

Did I answer her properly when I said if this bill is passed and that river is included, she will not build a cabin on the banks of the river?

Mr. CRAFTS. I think you did. This is one thing that concerns me about the lower part of the St. Croix. As I understand it, it is pretty heavily developed with private homes and cabins.

Mr. KYL. I have had letters from people who have cabins who oppose it because they will lose the cabins.

Mr. CRAFTS. An occasional one might be left that fits in naturally. But there is no point in setting up a Federal reservation with Federal money, and then dividing it up into lots for summer homes.

Mr. KYL. Now, we have talked a lot about buying land and easements. One of the Members of Congress this morning noted that it would be much cheaper to get easements than to get a fee.

We have a somewhat similar situation existing on Jacks Fork Riverway. In your experience in that connection, have the easements been inexpensive compared to fee?

Mr. CRAFTS. I cannot speak about Jacks Fork as such. But quite often the easements will cost almost as much as the fee.

Mr. KYL. That is the only response I need to the question, sir, and I thought that that was true.

Now, Mr. Aspinall's bill has a limitation of \$6.5 million on it.

Mr. ASPINALL. \$5.3 million.

Mr. KYL. This one says \$6.5 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman was right as far as my appropriating section is concerned. But as far as their figure downtown is concerned, they have cut it back. That is where the difference is.

Mr. KYL. Well, the figure in the bill is probably closer to accurate, but I think it is still a long way short of being practical.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman a moment ago said they had some cost estimates on the upper Missouri study and are using this simply as a comparison here, approximate cost.

When I went into this subject, trying to find out what this land would cost, and what comparable land had been costing in the area—about one-third of the area where we plan to purchase acres, in that case I did not come up with anything like \$1 million acquisition for land costs. But I think perhaps I was—you were including in your study some breaks along the river which the people up there do not want to lose, and which we kind of maneuvered out of my bill to get a piece of legislation they all agreed to.

Mr. CRAFTS. That could well be. I do not have the details on the upper Missouri here, Mr. Kyl. But most of the land, as you know, is publicly owned now. I think about two-thirds of it is Bureau of Land Management land. The other land is mostly owned by the livestock industry. Along that stretch of the river, cattle come down to the water. Those breaks are heavily grazed and eroding. I am sure included in this cost estimate is a substantial portion of these breaks. I must say this, that if your bill excludes those breaks, I think it is a mistake from the standpoint of preserving that waterway in any sort of a natural environment, because starting from the table lands and going down the breaks and along the cottonwood flats, and into that river, those breaks need to be grazed sufficiently lightly to permit very rapid range improvement and reestablishment of the grazing cover.