively, are all concerned with encouraging the development of a systematic approach to coastal zone planning and utilization. All three bills would designate a specific agency to administer the Federal Government's responsibilities in the management of the coastal zone, but disagree as to which agency this should be; provide that the designated agency would be empowered to make grants to coastal zone authorities which would be created by the various coastal States to develop master plans for the planning, de-

velopment and utilization of the coastal zone within their individual geographic areas of jurisdiction, and to guarantee bonds issued by these State authorities; spell out certain requirements that the State agencies would be required to meet in order to become eligible for the grants and loan guarantees, including the requirement that they must be empowered to determine land use and zoning regulations, acquire and develop land and facilities and issue bonds to implement their programs.

In each instance the State coastal zone authorities would be empowered to review all proposed developments within their areas of jurisdiction, whether proposed by private entrepreneurs or by local, regional, State or Federal agencies, for consistency with the master plans which the State coastal zone authorities would develop. And finally—but by no means of least importance—all three bills provide that the designated Federal agency would be empowered to approve or to disapprove the long range master plans developed by the State coastal zone authorities.

There are also, of course, a number of significant differences in the three bills. These include, in addition to the designation of different Federal agencies already noted, differences in the amount of funds which would be appropriated to the designated agencies, differences in the definition of what constitutes the coastal zone, and the fact that S-3460 is the only bill which provides for public hearings on the plans to be developed by State coastal zone authorities.

All three bills stem in large measure from the report "Our Nation and the Sea," submitted in January 1969 by the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources. It is important, therefore, that the report and its recommendations be related to the substance of the bills since their provisions would affect the broad range of port planning, development and administration activities.

We are very much concerned that the philosophy developed in the report may serve as the guide lines for the agency which would be designated to administer the Federal responsibilities and that administrative structures which would be established under all three bills would seriously affect the local and regional public agencies now responsible for port activities in the efficient and economical performance of their functions.

Although the Commission treated its overall mandate broadly, as evidenced by the scope of the report, its investigation was limited, in the area to which we will address ourselves, largely to the impact of marine technology upon our ports. Because of this very limited focus, the Commission repeated the classic error common to so many recent suggestions for Federal port planning. This error is the mistake of relating specific trades involving highly specialized deep-draft tankers to the general port requirements of the United States. The error is compounded by the indiscriminate grouping of containership, hydrofoil and hovercraft with the super-tanker and the assumption that such vessels are all components of what the Commission felt to be a common port problem, namely, the capability—or lack of capability—of our ports to accommodate all of these different types of vessels. From this followed the recommendation that what is required is a drastic departure from the traditional and historic approach toward port development in the United States.

The Commission's report states that super-tankers exceeding 300,000-ton capacity are now on the building ways in Japan. What the report does not state is that these vessels are specifically designed for the carriage of Middle East crude oil to Western Europe and to Japan. The report, however, casts these ships, with their deep-draft requirements, against the depth of a vehicular tunnel in Chesapeake Bay and dredging costs in New York and East Texas. In doing so, it emphasizes a specialized and unique problem in order to justify a generalized conclusion that Federal planning and control of the Nation's ports is essential for the future of maritime transportation.

There may well be a need for a relatively few regional oil unloading terminals served by adequate channels or for offshore transfer facilities to accommodate deep-draft tankers and probably some specialized ore carriers. In this particular instance, the ports of the United States are now collaborating with Federal agencies in the development of plans which will assure adequate facilities to serve the Nation. Except for these, however, the ports which now handle most of the ships engaged in our domestic and foreign oceanborne trade will not require channel deepening of major magnitude and cost.

What the Commission proposed was Federal study and presumably Federal direction and possibly control over the entire and far-ranging field of port and terminal development, including land transportation facilities, which have been historically and successfully accomplished by non-Federal interests. This would be accomplished by a national port survey

which would define "The Nation's requirements for major ports, offshore terminals and other facilities for marine commerce." On the basis of such a survey, a program of port and harbor development would be established. These proposals, if enacted, would represent a complete reversal of the traditional relationship between Federal and non-Federal interests and responsibilities in this field of activity. The Commission's report also contains the suggestion that the Federal Government should allocate or mandate Port activity as to type, scope and location of all port-related facilities and that this is a process superior to the benefits of healthy and vigorous port competition which have in reality spurred the pioneering of new techniques in developing the ports of this country, particularly since World War II. The test of provision of satisfactory facilities and services, developed on the basis of local initiative will, we believe, be a much better way to determine which of our ports will serve as gateways for the Nation's foreign and domestic oceanborne trade.

It is a fact that each port is a driving economic force in its local hinterland and that a great portion of the Nation's industry is centered in the ocean and lake ports and their surrounding areas. It would, we submit, be a mistake to subject local and regional initiative and enterprise to Federal review and determination. Such review and determination is specifically provided for in Coastal Zone Management legislation now before the Subcommittee. In their present forms, these bills provide that the designated Federal agency would have authority to approve or disapprove the comprehensive plans which the State agencies would draft as a condition to receiving program development and operating grants. We submit that these provisions should be amended to insure that port and harbor areas already under the jurisdiction of established public agencies be given separate consideration, recognizing the right of these public agencies to control their own development. This policy position of the Association was unanimously endorsed by the United States members at the Annual Meeting in late 1969.

It is relevant at this point to illustrate in specific terms why we are so concerned that the philosophy of the Commission of Marine Science, Engineering and Resources may provide guide lines for whatever Federal agency is designated. As the members of the Subcommittee know so well, historically the Federal Government has long had the responsibility for development and maintenance of navigable waterways and channels and for the provision of various safety aids to navigation. On the other hand, it has not had responsibility for determining

where, when and how port and terminal facilities such as piers, wharves, breakwaters, transit sheds, cargo handling equipment, storage areas and a multitude of other requirements necessary for efficient port operations should be planned for and developed, except for military installations. These functions have historically been performed primarily by local and regional public agencies and to a lesser extent, by private enterprise, the latter specifically in relation to the handling of bulk cargoes. What

the Commission proposes is to subject these activities to Federal review and determination.

Contrary to these recommendations, we believe that these activities should continue to be performed as they are at present. We are firmly convinced that in this manner the nation will be assured of the most efficient and economical facilities for the handling of our oceanborne domestic and foreign commerce.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

M. C. Barrilleaux
Houston Port Bureau, Inc.
Houston, Texas

Col. Edward L. Baw
Arroyo Colorado Navigation District
Harlingen, Texas

James R. Bradley
Industrial Economics Research Div.
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Harry C. Brockel
Center for Great Lakes Studies
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Robert Brown
Sabine Pilot Association
Lakeshore Drive
Port Arthur, Texas

David L. Buchanan
Port Director
Calhoun County Navigation District
Port Lavaca, Texas

John C. Calhoun, Jr.
Vice President for Programs
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

C. A. Christie
Phillips Petroleum Company
Bartlesville, Oklahoma

Willis H. Clark
Assistant Director
Sea Grant Program Office
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

E. A. Copp
Industrial Economics Research Div.
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Andre Del Flache
Lamar State College of Technology
Beaumont, Texas

Charles S. Devoy
General Manager
Galveston Wharves
Galveston, Texas

John P. Doyle
Texas Transportation Institute
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Glen F. Egan, Chief
Galveston District
U. S. Corps of Engineers
Galveston, Texas

Jane Ely
Houston Post
Houston, Texas

Tom M. Featherston
Merchants National Bank Building
Port Arthur, Texas

Captain W. F. Fredeman, President
Port of Port Arthur
Port Arthur, Texas

W. B. Gere
Marine Department
Humble Oil & Refining Company
Houston, Texas

Ben Goldstein
Assistant General Manager
Port of Port Arthur Navigation Dist.
Port Arthur, Texas

James H. Harwell
Executive Director
Texas Industrial Commission
Austin, Texas

Euclid Hudson
Vice President
Port of Port Arthur
Port Arthur, Texas

Jesse F. Jamison, Jr.
Assistant Port Director
Port of Corpus Christi
Corpus Christi, Texas

A. V. Koebley
Pure Oil Division of Union Oil of California
Nederland, Texas

Charles Krull
Manager of Planning & Distribution
The Dow Chemical Company
Freeport, Texas

Richard P. Leach
Director of Engineering & Planning
Harris County Houston Ship
Channel Navigation District
Houston, Texas

Joel E. Livingston
Groves, Texas

E. W. McCarthy
Port Arthur, Texas

Kim McMurray
Beaumont Enterprise
Beaumont, Texas

John H. Merrell
Texaco, Inc.
Port Arthur, Texas

J. Neal Miller
Gulf Oil Corp.
Port Arthur, Texas

Leatha F. Miloy
Sea Grant Program Office
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

John Miloy
Industrial Economics Research Di
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Lee Moore, President
Port Arthur Chamber of Commer
Port Arthur, Texas

Captain Ray North
Gulf Oil Corporation
Port Arthur, Texas

Stephen E. Pomeroy
Port Director
Orange County Navigation & Port District
Orange, Texas

Hoy A. Richards
Texas Transportation Institute
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

ald E. Walsh
Grant Program Office
as A&M University
ege Station, Texas

J. B. Wheelock
as Oklahoma Port Company
wes, Texas

G. White
' Chemical Company
port, Texas

ert Wildman
Ice of Sea Grant Programs
ional Science Foundation
shington, D. C.

ald Wiley
on Carbide & Chemicals
t Lavaca, Texas

n D. Winder
t Lavaca, Texas

Freeport, Texas

D. L. Turpin
U. S. Corps of Engineers
Port Arthur, Texas

John F. Vandegriff, Sr.
Captain Van & Company
Port Arthur, Texas

R. P. Walker
Texaco, Inc.
Port Arthur, Texas

F. Wistner
Jefferson Chemical Co., Inc.
Port Neches, Texas

John Wright
First Christian Church
Port Arthur, Texas

Dow Wynn
Manager & Port Director
Port of Port Arthur Navigation District
Port Arthur, Texas

