

corporation and they can afford to wait to sell this one small property. I suggest that you tell them that a successful transfer to public ownership could have great public relations value for Weyerhaeuser.

A complication is that only 40 acres of the Weyerhaeuser property is within the Wild and Scenic River boundaries. Longview Fiber, the previous owner of this property, reached a handshake agreement with the Forest Service when the boundaries were being established, and the agreement was that if their property was kept out of the river corridor boundaries, they would manage all of their property for timber management. This "agreement" is why boundary alternative number 2 to include all of the 240 acres in the corridor was rejected by the Forest Service. That was a bad decision, because it lacked long term viability. Fortunately the Forest Service can do a boundary amendment based on the boundary alternative that was not used due to the handshake agreement. The reasoning for this boundary amendment would be to protect the values for which the river was designated, and to prevent the likely possibility that the buyer(s) would be forced by the economics of the sale to convert to residential development.

When the Forest Service was placed in charge of the administration of the White Salmon Wild and Scenic River, Congress gave you three tools to help get the job done: (1) a Congressional mandate to create a management plan, (2) acquisition authority to implement the plan, and (3) the power of condemnation to prevent land uses inconsistent with the plan. This river was designated in 1986. Of the 1,800 acres within the corridor only about 150 acres have been acquired. During this period plenty of inconsistent land uses have occurred within the corridor, and more are pending. For instance, the Forest Service failed to consummate a Land exchange with SDS that was considered central to implementing the management plan. As a consequence, most of the forests within the river corridor have been clear cut. While this was a tragedy, at least trees grow back. However, the development that was inconsistent with the plan and yet was allowed to occur is irreversible damage.

History has proven that it is not a viable plan to wait for sellers to walk into the NSA office and offer their land for sale. Whenever an inconsistent land use is proposed, or whenever evidence suggests that an inconsistent land use is coming down the pike, the Forest Service needs to intervene and attempt to head off that inconsistent use, either by talking the owners out of it, or by acquisition, including the possibility of condemnation. When a timberland owner, such as Weyerhaeuser, tries to sell their timberland along the river for highest and best use, that is creating a situation that can only lead to a residential land use that would be inconsistent with the management plan. If they insist that they have a right to market their timberland at highest and best use prices, the Forest Service needs to place your acquisition authority and condemnation powers on the negotiating table. This would be a powerful negotiating tool, and the failure to do this in the past explains the history of failed land deals and the inconsistent uses that have followed. If we have learned nothing else during the last 33 years, we have at least learned that the Forest Service cannot get the job done unless all of the tools that Congress gave you are placed on the negotiating table.