

is public land. Along the Lochsa there is very little private land. I have been down that road. There are occasional developments. Down here, as you get further down, you get more private land. I would say occasional development would not bother us, but if we got a concentration of developments we might break the stretch here.

Mr. McCLURE. There is a concentration at the lower part.

Mr. CRAFTS. We might put a break in there—stop it above it and bring it out below it.

Mr. McCLURE. You would not attempt to disrupt it?

Mr. CRAFTS. I cannot say specifically. This is what we did at Fire Island. We had communities there. We stopped the boundary of Fire Island just before we got to the community and picked it up on the other side.

Mr. McCLURE. It would be your intention—

Mr. CRAFTS. The intent is minimum disruption.

Mr. McCLURE. There are a number of those people who are quite concerned about their future right to continue to own property which they now own and occupy.

Mr. CRAFTS. Yes. We are facing that right now in the North Cascade area. Here again the Park Service has developed a new policy which Mr. Hartzog announced. I would say this. The Park Service is now more flexible on this than it was in times past. But the intent is minimum disruption compatible with the purposes of the act, and as you say, this turns on the Secretary's judgment. I don't know how else you could handle it. You cannot spell out every single detail.

Mr. McCLURE. I would not expect you to know offhand, but could you tell me, supply to the committee, whether or not your preliminary investigations included a reconnaissance survey of St. Joe River, the Priest River, the Moyie or the Bruneau River in the State of Idaho.

Mr. CRAFTS. I can tell you in just a second. The St. Joe in Idaho was in the reconnaissance, yes. What were the others? Maybe you would rather have me submit for the record a list of 22 that we studied in detail and the 67 that we made preliminary reconnaissance and then you will have the whole list.

Mr. McCLURE. Since you have indicated one of these was included—were those studies in such detail that you would think it would not be appropriate to include them within the study section of this bill?

Mr. CRAFTS. No. There are quite a few of these that are proposed in the study section, and they were not studied in that detail. We certainly didn't spend \$50,000 per river on them. We maybe looked at them for a couple of days. If they were given preliminary reconnaissance, it does not in any way indicate they should not be in the study section.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this be made a part of the record at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered. That includes the 22 plus the others?

Mr. CRAFTS. Plus the 67. And we can give you a list of 650 that we initially screened.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This is now where there was some study given in the reconnaissance. I think that will be sufficient.

(The document follows:)