

could or could not charge for use of those facilities, we would have to say they could.

Mr. CRAMER. The thing I am concerned with is it a matter of policy? If the Federal Government is going to put up the lion's share which they obviously are in this instance and the largest proportion of the benefits are local and allocated to recreation, why there should not be some condition relating to local sponsoring organization's charges that reflect the small amount of local contribution and the large amount of Federal.

In other words, why should the taxpayers use the facility when they have already paid for it to construct it?

General NOBLE. Again, sir, I believe the charges that are made are made for ancillary facilities for the enjoyment of the facility that is now being participated in jointly by local and Federal interests.

Mr. CRAMER. Would you object to a requirement that user charges be on a reasonable basis and commensurate with the local participation and local improvements?

General NOBLE. Sir, I am going to have to submit something for the record on this.

(The following was received for the record:)

There would be no objection to a requirement that charges be consistent with the provisions of Public Law 89-72, the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. This Act specifies that the non-Federal share of the separable costs of a project allocated to recreation may be paid under two methods. One method is repayment over a period of years. Under this, the Act provides "That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the project by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than five years." It would also be proper to require that the scale of charges be consistent with those established by Regulation by the Secretary of the Interior under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897).

General NOBLE. The charges that might be made for ancillary facilities have no relation to the participation of the local interests in the recommended improvement. There will be other structures, other services rendered in addition to the facilities provided by the Federal Government in order to fully satisfy the recreation potential.

It would be extremely difficult to tie these additional facilities to any limitation based upon their participation provided in the basic facility.

Mr. CRAMER. Will you distinguish between user fees on what you just commented on? Is there any restriction relating to admission fees?

General NOBLE. This is a little unusual in that it is not a Federal facility. The Federal participation in this project is not similar to the construction of a Federal reservoir for example. It is to restore a condition which has been brought about largely through Federal actions and it is a mitigation project rather than a construction of a Federal facility. It is different in that regard and I again will have to provide something for the record for you to answer your specific question.

(The following was received for the record:)