

one resource evaluation—whether the standing timber is of a sufficient economic worth relative to present market conditions and costs of harvest. The designation “commercial timberland” is not based on any consideration of other resource values or social criteria, but is simply a technical determination of present values of one particular resource totally abstracted from these other considerations. On the basis of the kind of professional training and outlook on which this determination of “commercial timberland” is made, our maps are divided into areas classified according to timber value standards. It is essential to keep in mind that the values on which ultimate land-use decisions must be considered should include all potential resources and resource uses, not just timber evaluations.

This is not at all an indictment of timber management procedures. This technology for timber evaluation is highly developed and absolutely necessary for modern forest management. But decisions on land-use patterns cannot be made on the basis of timber evaluations or any other single resource dimension—they should involve all resource values.

It is convenient, of course, that commercial timberland can be readily evaluated in dollar and cents terms. We have no such means for putting that kind of monetary value on what might otherwise be called “commercial wilderness.” This surely does not mean, however, that such value does not exist. The use statistics which are available and the subjective testimony of wilderness users and others should be sufficient to indicate that wilderness has very real, if less tangible and less commercial, values.

And so, the decisions which must now be made concern the mixture of resource uses which will be permitted on the lands of this region. That decision, in each case, must be made with recognition that, just as these lands have value for “commercial timber,” they also have values of another (and certainly not lesser) sort as wilderness. The question in establishing boundaries between these non-compatible uses must be to give each sufficient area to maintain their own integrity and self-sufficiency—the one as commercial timberland and the other as wilderness. Only thus can we hope to maintain a sustained yield from which we can guarantee the perpetual harvest of each sort of value.

On the basis of these considerations and this regional perspective, I will proceed to present my views on the specific details of the Mount Jefferson Wilderness Area proposal. In doing so I would like to emphasize that, while we have a good start on an inventory of timber and mineral values in the Oregon Cascades, we do not have anything approaching a comparable inventory and evaluation of the values of these lands for recreation and wilderness purposes. To the degree that such information is lacking, we still face a seriously lop-sided balance in analytical information upon which to determine ultimate land-use policy. Legislation has been introduced to bridge this “information gap” by authorizing an inventory of park potential in the Oregon Cascades. I would urge this Subcommittee, in the interests of promoting balanced land-use analysis and decisions which must be made in the area, to expedite the consideration and passage of S. 2555.

The principal weakness of the proposed Mount Jefferson Wilderness Area in its present form is the narrow width—three miles—in the intermediate area of Mount Jefferson itself. For perspective, this is only slightly longer than the distance which separates the United States Capitol from the Lincoln Memorial down the Mall. Given the sloping terrain of the west side of the Cascades and given the needs of a well-integrated wilderness area, it is quite evident that a three mile width does not and indeed cannot possibly give adequate protection and self-sufficiency to a wilderness area.

Furthermore, this narrow neck of the wilderness is located in the vicinity of Jefferson Park, a superb wild parkland which is a major focal point of wilderness use (See photograph, page 21 of the Forest Service proposal document). The fact that “Jeff Park” receives heavy use makes it imperative that it be given adequate protection and that the wilderness area be widened in this region to allow for some dispersal of future users. For the ecological and psychological integrity of the wilderness at its logical center-point, it is essential that this narrow area be considerably widened by the addition of more suitable land. Only in this way will these values be given ample protection. Such action will also give wilderness protection to additional lower-elevation forest types and to important existing and potential approach routes entering the area.

What is required is the expansion of the present proposed boundary to the west in the valley of the North Fork of the Breitenbush River, the Firecamp Lakes Basin, the valley of the South Fork of the Breitenbush River, the White-