

such opportunities, suggests that there are minimum standards for wilderness areas based on the use they receive for recreational purposes. If the visitor is to find "a wilderness experience," the environment should offer him a high contrast from his usual surroundings, it should offer him a variety of activities and types of wild settings, and it should impress him with his dependence upon himself and his own skills are opposed to his usual dependence on the appliances of civilization. To accomplish this the area must be sufficiently remote—physically and psychologically—to separate the visitor from civilization and thus to provide him the "environment of solitude." A three or four mile wide wilderness area simply cannot attain that standard.

The Forest Service proposal document, in assessing this area, states:

"The proposed Mt. Jefferson Wilderness is one of the outstanding areas in this general region of superb mountain scenery. The broad expanse of natural forests and lakes topped by the towering bulk of Mt. Jefferson forms a setting to inspire any visitor."¹⁷

That kind of potential certainly remains—but the present proposal does not match this eloquent rhetoric. In this admittedly "outstanding area" can three miles really be termed a "broad expanse"? It seems confusion of terms.

The present proposal is clearly deficient, providing neither a self-sufficient wilderness unit nor a reasonable balance of resource allocation. It is essential that the Forest Service proposal be perfected by extending the west side boundary to include approximately 27,000 additional acres in the areas I have mentioned. I urge the Subcommittee to amend the present legislation to that effect.

The Forest Service proposal omits a 1,500 acre area at the southeast corner of the Mt. Jefferson area—the Square Lake-Long Lake region. According to the Forest Service proposal document road access will be developed here to provide a recreation facility in close proximity to the North Santiam Highway. In view of the regional setting, I do not believe this exclusion of suitable wilderness lands is necessary. As the map indicates, this area is quite close to the Metolius River, along which is located a considerable amount of recreational development, from simple campgrounds to fishing resorts. Jack Lake, located on the proposed wilderness boundary (but not labeled on the map), is accessible by road at the present time. From any point on the North Santiam Highway the wilderness will be close at hand by an easy walk.

The Forest Service argues that this area must be developed with sanitation facilities and to provide a base camp for day use of the Wilderness. Again, provision is made in the Wilderness Act for necessary sanitary facilities, and readily accessible "base camps" are presently available at Olallie Lake, Jack Lake—and as proposed by the Forest Service—at the roadhead below Pamilia Lake.

On the other hand, a glance at the map will show that these lakes lie close to Three Fingered Jack and that the proposed wilderness boundary has to make a deviating course to avoid including this area. It is a logical part of the wilderness. As such, these lakes can sustain only a certain amount of use before a deteriorating influence is made on the surrounding wilderness. Given the legal protection for which these lands are fully suited such overuse can be avoided. But a road and non-wilderness development will directly promote overuse.

Why, it needs to be asked, must the "base camp" be located at a most significant part of the wilderness? Why deliberately concentrate and focus use—artificially—on an area which has special wilderness values and which is easily destroyed by overuse? If this is "day-use" it can be based at a simple parking lot along the road—easily accessible in a few minutes driving time from one of the many nearby motor campgrounds. What is being sought by the user is not necessarily an "attractive" wilderness setting for his car—but a protected wilderness environment into which he can walk and within which he can find a wilderness experience precisely because he has left his automobile behind. It doesn't seem a wise priority to use the most fragile and wild lakeshores for parking lots when they have such outstanding potential for wilderness with only minimal development of sanitary facilities. One needs an elaborate base camp for a Himalayan expedition. In the Cascades, one can still walk away from his automobile and find wilderness.

The proposal before this subcommittee is a worthy one—the Mount Jefferson area is highly suitable for wilderness designation. In bringing this unit into the National Wilderness Preservation System I urge the Congress to improve and perfect the proposal by adding an additional 27,000 acres to give adequate

¹⁷ A Proposal, Mt. Jefferson Wilderness, U.S. Forest Service, p. 6.