

Mr. McCLURE. I didn't mean to be derogatory. I just meant to indicate that the estimates are very rough.

Mr. CRAFTS. They are very rough. With that I will concur.

Mr. McCLURE. And you would not expect us to take them as being an accurate reflection of what the costs are or may be.

Mr. CRAFTS. I think they are indicative but I do not expect you to take them as accurate.

Mr. McCLURE. You indicated earlier that there is no precise way of indicating what developments would be compatible and what would not be for a river in a wild river state.

Mr. CRAFTS. We could give you a statement. If you want a statement on the types of development that we construe to be appropriate within the various classes specified in the bill, we can write that out and give it to you.

Mr. McCLURE. I think that would be helpful. Could that be added to the record?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Without objection, that is so ordered. (The material follows:)

TYPES OF DEVELOPMENT

From a scenic river standpoint emphasis would be placed on providing principally those facilities that are oriented to active visitor use and enjoyment of the river. This would include such facilities as access points, campsites, picnic areas, and interpretive areas. In the case of rivers flowing through areas in which the natural scene has remained unchanged, development would be minimal to retain the integrity of the natural state. In those instances where the rivers flow through designated wilderness areas no development will be permitted unless expressly allowed by the Wilderness Act. Wherever possible visitor goods and services would be provided outside the boundaries of the rivers by private initiative in the nearby communities.

Existing farm and ranch operations normally would be consistent with the scenic river concept. Likewise, existing well managed timber operations would be compatible, except that clear-cutting of trees on the river edge may in some instances be too disruptive to the natural scene. Existing mineral activities would be compatible except where they tend to destroy esthetic qualities or pollute the river. Existing cabins, summer homes and other recreation oriented commercial developments may be compatible with scenic river objectives if they do not seriously detract from the esthetic features and qualities of the river.

Certain uses would be discouraged that are disruptive to the natural or pastoral river scene such as residential subdivisions, industrial plants, motels, and gas stations. The construction of dams, river channelization, closely paralleled roads and utility lines would be discouraged unless compelling reasons exist why they should be permitted.

Mr. McCLURE. I have only one or two more questions.

In an area which is designated as wild river, and which is paralleled by a developed road, what would be your attitude toward dwellings in that area that presently exist?

Mr. CRAFTS. And that are inside boundaries? What we will probably do is try to keep the boundaries from going out that far—keep that road and keep those dwellings outside the boundary of the national scenic river area. This is why this flexible thing has merit. We would pull in. We could pull in right close to the water's edge.

Mr. McCLURE. I am thinking in terms of the Lochsa River in Idaho.

Mr. CRAFTS. You are thinking of the road down the river?

Mr. McCLURE. Yes.

Mr. CRAFTS. There is a highway right down there, and you see this