Mr. JOHNSON of California. Your master plan concerns the upper reaches that they——

Mr. SWEM. Only momentarily.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What is that?

Mr. SWEM. Only momentarily.

Mr. CRAFTS. They finished the part from Taylor Falls up. They are studying the part from Taylor Falls down right now. The whole thing will be done very shortly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I doubt whether the lower reaches get in this first authorization.

Mr. CRAFTS. Well, they may not. I do not know. They are in the Senate-passed bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have others that will probably go in there, and naturally they would expect the plan to start on the ones that are authorized, so that they could get their development in and acquisition taken care of.

I have no objections to it, but I certainly want to make sure that in this particular instance, where you are thinking about leasing it back to private enterprise, with the Federal Government's expenditure of funds, that the operation of the scenic rivers is not different, as far as the public is concerned.

Mr. CRAFTS. This is precisely the same thing which the Secretary told us when he gave us our directions to go out there and consult with them. We agree with you completely. We must protect and manage it the same way.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Because in the establishment of the National Scenic Rivers program, I agree if a State is willing to do it, with assistance from the Federal Government, and operate and maintain it, fine. But if the Federal Government has to do it, either under Forest Service jurisdiction, or under the Secretary of Interior, I think we should have one basic pattern, philosophy, of authorization.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Thank you.

Mr. Crafts, I have one question.

On page 8 of your testimony if we were to approve the Aspinall bill, does that mean Clearwater—is that 190 miles?

Mr. CRAFTS. That is right.

Mr. SKUBITZ. We would take 320 acres in each mile; is that correct?

Mr. CRAFTS. That is what I was discussing with Mr. Saylor a few moments ago.

As it is worded now, it means that the maximum that could be taken under a combination of fees and easement would be 320 acres per mile.

Now, most of this would be easement. It does not mean we would have to take that much, or that we would take that much. It means this is the maximum, and the maximum fee part is much less than that. That is 400 feet as contrasted to a total of fee and easement together of 1,320 feet out. So you see, it is one-fourth of the——

Mr. SKUBITZ. I was using your figure of 320 acres per mile.

Mr. CRAFTS. That is the maximum, not for fee acquisition, but fee plus easement acquisition.