

former brought into clear public focus because of the critical low flows of recent summers.

The basic issue therefore before the league, the people of Virginia, and Americans everywhere, is whether it is necessary or desirable to construct a \$79.5 million project to produce average annual benefits of \$340,000 for water supply and \$157,000 for flood control—totaling less than 7 percent of the annual benefits claimed for the project.

Further, one might question the accuracy of the \$79.5 million figure (\$69.1 million now, \$10.4 million later for recreation). We note that the Corps of Engineers expects to purchase the 47,453 acres required for the project at an average of \$124 per acre—including 36,149 acres of woodland at \$60 per acre. We are not qualified land appraisers, but some of our members own property or are closely acquainted with landowners in the Rappahannock Basin—and it is our judgment that land costs may run at least 50 percent higher. If this is true, and if other estimates are equivalent in accuracy, the actual cost of Salem Church could run well over \$100 million.

On the basis of estimated benefits, Salem Church is being constructed 41 percent for outdoor recreation. We have carefully reviewed corps and Bureau of Outdoor Recreation projected use figures, and note that subsequent events have outdated them. In the spring of 1968, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. announced plans to build a large nuclear power station on the nearby North Anna River. The North Anna project will include power station on the nearby North Anna River. The North Anna project will include an 11,000-acre lake to be available for public recreation in site much more convenient to recreation users. VEPCO's reservoir will be 23 miles from Fredericksburg, 37 miles from Richmond, and 9 miles from Charlottesville. The Salem Church reservoir would be closer to Fredericksburg but farther from the other cities. The North Anna impoundment will thus meet much of the demand for flat water recreation which underlies the projected recreation statistics for the Salem Church project.

Additionally, when municipal and industrial pollution of the Rappahannock is abated, the Rappahannock estuary will provide greatly enhanced flat water recreation opportunities.

Salem Church is, of course, controversial because of its impact on quality recreation values. We have here the old issue of quantity versus quality in outdoor planning—the league is disturbed that neither the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation nor the Commonwealth of Virginia chose to explore fully both sides of this issue.

The Rappahannock River may be unique among east coast streams. Above Fredericksburg, the Rappahannock River of 1967 is clean and so unpolluted as to be safe for any use. Its banks are largely forested—nearly wilderness in character, inhabited by deer, wild turkey, and ruffed grouse. Along it are the ruins of an old canal, now overgrown by deep and silent woods. To give this river a value of \$900 per year for canoeing is as reasonable as stating that Rock Creek Park has an annual value of only \$900 for skiing—and stating no more.

Today's Rappahannock could well be put in the "Wild and Scenic Rivers Act" recently passed 84 to 0 by the U.S. Senate—and it would be unique as the only stream so designated and located in a megalopolis. We certainly accept the fact that eastern Virginia must plan now to meet future water supply needs—we hope others will face the fact that