

RIO DELL, CALIF., February 19, 1968.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Land,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I am writing to endorse the classification of the Mt. Jefferson area as wilderness.

Concerning the boundaries of this wilderness area I urge that Marion Lake be included in the wilderness. It has all the attributes of Wilderness and its exclusion would be capricious and arbitrary.

I also recommend that as wide as possible a marginal area on the northwest perimeter of the area be included, notably in the watersheds of the Breitenbush River, Whitewater Creek and Minto Creek. Much of this zone, not included in the proposal of the Forest Service, is of wilderness quality. If it should remain outside the wilderness the permanent wildness character of the whole northern portion of the wilderness, including Mt. Jefferson itself, would be in jeopardy because of the narrowness of the proposed area. This consideration ought even to override the occasional less than full wilderness character of the zone to be added (resulting from unwise recent road construction and logging, against the urgent advice of concerned citizens groups).

Please include this statement in the record of the hearing.

Yours truly,

K. H. MUNCHHEIMER, M.D.

ELK CITY, IDAHO, February 4, 1968.

HON. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: Some of my views on the wilderness area: Wilderness Areas should be used or made available for use for as many people as possible. This can only be done by building good roads and trails into these areas.

It is being very discriminatory by making these areas available to only a few who can afford the expense of hiring a guide and a pack-string. This is wrong on the face of it in a free country.

Not only the expense but the necessity of riding horse-back will keep many from the pleasure of seeing the wilderness. Again, only a few will have that pleasure.

If firearms are strictly forbidden in these areas I see no reason why good roads and trails cannot be made for use by all who wish to "get out in the wilderness."

If firearms are not used the wild game soon learn not to fear the vacationers. Again, firearms should be strictly forbidden.

I have lived in this wilderness area since 1930. I have a salt lick about seventy-five yards from my cabin and have the pleasure of watching Elk, Deer and Moose at the salt; sometimes a bear. I love to see the wild life as much anyone else.

Also I have fixed campsites for others on my mining ground for others who can enjoy seeing the wild game. Sometime awake them in the early mornings so they will not miss seeing the wild game.

Nearly forgot to mention that "dogs" should be kept on a leash. In my opinion this is almost important as the prohibiting of firearms. A number of times here dogs have taken out after the game. Some being gone a few minutes while others were gone at least a half hour.

The use of snowsleds and trail vehicles should be permitted.

A sworn statement should be signed that the party or person has no firearms in their possession and if they do claim to have hand guns for *protection only* they must check the number of shells they have in their possession going in and coming out of the areas. They should be informed of course that they will have to give account for reason of used shells.

Permitting only a few and refusing hundreds of people from the pleasures of getting out in the wilderness areas is a crime.

This is my opinion, period.

Sincerely,

DANIEL E. MULCAHY.