

property. When SDS started clearcutting they should have been confronted, they should have been asked to stop or do the land exchange, and the power of condemnation should have been on the negotiating table. SDS would have negotiated, a compromise would have been reached, and the exchange would have happened. Whether the Forest Service understood this or not, the fact remains that they left eminent domain off the negotiating table. They have continued with this failed policy all of these years. And the Forest Service has never gone back to SDS and attempted to renegotiate the land exchange, the exchange that they considered "central" to implementing their management plan. **THE FOREST SERVICE NEEDS TO MAKE A SERIOUS ATTEMPT AT CONSUMMATING THE SDS LAND EXCHANGE.**

Unfortunately, Congress did not establish the boundaries of the White Salmon Wild and Scenic River, but left that decision to the Forest Service. The Forest Service proposed boundaries that were far short of what the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act allows. That proposal was appealed to the National Scenic Area Office and the "pinched" boundaries were abandoned. Still, the Forest Service had showed their preference for a minimalist boundary. The public record showed that the public overwhelmingly favored Alternative 2 of the Forest Service boundary proposals, as did the Fish and Wildlife agencies and the Yakama Nation. Alternative 2 provided for the largest boundaries to protect the forests around the river. But the Forest Service ignored public sentiment, science and the Yakama Tribe by deciding on a compromise boundary which satisfied the timber industry and developers. Instead they trimmed 800 acres from the lower river corridor that would have been provided outright under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Some of this land which was excluded from the management boundaries is now pending major residential development, and threatens the environmental integrity of the lands within the boundaries.

Fortunately, the Klickitat Wild and Scenic River boundaries were determined by Congress. But the Forest Service was not pleased that Congress had set those boundaries to include and protect overlooking bluffs. The Forest Service arbitrarily tried to abdicate responsibility for the management of this river when they asked Washington State to manage this Wild and Scenic River with the State Shoreline Management Act. This would have reduced Congressional boundaries to 200 feet on both shores. Washington State declined the offer. We appealed this attempt to collapse Congressional boundaries to Forest Service Region 6 Headquarters, and prevailed.

These boundary issues helped clarify that the Forest Service had no interest in managing these Wild and Scenic Rivers to enhance their greatest potential, instead they wanted to trim these Wild and Scenic Rivers just as much as they could, and protect the interests of the timber industry and the developers.

Excepting for a few small acreage acquisitions to provide access to the river for rafters and for emergency river access, the Forest Service has never been proactive about acquisition. As the years passed the Forest Service did not monitor land sales and was