

about the recreation dollar value of present recreational use of the Rappahannock and Rapidan.

If I understand this correctly, the Bureau of Active Recreation is stating the experience of floating the Rappahannock each day as equal to \$3. If the canoeists know of this, I think it would take more than \$3 to persuade more than us to give up a day, much less a lifetime of canoeing which would be forfeited by the construction of the dam.

In economics, an accepted method of measuring the real cost of a project is to calculate the cost of replacing the values foregone.

We wonder what would be the cost of supplying the values of a free-flowing Rappahannock. I should think the cost would be much greater than the claimed benefits if the dam were in.

The second point I mentioned last September was of water quality. It appears to us that this is a rather cosmetic approach to a much deeper problem than water pollution. You cannot flush it downstream. The problem should be approached at its inception where the problem begins and not try to put it in someone else's jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES. Has that not been an integral part of abating pollution?

Mr. WALDROM. I understand the clean water which would be stored behind the Salem Church Reservoir would be used as an augmentation to improve the water quality downstream.

Mr. JONES. You say it would not contribute to the degradation of the part of the stream reaching at lower stages.

Mr. WALDROM. I think the point is, Mr. Chairman, there is some foreign material that perhaps should be cleaned off at its source.

Mr. JONES. Well, of course, one compliments the other. I do not see that it is a novel idea, that it does not contribute to the dilution of the stream below.

Mr. WALDROM. I am not suggesting it would not increase the turbidity. I would suggest it dilutes it.

Mr. JONES. You may proceed.

Mr. WALDROM. Thank you.

I understand in connection with the pollution problem that exists in Fredericksburg, that area of Virginia is taking steps to curb it, to prevent, to lessen the pollution load of the river by attacking the problem at its source.

Another point I made last September had to do with water supply and flood control aspects, the benefits of the project.

It seems to me as an area resident that a lot of public support upon which this project has been built has accrued from the advertising of the benefits from water supply and flood control, that these really only total I think somewhere around 7 percent of the total benefits.

A fourth point was that of salinity control. I am not about to dispute the argument that this increases the oyster fishery downstream, decreases the agriculture industry upstream.

I think a point could be made for the ecological ramifications of this project.

There are very sensitive forms that breed in estuaries that depend on fresh and saline waters. These are the reasons I gave last fall for this Sierra Clubs questioning of the project benefits.

Since that time additional information has come to our attention which causes us to again question the rationale of the project. This is the Vepco reservoir.