

Mr. ROWE. I also have nine letters of endorsement that I should like to read at this point, with your permission, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. You may proceed.

Mr. ROWE. First Mr. Chairman, is a statement of Francis S. Kenny, director of planning, Rappahannock Area Development Commission, a letter addressed to you, which reads as follows:

The Rappahannock Area Development Commission is a tax-supported Regional Planning Commission for the Central Area of the Rappahannock River Basin.

We appreciate this opportunity to present to your Committee, in support of the Salem Church Reservoir project, certain considerations which we feel have not been forcibly brought out. The Norfolk District, Corps of Engineers, in answer to a resolution of a Senate Committee, conducted a most exhaustive survey, which results are indicated in their comprehensive report dated May 1966. The engineering details are contained in that report. We, therefore, wish to point out additional economic benefits, thus establishing the far reaching effects of the project.

The reservoir proposed would provide a surface area of fresh water of 21,000 acres. The taking or acquisition area for flood protection and recreational area potential is 47,450 acres. Therefore, if we compare the watershed alone of 1,739,520 acres, the reservoir taking area amounts to only 2.5 percent of the total drainage area of the river.

The area which in the future will be served by water supply alone will exceed the total basin area by 300 percent to 500 percent. There are presently on record requests by jurisdictions outside of the watershed for reservation of water supply. The resultant economic benefits to the entire area, therefore, exceed the direct cost benefit ratio of the project as determined by the Corps of Engineers, many-fold.

This would be the largest lake in the Northern section of Virginia, north of the James River at Richmond. The population tourist potential (the second largest industry in Virginia) with a drawing power within a hundred mile radius in excess of 7,000,000 people, further indicates a spendable dollar for the counties immediately surrounding the reservoir far in excess of the direct cost benefit used by the Corps of Engineers.

Land values in the vicinity of the lake will increase by three to five times within five years of the completion of the reservoir. The economic advantage to each of the counties would be, therefore, equivalent to the location of a rather large industry in each of the counties. This is a multi-purpose dam, and the relationship of the values for each of the purposes should be borne clearly in mind. Salinity control for the counties downriver is assigned 26.65 percent of the cost. Recreation is assigned 18.42 percent of the cost. Water quality control is assigned 19.36 percent of the cost. Power supply is assigned 18.22 percent of the cost. Water supply benefits equal 9.67 percent of the cost. Flood control is assigned 7.68 percent of the cost.

Suggestions have been made that in lieu of one dam, several smaller dams upstream would serve the same purpose. The Corps of Engineers, as is indicated in their report, have investigated this point and determined to their satisfaction that such would not be the case. The cost would be greater and the benefits, particularly with relation to flood control, would not result.

Comparisons have also been made with other dams in the United States with particular reference to the drawn-down feature which on reservoirs designed solely for flood control has left an undesirable shoreline at certain periods of the operation. It must be remembered that this project is a multi-purpose proposal serving many uses and its design, therefore, tends to reduce the average draw-down to a minimum. Item 99 on page 30 of the Corps of Engineers Review Report (page 43 of Sen. Doc. 37) indicates that the draw-down in eight out of ten years on an average, during the twenty weeks of primary recreation season, would be ten feet or less with a possible draw-down once in fifty-seven years that would reach twenty-five feet during the summer season. This would not have a significantly adverse effect on the potential of the project to provide an enjoyable recreation experience, to quote the Corps of Engineers.

In my work as a member of the Virginia Metropolitan Areas Study Commission, we have conducted more than twenty-five full days of study in the past year on metropolitan area problems. The problems are those of growth. The cities attract people. Part of our consideration to alleviate metropolitan problems is to create a more viable and enjoyable atmosphere outside of the metropolitan area which would not only retain population, but would attract people