

I find it unfortunate that the Forest Service goes about finalizing administrative management plans for non-wilderness use of areas which are under simultaneous consideration by the Congress for wilderness designation. I believe the Subcommittee should clarify this matter by directing the Forest Service to refrain from undertaking separate management planning which in any way prejudices consideration of wilderness proposals which have been specifically called for under provisions of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

I see no reason for excluding this area from wilderness status. The point might be made that the area may, as a scenic area, eventually become so heavily developed that it would not then be appropriate for wilderness. In view of its obvious location within the wilderness area (it is, after all, surrounded on three sides) the overdevelopment of this area would be totally out-of-place. This is obviously a point of focused use, but that does not mean that it cannot or should not be wilderness. Rather, it means that its wilderness values are especially great and in need of especially careful wilderness protection. Overdevelopment, with tables, grills, water systems, sanitation installations and boat storage facilities would not only ruin the wilderness character of this one lake—but would have a traumatic impact on a considerable surrounding area, seriously reducing its wilderness qualities as well!

Why, one may ask, is boat use to be continued on Marion Lake at all—even to the extent of rowboats requiring boat storage facilities as planned by the Forest Service? Are we so short of lake area in the Pacific Northwest that even one of the most superb high mountain lakes, set in a delightful wilderness basin, needs to be set up with elaborate boating facilities and provision for storage of boats? (Whose boats, one might also ask?) This is a wilderness lake—a rare one at that—and set in a delightful alpine setting (see photograph, p. 11 of Forest Service proposal document). It should be included in the wilderness of which it is a logical part and should be protected, by law, from overdevelopment.

It is simply exercising a poor sense of priority to suggest that a gem of the wilderness such as this lake should be excluded from fullest protection in order to be "a base of operation for many who just wish to hike a short distance into the wilderness."⁶ Wilderness users can let their automobiles, parked at the end of a road, serve as the base for their short hikes. What they are after is wilderness beyond the last development—not development in the last wilderness. A base of operations is a patently synthetic sort of functional place—it can be anywhere, but there is only one Marion Lake which we can still choose to leave in its own wild integrity.

Marion Lake, Lake Ann, and the area surrounding them are so logical a part of the wilderness that I am surprised to find the Forest Service seriously suggesting their exclusion. More surprising still are the empty reasons offered in justification of the proposal.

The Wilderness Act contained sufficient specific provision to allow the maintenance of sanitary facilities and minimal fire grills (for fire safety, not for the convenience of users—this is wilderness) at points of special use concentration. If the use becomes greater than can be handled by facilities which are permissible in wilderness, do we then dilute the "semi-solitude" of Marion Lake, or do we control the use? (With our growing population we cannot seriously expect anything but increased use. At what point will it become so great that the Forest Service is forced to bow to demands for more and more tables, more and more grills, more and more boats—and motors. Will it be ten years—or five—before the pressure for a road to the lakeshore becomes too great for local administrators to bear?) The only answer for an area with as great a value as wilderness as this is to give it the full legal security available. That, as the Forest Service ought to realize, is just what the Wilderness Act is all about.

In disputing the proposal to extend the wilderness into these west side areas and others, the Forest Service has noted that "Some of the lands of the White-water Creek valley have been logged in recent years and are penetrated by Forest Development Roads. These intrusions are inconsistent with wilderness uses as set forth in the Wilderness Act."⁷ While this is true, it does not preclude congressional recognition that these roads and timber sales were indeed "intrusions" and allowed by an administrative error. They were allowed on the basis of an incomplete judgement of the relative values of these lands as timber resources and as wilderness, (note that to the east of the proposed boundary the wilderness is but three miles wide, while to the west lie twenty miles of Forest Service land much of which is available for timber production). While the lands

⁶ A Proposal, Mt. Jefferson Wilderness, U.S. Forest Service, p. 20.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.