

developed by joint and coordinated action of all the agencies, both Federal and State, concerned with the development, utilization and conservation of the Nation's rivers. Only in this way is it possible to insure that the withdrawal of a particular stream will be in consonance with an optimum comprehensive plan for the river basin in which it is located. In other words, each plan should be developed in accordance with the principles of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965.

Fourth, that the report and plan for each proposed wild river should present both (a) the advantages of the Nation of preserving the stream in its natural state, and (b) the economic values that would result from its development, so that before the Congress makes a decision it will know what the Nation would be giving up in the form of material wealth in order to preserve the intangible benefits of an unspoiled natural area.

There are undoubtedly a number of streams in the United States for which the intangible benefits of preservation will clearly outweigh the material gains attainable through development. But for very few of these have studies been made which provide an adequate basis for a wise decision. Yet H.R. 90, for example, proposes that the Congress immediately authorize the setting aside of 16 streams. As indicated previously, we believe that Congress should authorize individual wild rivers only after it has all the facts before it, including information as to the relationship of the wild river proposal to a comprehensive river basin plan. We suggest, therefore, that bills like H.R. 90 be amended to require that reports and plans for each proposed wild river area be submitted to Congress for its consideration prior to the enactment of legislation authorizing the withdrawal of that area.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. McGIFFERT,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., June 9, 1967.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: This is in response to your letter of April 17 requesting our views with respect to a number of bills relating to the designation and management of scenic rivers. Our comments are limited to those bills which would create a nationwide system of scenic rivers.

Since its establishment in 1933, TVA has concerned itself with protecting and where possible enhancing scenic and related recreational resources in the Tennessee Valley. Accordingly, we support the broad objectives of the "scenic rivers" bills now before the Congress. However, as the federal agency with special responsibility for the development of all the resources of the Tennessee Valley, we think that scenic rivers legislation should recognize TVA's regional development role and provide for its participation in the designation and management of scenic river areas within the Tennessee Basin.

With reference to the Buffalo River in Tennessee (which is specifically mentioned in several of the bills), we wish the Committee to know that we are currently conducting an intensive staff study to determine its potential as a scenic riverway. If our study indicates the desirability and feasibility of using the Buffalo for such purpose, we propose to request funds for demonstration in the utilization of a free-flowing stream (and its adjacent land resources) for selective recreation and other compatible activities. We also propose to cooperate with the State of Tennessee in planning and developing the river's scenic resources.

So far as the Upper French Broad and the Little Tennessee Rivers are concerned (they are listed among 82 rivers or portions thereof for immediate designation or future study in H.R. 90 and H.R. 493), we think that planning and construction of water control and development projects have progressed to a point which would make it inappropriate to include these streams in currently proposed "scenic rivers" legislation. Both are scenic but not uniquely so and neither is free flowing or wild.