



1-9-1951

Letter from Representative Burdick to Senator Iver Solberg Regarding Cost of Garrison Dam, January 9, 1951

Usher Burdick

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers>

Recommended Citation

Burdick, Usher, "Letter from Representative Burdick to Senator Iver Solberg Regarding Cost of Garrison Dam, January 9, 1951" (1951). *Usher Burdick Papers*. 186.
<https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers/186>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Usher Burdick Papers by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

January 9, 1951.

Garrison

Honorable Iver Solberg,
State Senator,
Bismarck, North Dakota.

Dear Iver:

In regard to your request for advice or suggestions you may use in connection with the Garrison Dam proposition, I am glad to give you the following information:

An estimate of the approximate additional cost of building the dam to the 1850 foot level would be as follows:

Cost of 90,000 acres of river bottom lands at and near Williston, \$5,400,000.

Flooding of three irrigation projects at or near Williston, (government cost) \$5,000,000.

Cost of removing the Great Northern Railroad to a point nine miles north of Williston, \$1,000,000.

Destruction of a city of 10,000 people, \$20,000,000.

Cost of dykes around Williston, the Railroad, and 3 irrigation projects, \$16,000,000.

APPROXIMATE TOTAL -- \$48,000,000.

Not one item of this estimated cost has been authorized by law and these figures do not take into consideration the annual crop production on this land of approximately \$1,000,000 per year. Also, the estimate does not take into account the future losses that may occur in life and property by the

I. S. # 2.

building of a dam that is unsafe. It is obvious that the higher the dam, the more pressure will be placed on it and, according to Dr. Mead's report, this dam would be resting on a bottom under which the mud extends for 85 feet with no stone support anywhere from top to bottom. Thus, the risk to life and property would be infinitely greater if the dam were built 20 feet higher.

Another argument against increasing the height of the dam is the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation says that we can produce all the power we can use at an 1830 foot level.

If you think you can use them to advantage, I will give you further facts concerning the reports of Dr. J. William Mead, who is an internationally-known geologist and who made the first report on the proposed dam site, as opposed to that of General Pick and the Army Engineers.

If there is any further information or assistance that I can give you, I shall be more than glad to send you further facts.

Sincerely yours,

Usher L. Burdick, m.c.