

Mr. SAYLOR. Could you provide this?

Mr. CRAFTS. We can supply this to you; yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

(The information supplied for the record follows:)

LANGUAGE TO PROVIDE A MORE FLEXIBLE APPLICATION OF THE 320 ACRES PER MILE

The new section 3(b), as proposed under amendment No. 1 on page 5 of the Department of the Interior report of August 14, 1967, on H.R. 8416 would be revised to read as follows:

"(b) The agency charged with the administration of each component of the national scenic rivers system designated by subsection (a) of this section shall establish detailed boundaries therefor as soon as practicable after the inclusion of such component in the system. Such boundaries may be revised from time to time, but may include on both sides of the river *an average, based on the total river miles of such component*, of not more than 320 acres per river mile. Such agency shall publish notice of such detailed boundaries in the Federal Register, together with appropriate descriptions."

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRAFTS, I want to commend you for a very fine statement here. It has pointed up what this is all about, as far as I am concerned, much more than anything I have read or heard before.

There are several things in my mind that I would like to try to clear up.

This morning we were told that the Department of the Interior was in negotiations with the private landowners on the St. Croix and other small tributaries.

Now, if I understood them right, it was that the private landowners are asking you to establish a national scenic riverway on these rivers. They in turn would enter into either a sale of a certain portion of the land in fee, and then easements, or all easements, and then they would ask to be the operator for operation and maintenance, is that right?

Mr. CRAFTS. You are talking about the St. Croix in this particular situation, Northern States Power?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. CRAFTS. Well, in the first place, I do not know, because the meeting is underway right now in Minneapolis. So I do not know what they are going to come out with.

We have met with them—I did not personally, but our representatives did—about a week ago, and out of that meeting came confusion, to be perfectly candid.

Also it was apparent that at that time the company was not quite sure what it wanted to do, and I am not sure that we were sure what we were able to do. But the best that I can indicate to you at the present time—and a week from now we can tell you, I think—now I can only conjecture—is that what is contemplated is a conveyance of fee title to a narrow strip, 400 feet, on each side, and a leaseback under such terms as I am told can keep the land on the taxrolls—and I do not really understand this—to allow the company to carry on its normal management processes, but within the restrictions that would be required under the act.

As I have just described it, it does not quite make sense to me. But it is not intended or contemplated on our part that this land would remain with the company by title or lease, and that the immediate