

a stream," or "here is a mountain range." But on the other hand, if we can agree generally upon where it might be, and what we might want to include, then I should think there is some merit in using natural features that occur, rather than arbitrary lines that would have to be determined by a survey.

I say that because in my own country, we have had a number of surveys, and they don't always parallel each other. I know one time, a group may find this to be the line, and later on, as is the case right north of my little town of Jackson now, the line coming from the north doesn't run into the line from the south.

I don't know who is right, but I know that the two lines just don't join, and this, of course, is one of the problems that I suspect the Forest Service contemplated when it chose, rather than to designate lines along section lines, in unsurveyed country, that they thought there would be some obvious advantage in streams and ridges.

Would you agree generally in that?

Mr. GUTERMUTH. Yes, that is right. That is in line with what I had in mind, but what disturbed me a little bit was what I call the more or less arbitrary decision, that in one particular case a ridge must be the boundary, and in the next case it is some other distinguishing formation.

Now, if a stream is a good, distinguishable boundary in one locality, and there happens to be another good stream in another locality that we are considering, I can't see why a stream, if it is the perfect boundary in one locality, couldn't as well be a perfect boundary in one of the others. That is the point I was trying to make.

Senator HANSEN. Yes. Of course, I think you have already said that your organization was not intimate and familiar with this area, and you didn't care to make any specific suggestions as to what might be included or excluded on the basis of your knowledge.

Was that right?

Mr. GUTERMUTH. No, except as I tried to bring out in my statement, I am inclined to think that these areas in the Washakie, areas J and D, we advocated that they consider the views of the Wyoming department. I listened carefully to the testimony this morning. I have a difficult time taking very much issue with anything that Ed Cliff says, because he is not only a truly outstanding forester but a great wildlife man, and a great friend of wildlife and conservation, a person whom I admire very much. On the other hand, I think there is ample evidence to show that where we have had areas opened up with a lot of roads and other forms of human encroachment, you will find that the elk population, pretty much, as I recall, go down, and while you can control certain aspects of the public use of these areas, I still think that the consideration and the recommendations of the Wyoming department should be weighed very heavily by this committee because I believe that they are on pretty sound ground.

Now, it isn't just a question of whether or not roads are going to interfere with the migration routes of the elk. It is not a question of whether they could not give adequate protection to an area during the calving season. It is just the overall human use and the cutting that is going to go on in there, and all other activities are going to be the things that will control this elk population up to a point. Those are the factors that I would like to see considered by this committee.