

we were successful in reducing the amount of oxygen-consuming waste discharged to the Rappahannock River by one-half even though production capacity had been doubled. In June 1966, an \$800,000 waste treatment pilot plant was put into operation. This unit further reduced oxygen-consuming waste by approximately one-third. Additional treatment units, at a cost approaching \$500,000, will be put into operation by 1970. This will result in another reduction of oxygen-consuming waste by approximately 50 percent. With this step, the overall reduction in the potential oxygen-consuming waste since 1946 will approximate 90 percent.

Despite these efforts there will still be oxygen depletion. Studies indicate that even without any municipal or industrial discharges, oxygen depletion will occur during periods of low river flow. An indication of the condition of the river is the action of the Virginia State Water Control Board on March 24, 1964, when it stated that it would approve no additional waste discharge at this time to the Rappahannock River or its tributaries near Fredericksburg.

Such conditions are a deterrent to possible expansion of our present production facilities and to other industrial development in the Fredericksburg area. Thus, the economic growth of the area will be stunted unless steps are taken to correct these conditions. It is our understanding that the Salem Church Reservoir project will correct these conditions and permit industrial development and orderly economic growth.

There appears to be little doubt that the present river conditions cannot support the requirements of an estimated 7 million people predicted within a 50-mile radius of the reservoir by the year 2020. Thus, the development of the urban corridor between Washington and Richmond will eventually require a project such as the Salem Church Reservoir. However, even the present economic stability and well-being of the Rappahannock River Valley is being stifled. For these reasons we endorse without reservation the Salem Church Reservoir project.

It is hoped that these comments will be helpful to you in your considerations on this project.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to present to the committee Mr. Julian Alexander, commissioner of water resources of the Department of Conservation and Economic Development of the State of Virginia.

Mr. JONES. Please to have you, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. Could I make one statement before we get into the other gentleman's testimony?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to acknowledge the fact that the gentleman from Virginia very energetically pursued this project and has contacted me a number of times on it. He has shown a deep interest in it, and as far as I am personally concerned, has expended every effort to at least see that my vote on the committee would be for the project.

The only difference I have with him is my position in relation to public power.

I did want the record to show that he has been very effective and very persuasive in his efforts to have this project put forward.