

Orofino, Idaho
October 6, 1962

BRUCES EDDY - LOCAL INTEREST

Gentlemen:

As mayor of the city of Orofino, it is my privilege and honor to speak to the Inland Empire Section of the Society of American Foresters on the Bruce Eddy project.

I have been assigned a topic which covers a very important \$186,000,000 "all-Idaho project" in water resource development. It would take a lot of time to cover the entire field on what local people see in Bruce Eddy, so I will have to discuss only a few of the many items and present a general picture of the situation on Orofino and the surrounding region.

To properly present the picture of our struggle for progress in the Clearwater valley, I think I should mention that Clearwater County is largely federally owned and the county has a mere approximate \$8,000,000 valuation with only a little over 8,000 residents in the entire county and over 5,000 living here in the immediate Orofino area. Our community has an economy pretty well built up on forestry and logging activities. There are a few other activities here to help along, such as State Hospital North, but principally it is forestry and the lumber industry. While this is true, our region is one abounding in other resources as yet not working in teamwork and is out of balance in its effort to effect a stable economy. There are many reasons why Orofino and the Clearwater country should take a big step forward in the next few years and occupy a position of greater importance in the society of Idaho cities and communities with Congressional approval of the project. For many years Bruce Eddy has been one of the great hopes of our people to take us further along the way of providing opportunities for the growth of our country which we are told will come in a few years hence with expanding population.

On the basis of present plans it may be of interest to know the ownership of the land to be flooded. Of the gross acres of proposed pool area (16,970 acres),

Originally, the Bruce Eddy project was thought to be developed in part by private interests, thus providing a more satisfactory tax base upon which our county and community could exist. Downstream benefits, however, are too great and the optimum development of the river cannot be dismissed. Such being the case, it appears that our efforts must be to develop all side effects possible in the interest of improving our position tax-wise. Federal development of the multi-purpose project is now apparent. It will be our challenge to do our best for recognition of companion resources and hope they will receive the fullest consideration. Through a better understanding of our problems and the desires of local interests, a real cooperative program is possible.

Having a large federal project in our area will have a "shot in the arm" effect, but the after effects may be like a tranquilizer and leave us in no better condition after the construction days. This is not what we desire.

It is our hope that the project will be a full-time working one, enhancing forestry, the management and harvest of our timber crops, recreation, water and such other activities as may develop.

The area principally affected by the Bruce Eddy pool is a very important tree growing and cropping country. Mother nature has endowed the region with those conditions that make it a true tree-growing country. The acres affected by the development are in ownership of both public and private, and this ownership pattern has created a cooperative approach to the problems of forestry and fire control for many years. Now, with water resources becoming so important to our nation, we welcome the opportunity of full development in the good multiple-use concept. It is hoped that we can demonstrate here the cooperative approach to build a model program of public-private participation.

On the basis of present plans it may be of interest to know the ownership of the land to be flooded. Of the gross acres of proposed pool area (16,970 acres),

4,963 acres are now in small private ownership and 3,369 acres are in large private ownership. This makes 8,332, or approximately one-half, proposed pool at maximum levels in private ownership. There are 2,626 acres owned by the State of Idaho, 629 acres owned by the U. S. Forest Service and 2,275 acres in other federal ownership. The balance of acres, or 3,033, is original river channel and 75 acres is highway right of way, making a total of 16,970 acres.

I must mention a matter of importance to us in the successful harvest of tree crops and forest management plans. The Bruces Eddy pool will have approximately 183 miles of shore line. On the basis of present plans 98.4 miles of the shore line property will be in private ownership, 44 miles of shore line in State of Idaho ownership and 40.6 miles in U. S. Forest Service and B.L.M. ownership. We hope that the shore line ownership status will remain in its present ownership pattern, and the approximate 300 feet acquisition of additional acreage around the perimeter of the proposed pool should be limited to those shore line properties now in public ownership. This will afford the logical use of the pool for milling and transportation of forest products from planned points of development and will also give some tax benefit to support local governmental units.

The recent policy of acquiring additional acres around reservoir projects stems from the Department of Interior and Department of Army joint policy program, and apparently has developed for the intent of creating additional public recreational areas. While the Bruces Eddy project has a land ownership of checkerboard pattern, most local people feel that acquisition of all ownership around the perimeter of the pool by the federal government would be detrimental. We hope that lands in private ownership can remain privately owned for recreational development as well as the development of other activities.

The present policy on the part of the federal government to attempt to administer the use of project lands in such a manner as to guarantee the maximum sustained

benefit to the greatest number of people has established priorities in four different categories of recreational use. These are: Priority #1 - general public recreational use; Priority #2 - recreational use by quasi-public organized groups functioning in the public interest such as boy scouts, girl scouts, YMCA and other youth organizations; Priority #3 - quasi-public organized groups functioning in the public interest of the service club type such as Kiwanis, Lions, Rotary, etc.; Priority #4 - private recreational use. With such a policy private cottage sites located on lakeside shore line property would fall in Priority #4, or the last classification. We hope that more favorable consideration can be given to this planned use, and there appears to be plenty of acres and miles of shore line property to satisfy the requirements of all. Certainly all federal recreation programs should be tempered to give an opportunity for some private activity.

The ownership of shore line property is also important to our forest industries to permit better planned and more economical operations in the competitive market of lumber production.

Along with ownership of lakeside property is the problem of transportation facilities into and across the pool area. It is important here that crossing facilities be provided at logical locations. I understand that this is being favorable considered.

Finally, log and forest product passing facilities at the dam site are important. Several means of transportation from the dam site to downstream points of manufacturing for use may be selected by the industries who produce in the region. Present plans are for adequate forest products passing facilities.

It is my understanding that the long time established policy of the Army Corps of Engineers is to hold several public hearings in the area to determine land use. These hearings are held a year or two before inundation dates. This should afford local interests the opportunity to express themselves.