

**STATEMENT OF CLIVE L. DUVAL II, A MEMBER OF THE VIRGINIA
HOUSE OF DELEGATES**

Mr. DuVal. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Clive L. DuVal II, of McLean, Va. I am a member of the Virginia House of Delegates representing the Fairfax-Falls Church area. I do not live near the Rappahannock, but the river is so rich in history, so magnificent in its scenery, that its fate must concern all Virginians and, in truth, all Americans.

I, therefore, appreciate very much the opportunity to make this statement regarding the proposed Salem Church dam and reservoir, which would destroy a long stretch of the Rappahannock between Fredericksburg and Remington. The Salem Church project is controversial, and testimony by proponents and opponents at this hearing should provide basis for a balanced evaluation of it.

I understand that the Salem Church dam to be built on the Rappahannock about 6 miles above Fredericksburg would be one of the highest in the East, rising 263 feet above sea level at its highest point, with flood storage capacity to an elevation of 250.5 feet. Maximum height above the riverbed would be 203 feet. Cost of construction and related recreation facilities is estimated by the Corps of Engineers at \$79.5 million, but in view of rising land and other prices, actual costs would almost certainly run well over \$100 million, most of which would be paid by the Federal Government. Water backed up behind the dam would create a lake 37 miles long flooding 21,300 acres. The Rappahannock would be submerged for 26 miles, and the Rapidan for 27 miles above the dam. Lost would be historic sites along the Rappahannock, such as Kelly's Ford, marking engagements during the War Between the States; lost also would be most of the Fredericksburg-Waterloo Canal built in the early 1800's and still amazingly well preserved; many miles of wild and unspoiled river flowing through undeveloped and magnificent country; fine small-mouth bass fishing and canoeing along scenic, rock-filled rapids. I also note in the District Engineer's report the statement at page 43 that the proposed reservoir would have a "fluctuating water level." During average summer draw-downs, this would mean, according to opponents of the project, that thousands of acres of what is now flat, rich farmland below Remington would annually reappear as mudflats.

This catalog of problems is set forth to demonstrate that the Salem Church project may carry with it not only the benefits set forth in the Engineer's report, but also serious disadvantages, not one of which, so far as I can find, is even mentioned in that report. A decision of whether to proceed with the Salem Church Dam or to seek some other alternative clearly requires a recognition and weighing of the disadvantages of the project as against the prospective benefits.

So far as benefits are concerned, no one questions the right of Fredericksburg and other jurisdictions along the Rappahannock to a sufficient water supply over the years to come. But equally obviously, an adequate supply could be assured by a much smaller dam or dams. In fact, Fredericksburg has recently decided to build a dam on Motts Run at a cost of \$806,000, which will store 1.3 billion gallons of water and will take care of the city's water needs until close to the year 2000. Further, I understand that the County of Spotsylvania is proceeding