

times lived up to the conditions of our lease. The Bureau of Reclamation had no cause to terminate this lease, and have no appeal procedure in regard to grazing lands.

These lands comprise approximately 63,000 acres of arid, sagebrush-covered hills. While this area was withdrawn for reclamation purposes, it has not been developed and the greater portion of it never will be. The best estimate I can give is that less than 15,000 of the 63,000 acres could possibly be reclaimed for irrigation. I am told, however, that such development is not planned in the foreseeable future.

Commissioner Dominy testified earlier in the day that future development is stopped on Muddy Ridge and Cottonwood Bench.

The Bureau of Reclamation terminated my lease so that the grazing lands may be used by a group of irrigation farmers who are in the Midvale area of the project. I ask that a letter from me to the Secretary of the Interior Udall, dated July 7, 1966, protesting the termination of my lease, be inserted in the hearing record at this point.

Sentaor HANSEN. Without objection it may be received.

(The letter referred to follows:)

RIVERTON, WYO., July 7, 1966.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of The Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: I wish to call your attention to a situation which, if carried through, will cause serious hardship on me and my family and deprive me of the most logical opportunity I have to make a livelihood. This is with regard to the Bureau of Reclamation's notice that they intend to cancel my lease for grazing on about 62,000 acres of lands surplus to the Riverton Reclamation project. While this land was a part of the area withdrawn for Reclamation purposes, it has not been developed and the greater portion of it probably never will. The best estimate that I can give is that less than 15,000 of the 62,000 could possibly be reclaimed for irrigation. I am told, however, that such development is not planned for a long time—perhaps as much as 30 years or more.

The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to cancel my lease on this land and turn the area over to the Midvale Irrigation District farmers. I suppose this is with the thought that these withdrawn surplus lands could be beneficial to this group. It is well known that many of the farming and ranching operations on the Midvale Irrigation District were started on an inadequate basis. The Third Division was later established for the purpose of rehabilitating land and permitting these people to have an operation of sufficient size to make an economical living. However, this may be, I am convinced that the Federal government has assisted Midvale Irrigation District considerably. Granting this use of these surplus lands to them would be of so little benefit that it will be of small consequence to the success of their operation. However, denying the use to me will cause me to fail entirely.

According to the Bureau of Land Management grazing capacity figure, the 62,000 acres can graze 505 cattle for one year. Since there are 370 Midvale farmers, if all shared equally in grazing benefits, each could graze less than two cattle apiece. The 505 animal unit grazing capacity is, however, sufficient to permit at least two successful cattle operations. The less than two cattle per farmer is of no consequence whatsoever from the standpoint of enhancing that farmer's opportunity to make a living.

I contend that those who are most interested in having these lands administered by the Midvale Irrigation District are largely livestock operators with holdings off the project area. If the District gains administrative control over this grazing land, these off-project operators would be able to expand their operations considerably. I say this because much of the grazing land controlled by the farmers in the project has been leased to these off-project livestock operators.