

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1967.
Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request, we submit the following information for the record of the hearings August 23, 1967, on S. 1267, a bill "To establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes."

The current annual cost of administering the National Forest lands which would become a part of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area is approximately \$123,000. Assuming investments in the development of the Area to the full extent proposed in our report and testimony on this bill, we expect the recurring administrative costs would increase to \$450,000 per year by the end of the 4th year. Such costs should level off at that stage.

Costs incurred by the Forest Service under the provision of Section 8 of S. 1267 are expected to total about \$100,000 for the first five years. A total of \$100,000 would probably be expended thereafter. These contributions would be largely in the form of technical advice and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. GREELEY,
Associate Chief.

Senator BIBLE. Now, might I ask an additional question? It seems to me that your troublesome zone is the zone that is depicted on the white, which is on the east side of the map. I would assume that is the area which is in private ownership, correct?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Senator BIBLE. Why isn't it possible to shrink that up and eliminate the 2,500 lots and the other in-holdings that appear to be giving you some trouble?

Secretary Freeman. Well, I think under the bill this would be significantly done if we had the resources and went forward under an agreed upon basis. In other areas, we may not seek to do it at all, because if the use is compatible with the area, it actually contributes to it, and the scenic easement accomplishes every purpose we have.

Ranching, for example, the running of cattle and sheep in the area, that does not detract from the area.

Senator BIBLE. I agree with that. I have no problem as to land.

Secretary FREEMAN. In the other areas, we would move ahead where there were the kinds of developments now—let us say housing that is an eyesore. And we would hope to get them, if people are willing to go along. Under this bill if we could not, we would just have to live with that. The ones that were not built yet, once the regulation were proposed, the people in question then would have to build according to the standard that had been established by administrative order. And if they were unwilling to do so, we may want to acquire a scenic easement in that instance, and that value will have to be determined either by negotiation or by condemnation.

So I don't think there is any way of really saying precisely how every foot of ground will be used, but, rather, to set down the basic principles of use, the means by which they can conform to those targets, and then go about the business of amicably trying to arrange accordingly, and then if necessary acquire scenic easements.

Senator BIBLE. I don't know that that is responsive, Mr. Secretary, because that isn't what I was trying to get at. What I am trying to