cling to the proposition that a huge and vastly expensive high dam is the only way to get enough water for Fredericksburg. We contend that Fredericksburg can get all the water it needs from impoundments by smaller dams in the headwaters of the Rappahannock River and other streams west of Fredericksburg. These would also take care of flood control. We submit that the further criteria which govern the building of a dam of this size are lacking. The kind of water recreation which is being stressed by proponents of the dam is not needed in an area which has already access to the far greater facilities of the Potomac River, the Chesapeake Bay, and the wide Rappahannock River below Fredericksburg. The Supervisors of Fauquier County also oppose the dam.

The Supervisors of Culpeper and Fauquier Counties further propose to have a park at Kelly's Ford which would make the Rappahannock River accessible to all who appreciate the beauty and rarity of an unpolluted wild river, the joys of camping, hiking, hunting, white water canoeing and fast water fishing.

Electric power to serve increasing needs is in excellent supply with the new Mt. Storm VEPCO plant. Nuclear power is an increasing reality each day.

The alternative of flooding and destroying what is now good tax paying farmland and the historic Rappahannock River Valley and its ancient Canal locks is coupled with a heavy burden on the taxpayers for the initial cost of the dam and subsequent fund-matching to develop the so-called recreational facilities of the man-made lake. In addition there will be a new set of fees which the Army Corps of Engineers expects to levy on private citizens using the lake.

It is a waste of the taxpayers' dollars and will serve only as a further aggrandizement of the Army Corps of Engineers whose activities should be devoted to useful Harbor and Ship channel projects, not the destruction of Virginia's natural resources of farm land and white water river beauty.

The Warrenton Garden Club, therefore, joins the other citizens and organizations and the elected government of Fauquier County in opposing the Salem Church Dam.

Dated: June 20, 1968.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CULPEPER COUNTY,
CULPEPER, VA., *June 19, 1968.*

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES,
Chairman, Flood Control Subcommittee, House Public Works Committee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

(Att: Mrs. Augusta Peterson, Clerk, House Public Works Committee).

DEAR SIR: It has been called to our attention that the House Public Works Committee will hold a hearing on 20 June, 1968, regarding the proposed Salem Church Dam Project.

We have also been advised by Mrs. Augusta Peterson, Clerk of the House Public Works Committee, that all the testimony taken before the Senate Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers & Harbors on September 21, 1967, will also become a part of and will act as testimony before your committee on June 20th, 1968, on the same subject.

Therefore, the Culpeper County Board of Supervisors ask that this letter be made a part of the June 20th, 1968, proceedings to reiterate our opposition to the construction of the Salem Church Dam at the 240 foot level. We further wish to state that our position is exactly the same as that expressed before the Senate Sub-committee on September 21st, 1968.

Very truly yours,

W. G. WHITE, *Chairman.*

ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Harrisburg, Pa., June 18, 1968.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Flood Control, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: On September 21, 1967, I submitted a written statement on behalf of the Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. in vigorous support of immediate authorization of the Salem Church Project in Virginia.

Enclosed you will find a copy of this statement, which we would like to have included in the testimony of the hearings on June 20, 1968.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. MATSON,
Executive Vice President.