

D. THE WILDERNESS RECORD

In accordance with section 3(d)(1)(B) of the Wilderness Act, a public hearing was held at Chatham, Massachusetts, between 9:00 a.m. and 9:35 p.m. on January 11, 1967. Mr. Daniel H. Janzen, former Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, was hearing officer. Mr. Richard E. Griffith, Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Boston, Massachusetts, represented the Bureau.

Communications received before and after the hearing from citizens, organizations, elected officials, State agencies, and Federal agencies totaled 615 statements in the form of letters, notes, and cards.

1. The public hearing transcript

(The hearing transcript consists of 145 pages.)

During the daytime portion of the hearing, 9:00-11:45 a.m. and 1:30-5:00 p.m., about 100 people attended. These people generally supported the Monomoy Island wilderness proposal and consisted primarily of local elected officials and representatives from conservation organizations.

A total of 180 individuals registered, representing various agencies, organizations, or themselves. At this part of the hearing, statements were presented by representatives of 19 organizations, of which 11 favored the wilderness proposal and eight opposed it. Individuals gave 16 statements, of which eight favored and eight opposed the proposal. Local elected officials presented two statements, both favoring wilderness status. No congressional or State Representatives presented statements at the hearing. Four State of Massachusetts agencies presented statements, one favoring the proposal, one opposing, one recommending action be deferred (a favorable statement, however, was received later and included in the communications from state agencies), and one was noncommittal. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, presented a favorable statement. The Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, took no position on the proposal, requesting action on the proposal be deferred until completion of Corps of Engineers' harbor improvement plans for the Chatham area. A plan was presented to the local interests on November 30, 1967.

An evening session from 8:00-9:35 p.m. was called in deference to requests from surf fishing interests. This meeting was attended by about 120 people who presented 10 statements opposed to the wilderness proposal and two statements in favor of it. Opposition to the proposal stemmed from restrictions on use of mechanical vehicles on Monomoy Island under wilderness status.

Arguments favoring wilderness status for the island were generally in one or more of the following categories:

- a. Preservation for future generations of the unique barrier beach-type island wilderness, still largely undeveloped and unspoiled by man's activities.
- b. The need of man for the solitude of wilderness in a densely populated area.
- c. The need for permanent protection of a natural refuge for feeding, resting, and nesting waterfowl, and for birds requiring this fragile island-type habitat.
- d. The only wilderness potential within a reasonable 1-day drive from the Boston and Cape Code areas.
- e. Wilderness status would complement the Cape Cod National Seashore by providing a true wild area for those who seek an ideal human retreat and are willing to endure the rigors of a journey to the island.
- f. Wilderness status would protect the town of Chatham from becoming a beach buggy access route to Monomoy Island; and it would protect the island from the ruts, refuse, noise, and smell of mechanical vehicles.

Arguments opposing wilderness status for Monomoy Island were generally in one or more of the following categories:

- a. It would preclude use of beach buggies which are claimed to be necessary to provide surf fishing access to the entire island.
- b. It would preclude camping and fires, claimed to be necessary for practical and enjoyable use of the island for surf fishing.
- c. It would preclude forever the possibility of opening part of all of the island to public hunting. This is a mistaken impression, because such hunting may be permitted under the laws now applicable to this area.
- d. Claim that Massachusetts Audubon Society and other camp permittees on the island were receiving special privileges denied the general public with respect to vehicle and overnight use.