

Mr. ASPINALL. To the 1,850 contour.

Dr. CRAFTS. Mr. Hartzog says it accounts for that, the 1,850-foot contour, but I think the answer is that we do not want dams and reservoirs in national parks. If this reservoir is necessary for Seattle City Light & Power Co., in the judgment of the committee and the Congress—and I certainly cannot assess that—then I think this area should be expanded to permit it but it should not be in the national park.

Mr. SAYLOR. I just want to say, Dr. Crafts, as far as I personally am concerned, if it is a question of water for human consumption, this is one thing. If it is a question of building a dam up there for power, this is an entirely different matter. As far as I am concerned, this needn't be built.

As far as I am concerned, I just eliminate the whole area. I am sorry that I have never been privileged to be in this area, but if it is an area as good as the pictures say it is then I am for preserving it for the people and not to take care of an outfit to produce electricity.

Dr. CRAFTS. There are three major drainages, Granite Creek, Panther Creek, Thunder Creek. Every one of those valleys are superlative valleys.

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have this basic question in regard to the proposal for building a dam within the recreation area. Do we have criteria established as to whether this is a compatible use in a recreation area?

Mr. HARTZOG. This Thunder Creek Dam would be compatible in the recreation area; yes, sir.

Mr. McCLURE. Would this be true of any recreation area or are you speaking of this specific instance?

Mr. HARTZOG. This specific one, sir, this specific one. You see, the Congress has affirmed the definition of these recreation areas by the President's Recreation Advisory Council, and they include national seashores and lakeshores as well as these reservoir recreation areas. My answer would be different if it were national seashore.

Mr. McCLURE. My question is not so much as to whether it could encompass an existing one but as to whether the future development within a recreation area would find further dam building, further reservoir construction within a recreation area to be a compatible use as a general matter.

Mr. HARTZOG. Well, I can answer your question in general by saying yes, and then qualify it by saying you have to look at each one of them and see how compatible it is.

Mr. McCLURE. I was a little startled by the thought that if we establish a recreation area, then a major portion of that recreation area might be under water.

Mr. HARTZOG. That is right. That is why I say I would have to qualify it to say a particular one. But this one on Thunder Creek we have been over repeatedly with the Seattle City Light, and it is compatible with the recreation area the way they plan to make their application and the way they plan to build it.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, if I might.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Idaho.