

cause there would not be enough water available. By contrast, Vepco's Possum Point plant can provide about $5\frac{1}{2}$ times as much power every hour of every day.

The Salem Dam's power output would be small, it would be irregular. With recent improvements in the efficiency of steam plants, a plant such as Possum Point may be able to produce power more cheaply than a hydroelectric facility such as the Salem Dam. And, in the not too distant future, nuclear power could turn out to be the cheapest source of all.

There's no shortage of electrical power in this area now. None is foreseen. Why waste money putting unneeded federal power facilities in the Salem Dam?

Another 20 per cent of the dam's benefits is listed for "salinity control." This means the water released from the dam would be used to control the salt content of the Rappahannock downstream. The Engineers guess that this would improve oyster production by some \$1,500,000 a year. Maybe, maybe not.

41 per cent for recreation, 23 per cent for power, 20 per cent for salinity control—about 85 per cent of the dam's benefits are listed for projects of doubtful essentiality. Whether it's federal money, state money, local money or money from our own pocket, we hate to see money wasted. The Salem Dam—with only 15 per cent of its benefits going to meet the essential needs of water supply, water quality control and flood control—would be one of the most wasteful pork barrel projects imaginable.

* * * * *

With modern know-how and equipment it's no problem to build a big dam. The Army engineers are good at it. But we submit that it's wrong to use our technological capabilities to unnecessarily destroy our natural environment.

The lake to be created by the proposed Salem Dam would stretch some 26 miles upriver from the dam. It would flood some of the most beautiful portions of the Rappahannock. Free-flowing water would be replaced by an artificial lake. At times the level of the lake would be lowered, resulting in ugly mud flats around its rim, mud flats that would destroy much of the lake's usefulness.

The Engineers don't talk about the destruction that would be created by the dam. But destruction there would be. Needless destruction, because a huge dam, 203 feet high, is not the only means of developing the river's resources.

* * * * *

Nine years ago engineering firms hired by the city said that Fredericksburg's water needs could be met until the year 2000 by a \$900,000 dam project on Mott's Run in Spotsylvania County. It wouldn't be a huge concrete monument to the Army Engineers but it would be big enough to store the water we need. The cost would have been less than the million dollars the city had volunteered as a contribution to the cost of the Salem Dam. Now, nine years after the report, the city is beginning to consider seriously the Mott's Run project.

The same report listed four other spots where small dams might be desirable. Such dams might well be a source of water supply for nearby counties.

By devoting to a study of a small dam or dams one tenth of the time and energy that have been lavished on the Salem Dam it should also be possible to devise a system that would provide some measure of flood control and water quality control.

The Engineers estimate that their Salem Church Dam would cost \$79.5 million. Since the Engineers' cost estimates are usually low, the ultimate figure will probably be even greater. We think that's too much money to spend on a dam that will be too big, flooding under normal circumstances some 21,300 acres ranging as far as 26 miles up the river.

Let's abandon this infatuation with monstrous dams and get to work on a project more reasonable in scope and more suited to our real needs.

STATEMENT BY DR. SPENCER M. SMITH, JR., SECRETARY OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE
ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I am Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., Secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a national conservation organization with offices in Washington, D.C.

Conservation organizations and other interested public groups have had some difficulty in understanding the procedure by which the program of the Corps of Engineers is reviewed and considered.

In the instant case, we assumed that the proposed report by the Corps after Public Hearings would not become final until the opportunity had been afforded