

There is little point in this testimony to describe what the bills would do. This is covered both in summary form and in depth in the key documents referred to above and that are before you.

Perhaps, however, the most significant questions are (a) the differences in the rivers that would be immediately designated under the various bills; (b) the more significant recommendations for amendment in H.R. 8416; (c) significant differences between the Senate-passed bill and H.R. 8416, if amended as recommended.

Following is a brief tabular summary of the number of rivers that would be immediately designated by the four key bills, the cost of acquisition and development for such rivers, acres to be acquired as well as the number of rivers on which study would be required:

SUMMARY OF NUMBER OF RIVERS AND ESTIMATED COST AND ACRES TO BE ACQUIRED TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF SCENIC AND WILD RIVERS UNDER 4 SPECIFIED BILLS:

Bill	Rivers to be established							Number of rivers to be studied
	Number	Estimated cost			Estimated acres to be acquired			
		Acquisition (millions)	Percent fee title is of total cost (percent)	Development (millions)	Fee acquisition (acres)	Less than fee acquisition (acres)	Total (acres)	
H.R. 4816 (Aspinall)-----	4	\$5.3	22	\$6.1	455	4,145	4,600	20
H.R. 90 (Saylor)-----	16	100.7	25	18.1	21,375	192,445	213,820	66
S. 119 (as passed by Senate: Wild, 7; scenic, 5; of these 12, 3 are part wild and, part scenic)-----	9	25.3	24	9.9	8,485	76,395	84,880	28
H.R. 6166 (Reuss-administration)-----	9	35.1	21	10.3	9,050	81,515	90,565	35

Not only is the number of rivers to be immediately established different, but also the specific rivers named are different. Even for the same rivers, the mileage to be included in the designated segments may vary substantially, as shown in the table on p. 125.

It is significant that the indicated development costs in relation to acquisition costs are substantially less than the normal ratio in park and recreation areas of development to acquisition. Usually, development costs run two to three times acquisition costs.

In this instance, the development costs are expected to be below acquisition costs except in the case of H.R. 8416. The probable reason is the considerable portion of the land that is already in public ownership.

If it is estimated that approximately \$50,000 per river would be needed to execute the studies that are directed by the various bills, this cost could range from \$1 million for H.R. 8416 to \$3,300,000 for H.R. 90. These are very crude estimates but do give the Committee some indication of the level of the costs are believed to be reasonable.

The fourth paragraph of the Department's August 14 report makes clear that any combination of the designated rivers as listed above in the Chairman's bill, in the Administration's recommendations, or the Senate-passed bill, would be acceptable for designation at the present time. The cost would vary depending on the length adopted but if the maximum length in any one of the three bills would be enacted, the estimated acquisition cost of such a combination would be about \$38.3 million.

Although the Department's report proposes 17 amendments to H.R. 8416, most of these may be categorized as perfecting or clarifying. Five amendments are considered to be the most significant substantively. These amendments are Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, and 17.

Amendment 1. (Section 3, pages 5 and 6 of H.R. 8416)—Bill provides for identification of boundaries of four rivers through maps.

Department report recommends that map references in bill be deleted and provides that boundaries of four river areas be established after on-ground surveys have been made. The amendment envisions that boundaries generally will not extend to a width of more than 1,320 feet (one-quarter of mile) from either side of river. This envisions the maximum that could be included to be an average of 320 acres per mile including both sides of the river.