

Beginning with June 1966, there have been eight meetings of the Advisory Council held in conjunction with regional hearings. This approximates a 2-month frequency of meetings rather than a 6 months' one. Are the duties and the contributions of the council to the work of the Commission such that these more frequent and enthusiastic costlier gatherings are justified?

Mr. PEARL. We think so, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated, we think that the members of the Advisory Council have benefited by attending the meetings at which the public has testified. We did not have formal advisory council meetings at each of these public meetings and we had, as I have indicated, six formal meetings of the Advisory Council. On the occasion of these other public meetings we have had members of the Advisory Council in attendance. They benefited not only from hearing the testimony but from going out on the ground and we think there is no substitute for seeing the actual lands.

Senator CHURCH. The last question that Senator Hayden would like asked is this: The Commission organized in mid-1965 and its staff was fairly complete by the end of that year. By the end of 1966, a number of proposed study plans were completed and had been circulated for review. Testimony at the August 16, 1967 House hearings showed that a substantial number of these plans had not yet been resolved into studies under contract. This record suggests the possibility of a serious constriction in this step of the Commission's procedure which may be a significant factor in the Commission's failure to meet the original time schedule. What is being done to reduce this timelag?

Mr. PEARL. Well after a study plan is designed and circulated among the Commissioners and the members of the Commission's official family, we get the comments back and the next step after that is to revise the study plan in conformance with those comments that we believe appropriate, then to discuss with members of the Advisory Council, members of the Commission, the Government agencies, how to go about doing the studies. We try to find out in that period of time what data are available from the departments so that we do not wind up paying a contractor to do the work of obtaining data that are available from the departments.

Then the final step in the process is to put the study plan into a request for proposal format and go out for bids. Well, it is only this last step that has not been taken on the bulk of these study plans, because we have been unable to go out for bids because of the failure to have the funds.

Senator CHURCH. You think that with the enactment of this bill the logjam, in other words will break quickly.

Mr. PEARL. Yes, sir; and then we can go ahead with the schedule that we have laid out and proceed immediately with these other studies.

Senator CHURCH. I wonder if you could tell us for the record just what is involved when the study is completed; that is, the contractor's study is returned to the Commission staff. How much time, for example do you contemplate will then be required by the staff to make its own analysis and evaluation of the study, and how do you propose to keep the members of the Commission advised? If you could explain what the plan is that you have in mind I think it would be helpful.