

ably the most outstanding difference, the mileage ranging from a minimum of 105 in the Senate-passed bill, to 340 in Mr. Saylor's bill. The Chairman's bill and Mr. Reuss' bill are the same.

On this list, those rivers for immediate designation from the Shenandoah River down appear only in Mr. Saylor's bill.

The point here is that the rivers are quite different not only in name, but quite different in length.

I think referring back to the table on the preceding page you will note that the development costs, in relation to the acquisition costs, underrun the acquisition cost except in the chairman's bill. Usually the ratio is the other way around. Usually in a national park or national recreation area, the development costs end up by being two, or sometimes more than twice the acquisition costs.

The probable reason the development costs are higher than the acquisition costs in the chairman's bill is that so much of the land and the rivers named is already in public ownership. But this is only a supposition on my part as to the reason for this difference.

Further, and this is a very broad estimate, we estimate that to make the necessary studies of the rivers so specified in the bills for study would average about \$50,000 per river. This means that the costs of the study part of the bill could range from a minimum of \$1 million in the chairman's bill, to \$3.3 million in H.R. 90.

As I say, these are very crude estimates.

The fourth paragraph of the Department's report of last August makes clear that any combination of the designated rivers, as indicated in the chairman's bill, in Mr. Reuss' bill, or in the Senate-passed bill, would be acceptable for designation at the present time. If you combined the rivers in those three bills up to the point of the Shenandoah and stopped—we did not include Mr. Saylor's bill in this policy statement—utilizing the longest length indicated, the estimated cost of acquisition would be about \$38 million.

Now turning to the Department's proposed amendments.

When we reported on these bills on August 14, we reported on a group of them, but we directed our comments to H.R. 8416. I believe there are some 17 amendments.

I am sorry the number is so large, because I think it is misleading.

Most of these amendments, in our judgment, can be properly interpreted as clarifying or perfecting, and not of consequence substantive.

We do believe that amendments 1, 2, 4, 6, and 17 are substantive suggestions, and I would like to mention those.

With respect to the first amendment that we propose, the bill, as introduced, provides for the identification of boundaries through maps. Our preference would be that the boundaries be established after we have made more thorough on-the-ground surveys than we have at the present time. I believe there is language in the report which proposes that the boundaries generally will not extend to a width of more than a quarter of a mile from either side of the river. Another way of expressing it is that the maximum that could be included per mile would be 320 acres.

Now, under this provision, as I am sure you realize, this would let us squeeze in and out like an accordion—come down to a hundred