

1010

9077
A9811
R88/10
88/10

FEDERAL COST SHARING FOR RURAL CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Y4
Ag 8/1
R88/10

GOVERNMENT

Storage

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 6127, H.R. 6169, H.R. 6178, H.R. 6233,
H.R. 6293, H.R. 6405, H.R. 6684, H.R. 7055,
H.R. 7110, H.R. 8383, H.R. 10298, H.R. 11260,
and S. 852

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

JULY 25, 1967, OCTOBER 10, AND 19, 1967

Serial EE

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1967

86-746

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION



COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas,
Vice Chairman

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas
MASTON O'NEAL, Georgia
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, New York
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JOHN G. DOW, New York
BILL NICHOLS, Alabama
G. V. MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
FRANK J. BRASCO, New York
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
Ranking Minority Member
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
CATHERINE MAY, Washington
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
GEORGE V. HANSEN, Idaho
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
THOMAS S. KLEPPE, North Dakota
ROBERT PRICE, Texas
JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Puerto Rico

CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*
WILLIAM C. BLACK, *Counsel*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Counsel*
L. T. EASLEY, *Staff Consultant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania

SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Puerto Rico

CONTENTS

H.R. 6233, a bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes.....	Page 1
S. 852, an act to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes.....	31
Statements of:	
Berg, Norman A., Deputy Administrator for Field Services, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.....	3, 25 ✓
Bradford, Carl L., Sr., recreation planner, State of West Virginia.....	59
Burleson, Hon. Omar, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.....	45
Carter, Hon. Tim Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky.....	39
Clapper, Louis S., chief, Division of Conservation Education, National Wildlife Federation.....	71
Gray, Dan W., chairman, Calhoun County Commission.....	69
Harrison, Hon. William Henry, a Representative in Congress from the State of Wyoming.....	40
Johnson, Hon. Harold T., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	41
McCulty, Roland, mayor, Spencer, W.Va.....	46
Morris, Hon. Thomas G., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Mexico.....	41
Rivers, Hon. L. Mendel, a Representative in Congress from the State of South Carolina.....	32
St. Onge, Hon. William L., a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut.....	43 ✓
Shaffer, Raymond, Pennsylvania Association of Soil & Water Conservation District Directors, Inc.....	65
Shoemaker, Myron, president, Endless Mountains Association, Laceyville, Pa.....	73
Studebaker, Sam S., president, National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts.....	61 ✓
Vigorito, Hon. Joseph P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.....	37
Walker, Hon. E. S. Johnny, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Mexico.....	22
Correspondence submitted to the committee:	
Agee, Vance, president, Nevada Association of Soil Conservation Districts, letter of September 29, 1967.....	76
Andrews, Hon. George W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Alabama, letter of October 17, 1967.....	38
Baring, Hon. Walter S., a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada, letter of October 16, 1967.....	75
Barske, Philip, chairman, Connecticut Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, Inc., letter of October 13, 1967.....	75
Cater, W. P., president, New Mexico Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, letters of:	
September 29, 1967, to Hon. E. S. Johnny Walker.....	76
October 6, 1967, to Hon. Thomas G. Morris.....	78
Cowger, Hon. William O., a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky, letter of June 28, 1967.....	21

Correspondence submitted to the committee—Continued

Edmondson, Hon. Ed, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oklahoma, letter of October 30, 1967-----	Page 40
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture, letter of July 24, 1967, report on H.R. 6233-----	2 ✓
Hammerschmidt, Hon. John Paul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arkansas, letter of October 23, 1967-----	40
Laxalt, Hon. Paul, Governor of Nevada, letter of October 2, 1967, to Hon. Walter Baring-----	76
Poole, Daniel A., secretary, Wildlife Management Institute, letter of October 18, 1967-----	73
Roybal, Pablo, chairman, R.C. & D. steering committee, Northern Rio Grande Resource Conservation & Development Project, letter of October 6, 1967, to Hon. Thomas G. Morris-----	79
Zion, Hon. Roger H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, letter of October 20, 1967-----	44

FEDERAL COST SHARING FOR RURAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

MONDAY, JULY 24, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, at 10 a.m., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Abernethy, Stubblefield, Teague, and Goodling.

Also present: Christine Gallagher, clerk; Hyde Murray, assistant counsel; Francis LeMay, staff consultant; and Fowler West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

We have before us for consideration today H.R. 6233 by Mr. Abernethy, and a number of similar bills before us for consideration.

Without objection, H.R. 6233 and the report of the Department will appear in the record at this point.

(The bills H.R. 6127, by Mr. Vigorito; H.R. 6169, by Mr. Stubblefield; H.R. 6178, by Mr. Waggoner; H.R. 6293, by Mr. Schneebeli; H.R. 6405, by Mr. Walker; H.R. 6684, by Mr. Gray; H.R. 7055, by Mr. Anderson of Tennessee; H.R. 7110, by Mr. Robison; H.R. 8383, by Mr. Hechler of West Virginia; H.R. 10298, by Mr. Kee, and H.R. 11260, by Mr. Carter; are all similar to H.R. 6233, by Mr. Abernethy, the text of which follows:)

[H.R. 6233, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1011), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In providing assistance for carrying out plans developed under this title, the Secretary shall be authorized to bear such proportionate share of costs of installing any works of improvement applicable to public fish and wildlife or recreational development as is determined by him to be equitable in consideration of national needs and assistance authorized for similar purposes under other Federal programs: *Provided*, That all engineering costs relating to such works of improvement may be borne by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That when a State or other public agency or local nonprofit organization participating in a plan developed under this title agrees to operate and maintain any reservoir or other area included in a plan for public fish and wildlife or recreational development, the Secretary shall be authorized to bear

not to exceed one-half of the costs of (a) the land, easements, or rights-of-way acquired or to be acquired by the State or other public agency or local nonprofit organization for such reservoir or other area, and (b) minimum basic facilities needed for public health and safety, access to, and use of such reservoir or other area for such purpose."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1967.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of March 17, 1967, requesting the recommendations of this Department on H.R. 6233, a bill to amend section 32(e) of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes.

We recommend the enactment of this proposed legislation.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cost share in installing works of improvement applicable to public fish and wildlife or recreational development under the Act. Such authority would provide more effective and coordinated assistance to local communities in carrying out resource conservation and development programs, which are designed to provide better use and conservation of resources and thereby improve the economy of the area and the income of the people. It would contribute to alleviating the shortage of recreational facilities, particularly in rural areas where the local economy is unable to provide for total resource development.

The proposed authority for cost sharing for public fish and wildlife or recreational development would permit the inclusion of such purposes in the initial planning by local agencies. When included at this stage, water storage and measures for fish, wildlife, and recreation can be constructed for less money than when added later. If a dam is needed to provide storage for flood protection, water supply, and recreation it should be designed for such multiple uses at the outset.

Many areas, having farms that are no longer self-sufficient, unsuitable soils and terrain, and inadequate financial resources, are suffering from abandoned farmland, loss of population, and economic stagnation, and are forced to seek alternative uses of land for economic survival. Local sponsoring organizations believe that they, with Federal aid, can help arrest the economic decline of rural areas by using more land and water resources for recreational developments. They anticipate that private income-producing recreation enterprises will be developed nearby to supplement and complement the public developments. This would help offset decline in farm income.

The proposed bill would serve not only local rural areas but also the broader community recreation needs of nearby urban areas. It would enable farm and rural leaders to retain the control and initiative in planning wisely for the use of rural lands and resources so as to protect and provide adequately for rural needs and interests, and at the same time to help meet the demands of urban people for recreational facilities. It would help to protect areas having unique scenic, environmental, and recreational qualities.

The proposed bill would help substantially in promoting better planning for development and use of the full resources of rural areas. This would result in improved community facilities, increased private investment, new job opportunities, a broadening of the local economic base, and a consequent strengthening of the overall economy.

The cost-sharing provisions are in harmony with the Federal assistance authorized for the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (PL-556).

The Bureau of the Budget advises that while there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program, the Bureau's views will be forwarded to the Committee subsequently.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy is not here, but we will proceed with the hearings.

We have before us a representative of the Department to testify as to the position of the Department on this bill.

**STATEMENT OF NORMAN A. BERG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR
FIELD SERVICES, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED
BY VAL SILKETT, DIRECTOR, RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT DIVI-
SION, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE**

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Norman A. Berg, Deputy Administrator for Field Services, Soil Conservation Service, and I have with me Val Silkett, who heads our Division on Resource Development.

H.R. 6233, an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, would facilitate rural areas development by providing Federal cost sharing for public water-based recreation and fish and wildlife measures in resource conservation and development projects.

Such authority would give local project sponsors the opportunity to create urgently needed outdoor recreation facilities available to all people; and at the same time, stimulate economic growth and job opportunities in the countryside.

For background, let me review briefly the purpose of resource conservation and development projects and how they are progressing.

The projects are often located in areas where the economic growth of rural communities is lagging behind the rest of the economy, areas that for a number of reasons have been skipped over in this era of technological progress.

The areas are not without potential. They have the needed resource base, but it must be properly developed and its use, in many cases, must be redirected to keep abreast of the needs of our rapidly changing Nation.

Through R.C. & D. project actions a favorable cooperative partnership is being stimulated to—

Provide a local means of coordinating and using aid available from the Department of Agriculture and other Federal and State agencies to help stimulate and develop the full resource potential of the project area.

Enable local people to initiate, sponsor, and carry out long-range plans in resource development designed specifically to meet their needs.

Create an investment climate attractive to private capital so that new enterprises may be developed to help the community adapt to changing conditions and needs.

Develop dynamic rural communities that have a pleasant environment and an improved enduring economy based on sound, well-planned resource use.

Congress funded the R.C. & D. program in 1963 and the first 10 projects were authorized for planning assistance in 1964. Presently there are 20 projects in the operational stage and six in the planning stage covering about 60 million acres of land in 27 States.

We have had 3 full years of experience in carrying out R.C. & D. projects. The results so far have been gratifying.

It was clearly evident from the beginning that the local people did have the desire, determination, and leadership to overcome economic decline in their rural communities. They have brought together many diverse interests for concerted action on locally developed goals.

To date, more than 350 project measures have been completed, 400 are being installed, and about 800 others are in the planning stage in the 20 R.C. & D. project areas authorized for operations.

Besides accelerating resource management programs, the measures include improved processing and marketing facilities, new and expanded industries, vocational training, tourist development, and other actions designed to strengthen the rural economy.

While sponsors have been pleased with the progress of R.C. & D. projects during the past 3 years, they have become aware of some of the program's shortcomings.

In most project areas one of the greatest potentials for economic growth lies in the development of land and water resources for outdoor recreation purposes—a resource use now in critically short supply throughout the Nation.

In the 20 projects in operation, the sponsors have made more than 400 proposals for community water-based measures for public recreation and fish and wildlife, but due to local economic conditions fewer than 10 percent of these measures have been completed.

Half of these projects are for multiple-purpose development—flood prevention and municipal water supply in addition to recreation.

Delay in the construction of these measures, so essential in meeting rural community needs, seriously hampers the effectiveness of the program.

H.R. 6233 would provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to furnish financial help to public bodies in planning and constructing recreation and fish and wildlife developments in R.C. & D. projects.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary could provide technical assistance and share the costs of construction. He would be authorized when certain requirements are met to bear up to one-half the costs of land, easements or rights-of-way, and minimum basic facilities.

It would give him essentially the same authority he now has under Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. It would enable project measures to be accelerated that are truly multiple purpose, including needed recreation and fish and wildlife developments.

Prior to the 1962 Public Law 566 recreation cost-sharing amendment, only nine watersheds included water-based recreation as a purpose in project work plans.

Since Public Law 566 was amended in late 1962 to provide technical and financial assistance to watershed project sponsors for developing public recreation facilities, a total of 131 public recreational developments in 112 different watershed projects in 33 States have been approved for operations. These developments are expected to provide over 7½ million visitor-days of water-based recreation each year. The sponsoring local organizations will provide more than one-half of the installation cost of these recreation developments.

About 75 other recreation developments in 30 States are in various stages of planning.

An example of a successful county recreation development is found in a multiple-purpose, floodwater-retarding recreation structure in the Cypress Creek watershed project in Union County, Ky. The water-based development will provide recreation for about 35,000 users per

year. It includes a 50-acre lake and facilities for fishing, boating, camping, and picnicking. The local people are very proud of this new community facility and are planning to dedicate the site this summer.

The Tradewater River area R.C. & D. project, which also includes Union County, Ky., contains many potential combination flood prevention and recreation sites, but these sites are not eligible for cost sharing because they are not located in a feasible watershed project.

The Tradewater R.C. & D. project towns of White Plains, Morton's Gap, Earlyton, Dawson Springs, and Princeton have all expressed a great need and interest in fully developing certain sites for recreation, as well as for other purposes.

If Federal financial assistance were made available for water-based outdoor recreation in R.C. & D. projects, these communities would provide the necessary leadership and assume the remaining financial and other responsibilities.

The enactment of this legislation would provide an opportunity for rural communities in R.C. & D. projects to develop their recreation potentials as part of an overall package resource development plan. Recreation could be included in structures for far less cost, during the initial planning and constructing.

If Federal cost sharing were made available, local R.C. & D. project sponsors could start at least 50 public recreation developments annually in the project areas now authorized for operations. Without this legislation, we estimate that not more than five public recreation developments annually would be properly constructed in these projects.

These 50 developments would benefit the rural communities, within the project areas, by an estimated \$225,000 a year.

During construction, they would slow down the population drift to urban centers by providing 250 more jobs a year.

In addition, the projects would—

Create even more jobs when completed through the operation and maintenance of facilities and through the establishment of new associated businesses.

Provide the rural people and nearby urban residents with much needed recreational opportunities.

Allow project sponsors to take advantage of areas having unique scenic, environmental, and recreation qualities while these areas are still available for development.

Make the area more attractive to industry and appealing to people.

The proposed cost sharing would not conflict with other programs.

In effect, the proposed bill would bridge the gap that now exists under present programs.

Funds to cover the needed cost sharing for recreation and fish and wildlife would be requested through the regular R.C. & D. program appropriation. Estimated cost for fiscal year 1969 is \$800,000. This is expected to increase about \$500,000 for fiscal year 1970.

The addition of this measure to the R.C. & D. program would significantly increase the effectiveness of project work and improve the economic climate of rural communities throughout the country.

I thank you for this opportunity to appear before this committee and would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Berg, we are delighted to have you here and we appreciate your attendance, but I would want to know if your

appearance here, and the failure of Mr. Hollis Williams to appear, indicates any kind of difference of opinion within the Department.

Mr. BERG. There is absolutely no difference of opinion. This is a type of operation for which I in my particular assignment have responsibility. It is not a program that conflicts in any way with the small watershed program. This is the resource conservation and development project activity administered by my particular office in the Soil Conservation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. You say it does not conflict with the small watershed program and yet you provide here some different criteria much more favorable for the development of these projects than under the 566 program. It seems to me they do conflict.

For instance, you propose to have the Department paying half the cost of easements and rights-of-way, which is something that we have carefully avoided in the small watershed program and we think for good reason.

Don't you think this could become a terribly expensive proposition when you have the Federal Government paying this amount, cost of the easements and rights-of-way?

Mr. BERG. The local project sponsors for the projects now bear the cost of securing easements and rights-of-way and the cost of operation and maintenance, as they do in small watershed projects.

We would envision with this particular bill that it would provide an opportunity for the sponsors to have assistance for these purposes on easements and rights-of-way similar to what now exists in the small watershed program.

The CHAIRMAN. In the small watershed program the local people have to pay the cost of easements and rights-of-way. It is true that we have a proviso to the effect that you can put one recreation dam in a project of less than 75,000 acres on which you can spend some money for recreation including easements and if it is less than 150,000 acres, two dams, and if up to 250,000 acres, three dams. We strictly limit and we provide that there can be some Government participation in securing of rights-of-way in that limited number of reservoirs only. That of course, was a compromise and I think that this is the next step. I think clearly the next step is for the Government to pay all of the costs. The next step is to pay it in all of the 566 projects.

I expressed that fear at the time we put in the three-reservoir provisions. I think that this but proves the correctness of our fears at that time that it would be used as a basis of expanding the Government payments and that we would never be able to keep it to where it stated one for each 75,000 acres. That is not quite an exact statement, but you know what I mean.

Mr. BERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this clearly shows the determination on the part of the Department to pay these costs of easements and rights-of-way. I do not believe, as some people do, that it costs the public nothing to have the Federal Government spend the money. If I believed the Federal Government has an unlimited source of money without any burden on the public, of course, I would be in favor of this. I would be in favor of the Government paying all these expenses and handing it out to the public, but I don't think that is true. I think the people pay for all these costs. I think these costs become much greater when the

cost is paid by the Federal Government than when the payment is made locally.

You put this in a bill and I don't think you can get one single contribution of land. Don't you envision that this is going to be entirely a proposition of buying these easements and rights-of-way?

Mr. BERG. We recognize that in the small watershed program this problem, as you point out, has been a continuing one of securing easements and rights-of-way. We are finding this to be true in the resource conservation and development activity also.

The local sponsors in their plans envision they will do as much as they can in the community interest to get these easements and rights-of-way given, if they possibly can, but, as they move ahead with the project measures, each local development requires an analysis of what they finally have to do to secure these easements and rights-of-way.

We presently cannot help these people in these resource conservation and development projects with any of their easement or rights-of-way problems, in the same way we do in the small watershed projects. This is the only way in which they can be given limited assistance for recreation development as you pointed out. This opportunity does not exist at all presently in the resource conservation and development projects outside feasible watershed projects.

The 3 years of experience we have had on R.C. & D. projects reveals that many of the same types of problems, regarding local sponsors getting the necessary land easements and rights-of-way, are also present. They have already faced this in many R.C. & D. projects which include small watershed projects with recreation developments.

There would be no competition between departmental programs if a small watershed project existed in one of these resource conservation and development projects. R.C. & D. projects include several counties, covering a much larger area than the small watershed project.

The Public Law 566 activity would be fully effective in this case and would continue to move ahead. It would be completely outside of the feasible watershed project areas that this authority would be utilized.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Berg, you have just made a statement there which seems to me to be the crux of the attitude which I think is an unsound attitude. You say this won't affect the 566 projects, that you will have a larger recreation area and within it you have a smaller flood prevention area, and this would in no way interfere with the development of the 566 program, that they would go right ahead and get their rights-of-way.

Do you believe there is one place in the United States where you could as a practical matter do that? Do you think that I, as a landowner, or Mr. Goodling, or any of the rest of us think if we own a piece of land there where you want to build a dam under Public Law 566 on my land—you tell me you can't pay me for it and I have to give it, and I see that just up the road the Government did pay a handsome price—and you are going to pay a very handsome price for Mr. Goodling's land because it was used for recreation. Do you think I am going to give my land for the 566 project?

Mr. BERG. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the local sponsors who have to deal with this problem are faced with some very perplexing questions that they are going to have to have some help on.

The CHAIRMAN. And won't the passage of this bill aggravate their problems?

Do you think I would give that land?

Mr. BERG. I worked on the small watershed project activity in a State before I came here and, as I said, and as you have rightfully pointed out, the problem that the sponsors have, once the project plans have moved to the point where they know they will have some structures that will require lands and easements and rights-of-way, is how to meet this need. In many cases they have been getting the land as a public donation. A community spirit exists in these areas that allows this to happen. Why people do this is, as you point out, somewhat questionable. In some cases they are trading water for land because they find some assets accrue to the surrounding area from a water development, but each one of these project sponsors, whether they be for small watersheds or for resource conservation and development work, are going to have to face up to what is needed to move the project ahead and to be fair to their neighbors in that particular community because these are neighbors who have to live with each other.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Berg, aren't you, as the Department of Agriculture, going to have to face up to the realities of human nature? I don't like to just use my own illustration but I think I can best illustrate by relating what I know about. Within the last week I signed a right-of-way deed to Throckmorton County, giving them a little land to increase the right-of-way on a road. I gave it to them and didn't charge them a dime. I have been going along for a year arguing with them because they intended to put all of the increase on my side of the road and take nothing from my neighbor. I told them a year ago I would give them just as much as the man on the other side gave and not 1 foot more. Now, I think I reflect the usual attitude of most landowners in rural areas.

I told them a year ago if they wanted 300 feet off of me I would give it if my neighbor gave the same amount on the other side of the road, but I wouldn't give them 1 foot more than he gave and anything more than he gave they were going to have to condemn off of me.

I think I expressed the same viewpoint almost everybody in that country expressed. I have never received one dime from Throckmorton County and I have given them lots of right-of-way but I don't propose to give them right-of-way and then have them pay the man across the road from me, and he doesn't either. We are all alike in that respect.

I have never had the opportunity to give any right-of-way for one of these flood prevention projects. I would be glad to do it, but I wouldn't do it if they are paying Mr. Gathings on the other side of me, and human nature being what it is—and I think I am just like the rest of our people—you begin to pay for these projects and you are never going to get another one free.

Mr. BERG. The local sponsors are faced with this question, whether or not there is Federal assistance, be it in the small watershed program, or in this R.C. & D. activity. In an increasing number, the local organizations—many organized under State law to cope with these problems of operations, getting ready for operations and construction, and eventually the long haul of operating and maintaining these structures—are faced with the fact that public funds will be needed for this type of a purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Now this raises this question then: I think you may be right on that, but should we go to putting these projects where the

people will not provide the rights-of-way, or should we, as long as we still have unfilled requests for these projects, put them where the people will provide the rights-of-way, put them where the people will make a contribution of the rights-of-way? Do you think we ought to just assume because some people don't want the projects sufficiently to pay for the rights-of-way that we ought to go ahead and pay for them all, or should we say, "All right, there are people who will pay for the rights-of-way and until we have served their needs, we are not going to bother about you people who are going to charge us for these rights-of-way? Which would you do?"

Mr. BERG. This is undoubtedly a criterion that could be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. There are things in my district they would like to have that you can't finance.

Mr. BERG. This is true. I think this is one of the criteria that has come to the foreground. It is in the interests of the local people to help themselves and we have been very gratified by the leadership that has shown up and the realism with which they have approached their problems. They recognize that because they extend an application for planning assistance on this type of project to someone else—either the Governor for his approval or the Secretary for his consideration—it does not change the nature of the problem, but they realize they had better band together to do something about their problems and this is one of the problems that they have to face up to, and if they can demonstrate ability to move in this direction, I think they would get a priority.

Some of them have already moved far beyond what we envisioned. Some of these people are not waiting for us to come forward with planning authority before they get together and make plans of their own that are realistic and sound technically.

I think the local people need additional help to do some of the things they want to do and have the right to do and just can't quite cut the mustard in terms of the local resources that they have available to do the job that will benefit the total community and in fact the State and the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. I come back to the proposition, are you advocating because some areas in the United States won't give these rights-of-way, that we ought to pay for them everywhere?

Mr. BERG. No, I don't think this would open that door at all because we would very closely follow the criteria that has already been demonstrated to be workable in regard to the administration of Public Law 566.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the criteria? Those criteria are not to pay for these rights-of-way?

Mr. BERG. This is the way we would approach this problem: The help these people need, as we see the plans that are coming forward, is on the cost-sharing for the construction of the facility.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not arguing that. I agree with the desirability of building these projects, but I am talking about the rights-of-way and easements. That is all I am talking about right now. There is provision in here which is quite plain, providing for the Government to share in the costs of rights-of-way and easements. I am asking you if that is a good provision.

Mr. BERG. Yes, we think it is. We would like to see it incorporated.

The CHAIRMAN. And then I ask you if it is not going to jeopardize our 566 program?

Mr. BERG. No, we do not think it will.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that I will give my land just as readily when the Government pays Mr. Gathings \$500 an acre for his, that I will be just as willing to give my land? You don't know human nature, Mr. Berg.

Mr. BERG. These are limited opportunities. Whether or not they even show up in some of the projects is still open to question. In other words, it has to be a planned activity that is sanctioned for operations, as it is in small watersheds.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not complaining about the planning. I am not talking about the Government helping to bear the cost of that. I am not complaining about the Government cost on the project construction. I am talking about the tremendous burden that you are about to assume in the way of rights-of-way, not only for these projects, but for the Public Law 566 projects.

You categorically tell me it won't affect the 566 projects. However, I think I know human nature. I know some places where it will affect them. I did ask you and you haven't yet answered, whether you think that if we adopt this kind of thing that we ought to still go ahead and spend our money first on those places where they will give the rights-of-way.

Mr. BERG. This we would agree to.

The CHAIRMAN. Then let's put it in the law.

Mr. BERG. We have worked with these local sponsors who, incidentally, are the same types of people who support the small watershed activity. Both the small watershed program and the resource conservation and development program are sponsored by the soil conservation district governing board members with additional help from county commissioners, municipalities, other local bodies who may want to join the activity locally. I think the criteria these people use locally, if they have small watershed work, would be very carefully thought through because the same types of people using R.C. & D. authority over a broader area have to live in that particular community and administer both programs.

I would agree with you that it would be difficult for a local group to take one action on small watershed work, with a neighboring activity outside of a small watershed project because it happened to qualify under the resource conservation development work, taking a different attitude, a different set of criteria. This would be most difficult for the local people to live with and we would not want to put them in that position.

The CHAIRMAN. You put them in that position the way the bill is written. You put them in that position or else you pay all of the costs under 566.

Mr. BERG. This would give the Secretary authority to share up to 50 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you here, with a straight face, tell this committee that the Secretary would pay only 10 or 15 percent. You tell us you want that authority and you don't expect to use it?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Are small watershed impoundments open to the public?

Mr. BERG. No, they are not.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. All these resource and development projects would be?

Mr. BERG. Yes, most of these, would be public-type, community-type facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not required by law though, is it?

Mr. BERG. No, it is not and we would encourage, in addition to the types of things the project sponsors plan, that there be individual farm and ranch developments that would be totally good for the community in terms of resource conservation and development. The conservation programs that are needed on individual farms, the possibilities of income producing type recreation as an example that could be fostered on individual farms for the benefit of the private owner. However, these types of things are not given assistance as project-type activities unless they are community-type facilities and community-type projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you be willing to amend this bill? Down there on page 2, lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, put something there to the effect that "Provided, however, that no project may be approved involving a Federal contribution for the payment for easements and rights-of-way so long as there were qualified projects pending not involving any Federal contribution for such payments." That is not an accurate statement, but you understand what I am driving at there.

Would you be willing to accept this type amendment?

Mr. BERG. I think this type amendment should be considered. I would not want to have to answer yes or no at the moment because I would want to check with my administrator and the Secretary on this, Mr. Poage, but, as a criteria as to who gets priority for the very limited funding that we have for this type of an activity, we certainly are going to have to recognize the reality of what you are stating.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stubblefield is the only author of a bill who is here. Would you be willing to accept that type of amendment?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I would be happy to see it go on, but I would want to know what the Department thinks about it.

How was that 50-acre lake acquired?

Mr. BERG. We will get the information for you, Mr. Stubblefield.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. There certainly wasn't any Federal contribution there. There wasn't any provision for it?

Mr. BERG. I believe that there was.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. For the land?

Mr. BERG. That is right. It had to be a local responsibility. They could have used some public funds.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I know they used State funds.

The CHAIRMAN. They could have used some Federal funds if they had given the easements and rights-of-way.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I am sure that is what happened.

The CHAIRMAN. The existing law provides for the use of Federal funds for the construction of the lake and that sort of thing, but it doesn't provide for buying easements and rights-of-way and my point is that you are going to run the whole cost up tremendously if you go to paying for any of these easements and rights-of-way because everybody is going to demand it, not only here, but under 566.

They are all going to demand it and you are going to raise the cost tremendously and you are going to, in effect, reduce the number of

projects that we can service very materially. To me it seems highly desirable that we fund as many of these projects as we can. Now, you are not going to get more money by reason of giving this to these individuals but you are going to be able to take care of less projects. Instead of having 60 projects a year, maybe you can only take care of 40.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I would go along with Mr. Berg. I don't know what language he would put in there.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not insisting on the identical language I was using there, but it could be something to achieve assurance that as long as there are people who are willing to give their rights-of-way and easements that they shall receive consideration before those who won't give the rights-of-way get anything.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Do you think you could take that, Mr. Berg?

Mr. BERG. Yes, Mr. Poage, inasmuch as the local sponsors are faced with this problem far beyond the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife effort, they are charged with securing the land easements and rights-of-way for these projects, and they are doing it in a variety of ways.

I think they should be encouraged to do this as much as possible in whatever way they feel is necessary locally, which may include something other than donations, but it doesn't necessarily involve Federal cost sharing on that particular feature.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not suggesting if they could get the local people to make up a pot and give it, that is not all right. I am not criticizing that. I am suggesting that we ought not to have the Federal Government going in here buying these rights-of-way in one area as long as there are other areas that are willing to give them, until we have taken care of the people who are willing to make the contribution.

Mr. BERG. We understand this. It has been reflected, of course, in the history of the amendments in 1962, to the Small-Watershed Act, and we know in regard to this particular feature that is being proposed here it will have to be administered in a like manner, or we just couldn't live with it and live with these local sponsors.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the sponsor proceed with an amendment to achieve this?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Could you come up with something tomorrow?

Mr. BERG. Yes. Let me take this question back to the Department and talk over what it is that you are concerned about and what could be brought back for the committee's consideration which would be an answer to your question, Mr. Poage.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Berg, you stated, I believe, that the estimated original cost for enlarging this program would be about \$800,000 the first year and then about \$1,300,000 the second year. Can you do very much with that small amount of money, comparatively?

Mr. BERG. This program is still operating at a low funding level. Our budget for this year, when Congress passes the appropriation and the President signs the law, will in total be a little over \$7 million. This is to finance the planning in 15 additional resource conservation and development projects as well as to carry out the operation in 26 that have been planned and are underway.

This addition, as we would envision it, is a very modest amount, but it is a small program in terms of numbers, to date.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is what I was getting at.

This proposal would appear to be meritorious, but about 90 percent of my constituents seem to want me to find ways to cut down on Federal spending and Federal programs, rather than embarking on new ones. I think some of us may be faced with that problem.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I would like to make this observation: I think we all have the pressure on us that Mr. Teague mentions. I happened to go through the Rockefeller Commission Report on Recreation the other day. As Mr. Poage recalls, we were in a recreation area some 2 months ago where they were endeavoring to encourage private enterprise to come in and build facilities to take care of this growing demand for recreation that the existing facilities just can't take care of. The Rockefeller Report stated that by the year 2000, which is about 33 years away, the demand for recreational facilities will exceed the supply by about three times. Certainly it would seem to me this type project where you come up with a resource, recreation should be a paramount consideration as a resource because the demand is increasing at a far faster rate than we are able to supply it. It is not a matter of spending money; it is a matter of furnishing the necessary requirement for the increasing population. It is as necessary as an automobile. "Spending money" is a broad term and in this case I think it should be considered as necessary and not as a rathole expenditure.

Mr. BERG. I would like to have Mr. Silkett, who has worked closely with these projects we are speaking of today, just briefly relate to the committee the types of things that are resulting which, as far as a Federal dollar being expended is concerned, is certainly giving a return far over and above the investment that the public is putting into this activity.

Mr. TEAGUE. Did I not understand you to say in your statement, Mr. Berg, that in 566 projects which are feasible from a cost-benefit standpoint, this could be done? Now, it couldn't be done where the cost-benefit ratio isn't favorable?

Mr. BERG. It is a complicated problem that you raise here because if there is not an authorized Public Law 566 project, it may have been because it couldn't cut the mustard from the standpoint of the benefit-cost ratio, but the likelihood is there were other problems involved beyond that in these broad multicounty developments that would have never met the criteria of the small-watershed program and it is this type of activity that builds on the soil and water conservation program that has been underway for perhaps 20 or 30 years, to do those things that the community feels still needs to be done to make the best use of the development of the resources that are in that total area.

The CHAIRMAN. If I understand Mr. Teague's point, it was simply that this allows the construction of projects without regard to the return or benefits that will be brought about then by the construction of the project, whereas 566 requires there be at least as much benefit come back to the public as the public spends. You can actually spend more money than you anticipate will be returned to the public here.

We generally think these projects are good or we wouldn't support them at all, but there is no monetary ratio required on these recreation projects, is there?

Mr. BERG. This is true, and the willingness would be the people meeting their share of what has to be done. In other words, that in turn is the criteria.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be a fair share under the terms of this bill other than one-half of the cost of easements and rights-of-way? What else is there?

Mr. BERG. It would include at least one-half of the cost of the structure itself and the long-term operation and maintenance of the facility.

The CHAIRMAN. This requires that the local people put up one-half of the cost of construction?

Mr. BERG. Oh, yes. That is in the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Federal Government may pay all of the engineering costs?

Mr. BERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. One-half of the basic facilities needed for health and safety the Federal Government pays one-half of that and not the full amount.

Mr. BERG. This is true. Up to one-half.

The CHAIRMAN. We are going to provide here the Federal Government could pay all of the engineering costs, even though it will be a profitmaking operation; isn't that right?

Mr. BERG. If there were Federal funding coming to this particular purpose then it would have to be open to the public.

They would have the right, I would imagine, to raise the necessary costs for operation and maintenance of the project area, but it would not be an investment in regard to this particular act that would lead to private gain or for private profit. This is for public use.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. All R. & D. projects would be open to the public?

Mr. BERG. Yes, these are all publicly based fish and wildlife and recreation developments.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Which would not necessarily come under the 566 projects. It would not apply necessarily to 566 projects?

Mr. BERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in direct conflict with what I understood you to say in answer to my question. I want to be sure that we are right. Is there a requirement in the present law—there is certainly none in this bill—is there a requirement in the present law that these projects shall be open to the public without charge? It is true, is it not, that they can charge admission to these projects?

Mr. BERG. Under the present authority?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BERG. Yes; I think they could. What have the plans shown to date, Mr. Silkett?

Mr. SILKETT. Charges could be made for use of these developments, but under 6233 these would be public recreation and Fish and Wildlife installations.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the provisions of this bill that we have before us, it provides that when the State or other public agency or local nonprofit organizations participating in a plan developed under this title agrees to operate and maintain any reservoir or other area included in a plan for public Fish and Wildlife or recreational development, the Secretary shall be authorized to bear not to exceed one-half of the cost.

That doesn't say they cannot charge the public. It simply says when a State, a public agency, or a nonprofit organization agrees to operate

and maintain. Now, that doesn't mean they are not going to charge for it. It seems to me pretty clear that they are going to charge for it.

We provide in the recreation projects in Public Law 566 where the Federal Government pays half of the cost of acquiring easements and rights-of-way on a possible maximum of three dams to a project, that they will do it providing that this land is open to the public without charge. We have no such provision here, do we?

Mr. SILKETT. It is not specifically in this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is neither in the existing law nor in the amendment as set out in the bill, so that there can be a charge even where the Federal Government is buying the land and paying all of the engineering and paying for half of the construction. Isn't that going a little far?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I think the rule is that there is a charge where there is some service provided.

Mr. BERG. Our policy on the small-watershed portion of the Small-Watershed Act that is similar to this states that local organizations may charge admission or use fees provided such fees do not provide revenues in excess of the local organization's requirements to amortize their initial investment and provide adequate operation and maintenance. Local organizations will be required to establish a schedule of maximum admission or use fees that may be charged by private concessionaires where involved. The schedule of admission and use fees together with other requirements for the operation and maintenance of the fish and wildlife or recreational facilities must be mutually agreed to by the local organization and the Soil Conservation Service and set forth in the operation and maintenance agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in either this bill or the basic law which is sections 10 and 11 of the code, is it?

Mr. BERG. No. In the watershed activity it is covered in our watershed memorandum —

The CHAIRMAN. It is in the law that relates to the 566 project. That is where it is, isn't it?

Mr. BERG. We cover it in this policy memorandum.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not talking about your memorandum. I am talking about the law.

I have the code here and it doesn't seem to have any such provision in it. So far as I know, this is all, this subchapter 3, land conservation and land utilization. It relates to—that is what is amended here by this bill, and this bill doesn't have any such provision in it. Neither does the basic law, so far as I can see.

It is true, you have nothing to protect the public except the present regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture which can be changed at any time. Isn't that right?

Mr. BERG. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that what we have done is give a great deal more protection in 566 than is set out here. It is true, is it not, that you can under the terms of this bill pay all of the costs of engineering, pay half of the cost of the rights-of-way and half of the cost of the construction of a reservoir that would be used as a profitmaking institution?

Mr. BERG. Not under the way in which we would administer the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't say the way you would administer it; I said under the law and this proposed amendment.

Mr. BERG. This is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that is going a long way in a dangerous direction. I know the Department is not doing it, but shouldn't we write this bill so that it could not be done? I would invite you to come back here tomorrow with amendments that will limit this thing to bona fide public operation, if the U.S. Government is going to pay half of the cost of building the reservoir. It doesn't seem they ought to build it where somebody can make a profit out of it. I am not charging that they can under the regulations, but I am suggesting under the law they could. I don't want somebody going down to my district saying "Well, Poage voted for that law."

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Berg, what are your requirements at this time in dealing with these local interests with regard to upkeep and maintenance of the facilities?

Mr. BERG. They are required to assume these responsibilities fully. This is a local responsibility, a non-Federal responsibility.

Mr. GATHINGS. So they can charge a reasonable fee to aid them in meeting those costs?

Mr. BERG. Yes; this is right, Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. And you want to deal with people that will assure the Government that it will not be a wrack and ruin proposition, and that the property will be maintained properly?

Mr. BERG. This is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Berg, I have a stock question I ask all of my constituents who asked me to support increased spending programs: What additional taxes do you propose?

Mr. BERG. I don't have the answer to that question, Mr. Goodling. We would operate this particular authority in accordance with the budget provided by the Congress, of course, and this would be one of the factors, if this could be considered as a purpose, in the administration of this particular bill, but we would have to fully justify the use of every Federal dollar that would go into these local projects.

This could require additional non-Federal spending for people to meet their responsibilities.

Mr. GOODLING. None of my constituents have the answer to that question, either.

Could this not be just one more camel's head under the tent project? Eventually, the entire camel is going to get inside and we are going to need a bigger tent.

Mr. BERG. These projects that undergo considerable scrutiny from the day that people make the application until they finally begin to do what they would like to do locally take a lot of judgment, and the local leadership, local sponsors who are the leaders of the community, are meeting together to assess what they think is the best for their particular community. We are not being a party to something that they have not felt should be done.

Mr. GOODLING. I am for recreation, I don't want to be misunderstood there. There is one thing that does concern me in all these projects. If you take 100 acres of land out of local tax production in Texas or in Pennsylvania, Bob Poage and George Goodling must pick up the tab

for the additional local tax. Now, on my own farm, my net receipts are becoming less and less each year and my local taxes are going higher and higher. Isn't that going to happen under these programs if they take land out of tax production?

Mr. BERG. I asked Mr. Silkett earlier to briefly relate what has been showing up in the way of plans from these sponsors in the projects that we have worked with so far that would indicate, I think, the desire of these people to move ahead to solve their local resource development and economic problems with whatever assistance they can legally get from local, State, or Federal sources. As we mentioned earlier, the results of these efforts in 3 years indicate a great willingness on the part of these people locally to face up to the issues that only they can solve locally, but they need some help and I would like to have Mr. Silkett briefly relate a couple of examples of where we have encountered these kinds of questions and what the local people have said they would like to be able to do.

Mr. SILKETT. One of those I would like to talk about would be the Wing River project in the west-central Minnesota R.C. & D. project. This is one where people have put together a plan to develop the measure but have not been able to carry through because of lack of financial assistance.

Mr. GOODLING. Louder, please.

Mr. SILKETT. This would create a 2-mile-long reservoir on Wing River and be a fishing and outdoor recreation center for Verndale, Minn., a small town. The water body would attract tourists to the area and create jobs from boat marinas, bait, and other recreation income. Tax base would be improved.

The structure is primarily recreation but has some erosion control and flood control in it. Estimated total cost for structure and related recreation areas is about \$140,000.

In this same R.C. & D. project we have an example of a recreation project measure which has been put into effect by local people, through their own efforts and by working with the State conservation department and others.

This is the Crow Wing canoe trail. The people in Wadena County, Minn., the local leaders, civic leaders, R.C. & D. leaders, soil and conservation districts decided they had a resource that wasn't being fully utilized. They mapped out 70 miles of the Crow Wing River and by cooperating with the State, getting grants of land and getting donations from local merchants, working with the State conservation department, Soil Conservation Service, and others, they have established a 70-mile canoe trail with 10 campsites. In the first year of operation—I believe it was 1965—about 500 people came into the area and utilized it. Last year, in 1966, 7,500 people used this canoe trail. They have expanded this facility to include a wilderness horseback trail with corrals and campsites. Further, they have expanded it further by utilizing it as a snowmobile trail in the wintertime which also keeps people coming into the area and spending money. I note from some reports by people that have made a study of the matter, that they estimate this has increased local community income by \$136,000 annually. The people who put this together tell me that they put into it about \$25,000 or \$30,000 in labor and materials.

I might also add there have been three or four new businesses spring up as a result of this particular activity. Three of them are canoe out-

fitters and one is a grocery store, and another one is a bait business. It is difficult to tell just what the turnover or multiplier effect of this kind of an income on the community would be. Here was a resource that people were willing to work at. This is what I think recreation will mean to some of these projects that have the available resources if they can get at it and develop it.

MR. GOODLING. If these projects turn out to be such a good investment, it seems to me local people would be delighted to go in there and do it themselves. Why come to the Federal Government and ask for help?

MR. SILKETT. In many cases this is true. I can cite you a situation in Wisconsin where the Taylor County Board of Supervisors issued \$300,000 bond issue to build a flowage, as they call them in Wisconsin, which is a lake. This is a part of the resource development up there, but in some other areas they simply cannot come up with the money to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN. May I ask you, Mr. Berg, about a legal situation. The law requires the same kind of a review by this committee over these recreation projects as it requires over 566 projects. There is an exemption of \$250,000. If the project does not involve more than \$250,000, the Secretary may approve the project without coming to any committee of the Congress. I assume that you have not spent more than \$250,000 on any of these projects. Is that right?

MR. BERG. That is correct. This is in the law in regard to the loan provision which would require that any loan exceeding \$250,000 come to this committee and a similar committee in the Senate for their review.

THE CHAIRMAN. Yes. It relates to the loans that will be made. Money cannot be appropriated for them until they have been approved by this and the other committee if they exceed \$250,000?

MR. BERG. That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN. Do you know if there is going to be any kind of departmental or executive protest about this? If you got a project on which you intend to spend more than \$250,000, would you send it to us?

MR. BERG. That is a question that is under review in the Department, and I cannot answer that, Mr. Poage. I just don't know the answer. The law is clear.

THE CHAIRMAN. Yes. I think the law is clear.

MR. GOODLING. One more question. Can local fish and game administrations be the sponsoring agents?

MR. BERG. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Have they done it?

MR. SILKETT. Yes. They have been working very closely with us, especially in the west central Minnesota project. The State fish and game department and also others.

MR. BERG. I believe they have in the New York project also.

MR. SILKETT. Yes. We are not completely in operation there yet.

THE CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

MR. STUBBLEFIELD. I would like to ask Mr. Berg a question.

You say you have about 400 proposals, water-based measures with public recreation. Only about 10 percent of these have been completed you say. Is that largely due to the lack of the ability to raise funds locally?

Mr. BERG. Mr. Silkett, would you review where we stand?

Mr. SILKETT. Yes. There are about 400 private and public type recreation proposals in these plans. Only about 10 percent have been completed and this slow progress is mostly due to lack of being able to come up with 100 percent of the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further questions?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. May I make just one observation on Mr. Goodling's question about the tax base.

Right in the middle of my district, the Tennessee Valley Authority has acquired about 170,000 acres between two huge lakes. Up until this development took place this was the lowest tax income area possibly in the whole district. There was no topsoil, just gravelly hillsides. After these lakes were formed and on the periphery of the area that the Tennessee Valley Authority acquired, land that used to sell anywhere from \$5 to \$25 an acre now is valued at anywhere from \$500 to \$3,000 an acre. The improvements that have gone up down there exceed the revenues that accrued before this development by about 10 times. So on my side of the lake, which was the lowest revenue-producing side of the county all of my life prior to this development, is now the heaviest revenue producer taxwise.

So actually when you take something out, you can't just say it is off the tax rolls and it is lost. Actually, you have a huge gain. Last year at the top end of this lake development there were 800,000 visitors; in 1966, 800,000. Of course, a lot of those were repeat people, but they count visitor-days. That gives you some idea of how big a business recreation is.

Mr. GOODLING. I think you have helped improve my argument. If it is a good investment local people should do it and not run to the Federal Government for help.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. It would be a little difficult to raise \$15 million locally down there, but it is coming back to the taxpayers because they make payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman, we feel that this proposal would aid in the Department's objectives of strengthening the economy and the standards of living and the development of our resource program in rural America, which I think everyone agrees is a good objective. These people that are working with the Secretary on resource conservation and development projects are exemplifying, as they have in conservation district work, as they have in small watershed work, that they are perfectly willing to do what they think is their job but they do need some assistance on especially the community-type work, that in many cases goes beyond in terms of benefit what they accrue as individuals. Many of these people are giving their time and effort to make these things work. We find that in regard to some of the tools that we have available to give assistance on, that Congress has provided and the very good support that Congress has given in terms of the financial help that is needed, that there are activities that can be strengthened, especially as we learn by experience, and this is one.

Mr. GOODLING. You speak of recreational dams and flood control dams. I would like to have this cleared up for my own thinking. Is a dam that has any value for recreation purposes any good for flood control?

Mr. BERG. Yes, if it is properly designed in the beginning to handle both purposes.

Mr. GOODLING. How do you do it?

Mr. BERG. The problem is a technical one, but it is a matter of planning for the capacity for both purposes, including the storage for flood prevention and the necessary storage to provide recreational facilities, recreational opportunities, as well as, for instance, fish and wildlife development, which may be a good thing to have.

Mr. GOODLING. I have a big flood control dam within a few miles of my home, but it is a dry dam. I can see how that can help in preventing floods but if that dam were filled it wouldn't have any value so far as flood control is concerned.

Mr. BERG. But if it is planned and designed so that there would be a permanent storage pool for recreational use, then that would be these and then over and above, would be the necessary capacity for flood protection, flood prevention storage for a limited time which may only operate in periods of heavy storms or a period of a few days to maybe a maximum of 10 days or so before it is back down to the permanent pool level.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will you yield? I might state in my district I do have three or four, maybe five, dams which serve both purposes, both flood control and recreation. So it is quite possible, depending on the topography and how they are designed, that you can have them do both.

Mr. BERG. The difficulty we find is that people after they have the structure, which may have been just for a single purpose, later on wish that they had additional purposes. Then it becomes more costly if, in fact, even physically possible to do. If it can be planned and designed with the purposes in mind in the beginning, it is the most effective use of the resource.

Mr. GOODLING. Do you cooperate with Army Engineers?

Mr. BERG. Yes; we do.

Mr. GOODLING. This dam of which I speak, a few miles from my home, is an Army Engineers dam.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I think the Army Engineers are involved in the Tradewater project.

Mr. SILKETT. Yes; this is right. They have been making a study of the Tradewater River.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy, the author of one of these bills, has come in.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I don't care to make any statement. I simply joined with Mr. Stubblefield in the introduction of the legislation. Actually, it was his idea and his bill. I think the committee staff requested a report on my bill simply because I might have been here a year or so longer than Mr. Stubblefield.

The CHAIRMAN. We have asked Mr. Stubblefield and others to bring us tomorrow suggestions limiting the provision for Federal payment of half of the cost of the rights-of-way so that as long as there are areas offering to pay these costs, that the program would be developed in those areas and that only when there were no areas offering to pay these costs would we then move to the areas that were asking the Federal Government to pay the cost.

Mr. GATHINGS. If the chairman will yield, I don't see that that is going to remedy the situation at all. Now, if you have 40 projects upon which studies have been made and you have the situation maybe where 20 of them might provide rights-of-way locally, there would be a conflict with Public Law 566.

The CHAIRMAN. When you reach that point, which I would anticipate to be a good many years in the future, I think that is exactly correct because, as I pointed out, I think that you cannot have this authority under this law and maintain the payment under 566. Immediately the people who have been giving right-of-way under 566 will demand that the Government pay for them. I think whenever you reach the point of making these payments you will have reached the point when you have to abandon the present program in 566. I think that this would put it some years down the road. Now, I did want to ask this simply as a matter of record: I don't know that I understand exactly what is meant there. Do you understand that this bill broadens the rural renewal authority?

Mr. BERG. Yes, it would, because they operate from similar authority, but they are not involved in the types of structures that we are talking of here, Mr. Poage.

The CHAIRMAN. So what would it involve, the provision that the Government would buy rights-of-way for them?

Mr. BERG. The types of projects that we are talking of here relate back to the resource conservation and development activity which includes an application for that type of a project; the authorization for planning and structures would be in a plan that comes forward through the resource conservation and development plan activity.

The CHAIRMAN. I think—I don't see how it would affect that rural renewal authority in this respect because this limits it to State and public agency or nonprofit organizations participating in a plan under this title who agree to operate and maintain any reservoir or other area included in the plan for public fish and wildlife or recreational development.

Mr. BERG. The provisions are now in the act and have been since 1962, that a loan—and this is administered through the Farmers Home Administration—would be available, but we are talking of cost sharing.

The CHAIRMAN. I know we are. I can't see how it would be applicable anyhow, because it is renewal only where they were building a dam and operating it in this manner.

Mr. BERG. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. So I guess it wouldn't touch that, although we and you want to watch that one, too.

If there is nothing further of the Department, we have a statement we were asked to place in the record from Congressman Cowger and, without objection, it will be placed in the record. We have a statement also from Congressman E. S. Walker.

(Mr. Cowger's letter and Mr. Walker's statement follow:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1967.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: I am writing in regard to H.R. 6169, which has been introduced by Congressman Stubblefield and which is presently pending before your committee. I would like to be put on record as being in favor of this legislative proposal.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM O. COWGER.

STATEMENT OF E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, I am appearing in support of H.R. 6405, a bill which I introduced on March 1, 1967, to amend Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. This bill would enable or permit funds from Resource Conservation and Development (R.C.&D.) to be made available on a cost-sharing basis for recreation, fish, and wildlife projects. In other words, this proposed legislation would give the Secretary of Agriculture the same authority for R.C.&D. projects that he now has under Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

Our critical need for more outdoor recreation areas is certainly evident; and this legislation, if enacted, would create new outdoor recreation opportunities for all Americans.

Our recreation needs for the future are even more critical than those of the present. To emphasize this growing demand, I shall quote a few predictions released this month by the U.S. Department of Agriculture:

We anticipate that by 1975, water-based recreation needs will increase by 170 percent over what they were in 1960, and by 400 percent by the year 2000.

The demand for hunting lands will increase by 125 percent by 1975, and up to 200 percent by 2000—and 90 percent of this activity will be on private land.

The demand for camping areas will increase by at least 160 percent by 1975 and by 250 percent by 2000.

These are some of the measures of the challenge we face.

To further illustrate this need, let's consider the problems faced by the National Park Service. Most of our National Parks are overflowing. For example, last year American and foreign sightseers made nearly 123 million visits to the large parks and other areas run by the National Park Service. The figure has more than doubled in the past ten years and is six times greater than in the period immediately after World War II.

We need to find ways to relieve some of the recreation pressure being placed on the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the dozens of other agencies that are directly or indirectly involved in outdoor recreation. H.R. 6405 will help do just this. It will help spread the load by providing more recreation facilities at a local level where the need is greatest.

Let's take a look now at boating and water sports. Boating is big business in America. More than 40 million people will be using boats this year. There are now 8.5 million pleasure craft afloat in the United States; or one boat for every 25 persons. By contrast, in 1950 there were only 3.5 million pleasure boats used by fewer than 15 million people. These are staggering increases.

The statistics on hunting and fishing are also a bit staggering. In 1965, some 33,000,000 sportsmen spent an estimated \$4,046,439,000 dollars on these two hobbies. Fishermen accounted for almost \$3 billion of this total. The provisions of H.R. 6405 are designed to help both the hunter and the fisherman, as well as other recreationists. For these reasons I urge your support of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am very much interested in the legislation, and people in my area are quite interested. It is my opinion and theirs that the bill would be rather beneficial to them as well as to comparable areas throughout the country. I hope that the committee would see fit to approve the bill. As I said a moment ago, if it does, I would recommend to the committee that they report Mr. Stubblefield's bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone else who wants to be heard on this series of bills?

Mr. MURRAY. May we ask one question for the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. What is the statutory basis for the rural renewal program?

Mr. BERG. The authority in the Bankhead-Jones amendment of 1962.

Mr. MURRAY. And what is the statutory basis for the rural conservation and development program?

Mr. BERG. The same authority, plus our Public Law 46 authority that established the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. MURRAY. This is my point. Both of these programs have the same statute as their legal basis. If we amend the statute in regard to the R.C. & D. program, aren't we also applying that authority from a legal standpoint to the rural renewal program?

Mr. BERG. It would be available; yes.

Mr. SILKETT. You would have to assume, however, that the rural renewal program would go into cost sharing. Right now it is a loan program.

Mr. MURRAY. But under the proposed legislation they could go into a cost-sharing activity legally?

Mr. SILKETT. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. I am speaking legally, not from the standpoint of policy.

Mr. SILKETT. I believe they could.

Mr. MURRAY. The amendments we are making in this bill could apply to the rural renewal program also?

Mr. SILKETT. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MURRAY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time we will hear the amendment on this bill.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, July 25, 1967.)

Mr. Murray: And what is the primary basis for the rural con-

stitution and development program?

Mr. Jensen: I believe authority, plus our Public Law 44 authority, that established that bill on the action series.

Mr. Jensen: It is my opinion that all these programs have the

same status and are not to be. It was my opinion that in regard to

the H.G. & D. program, we are the only authority that is a

real authority to provide a real authority.

Mr. Jensen: I would be glad to hear.

Mr. Jensen: I would have to assume, however, that the rural

development program would be in the same line as it is a

development.

Mr. Jensen: I think the proposed legislation they could go into

a development program.

Mr. Jensen: I am speaking largely now on the standpoint of

policy.

Mr. Jensen: I believe I would.

Mr. Jensen: The amendments are now coming in this bill would

apply to the rural development program also.

Mr. Jensen: The same is true.

Mr. Jensen: Thank you.

Mr. Jensen: Thank you.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morn-

ing at which time we will have the introduction of this bill.

When you are ready to go, the subject matter is to be discussed

at 10 a.m. Tuesday, July 25, 1967.

FEDERAL COST SHARING FOR RURAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Stubblefield, Jones of North Carolina, Teague of California, and Goodling.

Also present: Martha Hannah, subcommittee clerk; Francis LeMay, counsel; and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

Mr. Berg and his associates are back with us this morning. I understand they want to make a statement before we consider the amendment.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Berg.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN A. BERG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR FIELD SERVICES, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY CAL L. ROARK, RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, AND MARY M. GARNER, OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are pleased to be able to meet again this morning with your subcommittee to consider the amendment, H.R. 6233, to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

I have with me this morning Cal Roark, who is a member of our staff in the Resource Development Division, and Mary Garner, from the Office of General Counsel.

We went back, Mr. Chairman, to our work in this field of resource conservation and development, and in reviewing the progress and plans that we now have available, the reasons that show up indicate that Federal cost sharing is needed and desirable on land rights for public recreation and fish and wildlife developments in R.C. & D. projects, and that it would be desirable to include things such as these as justification for the bill:

First, many of the communities that we have worked with in this R.C. & D. development planning are areas, that is, rural areas in need of recreation developments that are not now financially able to meet all of the costs of land rights because many of them have a low tax base,

a fairly heavy financial burden for the public facilities and services that they are now providing.

And there is a low income in many of these areas.

Second, certainly many of the communities are striving to slow down or even reverse the serious outmigration, particularly of their youth as they either drop out or when they finish their schooling. These young people, the local sponsors feel, deserve better opportunities for both jobs and perhaps for recreation and fish and wildlife locally available.

Third, the communities with the heaviest drain are the same ones least able financially to provide recreation and other developments that will hold the people in that area.

Fourth, there has been a history in these areas for many years of a decline of agricultural and related businesses that has reduced the income of many of the people, and they have not been providing the recreational opportunities locally, nor can they afford to travel the distances to find recreational opportunities that may exist quite a ways from their communities.

This measure would in part make it possible for some communities to develop at least the minimum recreational facilities.

Fifth, the history of the watershed work has shown that land rights for flood water retarding structures are frequently obtained by means of donations, because the owners can continue to make use of the reservoir area and they also place some value on the water stored in the sediment pool. However, an easement would not be adequate for recreational development, because it would not permit public access and use. And we feel that if it is going to be a public facility it would require fee title acquisition as a preferable way of getting the land rights and this amendment would aid in that matter.

We do need authorization, if possible, that is consistent throughout an area, and this one would be consistent with the measure in the small watershed program.

Sixth, without the Federal cost sharing for land rights in recreational developments the more affluent communities will continue to progress more rapidly, and the poorer communities will continue to lag in meeting such needs.

Seventh, and, finally, in the multiple-use structures, the sponsors could be encouraged to plan for all of the possible uses of this including the recreation and the fish and wildlife uses, and they can be given the necessary incentive to do this. That is, if they can, it will be much more efficient in the use of the resource and will be less costly than if they want to do this later. In fact, it may be impossible to do it later, if it is not planned and done the first time the way it should be done.

These are the types of things that lead us to support this particular amendment, but at your request, Mr. Chairman, we do have a proviso that should be presented.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that the proviso which you have brought up here is the one that states:

Except that the Secretary shall not be authorized to bear such cost for any plan so long as there are other qualified plans pending which do not require Federal funds for such lands, easements, or rights-of-way.

Do I understand that the Department is willing to accept that amendment?

Mr. BERG. We in our agency accept this measure. We discussed this measure fully. We then met and discussed it with Assistant Secretary John Baker. We feel that the language which has been offered here substantially agrees with what you were saying yesterday, Mr. Chairman. Although we would prefer to have the amendment as originally drafted, this would be acceptable.

Mr. POAGE. Well, I prefer not to have any of this proviso in. We would have a better bill without it, I feel. Frankly, I think that this does none of the things that you have just talked about, except for a good many years in the future. I think it will be a long time down the road before we do any of those things that you have just talked about, but it will to some degree alleviate the danger that I think threatens the small watershed program in the Bankhead-Jones Act if we would pass this bill as it is now written.

It would be much better if you just eliminated the whole section relating to this acquisition of lands and rights-of-way. What you are doing here, as I see it, is that it will set up a great many hopes in many areas and then you will dash them down because the communities are not going to get the Federal funds for buying the lands for a long time.

I think that as long as you are not buying lands anywhere, I think that the communities will undertake to get the lands, but the minute that you begin to buy the lands anywhere, you are going to have no more lands given.

Is it your view that for a number of years you would continue to get rights-of-ways given?

Mr. BERG. I think that this would be a limiting feature on the possibility of people moving toward recreation and fish and wildlife developments. This would require acquisition in fee.

Mr. POAGE. Of course it will be a limiting feature. It is limiting on the flood-prevention programs. I have programs in my district that are not being developed because they have not been able to get the lands for them, but I believe that those people who do not want to give the rights-of-way will not do it anyway. There are plenty of places in the United States still where they want to do so.

Mr. BERG. This amendment would set that priority.

Mr. POAGE. It would set that priority, yes, but it would make it harder on you and on the Congress, too.

Mr. BERG. I think that if the law as such were available in the planning process, that this would be fully understood by the sponsors in making their plans.

Mr. POAGE. I think that we will get a lot of these people interested in plans to have the Government buy these lands, or to give them something. What do you think about it, Mr. Stubblefield? It is your bill. We do not want to pass the bill unless you are satisfied.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I think that this can be made clear to the sponsors as to what the story is.

Mr. POAGE. You would prefer to have this with the language just put out by the Department?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. We will have to make a case for this.

Mr. POAGE. It may be all right in the small watersheds. As you know, the Department has adopted what I think is a perfectly sound policy of not starting work on these watersheds until they get the rights-of-way—the deeds for all of the structures and not attempt to

get one or two to start on, but to wait until they can clear the whole project and know that they will get the rights-of-way over the whole area, and until they do they are not starting these projects now. If they can get them on two or three projects, then somebody will say, "I can hold this up and make you pay for it." And the result is that they stop and do not submit to blackmail. I think that is a good, sound policy, even though I have projects that have been held up by this policy. And people have complained bitterly about it. I think it is sound. I think this would be right sound as long as there is a project in the United States that will give the rights-of-way.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I think that the possibilities are remote in some instances.

Mr. POAGE. I do, too. I want it to be remote, but I am just wondering—I think that you are opening the door for trouble, both for the Department and the Congress, and I want this committee to understand that if we put this amendment in here that the Department is not going to circumvent it by holding up approval of somebody's project in which land will be given, until they can go along and make an artificial case that they could go ahead and buy the land somewhere else.

If you have a project in Mr. Teague's district where they are willing to give the land, you should not hold up on that in order so that you can go to Mr. Stubblefield's district and buy the land. You are not going to do that. I certainly will join in going to the Appropriations Committee and ask that your water be cut off right quick if you do.

Mr. BERG. And we would agree. This could not and this would not be fair. It could not be administered in this manner. The word does get around. The sponsors are in communication with each other. They are trying to work out their problems and to benefit by each other's experience. I think it would be quite clear with this particular amendment that we are discussing this morning that it is not the intention of the Federal Government to help on acquisition of lands for recreation or fish and wildlife developments in R.C. & D. projects if there is any other possible way of getting it done at a nominal cost.

Mr. POAGE. All right. Is there anyone else who wants to be heard on this?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I have one question here. How much Federal money has been expended on this program since its inception?

Mr. BERG. I may have to provide the exact amount.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I do not mean the exact amount, but approximately.

Mr. BERG. For the record, Mr. Teague, I will provide the exact amount, but the funding is now in its fourth year and this year it is about \$7 million. Of course, we are just beginning to move on that.

Last year we had \$4 million to spend.

The first year we had \$1,500,000.

So it is something in the neighborhood of less than \$15 million that has been available up to date.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Out of that \$15 million, roughly what percentage has gone into paperwork, plans, and planning and what percentage into actual construction of dams and other physical features?

Mr. BERG. The planning process is averaging about \$50,000 per plan.

And we now have 26 plans that are available for construction. The rest has been available for the technical support and loans that are needed to get into construction to do the necessary work at the project level.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Stubblefield.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. How many projects are in the R.C. & D. program?

Mr. BERG. Mr. Stubblefield, we got this in separate fiscal years. The first year we were authorized to move into 10; then we skipped the next fiscal year. Then we moved into 10 more and then this past year we moved into six more. This year when the appropriation bill is available there is a possibility of up to 15 new projects someplace in the country to be sanctioned for planning and, eventually, construction.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. How many recreation projects within each one of these—how many projects for recreation?

Mr. BERG. There has been no Federal assistance available in the way of cost sharing for recreation or fish and wildlife to date. They have planned for doing something, but it is to be done at no Federal cost-sharing expense. And they are averaging, as we look back over the plans, four or five as a maximum number and in some of the larger areas we have half a dozen or more counties that are sponsoring projects but these are a variety of recreational activities, not all of them for public benefit. Some of them include strictly private ventures.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Thank you. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Berg and your associates for coming here to be with us.

Mr. BERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. I think that will be all on this matter.

The subcommittee will now go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the committee proceeded into executive session.)

FEDERAL COST SHARING FOR RURAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, at 10 a.m., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Abernethy, Jones, Stubblefield, O'Neal, de la Garza, Dow, Nichols, Montgomery, Belcher, Teague, May, Dole, Wampler, Goodling, Mayne, Zwach, and Kleppe.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order in open session. We have for consideration the bill, S. 852.

(The bill follows:)

[S. 852, 90th Cong., first sess.]

AN ACT To amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1011), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In providing assistance for carrying out plans developed under this title the Secretary shall be authorized to bear such proportionate share of the costs of installing any works of improvement applicable to public water-based fish and wildlife or recreational development as is determined by him to be equitable in consideration of national needs and assistance authorized for similar purposes under other Federal programs: *Provided*, That all engineering costs relating to such works of improvement may be borne by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That when a State or other public agency or local nonprofit organization participating in a plan developed under this title agrees to operate and maintain any reservoir or other area included in a plan for public water-based fish and wildlife or recreational development, the Secretary shall be authorized to bear not to exceed one-half of the costs of (a) the land, easements, or rights-of-way acquired or to be acquired by the State or other public agency or local nonprofit organization for such reservoir or other area, and (b) minimum basic facilities needed for public health and safety, access to, and use of such reservoir or other area for such purposes: *Provided further*, That with respect to any single work of improvement applicable to public water-based fish and wildlife or recreational development the total estimated Federal contribution to the construction costs of such work of improvement, including the costs of the land, easements, or rights-of-way and minimum basic facilities, shall not exceed \$50,000; and that any such development shall be consistent with any existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan found adequate for purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897); and that such cost-sharing assistance for any such development shall be authorized only if the Secretary determines that it cannot be provided under other existing authority."

Passed the Senate September 21, 1967.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. We have before us the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, our friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Rivers, who wants to make a statement on the pending bill. We are well aware he has a great many other duties and we are delighted to hear you at this time, Mr. Rivers.

STATEMENT OF HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RIVERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want you to realize that I realize that it is dangerous for somebody to come before a committee when he is not knowledgeable, as the members on the committee are so frequently on the legislation. This does not always hold true, and sometimes by appearing before a committee on which one does not have membership, you cannot tell, you might get some good out of it.

The distinguished chairman of this committee testified before my committee, and before he left I think he got 90 percent of the bill, if my memory serves me correct. So you cannot tell, in my case even a blind hog may pick up an acorn.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a large metropolitan area, and a very large rural area. I represent the whole coastal plain of South Carolina as well as a large metropolitan area of Charleston, over 300,000 people, and 200,000-odd people who are rural people.

I have lived with these people on their watershed projects, which were approved by this committee under the subchairmanship of the distinguished chairman, and we have been stymied ever since. We have been trying to find out a way where we can get assistance in the construction of this great watershed project we have.

We hope that this bill will be in some wise helpful in the overall assistance by the Government in salvaging some land that is almost unusable now, and good land that gets overrun by water because it has no drainage.

I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. This amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act would provide for cost sharing on public fish and wildlife or recreation development in the R.C. & D. projects similar to the provisions now available under Public Law 65-66, and the small watershed projects. There are presently, I understand, 41 of these projects covering 99.9 million acres of land in 35 States. One of these is located in my district. Consequently, this bill represents an awful lot to a large group of people in my district.

In the low country of South Carolina, our projects cover over 3 million acres of land and six counties in the southeast portion of South Carolina. Part of that is in Mr. McMillan's district.

The economy of the area has been low and the outmigration of young people has been very high.

Agriculture employment dropped from 17,847 to below 8,000 from 1950 to 1965. Some of this loss was made up by industry coming in our part of the world, but not very much of it in this particular part of our State.

This area to which I refer desperately needs a boost economically and the potential for it is great.

Fish and wildlife resources in the project counties are among the best in the Nation. Lack of capital and local interest in the past has

caused these resources to remain generally undeveloped, but now interest is very high. A well-developed recreation complex in this area would have the same effect as a new manufacturing plant or canning plant or some industrial plant. It would mean jobs, it would mean services, and it would bring a lot of people into this area for recreation.

Potential sites for recreation and fish and wildlife development exist in all six counties of this area.

Remember, I told you there were 3 million acres of land.

Incidentally, this is land-grant country. The names of these counties still carry the names of the lord's proprietors. Charleston's rivers were named for Anthony Ashlen Cooper, the Earl of Shaftsbury, and the next one is named for the Earl of Dorchester and this is the county to which I refer. In Dorchester County, for instance, a 40- to 50-acre lake with recreation facilities is feasible. The shoreline is well suited for public beaches and camping and picnicking.

There is plenty of rain, plenty of flat country. The estimated cost of the lake construction is roughly \$75,000, with additional cost of \$25,000 for recreational facilities and the land. Dam construction, roadbuilding, and general construction would create jobs, require suppliers, and affect the local economy in terms of housing workers, providing food, and furnishing construction materials. After construction a continuing economic impact will be felt in housing, feeding, and supplying recreation seekers.

The surrounding land will have increased value due to its prime location near the recreation area, and, of course, the increased tax will provide community facilities. The South Carolina resource conservation and development project area includes several large military installations located mostly, as I said, in Charleston and down where Parris Island is about 75 miles away in a county known as Beaufort County. Beaufort County is a French name. The French sailed into Beaufort in 1562. That is 100 years before Charleston. On these military bases the Government employees and the service people would be provided access to these areas to which I refer made possible by this act.

What the project sponsors need, as I have said, is to get started on these things, and they could, I hope and believe by the passage of this bill. As you know, it has already passed the Senate and would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to share part of the cost not to exceed \$50,000 of installing public fish and wildlife or recreation developments. The cost sharing would be allowed only on public water-based developments where assistance is not available under other existing authority and allowed only on developments consistent with the comprehensive statewide plan found adequate for purposes of the Land-Water Conservation Act of 1967.

I am about finished, Mr. Chairman. This bill will help many economically depressed areas in improving local facilities, increasing private investment, creating new jobs, broadening their economic base, if they have one, providing a steady benefit that cannot be expressed in dollars and cents and strengthening the overall economy.

Mr. Chairman, the people back home in the rural areas—I am not talking about the metropolitan urban areas—are as much a part of this great country as are the hovels in the big cities. All we hear these days is the dialog on the ghettos, spend money on the ghettos. The grassroots

of America should be thought about somewhere down the line if we are going to survive for they are part of this country. This bill helps people out in the country areas.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is designed to invest a few dollars in some projects in rural America which will create jobs, improve property, bring happiness, improve land now idle. I think your committee should report it out and I hope it will, and I hope that the House will follow the lead of the Senate, should you report it out.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this opportunity to testify before your great committee. I hope I can respond should I have caused any of you reason to ask me questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We are delighted to have you with us, Mr. Rivers. We want you to always feel free to come before this committee at any time. We are glad to have your suggestions. Are there questions of Mr. Rivers?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman, as far as I can tell there is not that much money involved in this bill. It just takes part of the funds and uses them for recreation facilities to improve the land.

Mr. RIVERS. The reason I got involved in this, as Mr. Poage knows, is that this will help us both in getting our watershed projects off dead center as well as providing these things and increasing the overall package.

It cannot but help the people who cannot get help anywhere else. There is an intense amount of interest in this bill from my part of the world. I do not know about the gentlemen from Mississippi, but I imagine it is the same down there.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I know the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has fine recreation spots already in South Carolina. Your experience in South Carolina is the same as in Kentucky—the city people use the recreation facilities as well as the local rural people.

Mr. RIVERS. Surely. Good roads have taken care of that.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dole.,

Mr. DOLE. This really is not a question, Mr. Rivers.

The problem many of us have is about spending and priorities, I am wondering if we can in good conscience keep passing bills in our committees with open-ended authorizations that would require essentially more spending, and then talk about the need for cuts and spending at home and the fact that we are opposed to tax increases. Is that consistent?

Mr. RIVERS. If you want to approach it from that side, you can always find a reason to be against this if you are afraid of what people think. The people I talk to in my country— and it cost me \$30 to get home in a few minutes, and I go home an awful lot because we have planes running nonstop two or three times a day to Charleston—I talk to the people who live in the country and I represent about 600,000 people. They are more concerned about the spending on foreign aid. When you talk to Mr. Passman, you find out how much is spent on foreign aid over the years. I never apologize for investing in America.

I do not think they would criticize you for this. My people are very conservative. These people do not believe in squandering money.

Mr. DOLE. They want to save money somewhere else.

Mr. RIVERS. They do not apologize for the watershed projects this committee reported out.

Mr. DOLE. We don't either. We have a great many in Kansas.

Mr. RIVERS. We have recreation areas in my country. There are areas where these people are fenced in. The testimony I gave Mr. Poage on the watershed, water has no place to go because you are close to the ocean and if it cannot get through the vast swamp areas to the ocean, the water lies on top of the ground whereas in your country you may have dry ground and we have wet ground. If you invest a few dollars, you have the greatest hunting and fishing recreation area in the world, certainly in the United States. We will invite you down there. You will be the first person we will invite.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Rivers, I understood that this bill would not require any additional appropriation.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know what the bill requires, but I am for it. I do not think this bill is going to bankrupt America.

Mr. O'NEAL. It was my understanding that it would only broaden the use of money already appropriated.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right, the Bankhead-Jones statute, that is my understanding.

When I came in here, I said the humblest member of this committee knew more about this bill than I did. I started off that way.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I just say one word in reply to Mr. Dole? This is a cost-sharing project. It provides 50 percent for local contribution. The local people have to instigate this thing. It cannot come from up here. It has to come from the swamps of South Carolina. If they cannot produce they are not eligible for the cost-sharing provision of the bill.

As far as spending is concerned, it is not an outright grant. The local people have to contribute 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. DOLE. Who is going to pay the other 50 percent?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. It comes out of the soil conservation appropriation.

Mr. DOLE. Then they will ask for more money the following year to take care of this program.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Is it a good program or is it not? Is it worthwhile?

Mr. DOLE. I think it is a great program. That is not the point. Is it a priority program, one that cannot be deferred until we find a way out of this financial crisis.

Mr. RIVERS. It has been deferred for 27 years, since I have been here. They can continue to do it. They are going to bring in some emergency legislation to build up New Jersey on long-term financing, and Detroit, Mich., that will go through the House so fast it will make your head swim. These things, that involve farmers, we debate them and debate them. This is the attitude I do not like.

I've got Secretary McNamara coming before my committee this morning on cutting back his military projects. The very first group who feels the lash of the economy is either the farmer or the military dependents who cannot talk back. The farmers are not organized, and

the military dependents are not organized. They cut back their housing, they will cut back barracks and hospitals. They will cut back all these sewer projects that we are trying to get. You have one in your district, Mr. Chairman. All these things they will cut back, yet nobody has ever mentioned cutting back foreign aid. I would cut it all out for this year. I do not apologize for this. I can defend myself on looking out for my district and do it very eloquently.

You ought to hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions of Chairman Rivers?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Rivers. We appreciate your coming up here.

Mr. RIVERS. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 10:30 a.m., the committee adjourned.)

FEDERAL COST SHARING FOR RURAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, McMillan, Stubblefield, O'Neal, Foley, de la Garza, Vigorito, Dow, Nichols, Montgomery, Brasco, Belcher, Teague of California, Mrs. May, Dole, Hansen, Wampler, Miller, Burke, Mathias, Mayne, Zwach, Kleppe, Price, and Myers.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; Hyde H. Murray, assistant counsel; L. T. Easley, staff consultant; and Fowler C. West, assistant consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

Several members have asked to file statements. All Members of Congress will be permitted to file statements at this point in the record. (The statements and letters follow:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity which your Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit has given me to testify today in support of my bill, H.R. 6127, and companion measures, especially H.R. 6233, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Mr. Abernethy.

This legislation would amend Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to stimulate and accelerate economic development in rural America and create new outdoor recreation opportunities for all Americans. There is a demonstrated need for more recreational areas. Our increasing metropolitan-based society needs relief from the stresses and strains of urban living. Our rural areas also require preservation for future generations. This measure would encourage people in rural America to plan and develop recreational facilities in the most efficient and expedient manner.

H.R. 6127 would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to furnish financial help to public bodies in planning and constructing recreation developments in resource conservation and development project areas. It would give him the same authority he now has under P.L. 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, that is greatly benefiting watershed project sponsors throughout the nation.

Resource conservation and development projects are one of the most promising new approaches to natural resource development. These projects, initiated and sponsored by local people, are already contributing to the economic growth and joy opportunities of many areas. There are presently 26 projects in the operation and planning stages covering more than 59 million acres in 27 states. Although

their purposes vary, in the main their greatest contributions come from the development of recreational potential.

I can personally attest to the great value of these projects. In my 24th Congressional District of Pennsylvania we have underway the Penn Soil Resource Conservation and Development Project. It is sponsored by the directors of the Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the Boards of County Commissioners in Crawford, Mercer and Venango Counties. Its development plan was adopted in August, 1964, making it one of the first to be approved in the country.

Already the benefits it will bring to the area in terms of recreation, natural resource conservation and preservation, woodland and farmland development, and water and soil improvement are obvious.

I hold up the Penn Soil Project as a model of how much this type of development can contribute to rural America. It proves the value of these projects and illustrates why we should all work for the passage of the legislation under consideration today. Since resource conservation and development funds cannot presently be used for cost sharing on recreation and fish and wildlife developments, local sponsors have come across a roadblock.

More than 350 recreation developments presently planned by resource conservation and development sponsors cannot be completed without some public financing. Although project sponsors are encouraged to make use of any available public program that will meet their needs, funds are just not available in many project areas. State plans for outdoor recreation under which land and water conservation fund grants are made usually do not include resource conservation and development recreation project measures, or else assigns low priority to them.

The legislation I have introduced would fill the gap for aid in recreation development left by other program authorities. It would not overlap any existing programs.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. Rommel, assistant director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, both recommend passage of this measure. In addition, Mr. Norman A. Berg of the U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service has appeared before this subcommittee, urging that H.R. 6127 and H.R. 6233 be favorably considered.

It is my hope that the subcommittee, after studying the need for this legislation, will give it a favorable report to the full committee.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity you have given me to testify in favor of H.R. 6127.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1967.

HON. ROBERT POAGE,
Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I welcome this opportunity to present information and material in support of S-852 pertaining to cost-sharing on proposals relating to recreation, fish, and wildlife in resource conservation and development projects. One of these projects is proposed in the Wiregrass area consisting of nine counties in southeast Alabama, which I represent.

The sponsors of the Wiregrass RC&D Project recognize the development of recreation, fish, and wildlife potentials as being one of their greatest needs. There are almost 4,000,000 acres in the nine county project. The entire area is devoted to a diversified agriculture with over 40 percent being cropland and pasture. The 1965 population of the project was 259,872. These people, along with numerous outsiders, seek recreation in the Wiregrass area.

The Wiregrass Project area, without doubt, has fewer developed recreation facilities than any other area of the State. The only significant facilities consist of the Chattahoochee State Park (undeveloped), a camp site in the Conecuh National Forest, and skiing and swimming at three larger lakes. These lakes are remotely located at the extreme eastern and western boundaries of the project. No water-based recreation facilities are available to the majority of the people.

More than 200 proposals for development were received by the Steering Committee. Twenty-five percent of these were related to recreation, fish, and wildlife

development. Most are considered as "water-based developments". These developments would permit the installation of camping, picnicking, and other family type facilities. Presently, no such facilities are available. The project area is geographically located in an area through which thousands of tourists pass in route to recreation developments in other areas. Out-of-state tourists, as well as local residents, would immediately make full use of all developed facilities. Each of the potential developments would be water-based.

Other developments planned consist of additional lakes for water sports, boat ramps, community parks, golf courses, hunting preserves, and several unusual miscellaneous items.

The primary reason that few facilities have been developed is the lack of ability of local people to provide financing of 100 percent of the costs. Cost-sharing and loans are needed to encourage these developments.

Even though such assistance is provided under the PL 566 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program, no projects have been authorized under this legislation. Preliminary investigations indicated that, due to the nature of the topography in the area, no feasible structures that would include water recreation opportunities can be built under PL 566.

If the Wiregrass RC&D sponsors are to proceed on schedule with their over-all program, recreational opportunities must be developed. Cost-sharing through the RC&D program would help to make this possible.

I respectfully request the committee to give this bill favorable action.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE ANDREWS.

STATEMENT OF HON. TIM LEE CARTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege you have extended to me to appear before your subcommittee to offer testimony in support of my own bill, H.R. 11260, and related bills to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes.

According to my information, the Department of Agriculture recommends enactment of this legislation. It would authorize the Secretary to cost share in the installation of works of improvement applicable to public fish and wildlife or recreational development under the act. Inasmuch as this authority would provide more effective and coordinated assistance to local communities in carrying out resource conservation and development programs, designed to provide better use and conservation of resources and thereby improve the economy of the area and the income of the people, I am glad to endorse and recommend enactment of this legislation, especially in view of the fact that it would help to alleviate the shortage of recreational facilities, particularly in rural areas where the local economy is unable to provide for total resource development, according to my understanding of the legislation.

As we know, many areas having farms that are no longer self-sufficient, unsuitable soils and terrain, and inadequate financial resources, are suffering from abandoned farmland, loss of population, and economic stagnation, and are forced to seek alternative uses of land for economic survival. However, local sponsoring organizations believe they can, with Federal aid, help arrest the economic decline of rural areas by using more land and water resources for recreational developments.

The proposed legislation would not only serve local rural areas but also the broader community recreation needs of nearby urban areas and enable farm and rural leaders to retain the control and initiative in planning for the use of rural lands and resources so as to protect and adequately provide for rural needs. And it would help to protect areas having unique scenic, environmental, and recreational qualities. In addition, it would help to promote better planning for development and use of full resources of rural areas, thus resulting in improved community facilities, increased private investment, new job opportunities, and a consequent strengthening of the overall economy.

Therefore, as previously stated, I am glad to endorse and recommend the subcommittee's favorable consideration of this legislation for early House action.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1967.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my support for Senate Bill 852, which is currently before the House Committee on Agriculture.

This bill would amend Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization. It would further authorize the Secretary to share costs of installing public fish and wildlife or recreational developments.

I have had much correspondence from my constituents in Northeastern Oklahoma urging support for this bill. The Cherokee Hills Resource Conservation and Development Project is located in my district, and is one of 41 such projects in the country.

My district needs this legislation to develop the social, economic, and resource potentials for the people this project serves. They have made progress in carrying out the planned measures in their project, which covers a three-county area. Fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation development are important parts of their development plan, and they have excellent potential for development in these areas. This legislation will greatly enhance their development through the cooperative effort it proposes.

I would like to go on record as being in full accord with this legislation and its objectives. I encourage this committee to issue a favorable report on it, and to push for its final passage in the House of Representatives.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice my opinions.

With best wishes and kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ED EDMONDSON, *Member of Congress.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
*Chairman, Agriculture Committee,
House of Representatives,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN POAGE: It is my understanding that in the near future you will be taking Executive Session action on S. 852. Before you do, I would like to take a moment to make two comments about this proposed legislation.

First, the Resource Conservation and Development projects in the Third Congressional District of Arkansas, which I am honored to represent, have been highly successful. Legislation, such as S. 852, will assure the future success of these programs.

Second, it is my understanding that the passage of this legislation by the House will enable the local people to more effectively use the available resources to meet the recreational and fish and wildlife development needs.

Your consideration of my views is sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before you in support of S. 852, a bill authorizing Federal cost-sharing in recreation and wildlife development. Mr. Peter Meike, president of the Wyoming State Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and Mr. Leo Cornia, Chairman of the Program Committee of the

Western Wyoming Resource Conservation and Development Project, have asked me to also assure your Committee of the full support of their groups. Wyoming is a natural resource State, and recreation and wildlife are very essential to its future economy. For that reason it is extremely important that proper planning and development of both recreation and wildlife take place. Both Mr. Meike and Mr. Cornia would like to appear before your Committee in person but, unfortunately, the lack of funds prevents this. I do hope that your Committee will, after careful consideration, approve S. 852.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the other distinguished members of your committee for this opportunity to testify on a matter I feel to be of the utmost importance. This is S. 852, the legislation you have before you today, which amends the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to allow federal cost-sharing on recreation and fish and wildlife developments in Resource Conservation and Development projects.

I have personally supported and encouraged the North Cal-Neva Resource Conservation and Development project, located in the northeast corner of California and northwest corner of Nevada, for I feel this approach is the answer to the economic ills of the area.

The land is probably unequalled in either State for its variety of wildlife and its potential attraction as a year-round recreation area. Yet the area has suffered a general decline in population since 1950, and farm incomes are low. For example, in 1965, 40 percent of the Modoc County, California, farmers had net incomes of less than \$3,000.

Despite this, the people in the area know they can do better and are willing to work toward that end, invest their own funds, and obligate themselves for long term loans.

But they need help, Mr. Chairman, the type of help available through S. 852. The project sponsors will make substantial use of this new authority if it is enacted into law. Their Resource Conservation and Development project is now in the planning stage. Already they have found numerous sites where flood detention structures are needed. Many of these can be developed for multiple uses such as fish and wildlife and public recreation. But with their limited financial resources, the local people cannot shoulder the burden themselves.

Passage of S. 852 would give the local people the opportunity to create needed outdoor recreation facilities for all the people, and at the same time, stimulate economic growth and job opportunities in the area.

I firmly believe that Resource Conservation and Development projects are one of the most promising new approaches to natural resource development. Providing authority for cost-sharing on fish and wildlife and recreation development would substantially make these projects more effective.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for this opportunity of testifying before your Committee. I am here to support the principles embodied in S. 852, a bill to amend section 32(e) of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance in carrying out works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes.

The Secretary of Agriculture would bear part of the cost of installing public fish and wildlife or recreational developments in so-called resource conservation and development projects authorized by section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The cost of such installations should not exceed one-half the cost of the land, easements, rights-of-way, and minimum basic public facilities needed in connection with any such public fish and wildlife or recreational development. At the present time Federal assistance under section 32(e) is limited to planning assistance and loans. Grants are not authorized for installation assistance.

As you know, rural conservation and development projects were authorized by the Congress in 1962. This was accomplished by an amendment made by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. These projects provide a framework for cooperation between representatives of voluntary groups and local, State and Federal agencies to plan and develop economic growth programs for a rural region.

The program was funded in 1963 and the first ten projects were authorized in 1964. At present there are 26 projects across the nation in the planning and operational stage, covering about 60 million acres in all or part of 126 counties in 27 States. These projects are a very effective method through which citizens in rural America can develop natural resources and contribute to the economic growth of their communities. The widespread acceptance of this method is indicated by the fact that local sponsors of an additional 22 projects have made application to the Department of Agriculture seeking approval.

Experience with the existing resource conservation, and development projects shows that one of the important ways of achieving the purposes of the program is through the development of recreational and fish and wildlife measures. However, I would like to say that unfortunately, under existing law, the Secretary of Agriculture is not permitted to share cost for these measures with resource conservation and development funds. It has been reported that there are more than 350 recreation or fish and wildlife measures planned in the resource conservation and development projects which the sponsors feel cannot be developed without some financial assistance. Delay in the construction of these measures, essential to rural community needs, seriously hampers the effectiveness of the overall program.

One of the findings of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report was that the demand for outdoor recreation exceeds the public and private facilities now available. The physical supply of land and water is more than adequate; access is not. The types of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities which would be developed under authority of this bill would be a constructive step in meeting the need for access.

A report on the first ten resource conservation and development projects, which were approved between 1963 and 1965, shows that 610 project measures have been completed or are under development or being planned. The Secretary of Agriculture has estimated that more than \$71 million of increased income and 10,000 new jobs are expected to result from these 10 projects. The economic growth of these and the other projects would be substantially expanded by enactment of S. 852.

Despite its wealth of natural resources, a large portion of northern New Mexico has been economically depressed. It has been plagued by unemployment, deficient capital investment, uneconomical small farm units, and a lack of agricultural marketing and processing facilities. In 1964, New Mexico was given one of the first 10 pilot projects to help rejuvenate depressed rural regions. The project, the Northern Rio Grande Conservation and Development Program, covered more than three million acres of public, Indian and private lands in Taos, Rio Arriba, Los Alamos, and Santa Fe counties. The project developed by the people of northern New Mexico, with the assistance of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, the New Mexico State Engineer and many other local groups and civic organizations was a success because it was developed by the people. Local initiative and imagination shaped the project. It clearly demonstrated the type of development that can be accomplished by the people of an area if encouraged and provided with the necessary technical assistance to develop their human and natural resources. The twenty-five local sponsoring groups have in two short years set in motion measures creating approximately 35,000 man-days of employment and bringing \$398,000 of additional income per year to the four-county area. The project sponsors have received 168 proposals for such measures as marketing and processing facilities, income-producing recreation enterprises, flood control, watershed protection projects, community irrigation improvements, municipal recreation development, expansion of native arts and crafts industries, and many others. One such example is the community of Santa Cruz.

The community of Santa Cruz is approximately six miles east of Espanola. The population is estimated at 500. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service, through the East Rio Arriba Soil and Water Conservation District, has furnished technical assistance largely with resource conservation and development funds to assist the Santa Cruz community in improving their irrigation delivery system. The initial phase of the project was completed in the fall of 1965 with addi-

tional work being completed in 1966 and 1967. Total cost of improvement work to date is \$124,390. The Agricultural Conservation Program and the New Mexico State Engineer have cost-shared on these improvements. The complete irrigation system serves 1,200 acres of irrigated land operated by 208 rural families.

It is my view that the type of cost-sharing provided for in this bill will not conflict with other programs. It is possible with State plans for recreation for which Land and Water Conservation Fund grants can be made could be justified for some of the resource conservation and development project measures. Certainly, in the interest of efficiency it would be more effective to plan recreation and fish and wildlife development in the resource conservation and development regions at the same time as other uses for land and water are being considered.

In conclusion I would like to state that benefits would result from the enactment of this bill, which I consider to be important enough to warrant prompt and direct action by this Committee and the House of Representatives. This bill will advance the purpose of the resource conservation and development program, and also develop the natural resources of a region in a way which will create employment opportunities and increase rural income in communities not covered under P.L. 566. In addition there will be social benefits for all citizens of the country. It would enable project measures to be accelerated that are truly multiple purpose, including needed recreation and fish and wildlife developments.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to present my views on the bill, H.R. 6169, now under consideration before your Subcommittee. It calls for amending section 32(e) III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization. I am very grateful to you for scheduling these hearings on what I believe to be an important and necessary measure.

Every day we can observe the irreparable damage being done to our natural environment as the result of uncontrolled urban sprawl. The impact of population growth and economic expansion upon our land is a fact of twentieth-century life. However, the realities of the pressures of land use and the orderly and intelligent planning for future needs do not have to be mutually excluding goals. By recognizing the scope and urgency of the problem while there is yet time, we may avoid the mistakes of the past and ensure following generations the opportunity to enjoy the unique advantages of our inherited natural treasures.

The needs are so great, the costs are increasing so rapidly, and the problems are so interrelated that the time is upon us for an integrated Federal program to seek the best solutions. This was recognized recently by the New York Times which stated in an editorial that, "if conservation projects are not to become astronomically expensive, action has to be taken now to save wilderness, open space and future park and recreation lands." Further, it stated "Congress needs to develop an overall public policy on land acquisition. The future cannot be left to the mercy of the private speculator." Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill to be an important step toward developing the type of land and conservation policies needed to deal with these problems.

The advantages of this bill may be well illustrated by its implications for my own district in Eastern Connecticut. It will have a strong impact upon the success of the Eastern Connecticut Resource Conservation and Development Project authorized for planning by the Secretary of Agriculture. The primary objective of the project is to speed up conservation and development of the area's natural resources. This requires sound management of the natural environment and efficient utilization of natural resources for the benefit of the expanding population.

Although an ample supply of water reaches the area each year, the amount and quality of the water varies from place to place; from season to season; and from year to year. As the need for water increases, so does the need for careful planning and development management, agricultural water management, recreation, fish and wildlife developments, water quality improvement, and public and industrial water supply.

There is a need throughout the area for technical and financial assistance not provided under other existing authorities for water-based recreational activities, and fish and wildlife developments. Assistance is needed for installation and cost of land, easements, rights-of-way, and public facilities.

Benefits from fish and wildlife and recreational developments will extend far beyond the project. People from outside the area itself will be able to take advantage of hunting, fishing, swimming, picnicking, boating and other activities provided by such water-based developments.

Particularly significant public benefits will result from wetland wildlife habitat developments. About 200 wetland areas comprising 18,500 acres have been identified in the project. Many of these and other wetland areas which will be studied have potential for improved wetland wildlife habitat. One of the main objectives of the project is to improve conditions necessary for the production and preservation of waterfowl. The major benefits from this work will extend beyond the project area.

In 1960, the population of the area was 283,000 people. By the end of the century, it is expected that it will more than double. Present estimates indicate 732,000 people in the area by the year 2000. Also of importance is the expectation that proportional population increases will result outside the area itself in adjoining parts of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, where people look to this area for outdoor recreation and other natural resources and environmental values.

Because of the growing population and expanding urbanization, the preservation and development of available sites with potential for water resources development is urgent. Along with this strong degree of urgency, there is also the necessity of developing these sites consistent with the multiple purpose potentials and the ever-growing demands on water resources for recreation and fish and wildlife developments.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge your Committee to favorably report this bill and recommend its immediate passage. I feel that it is not only of very high priority on its own merits, but also can serve to set an important precedent in the preservation and management of our invaluable natural birthright.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that your committee is now considering S. 852 which would provide cost sharing for recreational projects under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. My own District would be directly benefitted by the enactment of this legislation.

The Lincoln Hills R.C. & D. project area includes four counties in the heart of the Eighth District. There are over a million acres in the project area and a population of just over 61,000 residents. Over the years the Lincoln Hills area has suffered the pangs of economic distress with little chance for improving the situation. Although there is great potential for recreation and tourist development, not much can or will be done without additional assistance from outside the project area.

Presently, three of the four counties have organized Park and Recreation Boards for the purpose of developing some of the recreational potential. However, their money must be secured by taxation of an already heavily burdened local tax base. Towns are also interested but do not have the financial means to proceed without assistance. "Water" is the first priority item, as stated by the R.C. & D. executive committee in 1964 while developing their project plan. This remains priority number one.

Two R.C. & D. project measures (Buffalo Trace Lake and Park Development and Buck Creek Lake) are currently in need of recreation cost share assistance. Other project measures will be developed as county park & recreation boards, towns, future non-profit corporations, and other public minded organizations see the possibilities when recreational cost share assistance is available to make local funds "stretch" to meet their recreational development needs.

Mr. Chairman, I will certainly appreciate your consideration of these facts as your Committee conducts its studies on this vital legislation. I respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the record of these hearings.

Sincerely,

ROGER H. ZION,

Member of Congress, Indiana's 8th District.

The CHAIRMAN. We are meeting today on S. 852.

Our first witness this morning is our colleague, Congressman Omar Burleson. We are glad to have you here and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. OMAR BURLESON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to advise your committee on the merits of the legislation provided by S. 852. I know all of you have followed these developments with very great interest and, of course, Mr. Chairman, you were the originator of one of the finest programs and most successful programs to which this legislation relates.

As set out in the Senate report, many areas with farms that are no longer self-sufficient, which have unsuitable soils and terrain, and lack adequate financial resources are suffering from abandonment, loss of population, and a degree of economic stagnation. It calls for alternatives for the use of this type of land as an incentive for people to remain in our more rural areas.

It seems to me that this should be a part, and a very important one, of ways to attract people to the land and to give greater incentive for those in the more rural areas to remain there. There is a real, deep philosophy involved in this idea. It affects both our urban and rural areas in that people living on farms and in small towns, migrating to the larger cities, compound problems already critical and in many places constitute a drain upon resources, which affects everyone.

The cost of this modest program can be easily related to the tremendous cost in meeting problems of our urban areas in the form of such facilities as schools, hospitals, housing, health, and welfare in the many forms they take. It seems to me this should be a part of long-range objectives to keep people close to the environment with which they are familiar and suited and from which has come the greatest influences which have made us a great people and a great nation.

You know these things, but let me philosophize just a little further. People in their environment of smaller communities are able to contribute because of a personal interest in things about them, to the betterment of all people.

I do not disparage the large cities, or even the ghettos in them, but, of course, we know that under these conditions people become numbers instead of individuals. This has not made our country great, nor will it maintain the spirit we need in America.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the provisions of S. 852 provide a capital investment. It is not a handout of a sort which disappears as soon as used, but a permanent and lasting effect. The provisions of this measure will enable people to do things for themselves in a joint, community undertaking which individuals cannot do alone, and the investment will be of benefit to a much wider area than those immediately affected. This, too, is a part of conservation,

which has been too long neglected and, if not better cared for, our natural resources may disappear as has been the case in some ancient civilizations.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the courtesy of permitting me to appear before you, and I offer whatever assistance I may be able to provide in furthering the idea embodied in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much for your comprehensive statement, Mr. Burleson.

The next witness that I have scheduled here today is Mayor Roland McCulty, town of Spencer, W. Va., representing the Spring Creek Watershed Development Corp.

We are glad to have you here and we will be glad to hear from you now, Mayor McCulty.

**STATEMENT OF ROLAND McCULTY, TOWN OF SPENCER, W. VA.,
REPRESENTING SPRING CREEK WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT
CORP.**

Mr. McCULTY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before you to testify in support of the House version of Senate bill 852.

I appear before you as the mayor of the city of Spencer, Roane County, W. Va., as a member of the Little Kanawha Resource Conservation & Development Steering Committee and as chairman of the Spencer-Roane Water Development Association.

The city of Spencer is the smallest municipality in the United States to be in active execution of an \$880,000 urban renewal program, to have a 70-unit public housing program, with construction under the turnkey method expected to begin in early 1968, with a new 80-bed hospital to be constructed under the Hill-Burton authority, anticipated to be complete in May 1969, with a new county courthouse completed in late 1965 under the old ARA authority.

You have a picture of a progressive city and county. We have a geographic location that places us within 20 to 25 miles of four interchanges of Interstates 69, 77, and 79 when completed.

We are actually in the hub of a trading center that includes Roane, Calhoun, Wirt, Clay, Gilmer, and Jackson Counties. We have two U.S. highways through the city and two State routes. In short, we have all the elements of a great potential for development.

We have also two great basic unfulfilled human needs.

Due to a drought condition that has persisted in each of the past 5 years, we do not even have enough water for our own consumption. Nor can we encourage industry to locate here even though unemployment and welfare statistics reveal that we have a tremendous trained and untrained labor force available. In fact, there is a cause to believe that without relief forthcoming in additional water storage facilities we could lose two employers who are the backbone of the area's economy.

The other basic human need is that we have no water-based recreation within 50 miles. Our citizens have to go 50 miles to the Ohio River or 80 miles to the Sutton Dam to find recreational facilities. In fact we have no State parks closer than 1 hour driving time.

Therefore we have put together, with the assistance of the Little Kanawha Resource Conservation & Development Committee, a pro-

ject measure to construct a water impoundment of some 70 surface areas, with flood-control features, public and industrial water supply, and a large area reserved for future recreational use. The land that we selected for the reservoir has been virtually abandoned for farming uses.

The local public agency proposes to acquire the entire 2,700-acre watershed in order to control pollution and siltation. Approximately half of this entire area will be usable and reclaimed land and an additional 550 acres strategically located at the rear of the lake is being reserved for a year-round recreational purposes.

Feasibility studies by the Soil Conservation Service on this watershed are scheduled to be complete in November-December of this year. Already options to purchase the land are being prepared for October 23, 24, and 25. Appraisals will be made to determine actual and equitable values.

Tentative arrangements have been made for the city of Spencer to borrow up to \$250,000, under R.C. & D. authority from the Farmers Home Administration. An application for supplementary funds is being prepared for submission to the Economic Development Administration. A 101 application has already been accepted for review by EDA and has been endorsed by Hulett C. Smith, Governor of the State of West Virginia, and by Senators Robert C. Byrd and Jennings Randolph and Congressman Ken Hechler. We also have the unqualified approval of the Appalachian regional office and the West Virginia Department of Commerce.

The local share of the urban renewal program in Spencer will be approximately \$225,000. To pay the local share of the new 80-bed hospital more than \$500,000 was raised by popular subscription. The local share of the new courthouse was funded by a bond referendum. The city of Spencer's share of the construction and acquisition of property for the R.C. & D. water supply and flood control structure is projected to be about \$250,000.

Due to the large public debt involved we do not plan a recreational development unless we can count on resources such as those which would be made available to us by the provision of Senate bill 852. Certainly a great opportunity will pass us by if this bill dies in committee.

As a member of the R.C. & D. steering committee I am also aware of other structures in the five-county area that are quite suitable for recreational development should Federal funds be made available.

In most of these counties, as well as our own, there are golf courses and recreational complexes available to people with money to pay for them. But their memberships are restricted because of the cost and we need recreation for all of the people, rich or poor, and regardless of race, creed, or color.

It should be stated that in 1958 a Public Law 556 feasibility study was initiated on the Spring Creek watershed. It was subsequently suspended and dropped due to the high cost. We are very grateful to be in an R.C. & D. project district and to have the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service available to us.

Gentlemen, I hope you are aware of what a fine thing R.C. & D. projects are. If you would go as I do to the meetings and see the same faces and some new ones each time and feel the spirit and enthusiasm that is generated by this group, you would realize what a truly fine piece of legislation the R.C. & D. bill is.

It needs this one thing to spark it into a great influence on the people in Appalachia and elsewhere. It needs this recreation feature; it needs to provide still more of the fundamental needs.

The R.C. & D. organization, the county of Roane, and the city of Spencer stand solidly behind this Senate bill 852. We earnestly appeal to you to report it out favorably.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor.

We appreciate your statement. I think that you have presented a very lucid explanation that we need.

I do not want to pick on you, as it were, but I wonder if you would give us—you have given us here your prepared statement, a good explanation of what one of these things does—give us a little bit of your local situation.

You propose to acquire, you say, 2,700 acres of watershed. Who is to pay for that watershed?

Mr. McCULTY. Who will pay for it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes—who will pay for it? Where will the money come from?

Mr. McCULTY. Well, at this time, Mr. Chairman, actually we have a deal made, we hope—it is not firm—it is not finalized as yet—with a water company which operates in that district to fund our share of the local funds over a period of 30 years; in other words, to guarantee the repayment of the Farmers Home Administration loan. It is a very small contribution and will actually make a very minimal effect on the water rates that the people pay.

If we wanted to go into it, of course, we could demonstrate that, if they were to develop the water resources on their own, they would put up "No trespassing" signs, and this would mean a higher rate, so far as the people are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. No, what I am trying to get at is this: Is the Federal Government going to pay for this land or are the local people going to pay for it? Who is going to pay for the 2,700 acres of land?

Mr. McCULTY. I would say that our EDA application at the present time is for \$495,000. It is not very refined. It is not down to the point where we actually know what the cost of the acquisition would be.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking in dollars and cents. I am just trying to find out who is going to pay for this land. Are we talking about a project where the Federal Government is going to pay for the 2,700 acres of land, or are we talking about a proposition in which you are going to pay for the 2,700 acres of land? Who is going to pay for the 2,700 acres of land?

Mr. McCULTY. What I am trying to say is that we are to obtain \$250,000. That would be our obligation to pay that.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to borrow \$250,000?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. From the Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. McCULTY. From the Farmers Home Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. That will not pay for the 2,700 acres of land?

Mr. McCULTY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How much do you estimate that this land is worth?

Mr. McCULTY. I believe that we have a price on it of about \$400,000—that is just an educated guess at this point. There are 2,700 acres in this parcel. They are not even grazing sheep on it now. It is mostly hillside—mostly sheep pasture.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you figure that land is worth, around \$200 an acre?

Mr. McCULTY. Well, in order for the city to have a municipal water impoundment, first of all, Mr. Chairman, they must pay \$135,000 for the cost of the structure.

The CHAIRMAN. I know that. I am talking about what you figure the land is worth out there—what this very poor land that even sheep will not graze on—what is it worth? What does it sell for?

Mr. McCULTY. I do not think it is worth over probably \$50 an acre, personally.

The CHAIRMAN. That would run about \$135,000, something in that order, would it not, at that price per acre?

Mr. McCULTY. In fact, I think that I have with me an actual breakdown of the property owners. Perhaps we are acquiring what may be a little bit ambitious in acquiring all of this land. It was worked out with the EDA people who control the actual pricing of the watershed. We have some strong pollution laws in the State of West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to get into that. I want to get a very simple answer. All I am trying to find out is who is going to pay for this land? I am not arguing about who ought to pay for it. I am not arguing about whether you need it or whether you do not. I am just trying to find out who is going to pay for it.

Mr. McCULTY. Mr. Chairman, we propose to take the \$250,000 that we hope to acquire from the Farmers Home Administration and become eligible for this under the Federal guidelines for a grant of up to $2\frac{1}{2}$ of the amount mentioned, of money that we are able to provide. At this time we do not have the appraisals made on this land. We have no way of knowing how much it is going to cost, but in the entire amount of perhaps \$600,000 or \$700,000 of money, this includes for the acquisition of the land, the appraisal, all of the contribution that the city will have to make to supplement the funds of the Soil Conservation Service which may be \$135,000. This is the whole picture.

At this time, to be perfectly frank, we do not know the cost of the land.

The CHAIRMAN. I am still asking who is going to pay for it, whether you pay \$10 or \$1,000 an acre. Who is going to put up the money?

Mr. McCULTY. The Federal Government will put up $\$21\frac{1}{3}$, presumably, to our \$1. They will share in the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that answers it. You will pay 30 percent?

Mr. McCULTY. That is about right.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Federal Government will pay about 70 percent?

Mr. McCULTY. That is about right.

The CHAIRMAN. I am now talking about something else.

Is the breakdown the same on the structure?

Mr. McCULTY. Our costs, I would suggest, are about \$135,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the ratio the same on the structure as it is on the acquisition of the land—I mean will the Government put up two-thirds and you will put up one for building the structure?

Mr. McCULTY. I would not say that is exactly true. In order to become eligible, let us say, for matching funds, we could not take the Federal money and match it. We are perfectly aware of that. So let us say that will be one-quarter million dollars which are eligible for under the R.C. & D. to borrow from the Farmers Home Administra-

tion, so long as we can demonstrate the ability to repay, let us say, the \$210,000 and match it with the $2\frac{1}{3}$ times our local money, we would take it to buy one portion of the land in this EDA application. We have made a reservation for a large industrial park which is not funded in the agricultural bill, but in EDA, of course, it is. So we propose to take perhaps \$50,000 and purchase some additional land to encourage industry to move into our rural economy, to stimulate it. And in addition to this, of course, one of the prime needs in our area is recreational activities. We have none.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that our problem here is solely that you assume that we know a great deal more about this than we do.

Mr. McCULTY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You assume that we know a great deal more about these projects than we do know. And we are trying to get you to give us some further explanation so that we may know just what we are talking about.

We are talking about something that you have been working with for a long time. You are thoroughly familiar with it. You understand all of these things and you assume that we understand them, too. So I am just asking very simple questions so that we will all understand this—maybe the members of the committee do, but the chairman does not. All I am trying to do is to find out what part of this money comes from the Federal Government and what part comes from the local people. And you have told us that about 70 percent for the purchase of the land comes from the Federal Government and about 30 percent comes from the local people. And I asked you what about the structure, what percentage of that comes from the Government? I do not know. You assume that I know all of these things. You have just assumed that I know a lot of things that I do not know. Will you tell us just what percentage of this money comes from the Federal Government to build the dam?

Mr. McCULTY. Mr. Chairman, I have not broken down the percentages, but you will notice in my statement that the feasibility studies were not complete and will not be complete until November–December of this year. They suggest a cost for this structure 86 feet high and 1,500 acre-feet of water in it for municipal water supply and industrial water supply; they project the entire cost to be—I am dealing with two sets of figures, because we have dealt with the two different sites—we selected two different sites. The local share on the cost of building the structure is estimated to be \$135,000, some few hundred dollars and I cannot remember the exact amount, and the Federal share is estimated to be \$86,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That means that you would be putting up about \$1.70 for each dollar that the Federal Government does?

Mr. McCULTY. That is what it amounts to under EDA authority.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am trying to find out—that is the kind of information we need to know, rather than to go on the assumption that the Federal Government is putting up \$2.30 for every dollar that you put up.

Mr. McCULTY. This is under the Soil Conservation, or, I should say, the R.C. & D. contribution. The structure, if it goes higher, and as the amount of water is developed further for municipal consumption—and the acreage at the lake that will be impounded there is increased—

our local share sometimes becomes topheavy over there—for example, on the first one that we had planned the land costs were exorbitant. Our share on that would have only been \$85,000 but it would have contained the same 1,500 acre-feet of water. It did not have the potential to be developed industrially that this site does.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Does anybody care to ask the witness any questions?

Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. McCulty, you are mayor of a small community. It is quite obvious that you are very much a respected citizen in your community from the work that you have done, and you are to be commended for that.

I would like to see if you could tell us specifically what are you looking for that you can get out of S. 582?

I might add here right at the outset that you are aware of the fact that the maximum participation for a single improvement is \$50,000.

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. KLEPPE. That is, under this bill.

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. KLEPPE. I think you have clarified the other point that I had in mind, with the chairman, which is that under the cost of the land, the easements, the rights-of-way and what not, the Secretary of Agriculture can only participate up to one-half of the cost.

Mr. McCULTY. That is true.

Mr. KLEPPE. And the figures that you just gave indicate that the local participation is in excess of one-half, so that would qualify. My question is specifically this: What do you think that you can get for your community or your district out of this bill?

Mr. McCULTY. Well, first of all, I am presuming that this \$50,000—I am not sure that it is very clear in the bill, but that the \$50,000 means that we can take the land—let us give a little background—take the \$250,000 that we hope to acquire from the Farmers Home Administration which we know that we can demonstrate the ability to repay—they have indicated their willingness over the signature of the State director for the Farmers Home Administration to loan us this money, and let us say that we cut this money off right at a certain point and—and turn our EDA application in with so much money and request the appropriate amount that we will need to match what we have in the local resource, then we reserve a part of this money to buy 550 acres which we intend to make into a recreational area. Admittedly, I am presuming that we can take the 550 acres and use this for noncash contribution to make an application to the R.C. & D. for the \$50,000 to develop the recreational complex.

Mr. KLEPPE. You are expecting to get the \$50,000 out of this bill, actually, if it is passed?

Mr. McCULTY. This is what we hope to do; yes, sir.

Mr. KLEPPE. This is what you have in mind?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. KLEPPE. Where the benefits seem to accrue?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes. We are talking about the simple things, just people-oriented things like trails and the development of water-based recreation and the like, not motorboats, but rowboats and things that people enjoy doing.

Mr. KLEPPE. One more question. Do you have any idea that you would try to break up your improvement program as such and you could qualify for more than one improvement and could come in to the Secretary under this bill and get \$100,000.

Mr. McCULTY. No; not at this time.

Mr. KLEPPE. This was one of the things mentioned.

Mr. McCULTY. I think that the bill makes that pretty clear that it is one and that is all we would be eligible for.

Mr. KLEPPE. That is fine. That is what I wanted to hear from you. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Dow. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCULTY, you mentioned that the dam structure would involve \$135,000 of local funds and \$86,000 of Federal funds. And that is relative?

Mr. McCULTY. That is the projection.

Mr. Dow. Could you say what the figures would be on the land acquisition; in other words, how much would the Government and how much would the local pay in the acquisition of the land?

Mr. McCULTY. I am not sure at this point. Let me see if I can demonstrate. I am a little bit confused about this thing. To begin with we could borrow a quarter of a million dollars from the Farmers Home Administration. We doubt that this would be enough. Then we see that the land acquisitions are going to run more than this. So that with the aid of the Appalachian Development Office where we get into meetings with them, because some of the needs that we want to serve, such as to provide proper environment, which will encourage industries to locate in that area, so that at this point nobody has really explained to me—it is relatively new to me in dealing with the EDA—just exactly what their requirements and guidelines are and I do not know how at this point we would use the money. We had only had two meetings with them. We are preparing an application for submission—the formal application. At this point I do not know how much of the \$250,000 we would be able to escrow and match with EDA money. I do not know what the EDA requires of us in terms of appraisals. I do not even know whether they will accept the Farmers Home Administration appraisal.

To answer the question directly, I have asked directly of the EDA. I am not being evasive with the committee. I am simply saying at this moment that I am familiar with urban renewal, I am familiar with public housing—I have read the act—and I have experienced a great deal of trouble in getting off the ground or on the ground, let us say, but the Office of Economic Opportunity is relatively new to me and I do not know at this point how much money, No. 1, we will need until the appraisals are completed and so at this point I just cannot give you a satisfactory answer for what you want to know.

Mr. Dow. In other words, you do not have an idea what the gross amount of the land you are contemplating to get here would be?

Mr. McCULTY. We have data which I do not have with me—we have an actual description of the land, the number of houses on the land, the approximate acreage in it according to the deeds—it was researched in the county clerk's office—we have an estimated cost. That is all we have at this moment to determine the actual value of the land on the watershed, but we do not have a final appraised price to determine the actual fair value of it at this moment.

Mr. Dow. If you were to secure that \$250,000 which you indicated the \$86,000 that you are going to spend on the dam structure would be drawn from that amount?

Mr. McCULTY. I see what you are getting at. Our share would be \$135,000.

Mr. Dow. Yes. If you applied \$86,000 of Federal funds and do that from the \$250,000 you are seeking from the Farmers Home Administration that would leave you about \$164,000 to apply to the land?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. Dow. And then how much would you have to appropriate of that \$164,000—how much of your own funds would you have to put with it to secure the land?

Mr. McCULTY. Well, the land has been estimated at roughly \$400,000. Where they get this much I do not know. I believe that has the \$135,000 in it. I did not bring the budget with me. As I say, it is not finalized yet.

Mr. Dow. Mr. McCULTY, just one more question, that is, this \$250,000 of Federal funds would be a loan?

Mr. McCULTY. That would be a loan.

Mr. Dow. None of these Federal funds are going to be a grant—they are all going to be a loan except, approximately the \$50,000 that might come through the operations of S. 852—that would be a grant, would it not?

Mr. McCULTY. We are applying for a grant under the EDA.

Mr. Dow. Would that grant that you are applying for be over and above the \$250,000?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, it would be.

Mr. Dow. How much are you applying for from the EDA?

Mr. McCULTY. Actually, I do not know. At one time we had this up to \$495,000, and my guess would be that we are going to ask the EDA to match about \$200,000 on a 2-and-1 basis.

Mr. Dow. In other words, if they put up \$200,000, you have to put up \$200,000?

Mr. McCULTY. They would have to put up approximately—that would be, roughly, \$460,000.

Mr. Dow. That would be a grant?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, that would be a grant, correct.

Mr. Dow. So that in the whole thing you would be getting \$250,000 of loans from the Farmers Home Administration and maybe \$400,000 and some as a grant, and then in addition you would like to explore the possibility of the \$50,000 under S. 852?

Mr. McCULTY. That is right.

Mr. Dow. I was just trying to get an idea of the dimensions of the whole thing. This gives me a little better idea. I appreciate your answers.

Mr. McCULTY. We have a situation here in my hometown which can affect the lives of all of us. We have a State hospital here. The State hospital employs about 393 persons. We are on its payroll, a lot of them technical people, highly trained and highly paid. It makes a tremendous contribution to the entire economy in our community.

In addition to this we have 1,100 patients in the hospital. And you have a great influx of visitors and people who come here and contribute to the local economy with the money they spend. They buy clothes for them. They buy cigarettes and candy and different things.

This particular State hospital does not buy water from any water company. They do not have any money in their budget for it. They have indicated that they would, when we got this project farther along, consider making some kind of a contribution to us to maintain this impoundment.

What they do, and the water company does the same thing, is that they actually pick the water right up out of the bed of the stream. They do the same thing. Last year they were down to less than 6 hours of water supply. They had the patients down to taking a bath once a month. This is all in the application, of course. And so they need help. This is an institution for people who cannot help themselves. This is a tremendous contribution to the economy of the area.

So we are trying to sort of kill two birds with one stone, maybe three birds. We are trying to help them maintain the economic stimulus that they provide for our area, to keep them from going out of the county, to keep them from abandoning their facilities there. So this is another thing that the city necessarily has to pay attention to.

We have a large manufacturer there. This manufacturer would like to install a commercial dye plant which would create employment, some 130 additional jobs. He cannot afford to buy the water at the rate they are now being charged. We aim to make some arrangement whereby this manufacturer can have available a source of water that he does not have to purify—all he needs to do is to filter it, that way to make available to him a pool of water, a large amount of water which he can use for the commercial dye works which would mean 130 new people on the payroll. And they would average around \$90 to \$100 a week. You can see, that it would mean a great deal to us, to our county.

Mr. Dow. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Teague.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. One question, Mr. Mayor. You stated that the average value, in your opinion, of the land was about \$50 an acre?

Mr. McCULTY. That is a wild guess. Actually I do not think it is worth that much.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. All right; \$50 an acre, that would be about \$135,000 to acquire 2,700 acres?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Did you say that \$250,000 would not be enough for the land acquisition. Is that because there are houses and the like, such as barns and service stations on the land?

Mr. McCULTY. There are no commercial establishments on the land.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. And that accounts for the differences?

Mr. McCULTY. This accounts for a large part of the difference because we have some homes that we judge to be worth \$10,000 or \$12,000 or \$15,000. We have got probably altogether 20 of those. Of course we are not just talking about the land. We are talking about these things. This tends to escalate the price, of course.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. You would have to acquire his house and barn and the like?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, sir. I am not talking about that part of it now.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. Maybe you have stated this already, Mr. McCulty. I wondered if you would just give us a little more information about your R.C. & D. project—the size—how far it reaches. I believe you mentioned several counties here. Are you right in the middle of the area? Will you tell the committee what makes up the R.C. & D. District? What is the Little Kanawha, how big it is?

Mr. McCULTY. I am not familiar, of course, with any other R.C. & D. project, but I do know that this one insofar as the information I have learned since I became a member of the steering committee and they have invited me to become a member of it—I was elected sometime this year—I think about April—and this is what they included in their annual plan of work—the water impoundment for the city's service needs and the R.C. & D. Little Kanawha regional project includes five counties—it includes the counties of Wood, Ritchie, Wirt, Calhoun, and Roane.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are all of those counties in the organization behind this movement?

Mr. McCULTY. Very much so. Very much so.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many are there on the steering committee?

Mr. McCULTY. I could not tell you the exact number. I would say perhaps 12 to 15. I could not tell you the exact number, in the actual steering committee. I know all of them, if I want to stop and count them. I do not know whether they have been to each meeting. They have an excellent attendance, however.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stubblefield.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Are these committees part of the Soil Conservation personnel?

Mr. McCULTY. So far as I know there is only one. I think he acts as the secretary because he does have, I presume, recourse to transcribing the notes and so forth, and to present them to the next meeting. I do not believe that there is anybody who is employed by the Soil Conservation Service or any form of government except elected officials and perhaps those who are members of this steering committee.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. How much money has been pumped into this Little Kanawha by the Federal Government—how much has been put in by the local agencies—the local interests?

Mr. McCULTY. Well, sir, I would hate to say—

Mr. GATHINGS. Overall up to this time. This is a new project—only about 2 years old—the whole R.C. & D. has not been in existence for more than 2 years, has it?

Mr. McCULTY. That is true.

Mr. GATHINGS. How much money was appropriated?

Mr. McCULTY. I believe that our appropriation for this year, and this is only hearsay—I believe that our appropriation for the Little Kanawha R.C. & D. was somewhat over \$200,000. If I am not mistaken I think this is the whole thing, something over \$200,000. It is not a big thing. I will say this, however. I have attended hundreds of meetings. I have to by virtue of being involved in so many different projects—and I will say this for the R.C. & D, these are the most dedicated group of people I have seen. They are farmers, they are

mayors, they are businessmen. And at every meeting they have a speaker who comes in from the Federal Government, from the Soil Conservation Service, from the Department of Commerce, from the Economic Development Administration, from the Farmers Home Administration, who make a presentation that is useful to these people. And I will tell you frankly, all of you here, that I very much believe in this R.C. & D. thing. I very much believe in it. I have seen more participation in this and more enthusiasm, more people really dedicated to accomplishing something. And they get absolutely nothing out of it except the overall gain to their economies. They prepared a report for this year which is about, I would say, 40 pages long. And to speak of the unselfishness of the members of the steering committee, they give us approximately one-half of their budgets for this year to provide water impoundment. The rest of the things are very small, a few hundred dollars per year there.

One of the most useful things that they have proposed is a series of low-water dams on the Little Kanawha River. And we were hoping that by some means or another this bill could be interpreted so that we could have these low-water dams. These would also serve as bridges, you see, and would create 4 or 5 miles of 5 or 6 feet of water. So I think that this is one of the real great things in the plan this year.

Then they have forestry, they have soil stabilization and conservation, they have this and that. They do this and they do that. I am not familiar with all of the aspects of it, because I am necessarily pretty much involved in this part of it right here. And I have been giving this the most of my attention.

Mr. GATHINGS. How long will it take to complete the overall R.C. & D. project on the Little Kanawha—what is your estimate of that?

Mr. McCULTY. How do you mean?

Mr. GATHINGS. You have \$200,000 now in the current year, and then how much more is to be provided in the next fiscal year and how much in the following fiscal years, to do the work that you anticipate?

Mr. McCULTY. I could not give you any projection of that. I simply do not know. I do not know at what level it is decided how much each R.C. & D. gets. I know that they make an application but they do not always get what they want.

Mr. GATHINGS. You testified, though, that there are impoundments and that you have other small structures throughout the area.

Mr. McCULTY. Yes. I would say that they will be asking for all of the money that they can get, of course, because they have a lot of good plans; if they have the money to put them into effect, they will. I know that at Pullman, and I do not even know where Pullman is, they are building some dams. This may be under Public Law 566, I am not sure about that. They would be eligible under Public Law 566 for this recreation money, anyway.

Of course our contention is that we cannot support a \$8 million local referendum for a watershed, a complete watershed in our area. We simply do not have that kind of an economy, and so we would like to begin. And this is our way of beginning, to serve all of the needs of the people throughout the area, through the implementation of our R.C. & D. and we are hoping that S. 852 will provide us with some money to develop it on a minimal basis for recreational purposes. I do not know at this point what amount of money they will ask for in

the next fiscal year or the succeeding fiscal year. Whatever they do, I would hope that they would receive favorable action. I do not know how well it is working in other areas, but I think that this is a fine thing—I really do.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you think that the R.C. & D. proposal will put more people to work?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, I do.

Mr. GATHINGS. In your area?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, I do.

Mr. GATHINGS. In your county—in your city?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, I do. I think that it has made it possible for us to do this. I would say that the effects of this will not be seen for 50 years. I am trying to say that it will affect our entire economy for perhaps 100 years to come. I would think that this is not the end of it. I think that we have a lot of developable land and we have a lot of resources. We simply do not have any means to develop them at present.

Mr. GATHINGS. You are mayor of Spencer?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. And when you send out a brochure about your city you want to be able to tell this industry, "We do have here fine recreational facilities if you come here."

Mr. McCULTY. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. McCULTY. That is exactly what we want to do.

The CHAIRMAN. I am old enough, I guess, to remember some things that some of you do not recall. Some years ago in Texas we had a project, and we employed a man by the name of Chapman and the State paid him \$120 a month. Of course, that \$120 a month did buy a great deal more than it does now. He was an engineer. He supervised the construction of low-water dams, the kind you mentioned on the Little Kanawha—he built 120 of them that I know of. Under that State program they were built with the labor of local people, and the local businessmen paid the cost of the cement, and if there was any reinforcing steel they purchased that, too. The local unemployed people were doing the work. The landowner gave them the easements to put the dams on their land. The local people who did the work built the dams with practically no cash. They built 120 of those. That was done years ago, as I say.

And here this area is supposed to have a great percentage of unemployed people. Are any of them employed on any of these kind of programs whereby they could do something throughout the area and help themselves?

Mr. McCULTY. You are talking about self-help?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I am talking about self-help.

Mr. McCULTY. Well, I would say if you want an opinion and I am not sure that you want one—yes, some of them are. Some of these people are—some of the people do these things by themselves. They have fishing camps. They are not too successful for this reason, that there is simply not enough water in the Little Kanawha River. They need some kind of a structure to maintain the water level, just like you mentioned about your engineer down there in Texas and I presume that it was in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. McCULTY. If you took the Little Kanawha River, in 1942 the Army Engineers went in there at Palestine, and since that time the River has silted. I have a camp on the Little Kanawha myself. There is no place on the river that you cannot wade in and walk across. There are some places, of course, where there are deep holes, but at certain times of the year the river keeps creeping in and creeping in. And then along comes the thing we had this spring, a tremendous flood. We had 3 to 4 inches of water in 24 hours. And it tore up the countryside. We need measures for flood control. There is no question about it. The question is where do you come to in an area that is so depressed that you cannot get the voters to go along with anything like this—where do you come up with the money to control these factors?

You might take the position that the investment is too great, but I really believe that no matter whether we still have to drink bad water or not—whether we have a low water or not—I do not know how Roane County got into the R.C. & D. The river does not flow through our county. But Roane County is very much in it. And every month we have our meetings, they attend them.

We have to start somewhere, Mr. Chairman. We have to start somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not criticizing you for the start. I am in favor of the start. I think that these small watershed programs have been the finest things we have had over the country. I think they have done a great deal of good. They are very well worthwhile. I am talking about the basic philosophy of whether you come to Washington for every piece of help we get or whether we can do some of the things at home. I know that I am out of step in that philosophy but I am convinced that the people could do a great deal more at home. I am not trying to point a finger at West Virginia. The same situation exists in Texas and in Oklahoma and in Arkansas—it exists everywhere. As long as people think that they can have Uncle Sam deliver the money, why, they are not going to go out and do it themselves.

Mr. McCULTY. This is logically true of people. I will have to agree with you on that.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Do you have the Army Engineers involved in this program?

Mr. McCULTY. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Are they available?

Mr. McCULTY. Yes, I am sure they are. At one time this was a navigable stream. It is a tributary to the Ohio River. It ends at Parkersburg.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Is there a possibility of the United Mine Workers being involved in this?

Mr. McCULTY. We do not have any mining in Roane County. We have a great deal of oil and gas development. For our hospital we raised approximately \$540,000 from the people who made their contributions over a period of 3 years. If you want to demonstrate self-help projects, I think that this is an outstanding example. In the 60 days, through local resources, practically 95 percent or \$500-and-some-odd-thousand was raised to make us eligible for a Hill-Burton grant for a hospital. We had no hospital there. We have no hospital within 50 miles of our city. I am on the board of directors but I am not able to attend all of the meetings. It was \$500,000 that was raised. I am not trying to say that our resources for this kind of recreational development are such that we would not do it anyway, but I would say this, that if we

had access to a grant—if we had access to a grant, naturally we would want to take advantage of it to match it on a local basis. We do this wherever we can. We do this in every way possible.

If I understand you correctly—I am not sure of my grounds here, but I think that there are 26 or so R.C. & D. districts, but whatever there are, let us say there were four structures on each R.C. & D. district. Let us say that each of the four applied for \$50,000 this one year. That would be \$1 million for each R.C. & D. district—no, it would not—that would be \$50,000—that would be 20 to the million so that if there were four, it would only cost \$9 million if they all applied for it in 1 year. I am not trying to make an implication that this is peanuts. Most surely it is not.

I have thought right from the beginning, and I am convinced, that it is a good piece of legislation. It is something that will help it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Mayor, for your appearance here today. We appreciate your statement.

Mr. McCULTY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Mr. Carl Bradford, Sr., recreation planner, West Virginia Department of Commerce, Charleston, W. Va.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Bradford.

STATEMENT OF CARL L. BRADFORD, SR., RECREATION PLANNER, STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BRADFORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am appearing before you today to express the interest of Gov. Hulett C. Smith and Commerce Commissioner Angus E. Peyton in the passage of S. 852.

West Virginia, a State with an abundance of natural resources, has a deep interest in the orderly development of its resources and the maximization of the benefits received from their usage. Much of West Virginia's future lies in the wise usage of its natural resources and we feel that S. 852 would provide the State with valuable assistance in maximizing the benefits from the usage of its land and water resources.

At the present time, seven West Virginia counties would be affected by the passage of S. 852. These counties are Wood, Ritchie, Wirt, Calhoun, and Roane, which are included in the Little Kanawha resource conservation and development study, and Summers and Mercer, which are included in the Mountain Dominion resource conservation and development study.

All of these counties have been identified in West Virginia's statewide outdoor recreation plan as needing further development of local and county-serving recreational areas. We feel that the passage of S. 852 would provide the assistance necessary to encourage county and municipal governments to initiate projects to provide these needed recreational facilities. In the majority of these counties, the greatest potential for economic growth lies in the development of resources for outdoor recreation, both for improving the quality of the environment for the residents to encourage residential growth and in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities as a stimulant to tourism. Due to local economic conditions, few, if any, of these recreational facilities can be provided entirely from local financing. Without assistance, many outstanding opportunities for providing much needed outdoor recre-

ation areas will be lost and at a time when the country has shown a great concern for environmental quality, the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities, and stimulating economic growth in Appalachia.

West Virginia is pleased that this bill includes provisions for coordinating projects with the State outdoor recreation plan found adequate for the purposes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. West Virginia has completed such a plan, which has been found qualified for land and water conservation purposes until October 1969. This is one of the older qualifications in the country.

The State is presently in the process of implementing its outdoor recreation action program, which places strong emphasis upon the development of water-oriented outdoor recreation areas. West Virginia is greatly concerned with the national interest in water-associated activities as indicated in the Department of Interior publication, "Outdoor Recreation Trends," which indicated that swimming will be the most popular outdoor recreation activity by 1980, and that fishing, boating, and other water-contact sports will also show a tremendous increase in participation rates. With this demand in mind, West Virginia is greatly interested in the development of water-oriented outdoor recreation activities and greatly interested in any Federal program which will assist us in their development.

In summation, I would like to say that West Virginia is vitally interested in S. 852 in that we feel it will provide assistance to us in—

(1) Improving the quality of the living environment of our residents;

(2) Providing outdoor recreation activities for our citizens and for those residents of other States who visit West Virginia to share our scenic natural attractions;

(3) Stimulating the economic growth of our State.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Bradford.

Are there any questions of Mr. Bradford?

Mr. Wampler.

Mr. WAMPLER. I would just like to note for the record that in your statement you made reference to the Mountain Dominion resource conservation and development study.

Mr. BRADFORD. Yes.

Mr. WAMPLER. We have three counties in Virginia in that organization. It is a five-county organization. I am thoroughly familiar with it, and was pleased that it finally received approval by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BRADFORD. We received word yesterday of formal approval having been made.

Mr. WAMPLER. I would like to say that the Mountain Dominion plan is well put together. I find myself very enthusiastically supporting it and the legislation that is before us today.

Mr. BRADFORD. Fine. We have found that this is one of the better examples we have of interstate cooperation at the present time, this Mountain Dominion District.

Mr. WAMPLER. We do have some quarrel with West Virginia relative to the building of the Blue Ridge Dam in Virginia. This is another issue not related here.

Mr. BRADFORD. Right.

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Bradford.

Are there any other questions of Mr. Bradford?

If not, we thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Sam Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio, president of the National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Studebaker.

**STATEMENT OF SAM S. STUDEBAKER, TIPP CITY, OHIO, PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION
DISTRICTS**

Mr. STUDEBAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present a short statement in support of S. 852, as amended, which would authorize cost sharing for fish and wildlife and recreation developments in resource conservation and development projects.

I am speaking for the National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts in behalf of our 3,005 member districts and 50 State associations.

At our national convention earlier this year our policymaking body—the NACD Council—adopted a resolution supporting cost sharing in R.C. & D. projects. We feel that sites within R.C. & D. projects that are suitable for watershed structures should be developed to their highest potential to meet long-range needs of the area and communities concerned.

Sites that can be developed for water-based recreation can mean as much to the local people and the local economy as a small industry. Such developments create job opportunities and generate demands for new businesses and services.

In addition, they can fill a real need by providing more public water-based recreation areas—now in short supply throughout most of the Nation.

In my home State of Ohio, the Buckeye Hills R.C. & D. project, covering five counties and 1.5 million acres, is presently being planned. Land in this area in the southeast portion of the State is heavily wooded and most scenic and attractive. One of its prime resource development potentials is for water-based recreation development.

Possible sites in Monroe, Washington, and Noble Counties have already been selected for recreation development if Federal cost sharing is made available.

Presently, this type of development is seriously hampered due to lack of cost-sharing funds. It is our contention that S. 852, as amended, will help fill this void and put R.C. & D. project cost sharing on a more equal basis with the provisions of other Federal programs.

Soil and water conservation districts are among the principal sponsors of resource conservation and development projects. We believe that S. 852 is good conservation legislation that will improve the functioning of a fine program. We urge that it be enacted by the House of Representatives during this session of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Studebaker. You have to go into the question of the financing of this program, because after all, that is the thrust of most of these programs as they come before the Congress, who is going to put up the money? I do not see that you need to tell this committee of the desirability of all of these developments. We would all like to have roads in the countryside. We would all like

to have fences like the Government builds around its property. We would like to have all of these but there is a financial limitation. The House yesterday took cognizance of that financial limitation and many of the members of this committee voted with the majority of the House to put some limitation on expenditures.

With a budget of some \$136 billion, what we have done is not in itself big, but when added altogether it becomes tremendous.

This bill does not authorize the appropriation of any additional money, does it?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. I do not understand that it does. And it is my understanding that this legislation merely frees the already appropriated R.C. & D. funds for possible use in cost sharing for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. It is obvious to me that the money has already been authorized and appropriated. To the extent that they use it for this purpose, it would be withdrawn from some other purpose, would it not?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. No, you cannot use the same money twice. The only answer that I can give to that is that the use of this money would be in providing recreation possibilities in an R.C. & D. project on a cost-sharing basis and that it would enhance the implementation of the whole project.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that, but this means that there would be that much less money for other purposes.

Mr. STUDEBAKER. There is no question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Then what you feel is that this is a better use of the money than the programs on which it is now being spent?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. The answer to that is "Yes." And that decision would have to be made by the sponsors of the projects.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is correct. I am not trying to be critical. I am just trying to know the facts here.

You suggest that this is desirable conservation practice. I think that we could agree as to its desirability, whether it is a conservation practice or otherwise—it is really a recreation project.

But would you be willing to take this money—and it is not a great deal of money—I think that somebody figured that it was \$9 million. But would you be willing to take that away from the soil conservation funds? You are here representing an association of soil and water conservation districts. Would you be willing to take the money from the soil conservation funds?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. I think that we have little enough.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so, too. Would you be willing to take it away from the Public Law 566 funds, the small watershed program?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. The understanding of this is that this would make the R.C. & D. projects comparable for the use of such funds.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the point on which I am trying to get your opinion. You are here representing the water conservation districts. Would you be willing, however small this payment would be, that it be taken out of the funds now approved for the small watershed projects?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. I cannot say yes to that, Mr. Chairman, because we are plugging for an increase in appropriations for the small watershed program.

The CHAIRMAN. And I am with you. I think that we need it. But it is obvious that if this is a better use, you should be willing to cut your own projects to pay for this kind of development; Would you?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. The Public Law 566 program would be in the R.C. & D. project, to that extent, yes, where it would be.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. If you will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. May I just say this, or make a statement?

The CHAIRMAN. I wish that somebody would explain this.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. It does not go that way. It does depend on the circumstances that prevail at that time. It has to be a matter of judgment to take it away.

The CHAIRMAN. We have to exercise the judgment. I know that it will be a matter of judgment. We have to exercise that judgment right here.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. People have to make that judgment, too, the local people.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you willing to provide that the local people should determine whether they want to take money away from Public Law 566 projects and put it into this? What I am trying to say is this money has to be taken from some other program somewhere and it is money that has come from some existing program.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If I may interrupt.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am going to suggest that I voted for foreign aid but many people think that it is a waste of money. So you can take it out of foreign aid. That is one place.

Mr. WAMPLER. If I may interject.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WAMPLER. I am one of those who voted with the majority you referred to on the floor yesterday. It seems to me that in the legislation before us we are trying to give to the R.C. & D. program the same treatment we give Public Law 566 projects and that they should be able to do this if they want to. From year to year we will have to face the facts of the fiscal situation at the time. If the funds are available they can be used; if not, they cannot be used.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to get this clear. Is it not true that under the existing law that you can establish Public Law 566 projects anywhere in the United States, any county in the United States, if you have a stream that causes enough damage to justify the expenditure of this money and to make it a profitable proposition, that you can get a Public Law 566 project anywhere from Maine to California, but that is not true of these R.C. & D. projects. There are 26 of them. You have to be in a favored area.

Mr. WAMPLER. A deserving area.

The CHAIRMAN. I happen to represent a county that I did not know was bad off, but the statement was made publicly by one of the Federal agencies—it was announced just last week that one of my counties is one of five of those with the lowest income in the United States, and yet it does not have the opportunity to take advantage of these projects.

Now, if you are really trying to help the deserving people, let us help them. Some are not so deserving. Some of them are that way

by choice. Some are that way involuntarily. And they ought to have help. I am not interested in some of them. Some of the people are voluntarily poor. Some of them have managed to become poor because they have found that it is a policy, probably to get it from the U.S. Government—you can probably get it more easily than you can by going out and working. That is true all over the United States, whether it is a rural or a city area; whether in West Virginia or in Texas. People are pretty much all the same.

I know of no reason why you should confine it to the Little Kanawha—to say that the people there are entitled to have special help, whereas in my area they are not entitled to have it. Why should we set up a program that is confined only to certain areas of the United States?

Mr. WAMPLER. Do you want me to answer that?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wampler. Because they are in the particular areas where the concept of the R.C. & D. program is justified. It is not just one county.

No question but what it would have a good effect. But I can say that many other areas in the United States are entitled to the same need and cannot get help. I just say that is discrimination.

Mr. WAMPLER. We have to start somewhere and this is a proper beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do we not extend the policy and the projects to the whole Nation, just as we have Public Law 566?

Mr. WAMPLER. We have other kinds of programs.

The CHAIRMAN. No, we do not. What do we have?

Mr. WAMPLER. We have the EDA, which is another program.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not get EDA. I do not get the others. I want to know how the people in my county, which they tell us is one of the poorest counties in the Nation, could get it and why they do not get it.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. All you have got to do is to formulate a plan and make an application.

The CHAIRMAN. No, it is not all that they have to do. They have got to get the approval on their plans.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. They have to form that. Before they get approval they have to make an application.

The CHAIRMAN. Sure, they have to do that.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. This comes from the local people. This is not something cooked up here. You have got to come up with a plan. Anybody in the United States can come up with a plan.

The CHAIRMAN. You can come up with a plan, but you cannot get the area in.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would be surprised that a Texas program would be automatically rejected.

Mr. WAMPLER. I am surprised that the representative of this county that you are referring to cannot get this.

The CHAIRMAN. He does not seem to be able to get those things, unfortunately. I do not believe that this plan should be for your district or Mr. Stubblefield's district alone, that they ought to be able to get anything that Mr. Gathings' or Mr. Teague's district cannot get.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. You can, if you make application.

The CHAIRMAN. We have made application.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. For an R.C. & D. program?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WAMPLER. What happened in this respect?

The CHAIRMAN. Three of them are in West Virginia. And I am just saying that we ought to have a program that takes in everybody in the Nation on the same basis. Surely there is a problem of poverty in Appalachia. There is poverty elsewhere. There is poverty in Washington. There is poverty all over this country. But be that as it may, I think it is clear that Mr. Studebaker feels it is all right if the money comes out of the special program but it is not all right if it comes out of the existing conservation or small watershed programs. And I would agree with him. I do not want to take funds away from them. They have enough troubles now.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. The small watershed program and the R.C. & D. are separate things.

The CHAIRMAN. I know. He is willing to have the money taken from the R.C. & D., but not from the small watershed program. And I will agree with him. I will not agree to take it from the small watershed program, either.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. It would be in the R.C. & D. program.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is he indicates that if the R.C. & D. is in line with the small watershed program, it is all right. That we are satisfied with the expenditures in soil and water conservation districts. And I am for it. I am not talking against it. I am not singling out anything or anybody.

Are there any other questions of Mr. Studebaker?

If there are not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Studebaker.

Mr. STUDEBAKER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Mr. Raymond Shaffer, Pennsylvania Association of Soil & Water Conservation District Directors, Inc.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Shaffer.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND SHAFFER, PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT DIRECTORS, INC.

Mr. SHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the Pennsylvania Association of Soil & Water Conservation District Directors, Inc., to your committee on the proposed amendment to the resource conservation and development law.

On behalf of the Pennsylvania association, please convey our appreciation to the sponsors of H.R. 6169 and Senate bill 852. This amendment is needed. It will improve the effectiveness of the resource conservation and development legislation for cost sharing with the local people in building recreational developments and will help stimulate the economy of resource conservation and development project areas.

Underemployment has plagued many of our rural areas for some time simply because we can't get enough industry to locate in the country. Many of our country people have moved into the urban areas only to compete for the limited number of jobs available to them. Only

recently, some official in the U.S. Department of Agriculture claimed that some of our urban problems begin in the country because we haven't been able to keep our people at home.

We need new job opportunities in our rural areas. By improving our recreational facilities we can make our rural areas more attractive to industry, for industry wants to locate where its people desire to live. This is a side effect of recreational development which has a significant impact on creating new sources of employment in our rural areas.

I personally am acquainted with the many fine opportunities there are for developing recreational areas in Pennsylvania, particularly in the two resource conservation and development projects authorized for Pennsylvania. In both of these areas, new recreation lakes would be built, ski slopes could be constructed, scenic outlooks could be improved, fishing areas could be made more accessible, and streams improved for water sports. There are numerous sites which could be developed for all kinds of outdoor recreation activities but they aren't being developed. The local people just don't have sufficient funds to participate in their development. The tax base isn't there to raise the needed funds.

In many of our rural areas, tourism contributes significantly to the local economy. We would strengthen this economy by developing some of the available sites to attract more vacationers. These new developments would have a stimulating effect on bringing into the area private recreational enterprises. Recreation areas attract tourists and tourists mean jobs.

The Pennsylvania Association of Soil & Water Conservation District Directors, Inc., feels that the amendment of the resource conservation and development legislation would serve as a catalyst in getting a number of the recreational developments underway. In a sense, this cost sharing would start a chain reaction which would not only improve the tourist trade but it would have an effect on bringing in new industry and creating new job opportunities where they are urgently needed today.

Mr. Chairman, we feel fortunate in having two resource conservation and development projects. Our association has followed the significant progress made in the Penn soil project with great interest. We are hopeful that the same kind of results will take place in the recently authorized project for the five counties in north Pennsylvania. It is our belief that the amendment your committee is now considering would help us reach the objectives of the resource conservation and development projects which are aimed at improving the economic growth of the area by developing and conserving the natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that your committee will give this amendment every chance to prove its merit. The Pennsylvania Association of Soil & Water Conservation District Directors believes that resource conservation and development projects are a sound approach to rural progress. They help bring our rural people a better opportunity to make a living and at the same time improve the beauty and productivity of the land for all the people. I urge your committee to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Mr. Brasco.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Shaffer, you mentioned that the area that you represent here before the committee has a great amount of unemployment; is that correct?

Mr. SHAFFER. Yes, this is so.

Mr. BRASCO. And this is in the area where this project would be?

Mr. SHAFFER. It is principally there but it is spotty in its unemployment.

Mr. BRASCO. I am talking about the area where this project would have its impact.

Mr. SHAFFER. Western Pennsylvania, the three-county area.

Mr. BRASCO. What counties are those?

Mr. SHAFFER. Crawford, Mercer, and Venango.

Mr. BRASCO. What about the unemployment situation in those counties?

Mr. SHAFFER. There has been appreciable unemployment in these counties.

Mr. BRASCO. Would you have any idea of how much?

Mr. SHAFFER. No. I am not a statistician. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. BRASCO. In connection with this particular program, if the bill were to be passed, could you tell us what, if any effect, this would have on those people who are unemployed now?

Mr. SHAFFER. Yes. These people just live——

Mr. BRASCO. What I am trying to find out is would those people be getting any work as the result of this—would this go to some big construction company who, supposedly, has the know-how and everything else to do the work, which would leave the unemployment situation about the same?

Mr. SHAFFER. I do not believe that to be the case. I have no definite information as to who would get what contracts. I do know that after recreational facilities would be instituted—this is within a very short distance of the cities of Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Erie, and several other cities, and that the people who would maintain these recreational facilities certainly would have employment for these people. But the number is an unknown factor.

Mr. BRASCO. Would that really then affect the poor people who are employed? When you are talking about jobs, you are talking about jobs that poor people could fill or as, I think, for recreational leaders and other positions which would require a substantial education background.

Mr. SHAFFER. The other thing about it is the fact that this is sort of creating an atmosphere for people to bring industry in. In other words, industry looks to the community. And one of the prerequisites is are there recreational facilities? And if this were established there are other spots in Pennsylvania, and other spots which have been proven to be true. If this recreation and good water and so forth are supplied, industry will look to these areas and move in. And thereby the people will benefit because they will then be employed by industry.

Mr. BRASCO. Would you be for this bill if there were amendments to it which would provide that the work in particular areas would have to go to poor people as far as practicable, that the jobs would have to first go to the poor people in the particular county, people who do not have jobs now, are uneducated, do not have any particular prospects

of becoming a park director or a park supervisor or a recreational leader or a swimming instructor.

Mr. SHAFFER. My answer to you is, obviously, that it would be practically impossible to control that.

Mr. BRASCO. I'm not asking for complete control, I am just curious as to whether you would support such amendment.

Mr. SHAFFER. Definitely I am in favor of it.

Mr. BRASCO. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will you yield for a question?

Mr. BRASCO. Yes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. You mean on construction work the contractor would have to hire the poor people, the hungry people in that area, to help build the dam; is that what you are saying?

Mr. BRASCO. Yes. That is what I am trying to say. We talk about unemployed people. I think that what happens is that you get a construction company that has a full complement of employees. They are going to do their job. And the same people who are out there, who are unemployed, the poor people, are going to be there and would remain unemployed. I am just wondering whether or not the construction companies, whether they like it or not, put in such provisions, so that it is a choice of putting some of the net profits not into their own pockets but into the poor people, taking a little more off the top and less to take home. They may not like it. I am wondering if the gentleman's association would object to that kind of an approach, that these companies or the project itself would find some kind of work for these people, whether it be digging the foundations or what have you. But some kind of a situation be created where these people would be used. I think that we talk sort of in circles when we say that it is going to help unemployment. We do not really talk about the poor people who are unemployed, because we have the highly profit motivated construction companies coming in and doing all of the work, and these people who are poor in that area, without any particular affiliation, will be there anyway. They will not get the jobs. We keep traveling the same circle.

Mr. SHAFFER. The association has a longer viewpoint than this. Actually, the construction of these would be a very temporary situation. They would be shortlived. The real benefit is the fact that this would be a permanent improvement which would attract industries which would then begin to hire people. There is no question about it that industry once attracted does that. We have many illustrations of this in Pennsylvania where this was done by chambers of commerce, but there are still many small communities which cannot help themselves sufficiently where this would probably form the catalyst or the stimuli to get the thing going, to get it started. The long real benefits from this are the permanent kinds, oh, 20, 30, 40, 50 years from now, rather than the temporary ones, as I would see it. And I think that the associations would agree with that. This is my point and my purpose in presenting the statement.

Mr. BRASCO. I have no further questions.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Shaffer.

Mr. SHAFFER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now call on Mr. Dan Gray, chairman, County Commission of Calhoun County, Ala., and chairman, steering committee, Coosa Valley R.C. & D. project, Alabama.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Gray.

STATEMENT OF DAN W. GRAY, CHAIRMAN, CALHOUN COUNTY COMMISSION, AND CHAIRMAN, STEERING COMMITTEE, COOSA VALLEY R.C. & D. PROJECT, ANNISTON, ALA.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your House Agriculture Committee in support of Senate bill 852, as amended.

I am Dan Gray, chairman of the County Commission of Calhoun County, Ala., and chairman of the steering committee of the Coosa Valley R.C. & D. project in Alabama, which has been in operation for about 2 years. I am representing, and speaking for, the sponsor organization, which is composed of the county governing bodies and the soil and water conservation districts of Calhoun, Clay, St. Clair, and Talladega Counties.

We are engaged in an all-out effort to assist the people in this four-county area to improve economic opportunities through resource development.

People in the area are totally involved in this development venture and are enthusiastically carrying out that part of the project which they have the resources to install.

Approximately 100 project measures are included in the development plan. Over 60 of these measures have been activated and are in various stages of planning and development. Local people have readily committed funds to the extent of their abilities; however, the area is mainly agricultural and the economy has been severely depressed for a number of years. Project sponsors find it extremely difficult, and many times impossible, to provide funds needed to trigger economic development.

The Coosa Valley project is in a beautiful and scenic area of Alabama located in the Appalachian Mountain Range. The topography of the area is such that the construction of lakes would greatly add to its attractiveness for local and tourist use.

The importance of developing the recreational potential of the area cannot be overemphasized. Studies by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and others show that travel and tourist expenditures could be doubled within the next 10 years. This would mean approximately 6,000 new jobs, and an added \$20 million annually to the economy of the area. The first objective of the project sponsor was to develop the water resources and provide for orderly development of the vast recreational potential. This objective cannot be met without the construction, full development, and utilization of all potential water impoundment sites.

There are at least six sites for floodwater-retarding structures that lend themselves to the development of recreation that we have inventoried as having a high potential for potential water storage. These sites are in mountainous terrain and in counties that are least able to bear the cost of construction. All are located in areas of natural scenic beauty and will greatly enhance opportunities for people in the area to

enjoy fish and wildlife and other water sports and camping. This will attract tourism, which will benefit the economy of the area.

The sites for recreational development, to which I have referred, are located outside of feasible Public Law 566 watershed projects, and will contain flood protection for highly productive bottom lands. The individual sites are economically feasible on the basis of flood prevention; however, it is not practical to develop a Public Law 566 work plan for these small tributaries.

Congressman Poage, I want to thank you and your committee for your interest and leadership in the Public Law 566 program, which is making a significant contribution to resource conservation and development in our area. I feel sure that you have an equal interest in opportunities afforded by the R.C. & D. projects. I also wish to commend the soil conservation service at the county, State, and National level for its aggressive and effective leadership in a total resource conservation and development effort.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that this important legislation be submitted to the full House committee for its consideration, and I urge members of this committee to give this legislation a favorable vote, so the people in the Coosa Valley R.C. & D. project and other approved projects throughout the Nation will have an opportunity to fully develop and utilize their water resources.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your attendance here.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Nichols.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Gray is from my own district. He has been in soil conservation work for a number of years. He is a highly dedicated worker. I want to commend him for his statement and to say that I appreciate his coming up here and appearing before the committee.

I would like to point out to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that these people who serve in this capacity are doing so entirely without pay.

They spend many long hours on these problems. They are dedicated people. And the only reason that they do this is their keen interest in soil and water conservation. I think it is most commendable.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I believe that you have Fort McClellan near Anniston, Ala., is that correct?

Mr. GRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. This is one reason that the people from your area are pushing this particular amendment, that it would help our service personnel and give them additional recreational facilities, would it not?

Mr. GRAY. It certainly would. We are close to Birmingham and Atlanta—about half way between. It would be of great advantage to people coming there as well as to Fort McClellan. I was in Detroit and saw what happened up there and visited the area. I think everyone realizes today that we need more recreational places for people to get to instead of leaving the farms and going to the cities, that we need to get them back out in these areas. And this would do a lot in this way.

Also, we had difficulty about 3 or 4 weeks ago at Fort McClellan, and there is only one way to get out of that town. General Throckmorton happened to be down visiting there. And this would control that. Also, about 3 months ago we had a flood down there from a flash rain and it did over \$2 million worth of damage in three counties whereas if we had had the program in effect we would not have had that damage. And we have that about every 5 or 6 years.

My thinking is that what we are putting in it that it will result in great benefit, like our national parks today. Look at the money that the Federal Government put into them. Look at Gatlinburg and what you are getting back today in money that is coming back—you are paying for these programs in that way. And they are doing a lot for us. It is just that simple.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have made a fine statement.

May I say this off the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further of the witness?

Mr. O'Neal.

Mr. O'NEAL. May I express a personal word? I am interested in this because of the fact that I served on active duty with ROTC at Fort McClellan 41 years ago and participated in the assault on Choccoloc Mountain in a sham battle.

Mr. GRAY. That comes down through the area we have in mind which is Government owned. The national forest adjoins this. We are spending a lot of money. Congressman Poage asked the question earlier. We are putting in 50 percent. It is a 10-year program. Some of these programs fall by the wayside for certain reasons. And then we can pick up other projects. Certainly these we are talking about would come under this new bill to replace some of these we have money set aside for in the years to come. We would like to have you come down to Fort McClellan again. We have a great installation there.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions of the witness?

If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you for coming today.

Thank you.

Mr. GRAY. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Mr. Louis S. Clapper, chief of the Division of Conservation Education, National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D.C.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Clapper.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS S. CLAPPER, CHIEF, DIVISION OF CONSERVATION EDUCATION, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Louis C. Clapper, chief of the Division of Conservation Education for the National Wildlife Federation which has its national headquarters at 1412 16th Street N.W., here in Washington, D.C.

The National Wildlife Federation is a private, nonprofit organization which seeks to attain conservation goals through educational means. The federation has affiliates in 49 States. These affiliates, in turn,

are composed of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, number an estimated 2 million persons.

We appreciate the invitation to appear here today.

The National Wildlife Federation supports the principles outlined in the Senate-passed version of S. 852.

Mr. Chairman, our organization is vitally concerned about public opportunities for engaging in fishing, hunting, and other outdoor recreational pursuits such as camping, swimming, hiking, bird watching, and picnicking. A survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shows that, in 1965, 33 million sports fishermen and hunters traveled 4 billion passenger-miles. These figures represent material increases—3 million sportsmen, 50 million recreation days, and travel of 4 billion miles—over those developed by the same survey in 1960. In short, the numbers of sportsmen are rising. And, due to longer periods of leisure and improved modes of transportation, they are able to spend more and more time at these pursuits. Comparable increases are evident in other outdoor recreational fields.

It is obvious that most hunting and much of the fishing must be performed in rural areas, in community ownership or in private ownership. Thus, our organization long has supported agricultural programs which afford opportunities for rural people and recreationists to cooperate. This was one reason why we supported land retirement measures, such as the conservation reserve program and the cropland adjustment program, for individuals, along with wildlife practices under the ACP program. This is among the reasons why we have supported the small watershed program. And, we believe the resource conservation and development program can be exceedingly important in this respect if amended to permit greater Federal participation in recreational aspects.

As we understand it, S. 852 will allow the Department of Agriculture to bear a proportionate share of the cost of installing public fish and wildlife or recreational developments under the program. The Department also can pay up to half of the cost of land, easements, rights-of-way and minimum basic facilities for these same public benefits. This will be a change from the present situation wherein the Federal assistance is limited to planning help and loans, not grants for installation. The projects, while developed by USDA team efforts, affect whole rural communities rather than just farmlands.

At the present time, 25 of these projects are operational. And, one more soon will be operational. These affect 60 million acres of land in 27 States. In addition, 15 other projects are authorized for planning and they will affect 40 million acres. More than 350 measures have been completed in the first 20 projects and 400 more are being installed, with 800 in the planning stage.

Like water development projects of a larger size, many of these offer multiple benefits in flood control and water supplies for a variety of purposes. It is our opinion that additional public benefits will accrue when the full recreational potentials are realized, especially when planned into the projects at the early stages. Recreational opportunities will attract many people from urban areas, offering badly needed facilities and enhancing economies of the rural areas. It goes without saying that recreational facilities of this type also will en-

hance the quality of the lives of the people who reside in the rural areas.

Limitations written into the bill by the Senate will strengthen the program. The \$50,000 project limitation appears reasonable. The requirement that assistance can be provided only when not available under other authority should prevent duplications of effort. The requirement that developments consistent with a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreational plan should assure coordination at all levels.

We hope the committee will see fit to issue a favorable report upon S. 852, allowing it to be an early conservation accomplishment of the 90th Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Clapper.

Are there any questions of Mr. Clapper? If not, we are very much obliged to you.

I would like at this point to insert into the record a letter received from Daniel A. Poole, secretary of the Wildlife Management Institute, dated October 18, 1967. And without objection it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: The Institute will not be able to be represented at the committee's public hearing on S. 852, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance to public bodies in acquiring and installing fish, wildlife and recreational developments.

This added authority would be essentially the same that the Secretary already has with respect to projects that qualify under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. The Institute is pleased to join with other national conservation organizations in supporting the objectives of S. 852.

I would appreciate having this letter made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely,

DANIEL A. POOLE, *Secretary*.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Mr. Myron Shoemaker, on behalf of the Endless Mountains Association of Pennsylvania. We will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF MYRON SHOEMAKER, PRESIDENT, ENDLESS MOUNTAINS ASSOCIATION, LACEYVILLE, PA.

MR. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, before reading my statement, I should like to state that our organization is officially recognized as a tourist promotion agency, affiliated with the Travel Development Bureau of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my pleasure to present this statement to your committee on behalf of the Endless Mountains Association of Pennsylvania.

The Endless Mountains Association is vitally interested in the amendment to the Resource Conservation and Development Project Act which would permit the Federal Government to cost share in building fish and wildlife and recreational developments. Our associ-

ation, which incidentally covers the same area as the newly authorized resource conservation and development project in Pennsylvania, has been promoting recreation for a number of years. We recognize that the economy of our area is based largely on tourism.

Tourists come to swim in our lakes, ski on our slopes, fish in our streams, hunt in our forests, and enjoy our scenery. They require lodging, food, gasoline, and sundry other services, all of which have a wholesome effect on the economy of this Endless Mountains area.

Recreation is a major business in the Endless Mountains area. We want to continue promoting the development of recreational areas because this is one of the chief sources of our income. Recreation supports motels and hotels, restaurants, service stations, sporting goods stores, and local grocery stores. All of this means jobs. However, it is disappointing to see the many undeveloped sites which could be used to attract even more tourists to this area.

The Endless Mountains Association was pleased that a resource conservation and development project was authorized for our five-county area. This project, as you know, is aimed at improving our economy by developing and conserving the natural resources. Our tourist business is based primarily upon the natural resources of land and water. We know that the resource conservation and development project will have a real impact upon this entire area, especially with the addition of the amendment you are now considering.

This amendment, which provides for cost sharing in recreation and fish and wildlife developments, will serve as a much needed stimulant in assisting the local people in developing recreational activities. We need this type of financial assistance because local government's participation in resource development is severely limited by the low tax base in the five-county area.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you are aware that things begin to happen once a recreation area is developed. These areas always attract people and people need services and services mean new jobs.

In addition, public recreation areas always have a stimulating effect upon private recreational developments. We often find that private developments take place nearby public developments. The public and private developments complement each other and add up to new job opportunities for the entire community.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the available recreational and fish and wildlife developments are factors considered when industry plans new plant locations. The more attractive we can make our rural areas the more successful we will be in getting industry to locate in them because today industry is very conscious of the needs of its employees. Recreation is a factor which helps attract industries to rural locations. New factories, of course, mean new jobs and all of this has a significant effect on improving the tax base of the entire community.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the approval of this amendment as outlined in Senate bill 852 could be a significant step in helping to improve the economy of the five-county area in northern Pennsylvania. I am sure your committee will give it every consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Shoemaker.

Are there any questions of Mr. Shoemaker? If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Shoemaker.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone else to be heard this morning?

All witnesses I have listed here have been heard. Is there anyone here who wants to be heard on this bill?

Mr. ZWACH. I would just like to say for the record that I have a number of letters in support of this bill and I think that we should pass it, and when we get the Vietnam matter out of the way I think that the people in America are going to have to be moving into these areas. I am supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Zwach.

(The following letters were also submitted to the committee:)

CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF SOIL &
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, INC.,
Fairfield, Conn., October 13, 1967.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
*Congressman, Texas,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: It has been brought to my attention that the House Version of SB-852 (to provide federal cost sharing for recreation and fish and wildlife habitat improvement in Resources Conservation and Development projects) will be heard on October 19. I had hoped to appear before the committee, but a previous engagement prevents this.

The Senate has acted favorably on SB-852, but to date the House Sub-Committee on Agriculture has failed to consider this item.

The Resource and Conservation Development projects have a great potential to stimulate conservation action in a zone hitherto considered a "No-Man's Land". Due to local economic conditions and due to the fact that no over-all conservation *agency* or *program* has really concentrated on complete *local* conservation projects, the Resource and Conservation Development project is a pioneer venture and of considerable economic value to the community and regions involved.

I hope you will consider the merits of this bill and that this letter will be made part of the over-all record.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP BARSKE, *Chairman.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1967.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
*Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know from previous discussion and correspondence I am very much in favor of S. 852 providing financial assistance for Land Conservation and Utilization, and which bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to share costs of installing public fish and wildlife or recreational developments.

This letter is to re-emphasize the importance of this legislation not only to my own state of Nevada but to many other states throughout the country. This legislation would provide us with an opportunity to make appropriate plans and go ahead with improvements for public fish and wildlife or recreational works which would not be possible without the provisions included in S. 852.

To further emphasize the importance of this legislation to my state I am enclosing letters from our Governor, Paul Laxalt, and from Mr. Vance Agee, President Nevada Association of Soil Conservation Districts, both of which I believe you will find self-explanatory.

Again I urge your support and early favorable action on S. 852, and would appreciate if you would include this letter and attachments in the record of the hearings scheduled by your Committee on this legislation on October 19th.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, Nev., October 2, 1967.

HON. WALTER BARING,
Congressman for Nevada,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: I have just received word that S. 852 has passed the Senate and is before the House for action.

This piece of legislation will be of great assistance to our State on water-based developments for recreation and fish and wildlife. At this time passage of this legislation will be especially helpful to the sponsors of the North Cal-Nevada Resource Conservation and Development Project which was recently approved for planning by Secretary Freeman.

Any action you may be able to take in support of this bill will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

PAUL LAXALT, Governor of Nevada.

NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Reno, Nev., September 29, 1967.

HON. WALTER BARING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARING: I urge you to lend your full support to obtain favorable House consideration to Senate Bill 852 which I understand was passed by the Senate on September 21, 1967. It now awaits House of Representatives' action.

Enactment will mean that the sponsors of the North Cal-Nevada Resource Conservation and Development Project will have opportunities to plan for public fish and wildlife or recreational works of improvement that are non-existent without provisions included in this Bill.

The sponsors are the Vya and Gerlach Soil Conservation Districts of Nevada, the Surprise Valley and Goose Lake Soil Conservation Districts of California and Washoe and Modoc Counties. They were notified that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on August 22, 1967 had authorized agencies in the Department to assist them in planning their project. They are now in the process of developing their Project Plan.

The legislation is also of utmost importance to the people of central Nevada. The Central Nevada Development Association Steering Committee, composed of supervisors from the Eureka, Austin, Tonopah, and Esmeralda Soil Conservation Districts and Commissioners of Eureka, Nye, Lander and Esmeralda Counties have an Application for Planning Assistance on file with Secretary Freeman for their proposed Resource Conservation and Development Project.

I hope you will not only support this Bill personally but that you will exert whatever influence you may have with colleagues from nearby western states where this type of resource conservation and development legislation is also direly needed.

Very truly yours,

VANCE AGEE, President.

NEW MEXICO ASSOCIATION OF SOIL &
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Questa, N. Mex., September 29, 1967.

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHNNY: The Senate last week passed Senate Bill 852 which would amend Section 32(e) of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans and furnish cost share assistance for recreation purposes in resource conservation and development projects.

It is my understanding that this Bill will now go to the House for hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture. The passage of this Bill by the House is of vital importance to the success of the Northern Rio Grande Resource

Conservation and Development Project. As you know, the project currently covers Taos and portions of Rio Arriba and Santa Fe Counties. We are in the process now of expanding this project to also include all of Rio Arriba County and Mora and San Miguel Counties. We consider income producing recreation to be one of the real ways in which we can help advance the economic development of northern New Mexico. The stumbling block in carrying forward the recreation development program in this area has been the inability of the local organizations to obtain financing. The passage of this Bill would make both loans and cost share assistance available.

I am attaching for your information, a copy of a study Soil and Water Conservation Districts have made of two recreation enterprises which have been developed in the Northern Rio Grande Resource Conservation and Development Project. One is on Mercedes Ortiz, and the other is for Arturo Jaramillo's Rancho de Chimayo. This will give you some information of the impact which this type of work can have.

I know we can count on your support for the passage of the Bill, and will appreciate all that you can do. Please let me know if there is any further information you would like to have in connection with this measure.

Very truly yours,

W. P. CATER, *President.*

ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY—MERCEDES ORTIZ—COW CAMP, RECREATION AREA,
AND RANCH

R.C. & D. PROJECT MEASURE NO. 145

Mr. Ortiz submitted his project assistance request in October 1965. He wanted to establish a recreation area for himself, his family, and friends. He also wanted to provide opportunities for a few friends to build cabins and enjoy the area.

He began construction in 1966. A fish pond was constructed and stocked with trout. The trout are fed commercial feed and are providing good fishing. Access roads have been constructed and improved. Diversions, pipelines, fences and other conservation measures have been installed.

Four vacation cabins have been built, one by Mr. Ortiz and three others on lots he sold at the area. The cabins use butane and an electric generator. Insurance is carried on the cabins.

He has purchased a snowmobile and "toegoat" for winter and summer use in the mountains at a cost of about \$1535.

Mr. Ortiz uses about 30 man days labor on the area each year. He owns his own caterpillar and it is used extensively.

SUMMARY OF ADDITION OF INCOME TO AREA

Pond, Fish and Feed, Fences, Roads, etc. -----	\$ 4,650
Cabins, Power Plant, and Other Recreational Facilities -----	31,735
Total -----	36,385

The area has been providing approximately 150 man days of recreation each year. This includes, fishing, picnicking, hunting and general use.

The Kit Carson Electric Co. is planning to install a 10 mile electric line into the area to provide electric power at the site and elsewhere.

The use of this area up the Los Pinos River is stimulating general improvement of access and use of community.

The \$36,385 spent to date as a result of this project has been over a two-year period. Assuming $\frac{3}{5}$ of the money has been circulated in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado, it ultimately would be expanded to an impact of about \$72,752. The continued use and maintenance of the area will have a yearly impact somewhat less than this figure.

This information was provided by Mr. Mercedes Ortiz. The figures and amounts are estimates. Mr. Bernabe Herrera, Soil Conservation Technician, assisted with the gathering of the data. This recreation area has been aided by the efforts of the Soil Conservation Service and the Steering Committee of the Northern Rio Grande Resource Conservation and Development Project.

ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY—RANCHO DE CHIMAYO—ARTURO JARAMILLO

R.C. & D. PROJECT MEASURE NO. 145

Mr Jaramillo was employed in the eastern part of the United States. He had a desire to return to New Mexico. He acquired his grandfather's old farmstead and began re-development of it in the community of Chimayo.

He submitted his project proposal in 1964 and the initial phase was completed in 1965. His plan was to develop the farm into an operating unit, restore the old home, convert it into a Spanish restaurant, and install other recreation facilities such as riding stables, tennis courts, lodge, nature trails, miniature golf and a swimming pool.

The farming operation is underway and the restaurant has been completed. Nature trails have been laid out and signs at entrance to farm and restaurant installed.

Since 1965 Mr. Jaramillo has spent approximately \$35,000 in improvements on the area. This includes such items as supplies, materials, and equipment. Most of it was purchased locally.

During the process of rebuilding the farm house and installing the restaurant, Jaramillo employed as many as 20 people for six months. Later this rose to 34 people during the main tourist season. He now employs 22 people full time during the spring and summer and 14 people during the winter. He uses musicians for entertainment on special occasions. His annual local labor amounts to approximately \$27,000.

The majority of the full time employees have been inexperienced in the restaurant business and have been trained on the premises.

His annual supplies amount to about \$32,000. He also uses the products grown on the farm.

He pays local taxes, insurance and interest on a loan.

Annual Improvements (\$35,000 over two-year period)-----	\$17, 500
Annual Labor Force-----	27, 000
Annual Supplies, etc-----	32, 000
Total -----	76, 500

Assuming he continues to make improvements and additions and that $\frac{2}{3}$ of this money is spent within the immediate area and that it continues to circulate, the \$76,500 would ultimately expand to an annual community impact of \$153,000.

The restaurant and farm are drawing thousands of people each year from all over N.M. and from out of the state, as well. It is recognized as a major tourist attraction and therefore influences general tourist trade in the area and community.

Mr. Jaramillo has plans to expand and intensify the recreation complex which will increase the economic impact.

This information was provided by Mr. Arturo Jaramillo. The figures and amounts are estimates. Coy Garrett, WUC, Soil Conservation Service, Santa Fe, is working closely with Mr. Jaramillo on plan application and assisted with the gathering of this information. This recreation and tourist enterprise has been aided by the efforts of the Steering Committee of the Northern Rio Grande Resource Conservation and Development Project.

NEW MEXICO ASSOCIATION OF SOIL &
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Questa, N. Mex., October 6, 1967.

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS,
Congressman from New Mexico,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRIS: Senate Bill 852 offers tremendous opportunities to carry out recreational development projects in the Northern Rio Grande RC&D Project. Senator Montoya, co-sponsor of the Bill, has informed me that it has been passed by the Senate. You may be sure that we strongly endorse this legislation and urge you to do everything you can to secure passage by the House.

Thank you very much for your continued support of legislation of benefit to New Mexico. I send you best regards,

Sincerely,

W. P. (BILL) CATER, *President.*

NORTHERN RIO GRANDE RESOURCE,
CONSERVATION, & DEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
Taos, N. Mex., October 6, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS G. MORRIS,
Congressman from New Mexico,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRIS: It has come to our attention that S. 852 has been passed by the Senate and is now under consideration by the House. The Bill will provide cost-sharing on public fish and wildlife or recreational developments in RC&D Projects. The provisions of the Bill will help us carry out a number of recreational development facilities in the Northern Rio Grande Project.

We want you to know of our interest in the matter and urge your support of this legislation. You know that we appreciate very much your strong support of the Northern Rio Grande RC&D Project.

Very respectfully yours,

PABLO ROYAL,
Chairman, RC&D Steering Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nothing further on this bill, the committee will now go into executive session.

We appreciate our visitors being here. We are glad to have had you here.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon the committee proceeded into executive session.)

○

...the fact that you have not yet received your copy of the report. I am sorry to hear that. I will be glad to send you a copy of the report as soon as it is available.

Very truly yours,
John F. Kennedy
President of the United States

...the fact that you have not yet received your copy of the report. I am sorry to hear that. I will be glad to send you a copy of the report as soon as it is available.

Very truly yours,
John F. Kennedy
President of the United States