

Mr. BAKER. Ed, you have seen those buildings that Congressman McClure is talking about. Would you respond to that?

Mr. CLIFF. I am glad that this has come up, because that is not our interpretation of the Aspinall bill as it applies to the Salmon. If that is the interpretation, I would want to try to get it modified, because I do not think the whole stretch of the mainstream of the Salmon from North Fork down to Riggins should be managed as a wilderness river. It just is not that kind of a situation.

Using the classifications in the bill, and starting at North Fork, there is a considerable stretch of the river that would qualify as a natural environment or pastoral river, but not as a wild river, because there are already developments along it. There are roads, there are private resorts, some ranch and farmlands and residences, and that part of the river just would not qualify as a wild river.

Then you get into a stretch of the river that does go through wild country. It borders on the Idaho primitive area on one side and the Salmon Breaks Primitive Area on another, and that section would qualify as a wild river.

Then you emerge from that section to an area that is relatively undeveloped, accessible only by trail, but not in a wilderness, and may not be put in a wilderness, and we would not want to have the management of that land prejudged by the classification of this stretch as a wild river.

And then you emerge near Riggins and another developed section of the stream which might qualify as a pastoral river but not as a wild river. So this mainstream of the Salmon would be a scenic river in its entirety, but it may fit in three categories in this section of the river. That is the way we would intend to manage it, according to the land use patterns that are there and that might evolve.

Mr. McCLURE. Would the similar situation exist on some of the lower sections of the Clearwater?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, sir; very definitely.

Mr. McCLURE. And to classify the entire stretch clear down to Kooskia as a wild river within the definition of a wilderness, would be inappropriate, would it not?

Mr. CLIFF. It is entirely inappropriate. The part within the Selway Wilderness Area would qualify as a wild river, the part of the Selway, but below Selway Falls, would not, because that part of the river is accessible by road. There are developments along that river which would be compatible in a natural environment or pastoral river, but incompatible if it is classified a wild river. And from the forks of the Selway down to Kooskia, there is a major highway. There are improvements and residences and some farmlands that certainly would not be compatible in a wild river. The entire Lochsa is paralleled by a trans-mountain highway. There are intensive recreation developments along that stretch of the highway along the river. It could qualify as a natural environment river under the definition of this bill, but not as a wild river, so that would be an inappropriate classification.

Mr. McCLURE. And it wouldn't be your thought that these developments, at least in the main, but not wholly, that the developments which exist now along these lower stretches, the stretches on the river which you have designated as being inappropriate to the designation wild river or wilderness area.