

has been made. The pie charts and descriptive material before you, I think, demonstrate this conclusively.

Senator ALLOTT. May I ask where are these pie charts? I have a tabulation at the end of my statement but no pie charts.

Mr. CRAFTS. You should have one of these green booklets, Senator Allott.

Senator ALLOTT. Thank you.

Secretary UDALL. For example, the three Federal agencies—National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—have acquired 310,000 acres with an expenditure of \$88 million since the initiation of the fund.

On the State and local side, there was some slowness getting started because it was necessary to have prepared and approved statewide outdoor recreation plans. All States have done this and as of January 1, 1968, State and local governments had submitted some 3,300 projects for \$278 million to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Of this amount, some 2,400 projects with a Federal expenditure of \$138 million have been approved. The apportionment between Federal and State agencies of the \$370 million appropriated has been 39 percent Federal and 61 percent State.

Many of the States are in a position to considerably more than match the Federal dollars that have been available.

That is one of the encouraging things, the leadership that many of the States have provided in this area.

About a year ago, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation took a hard look at the long-range program needs under the fund and the problem of land price escalation. Its report on price escalation has previously been made available to this committee. It showed a prospective need during the next 10 years of \$3.6 billion, prospective revenues to the land and water conservation fund of a little less than \$1 billion, and a prospective deficit of \$2.7 billion.

In approaching the question of what to do, three alternatives were considered. The first of these was to devise new sources of revenue to meet the 10-year deficit of \$2.7 billion. A second alternative was a more modest approach of looking 5 years ahead with a total program objective of \$1.5 billion. A third and still more conservative approach was a 5-year program with an objective of \$1 billion. Even this third alternative is about twice the present level.

These alternatives and the amounts that would go to the various agencies, plus possible revenue sources are shown in more detail below.