

A breakdown of the \$50,000 follows:

Personnel costs (3 man-years)-----	\$42, 000
Miscellaneous (travel, materials, per diem, etc.)-----	8, 000
Total -----	50, 000

The figure may vary depending on the particular river being studied. For example, study of a large river like the Susquehanna in New York and Pennsylvania with its extended length and complicated land ownership and use pattern, will be more costly than of a smaller river like the Klamath in California, where most of the land is already in public ownership, and where there is little development. However, we believe \$50,000 to be a reasonable average.

Mr. ASPINALL. Now, as I understand the attempt in the bill which bears my name, there is not any desire to name any of these rivers, as such, wild rivers, natural environment rivers, pastoral rivers, or anything like that. The attempt is to call them scenic rivers. And if they possess these qualifications that are in the different definitions, then they come into the scenic river program.

We do not intend to call any of them wild rivers, as such. You may designate them as wild rivers.

On page 2 it says "The following types are eligible for inclusion in the management scenic rivers system." Then we go ahead and set forth six classifications—four classifications I guess it is.

Then we set forth another group, and we give two more designations to that. And if they qualify within that group, they are placed in the national scenic river program.

Isn't that better than trying to describe what a wild river is?

Mr. CRAFTS. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, there is some misunderstanding or misinterpretation on our part.

You know what you intended—I don't. I am not a lawyer. What led us to that conclusion was that on page 5 in section 3, where the rivers start to be named, the Rogue River, that segment, and so on "to be preserved as a wild river." The next one, the Rio Grande, "to be preserved as a natural environment river." And so on. Each of these rivers named—the Salmon, "to be preserved as a wild river." I guess that is what led us to that conclusion.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, rivers today may be as wild as all get out—tomorrow there may be no water in it whatsoever, at least in my country. And that is one of the difficulties I have.

I notice that all of the bills except mine, or the one that bears my name, have opened authorization. That has been contrary to the desire of this committee.

You have, do you not, the necessary information on each one of the rivers so that we can use a closed appropriation figure, not only for study, but also for implementation.

Mr. CRAFTS. You tell us which rivers you are going to include, and we will give you the information.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would like to have that information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRAFTS. You want it on your bill as it now stands, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will take it on yours—mine as it now stands, yours as recommended, or if you have some information—

Mr. CRAFTS. I think we could give it to you on all of them.

(The information furnished for the record follows:)