is already flooded and another heavy rain comes along, the flood is

going to be worse than it was before.

3. We object to being flooded out permanently for a dam that is to give Fredericksburg flood control for a flood that has come once in 100 years. It should be noted that a large percentage of the 1942 flood damage as not caused by the Rappahannock River, but by a cloudburst in the Maryes Heights of Fredericksburg and a break in the canal in this area. We want flood control along the entire river, not flood control for Fredericksburg and a break in the canal in

trol for Fredericksburg only.

We believe that smaller impoundments in the upstream areas of the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers would give flood control along the entire river, and could be of great assistance in augmenting riverflow in dry weather, and thereby give Fredericksburg all the water it will need. We believe that these massive dams in one place are now obsolete, and that smaller impoundments are the answer for the entire river. They also assure water for the upstream communities, and will be far cheaper to construct.

4. This Salem Church Dam at elevation 240 will cover 21,000 acres with water. When it drops down 20 feet in dry weather, it will cover only 12,000 acres with water. This leaves 9,000 acres of mud exposed.

It may be even worse since the Army Engineers say the lake level

may drop down 40 feet in extremely dry weather.

This drawdown makes an impossible mudhole around the lake, and it is particularly objectionable in the upper shallow reaches of the lake in Fauquier and Culpeper Counties where the drawdown makes the greatest area of exposed mud. We believe that this kills the proposed lake for recreation and makes the area a recreational loss to the entire

community.

5. We do not go along with the Army Engineers argument that this lake is needed for recreation. Why build a new 21,000-acre lake only 15 miles from the Potomac River where there are ample riverside recreational facilities and hundreds of miles of undeveloped shoreline? Why build a new lake beside a river 5 miles wide and only 15 miles away? We feel that the only kind of recreation the Army gives any value to is motorboating on a lake. We feel that the 21,000 acres of lake land they would flood would serve as better recreation as an area for hunting, fishing, bird shooting, camping, hiking, canoeing, fast water fishing, and wilderness enjoyment; all along the existing natural beauty of the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers. We do not feel that to make an acre of land usable for recreation it must first be flooded.

We do not see the slightest need of additional artificial recreational waters in this area, especially since the Virginia Electric Power Co. has already started on a new lake for their new atomic energy plants on the North Anna River. This lake will have 11,000 acres of water, open to the public for recreation, and it will be only 20 miles from the proposed Salem Church Dam. Surely we do not need to crowd in a Government-built lake on the Rappahannock 20 miles from this new lake of Virginia Electric Power Co. and only 15 miles from the

Potomac River.

Of the costs of the dam, \$12,970,000 is allocated for the recreational share of the project with \$10,400,000 for future recreational costs, making a total of over \$23 million which the taxpayers will have