

We do not oppose Little Cacapon Dam and Reservoir in West Virginia, believing it can provide an emergency source of water supply and provide important lake-type recreation.

We do not oppose the North Mountain Project.

We oppose Sideling Hill Reservoir in Maryland, unless proven economically feasible, and further recommend that the dam site be moved upstream 6.1 miles from its presently designated location, thereby saving from destruction and ruin one of the few important trout fishing streams in Maryland.

We do not oppose the Sixes Bridges and Verona Reservoirs in Maryland and Virginia.

We contend that it should be the responsibility of the Corps to construct all the small soil and water conservation pools in the watersheds above the dam sites of each of the projects proposed before the gates of the large dams are closed. This is only common sense and good economics.

We also contend that the remaining small soil and water conservation structures should be constructed during the next five years, and that studies should be conducted to determine their effect on the water supply and flow level in the Potomac.

In conclusion, we question the need for haste in moving ahead to gain authorization for these reservoirs at this time. Many important decisions relating to the overall Potomac Basin plan, such as the proposed Compact and the National River, are in various stages of development and to proceed with piecemeal authorizations appears premature at this time. This is particularly true during a time when the Nation's financial resources are strained by military and social needs.

We wish to further advise that several meetings have been held with our affiliated organizations in Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia relating to these proposals and they have approved of the position which has been set forth in this Statement.

Thank you for the opportunity of making these remarks.

STATEMENT BY DR. SPENCER M. SMITH, JR., SECRETARY OF THE CITIZENS
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., Secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with offices in Washington, D.C.

Conservation organizations and other interested public groups have had some difficulty in understanding the procedure by which the program of the Corps of Engineers is reviewed and considered.

In the instant case, we assumed that the proposed report by the Corps after Public Hearings would not become final until the opportunity had been afforded the Corps to modify the recommendations, as appropriate, to reflect the comments of the States and other Federal Agencies. After this procedure had been achieved, we understood that the report would be transmitted to Congress for consideration.

We were unaware that the States and Federal Agencies had reported or that the Corps' report reflected their comments. An additional problem has been the analytical consideration of alternatives. This was indicated in Senate Document #97 of the 87th Congress, Second Session. In Section V, Part A, Paragraph (7), the following appears:

"When there are major differences among technically possible plans conceived as desirable on the basis of consideration of intangible benefits and costs, in comparison with optimum plans based on tangible benefits and costs, alternative combinations of projects within a river basin or alternative projects, giving expression to these major differences, shall be planned. Comparison of their economic and financial costs shall be set forth in reports to provide a basis for selection among the alternative by reviewing authorities in the executive branch and by the Congress."

To further buttress this recommendation, a report of the Civil Works Study Board issued in January 1965 comments:

"One of the most frequent criticisms of Corps planning is that the Corps reports tend to show only whether a particular project is or is not economically justified and that alternatives either have not been given sufficient consideration or, at least, have not been discussed in reports so others may judge the Corps recommendation in the light of alternatives. This is a valid criticism and the Corps procedures should be adjusted to meet it. There is evidence that extensive consideration has been given to alternatives in some reports but there are only a few recent examples where the alternatives are described and evaluated in