

document and negotiate it individually within certain broad criteria, which will be sufficiently embracing yet possess the flexibility for individual differences. The task, though far more arduous on the part of the administrative agencies, would save the funds of the Federal Government and result in greater acceptability by the private landowner.

We do not propose to provide the committee with any definitive list of tools or a procedural manual dealing with land acquisition in less than fee. Some thoughts do occur to us, however, in analyzing the activities of a number of States, Wisconsin in particular, that devices are available and should be tried—such as scenic easements, reciprocal covenants, purchase and lease back, et cetera.

Whether the committee finds favor with H.R. 8416, H.R. 90, S. 119, H.R. 6166, or any of the other measures that it has before it, we hope that a classification of types of rivers to be included in a wild or scenic rivers system will be a part of the statute. Whether there are six classifications, as indicated in H.R. 8416, or three, as noted in H.R. 90, is not as significant as determining, at least, the different characteristics of streams and rivers that will qualify as a part of the system. As a consequence, it appears axiomatic that the manner in which these rivers will be administered will be different because of the variation of rivers and streams themselves, as well as the different patterns of land use.

While it would be our hope that a number of rivers could be added to the longest list of any of the measures before the committee, we are acutely aware, especially in this session of Congress, of the art of the possible. We do not consider that we are striking our colors in this admission, but it appears intuitively obvious to us that those rivers that are highly controversial as to ultimate use may have to be brought into the system at a later date. Such cases will be determined more equitably and effectively if a plan has been accomplished. Also, we are aware that there are instances wherein a paradox results. If a river happens to be of special quality which, all other things being equal, would qualify automatically for inclusion into the system and controversy rages about its ultimate use, a difficult determination would have to be made as to the possible risks of attempting to incorporate it.

Another difficulty that faces any student of this problem is the rapidly changing plans that involve local, county, and State jurisdictions as well as different Federal agencies. A decision by a Federal agency to initiate plans for water impoundments or the decision by a Federal agency to abandon their plans for water impoundments have to be considered in all their aspects as the legislation evolves. Hence, an almost constant review is necessary if one is to keep current as to the particular status of these rivers.

The provisions of both H.R. 8416 and H.R. 90 preclude the Federal Power Commission from licensing installations on rivers in the wild rivers system. We hope such a provision will be maintained and that the language be explicit so that the congressional intent cannot be questioned.

By the same token, the rivers in the system are afforded far greater protection if the provisions in section 9 of H.R. 8416 are adopted. Such protection applies not only to the setting of the river itself but also maintains a high water quality.

S. 119, H.R. 90, H.R. 8416, and H.R. 6166 contain provisions which will permit the States or local governments to designate wild or scenic