be possible to have a third alternative on there, or a fourth alternative perhaps, wherein instead of going as high as 10 billion board feet of output at any given time, let's say the year 1980, could you take that up to say 8 billion and stretch it out for a longer period of time, or is the factor of age and amount of maximum cut involved? Have you used calculus in this computation, so that that particular geometric design brings forth the maximum that would otherwise be lost, or are there alternatives that would bring forth about the same amount?

Dr. GRAVES. I think there are any number of alternatives, and I would expect that this would depend upon the area of management decisions that would be involved here. The optium which is obviously not readily obtainable is the dashed line on the chart that shows a full accelerated program. In other words, the more rapidly the excessive inventory can be utilized, the more rapidly in turn can those acres be returned to production, into fully useful timber growth. But it would be a virtual impossibility to immediately start out with a substantial increase from the present level of about 5 billion to a little over 10 billion as the dashed line on the chart would indicate. That was the reason why a gradual adjustment was shown in the modified accelerated program to reach this higher level by 1980. Now, these are various other possibilities, each of which would have an impact upon both the amount of old-growth inventory that would be salvaged, in other words, the efficiency of the salvage program, and the speed with which the entire area could be brought under a fully managed condition. In other words, it might delay the point on the other end of the chart.

Representative DELLENBACK. I am thinking again of the line of questioning which Senator Hatfield, I think, very soundly brought out, that the first dashed line indicates what you consider from a strictly conservation standpoint to be the optimum cut to get the most board footage out of the forests. When you used the term "depressive" we see there what a massive fade-off in allowable cut would commence about 1990 and continue on until 2020, where it would start to pick up again. I can see that would drop it from about 10 billion board feet to about 3.5 billion board feet, and if any industry were to come into being by about 1990 and be in existence at that time based on the 10 billion board feet, there would be severe economic dislocation, and this is what you meant by depressive.

Dr. GRAVES. That is right; yes.

Representative DELLENBACK. If we tried to get the maximum board footage out of the forests, and yet at the same time dislocate the economy the minimum, you might go to a different chart. You would go up less severely and stretch it out for a longer period of time.

Dr. GRAVES. That would be entirely possible.

Representative DELLENBACK. I assume what you are saying is that every move in that direction would mean a less full utilization of the substantial resource.

Dr. GRAVES. It would be done at a cost is another way of saying it, the cost of lost timber and lost growth on the timber from the land now occupied by the timber.

Representative DELLENBACK. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MORSE. Congressman Clausen.