

cating that after 20 years or so Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti will outgrow the capacity of the Huron River for either water supply or waste water disposal.

2. Consideration of whether smaller reservoirs used singly or in combination for flow augmentation and recreation. The reasons for rejecting the Seneca Dam on the Potomac in favor of several small reservoirs as presented in the Department of the Interior report to the President, January 1966, may be relevant here, and the "pretty little lakes" might be much more valuable.

3. Exploration of ground water resources.

4. Examination of various methods of tertiary treatment and the possible applications in this situation. Technology is growing so rapidly that with new methods of treatment, low-flow augmentation for dilution of wastes may be unnecessary in the not too distant future.

5. Analysis and elimination of pollutants at their sources.

6. Evaluation of pumped storage reservoirs as conceived by Clarence Velz for other midwestern regions where good reservoir sites are unobtainable.

How can the public attack the problem of determining which of these methods will benefit the greatest number of people?

Would the National Sanitation Foundation recommendation if developed with tertiary treatment provide a greater control over effluents flowing into Lake Erie? At what point will the Huron River cease to be able to assimilate the wastes from the treatment plants?

Have scientists found specific gages for estimating when these critical points will occur?

The flood control, which is the means of entry for the Corps of Engineers into the Mill Creek project is now acknowledged to be less than 5 percent of the project's "benefits." It is also apparent that flood control devices (channel straightening, widening, and dikes) can be constructed in and around Flat Rock where the floods occurred 25 years ago.

We anticipate that the corps will conclude their study in the spring of 1967, and we have been chided for not awaiting that report before raising the questions and issues which concern us. However, we believe that if the corps requires several years and many dollars to make its study, those who have to evaluate it certainly need a few months to gain at least some of the basic information. Without such information intelligent decisions will be inconceivable. It is becoming evident that in spite of the money that has been spent, obvious deficiencies and inaccuracies remain which indicate that the conclusions to be reached may be worth very little.

Is it possible for local governments and the citizens they represent to end a project begun by the Corps of Engineers if they believe it is not in the best interests of the community as a whole?

Or is it a fact that once the Corps of Engineers is involved in a project, the decisionmaking stage is complete?

Since the decision to build the dam is irreversible it is vital that every care be taken to insure that the decision is a correct one.

To summarize we review the following:

(1) Flow-rate statistics used by corps were in error.

(2) Disposal of waste water in the Huron River works a hardship on the downriver population.