

costs. You recognize that we do much of this construction as timber purchasers. We have not yet, because the technique is new, worked out the frustrations of getting a computer location that needless goes through rock moved to a location less costly to construct. Similarly, we have problems with too rigid insistence by the Forest Service on uniform grades, uniform alignments, balanced cuts and fills, and excessively detailed surveys in forest road construction. Other possibilities for savings involve less costly bridge and drainage structures. We hope to work together with the Forest Service so the many new techniques available to us now allow actual realization of the theoretical economies.

Forest road locations can be much more flexible than highway construction requirements would permit and still provide long-term efficiency.

We fear that Federal budget cuts may result in timber purchasers being forced to build roads to unnecessarily high design standards and costs in order to get timber put up for sale. This threat stands as a nightmare for the Federal timber dependent economy. Federal timber purchasers even today buy sales that cannot return a normal profit margin because of costly road construction requirements. The operator's choice in Federal timber areas is often to buy or abandon the business. We are naturally upset when high road standards or failure to supplement construction costs with appropriated funds is the cause of the deficit sale. Failure to sell the timber means that communities and businesses will wither and die.

Another of our goals is to help the Forest Service keep standards within limits of economic prudence and in compliance with section 4 of Public Law 88-657.

Several years ago, your committee conducted a staff review of forest access road construction in the major Federal forest areas. Because the staff review resulted in an improved understanding of the administration of the funds authorized by this committee, we think it timely that both the House and Senate Public Works Committees consider the advisability of another committee field review. We offer the full cooperation of the forest industry in making available whatever information the committee deems necessary to making such a review.

In conclusion, my industry fully supports an annual authorization of \$170 million for national forest development roads and trails. This is an investment which will create manifold returns to the U.S. Treasury in direct timber sale receipts and taxes on income producing activities generated by the forest products industry. In approving an authorization of this magnitude, it is essential that Congress be assured that these funds be spent in the most efficient way.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Cramer?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Marshall, I think you stated very well, on behalf of your industry, the case as it really is. You have placed emphasis on the fact that some of these Federal timber area communities are certainly almost operating with a gunther head unless they can have something more in the way of a substantial guarantee that this program will continue to go forward and be sustained with the best enforcing management practices.

Now, is there anything that you can think of that this committee might do in order to advance your suggestion here relating to this