

Senator HANSEN. I am a little confused about the management of a watershed. Frankly, I have been exposed more, I should think—and maybe I am misreading your statement—to just the other approach. In some of the redwood areas which we were discussing not too long ago, where I think some competent timber management has been employed, seemed to bring forth great cries of anguish from a number of people who feel that precisely the wrong approach was taken down there. There was comment in one of the magazines, the Sierra Club's magazine, I think, about the first evidence of a little cloudiness in the water as being a threat to the watershed. I recognize that if our concern is only to try to see how much water we can get off an area and give no concern about erosion or anything else, I suppose you can't argue with the idea that if you take every living thing off the land you will get the water. If you have some way of catching the water and regulating it from that point on, maybe that is a good practice. But you are not suggesting commercial timber cutting as part of a watershed improvement program, are you?

Mr. GREELEY. I don't want to link the timber harvesting that I talked about to the need in the future to do work like this in watersheds. I am arguing here this afternoon, sir, that in the future we should look forward to managing this area for production of water.

Over in the adjoining State of Arizona we have a number of projects going on which have been going on for 8 or 10 years now to establish principles of vegetative manipulation in locations which are intended, on a planwide basis, to reduce the amount of moisture that is lost through transpiration through the brush and the other is to have patterns that affect the way the snowfall is caught so that the amount of streamflow is increased.

Maybe I should back off and say that is an important consideration here because I am testifying here today, attempting to respond to your question about what we should be doing in the future in this kind of area. I don't want to say to you that we should be planning the managing of the Pueblo de Taos drainage and no other watershed improvement. This is going to become important in the future such as we are doing on the Beaver Creek and we want to work out ways of applying those principles and they will be most important in the high producing watersheds and this is a high producing watershed.

Senator HANSEN. You spoke about the possibility of more livestock being run in this area. Is this area unique among most forest areas insofar as the livestock that are grazing on it are concerned?

Mr. GREELEY. There has been relatively little in the way of planned range management. There has not been the construction of pastures and cross fences and the division of the whole area into subunits which permits manipulation of the stock in the summertime with the kind of planned range management that you are familiar with, Senator Hansen. This has not been done. It would be a long-term effort, one which I think it would be well to be undertaken here. We have not started on this here in this particular area as much as anything else because of the special circumstances surrounding it.

Senator HANSEN. Do you suspect the construction of cross fences and separating the areas into pastures might do some violence to the religious contribution insofar as the Indians are concerned?

Mr. GREELEY. I must admit, Senator, I don't know how to answer that question.