

of the FPC in the two recreation areas. It is clearly intended that none of the Seattle City Light's project be located within the proposed park.

The boundary is not drawn on a topographic map, and its location in regard to the 1,850 foot contour can only be estimated. However, it seems clear that if the area included in the application for the project license goes to the 1,850 foot contour, the boundary set by S. 1321 is necessarily above that elevation.

Your committee may want to clarify this matter further by noting in its report that the legislation does not affect the FPC's jurisdiction in regard to the Thunder Creek Project below the 1,850 contour.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. HARTZOG, *Director.*

McCARTY AND NOONE,
COUNSELLORS AT LAW,
Washington, D.C. July 30, 1968.

Re North Cascades proposal and Thunder Creek project, FPC No. 2657.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This relates to National Parks Director Hartzog's letter of July 26, 1968 commenting on Mr. John M. Nelson's letter of July 12 informing you of changes in the Thunder Creek project necessitated by studies being conducted by the Department of Lighting, City of Seattle, under the preliminary permit issued to Seattle by the Federal Power Commission. It appeared that the City's proposals would be covered despite the changes but Mr. Nelson wished to make certain in view of the importance of the studies and the expense involved.

Mr. Hartzog's letter makes it clear that while the map referred to in S. 1321 (which presumably will be the map incorporated by reference in H.R. 8970) is not a topographic map it was nevertheless intended that the boundaries include the Seattle proposals within the proposed Ross Lake National Recreation area, where FPC would continue to have jurisdiction, and not within the proposed park.

This clarification by Mr. Hartzog is very helpful as is his suggestion that you may wish to make reference to the situation in the Committee report.

With thanks for your consideration,

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. McCARTY.

STATEMENT BY THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, SUBMITTED BY
KENNETH B. POMEROY

I am Kenneth B. Pomeroy, Chief Forester of The American Forestry Association.

The fundamental issues posed by H.R. 8970 are (a) how best to preserve wilderness conditions, and (b) how best to provide for mass recreation in an area having exceptional values for both purposes.

Title I of H.R. 8970 calls for establishment of a two-unit North Cascades National Park. Heretofore, most of the Northern Unit, composed mainly of the Picket Range, has been managed as a national forest wilderness. If reclassified as a national park, parts of the area would be opened up for mass recreation by means of trails and tramways according to news releases issued by the Department of the Interior.

The American Forestry Association believes it would be a mistake to turn the vacationing public loose on a wilderness by opening it up as a park. Under present administrative procedures all of this rugged scenic area would be preserved in its natural condition under the Wilderness Act of 1964. We do not know what percentage would be retained as wilderness if the area is reclassified as a park. No portion of any national park has ever been formerly designated as wilderness up to this date.

The Southern Unit of the proposed national park, extending from Eldorado Peaks to the Stehekin Valley presently is managed for multiple purposes with recreation as the dominant use. Members of our Association make annual camping trips via horseback into this area. We recommend that the Eldorado Peaks-Stehekin Valley area continue to be managed as at present.