

e. Demand for greater public use of the island—this was a covering statement intended to advocate beach buggy use, overnight camping, hunting, and the building of bonfires by the general public.

Interests identified with surf fishing were the chief source of opposition to the wilderness proposal. Surf fishing is a potential recreational use if Monomoy Island should become accessible by land. In this event, it would be possible to traverse the island by beach buggy or other vehicle designed for travel over beaches and dunes. The owners of this type of vehicle opposed the wilderness designation, though not excluding hunting and fishing, would preclude their particularly desired transportation method for recreational use of the island.

2. Communications from citizens

Communications from citizens in the form of letters, notes, and cards totaled 550 with 492 in favor and 58 against the wilderness proposal. These probably represent a cross-section of local public opinion on the wilderness proposal. Opposition to the proposal was for the same reasons listed in "1" above.

3. Communications from organizations

Communications from organizations totaled 60 with 31 in favor, two noncommittal, and 27 opposed to the wilderness proposal. Opposition was for the reasons listed in "1" above.

4. Elected officials

Elected officials submitted four statements, all in favor of the wilderness proposal. A spokesman for the Governor of Massachusetts stated that the present lack of development of Monomoy Island is largely due to almost all of it being in Federal ownership and its inaccessibility to vehicles. The Governor favors wilderness status, with provision that (a) Corps of Engineers' plans be taken into consideration by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in submitting wilderness recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior, (b) and consideration be given for allowance of over-the-sand vehicles on a limited permit basis for all conservationists and sportsmen in the form of a beach taxi service. The Selectmen's Association, Board of Selectmen of Chatham, and the Cape Cod Planning and Economic Development Commission favored wilderness status for the various reasons enumerated in "1" above.

United States Senator, Edward M. Brooke, submitted a letter to the Department of the Interior for the hearing record in which he supported the wilderness proposal.

5. State Agencies

The Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources, designated by Governor John A. Volpe to represent him in this matter, supported the wilderness proposal, with the suggestion that submission of the proposal to Congress follow the release of the Corps of Engineers' plan for navigational improvements in the Chatham area.

6. Federal Agencies

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior provided a statement favoring wilderness classification. That Bureau has reviewed the acreage of publicly owned outdoor recreation land and water in the New England States and has found no potential wilderness areas within 200 miles of Monomoy Island. The island will provide needed wilderness opportunity close to the population centers of the Northeast.

No change has been made in the boundaries of the Monomoy Wilderness proposal since the public hearings of January 11, 1967. All of the above comments are therefore applicable to the proposal.

[S. 3502, 90th Cong., second sess.]

A BILL To designate certain lands in the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges in Michigan, the Gravel Island and Green Bay National Wildlife Refuges in Wisconsin, and the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine, as wilderness

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 3(c) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 892; 16 U.S.C. 1132 (c)), certain lands in (1) the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges, Michigan, as depicted on maps entitled "Seney Wilderness—Proposed,"