

lands in here which are still under public ownership. When these have been acquired, there will be nobody living on this road at all.

We have been informed, in addition to the testimony given earlier, that the county would no longer maintain the road even if no wilderness designation were given to the area by virtue of the fact there would be virtually no need for this road and we would certainly welcome the actions by the two townships to vacate the road as they have offered in testimony given previously.

Senator HANSEN. One further question: As you view the proposal now, might this road play a significant role in making available to an important number of people wide use of the area or do you think this can be accomplished without the road?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. I think it can be accomplished without the road.

Senator HANSEN. Do you have a specific recommendation that would reflect your view as to the abandonment?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. I would recommend under the circumstances that the road be abandoned, although when we made our original study we did not contemplate this as we were apprehensive that this might bring another problem into the whole picture. In our ultimate plan for the use of the refuge, this road, if vacated, would become a footpath or bridle path.

Senator HANSEN. I think you referred someplace in your statement to the necessity or the desirability of some sanitary facilities that could be made available to the public throughout this area; is that right?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes, sir.

Senator HANSEN. I recognize full well the need for some facilities in an area in such close proximity to so many millions of people. I suspect in the west there are some of us who would be somewhat dismayed or frightened if a similar concept were to characterize the administration of some of our wilderness areas.

I like to think of them as a place where a man comes to visit and he doesn't remain and leaves no evidence of his presence behind him.

Is this the proposal of your administration?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. It certainly applies to the smaller areas which will be subject to public use. I feel that it is necessary in trying to accommodate public use without destroying the essence of the area. It seems to us there has to be some regimentation of the public and in certain areas we will have to have sanitary facilities, but in many areas it will be possible to locate these on the periphery of the wilderness and that is what we would propose to do here.

I might say this subject became a matter for considerable discussion in the hearing before the House committee and I brought it up only because I felt it was needful early in the history of our presentation before the committees to recognize this kind of problem.

I would say that at Great Swamp we do not plan any intensive development, but I wouldn't want to commit my successor of 20 years from now to the possibility of not putting in sanitary facilities if it turned out this is what would have to be done to protect the area.

We are planning a visitor center in the recreational area and we could spot facilities around the area not included in the Great Swamp. We do not have this problem now.

Senator HANSEN. As I look at the map and try to get some concept of distances, I would make the observation that it appears as though