

years—a \$400 million level, a \$300 million level, and a \$200 million level. That latter is the far right—alternative three. Under the chairman's bill, as we have tentatively programed that money out, as between how it goes to the Forest Service, the Park Service, and how much to new park authorizations—already enacted ones—and the scenic rivers—we have tentatively programed out \$9 million for acquisition in the first 5 years if the Congress enacts the \$200 million level. This would cover the requirements of Mr. Aspinall's bill.

I should say, too, that of course this is very tentative because adjustments can be made within this total. But this is the way it is programed at this time.

I should also point out that these acquisitions presuppose something that may not happen. They presuppose fee acquisition for an average of 100 acres per mile—400 feet, and easement acquisition for the balance of the acreage between 400 and 1,320 feet.

Now, it is quite possible that both the fee acquisition and the easement acquisition would be less than that. It would not be more than that. If these cost figures are realistic, this is the anticipated amount or the highest you would get, not counting escalation. However, the history of all of this has been that the cost estimates are always low. So my guess is these figures are not too high.

The St. Croix, one little comment—Senator Nelson pointed out this morning negotiation is underway with Northern State Power Co., and so on. We do not know what is coming out of that, but the indicated acquisition cost estimate from Taylor Falls on up, is \$7 million. This applies to estimates made before the Northern States Power question entered into the picture. The Park Service has just given me a newer figure which indicates that the range here might be anything from between \$3 and \$4 million to about \$7 million. So we may be a little bit off on that.

But I thought you ought to know how these costs related to what the Land and Water Conservation Fund capabilities might be.

Thank you, sir.

(The prepared complete statement of Mr. Crafts follows:)

STATEMENT OF EDWARD C. CRAFTS, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

I am privileged to testify today on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior in support of legislation to establish a National scenic rivers system.

Secretary Udall asked me to express his deep regret that he was unable to adjust prior out-of-town commitments in order to appear personally. I know he had every intention of testifying himself because of the importance attached to these pending bills as one of the 4 or 5 major conservation legislative items now pending before the Congress.

The Senate passed a bill in the first Session of this Congress to establish a wild and scenic rivers system. That, coupled with the early consideration of the pending bills by the House Committee in this Session, is deeply appreciated by the Administration. The Committee is to be congratulated for so doing, particularly in view of the fact that it carries one of the heaviest legislative schedules of any House Committee.

The genesis of the idea for giving special legislative protection to certain remaining sections of America's rivers was perhaps first given National impetus by the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in 1962, which endorsed the concept.

In 1963, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture jointly and in cooperation with the various States, screened some 650 rivers for study as possible