

ing a plan of management and protection that the Secretary finds compatible with the purposes of the Act.

There is also included a clarifying amendment here to make clear that Land and Water Conservation Fund moneys can be used for the purposes of acquisition. I believe that this relates to a possible problem of the Forest Service where it might be acquiring lands outside authorized boundaries of the National Forest. I believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act in general limits the Forest Service to the use of such funds within the boundaries of the forest as established at the time the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act passed.

So this is really only a clarifying point.

Another substantive amendment is that as we read the bill, that all federally assisted water resources projects constructed on or directly affecting a river included in the system be precluded. This turns in part on interpretation of water resource projects. Again we are advised that sewage treatment plants might be construed as water resource projects, and we think that construction of such plants might be desirable.

So we have recommended that the bill be amended to preclude water resources projects that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the rivers are established. I would judge here that the intent is the same.

The last substantive amendment concerns special provisions with respect to the Allagash River and that portion of the Wolf River administered by the State with Federal financial assistance.

There was considerable discussion of the Wolf this morning. I can give you some specific cost figures and so on on it if you wish to go into that further.

The Allagash was not mentioned this morning. This is a stretch of a hundred or 120 miles in northern Maine which is being purchased and administered by the State. The expenditures by the State is being matched by a grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We are putting into it \$750,000, and the State voted a bond issue. That money is available, titles are being searched, and the land is under acquisition now. It would be administered as a State wilderness river. The widths are somewhat different. There is a maximum width under the State law of a mile on each side of the river for fee acquisition. I emphasize "maximum." And a maximum 2-mile width for scenic acquisition.

But this does not seem to us to be a hindrance to including this river, administered by the State and owned by the State, as part of the National System of Scenic Rivers if the Governor of the State so recommends. And we offer an amendment to that effect.

Essentially the same thing applies to the Wolf—although the pattern is a little different. Again, without going into the details on the Wolf, the part in Langlade County will be handled exactly the same way as the Allagash was handled—it is going to be a State river with State management. The State is acquiring greater widths than are provided for in these bills. And we have a commitment I believe for over a period of several years for about \$511,000 out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to match the State inputs. The lower part of the river would be strictly in the pattern of the scenic rivers legislation as it may pass, and be a federally administered river.