

with plans for a small dam on the Ni River. This project will satisfy that county's water needs for many years and apparently will also provide an additional source of water for Fredericksburg.

In this connection, the District Engineers' report makes it clear that water supply is a very junior justification for the Salem Church high dam proposal—carrying less than 5 percent of the necessary economic justification for the Salem Church project. Flood control is even less important, accounting for 2 percent of the average annual benefits, while water quality control represents about 8 percent of estimated annual benefits.

The Army Engineers could not, therefore, justify the huge expense of this project without relying on the estimated annual benefits from:

Hydroelectric power to be created—23 percent of total benefits—although more than adequate power for the entire area to be served is soon to be provided by private enterprise through the huge Vepco plant which will be constructed on the nearby North Anna River.

Salinity control which it is hoped, would improve the oyster crop downstream—20 percent—although to provide this estimate the Engineers were forced to rely on a "100-year economic analysis" and to disregard a variety of other economic factors which 50 or 100 years from now might well have a controlling impact on the value of oysters.

Public recreation on the flat water lake above the Salem Church Dam—41 percent of total benefits—although the above-mentioned Vepco dam on the North Anna River will provide a huge 11,000-acre flat water recreational resource in the area without cost to the Government, and other such flat water resources are easily accessible on the lower Rappahannock, lower Potomac and Chesapeake Bay.

Assuming, however, that the Salem Church Dam and Reservoir would produce certain benefits, in terms of water supply, flood control and additional flat water recreation, the basic question, as I see it, is: Do these benefits justify their enormously high cost not only in dollars but in terms of the destruction of a truly unique asset, a historic and scenic stretch of a beautiful river? My own answer to this question is "No." As I have already pointed out, private enterprise and Virginia municipalities have recently taken significant actions to provide large resources of power, water supply and recreation in the area to be served by the Salem Church Dam. Under these circumstances, most of the engineers' economic justifications for the Salem Church project collapses. With the Federal budget in a continuing deficit position, action by the Congress to commit the Government to spend upward of \$100 million for a dam which at this time certainly cannot be shown to be clearly necessary would appear to be fiscally unwise and most unsound.

I respectfully request this Subcommittee and the House Public Works Committee not to approve the Salem Church high dam project, as proposed by the Chief of Engineers.

I want to thank you very much again for giving me this second opportunity to appear.

Mr. JONES. Thank you. It was a pleasure to have you. I will place in the record at this point letters and statements concerning the Rappahannock River and Salem Church projects.

(The information follows:)