

alent with the possible exception that the FMC Corporation's level of treatment may be slightly less than secondary due to technological problems insolvable at this time.

The above information is provided to show that recent Board action taken, although not to facilitate the construction of the Salem Church Dam, will at least facilitate the assignment of benefits for the release of water for water quality control.

A great deal of staff study has been conducted since 1946 in order to enable the staff to make recommendations to the Board concerning the treatment needs of owners located in the lower Rappahannock River Basin. The data collected by the staff was used by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in compiling the report incorporating the water quality aspects of the construction of the Salem Church Dam.

We feel that the Rappahannock River below Fredericksburg might be characterized as a pond during periods of low flow. This is because the river in this area is influenced by tide and flow fresh water from upstream is so low that this tidal influence is not overcome. This results in large volumes of waste being discharged daily to a small segment of the river with very little of the waste being carried downstream due to the above-mentioned characteristics. You can well imagine the resulting conditions from this situation during extended periods of low river flow.

The staff, in recommending that the Board continue to keep pressure on the owners in the Fredericksburg area, has always informed the Board that the very expensive and extensive types of treatment required would in no way completely solve the problems in the Fredericksburg area. The addition of treatment, however, would mean that a shorter segment of the river would be adversely affected and that the frequency and duration of the adverse effect would be shorter than heretofore experienced.

We have always been convinced that in order to obtain acceptable water quality below Fredericksburg, additional dilution water from upstream would be needed during periods of low flow. A dam such as Salem Church will have the effect of flattening the characteristic peaks and valleys in the flow curve for the Rappahannock in this area, so that when there is an over-abundance of flow water can be stored for release during drought periods. As a result, we will be assured that flow in the Rappahannock at any time will never be lower than a certain figure. We are confident that if the Salem Church Dam becomes a reality, this guaranteed minimum flow coupled with higher degrees of treatment in the area will result in much more desirable water quality below Fredericksburg.

I hope the above information is satisfactory. However, if we can provide additional information, please let us know.

Very truly yours,

A. H. RAESSLER, *Executive Secretary.*

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
HOUSE OF DELEGATES,
Richmond, June 19, 1968.

HON. ROBERT JONES,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Flood Control,
Committee on Public Works,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have reviewed the report prepared by the Department of the Army, dated May 2, 1966, relative to the Salem Church Reservoir Project on the Rappahannock River. I have also conferred with representatives of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science at Gloucester Point, Virginia, relative to this Project.

I am convinced that the controlled release of water from this Reservoir can prevent the excessive run-offs of fresh water such as we experienced in 1955 which resulted in the destruction of about 80 per cent of all oysters in the lower Rappahannock River from just below Tappahannock to Urbanna, Virginia, a distance of about twenty-five miles.

I am also satisfied that this project will vastly improve the water quality of the river just below Fredericksburg. I have consulted with the staff of the State Water Control Board of Virginia requesting their comments and opinions, a copy