

PANEL DISCUSSION: Impact of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act on Idaho

"What is in the Act?"

By

Bruce Bowler, Attorney-at-Law, Boise, Idaho

Public Law 542 of the 90th Congress approved October 2, 1968, provides for three classes of rivers, Wild river areas, Scenic river areas and Recreational river areas. The policy of the law is that certain selected rivers with their immediate environments possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or like values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

The purpose of the law is to implement that policy.

Wild rivers classification is free of impoundments and generally inaccessible except by trail, essentially primitive and containing unpolluted waters.

Scenic rivers classification is free of impoundments with shorelines or watersheds largely primitive and undeveloped but accessible in places by roads.

Recreational rivers classification is readily accessible by road and may have some development and undergone some impoundment or diversion.

To implement the policy to protect water quality and its immediate environment in fulfilling conservation objectives is legislation establishing National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, with federal administrative functions by Interior and Agriculture Departments. States may designate classification, with approval of Interior Secretary, for state administration with grants to be available from the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund laws.

The law immediately included the Middle Fork of the Clearwater from Kooskia to Lowell, the Lochsa from Powell to Lowell, and the Selway from its origin to Lowell, and the Middle Fork of the Salmon from its origin to its confluence with the main Salmon, with Agriculture (Forest Service) the designated administrative agency, which has a year to establish the boundaries and determine which of the three classifications best fits. The boundaries shall include an average of one quarter of a mile, not more than 320 acres per mile on both sides of the rivers.

The law further provides that Interior and Agriculture study other rivers for their inclusion within the system, and those in Idaho in the study section are the entire main stem of the Bruneau, the Moyie from the Canadian line to its confluence with the Kootenai, the entire main stem of the Priest and Saint Joe, and the main Salmon from North Fork to its confluence with the Snake.

The study rivers are to remain free-flowing and protected from development that would infringe their scenic and recreational values. Ten years is allowed for the studies during which there is protection for five years plus such time Congress needs, from Federal Power dam license or loans for development. The states are encouraged to formulate plans for Wild and Scenic rivers.

PANEL DISCUSSION: Impact of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act on Idaho

"Implementation of the Act"

By

Richard L. Harris
Assistant Regional Forester
Division of Recreation and Lands
U.S. Forest Service
Ogden, Utah

Thank you, Mr. Bizeau. Ladies and Gentlemen: I am pleased to be here at this meeting of the Idaho Chapter of the Wildlife Society to discuss how the Forest Service will implement the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. I particularly want to thank Mr. Bowler for his able presentation on the Act. It certainly made my job easier.

One thing I want to comment on at this time is that the Forest Service in initiating the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is not going to keep you in the dark. We are going to keep you informed. We are, in reality, going to solicit your ideas and thoughts concerning implementation and management of the Wild and Scenic Rivers in Idaho.

In Idaho the Forest Service is involved with two rivers that are to be initial parts of the "National Wild and Scenic Rivers System." These are also involved with four rivers included in Section 5 of the Act as potential additions to the system. These are the Moyie, Priest, Saint Joe, and Main Salmon Rivers.

Before I proceed any further, let me correct one possible misconception that came up in the earlier discussion. At this moment there are no rivers that are actually designated as wild, scenic, or recreation rivers. While certain rivers were designated in the Act as so-called "instant" rivers, they are not actually present in the system until the boundaries of the rivers have been determined for the various component parts and development plan has been prepared, published in the Federal Register, and forwarded to the Congress. A 90-day waiting period follows the transmittal to the Congress. This Act must be completed by October 2, 1969.

For the past several years, the Forest Service has been studying various rivers within National Forests that have been suggested for "wild river" status. We have collected a substantial amount of inventory data on such things as potential recreation sites; landownerships; transportation facilities, existing and needed, including roads, trails, bridges, and airfields; historical and archeological sites; and wildlife habitat; range, and timber resources.

For example, a rather complete inventory of recreation occupancy and development sites has been completed for the Middle Fork of the Salmon and most of the main stem of the Salmon. This involved 327 individual sites that were inventoried, classified, and photo points taken. A wealth of additional basic inventory data has been completed. We have several file drawers full of these data.

This information will be very useful in the preparation of plans for management of components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I can speak only in general terms about how the Forest Service will now implement the requirements of the Act. Our detailed plans for this work are still being formulated, but should soon be complete.

Two separate tasks are involved in implementing the Act. One relates to the established components of the system as listed in Section 3 of the Act. We refer to these as "instant rivers." The other task is the detailed study of potential additions to the system. These are called "study rivers."

First, I'll discuss the jobs we must do on the instant rivers. (In Idaho these are the Middle Fork of the Clearwater and Middle Fork of the Salmon.)

By October 2 of this year--which is one year from the date of the Act--we must publish in the Federal Register and forward to Congress three items. These are:

1. Description of detailed boundaries of each river.
2. Classification of each river into wild, scenic, or recreational river areas--or combinations thereof.
3. Plan of management and development of each river.

The boundaries of a river area will be located in accordance with the language of the Act. We cannot exceed an average of 320 acres of land per river mile. (This is an average of one-quarter mile on each side of the river.) So far as possible, boundaries will be located on recognizable topographic features or along legal subdivision lines. Some stretches of river may need much less than 320 acres per mile included within the boundaries. Other stretches will need more. The determination will be based on the topography adjacent to the river, and the importance of land areas along the river for the purpose of the Act.

The official boundaries will be delineated on aerial photos and on large-scale maps. These will be available for review by interested persons. It is important that boundaries be well-defined and recognizable because the Act places several restrictions on activities within those boundaries.

For example, there are limitations placed on the acquisition of land or interests in land (Section 6). The area within the boundaries is withdrawn from disposition under the public land laws of the United States (Section 8(a)), Mining activities on existing claims within the boundary will be subject to regulations that the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe (Section 9(a)(1)). (It is interesting to note that the Act withdraws from mineral entry the land within one-quarter mile of the bank of any river classified as "wild" even though the boundary may be established less or more than one-quarter mile from the river) (Section 9(a)(11)).

Rivers, or segments of rivers, will be classified as either "wild," "scenic," or "recreational." The definitions of these three classifications are given in Section 2(b) of the Act. The language in the Act will need some interpretation to further define such terms as "generally inaccessible" and "largely undeveloped." The interpretation of these definitions is not yet complete. I speculate, however, how this might work for the Middle Fork of the Salmon River as an example. This we touched on following Mr. Bowler's presentation. As we view the application of classification--and please remember this is based on limited interpretation of the Act--most of the Middle Fork will likely classify as a "wild river area." Short stretches, however, appear to meet the definition of "scenic river area." These would be at Dagger Falls where the Middle Fork is accessible by road, and at developed sites with airfields along the river such as the Pistol Creek subdivision, Middle Fork Lodge, and the Flying B Ranch.

In preparing plans for management and development of river areas, the basic Forest Service planning procedures will be followed.

A multiple use management guide will spell out how various activities and resource uses will be coordinated to accomplish the purposes of the Act. Section 10 provides the basic management direction. Let me quote from that section in order to recall your memory:

Each component of the National Wild and Scenic River System shall be administered in such manner as to protect and enhance the values which caused it to be included in said system without, insofar as is consistent therewith, limiting other uses that do not substantially interfere with public use and enjoyment of these values. In such administration primary emphasis shall be given to protecting its esthetic, scenic, historic, archeologic, and scientific features. . . .

Our management plans will reflect and carry forward this basic direction. The multiple use management guide will be supplemented with a recreation plan and such other special activity plans as necessary. The recreation plan, for example, will provide details on recreation developments to be provided and on how recreation use along the river is to be administered.

The plan which we are required to publish in the Federal Register and submit to Congress will probably consist of a summary of the essential features of the more detailed plans rather than a large and complete document.

As I mentioned before, the boundaries, the classifications, and the plans do not become effective until 90 days after being submitted to Congress (Section 3(b)).

Now, I'll briefly discuss how the Forest Service will implement the Act in regard to "study rivers" as listed in Section 5(a). As I previously mentioned, the Idaho rivers in this category are portions of the Moyie, Priest, Saint Joe, and Main Salmon Rivers. The main stem of the Bruneau River is also listed, but no National Forest land is involved there; Bruneau will be handled by the Department of Interior.

The actual priorities as to what rivers will be studied first and when has not yet been set. We do know, however, that for the study rivers the Main Salmon will be the first. At this time it appears that the detailed study of the Salmon will probably not be started until F.Y. 1971 which begins July 1, 1970. As each of you are well aware, scheduling of the study river will have to be considered in our regular budgetary policy so that the necessary funds can be arranged.

We are directed to act to ". . . proceed as expeditiously as possible to study each of the rivers. . ." to determine whether or not it should be included in the system. We must submit a report on each study river to the President and to Congress no later than October 2, 1978.

It will be necessary for us to pretty much complete our required work on the "instant" rivers before we can start on detailed field investigations of the "study" rivers. From a practical standpoint, this will mean--for example--that field work on the Main Salmon River would start during the summer of 1970. In the interim, detailed plans for carrying out that study will be prepared.

The Act directs us to pursue these river studies in close cooperation with appropriate state agencies. Upon request from such an agency, the study will be carried on jointly.

The Idaho Water Resources Board has expressed interest in a joint effort with a particular emphasis on the Main Salmon River study area. We have been in touch with Dr. Lee (here on the panel) concerning a joint study of the Main Salmon. Many details need to be worked out in the coming months to prepare a joint study plan that will accomplish the desired results. We are looking forward to this joint effort with Dr. Lee and his people.

As part of this effort, the Idaho Water Resources Board and the University of Idaho have proposed a cooperative Federal-state study on the Main Salmon River to determine an appropriate methodology for studying "study rivers." This could be an important and worthwhile early step in implementing the study requirements of the Act. We have held an initial meeting with Dr. Warnick

of the University about the methodology study. We plan to continue to work closely with him and Dr. Lee on development of this project.

Two Regions of the Forest Service are involved with the Main Salmon. The river forms part of the boundary between the Intermountain and Northern Regions. The Intermountain Region, that I represent, will take the lead for the Forest Service in studies of the Main Salmon. The Northern Region will handle the studies of the Priest, Moyie, and Saint Joe Rivers. The Department of Interior will also be involved in each river study.

In addition to the "study rivers" named in the Act, we are directed (by Section 5(d)) to identify additional rivers or river segments that should be evaluated as to their potential for management in a free-flowing condition. Suggestions in this regard from members of the Wildlife Society will be welcome.

I regret that I cannot be more precise in discussing how the Forest Service will implement the "Wild and Scenic Rivers Act." The timing of this meeting catches us at an awkward moment with our plans nearly formulated, but not quite complete. I hope my remarks have given you at least a general idea of the big job and challenge that lies immediately ahead of all of us.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT
ON IDAHO WATER RESOURCE PLANNING

The Idaho Water Resource Board was created in 1965 in response to threats to divert the waters of Idaho out of state. The Board was given the authority to formulate a State Water Plan and to embark upon a program of development to implement that plan so that the future prosperity of the State might be assured. Shortly after it was created, the Board was plunged into the wild and scenic rivers controversy. Even though the legislative groundwork was almost completed, the Board felt that it was essential to evaluate and comment on the bill, since it had possible far-reaching implications on water planning in Idaho.

The instant Wild Rivers System comprises 545 miles, of which 290 miles are in the State of Idaho. About one-half of the 290 miles are on the Middle Fork of the Salmon River, and the remainder on the Middle Fork of the Clearwater above Kooskia and the Selway and Lochsa tributaries. Water resource planning is simplified considerably with respect to these instant rivers since no plan need be developed. Because of the remoteness of the Middle Fork of the Salmon and the relatively low average annual runoff in the higher elevations, there appears to be no conflict with potentials for water resource development. I would suggest, however, that the publicity given to the Middle Fork of the Salmon may result in the necessity of rationing trips down the Middle Fork in order to preserve the wilderness experience that most people seek. I understand that in one day last August over 300 rafts were counted at various points along the Middle Fork and that adequate facilities for camping and waste disposal are a serious problem. The designation of the Middle Fork of the Clearwater and its tributaries as a wild river prevents the construction of Penny Cliffs Dam, unless Congress should later decide that the need for development on this river exceeds its values for a wild river. I would point out that the Clearwater River at Lewiston discharges about 11,000,000 acre feet per year, with the only major regulation being that of the Dworshak Dam and Reservoir on the North Fork of the Clearwater. This compares with an annual runoff of about 8,000,000 acre feet from the Salmon River and about 11,000,000 from the Snake River at Weiser, and a total runoff of the Snake River at Lewiston-Clarkston of about 35,000,000 acre feet.

Those rivers in the study section of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act include the Main Stem of the Salmon River from North Fork to its confluence with the Snake River, the Moyie River, Priest River, the Bruneau River, and the St. Joe River. Our staff has briefly reviewed reports by other agencies on these rivers and has derived the following information:

1. Moyie River from the Canadian border to the Kootenai River. Apparently there is no significant water development potential in the Moyie River Basin. No federal agencies have studied the basin. According to the Idaho Fish and Game Department, it is a third class fishing stream.

2. Priest River--the entire main stem. The Corps of Engineers 308 Report quoted the potential of developing less than 60,000 kilowatt capacity on Priest Lake. However, this was dropped in the 1962, 403 Report, apparently because of recreational development around Priest Lake and the necessity of maintaining a fairly constant recreational pool.

3. The Bruneau River--the entire main stem. The Corps of Engineers has conducted survey investigations looking to the possibility of building a multipurpose project in the Bruneau Canyon, but no feasible projects were found. The average annual runoff from the Bruneau River is approximately 200,000 acre feet, but flows are extremely variable.

4. St. Joe River--the entire main stem. The Corps of Engineers has identified the Siwash, Avery, and Sisters Creek sites as potentials for alleviating flood damage downstream. However, local opposition, technical, and economic problems appear to preclude development of any of these sites. This area is now under study as part of the Spokane River Basin Study being conducted by the Corps of Engineers.

5. The Salmon River--the segment from the town of North Fork to its confluence with the Snake River. The Salmon River presents the main water resource planning challenge because of its potential for power, water quality control, flood control, and irrigation. Our water needs studies reveal that there are currently 3 1/2 million acres of land being irrigated in the southern part of the State, with an additional potential of 6 million acres in the Snake River Basin alone. In the long run it is conceivable that pumpback from the Salmon and Snake Rivers to the southern part of the State will be feasible. From the water control standpoint, the Nez Perce Dam just below the confluence of the Salmon and Snake Rivers would provide the best site. However, until a solution is found to the passage of anadromous fish over high dams, this alternative is not feasible. A possible solution to help meet upstream water needs would be a tunnel in the vicinity of Lucile, Idaho, from the Salmon to the Middle Fork of the Snake. There is, however, also a problem of mixing of Salmon River water with Snake River water, which some fish biologists say would confuse the anadromous fish as they make their run up the Lower Snake and on into the Salmon River.

Pure water from the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers held in storage and released during late summer periods could help alleviate a water quality problem which is beginning to emerge on the Lower Snake. The Interior Department in its 1968 Middle Snake Reconnaissance Study pointed out that a thermal block periodically occurred at the mouth of the Snake which impeded anadromous fish runs. Therefore, the Interior Department proposed an allocation of 500,000 acre feet storage from the Appaloosa Dam to help alleviate this problem and to enhance the salmon runs. Their estimates of benefits for these releases would amount to about \$6 million per year. If upstream development is to continue in southwest Idaho, it is becoming clear that tributary storage for water quality control will be necessary to alleviate the downstream water quality problem. Recent studies of hydro-electric resources in the Northwest as part of the Columbia-North Pacific study demonstrate the tremendous hydro-electric potential on the main stem of the Salmon River. The three sites listed are Lower Canyon, Crevice, and Freedom. Lower Canyon would be just above the confluence of the Salmon with the Snake and would back water to the Freedom site approximately 70 miles upstream. Freedom Dam would back water to seven miles above Riggins, and the Crevice Dam would back water 65 miles up the main stem of the Salmon and ten miles up the South Fork of the Salmon. The Lower Canyon facility is described as having a 2.5 million acre-foot usable storage capacity with a 1,500 megawatt January peaking capability. The Crevice facility would have 1.03 million acre feet usable storage capacity and 1,000 megawatt January peaking capability. Some recent estimates by the

Corps of Engineers on Nez Perce show that it would have an active storage capacity of about 4.5 million acre feet and ultimate peaking capability of 4,780 megawatts. Of course, none of these dams can be authorized for construction by Congress nor can the FPC issue a license for their construction for a period of five years as specified in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Certainly the value of these facilities for economic development must be weighed against values that would be lost if they were constructed.

The Idaho Water Resource Board intends to study these other river systems as part of its state water planning effort. We have made initial contact with the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and have received notification that for those lands under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will be the study coordinator. The Forest Service will be the study coordinator for those rivers where the Department of Agriculture will be the lead agency. Our objective is to gain as much information on these rivers as possible so that our Board and the citizens of Idaho will be in a position to make the important value judgments as to how these rivers should be used.

Under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the federal agencies are directed to carry on the study of additions to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System in close cooperation with appropriate agencies of the affected state and its political subdivisions, and these studies should be joint studies if such a request is made by the state. Governor Samuelson has written to the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture requesting that joint studies of the potential additions to the Wild Rivers System be carried on between the State of Idaho and the federal agencies. He has designated Professor C.C. Warnick, Director of the University of Idaho Water Resources Research Institute as coordinator for the State's input into the joint studies. The Idaho Water Resource Board has already contracted with Professor Warnick and the Water Resources Research Institute for a study to attempt to develop a methodology by which to evaluate wild and scenic rivers. Other state agencies will likely help support the continuation of this important study.

As I have discussed our water resource planning program with members of the Board, I have concluded that the question is not whether there should be wild and scenic rivers in Idaho, but how much additional mileage should be added to the national system. Currently 290 miles out of the 545 miles designated are in Idaho. About 500 additional miles are listed in the study category. What will be the incremental value to Idaho and to society of each additional mile added to the system in Idaho? Where is the break-even point beyond which our State's economic development will become significantly restricted?

It is evident that the Salmon River projects and the Middle Snake projects are the most economic in the State and represent a great economic asset for the State of Idaho. The size of these projects far outdistances those remaining in the Upper Snake.

I believe it well to emphasize that the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission now has underway what is termed "The Columbia-North Pacific Framework Study." This study will serve as a framework for evaluating where detailed feasibility studies should take place in the future and how those studies now underway fit into an overall scheme. The entire State of Idaho will be covered by this framework study, and the Idaho Water Resource Board staff is participating to a great degree in order to insure that the best information possible on the State's resources and needs is incorporated in the study.

Three planning objectives have been adopted by the Commission, and separate plans will be developed for each one. These are: National Efficiency, Regional Development, and Environmental Quality. Under environmental quality we expect to mention the potentials for wild and scenic rivers and the potentials for enhancing environmental quality. Under economic efficiency or regional development we intend to identify how these same rivers can be developed to bring about economic benefits to the State and region. The conflicts between these objectives then will be clear to the decision makers. The results from the University of Idaho's Wild and Scenic Rivers Study will serve as input into the C-NP study and to the Commission's Comprehensive Plan, which will follow in ensuing years.

THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT:

HOW IT WILL AFFECT WILDLIFE AND RECREATION IN THE NORTHWEST

by

Dr. Maurice Hornocker, Leader

Idaho Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit

A better title might be 'Future effects....' or "Effects in the future...." of this legislation because we really are talking about effects in the years to come. Little immediate change will be brought about, as far as effects on wildlife are concerned, on those rivers included in the Act in Idaho. Very important effects will be felt in outdoor recreation in the future, some perhaps in the very near future.

In discussing effects of the Act on Wildlife, I will confine my remarks mainly to big-game species. Certainly lesser game and nongame species will be affected, as will both resident and anadromous fish, but for purposes of this discussion I'll stick chiefly to big game animals.

Before going on, I should point out that 'wildlife' and 'recreation' are synonymous but that recreation embodies a great deal more than wildlife. Wildlife populations enhance a recreational experience, whether the participant is hunting, photographing, or merely viewing. A great many people gain from just knowing that certain species are present in a given area, even though the animals may seldom be seen. When we speak of management of game animals here in the West, we normally think of management for hunting purposes. But more and more in other parts of the country these other 'uses' of wildlife are becoming more important.

The two Idaho rivers initially included in the legislation--the Middle Fork of the Salmon and the Clearwater's Middle Fork, including the Lochsa and Selway tributaries--flow through some of the state's finest big game country. Of those in the "Study" category, the main Salmon in central Idaho and the St. Joe in the Panhandle are noted for their excellent big game habitat. Three of these four rivers or river systems, excepting the St. Joe, carve deep, steep-walled canyons--the Salmon canyon is more than 6,000 feet deep in places. Ecologically, the canyons of the Salmon and its major tributaries, along with Hells Canyon, are unique to the Intermountain area. The Clearwater system canyons, while not so striking physiographically, serve the same ecologic functions in that the canyons provide a great percentage of the available winter range for big game animals. The Bruneau, a 'Study' category river, serves the same purpose, although it exists in entirely different type of terrain. The two other Panhandle rivers in the Study group---the Priest and the Moyie---are quite different ecologically. Year-round precipitation is greater, topographic relief is less, and their canyons, if one could call them canyons, are much shallower.

The steep-walled canyons of the Salmon and Clearwater systems provide winter range for the major portion of the nation's largest elk herd, as well as for two species of deer, bighorn sheep and mountain goats. The relatively small area of land bordering the rivers affected by the Act often constitutes an important part of the big game winter range. In years of heavy snowfall and prolonged cold temperatures--'hard' winters--game animals are forced lower and lower in these canyons. Forage in the lower one-fourth of the canyon sometimes must sustain the entire herd for varying lengths of time. If this forage is not available low along the river, for any reason, then during these hard winters we may expect serious losses, and thus smaller populations. Spring is another period when the lower portions of the canyons receive heavy use. All species of big game animals are attracted here by the new grass. This is not so important in the survival of these populations but it does provide considerable forage at this time of year.

The importance of the lower canyon is evident to anyone who spends any amount of time in these areas during winter and who views things objectively. There is, however, scientific evidence to support this view. Dr. Paul Dalke, for more than 20 years the Leader of the Idaho Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, conducted extensive research on winter range in the canyons of the Clearwater and Salmon river systems. His work points up the importance of this portion of the winter range. Stewart Brandborg, who studied mountain goats in the Salmon drainage, states "During severe winters all of these big game species (elk, mule deer, bighorn sheep, and mountain goats) are concentrated on the lower slopes." Dwight Smith, in studying bighorn populations on the Middle Fork of the Salmon, found the lower canyon important not only to sheep but to elk, deer and goats. Studies are currently being carried out by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Division of River Basin Studies in the Hells Canyon area of the Snake. The canyon is ecologically similar in many respects to the Salmon. Preliminary findings indicate the lower elevations of the canyon - which would be affected by inundation by High Mountain Sheep Dam - receive much use by deer. My own work in the Primitive Area supports this view. Winter range has been shown to be the foremost factor in limiting the numbers of elk and mule deer. And in one winter--1964-65--the lower portions of the canyon sustained these herds throughout late December, all of January, and early February.

To determine the effects on big game herds of retaining these lower-canyon lands, we must consider the alternatives. These include impoundment and subsequent inundation, road building, logging, mining, and other forms of development. Some of these alternatives destroy the winter range completely, others make it, in effect, unavailable to wildlife. The Wild and Scenic Rivers legislation insures the retention in a natural state of this small but extremely critical portion of land.

While the Act will have future effects on wildlife populations, the effects on outdoor recreation in the state will be many times greater. To establish this thesis, we must look at the broad recreational picture, both now and in the future. And again the alternative uses must be considered and their benefits compared. It might be well to establish here what I mean by 'benefits'. I'm speaking of both economic and cultural benefits. Monetary wealth and material gain are important in our society but in our individual lives these alone are not enough. There are many, many things--intangibles--which we cannot and make no effort to place a dollar sign on. These kinds of

things include good music, art, architecture, and the like. Open space, a mountain lake, a free-flowing river fit the same category. These intangibles instill quality in our individual lives and psychologists tell us they are absolutely essential to physical and mental health. I believe society must recognize that the same kinds of things are essential to its health and well being. We as a society should strive for this quality and not only for "goods." Gross National Product is a very poor measurement of the progress of a society.

We enjoy a quality way of life here in the Northwest. I believe we can retain this quality and still 'grow' economically. The economic growth is assured one way or the other, but with some kinds of growth all semblance of quality in the environment is lost. I believe, by developing our recreation industry, Idaho can enjoy lasting economic growth and at the same time retain for its citizens the kind of an environment conducive to 'good living.' In this regard--that of developing a recreation industry--Idaho's rivers and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act are vitally important.

The United States is currently undergoing an unprecedented boom in the recreation industry. The July 1968 U.S. News and World Report states that an estimated 100 million people in this country engage in one or more forms of outdoor recreation. In 1900, 3 percent of total consumer spending was devoted to recreation; today 6 percent goes for recreation. The national bill for all this--in equipment, fees of various kinds, and related expenses--adds up to \$50 billion a year. The magazine goes on to say that if anything ever happened to blight outdoor recreation the whole economy would be disrupted. Reasons for this boom include improvements in per capita income, per capita leisure time, and mobility brought about by gains in productivity and technology. An expanding population and a changing style of life are other factors. A striking example is the change in one of these factors--leisure time. U.S. News and World Report states that the average worker is at leisure about 25 percent of the time. This contrasts to about zero a hundred years ago and the prediction of M.A. Holman, writing in Sociology and Social Research, October 1961, that vacation time will triple between the years 1950 and 2000--from a work-force total of 213 to 668 billion hours. The Southern California Research Council believes that by 1985 Americans will be at leisure 1/3 of the time. The impact of this on the recreation industry is obvious.

The Pacific Northwest (encompassing Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana west of the Continental Divide) is riding the crest of this boom. The Bonneville Power Administration, in its 1967 publication "Pacific Northwest Economic Base Study for Power Markets," reports that \$900 million is spent annually by tourists in the region. Projections forecast an increase to \$2,210 million by 1985 and \$6,765 million by 2010. Recreation demands in the region will be three times greater in 1985 than in 1960, six times greater in 2000, and more than nine times greater in 2010. This region with approximately 3 percent of the nation's population, accounts for about 7 percent of the nation's tourist expenditures. Because of the sheer diversity and immensity of Pacific Northwest recreation opportunities, Northwest residents vacation more in their own region than do residents of other regions. Further, more tourist dollars are spent in the

Pacific Northwest by nonresidents than are spent by tourists from the Pacific Northwest in other regions. This leads to an important conclusion. Tourism in the Pacific Northwest is properly classed as a basic or export industry. That is to say, the economic structure of tourism serves to generate a significant net credit in the region's balance of interregional payments. This is a very important point.

In terms of employment, tourism is the fourth largest and probably the fastest growing industry in the Northwest. (It ranks third in Idaho). The equivalent of 100,000 average workers are employed in jobs which stem directly and exclusively from tourist spending. Of these, 14,700 are employed in Idaho. Projections by the Bonneville Power Administration forecast an increase to 165,000 in 1985 and 276,000 in 2010. By 1985, it will be the second ranking industry (behind food) and by the turn of the century may be the No. 1 in the Northwest.

Idaho is keeping pace with this regional growth in the recreation business. The Commerce and Development Department reports that, despite a cool wet season, tourism was up an estimated 5 to 7 percent, bringing a record \$215 million into the state in 1968. Sun Valley reports the biggest summer ever and the Fish and Game Department reports an apparent increase in hunting and fishing by both residents and nonresidents, although final figures aren't available. All other indicators--requests for literature, out-of-state travelers, etc., were up markedly in 1968.

Why is the Northwest region so well off, so to speak, in the recreation business? It's diversity is an important factor. It's topography is renowned for high scenic qualities and suitability for recreation purposes. It has everything the outdoor recreationist wants--oceans and beaches, forests, mountains, valleys, rivers, lakes, canyons, waterfalls, deserts, and extensive wilderness. Another factor is the fact that the region is relatively uncrowded. Against the national average of 54 persons per square mile, the Northwest has 21 per square mile. Thus the region has a decided advantage over other regions, namely natural environment, low-density, resource-based outdoor activity (as opposed to high-density, close-in, user-oriented activity.) Further, as the Bonneville Power Administration points out "...the region's recreational resources are used less intensively than elsewhere, allowing for a wide range of dispositions or forms of development. Portions remain susceptible to preservation in their natural wildland character, a major attraction of the region. Other portions are susceptible to improvement in quality and accessibility with corresponding stimulation to demand, where comparable improvements elsewhere in the nation are either impossible or achievable only at very high costs... (we have) emphasized natural environment because it is here that the Pacific Northwest has a unique and demonstrable advantage over most of the nation." In short, Idaho and the Pacific Northwest have an ideal recreation resource base upon which to draw.

Another factor in the region's favor is that over half the land area is

owned and administered by the Federal Government. In Idaho the figure is 64 percent. In addition, State governments own 5 percent of the land in the region. This is extremely important to the expanding recreation industry because publically-owned land is generally available to the public for recreational use. Planning and careful management (which assign a high priority to recreation) should be able to expand the resource supply sufficiently to accommodate the forecasted demand, and at the same time provide a wide range of recreational opportunity, from high-density use, such as skiing and picnicking, to wilderness experience. But it will require planning. One way to achieve this diversity in supply is to ration out scarce and unique resources such as wilderness and wild rivers. This is the only way to maintain quality and uniqueness in such resources.

What are the advantages, both economic and cultural, of a recreation industry over alternative industries? I have pointed out that recreation in the Northwest is a basic or export industry--it brings in a net credit to the region. Another benefit is what economist Myron Katz calls the "Multiplier Effect." Money spent by nonresidents moves quickly and widely through the economy. This money creates primary jobs and income for businesses serving the tourists. This money, however, is quickly spent and re-spent on other goods and services; thus nonresident tourist expenditures have a "multiplier effect" on employment and income. They raise income directly, but in addition they set up a chain of further spending and re-spending. Further, studies show that most of these dollars are spent on goods and services which are produced in the Northwest, thus tending to further stimulate the region's economy.

Outdoor recreation disperses income and employment throughout the region, rather than concentrating it in already densely populated areas. Thus tourism does not create many of the problems generated by some other industries. Less money is required of society for public services, such as sewage systems, fire and police protection, etc. An interesting comparison may be made here. Tourism brought \$215 million into Idaho in 1968. The Idaho Mining Association reports the total value of mining production in Idaho in 1968 was \$118.1 million. The most important facts to consider, however, are that tourism income was relatively well dispersed over the entire state; mining income was largely restricted to one small area in north Idaho. Further, it is imperative that we consider the atmosphere--the quality of the environment--in the north Idaho mining districts to that of some of our more intensively used recreation areas such as Sun Valley, McCall, or Salmon. If 'tax base' is our only criteria for measurement, then certainly Smeltonville has it over Salmon or McCall as a desirable place to live and raise a family. I don't think so.

The really important consideration, at what former Secretary Udall terms this 'critical moment' is the environment. It is here that the strongest argument for a recreation industry, over some alternatives, exists. The amount of pollution to the atmosphere and water attributable to recreation is relatively minor. In this respect, the economic costs to society of the recreation and tourism industry are probably more fully borne by the industry itself, per dollar of income, than is the case with many other industries. And certainly the cultural costs to society are far less. Contrast the air and water at Smeltonville with that at Salmon or McCall.

Finally, a characteristic of the recreation industry that is important both economically and culturally is that it does not ordinarily deplete the resources upon which it depends when those resources--scenic and other outdoor recreation attractions--are properly managed.

owned and administered by the Federal Government. In Idaho the figure is 64 percent. In addition, State governments own 5 percent of the land in the region. This is extremely important to the expanding recreation industry because publically-owned land is generally available to the public for recreational use. Planning and careful management (which assign a high priority to recreation) should be able to expand the resource supply sufficiently to accommodate the forecasted demand, and at the same time provide a wide range of recreational opportunity, from high-density use, such as skiing and picnicking, to wilderness experience. But it will require planning. One way to achieve this diversity in supply is to ration out scarce and unique resources such as wilderness and wild rivers. This is the only way to maintain quality and uniqueness in such resources.

What are the advantages, both economic and cultural, of a recreation industry over alternative industries? I have pointed out that recreation in the Northwest is a basic or export industry--it brings in a net credit to the region. Another benefit is what economist Myron Katz calls the "Multiplier Effect." Money spent by nonresidents moves quickly and widely through the economy. This money creates primary jobs and income for businesses serving the tourists. This money, however, is quickly spent and re-spent on other goods and services; thus nonresident tourist expenditures have a "multiplier effect" on employment and income. They raise income directly, but in addition they set up a chain of further spending and re-spending. Further, studies show that most of these dollars are spent on goods and services which are produced in the Northwest, thus tending to further stimulate the region's economy.

Outdoor recreation disperses income and employment throughout the region, rather than concentrating it in already densely populated areas. Thus tourism does not create many of the problems generated by some other industries. Less money is required of society for public services, such as sewage systems, fire and police protection, etc. An interesting comparison may be made here. Tourism brought \$215 million into Idaho in 1968. The Idaho Mining Association reports the total value of mining production in Idaho in 1968 was \$118.1 million. The most important facts to consider, however, are that tourism income was relatively well dispersed over the entire state; mining income was largely restricted to one small area in north Idaho. Further, it is imperative that we consider the atmosphere--the quality of the environment--in the north Idaho mining districts to that of some of our more intensively used recreation areas such as Sun Valley, McCall, or Salmon. If 'tax base' is our only criteria for measurement, then certainly Smeltonville has it over Salmon or McCall as a desirable place to live and raise a family. I don't think so.

The really important consideration, at what former Secretary Udall terms this 'critical moment' is the environment. It is here that the strongest argument for a recreation industry, over some alternatives, exists. The amount of pollution to the atmosphere and water attributable to recreation is relatively minor. In this respect, the economic costs to society of the recreation and tourism industry are probably more fully borne by the industry itself, per dollar of income, than is the case with many other industries. And certainly the cultural costs to society are far less. Contrast the air and water at Smeltonville with that at Salmon or McCall.

Finally, a characteristic of the recreation industry that is important both economically and culturally is that it does not ordinarily deplete the resources upon which it depends when those resources--scenic and other outdoor recreation attractions--are properly managed.

This aspect--proper management of our total recreation resources--is where the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act fits into the picture. This Act is doubly important because it deals with what the Bonneville Power Administration terms a unique resource. And uniqueness is one factor which gives Idaho and the Pacific Northwest such a decided advantage over the rest of the nation. Idaho's wild rivers and their canyons are definitely unique. An indication of the interest in these rivers is the increasing number of visitors to the Salmon and the Middle Fork--1450 boat visitors on the Middle Fork alone in 1968. The number of float boats on the Middle Fork has risen rapidly--from 218 in 1965 to 413 in 1968. The Forest Service estimates 6000 visitors spent 11,500 visitor days on the Main Salmon from the road's end to Lantz's Bar. Further evidence of the appeal of Idaho's wild rivers is the fact that the National Geographic Society chose the Middle Fork and main Salmon for an hour-long television documentary. This will be shown in the fall and will reach millions of viewers. The possible effect of this upon the tourist industry may be forecast by a related incident--the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association's office was flooded with requests for information on Hell's Canyon excursions after one small item about Hell's Canyon appeared in the New York Times.

Idaho's free-flowing rivers are one of the state's major tourist attractions. And yet we have done very little on the state level to insure that this resource is not irreparably altered or lost. Recreation is not even considered a beneficial use of water in our laws--it must be given recognition. Wisconsin as early as 1905 passed legislation protecting its streams and for a number of years has had its own 'State Wild Rivers Bill.' Missouri has a similar law. Further, we need a system of evaluating and classifying the recreation potential of all of our major streams and their watersheds.

This classification should periodically be updated as situations arise and needs become evident. A highly objective system proposed by John and Frank Craighead in The Minnesota Naturalist, No. 2, 1962, appears to be an excellent method of beginning such a classification. Once such data have been assembled, objective decisions can be made regarding uses of these rivers. I hope that the Craigheads' system will be considered in the upcoming cooperative study of the main Salmon.

My whole discussion may appear more a pitch for recreation development and planning than a discussion of Wild Rivers legislation. What I've tried to do is point out that we in Idaho have an opportunity to grow economically and at the same time maintain a quality way of life. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is a step in this direction. Many of us live in Idaho because of the excellence and diversity of outdoor recreation opportunities and because intangible things that are important to us as individuals exist here. I believe the recreation industry offers a way to have 'the best of both.' I do not advocate the status quo as far as a statewide economic base is concerned, nor do I advocate 'turning the state over' to recreation. Certainly diversity in economic development is desirable. I do advocate giving first consideration to managing our resources for recreational purposes when it can be demonstrated that in the long run society will receive the greatest benefits. These benefits may be economic or cultural, or both.

Summing up, the burgeoning recreation industry makes it imperative for us in Idaho to:

1. Keep the options on our free-flowing rivers open. Rivers are one of our most unique resources--they also are the most fragile.
2. Classify the recreation potential of our rivers and water resources and periodically update this classification.
3. Retain diversity, both in the landscape and in development. We must provide both quality and quantity recreational experiences.
4. Continually strive toward quality in economic growth and way of life.

We have an unparalleled opportunity. But to accomplish it we must alter our thinking concerning 'development.' We must cast off provincialism and attitudes that were valid 30-40 years ago. Technology has changed all that. Our thinking on free-flowing rivers is an example. The West has long guarded its water for irrigation purposes. Hydroelectric power has also come on the scene. We must recognize there are alternatives often much better uses of our water resources. As Bill Hall, writing in the Lewiston Tribune, May 26, 1968, states "...Leaving a stream alone is using it. It is shocking (to the reclamationist) that the Middle Fork of the Clearwater and that stream's tributaries can run untouched through the mountains, and the people who live here still think they are deriving some benefit. (This river)...meets the demands of the north Idaho tourist industry and the recreation demands of those who live in the region..... Anadromous fish runs are caught up in the economy of the state and region--the commercial fishing in Oregon and Washington, the tourist industry, and the casual sports fishery as a part of the quality of life in this region that permits us to attract and hold able people. It permits us to bid for talent in industry, education and government against high paying communities and states."

"....(Reclamationists) view those who battle for free-flowing streams as a poetic minority. (To them) it's money running toward the ocean. (They) don't understand that the thousands of tourists who come to see open rivers pay cold, hard cash for the privilege. And more are coming every year....."

June 26, 1969

This report is a compilation of the panel discussions which were presented at the First Annual Winter Meeting of the Idaho Chapter of the Wildlife Society.

The topic, "Impact of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in Idaho" was chosen because of its timely nature.

I want to take this opportunity to again thank the panel members for helping make our first winter meeting a complete success with their excellent presentations which were well received.

Elmer R. Norberg, President
Idaho Chapter
Wildlife Society