

In the event that you will not consider a National Park, then our second position is that the recreation area idea be completely abandoned, and that the wilderness status of the primitive area be implemented at the earliest possible time. To leave the area as it is will be better than the recreation area idea.

Our third position, if neither of the above can be achieved, is to include in the bill for the National Recreation Area minimal housing requirement so that subdivision concentrations cannot completely ruin the valley's natural setting. This minimum would be to allow one summer home in ten acres in the open, and five acres if partially or wholly wooded. Under no condition should less than a five acre plot be allowed. We contend that this should be made part of the condition of the establishment of the National Recreation Area.

We appreciate the interest of Idaho's Congressional Delegation and further realize that no plan will please all people, especially those who anticipate sudden monetary returns if their favored plan is used. You should also be informed that there is a growing resentment by some toward the recreational area plan. Some who had previously advocated in favor of the recreation plan are now wholly opposed to it. They are beginning to suspect the whole plan. We earnestly suggest the abandonment of the plan and that a National Park plan be studied for the Sawtooth area.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. PERFECT, *Secretary.*

[Editorial from the Post-Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Aug. 13, 1967]

THE SAWTOOTH URGENCY

The pivotal judgements on the proposed Sawtooth National Recreation area will most likely revolve around the U.S. Forest Service standards for land use in that magnificent valley.

The minimal land standards for summer homes in those areas where new summer homes will be allowed, have already been recommended by the Sawtooth National Forest office and a team of land use analysts of the Forest Service staff.

These base-level standards are practicable and are capable of preserving the valley from the housing developments which could seriously detract from the valley's natural setting. They allow a summer home every 10 acres if it is in the open, five acres if partially wooded, and one acre if the summer home is in dense timber. The one acre prescription, we feel, may be too small and would have to be adjusted to avoid unsuitable concentrations, but it is possible to maintain the frontier ranching atmosphere if the five and 10 acre standards were applied. These are minimal standards, however. If in some areas such standards fail to sustain the natural setting, the acreage ratios should be raised. The standards are now being assessed by the national officials of the Forest Service in Washington, D.C., and undoubtedly final judgements on the standards by the agency will be available for the congressional hearings, Aug. 23.

The National Recreation Area prescription which the U.S. Forest Service presented last year deserves the wholehearted support of Idahoans and their Congressional delegation. Senators Frank Church and Len B. Jordan and Cong. George Hansen are fully in accord on the proposed national recreation area legislation already introduced in Congress. We hope they pursue the legislation through to its successful conclusion as soon as possible before a mushroom of development in the valley complicates the prescription which the government must apply to preserve the valley.

From its stance at the Ketchum hearings, the Forest Service is relaxing its standards somewhat—but not beyond the minimum preservation values. The Forest Service gave the impression in its recreation area report of not allowing any new summer home concentrations. It is now allowing them in certain areas but with the preservative of minimum standards.

This newspaper feels that the standards which the Sawtooth National Forest office has advanced—with the possible exception of the one acre in the trees ratio—should be incorporated into the legislation itself. Idahoans, and the nation at large can then be aware what they are really buying in Sawtooth Valley. As the legislation stands now, the standards would be entirely discretionary with the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture depending on hearings which the Forest Service will conduct.

Sawtooth Valley needs preserving, and the National Recreation Area proposal of the Forest Service is the soundest way of achieving it. We are confident that everyone else will think so once they are able to examine that proposal and the recommended standards which could go with it.