

against the corps plan on grounds it would destroy the natural significance of this outstanding example of postglacial ecology and geology. And third, the Advisory Board on National Parks, the members of which constitute many of the Nation's most competent authorities, have accorded eligibility for natural landmark status to the area which would be destroyed by the present design of the corps project. Thus, the values of the upper valley are clearly recognized as of national significance. There are only 130 sites in our entire Nation which have been accorded such recognition since the year 1964. The citation heavily stresses the flood plain characteristics, and natural landmark status will not be granted if the present design of the corps project is approved.

Throughout the progress of this issue, it has been contended that a major project benefit in Big Walnut Valley is for water to Indianapolis. This would be a costly 35-mile interbasin transfer, said to produce a benefit of some \$500,000 annually. The projections of needs and supplies are through the year 2020. It is assumed that, in making these projections, the Corps of Engineers has been thorough and has taken into account all the likelihoods of alternative sources. However, the record clearly indicates that the corps has been less than thorough. At no point in our studies of the third interim report are we able to find any reference to the plan announced January 24, 1968, by the Indianapolis Water Co. to construct a 21-billion-gallon reservoir in the Mud Creek Basin just northeast and upstream of Indianapolis. There is not even any mention of the storage potential there. This project is claimed to be adequate for municipal supply to a population of 1 million. The most updated population figures for Indianapolis released only a few days ago indicate the population is now 519,000. The absence of any mention whatever of the Mud Creek storage cannot be overemphasized.

A conclusion, or a question, which can be raised now is why the Federal Government should be asked to authorize and/or appropriate at least \$25 million in tax funds—plus another \$15 million in State tax funds—for a project that will be at least partly redundant to a water supply which will be built through private investment, and which is also expected to provide general recreation benefits.

It is entirely possible, even at this awkward date, that the corps and other interests supporting the Big Walnut flood project may attempt to demonstrate a relationship between the private Mud Creek project and the proposed Federal project in Big Walnut Valley. However, it is obvious that a surplus and completely unanticipated supply will become available from Mud Creek well within the projection period to 2020. The Mud Creek private project is scheduled for completion by 1977. Whether or not some form of relationship between the two sources can now be shown by Big Walnut Reservoir proponents, it would seem clear that if any water for Indianapolis is needed—or ever will be—from Big Walnut, that delivery can be reduced by some increment related to the new increment from Mud Creek.

Thus, our contention that smaller, less expensive plans on Big Walnut should be considered, appears viable. This factor makes many of the entirely feasible alternatives to the present plan much more attractive. The third interim report should be set aside and returned