

Senator HANSEN. I gather that the thrust of your observation is that, while initially it was your belief and understanding that the area included within the dotted line staked out all of the area of particular religious significance to the Indians, nevertheless you do not argue that other areas might be included upon a reasonable presentation of a case?

Mr. GREELEY. Let me be specific. The Blue Lake area and its immediate environs were the principal source of concern. At the hearings 2 years ago there were references to Star Lake and Waterbird Lake.

We made efforts to find out additional information. Since Waterbird Lake and Star Lake area were testified to as important areas, this was the purpose of delineating the areas shown there on the map.

Senator HANSEN. What would be the attitude of the Forest Service, Mr. Greeley, with regard to keeping this entire 48,000-acre area in a primitive state, which I understand is essentially the status it now has, maybe not official status but insofar as reflecting the uses to which it has been put?

I gather there has not been any commercial sawmilling activity within the area, there have not been those developments taking place which would tend to destroy the primitive, pristine character of the area. What would be the attitude of the Department insofar as maintaining the primitive character of the whole area?

Mr. GREELEY. Senator Hansen, there are probably only a couple of reasons for us to have very specific reaction to this. We think there could be more livestock raised up there if there were some range improvements and range management practices which would be difficult to put into effect and carry out, and be consistent with the maintenance of a wilderness condition.

As I have indicated, there is some timber which we think would be useful. It is not vital. There is not a community life which depends upon it now but over the long pull we have thought that it would be desirable to harvest that timber that is located on the east side.

Over the long pull it is my belief that there are going to have to be more watershed improvement practices on some of these high water yielding areas in the southwest which would require some manipulation of vegetation that would not be done in a wilderness area. This is a high water yielding area. There is a yield of 100 acre-feet per section of land that comes off the area here. These are long-term considerations. The area is pretty much in a wilderness state now. To keep it in the wilderness state would not make an awful lot of difference except these possible future uses would then be foregone.

Senator HANSEN. Do I understand you to suggest, Mr. Greeley, that, appreciating the importance of this area as a watershed, it is your thinking that watershed improvement work within the watershed area would include the removal of timber.

Mr. GREELEY. The removal of timber can be done consistent with good watershed practices.

Senator HANSEN. If your prime concern is watershed management, are you suggesting that timber removal be part of such a program?

Mr. GREELEY. No. When I talk about programs for improving water yield, I am not talking about primarily timber removal. Senator, I am talking more about manipulation of brush type vegetation and cutting patterns when timber is to be harvested.