

has been made of candidate rivers to include more than the four named in H.R. 8416. It is believed that the bill should contain, in addition to the four named in H.R. 8416, at least the Namekagon, Wisconsin; Saint Croix, Minnesota and Wisconsin; Suwanee, Georgia and Florida; Eleven Point, Missouri and Arkansas; and the Wolf, Wisconsin.

We realize that the easiest rivers to include in the system are those which flow through lands owned largely by the Federal Government. These rivers should be classified as initial units wherever possible, but the truly national character of the wild or scenic rivers system will not be achieved if the application of this authority is limited mostly to federal lands. The record shows that there are a number of rivers, in scattered sections of the country, that do not flow entirely through federal lands, but which meet the high standards that are envisioned for national rivers. Conservationists are hopeful that a number of these superior streams can be designated initially as units of the system. The wild rivers study team in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture ended up with a list of slightly more than 20 rivers believed qualified for designation as units of the wild rivers system.

The several bills differ in the acreage of lands that would be incorporated into any single river. The committee is urged to avoid setting inflexible distances or acreage limitations. The need for stream bank protection is not uniform throughout the length of a river. This is influenced by streamside topography, land uses, ownership of land, and other factors. S. 119 and H.R. 6166, for example, provide that not more than a total of 320 acres per mile may be included in a designated river. That appears to imply a uniform holding, mile after mile. Conservationists believe that this stipulation would be more responsive to the need if the language were changed to stipulate an average of 320 acres—or whatever acreage the committee decides—per mile for each project. This would give the administrative agencies an opportunity to acquire lands at the points of need and to otherwise fulfill the objectives of the wild or scenic rivers system.

The several bills take different approaches on the matter of listing rivers that would be studied for possible addition to the system. Our belief is that this initial list should be as comprehensive as possible. A federal team has been studying candidate rivers for a number of years, and the list has been narrowed considerably. The rivers designated in H.R. 90 probably reflect those streams that have survived the team's screening process. It is believed that the inclusion of their names would be helpful, both to the agencies that will be implementing Congress' directions with respect to the wild or scenic rivers system and to the states, counties, and others who also will have a role in this new program. It is entirely possible that some units of government do not realize that they possess a river resource of sufficient quality for national, state, or local designation. Interested local groups and individuals also will have their positions strengthened if the streams are named in national legislation. We can think of many more benefits than disadvantages that will accrue from making the list of study rivers as all-inclusive as possible.

We wish to point out that Section 4(a) of H.R. 8416 apparently has a printing error. As it now stands the language would restrict future additions to the system aside from the 20 rivers named in Section 5, to the types of rivers set forth in Section 2, subsection (c), paragraphs (i) and (ii). Section 4(a) refers to Section 2 subsections (c) and (d). There is no subsection (d), and subsection (c) in itself would be unduly restrictive. It is believed that the reference should be to subsections (b) and (c) of Section 2.

We believe that the bill that is approved should contain a timetable for completion of the required studies of candidate rivers. H.R. 90 has a timetable of sorts and H.R. 8416 could be construed as having one because of the limitations placed on the Federal Power Commission and others in Section 7(b). The experience with the administration of the Wilderness Act of 1964 supports the value of requiring the executive agencies to comply with a specific time schedule for the completion of necessary reviews and recommendations. This is not in criticism, Mr. Chairman, but it should be recognized that only one federal agency has been able to comply with the wilderness act timetable. There are a number of reasons for this, of course, but there is no question in my mind that the record of wilderness reviews would be even less satisfactory in the absence of the congressional timetable in the 1964 Act.