

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL J. EVANS, GOVERNOR OF WASHINGTON

Congressman Taylor and members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, let me express to you my appreciation for the opportunity to appear before your subcommittee on the question of future best use of the great North Cascades region.

You have before you a document entitled "North Cascades National Recreation Area Report and Recommendations." It was my pleasure to present this report before the Senate Interior Committee on April 24, 1967. I would like to reaffirm that these recommendations still reflect the official position of the State of Washington.

I would also like to take this opportunity to emphasize two important characteristics of the report. First, that it does have major support in the state, primarily because of the background of the committee which worked with me in putting the recommendations together. Second, that the recommendations present a new and different concept of preservation and use. It is the only proposal to my knowledge which contains a comprehensive land use policy preserving this superb region intact and yet containing enough flexibility so that the outdoor recreational interests of all citizens are taken into account.

By way of background you will recall that in the so-called "Craft's Report" the Governor of the State of Washington was requested to present an official position on the part of the State of Washington. We recognized at the outset that not only should conservation interests, but also the multiple use interests have an important part to play in any forthcoming state position. The subject is not only of great concern to these particular people, but also to business and industry people and to officials of state government.

The result was that I appointed a study committee which is broadly representative of the state. In addition, there was also a vast store of expertise and knowledge in conservation and resource matters in this committee membership.

I think perhaps the most significant factor was that each member realized the state had the opportunity and the challenge presented to it to come forth with a unified position in this matter, which had never been achieved before. It was recognized that the subject was far too important to the State of Washington to simply allow the discussions to develop into a park versus no park exchange, but that in this vast area of approximately one million, eight hundred thousand acres, a new usage combination could be found. The committee met a number of times at Olympia and in the interim spent long hours in subcommittee meetings and also in discussions with people in the areas from which they came.

At the completion of its work the recommendations which you have before you were presented and it is significant to note that out of the entire committee there was but one dissenting vote. Since that time, considerable effort has been made to assure that the greatest possible number of our citizens are made aware of these recommendations, and they have been discussed at innumerable public meetings, both large and small throughout the state.

With reference to the second point, that of the new land use concept, let me speak of one item which may be causing some confusion. You will note in the report the committee has termed the entire area of one million eight hundred thousand acres as a national recreation area. This term was selected by the committee not to equate it with a National Recreation Area as defined by federal standards; rather to describe an entire area which should be set aside primarily for preservation and recreational use. That within the outside confines of the area, its inner portions could be further zoned into high intensity recreation use areas, wilderness areas, and perhaps a national park. There was only one point in which there was any significant difference of opinion in the interior zoning, and this did not affect the wilderness or high intensity recreational use areas, but revolved primarily around the extent of the wilderness national park.

I still firmly believe that the proposal of the State of Washington represents a reasonable compromise. Its recommendations contain the most realistic, the most practical and certainly the most balanced recreation usage of this area within the primary objective of all of us, which is to provide natural preservation and outdoor recreation in this unparalleled region.

In closing, let me reiterate three recommendations which I made to the Senate Interior Committee on April 24, 1967:

"1. That the Congress of the United States by a specific act create, designate and define the boundaries of a new North Cascades National Recreation Area,