

A prime example is the acquisition of recreation land at nationally famous Lake Tahoe, made possible through Land and Water Conservation Funding. To date, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of the few federal programs which we feel are being administered with the least strings attached and with benefits to such a wide segment of the population.

Nevada, like many states, and the federal resource agencies are experiencing demands for Land and Water Conservation funds far exceeding the money presently available.

We have felt for some time that if the intent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was going to be fully implemented, a new source of funding would have to be found to increase present state and federal apportionments. We have studied Senate Bill 1401 in detail and urge its passage in principle at the earliest possible date. Amendments proposed by the Department of the Interior may have merit as we certainly do not advocate legislating funds in excess of what can feasibly be used in the recreation program.

We do question the Department of the Interior's proposal for stabilizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund at \$200 million and changing the distribution ratio to 50% federal and 50% state. Presently, the existing state-federal distribution is 60-40; with 60% of the money being allocated to the states.

We feel prior to changing this ratio very careful consideration should be given to determine if adequate funding would be available to the states under the proposed 50-50 modification and to insure that equitable apportionment between the states and the federal agencies is achieved.

It is impossible to determine under the Department of the Interior's stabilization plan, the amount Nevada's apportionment would increase.

I hope that your committee and the Congress will proceed rapidly with the enactment of a bill that will carry out the intent of S. 1401 and retain the present state-federal distribution at 60-40 until such time as studies show a need for change.

Sincerely,

PAUL LAXALT, *Governor of Nevada.*

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Carson City, Nev., February 5, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: In reviewing S. 2828, I find that passage of this legislation will prohibit the charging of fees in connection with projects administered by the Secretary of the Army as provided for under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation program in the State of Nevada has created a public interest in all of our resources. We have not only received substantial financial support in our recreation programs, but we have received indirect benefits which cannot be measured in money.

Developing our State Park Master Plan, as required in the program, has done more to coordinate the thinking, planning, and programing of our various resource interests than any program with which we have worked in our State. Resource interests on both the federal and local levels who have in the past had conflicting views on the development and use of our natural resources, worked closely together in an effort to develop a plan which would serve the best interests of our state and nation.

Our State Park Program will be developed with due regard to all of our natural resources, and with the objective of obtaining the greatest benefits for the public. I am confident that without the incentive created by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation program and the Land and Water Conservation Fund monies, it would have taken many years to achieve this coordination.

I appreciate that in any new program of this nature we cannot avoid some public resistance, but the benefits we have derived and those we can expect in the future will far outweigh the small resentment we are experiencing now.

Receipts from the Golden Eagle portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program have been a disappointment to all of us and studies are in process in an attempt to correct deficiencies. It would not be in the best interests of the Land and Water Conservation program to pass legislation such as S. 2828 pending the results of the investigations and studies.