D. THE WILDERNESS RECORD

In accordance with section 3(d) (1) (B) of the Wilderness Act, a public hearing was held in Marquette, Michigan, on May 10, 1967. Mr. Daniel H. Janzen, former Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, was hearing officer. The Bureau was represented by Mr. Frank R. Martin, Assistant Regional Supervisor, Division of Wildlife Refuges, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Both proposals (Seney and Huron Islands) were presented at the hearing, but separately. A transcript was made for each proposal.

1. The public hearing

Seney.—A total of 36 individuals and several Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife personnel were present at the hearing. Eight persons spoke as individuals and eight organizations were represented at the hearing. One individual and one organization spoke in opposition while the remainder were in favor of the wilderness proposal. The opposing organization, "Forum of Resources of Upper Michigan", emphasized that the management of Seney National Wildlife Refuge is a professional responsibility and wildlife would benefit most under present management goals. Those appearing in favor of the wilderness proposal wished to insure protection for the habitat and some suggested an additional 6,000 acres of the national wildlife refuge be added to the proposal.

Huron Islands.—A total of 36 people and several Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife personnel were present at the hearing. Eight persons spoke as individuals while ten organizations were represented at the hearing. All were in favor of the wilderness proposal. Two organizations and one individual recommended a change in primary jurisdiction of the two largest islands within the wilderness proposal from the Coast Guard and Department of Army, Corps of Engineers, to the Department of the Interior.

2. Communications from citizens

Some persons wrote in regard to the Seney proposal, some concerning the Huron Islands proposal, and some about both proposals. The following synopsis covers the total correspondence received.

Opinions were expressed by 116 individuals and nine organizations. All were in favor of the proposals with the exception of three individuals. A variety of favorable reasons were expressed for the *Seney* unit, including the preservation of the area for study and public enjoyment, the protection of the area for enjoyment of future generations, and the preservation of the unique string bog. Some of the letters urged an additional 6,000-acre addition to the proposal. Those in favor of the *Huron Islands* unit wanted increased protection for the island habitat, though some had only the vaguest idea of the intent of the proposal. Those opposed to the proposals believed the attention given the islands by wilderness classification would eventually destroy the very things we are now trying to save, and that the true meaning of wilderness would be corrupted by inclusion of such small areas. There was a misconception that the proposals involved a change from wildlife management of the area to no management of wildlife.

3. Communications from organizations

All organizations, including the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, and Audubon Society, expressing an opinion were in favor of the wilderness proposals. Their main contention was that the areas would be protected from commercialization or other developments and the geological, botanical, zoological, and ecological features of the areas would be preserved in their natural state.

4. Elected officials.

No written expressions of opinion were received.

5. State agencies

The State of Michigan expressed a favorable opinion through the State Conservation Department.

6. Federal agencies

A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation representative presented a favorable statement at the public hearing.

A Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines mineral report was read into the record of the hearing. No minerals of significance occur.

A representative of the Coast Guard was present at the hearing, but made no statement. The views of the Coast Guard are contained in a letter in the appendix.