

Yellowstone Lake Sluts
Library

623.88

2158

h

Vol. 3

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

HEARINGS ON PROPOSED MOTORBOAT RESTRICTIONS

ON YELLOWSTONE LAKE

August 23, 24 & 26, 1960

Vol. 3 Pages 351 - 541 Idaho Falls, Idaho August 26, 1960

YELLOWSTONE
NATIONAL PARK
LIBRARY

1606

PROCEEDINGS

6-23-88

7-5-8

h

Vol. 3

Civic Auditorium**Idaho Falls, Idaho**

August 26, 1960**10 o'clock a.m.**

Before:

**Conrad L. Wirth,
Director, National Park Service
Hearing Officer.**

In Attendance:

**Thomas Flynn,
Staff Assistant to the Assistant
Secretary for Public Land Management.**

344.04760267 U58
YELLOWSTONE
NATIONAL PARK
LIBRARY

1606



I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
BARBEE, LESLIE K.	523
BARNARD, HAROLD D., M.D.	518
BENSON, AMMON	368
BRITTON, MERLE	486
BURTON, AL	415
CLARK, MERLAND	531
CUSHMAN, R. A.	527
DYER, BILL	440
FLUHARTY, REX G.	512
GARRISON, LON	358
HAGEN, JACK	499
HANDLY, O. V.	367
HANSEN, KEITH	407
HOWELL, JAY C.	401
KILGORE, BRUCE	460
LOFGREN, EDWIN G.	431
LONG, JOHN	455
MILLER, HUCK	419
PACKARD, JOHN	377
PATTERSON, C. A.	471
PEARSON, L. C.	397
PULLING, ALBERT "PIERRE"	505
REES, DR. MILTON T.	477
SMITH, RICHARD R.	436
SOLBERG, A. W.	384
STUCKI, J. W.	389
TRILLHAASE, MARTIN	502

* * *

Documents Introduced and Received

	<u>Page</u>
Binford, L. C.	469
Letters in Support of Proposed Regulations	538
Letters opposing Proposed Regulations	540
Idaho Residents Supporting Proposed Regulations	536
Petition Favoring Proposed Regulations	512, 514
River Rogue Boat Club	486

P R O C E E D I N G S

HEARING OFFICER: I believe we will get started. It is a little late. We got a big package of mail, and we were trying to open it, but I think we will do that between lunch and this afternoon.

First I want to say my name is Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, and I appreciate very much the opportunity being out here and meeting you people and getting your reactions to the proposed zoning regulations for Yellowstone and Yellowstone Lake. The hearings are being held at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, and the Secretary is desirous, for a passage on the proposal which has been made by the National Park Service, to get a frank, honest public opinion and any suggestions or recommendations you might have regarding the proposed regulations.

The proposed regulations have been printed in the Federal Register. They have already been made part of the file in the first hearing in Cody, together with the Secretary's press release. I am sure you are all familiar with it.

The point of conflict of opinion seems to be in the closing of two arms of Yellowstone Lake.

I would like at this time to introduce Mr. Tom Flynn, who is here with me, and is from the Secretary's

office as an observer. Mr. Tom Flynn, would you please stand and be recognized?

(Mr. Flynn stands.)

HEARING OFFICER: As I stated, the purpose of the hearing is to assemble information for the Secretary so that he may review the opinions and suggestions of the public before he approves or disapproves the proposal made by the National Park Service. We have had hearings in Cody and we have had hearings at Lake in Yellowstone, and this is the third hearing and the last.

We have adopted a rule which has worked very well in Cody and Lake and has been accepted by both the proponents of the proposed zoning and the opponents. What we are doing, we are getting the name of all those who wish to be heard and giving them a full opportunity to say what they wish. There will be no cross-examination of a witness. The facts that he wishes presented will be recorded. If he has supporting material, he may present that and it will be put in the file, which will be part of the record, and it will be called to the Secretary's attention, along with the record, at the proper time.

The proper time, I might define, is this: That we are proposing to keep the record and the files open until September 30th for anybody who wishes to write in or to send his remarks in writing, and after September

30th the entire record and file will be assembled and will be placed on the Secretary's desk for the Secretary to make his final decision.

I can assure you that this is a sincere public hearing. I say that because one witness yesterday questioned whether the Secretary was sincere in calling these hearings, but I can assure you that he is.

We of the Park Service naturally feel that we are right in proposing these zoning regulations to him. The fact I am holding hearings will have no effect on the Secretary's decision, because I will not, nor will any Park Service person, take part in this hearing other than to help conduct it. And every word that is said and all the material, together with any report Mr. Flynn might want to give to the Secretary, will be presented to him and he will make the decision.

I want to re-emphasize that the record will be kept open and the file will be kept open until September 30th.

We have employed an official reporter from a U. S. Court, the reporter from the District of Wyoming, Mr. Thomas G. Stalcup. I have his card in front of me, and anybody who wishes a copy of the hearings should get in touch with him direct. We are, naturally, getting our copies, and if anybody wishes a copy to review the record,

they may do so by getting in touch with him direct. He will be around here during the hearings this noon, and, as I say, he is from Cheyenne, Wyoming, and is the U. S. District Court Reporter.

Now, I have a problem today which I don't anticipate will be too much of a problem. I think we will be through in time. I am to get a 5:20 plane this afternoon, so I would like to close the hearings by 4:30. I might say, at the hearings at Cody we had no time limit on anybody and they were finished by 3:15, with an hour and a half lunch, and at Lake we were finished by 3:45, with an hour and a half for lunch. So I don't anticipate any problem, unless at this meeting we have more witnesses than we anticipate. I think there were about sixteen at Cody and I think there were about twenty-eight at Lake.

I want to give everybody a chance to be heard. We do ask you, naturally, to keep it as concise as possible, and factual, and so that the record could be better understood and your points put across stronger. We have not drawn a bar on somebody who appeared in Cody, appearing here or at Lake. There were some, about five or six, who appeared at Cody and also appeared at Lake, and this is another hearing here so they have a right to appear here. We do ask that they not repeat their information that they have already given but to give new information.

✓ This will save on the record and, of course, their statements are already in the record to go to the Secretary. Also, those who wish to be heard, who were heard before and supplied basic material or supporting data for the file, they need not do it, for, naturally, it is in.

I might say that for those who were not at the previous hearings, that the complete record of the Senate Subcommittee Hearings held in February in Cody, has already been incorporated as part of the overall record.

I have received a considerable number of letters here addressed to the Hearing Chairman. I will not read them into the record, but I will at the proper time towards the close, when we get them all assembled -- which we will do this noon -- indicate who has written and whether they are for or against and put the letters themselves in the file rather than in the record. All letters which have been received by the Secretary already, both for and against, and those which might be received between now and September 30, will be noted in the record and will be part of the supporting file that will go forward with the record.

Now, I believe that pretty well covers our general line of procedure and I do urge that each and every one of you who wishes to be heard, to let us know your name, who you represent, whether it be yourself or an organization, so I can announce you.

Now, we had some slips made up, so all you had to do was fill them out at the other two hearings, but I have just received a report that somehow in the transportation over here the slips have been lost, but Mr. Hadley is at the door there and he has paper, pencil, and he is writing down those who wish to be heard and who they represent and how much time they think they need. That will help us greatly in our announcing and arranging the program.

I am going to do something a little different than we did the other time, because this is a long walk up here. I am going to put somebody in the batter's box at the time I announce the first speaker, and he can come up here and sit, and the next time I call somebody, I will call for somebody in the batter's box. That, I think, will save us some time.

At Lake we adjourned at 12:30 and convened again at 2:00. I think that is what we might do today, depending on how the hearing goes. If it looks as if we are going to be crowded, we will perhaps take a shorter lunch period.

Now, to open up the meeting, I think it is only fair that the superintendent, Lon Garrison, of Yellowstone, outline for all those present the purpose of the proposal made to the Secretary by the Park Service and explain it here on the map so it will be as clear as

possible as to what the problem is. Mr. Garrison will explain it in as few words as possible and then we will proceed with the hearings.

Thank you very much. Lon Garrison.

LON A. GARRISON; SUPERINTENDENT, YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yellowstone National Park was established by the Congress of the United States in 1872 to preserve its natural wonders as a public benefit for all the years to come. Each succeeding generation has been faced with the responsibility of faithfully protecting this nationally-important resource to provide a full measure of enjoyment without diminishing its fundamental qualities.

We are here today to consider activities having to do with the waters of the Yellowstone and the principle that its lakes and streams must be conserved if its purpose is to be fulfilled. Specifically we are here to consider the proposition that there are some waters in Yellowstone that will not support the present trend in motorboating and at the same time perpetuate an atmosphere of harmony with natural conditions.

We must also recognize that while this hearing has tremendous local interest and support of varying viewpoints, the national interest and the broad aspects of the eternal preservation, presentation and use of Yellowstone

National Park for all future generations must inevitably guide the final decision. To do otherwise is to destroy some of the elements which make the Yellowstone a continuing invitation to all vacation-bound Americans; and to thus waste for a brief local pleasure waters which are a national heritage. This can short-change and ultimately severely damage or destroy segments of the recreation industry in our neighboring states which are dependent upon this vacation travel for a livelihood.

The proposal to zone the southern arms of Yellowstone Lake for hand-propelled boats seems reasonable in that over 70,000 of its 90,000 acres of water surface would remain available for motorboating. Also, physical improvements are in progress along the lakeside, accessible by road, that will provide the features needed for safely convenient boating operations. The proposal takes into consideration the requirements of quiet security for the wildlife occupying the secluded reaches of these more remote corners of the lake that offer at the same time a retreat for those who on their own power wish to get away from the usual rush and bustle of every-day life. For these same reasons it is also proposed to preserve the natural character of Shoshone Lake, yet continue to permit motorboating on Lewis Lake where a physical improvement program is underway that will provide better motorboating

and camping facilities. A new campground will have 100 campsites ready next year and another 100 soon thereafter, comfort stations, campfire circle or amphitheater, ranger station, boat dock, launching ramp, et cetera.

Grant Village on Yellowstone Lake (indicating map) will provide 550 tent and trailer campsites, overnight accommodations and meals, space for parking 260 vehicles and 180 boat trailers. Bridge Bay (Hearing Officer indicating map) will provide 200 campsites. Proposed marinas at Grant Village and Bridge Bay are expected to accommodate up to 600 boats. Additionally there will be facilities for motorboat campgrounds at Flover Point (Hearing Officer indicating map), Wolf Point, Elk Point, and Eagle Bay that will require garbage hauling by boat, launching ramps, toilets, and some docks.

Wilderness camping locations with a bare minimum of facilities will be designated along the zoned area shorelines. These bare minimum facilities will be strictly limited to a safe beach for landing, a fire circle of some kind, and one garbage pit and, possibly, pit toilet for each of the five proposed campgrounds. The only reason for designating such camps is that we believe wilderness without appropriate human use and enjoyment is meaningless. To achieve this goal of motorless water wilderness the National Park Service proposes that all

housekeeping-type of operations and patrol within the motorless area will be by hand-propelled craft to the greatest extent possible. Motorboats will be used for administrative work and for emergency only such as fire and preservation of human life.

✓
The notice of proposed rule making as published in the Federal Register of May 24, 1960, sets forth amendments to the Code of Federal Regulations necessary to effect the zoning proposal. A typographical error occurring in the boundary description in Flat Mountain Arm will be corrected. The last two digits should be 40" rather than 70". Reference has been made to the published report of hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, held in Cody, Wyoming, on February 3, 1960. This data is part of the record and needs no repetition.
✓

In this connection I point out, however, that the full report contains contentions which are at variance with the facts as we know them. For instance, the matter of shoreline erosion has been grossly exaggerated. The element of safety of canoes in the upper arms has been tested, and results indicate that canoeing there offers a superlative experience to a wide range of age groups with modest costs and reasonable safety as long as proper respect is given to the recognized natural hazards of

wind and storm. The claim that restrictions on motorboating are contrary to basic national park legislative intent represents a misunderstanding of purpose which is appalling. There have been many lay opinions expressed on the relationship between motorboats and wildlife such as the birds on Molly Island, which are at great variance with known professional biological facts and observations.

For the file we will submit a letter from the Yellowstone Park Company indicating their willingness to establish tow service from Lake or West Thumb docks to Plover Point, Flat Mountain Arm, or Promontory Point as desired. We expect to begin this service in the summer of 1961. The rate to be charged will be as reasonable as is at all practical under the circumstances and will be set so as to encourage hand-propelled craft to make use of the resources of the upper lake in a fitting manner. It is proposed to have rental rowboats available at the Plover Point campground. Consideration was given to provisions for rental canoes but this presented such great problems of unexperienced persons in unfamiliar craft that the matter was dropped.

The Yellowstone Lake ecological and use studies continue and preliminary findings are not presently at variance with conclusions reached last year. The number of boat permits issued in 1960 total 4,229 including

August 21. This is 555 boats less than had been registered on the same date in 1959, a decrease of relatively the same amount as the travel decrease for the 1960 season.

The proposed rule making published in the Federal Register of May 24, 1960, makes certain changes in existing regulations. The three major points of interest are as follows:

(1) Section 12 prohibits the use of water-borne craft of any type on Sylvan Lake, Eleanor Lake, Twin Lakes and Beach Spring Lagoon. This opens the waters of Goose and Feather Lakes in the Old Faithful area and Squaw Lake near Fishing Bridge for hand-propelled boats and canoes.

(2) The channel between Lewis Lake and Shoshone Lake, and Shoshone Lake itself are to be restricted to hand-propelled water craft. The reasons are the same as apply to the proposed zoning of the arms of Yellowstone Lake.

(3) The operation of any machinery-propelled water-borne craft on the Southeast, South and Flat Mountain Arms of Yellowstone Lake is prohibited and a one-fourth mile protection zone is established around the Molly Islands.

This is the most controversial of all points of the proposed rule making, and, of course, is based upon the advice of competent biologists who point with some alarm to disturbance of water and shore birds particularly in the Molly Islands rookeries and the effect of motorboats

upon deer, elk, and moose. The principle of wilderness preservation and the long-standing legal responsibility for national parks to maintain certain unique areas undisturbed for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations, require that corrective action be taken immediately.

This action must be effected in order to avoid continuation of the disturbances of these wildland characteristics by motorboats. Rather it is our contention that the satisfactory wilderness experience can be obtained through the use of hand-propelled craft which, by their very silence of operation, are appropriate in this particular natural setting.

To review the map, which calls attention to all phases of the proposed public use plan for Yellowstone Lake, we have already mentioned the zoning lines proposed to be established in the arms of the upper lake. On Flat Mountain Arm the zoning has been in effect for two years with good success and several troops of Explorer Scouts have camped here with resultant character-building and inspirational experiences. On South Arm and the Southeast Arm the proposed zoning lines have been carefully established with the needs of boaters in mind so as to provide points of shelter from the recognized frequent and severe windstorms that sweep across Yellowstone Lake between Frank Island and Promontory Point.

Along the roads we might begin with Grant Bay near West Thumb, where a village is proposed to take the place of the present West Thumb development which is encroaching upon important thermal features. This new village will be a complete unit of which a marina will be a portion. Construction of a launching ramp at Grant Village in the new campground (Hearing Officer indicating map) is well underway at the present time, although we do not anticipate that the facilities will be ready for public use before the summer of 1962.

At Bridge Bay (Hearing Officer indicating map) a full marina development is scheduled to become the National Park Service headquarters for control of boating on all of Yellowstone Lake. Construction of the new road, the new high bridge, the bulkhead and marina roads, and dredging of the lagoon, are well underway. Because of uncertainties of financing utilities, road paving and dock construction, we can only say that this marina will be ready for public use in two or three years.

To meet our responsibility for visitor protection and safety and for enforcement of regulations on boating and fishing, a comprehensive operational plan for lake management and patrol has been developed to accompany the construction which is underway. Boat patrols have operated from both Lake and West Thumb docks this past summer and

a new patrol station has been established on Frank Island. With the ecological studies continuing, this makes a total of seven uniformed men who have been assigned to lake patrol and research this season. Probably additional manpower will be required as our zoning plans come into full effect.

We are conscious of this and feel certain that we can provide the needed manpower to effect adequate protection to the boaters themselves and to the resources of fish and wildlife around the lake shores. Supplementing the patrol program will be ecological studies and observations of visitor use. Additional facts in these two fields are needed for us to meet the new situations we will face in zoning and in caring for the burgeoning boating use.

Mr. Chairman, that about concludes my statement. I would like to read very briefly from a letter I have from Edson Fichter, Professor of Zoology and Curator of Mammalogy of Idaho State College Museum, and Field Consultant to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Dr. Fichter says:

"We need the humility to know ourselves not as the center of the universe but as responsible members of a continuing community of life. We need to recognize our littleness, to sense our indebtedness to the land, to accept the responsibility of stewardship. Perhaps this is the

distinctive ministration of wilderness to modern man. Perhaps in the wilderness we will discover the key to survival itself."

I am now concluded, Mr. Chairman. I will be available all day to offer additional information or clarify any points as you may request. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Lon.

I wonder whether the press would like to use this table up here on the platform. We will be very glad to have you do so, if you wish. It is available to you, and that is the main purpose for it.

I haven't tried to arrange these. I have several who ask to be heard after lunch, some late in the program, and I have put them in the back, and then we will just take them as they come. And these cards do not indicate whether "for" or "against" that I have here today, so I haven't even the opportunity to stack them if I wanted to.

I would like first to call on Mr. O. V. Handly, Route 3, Idaho Falls, speaking on behalf of himself, and Mr. Ammon Benson of Idaho Falls, speaking on behalf of young boaters, will be the batter in the hole, and he can come up here and we will have a chair for him.

O. V. HANDLY, ROUTE 3, IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

YELLOWSTONE
RESEARCH
LIBRARY
1606

I will just take a moment to enter my own personal feelings on this matter. I have spent about ten years

or more boating on Yellowstone Lake. In the last several years we have boated into the South and Southeast arms of Yellowstone and made camping trips in there and enjoyed it.

We have observed several storms. About three weeks ago one of them completely swamped a sixteen and one-half foot boat which was beached on the South Arm of Yellowstone. From reading the reports in the paper of the damage, I was amazed to think of considering a boat's damaging the shore with relation to this high wind that we had that particular day, when it took the rest of the afternoon to salvage the boat. And this was a large boat with twin boat motors on it.

We have enjoyed fishing in there. I have never noticed a large amount of boats, myself. We camped in there twice last summer, alone in the campground. So I thank you for the opportunity to protest the closure of these arms.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Handly.

The next witness will be Mr. Benson, who is in the batter's hole now, and Mr. John Packard of Salt Lake City will take his place in that position.

AMMON BENSON, 295 S. EASTERN AVE., IDAHO FALLS,
IDAHO: Thank you, Mr. Wirth.

I am Ammon Benson of Idaho Falls. I am a school

teacher and associate directly with large groups of young people in this area. I am also a member of the local boat club, Snake River Boat Club, and have been very active in this field of recreation. For many years I have been an ardent boater, lover of the great outdoors and a vigorous conservationist.

I know the Yellowstone Lake as few Rangers know it, having gained knowledge of this great area over a period of some thirty years. I have spent full summers in the Park and I feel that the testimony that I am about to give and ask, the favors that I am asking, are, we might say, very valuable.

It is with astonishment that we read of the efforts of a few to close this area to our young people of tomorrow and it is with sadness that we have to go to such costly efforts to protect our heritage. It is true, some will argue, that this is exactly what they are proposing to do.

But many of those supporting this proposal are people who have never seen the area, including some that have -- well, they have never been into the area up until the time that these hearings were first heard. It seems that the words that many of these people are using have been previously read by certain ones, and that they have been coached in their efforts to get this proposal through.

I was at one hearing where I asked the person who was conducting the hearing, I asked him, "Have you ever been into this area?", and he admitted he had not, and yet he was out proposing the closing without having first made an investigation. So I feel that those that are protesting this may be sincere in their beliefs, but I do not see how they can very fairly protest the protest the proposal or support it honestly if they have never been into the area.

I have a roll of film in my pocket which was exposed in this area of the lake on August 8, 1960. I made some broad, sweeping views of the lake areas which are under this proposal. This film is available for the hearings, if desired. It will show but one boat owner anchored at the Trail Creek docks. There was one boat which was on the opposite side of the lake which came across in the morning. That left a total of two besides my own boat. This does not speak of congestion that is indicated, for a large portion of the summer in this area.

I made another trip into the Park especially for the purpose of entertaining some young men on August the 22nd and the 23rd. We were told of the snow and unfavorable conditions existing on the previous week. We encountered much of this same weather at this time, including hurricane winds and snow for two nights and two days.

It was still blowing when we left. In fact, it was blowing so vigorously that we were required to leave our boat in the Park. It is up there at this time. Mind you, this is in August.

I repeat again that the weather in Yellowstone is so unpredictable that no month of the year is canoe weather for anyone who is in any way limited, physically limited, or as to the time element in which he has to return to his work.

The program proposed is a rich-man program. It is not a people's program. It would require, in my estimate -- I have studied the prices that are charged in the Park for guides today and I have estimated it would cost \$198 per person under today's prices for an inexperienced, handicapped person, a young or an old person, to traverse this area in propelled -- hand-propelled craft. It would necessitate a guide, equipment for boating and camping. It could necessitate also longer delays in getting back to work because of persistent inclement weather.

This program is, I honestly believe, a commercial venture which eventually would work into a rich-man trip. It would exclude many of those that even now are supporting this, but who would find later that the area was an off-limit to they, themselves, because of the nature

of the whole proposal. In order to go into this area, as I mentioned, it would necessitate a guide unless you can row a boat yourself.

V So I would ask those proposing this to study it vigorously, to go into it thoroughly and see if they understand the full conditions that we are confronted with.

/ Mr. Wirth, this present season is a ninety-day season for large boats. The proposal, if granted, would provide, in my estimation, not over fifteen days of good weather for canoeing, and we might even question the fifteen because of the rising winds. I read the report of Mr. Brown and his party of nine people who traversed the area, and it took them nine days; and if you will study the report you will find that nearly every day, in fact even beginning the first day, they could not unload their boats where they proposed to unload them, or their equipment. They had to seek shelter in a different area in order to unload their boats because of the high wind velocity which nearly always parallels the arms.

Now, if we study it from this standpoint we can see they would be restricted to early-morning and late-afternoon movement on nearly every day of the fifteen. Many, many camps would be created along the shores eventually as a result of sudden squalls.

I will venture to say that every one of the

people here, or even Park personnel, if they were out last Tuesday in that storm, if they had started out and the storm came up such as that, they would go ashore; they wouldn't get to a campground; they wouldn't have time; they wouldn't be able to. The wind was such and the waves were such that it would be over the front of the bow of a nineteen-foot boat. That is not canoe weather, even though it was in August. One should know they would not be able to prevent fire-building to keep one from freezing in this type of weather.

The small boats would be close to shore at all times, interfering with the natural nesting of birds. I am speaking of the small boats that it is proposed to open this area for, mind you -- not to open it, because it is already open to them, but to restrict it to those. Those boats would have need to remain close to shore, which is, I understand, just what we want to avoid when it comes to the nesting areas and the feeding of animals. Large boats do not go into the shallow areas. It is impossible.

I recently read a report of Park travel drop, Park travel dips, I believe, and I do not believe that this cannot be attributed somewhat to the reception that many of the people have received when they come into the Park. I know of many people that have reported this even as late as last week when a man unloaded his boat at the

✓
Lake shoreline, or the Lake ramp, and his boat was becoming swamped. He called for help. A man came running up the incline to the top and shouted for help -- "Give us help down here, we are being swamped." There was a Park Ranger that was sitting there in a car, and while they did recruit about six or seven people eventually to run down and help them, the Park Ranger started his motor and gentlemanly rode away instead of offering the help that we often expect of those people that are there to protect us.

I also saw another condition the next day that existed in which a man was stranded on an area where there was a sandbar. And this sandbar -- he became stranded on the sandbar as a result of trying to miss some fishermen's lines that were extending way out in the water. There were no markers. There were no markers whatsoever to indicate that there was sand there. He became stranded and he called for help. It was impossible for him to get off. Now, this was 200 feet away from a concession that is being operated in the Yellowstone Park. I am speaking of a boat concession. No one would come to his aid. There were three young boys on the shoreline that volunteered to go help. They went to the concessionaire and they asked if they could take a boat and go out and help. They were informed that for \$1.00 for an hour they could go out and

help. They produced the dollar and, to their amazement, then when they went to get the boat, they were instructed they would also have to put a \$5.00 deposit on this boat in order to go right out in front 200 feet to aid a stranded boater. Between the three, by scraping up the \$5.00 -- which they managed -- then they did their good turn, receiving the \$5.00 deposit when they returned. I counted seven men standing in around the fire, that were employees, that could have aided.

Now, in our code of ethics as boaters, we wouldn't have been disgraced by a situation such as that. Many and many the time that we go to the rescue of the small boater as he is out on the lake. There are very few boaters that in their lifetime don't have a chance of saving someone else's life, and it is usually in a small boat.

I mention this only because you have mentioned the spirit of those who sat around the campfire -- Mr. Colter and so on. I wonder if we haven't permitted the violation of the spirit of Colter and others when they wished the Park to be for the use of all. Have not monopolies been criticized where the people have been made to feel they are not wanted? Has the refusal to provide adequate launching facilities for thirty years not been evidence that the general public was not wanted on

the lake in their own boats? Does the building of large, modern, plush hotels not cater to a clientele that is being considered a spending group? Is this what Mr. Colter envisioned, or did he wish to see plans or a condition that would leave the Park free of rigid monopolies and allow its use to the common people?

In the interest of time, I would like to submit a written statement containing about -- I think it is about twenty-five reasons -- twenty-three reasons why we should reconsider this possibility of closing.

I feel, as I submit this written statement, that we must not discount the possibility of this becoming a national political issue. Over 18,000 clubs have protested this action at the Cody hearing. Those are affiliate clubs with the Outdoor Boat Club of America, so we must not discount the fact that there are few protesting simply because it is through one organization.

I would like to do anything that I could to help support sensible regulations. I am sure that these boat clubs will provide rescue vehicles or boats when needed for policing of the area. I am sure they will not ask for the exclusion of the wilderness people, the Audubon people or the Izaak Walton League, from going into the area. All that we would ask is that we be not excluded. We would ask that you allow an investigation of this area

under normal conditions by an impartial group such as editors, Senators, chambers of commerce, before you act on the advice of one group. I thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: The next witness will be Mr. John Packard of Salt Lake City, and Mr. A. W. Solbrig is in the batter's hole. Mr. Solbrig is from Idaho Falls.

Mr. Packard.

JOHN PACKARD, 2065 BOMAR DRIVE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, it certainly gives me pleasure to have this opportunity to give you my views and the views of a number of others with whom I have talked concerning this proposed zoning of the Yellowstone Lake area.

I would like to make some statements concerning what was said by Mr. Garrison of the Yellowstone National Park. One of the first things that he mentioned was a full measure of enjoyment that the Park commission wished to allow ourselves and our posterity. I don't see how on earth it is possible for us or our posterity to gain a full measurement of enjoyment out of the Park unless we have ready and easy access to the wilderness areas that are in question now. It just isn't possible. You, yourself, know how you would feel, if you will be honest

about your feelings, about how it would be to row a boat into any areas for ten or fifteen miles, if you had the strength and ability to row it that fifteen miles. I know how I would feel, wanting to get back. I would seriously doubt whether I could make it, and I certainly wouldn't want that experience.

They mentioned that there was some 70,000 acres of water that would be left available. Now, I wonder about this zoning and the zoning two years ago when they zoned the Flathead Lake area, if we really will in the future be allowed this 70,000 acres of water. Now, this is taking a little bit away two years ago, little bit away this year; what is going to happen next year and five years from now?

Putting these campsites in wilderness areas, I think, is a safe thing to do. It was asked, I believe, at the Cody hearing how these areas would be policed. I don't think there is any problem in policing these areas since so few people would get to these places to use them.

Concerning when they asked or mentioned that their bird nesting places and so forth had been destroyed and were being bothered and that sort of thing, I wonder if there are any facts available that these people have gathered that support the idea that these nesting places

are being destroyed. I have heard people's opinions and read of people's opinions and that sort of thing, but we all have our opinions on what these things are -- if or not these things are being destroyed.

Another thing was mentioned, they would put some rental facilities close to these arms. Well, it is a well-known fact that since boating has become so popular that the average person can now afford a boat and powerboat at a reasonable rate, that the rentals systems in the Park have been going downhill steadily. Of course, this would bring more revenue into the people who are in these concessions in the Park and this would be extremely interesting to these people. I think that if I were there, I would certainly want to see these boats restricted because I would -- it would mean my business would pick back up.

The effect on deer and elk and the other animals that inhabit these areas was questioned. I seriously doubt whether, say, 5,000 boats a year will have much effect on the elk and deer, since the main attraction to the Yellowstone National Park seems to be the animals and we drive up and down the highway approaching a half million cars each year, and we all see the deer and elk and these wild animals right along the highway. Now, they over the period of years have become accustomed to these people

traveling here and there and throughout the Park; and why should a few boats disturb these animals? It just doesn't stand to reason.

They mentioned the silence of the operation of a rowboat. I don't believe it is the boats that make so much noise; it is the people in them that cause the most noise. If you have ever been along the highway, of course you see these deer and elk and bear, and, of course, the people stop and they are over walking a little closer to get a picture of them, and this doesn't seem to bother these animals; so there, again, I don't see why these things should bother the animals at all.

I wonder if in these areas where the animals may not be as used to the human beings, if these people along the shorelines will not get a little more careless, too. You know, with these campsites and people going into these areas, if they get a little more careless and try to do the same things they do along the roadways, they may cause some problems concerning the mutilation of some people.

Mr. Garrison also mentioned that since the closing of the Flathead Arm several troupes of scouts have visited these areas. Well, that is a very minute portion of the people who are able to visit these areas. These scouts -- of course, that is a training program -- they

like to hike, row and this and that. They are young; they are able to do these things. What about the rest of us, the rest of the people? They are not able to row and take these long trips because, as mentioned by the speaker before me, they can't afford these things or they are not physically able to endure these things. They don't have the time to spend packing into these areas.

These areas, of course, are set aside for all of us. We go up there on a short vacation most generally, and as the speaker mentioned, it took a group nine days to go into these areas. I have two weeks vacation like most the other people. I have some of it to spend around home. I don't feel I can afford to spend all of it in one area.

Also mentioned were a number of the developments under construction in these areas. I believe that these are appeasements being put to us so that we will forget and feel more kindly towards the closing of these areas. These are things -- take a little bit here, take something away from you, but give you something else. These are things that are needed anyway, these improvements have got to be made anyway to allow people decent facilities to attend these areas.

There was mention of giving adequate protection to these hand-boaters along the lake area. Can you give adequate protection to these people? I don't see how it

is possible. People are not used to rowing boats any more, or rowing canoes. They mentioned that there is a danger in handling canoes. Certainly there is a danger in handling rowboats. With people who are unsure of it, you lose perspective of how far you are from the shore, and when a squall comes up or a fast storm, you get in trouble there.

And also these people think, well, this rowing is going to be a lot of fun, I will enjoy that. You get on the lake, you fatigue, and I think this protection and towing service to bring these people back will be considerably more expensive to the Park or whoever is going to pay for this service, the Park or the people themselves.

When they are restricting areas of a lake like Yellowstone Lake, a national forest set aside for the enjoyment of all people, at the same time you wonder, if migratory birds and that sort of thing are being disturbed so much, why there are not restrictions put on the Everglades National Park. Why, that is the only form of entry to these areas. Likewise, this is practically the only sane entry into these reaches of this lake. It seems kind of strange that they will take the easiest entries to these areas for the most people, away from us.

And it seems to be the consensus of opinion that it is just strictly the boaters who are in favor of this, leaving these areas open. Well, certainly it is

the boaters, because the boaters are the sportsmen, those are the people going up there with the express interest of seeing these areas, with the express interest of doing a little fishing, of enjoying the areas to their fullest extent with the easy accessibility to them.

These boaters are everybody, potentially everyone is a boater. If they get an opportunity to do a little boating, it is good recreation for their families, themselves, and you can -- allows you to take your family into these areas. So this is not just strictly for the boaters; it is for everyone and for the future, if you would consider what on earth you are doing.

Some day you might like to go see those things. How on earth could you get there unless with a powerboat, and see these things?

I noticed up in Yellowstone they had a fellow there from the -- I think his name was Mr. McNees of Butte, Montana, Chairman of the Montana Division of the National Boating Association. He stated that they should close these areas, that Wyoming, Idaho and Nevada have sufficient water, sufficient lakes for the enjoyment of the people anyway. Well, this doesn't just affect Idaho, Montana and Wyoming. How about Utah, where there is so little water? How about New Mexico, California areas? These are not just for the enjoyment of these people

right here, although these are the people who are able to take most advantage of this. These national parks are set aside for all of us. We all should be concerned with this. We have enough water around here to do our fishing and that sort of thing. So I don't see how on earth it is possible for us to set aside such a large portion of beauty and wilderness for so few people.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Packard. I am sure you will not mind my correcting one statement. There are sections of the Everglades that are definitely closed to the public on account of the birds' rookeries and so forth, and also glade buggies have been eliminated from going through the glades.

A. W. Solbrig is the next one and in the batter's box is J. W. Stuckl of Rexburg, Idaho, speaking on his own behalf. Mr. Solbrig.

A. W. SOLBRIG, IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO: I am speaking on my own behalf, not on behalf of any organization or group.

I would like to first make a couple of remarks on the excellent presentation of the speaker who preceded me. He mentioned that the boat clubs or the boaters represent the people, large numbers of people. I believe that actually only about one and a half percent of the people

✓ who enter Yellowstone Park bring boats with them. I suspect that if people throughout the nation had a chance to speak on this matter, the numbers would be predominantly in favor of the proposal, that is, in favor of the closing these arms. The hearings are being held in the neighborhood of the lake, within a few hundred miles of the lake, and this is the area from which the boaters come. The people who come from distance normally do not bring boats with them.

I am not sure at this point, but it seems to me that in a presentation put out by the Park Service, they did mention statistics, facts, to show that the wildlife in these lower arms of the lake are receding, are moving back, they are decreasing in numbers now. I may be mistaken on this fact. Maybe someone else has this presentation by some of the Park Service people in which they actually give facts concerning the wildlife population in the areas under consideration.

✓ Personally I feel that Mr. Garrison and his people are dedicated, well-trained. They know what they are doing. When they make a recommendation, it behoves those of us who are not trained in these subjects, to listen carefully on it. It is their duty by law to preserve this Park for future generations, and I feel they are doing their best to preserve the Park.

I might mention that I work in an office, I spend most of my days sitting on my chair in front of a desk. Today I took a day vacation for the purpose of coming to this meeting. I believe that areas of beauty are extremely important, particularly to those of us who work indoors. We need the beauty of the outdoors, the greenness of the trees, the wildlife which we occasionally see in these areas.

Therefore, I feel rather strongly that Mr. Garrison and the Park Service people should be allowed to use their judgment in preserving these areas.

When I go out into the country, I want to see this beauty; I don't want the noise of a large number of boats in my ears. I like to hear the whisper of the wind in the trees.

I think the preceding speaker mentioned that the people in boats make more noise than the boats. I don't think this is really substantiated by facts. I live here within a couple of blocks of the high school away from the river. I can hear quite clearly each week end the noise of the boats from the river, and I don't hear any noise of the people in the boats. All I hear is the boats, and I can hear them from the river, too, a couple of blocks beyond the high school.

Now, when I go out to see the trees, to see

greenness, to get away from the office and my desk, I don't want that boat noise. Actually, I think it would be better if more of our waters were closed completely to boats.

✓
Some of the speakers have made the point that, logically, if we are going to close part of these areas, we should close them all. I think this is true. These areas are set aside for the pleasure of the people and also for the future. They are to be preserved for the future. I believe that having large numbers of powerboats on these lakes is not in accord with preserving them for the future, and I believe that it does destroy the pleasure.

Those who visit here from a distance come to see the beauties of nature and not to hear the roar of boats and smell the smell of gasoline.

Mr. Chairman, the August 25th Denver Post contains a short article on the subject at hand, which is pertinent. This article says in part, and I quote:

✓
"Boaters are again being offered a chance to cut their own throats in the public hearings about Yellowstone Lake. We wish desperately that they wouldn't.

"The National Park Service has proposed closing the big lake's three south arms to powerboats. The remainder of the lake, a full eighty percent of its surface area,

would remain open to all boats. The reasons for the proposed closure are obvious. Motorboats, with their ear-shattering noises, their oil smoke and exhaust, their destructive wakes, are raising hob with the natural values of this beautiful wilderness country. Hearings on the matter were held last February, when the boaters, liberally aided and abetted by commercial interests, were on hand with their crying towels fairly dripping.

"More hearings are now near conclusion in Wyoming and Idaho, and we hear the boating interests are out in force again. They are dwelling on a section of the Act establishing Yellowstone Park which says its lands are dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. And they are blandly ignoring the Act's provisions that the Park Service is to be dutybound to provide for the preservation from injury and spoliation all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities or wonders within said Park, and their retention in their natural condition.

"Motorboats are busting up huge colonies of nesting birds, driving game back from the shoreline. The thousands of people who ride the powerboats are littering the shorelines with junk. The Park Service is trying to put a stop to all this, and the motorboat jockeys

are fighting them for it.

"If the boaters win, it will be a hollow victory. They will have proved to the public that they have no interest in preserving the natural and irreplaceable qualities of the nation's most famous national park, but only in serving their own selfish ends.

"Boaters in general have made a good name for themselves in this part of the West by promoting their sport with determination and good sense. It is a pity that those fighting the Yellowstone closure have to throw away that name for a small part of a very big and beautiful piece of water. It's a pity they insist on cutting their own throats."

Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, sir. The next witness is Mr. J. W. Stucki, speaking on his own behalf, and Mr. L. C. Pearson of Rexburg, Idaho, on his own behalf, is in the batter's hole.

Mr. Stucki.

J. W. STUCKI, REXBURG, IDAHO: Mr. Chairman, as was announced, I am J. W. Stucki of Rexburg. My interests are entirely in the field of agriculture. I teach at Riggs College and I have had the responsibility for a long time of managing two dairy herds.

My interest in this hearing is to sustain the suggestion of Park management that these arms of this lake be closed. I have two special interests in addition to the scenic and the esthetic value of the Park and the Park Service. I have visited a great number of our national parks through my lifetime, and I am greatly appreciative of the things that are being preserved in this service.

I am also, I think, aware of the opportunities and the privileges and joy and satisfaction that comes from boating. I think I have had my share of pleasure from the larger boats on the lake, and I am aware of the security that a large boat and plenty of power in the motor brings on the lake.

But I have also had a great deal of satisfaction come to me over the thirty years I have been raising a family -- and I have a boy still eleven years old, so I will probably be raising a family all of my life -- and one of the great joys and satisfactions we have had as a family has been to go out on that lake in a rowboat. Now, I am not an expert oarsman, but I have had some wonderfully satisfying experiences with my boys there on that lake in a rowboat with a fishing line. Now, we don't go out when there is a wind and we don't go out in a storm, and we don't try to compete with you men who drive a boat with a 150-horsepower motor. We are not

attempting to cover any great distance, but I want to tell you that during the last ten years especially, and some years previous to that, going out just peacefully a little ways from the shore and fishing and having a happy experience has really been marred by the wake of these big boats as they come along, and it has just really spoiled this rowing on this lake.

If any of you fellows would like to have a thrill of one of those experiences, get in a rowboat at some time and watch some of you fellows in your big boats begin to go by. Even though you have got wonderful weather and you have got peaceful surroundings and you are having a good catch, it is all done when one of those boats begins to go by. I have had that experience again and again and I would like to enjoy some of these things, but really and truly the rowboat and the canoe just can't compete against these people. And the fact that with eighty percent of the lake available, I have a little trouble wondering how we are different.

I guess all of us are about alike, but I remember hearing the statement about the old brother that prayed and said, "Oh, Lord, bless me and my wife and my son John, and no three and no more." I just wonder what we are thinking about when we can't provide a little seclusion, little opportunity for somebody with a rowboat

and a canoe. It just seems like somewhere in our good land there ought to be a place for this kind of a thing.

There is another interest that I have. I have two boys, one eleven and one fourteen, and we have three saddle horses, and there isn't anything that we do that we enjoy more than loading those three saddle horses in a truck and in getting out to some of these secluded spots. Now, we don't go out with a rowboat for long periods so that we are going to be fifteen miles away from the shore, and we don't go for great long periods with these saddle horses, but one joy we get is to take these saddle horses out into a remote area where we have a little seclusion, where there isn't going to be 500 people every way you look.

That is one of the things that is spoiling the Park, is the terrific population that is there. And to have a little seclusion somewhere where you can get, and then you can't go far without water, and move down off of those mountains down at the lake and enjoy that, is one of the great lessons.

I am a member of the American Farm Bureau, and I am a member of the Dairy Advisory Committee to the American Farm Bureau Board, and for ten years I have been meeting in Cheyenne there with the American Farm

✓ Bureau Board on problems, and one of the problems that came up not long ago was the problem of this wilderness area in Idaho. And on this committee, this advisory committee, is a man by the name of Howard Waters who lives near Davenport, Iowa, and this man feeds sheep out every year and he comes out to Idaho and Wyoming to buy our sheep. And the summer before last he brought his two boys with him and the sheepman who supplied him the sheep out in western Wyoming supplied him with the packs and the guide and they moved through western Wyoming up from Cody and up into the Park and up into this area. And you know how the farmers and ranchers generally react to this wilderness area -- the are in favor of multiple use of our forests.

And this man said, "I favor this multiple uses and I am interested in the livestock industry. I feed sheep for a living and I feed my produce off my Iowa farm to western sheep, but I am here to testify, after having been out in that wilderness area, after having been through Yellowstone Park with a pack train, that I want to see those things that our first men found, that Dan Colter found, preserved. I want to see those things preserved so that my children and grandchildren can enjoy the same things I found out there in with that pack train."

I have before me here a list of studies that

have been made that I have had a chance to study through. One of these is "A Public Use Plan for Yellowstone Lake." Another one is "The Management of Sport Fishing in our National Parks," and sport fishing and 150-horsepower boats don't quite go together. I would like to refer the studies to you to see what studies have been made. These are not opinions, these are studies.

One of these, "Two Parasites of Cutthroat Trout in Yellowstone Lake" by Oliver B. Cope, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Denver, Colorado. Another one is "A Memorandum on Yellowstone Park," a report of rowboat and canoe trips around the arms of the lake, to which Mr. Benson referred.

He made the statement that they took a great number of days to go around it; I believe from August 15th to August the 22nd, as I remember, as I went through here. Now, one of these men was seventy-one years old that made this trip.

I have been there. I go up at the Park and I leave Rexburg in the morning, take my two boys with me, and we get in a rowboat and we spend three or four hours fishing out on the lake if the weather is fine. If the weather isn't such we can get out with a rowboat, then we do something else, and then we come home in the evening. We don't have to be up there seven and eight days to go

and enjoy rowboats, but you can't enjoy a rowboat with these big boats running around. At least, I can't. And I would just as soon face a storm.

I have been there when the waves have been pretty rough, with wind, too. I have seen these waves that have been mentioned here in this hearing, but I would about as soon face a storm as some of these wakes that follow these big boats. I don't like rowboating on that place.

Another one of these reports is the "Molly Island's Nesting Colonies on Yellowstone Lake." And these people don't only -- that have made this study of the reaction of birds, don't only cite what the boats do to the birds and the wildlife that is there in this area, but they point out that even photographers, even some of the official parties that go there and try to compile a few statistics, band the young birds and so on, have had a real detrimental effect on these and they question the wisdom of that in the banding of some of these birds.

I have taught enough biology and studied enough biology in my life that I am aware of the value of the wildlife and I see here in this report, in this study -- it is rather a lengthy study that has been made on the effect on birds, and they have studied even how far away a boat or some other disturbance must come before the

✓ mother bird flies away from her nest and so on. And they have also made studies there of finding out how long a bird stays away when once she has been frightened to fly.

And these studies surely do point out the need for some reservations in all of our areas if we want to preserve these things.

And you folks know what all of us do in a thoughtless way on this kind of a life. We just crowd our wild animals out. Anyone who has studied conservation of wildlife knows without any contradiction that human population comes in and we just crowd them out. They are crowded for food supply, they are crowded for space, they are crowded for cover, wherever the human being moves in.

We don't have to go to our National Park Service to find that; we can find that in our own fields and our own game right here close at home.

Another pamphlet that I have studied is one, "Boating Use of Yellowstone Lakes," and it points out the number of boats, and among other things that I have learned in this investigation is that the number of boats on the lake is doubling every five years. And if that continues, where are we going to have some of these other things?

There are all kinds of people in the world, and I guess it is a good thing all of us have different likes and different desires. I believe that is all I care to say. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Stucki.

The next witness is Mr. L. C. Pearson of Rexburg, Idaho, and he is speaking in his own behalf. The batter in the hole is Jay C. Howell of Logan, Utah, testifying for himself.

L. C. PEARSON, REXBURG, IDAHO: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I believe I represent the majority of the visitors in the Yellowstone Park. I am not one of the 4,000 who owns a powerboat. I am one of the other half million, or however many it is, each year. Today I had the opportunity of doing something that I wanted to do for several years and this was to take a hike with a few other men and a couple of boys, from Old Faithful over to Bechler's, and I didn't take that opportunity because of these hearings. I would have liked to have been there very much, but I hope to get around to it in the future.

As you know, there is no road there. I hope that a road will not be built across that area because it makes it possible to see some of the plant and animal life in a relatively undisturbed condition and, of course,

there is one of my major concerns as far as the arms of Yellowstone Lake are concerned: that some place some of these waterways should be preserved to make possible the development of wildlife there.

Concerning the remarks made by one of the speakers, I believe it was Mr. Packard, that everyone is expressing his feelings, his emotions and so forth in these meetings, I would like to point out again the papers that were mentioned by the preceding speaker concerning studies that have been made at Yellowstone. My work at Riggs College is as a botanist, as an ecologist, and in going through these papers I am impressed by the fact that they are good ecological studies, scientific controlled and carried out in a very thorough manner. And, of course, as ecologists have known for a good many years, there are very critical periods in the development of any species of plant or animal, and generally the most critical time in the life history of a plant or animal is during the period of reproduction.

Now, the elk and moose and bear and birds may be very intimate with us on certain occasions, but at other times they are under very heavy pressures from their natural enemies, and during periods of reproduction this is especially true. And so even though we

may be able to get very close to these animals at certain times of the year, it should be remembered that there are other times of the year when this is not possible.

The Park Service has gone to great lengths to point out that the lake would still be used, these arms would still be used. And one statement that I disagree with to a certain extent is the statement that if the arms were not at all used, then this program would be of no value, that is if they were not used at all by humans. I believe there might still be value even if it were necessary to bar human beings entirely from these arms. To give the wildlife an opportunity to reproduce might be well worth that. However, I believe that the studies of the naturalists and the Park Service and scientists that are not necessarily associated with the Park at all, bear out that such extreme measures are not needed. I would be willing to rely on the careful studies of these men in drawing the limitations.

My own person interest, of course, is desiring to find secluded spots, some place where I can have a certain amount of reflection free from the noise and odors and so forth of motorboats, automobiles, other aspects of civilization, and this has prompted me to speak in behalf of zoning.

Also I would like to speak in behalf of this because of another interest. And here again I am only expressing my own views; I am not speaking for any group. But almost constantly for the last eleven years I have been working with boy scouts, and I have observed how these young people are anxious to come in contact with nature in an unspoiled condition and the values which come to these young men by this opportunity, and it seems to me that it would be a shame if it should be made impossible for them, especially if they are not in a position to afford the expensive boating equipment, powerboats -- it would be a shame if they were to be barred from visiting some of these areas on their own manpower, getting out and exerting a little bit of muscular effort in getting into these areas.

I would like to thank you for your courtesy in listening to me. I think this is all I have to say at this time.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, sir, very much.

The next witness here is Jay C. Howell, testifying in behalf of himself, from Logan, Utah, and the next gentleman in the batter's hole is Keith D. Hansen of Logan, Utah, representing the Cache Boating Club.

Mr. Howell.

JAY C. HOWELL, 696 NORTH 2ND WEST, LOGAN, UTAH:

✓
Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to be here and voice my views today. I have very many varied interests and I hope, even though we are very definitely reflecting our prejudices and our biases in our testimony here today, that we can be as objective as possible; and in spite of my biases and prejudices, I hope that I will not appear to be selfish in any manner, because I think it is all our desire -- really when you come right down to the basic facts, our desires are to preserve as much as possible and properly use the resources that are God-given so that not only we but those who follow us can enjoy as much as we can the things that are here for us.

While I am speaking only for myself, I would like to state just as a matter of record that I also have been very heavily involved in the boy scout movement. I have been forty years as scoutmaster. I have been scout counselor for three years and I have enjoyed many experiences with them. And in addition to that I have been very deeply involved in the Utah Wildlife Federation and other wildlife groups obviously for the preservation and proper utilization of our natural resources for at least twenty years, during which part of that time I was the head of the Utah State Wildlife

Federation's big game committee. And, of course, I am a boat owner and a member of the Cache Boating Club as well.

I have boated on Yellowstone Lake and enjoyed the facilities there for at least thirteen years. I only state that so that will at least qualify me a little bit.

Would it be safe to assume that all these things that are made available to us should be for the benefit of the maximum numbers of people with reasonable use of all the resources? I think it would.

My wife and two children and I have enjoyed very much going to Yellowstone for a period of years. My first trip probably has been -- oh, it was possibly as far back as twenty-five years ago, to Yellowstone, and I have noticed a continuous increase in numbers there, the utilization of the campgrounds and so on.

✓ I might give just a little opinion here. I am inclined to think that this proposed closure might be kind of a back-handed thing. Inasmuch as it seems as if the overall problem of the Park is administration, and the need for additional moneys, possibly, and additional campgrounds and facilities, are so great, that possibly this is one thing, they are trying to close off a little bit so they can utilize it for other purposes.

But at any rate, I was up there to Yellowstone two weeks ago today. In fact, I was in the Southeast Arm, the South Arm and Flat Mountain Arm, and with me I had an aged uncle who is not a boater, but he loves photography, As I do. And it was a magnificent trip. We got in there and really enjoyed it, and since we got home he got the film back and we ran them through, and he will relive that forever, as long as he is able to watch it.

And it has been our experience as our family has been going back in there, that that always has been true, pictures have been very good and we have relived it. We have enjoyed the fishing. As far as that is concerned, I can catch fish in any part of the lake; that is no problem. But as a matter of record, in the last three years the opportunity I have had of taking elderly folks and people who are unable to go into those areas otherwise, that has been one of the greatest pleasures I have enjoyed.

✓ I personally am unable to hike into those areas, and I know some of those elderly people and others who aren't as fortunate as we are, can't go on in and enjoy the things. And again as I see it, there is no necessity of having something if it can't be appreciated.

In the scout situations, you have opportunities

numbers of times to take the troops in Flat Mountain Arm and other areas. We have had canoes, we have had good equipment and it has been fine, but invariably we have had to feel like that we needed the boat in there to kind of protect the canoes. Over a period of years that we have done that, even with good constant supervision and so on, it is possibly so that there could be some jeopardy involved to people who have row-boats and canoes and are unable to reach shore, in the event of difficulty, quickly. Then, of course, it has been my experience that a lot of times you need to get to shore quickly.

There possibly has been comment made previously here, and in the previous meetings which have been held, on this so-called litterbugging. I never saw litterbugging. There may have been, but I have missed it in all the times that I have been back in those areas.

I am inclined to believe, too, that the people that go back in there, the majority, at least, go in there because they do appreciate these God-given blessings of ours and they tend to try to protect them.

At West Thumb two weeks ago when I was asking about campground to go to out there, I gained the impression from the folks at the West Thumb Ranger Station that they prefer that people didn't utilize the

lake. Now, maybe I am biased, that may reflect that; but in endeavoring to get lined up on some different campgrounds around there -- and there was no assurance of it -- they said some of the campgrounds were full. And in reality, when we got out there, there were absolutely no people at the campgrounds nor were there any there in the evening, either, prior to the time we left to come on in to West Thumb.

I don't know, maybe the administration of the Park has a tremendous responsibility and a job and maybe it gets a little bit tough on occasions, with as many people as they have to handle, but I was inclined to feel that for what reasons they may have had, they would prefer not to have us go on out and utilize some of that. That may be completely false, but that is my impression.

I don't know; I am inclined to believe here with the closure of these two arms, that there would be a hazard involved. I don't know what the regulations would be if it were closed, but it is unlikely that a person can start in one end of the lake and go clear around the lake, across those open waters. Now, maybe that previously has been discussed and will be further clarified.

But I guess I could sum the thing up that I

have to say by saying that if the parks are for the benefit of the people, for proper utilization, preservation and so on, I don't see why this portion of the Park isn't as open as any of the rest and why it would be restricted. If we were going to preserve the Park in its entirety, then obviously the thing to do would be to close up all the entrances and nobody go in there, maybe, other than afoot.

I do appreciate the opportunity I have had of talking and I hope that whoever speaks here will say such things that we do arrive at a conclusion, that it be an honest conclusion and not subject to all of our biases, and will be for the maximum benefit of all of us.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Howell. I can assure you that the Secretary will decide it on the basis which you suggest, and I appreciate your expression along that line.

Mr. Keith D. Hansen of the Cache Boating Club, speaking on their behalf, of Logan, Utah. Mr. Al Burton will be in the hole. He is from Idaho Falls and will speak for himself.

Mr. Hansen.

KEITH D. HANSEN; 684 NO. 2ND WEST, LOGAN,
UTAH; CACHE BOATING CLUB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In listening to the various pros and cons, I am reminded of an incident in the south where a certain minister was in the process of delivering quite an oration, and during this oration he became rather emotional at time. And he happened to notice down in the congregation one of the ladies was rather irritated, and it so happened that this lady had just remembered that she had a roast back home in the oven and she was afraid that it was going to burn, and so she scribbled down on a piece of paper a little note and she called the **usher** over to her and she instructed the usher to take this note across the other side of the congregation to her husband. But the usher received his directions and he got something crossed; instead he took the note up to the minister. And the minister stopped just for a moment in his oration. He wiped his brow and he picked it up, and it said, "Why don't you go home and turn off the gas?"

Now, some of the things you have heard, you have heard many times back and forth. Some of them have been stronger in various senses, some of them have been weak.

Just as a bit of background, I am here repre-

senting an organization of sixty boaters listed as the Cache Boating Club located in northern Utah and southern Idaho. As an employment my occupation is in charge of finance at Utah State University. I have been an ardent follower of wildlife, not the wildlife you pursue in the evenings, but I like to fish and hunt.

I live in the Rockies primarily because of the accessibility to our natural resources. In Utah we aren't blessed with the vast amount of water which you have in this area, but we do have a situation where you can come home from your work in the evening and in the process of two or three or four minutes you can be ready and drive maybe five miles and there you can have adequate duck hunting, or you can drive in the other direction and you can have adequate fishing. And then, on the other hand, in the summertime if you want to drive still another seven miles in a southerly direction, there you can have adequate boating and swimming, water skiing, and the other natural attributes of this life.

To me, personally, enjoyment and satisfaction of going out and seeing what we have is a God-given right here in this life, is one of the greatest satisfactions you could ever possess.

I have worked with the boy scouts for many

years. I myself am an Eagle Scout. I have had the opportunity, too, of going in as a scout and also a scouter into the various wilderness areas in this part of the United States. To me there is something there that you can't get any other way.

Like most of us, we like to work when we have to and then we are blessed with a short vacation. Now, it has been a process of great enjoyment to be able to see some of the areas which we classify as wilderness and still fit it in within our short vacation period which we have. Many of us are in occupations where we would have six or eight weeks that we could spend, and at that time I am sure we could adequately row around Yellowstone Lake and see the various areas, but where you have to put it into a weekend --

Just to give you an example, I myself have been into the Southeast Arm, the Flat Mountain Arm and the South Arm. I was in there on the 24th of July of this year and also again two weeks ago. We left our home Friday evening at 5:00 o'clock. We drove just about to the entrance of the Park and threw our sleeping bags out on the side of the road, and then at daylight we arose and went into the Park, and by about 8:30 we were over into that area, the Southeast Area, where we could enjoy these various qualities that we have

discussed today. And then we stayed over there that night, camped on the Flat Mountain Arm.

We were instructed that it was so vastly crowded they couldn't even assure us of any portion or any place to lay a sleeping bag. We went over there. If you are familiar with the area, we camped right on a spring, the main Flat Mountain Arm campground. We were the sole people in that area. And just for a little curiosity's sake we started the motor and went on around the Plover Point and on down. There wasn't a soul anywhere, and yet it was so vastly crowded as to the instructions we received. The only thing that interrupted us that night was the snoring of one of our companions and the perpetual howling of the coyotes. In addition to that, it only rained after 3:00 a.m., but we had a very enjoyable time.

What I am trying to show right here is that you are saying that powerboats are detrimental, you shouldn't have them in there. We, in this particular type of society, are forced to put a lot, crowd a lot into a short-length vacation period, and we don't have the time allocated to row such a vast distance.

Now, I myself have been into the Park area every year for the last seven years. To me it is a process of great enjoyment to be able to take my wife

and my four children and to go down into that area and get away from the congestion and actually to get down under the stars and to be able to sleep there at night. It is so quiet that it is almost frightening to be there as a small unit around a small campfire, that is a privilege that very few people have. If we restrict it to other means of conveyance, much fewer people will have such an opportunity.

This spring also we were privileged to take a cruise -- if you are familiar with what they call a "friendship cruise." It is a 200-mile run. We leave from Green River, Utah, and go down the Green River to about the confluence of the Colorado and back up the Colorado River to Moab. That, too, can be taken in a very short time, if you want to make it. We did it in three days, but through a wilderness area completely inaccessible by any other means of conveyance other than boat. Some of the most beautiful sights that you have ever seen are there.

What I am trying to say is we shouldn't restrict areas, God-given rights to man, to one or two different means of conveyance. We should be able to make it accessible.

I find that one of the speakers who was speaking here a few moments ago mentioned that he was

very much frightened because of the wakes of boats. Every time that I have been on Yellowstone Lake -- and I am sure that I can say this truthfully -- every time in the morning the water is calm, but in the afternoon from around 12:00 o'clock on there is a slight breeze that comes up and usually by the time you want to come back across, the small ripple has grown to waves of three or four feet in height; and I myself would be completely afraid to try to ride a canoe in that type of water. There have been many times in my boat that I was wondering whether I ought to pull into shore, sit down and ground myself for a while. In fact, on the 24th of July that is what we did.

✓ Now, one thing that I would suggest, if people like the beauties of being able to row a boat or rent a canoe, let's have an area designated for them close to the road where they can row to, and not restrict it to an area where they can't possibly get there unless they have four or five days to do it in.

One other attribute I have noticed particularly on the last time, since we have been discussing this matter, I looked around and I did see four or five canoes on Yellowstone Lake, but in every case the ones that I saw -- of course, I might be prejudiced

again -- but the ones that I saw all were equipped with a motor on the back or hanging on the side. So maybe they do like a little propulsion when the arms get tired.

One other idea, and that is the fact that the powerboats are noisy. A few years ago I would definitely say they were. We had what we classify today as the old ear-splitters, the good old motorboats that had the exhaust going straight out into the air just like an airplane engine, but since that time we have muffling devices and we have motors of this particular day and time that you can sit and talk just as casually as can be and be able to understand one another. I don't think the sound is something that is interrupting people's sleep.

The slapping of the water, the rippling of the stream, the motion of the trees in the air; those sounds to me are very beautiful. And with powerboating I have many, many pictures to show the fact that you can come up to deer and elk feeding on the shoreline. You can idle your engine and come right within easy camera shot, and I don't think I could have gotten any closer had I paddled from Thumb twenty miles and then tried to get my camera out and take a picture. If you want to get any closer, all you have to do is turn your motor

off and let yourself drift; but I doubt that you can get there any faster any easier.

So, gentlemen, what I would like to say -- in fact, there is one lady I have noticed, or two -- I would like to say this: That when we come to this particular decision, let's meet that decision truthfully and honestly within ourselves, let's think of all concerned, let's think of those that like to be able to visit an area and because of society they must do it in a short time, let's think of those things that they say that wake or the wave action is causing all the destruction on the shoreline. More damage can be done in just two minutes with that high wind and high waves than a boat ever thought of doing. Let's think of the ability to get people over in there so that more people can enjoy it, instead of restricting it to a few.

I thank you for the time allocated me and I pray sincerely that we reach a decision and that decision is done without prejudices and without bias, the best for all concerned. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much, Mr. Hansen. I must refer, however, to your opening remark and story for the simple reason that it seems that the people speaking here today are speaking much longer than the people spoke in Cody and in Lake. I find by

multiplying those left by the average time of those who have spoken already, it is going to take four hours and fifteen minutes. With that thought in mind, and without curtailing anybody, I am proposing we go right through lunch and we will not take time out for lunch so that everybody will have a full opportunity to speak. Now, those who prefer to go out and get a bite to eat and come back, I am sure you will have time, if things hold true to the way they are running.

The next speaker, Mr. Al Burton, of Idaho Falls, speaking for himself, and the one in the hole is Huck Miller of the Deseret News.

Mr. Al Burton.

AL BURTON, 1385 SO. EAST BONNEVILLE, IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO: I appreciate this opportunity to stand before you and express my views. I think it is an opportunity, and if we feel as strongly as I do about this thing, we will all express ourselves.

I, for many years, have longed for a boat and a motor by which I could go back to such places. After this length of time I have finally succeeded, whereby I can go back into these areas like the previous speaker who says he likes to take his horses and go back. I have no objection to him doing that with his horses and I don't like to have any objection to me doing it

with my boat.

One speaker referred to the fact that they wanted to maintain the beauty back in there and they wanted to maintain it as Colter found it. I don't know where they got the idea that we with boats don't want the same thing. We want to maintain that beauty just the same as they do. And I will tell you I am quite sleepy. My wife was operated on yesterday, so if I am a little bit incoherent, why, just forgive me.

I would like to state some facts that have actually happened to me and that are as I see them. I have a fourteen-foot Lone Star boat and we have gone around from the docks, through the narrows and over into the arms with my wife and father, and very thoroughly enjoyed it. We have been over there when we have been caught in a storm when the waves, I believe, were as high as a car. One speaker previously referred to waves two, three and four foot high. These were all of that, maybe more. We, of course, had to beach the boat and we pulled it up on the shore, which I thought was sufficiently clear of the water. At the time we came back from undercover there was water in the boat and we had to take the motor off and tip it over to get the water out. That is how far the waves came up on the shore. I would like to challenge anyone, the man who sits in the

office here -- I will challenge anybody to go over there with the biggest kind of boat, however, most of the motors over there -- I have never seen 150 horses -- most are five, ten and maybe up to thirty and fifty, some seventy-fives. I would like to see any of them put water in my boat. They couldn't come close enough without shearing a propeller to do it, and I would like to see them do it. I would like to see them be able to put any water in my boat, but this storm did and the water was chalky and milky out from the edges, out twenty, thirty feet, maybe in some places further. If there was a thousand boats over there going up and down that shore, they couldn't possibly make that water as muddy and as milky as it was.

We have had a great many good talks here by these professors, which I don't -- I am not capable of making speeches like they are, but again I would like to say that a good share of their talk was not on our problem which we have at hand. As I understand it, the first was on reproduction in the arms, and erosion; and there was one other that was the main reason for curtailing these boats -- oh, littering the shores.

And I have been over there when the moose came right out while we were fishing there, the moose came out to where they were visible and went right out in

the water and swim, and I have an 8-millimeter camera that I took a picture of those moose in the water to show how really frightened they are of people over there.

✓ We usually take **our** lunch over there and usually eat it in the boat, but if we get out, it is for **some** relief or rest. And if you were to allow canoes in there and commercial setups there, your shores are going to be used far more.

And as far as the feeding, the motors hurting and feed, I don't believe the animals are in there in such numbers that it even has any bearing on it. I don't think there is a moose that ever went hungry because of a motorboat. And the amount of elk that are reduced in the Park and slaughtered each year in the Park seems to make this thing ridiculous to even think about. And as far as the noise and the smell of gasoline goes, unless these people are over in the arms, I don't know how in the world they could ever hear them or smell it over there in the arms, because that is what is in question now; it isn't on the lake itself.

I am just speaking off the cuff on this thing as to how I feel. I haven't organized anything.

I was just wondering how that gas and the noise had a bearing where the arms are concerned.

✓ Certainly, I don't know how they would stay on our **highways**

with these trucks and diesels and all if that affects them that much. It just don't seem to make sense. And I don't know how a man could hear an outboard motor over here on the lake a few blocks from this building and be able to sleep with cars passing his house. It just doesn't make sense.

So I have spoke my piece and I appreciate the opportunity to do so, and I believe that is about all I have.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Is Mr. Huck Miller in the audience?

A VOICE: Right here, sir.

HEARING OFFICER: You are up, and Mr. Edwin T. Lofgren of Idaho Falls is in the hole.

HUCK MILLER; DESERET NEWS; SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH: Ladies and gentlemen, I am Huck Miller, Sports Editor of the Deseret News of Salt Lake City. I have been putting out the Fish and Game Weekly now for twenty-six years next month -- that is excepting the five years I was in service, as most of us were -- and I get into these problems quite a bit.

I want you to know that I am up here representing my newspaper, only. They paid my way up here to argue this boat case. I am against the closure and so

✓ my
is my newspaper against the closure. I belong to the Outdoor Writers Association of America. I am First Vice-President of the Basketball Writers Association of the United States, and I belong to a lot of other football writers' associations and all that.

It is interesting that I get about nine out of my ten calls a day at the office, or letters I receive, on fish and game matters. I believe there is a lot of interest in it.

J
I am not going to speak just off the cuff. I am going to try to give you some observations that I have had. I think they are pertinent to the case and I am only going to speak pertinent to the case, except to say that I don't like figures too much. I think they are for statisticians and I am not a statistician. I can prove beyond any question of a doubt that mothers are in the minority and I don't believe that any of us wants to get rid of motherhood. I just think this: There are some minorities that have a big standing.

I also might refer to Mr. Stucki of Rexburg. I am a cow milker, too. I just love to have that nice smell on my hands, but you know, I will bet four bits he uses that electric milker. I hope he does. I think the milk is better as a result thereof.

What about the animals? Well, I have had

observations on some of those things, the animals in the Park. I think the finest show of animals is right on the highways. I have been over in the Southeast Arm many, many times. I have seen some animals over there. I have been licked by a bear. We called him Homer. I think the Park destroyed him because he was a nuisance to mankind in the one camp area down there.

I was up in the middle fork of the Salmon River, which is a primitive area in Idaho. We have gone in airplane. We wanted to take off the strip. A hundred and twenty-six deer were out on the strip and our motors were running. I had to get out of the airplane and run down to try to clear the field. Then we raced back and tried to get back up in the air again.

The Idaho Fish and Game Department, while I was in there at the old Tom McCall Ranch counted 810 deer in about a mile and a half out where they were winter-ranching, and I believe from my experience that the airplane has done more in that primitive area to alleviate the overpopulated deer and elk condition than any other factor we have. There are no roads into that area and yet we have a fine harvest, considering the hazard of getting in there.

Now, the Yellowstone Park -- I believe in perpetuating those elk, but I believe that like the

Jackson elk herd in the early 30's, when they get five percent over what the ranges support, that we may lose them. And talking about those poor elk, they are right down there in Jackson Hole every winter. They run down there and walk back because of their familiarity with the hunting conditions.

So I can't see any argument on this wild animal business. I believe that the natural habitat-- and I have had twenty-six years of conservation experience -- that the habitat is more important than the hunter's rifle or anything that we have. If we protect that habitat, we will have fish and game. But let it get five percent too much and you will have the whole herd gone, but keep it under what is compatible for the habitat and you will have it there. I think that is a good answer to this wild game. You see moose all the time. Certainly the auto hasn't hurt the bear and I don't believe the motorboat is hurting the others.

For many years I have been a rowboater. I was on the second party that ran the middle fork of the Salmon River as a major expedition. We had three members of the Royal Geographical Society of England, we carried the 93rd Flag of the New York Explorers Club and ran the middle fork and the River of No Return. After that party one of the fellows came to me and

said, "We shouldn't publicize this area. It should be kept closed. People will spoil it."

V
I guess on the middle fork there are two to five hundred boats run this year and they have never worn out that water one bit. They patrol the area real well. They are having fun, they are seeing the country and they are doing a real fine job in policing the area.

Now, I would like to ask this question and I have asked it many times: What about the area down in here? We say, "Let's keep it primitive." Well, I don't believe I am old enough to remember when some of these Idaho, Utah, Wyoming and Montana fellows worked real hard to put in the boat ramps at West Thumb and other places, some with their own money and others with the help of what little Park staff was in those days, but the boaters have done that, they have kept this area the way it is today. And I think Mr. Garrison -- and heaven bless him, I think he has gone about doing a wonderful job. He admitted at the Cody hearing in the spring that there had been a little -- not malfeasance, because that is a bad word, but a little neglect in keeping up the camp areas and providing proper disposal for those who used the area.

Now, I am a rowboater. I am as good a rowboater

as there is in the country and I really get tired when I row a boat too long, and I have been over there since we had the Cody hearings in the spring and I have taken all of the information I can get and I have studied it carefully and I have written about it. And I can't conceive of any reason for building additional bulldozed areas, campgrounds, concession stands, in and around the lake. I believe that it is real primitive now in some of those areas and I think we could continue to keep a lot of that merchandising, concessions away from it. I believe the real problem will be not only in creating all of these things to get us down there with our rowboats, but in protecting the rowboater who goes down there.

I rent a boat, a little outfit, either a rowboat or a trolling boat, once or twice each week of the fishing season. I know the hazards and I can't conceive of reaching designated campgrounds in that area, knowing it as well as I do, in a prescribed time. It can't be done. We are going to have to go to shore; people are going to have to look out for us.

I have here as an exhibit -- I will give it to you, Mr. Wirth -- a little column or a little story that a fellow did for me on the trip of the Tippecanoe, ran in our paper last Saturday. It has nine explorers,

thirteen Explorer Scouts going down the Snake River, which is swift but it is rather smooth from Jackson Lake to Jackson Hole. Five of them tipped over the first day -- picture of them tipping over here, pictures of one wrecked boat which they had to have pulled out with a crane. It was a bad thing. I asked if the kids were shaken up, young men, explorers -- you are talking about your scouts -- yes, they were in bad shape. This one fellow wasn't hurt at all but he went into one of these nervous fits. He said it scared the life out of him and he had to be very careful with him after that.

Well, this is just a case of a canoe trip. They lost some of their equipment. But one of those hazards that they possibly didn't expect, which you and I will get, is a storm if we are taken down in that area.

I will give this to you, sir.

Now, first -- or almost last -- I want to say that I think Mr. Wirth and Mr. Garrison and the others are doing a commendable job in fighting this thing. I think there should be two sides to each question. Some day we may come to these gentlemen and say, "Thank you for doing what you did in face of the opposition we gave you."

I am not convinced after perusing all of the

✓
evidence before this thing that I have been able to get -- and I get it quite a bit, as does Don Brooks of the Salt Lake Tribune and those other writers here -- I am not convinced that this closure is necessary, and the reason I am not convinced of it is because I don't think there is any hazard there the like of which is going to be created by, should we say, merchandising this water and using the water on a restricted basis.

We pass over the bird stuff and the shoreline erosion; that has been dropped, I think, in the original hearings. It did do a lot of damage, however; it did a lot to wonder what the man upstairs had in the way of an ax to grind. We all blamed Mr. Seaton and Mr. Wirth and Mr. Garrison, and possibly they had it coming when they brought out this erosion stuff. I won't mention it again because we have all agreed that it is absurd.

Now, we talked about noises, one boat might scare the animals if they are not used to boats, more than several boats. I don't believe it scares them at all, as I have pointed out. But let's argue this case. I don't think the Rangers' boat makes any less noise, one of those speed jobs as yours and mine. I don't think the gas smells any different. I don't feel that the patrol can sneak down there and take adequate safeguards in protecting the boaters and keeping the

area in the shape we would like to have it kept in, without doing the very same thing they are complaining against. I know patrol boats, I am familiar with wardens. I am familiar with the federal warden. I am familiar with the Park Rangers and I go with them a lot. I see their problems, and those things are such that they make me wonder how we are going to do that without breaking up this silence.

Now, I believe Mr. Wirth took a boat ride yesterday and I believe he was in one of those windstorms. I believe he might have realized what it could mean to a man and his family to be down there without some safeguard. And the last time I was down in there we had some hikers in there from Utah State University and some Utah college professors; we were on a camping class. They were getting credit and I went in to do a little story on it, with a speedboat. And we got in there and we had to take out one of the fathers whose little boy had been run over and killed in Utah. And he would have had two or three days before the patrol boat could have taken him into Lake. We got him so he wouldn't miss his own baby's funeral. Now, isn't that an ugly thing to think about? But those fellows weren't going to see another boat for at least another couple of days. Those things happen.

We fly helicopters into the Uinta Mountains and into the Wind River Mountains to pick up people who have gone in to see the game and watch the birds. And I am a birdwatcher; I love it as much as anybody else, but I like to see these people get out before rigor mortis sets in and we have an obligation to them.

✓ Now, in Utah we tried this no-boat deal on our lakes and I was the biggest proponent of it, just like I was the proponent of the buck law before we overgrazed our ranges and put them in such a bad shape, and no man can make any more mistakes than I have, unfortunately; but I think I am wise enough to change my mind. Some day, as I said just a minute ago to Mr. Wirth, we might be changing our minds and thanking him for this. But we have tried this no-boat law and we found we accomplish nothing by it, not a thing by it.

We don't allow motors on Uinta lakes; we haven't allowed motors back in there but we do allow them in wherever we can get to a lake with an outboard motor. We found out that more people have more pleasure and keep an area just as clean in that condition as we do in trying to keep parks in a noiseless, primitive area.

I might say in conclusion, Mr. Wirth, that I don't own a boat and neither does my boss. He sent me

up here, paid my way to come up and see if we couldn't put some light on this thing. We think that -- In my observation of this thing, I think that the boater has taken care of, and the other users, the hiker and the camper, have made good use of this area. We have a pretty area down on those arms, and we call it primitive and we say, "Let's keep it primitive," but I think the user of that area, with the help of the Park and the guidance, and the ethics of the man in the boat -- and you find a man who has got money to buy or build a boat and go down there, is usually a man who has got enough brains to think about ethics and litter and clean things.

I think we have done a real good job down there in keeping it as primitive as we have and I am a little concerned, looking ahead, if we start going in there with bulldozers, excessive camps, excessive concessionsaires, and making this lake like we have done up in Canyon in areas which maybe are unnecessary, where we have got shopping centers, we have got traffic lights, we have got all of the things that we didn't think the public pressures would force upon us in this old famous Yellowstone country of ours. Maybe we will have to come to it, but this person, for one, is sort of dragging his feet because we like to think that things are pretty well as they are right now.

If we need more regulation, let's have it, but keep as many of these areas open to the using public as we possibly can.

I think you, sir.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, sir.

I did go down the lake yesterday with those who are opposed to the zoning, and so did Mr. Flynn, so we could take a complete look both in the Southeast Arm and the South Arm and the Flat Mountain Arm. We did a lot of talking and we did a lot of listening, I should say, more than talking, because we wanted to give them a full opportunity to show us anything and outline anything they wanted. I perhaps shouldn't say this, but I am inclined to believe that we all want to preserve it and use it and see it; the whole thing seems to hinge around how are you going to do it.

I think you gave, Huck, in your statement a lot of fine information and opinion which certainly will be taken in careful consideration by the Secretary in reviewing the whole matter.

Now, we are going right on through, but a gentleman down in front suggests I read the list of the people I have got here in the order they are so they can judge their time and also the reporter suggests we take a little breather, so he can cut off now.

I will read this list and we will take a five to seven minute stretch here and then come back in.

(Off the record.)

(Recess.)

HEARING OFFICER: Is Mr. Lofgren present?

A VOICE: Right here.

HEARING OFFICER: Fine. You are next and in the hole is Richard R. Smith. Mr. Lofgren is from Idaho Falls, representing the Snake River Boat Club.

✓
EDWIN G. LOFGREN; IDAHO FALLS; SNAKE RIVER
BOAT CLUB: I am one of the members of the Snake River Boat Club. We have several others here who are going to testify, and there is a lot of this stuff that has already been gone over a lot of times, pros and cons.

Now, I am also a boat dealer and I have sold marine equipment, boats and motors, since 1948, and -- or '46, rather -- and I have had fourteen years experience with study at the factories and motor schools, and I know today that this one clause in this particular argument about the erosion, to me, I just don't understand it. Simply the fact that you have different types of boats, you have different boat handlers, and altogether it piles down to one thing: it is the type of equipment you have got and the way the boat is handled and where it is handled that will make the difference,

✓

the difference in the reaction you get in the water from it.

✓ In the first place, you would have what you call a displacement hull. It runs deep in the water and is not a fast boat and it will, if driven too fast, create quite a wake; but most boats of that type can't get close enough to a shore so the wake is really detrimental in the way of erosion.

The second type of boats you have is fast-planing hull; the faster it goes the less wake it leaves, and it takes power to get a boat up fast.

Now, going into motor types, today's motor manufacturers and boat manufacturers have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars quieting the operation of boat motors down, and today the modern outboard motor, for example -- that is what I sell primarily is outboard boats and motors -- I would defy you, if operated properly, to hear this motor at least 200 yards off shore.

Now, another thing. Being a dealer in this territory this long, I have had a lot of bellyaches from a lot of the customers going to the Park, and we feel that discriminating a little bit against the boaters has been going on for quite a while simply because of the boat regulations on the types of boats

they can use up there, and the biggest beef I think most of the public have is the way they measure boats. Of course, that don't concern this, but it is one thing the boat people have been putting up with. And now they want to restrict the best part of boating water to the boats, and we feel that this would discriminate against a few or all boaters for the pleasure of a few, and we think it can be handled in a different way.

I think it is probably the lack of public education and, probably, public relationship. Now, what I mean by "public education" is this: Today we have a lot of brand-new boaters. There is a lot of new boats that people are running that have never run a boat before. They don't have the proper boat-handling ideas because they are new with the equipment, and you can take a new boat handler and he will probably operate his boat too fast in some places and too slow in others, and it is lack of knowledge and it is a problem of public education and public relationship; but I think we can answer the question outside of restricting this water to the boaters.

I think it is a matter of getting people educated, and there are, of course, several sides to the thing. Today there is people that are buying boats, don't have no knowledge of how they operate, and a lot

of the people that are selling boats actually are not educating them properly. I think it is partly some of the boat dealers' fault. They just turn people loose with an outfit, that are not properly educated in the handling, and it creates a condition where they interfere with other people.

For example, these big boats coming too close to small boats or rowboats, sailboats -- anything that is not propelled has the right of way on the water. Anybody that has been actually operating a boat a long time knows that.

And I think what is lacking is the fact the people don't really know how to handle them, rather than trying to destroy the pleasure of these other fellows. And the way we today look at it in the boat club is the fact that I think this can be handled without restricting boats, by proper control of the boats and their knowing their operation, which will go back to public education. It is going to take a little time to do that, rather than restricting it, because there is no reason your powerboats, sailboats or rowboats or anything can't operate in the same water if it is controlled properly and people understand.

Now, as far as the littering is concerned, that is another thing that would go back, I think, to

public education. Today people are finding litter barrels along the highways all the time; they are not littering up anything. And a lot of them -- you will find today that the highways are cleaner and simply because if they have got paper or hamburger wrappers and pop corn boxes and pop bottles, why, they usually keep them in a sack and drop them in these litter barrels along the highway. There is no reason, if that is once set up in the Park areas, that litter can't be handled the same way, because people are getting educated to it on the highways and I think that is one way of keeping it clean. It is another point; rather than restriction, go to public education.

One thing about your windstorms: There is a lot went into the danger or rowboats and stuff in the windstorms and up there in the prevailing winds, and it is a cinch that sometime somebody inexperienced is going to get caught rowing a boat out there, and then a powerboat would be pretty nice to have around.

The main point is, I think that the big item we are after is not restricting waters to one bunch. The boating public I know is willing to cooperate and they want to get reasonable regulations, keep the boat water open to all the boats and take care of the safety. In fact, it is safer than we would have if we just had

rowboats up in these arms, because your powerboats are handy sometimes in a windstorm and could save, maybe, somebody's life.

But I think there is a lot of other fellows that has got more of the definite dope on this argument than I have. The main thing we would like to point out is that we think the public relations and education is the big item to answer the problem and probably everybody could enjoy these areas.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Chicago
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. The next gentleman to testify is Mr. Richard R. Smith of Idaho Falls, and I had a request from Bill Dyer of Chicago to ask whether he could be moved up because of a transportation situation, so I granted his request and he is in the hole.

RICHARD R. SMITH, 915 SOUTH HIGBY, IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO: To begin with, I would like to clear up some misconceptions reflected in the comments made by previous speakers this morning.

One of the speakers intimated that the impracticability of taking canoes down the arms of Yellowstone Lake during inclement weather, that inexperienced people would not be able to cope with

the situation. Now, I am just an ordinary average office worker. I am making my occupation by sitting in back of a desk, like another previous speaker. I am probably not very physically capable, but yet during the storm that one previous speaker mentioned, I was in the South Arm with a canoe. We had no difficulty whatsoever in running out the storm. We had no trouble whatsoever, and I might add this was my first trip in a canoe. So I don't think that argument is very valid.

Another speaker mentioned the fact that canoes must remain close to shore would mean that the canoes would have free access to camp spots indiscriminately scattered along the shore; they would frighten game and so forth. Another speaker, however, mentioned that he had a powerboat, that he could come in close to shore and that he couldn't scatter game. These two statements seem to be inconsistent.

Other members of the opposition have brought up the point that right now the southern arms of Yellowstone Lake are not being used by the canoes, that the number is strictly limited. On the other hand, other members of the opposition have pointed out that it is the hiker, the canoeist, people that travel along the shore, are responsible for the clutter that we find there. Here again is a glaring inconsistency.

Now, if we grant the opposition the position that it is the canoeist, the hand boater, the hiker and so forth that are cluttering up the area, and they travel there in very limited numbers, it is rather difficult to account for the astronomical quantity of trash picked up in a recent clean-up campaign in the Park area along Yellowstone Lake. Now, the number I have -- and it comes from a very reputable authority -- is in the recent clean-up campaign along the far shores -- this does not include the shore along the highway-- that 1,000 bushels of tin cans, beer bottles, whiskey bottles and this sort of trash, were picked up. This is an example of an extremely untidy housekeeping which can not be tolerated.

Now I would like to issue some friendly advice to motorboats and the owners of motorboats, that if their housekeeping is not radically improved there will be an onslaught of the public that will clamor for legislation to forbid powerboating not only in Yellowstone Lake but other lakes as well. This condition can not go on.

Now, I feel that the important issue involved here is whether we are all unselfish enough to deny ourselves a little less pleasure and convenience now so that our children and their children will experience

the thrill that comes from gazing on wilderness unmarred by the hand of man. The wilderness is fast disappearing at an alarming rate. If we are to preserve these areas we must act now, not only to slow this trend but to reverse it, and to reverse it we must all sacrifice some convenience, pleasure and profit.

In some cases opposition to the preservation of primitive areas comes from mining, grazing and timber interests, and others from resort, filling stations and cafe owners. In this case the owners of powerboats are the ones asked to sacrifice, and I call on them to do so gracefully, to accept the zoning in the spirit for which it was intended. For what is decided here will influence attitudes and policies for some time to come regarding wilderness preservation.

I sincerely believe that we all share a common interest -- canoeist, hiker, boat owner alike -- and this is the appreciation of uncluttered natural beauty. Why can't we disregard petty differences and work together toward the same common goal, to set aside and leave forever unchanged large tracts of woodland, water and desert wilderness?

I call on those of you who are boat owners to accept this very necessary zoning. Through your example others among us will more leniently sacrifice some of

our selfish interests and the sparks of a truly effective wilderness planning program may eventually be fanned to a flame.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Mr. Bill Dyer of the Outboard Motor Club of America, Chicago, Illinois; and the man in the hole is John Long from Idaho Falls.

Mr. Dyer, Bill Dyer.

BILL DYER; OUTBOARD BOATING CLUB OF AMERICA; CHICAGO, ILLINOIS: Thank you, Mr. Wirth.

I will have to correct you there: I represent the Outboard Boating Club of America.

We have prepared a formal statement which we hope will find its way into the record. Something happened last February -- inadvertently, I am sure -- and our statement did not get into the record. In the main, I will be reading our formal statement, but there will be points which I would like to expand upon a bit.

First of all, to those of you who don't know, the Outboard Boating Club of America is a national association which represents the outboard sport and industry, and here we would like to join the great multitude of other outdoor recreationists in protesting

the proposal of the Park Service.

I fully realize at this late date that it is quite possible that every argument on both sides has been advanced. However, I traveled quite a great distance to be here, so I would like to ask that you lend your sore and callused ears once more.

Here this morning heights of persuasiveness have been reached which I will make no attempt to match, that the slight sense of futility that I feel is far outweighed by the seriousness of the matter here under consideration.

Now, before going any further I must point out that I do not profess to be an expert on all of the points which will come up in my statement, but the statement will reflect the expert opinion of a great number of people on our staff who are exceedingly well-informed, and of other people through the United States, for that matter. So to that extent, I am merely an agent for the transmittal of a good part of this material. I say this to you in a spirit of frankness. I don't wish to deceive you, try to appear to be something I am not.

Now to get on with it. We feel that to close this portion of the lake to motorboating is to close it to the vast majority of those who wish to see and enjoy it. It would also have the practical effect of

placing the best waters both for fishing and boating, off-limits to those people who wish to do so in their own boats.

Mr. Huck Miller, I think, pointed out that motorboats do not wear out the water, which I thought was a good point, and I would like to remind you that virtually nothing known to man leaves a less permanent trail-mark than a boat passing over water.

Now, the vastness of this area makes it virtually impossible for any really significant number of people to see it and to enjoy it unless they are allowed access to it from their own motorboats. So with this general statement in mind, we would like to place our views in proper perspective.

We would like to emphasize that we don't react automatically to every proposal to zone waters against motorboating. We are quick to acknowledge that the supply of water is limited and that proper accommodation must be found for all those who are concerned. As one example of this, we have just recently cooperated closely with a state conservation department in securing legislation which prohibits the use of motorboats in certain areas. This was done, of course, to aid the fisherman and fishing. As another example, we are producing at this time a movie at considerable cost which

shows the importance of sharing the waters. The list of our activities could be extended at some length, but that isn't our purpose here.

We are much concerned with the fact that our population is growing and that the interest in outdoor recreation is increasing apparently much more rapidly than facilities can be provided. Thus far we substantially agree with and endorse the wilderness advocates of having some areas maintained in their natural state. The problem is not one of being for or against wilderness. Regrettably, many wilderness partisans put any opposition to their views in exactly these terms. Rather, the objective is a proper balance of finding as much room and opportunity as possible for all groups consonant with the demand and with available facilities.

One aspect of this which makes it difficult to maintain a completely calm demeanor when considering the question of the procedural history of this particular controversy, through much of 1959 there were rumors of impending action to be implemented with the minimum of notice and hearing required by law. This process was apparently halted only through the timely efforts of Senator McGee in calling his hearing last February. Now, hard upon the heels of that hearing

there have been -- this being the third -- three additional hearings. It is hard for us to believe that the situation during these intervening months has altered so greatly as to produce any startling new testimony either on one side or the other, and we wonder if maybe the Park Service intends to continue calling these hearings the way they have until a record satisfactory to the Park Service has been created.

We must also confess to some confusion about the Park Service's reasons for wishing to close these areas. Initially there was a great deal of emphasis placed upon the factor of erosion. Now it has been implied that this argument was an unfortunate mistake. While agreeing that the argument had no merit, we feel constrained to point out that there is no assurance that the arguments raised in these hearings to support this action may not likewise be discredited or abandoned at some future time.

We are told that the closure is necessary to protect nesting waterfowl. It seems that the arguments with reference to big game have been abandoned. Yet it is true that in February Mr. Garrison readily acknowledged to Senator McGee that from this standpoint the areas to be closed could be markedly reduced in size.

This is mentioned primarily to point out our

confusion on this point. Following our consistent policy of seeking a proper accommodation with all important interests -- and certainly the protection of our nesting waterfowl is an important interest -- we would be more than happy to consent to the closing of certain areas for the protection of these birds. As we read the testimony of the February hearing, boaters in the area, in the main, are likewise willing to agree to proper, reasonable arrangements in this regard. If there are sufficient reasons why certain areas must be buoyed off for the protection of wildlife, and if the existing confusion as to the proof of such necessity has arisen because of improper or insufficient presentation of evidence to date, then we have very little in dispute here. We certainly offer our full cooperation to the National Park Service in arriving at a satisfactory solution. We only seek authoritative evidence upon which we can rely.

V
winning

The questions of sanitation, general boat safety or litter -- I believe Mr. Garrison himself has testified that these are of no great consequence.

This would appear to bring it down to the remaining argument that it is necessary to close off these arms so the canoeist will have an unspoiled area in which to do their paddling. Here we come to the

heart of the question of seeking a reasonable accommodation or a balance of interests.

✓ We certainly do not deny that there ought to be places where persons interested in canoeing in strictly wilderness areas should have an opportunity to do so. We say this notwithstanding the fact that there seems to be relatively little demand by our citizens for this kind of activity. We say "relatively" because obviously this is something which must be measured against total recreational demands. The question is of anticipated usage and whether this particular form of recreation does not already have more than its fair share of facilities available , particularly in the Yellowstone Park area.

We are advised that there are 214 other lakes in Yellowstone. Admittedly none of these compare to Yellowstone Lake. They are all apparently quite small, and there seems to be justification for keeping these unspoiled. On the other hand, the boaters have only one lake. Now, I believe that maybe there are two other lakes upon which boating is allowed to some extent, but in the main the boaters have the one lake to look to.

Now, we don't propose to enter into the numbers game which has been played as to how much of the area percentagewise is actually being taken by the

proposed closure. We do, however, give credence to the considerable testimony already adduced that the best boating and fishing waters and the safest -- and let me emphasize that "safest" -- boating and fishing waters are in the South and Southeast arms. The taking of boating waters here is considerable and the de minimus rule has no application to this situation.

Now, the question isn't one of being for or against wilderness. The question is whether in the overall picture it is reasonable to take away the only prime boating area in Yellowstone Park -- and indeed it seems to affect a pretty large area where there isn't adequate boating waters, as people here from Utah have testified this morning -- and to turn this over to the very limited use of canoes and rowboaters, who already have other areas available to them with similar conditions and within Yellowstone Park.

✓
Note that from a strictly wilderness point of view, it might be desirable to retain the entire state of Wyoming or possibly the entire Northwest in its original condition. Maybe we could make one vast open-air museum of natural history.

(Applause.)

And if funds ever become available, we could put it under glass maybe.

Well, we say this is an absurdity, and I agree, but it is an absurdity mentioned only to demonstrate that in all of our decisions we have to strike a balance. We ask only that it be done openly and reasonably and without prejudice or haste.

We must also at all times keep in mind that it is possible -- and, in fact, in many instances most desirable -- to have gradations of wilderness. There are today wilderness areas which do not bar motorboats per se. With appropriate shoreline restrictions, the upper arms of Yellowstone Lake will still be wilderness areas, for all practical purposes, even with motorboats allowed. By no stretch of the imagination is Yellowstone Park as a whole, or the lake and its environs, in particular an absolute wilderness. There have been accommodations made because of visitor pressure and this has by no means made Yellowstone less of a national park or less of a desirable park.

We would now like to turn our attention to some of the specifics in the proposed regulations. Now, here I won't be dealing with a question of closure -- I am about finished with that -- but with the rules governing boat operation in Yellowstone Lake. We would like to take this opportunity to encourage the National Park Service to take another look at its pre-existing rule,

carried over into these new regulations, which provides that boats under sixteen feet must stay within one-quarter mile of shore.

✓
Granted it has been testified here this morning by a number of people that Yellowstone Lake is a dangerous lake. This would seem to be one of the reasons why boaters and fishermen would like to have the protection of these lower arms. Now, the absence of this sixteen-foot restriction on a good number of lakes of equal size and larger, and lakes presenting conditions which are equally dangerous, we haven't seen that that has caused any real problem.

✓
The cut-off point selected at sixteen feet is most unfortunate. There are a great many boats between fourteen and sixteen feet which are quite safe more than a quarter mile off shore. I am acquainted with one boat in particular that is fifteen feet eleven and one-half inches which is very seaworthy, much more so than many boats I am acquainted with in the twenty-foot class. It is also well-known that for many years manufacturers were constructing boats just barely under sixteen feet to avoid the necessity of complying with the Numbering Act of 1918.

Note, also, that when boating it is not a very easy or simple thing to determine when you are a

quarter mile from shore. All of us know that judging distances over water can be pretty tricky. In addition, on many waterways the area closest to shore is the most dangerous because of the possible trees and stumps and rocks and reefs and other hazards to navigation. In the event of a storm, it is sometimes safer to take a boat into deep water to ride it out than risking being blown onto the shore, and after hearing some of the things that I have heard said this morning, I may reflect afterwards upon the wisdom of including that particular point in this statement. Indeed the water is sometimes rougher close to the shore than further out. Basically this regulation on the part of the Park Service would appear to be paternalistic and maybe it would admit of some changing or doing away with altogether.

We would also like to respectfully suggest that the Park Service take another look at their regulations concerning limitation of boat loads. Overloading and overpowering of pleasure craft is, of course, a matter of considerable importance from a safety standpoint. It is also a matter which has been examined most closely in recent years by industry and other agencies of government. A considerable amount of engineering talent has been expended on finding a solution to this problem. At the moment, for example, instrumented

boat tests are being conducted utilizing the latest equipment to obtain better answers. The specific formula suggested in the regulations is, regrettably, too simple. If we have not as yet found what is the final answer to the overall question, we do at least know that it is not possible to simplify to this degree.

In discussing the Park Service's formula for determining boat capacity with one of our own engineers, his comments boiled down to this: that it is an oversimplification, and in more instances than not, it tends to overload rather than to underload.

Now, we don't say that we have a formula and here it is and this is the only one. We do think that we have a good one. It represents the judgment of a great many people in the boating industry and our own engineering staff, and we are trying to improve upon it, but it is certainly much better than the one that is being used by the Park Service.

A member of the Park Service staff told me this morning, "We have so many boats to check that we can't be bothered with a complicated formula." Well, I am sure there is some problem along that line, but to apply this one is going to defeat the purpose for which it was adopted. So we recommend that this formula be removed from the regulations. In many

instances it could be misleading to boaters and would encourage practices which would not be safe. We suggest that the question be taken up with the agency of the federal government which has devoted more time than any other to studying this question. That is, of course, the United States Coast Guard. We would also be happy to make available to the Park Service all the extensive testing records and experiences to date attempting to arrive at an accurate and workable formula.

I would like to point out, too, that today a great many boat manufacturers conduct tests on their own individual models in production, and they arrive at what they consider safe limits and they put plates on the boats to that effect. We think that these should be accepted by the Park as being valid.

✓ We also urge that the specific equipment and other safety rules be amended so that they are identical with those contained in the Motorboat Act of 1940 and the Coast Guard regulations. One of the major problems today is securing some uniformity between the various -- not competing, no -- just the various governmental agencies, and this is a big headache for the boater who wants to put his boat in a trailer and travel across the country and put it into waters, as he finds them, where boating is allowed.

Finally, OBC wishes to emphasize its absolute willingness to extend all of the facilities at its disposal in finding an intelligent and reasonable solution to this whole problem, the closure included. In an effort to avoid future acrimony and to produce agreement without discord, we extend to the officials of the National Park Service an invitation to meet with the leaders of the industry and sport to discuss this and other mutual problems of interest at an early date.

In conclusion, the Outboard Boating Club of America and many persons and groups in the area intimately concerned with the future of pleasure boating, are most appreciative of the opportunity to submit our views and make them of record. In summing up, we would like to salute the many persons, both at these hearings and in February, who have come literally hundreds of miles to testify at these hearings, and we think that this vigorously attests the seriousness with which this proposition is viewed.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Dyer. I would like to say this: that we do consult the Coast Guard very thoroughly on all our regulations. We do have safety engineers that are not employed by the

2.
government, which we hire as consultants to consult with on our regulations on safety matters especially. The responsibility of any federal agency, public agency, with the lives and welfare of the people on government property is a tremendous responsibility and one which we feel very strongly about, and consequently we spend considerable more money than people realize on getting the best advice possible. If you have any written material on why this regulation as to safety is not good, we would certainly want to take it and consider it and match it up with the Coast Guard and others that are dealing in that job all the time.

MR. DYER: Excuse me, sir. I was standing here listening to your remarks. We will make that available to you immediately.

HEARING OFFICER: Fine. We will be glad to have it.

I might say, also, that the February hearing, February 4th hearing, which I explained the other day, was not a departmental hearing; it was a hearing by the Senate Committee, and I am sure they are sorry that your material was not printed in their record, but I can also assure you that we will put your material in this record here for the Secretary. The responsibility for the policy of the Park Service is in the hands of

the Secretary and consequently he felt that even though the Senate had this hearing in February, that it should be presented in a way to cover more territory for more opportunity for consideration before a final decision -- hence, the three hearings.

The next gentleman is Mr. John Long of Idaho Falls who speaks for himself, and in the hole is Bruce Kilgore of the Sierra Club, who will present an official statement of the club.

Mr. Long, please.

JOHN LONG, 1965 SEQUOIA DRIVE, IDAHO FALLS,
IDAHO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I must say the hearings have not been at all as I expected. There has been less heat and more reasonable argument than I had hoped, and I have found the talks have been instructive so far.

My own background is that of a New Yorker. I was born and raised in New York City, lived there until I was twenty, and I have been out in this area only five years. As an outdoorsman --

A VOICE: Pardon me. Would the speaker use the microphone there?

MR. LONG: Certainly; I am sorry.

As an outdoorsman, I rank as a tenderfoot, but I do like canoeing. I think it is a superb way to

travel, even though canoes can't compete with motorboats. The previous speaker pointed out that in some areas of the country reservations are set aside where hand-propelled boats are permitted and powerboats are restricted, but there are precious few such waters in this area in spite of the thousands of lakes in Yellowstone Park. Most of these, of course, are not accessible to either motorboats or canoes.

On the other hand, the impression has been given that the only waters in this area available are Yellowstone Lake. Well, of course, Yellowstone Lake and Lewis Lake are the only major waters in Yellowstone Park which are available, but just south of that is another national park; Jackson Lake is pretty good water -- Jenny Lake. There is a lot of navigable portions of the Snake River. There is Palisades Lake, American Falls; up the other way, Hays Lake, Hebgen Lake. I could name dozens, and you could too, all within driving distance here and all available to motorboaters. So it is probably not fair to say that a major part of the available water in this area is being restricted.

From my own point of view as a canoeist, I would like to see waters which are available for canoeists and which would be free of powerboats. I have never

had the audacity to actually ask that such areas be set aside, but when the Park Service proposed this suggestion it seemed at first -- at first it seemed to me like a wonderful and fine idea from my own point of view, but I got to thinking about the suitability of this area for canoeing and a number of questions were raised in my mind which have already been mentioned by the previous speakers, about the length of time required, the size of water, the sudden storms in these mountain areas, the distance between camp spots and so on. I therefore arranged to take a trip by canoe down through the South Arm of Yellowstone Lake and made it within a three-day period.

In answer to some of the questions raised above, the waters of the South Arm are pretty big for canoes and I think canoes would be well advised to stay close to the shores in this area. Sudden storms do arise, but with precautions of staying close to shore and keeping your eye on the horizon, I think the canoeing is as safe there as you have in any boat on any lake. I was happy that there was relatively little interference from motorboats in this area to our canoe. I am not concerned that a motorboat would ever cause our canoe to capsize, both because of the stability of the craft and because of the courtesy which I have found

generally prevails among motorboaters. So I can not agree that a motorboat is a hazard for canoes.

But it is just this: As a canoeist, I like to get away sometimes where I can travel at a leisurely pace and in leisurely company without haste and in quiet without the noise of motorboats. I am happy to hear that mufflers are being developed for motorboats. They are not in use on the South Arm as yet. Motorboats are -- that we heard on the South Arm are audible for four or five miles.

It seems to me that this particular area which is set apart to be zoned is particularly suited as a wilderness area. It has not been badly exploited either by motorboatists or other travelers up to the present time, and I think it could be soon redeemed to be a complete wilderness area. I note, and you can see on the map, that the civilized developments along the lake follow along on the north shore, that when one gets down to the mouth of the south arms, say Plover Point, one is already twelve or fifteen miles away from the more civilized and mechanized areas, and that the two arms extend down as long fingers into the wilderness areas, which use up relatively little of the available water and yet extend way down into the heart of this beautiful and wild country.

Now, as an easterner, I point out that in many areas of the East the increase in population was not anticipated, the intensity of urbanization was not anticipated, and so the wilderness areas which were set aside there are now quite crowded. I think it is well for us to try to avoid the mistakes which were made in the other parts of the country, set aside large tracts of wilderness area now to be available as a very-long-term investment in wilderness real estate. I realize that there are many wilderness areas in the Park, but these proposals under consideration at the present are rather unique in that they are the only wilderness areas easily accessible by water.

Now, I would like to say that our trip down the South Arm was a pleasant two-and-a-half or three-hour paddle, but this would not be exactly true. It was hard work and by the time we reached Peale Island at the head of the arm, we were very tired. But all in all it was a wonderful experience and one that we would be happy to repeat if the chance comes up.

Mention was made of the storm of August 22nd and 23rd. I was in the South Arm on August 22nd. We were returning from Peale Island. The water was choppy but our canoe rode well, and although the Rangers told us later that in their experience of some eight

years on the lake it was about as bad a storm as they had ever seen on the main lake, still we had no difficulty riding close to shore on the South Arm. It was a very thrilling experience. I hope you motorboaters will try it sometime. It may be a new experience to you, but it is certainly a marvelous way to travel, a marvelous leisurely way to see these wilderness areas.

I support the Park proposal. I believe it is good to set aside these wilderness reservations at this time before it is too late. Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. The next gentleman to be heard is Mr. Bruce Kilgore of the Sierra Club, and he is presenting an official statement from the club, and in the hole is C. A. Patterson, D.D.S., Idaho Falls, President of the Snake River Boat Club.

BRUCE KILGORE, SIERRA CLUB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am managing editor of the Sierra Club publication program, and for those of you who are not acquainted with the club, it is one of the nations largest citizen volunteer conservation organizations, having special interest in park and wilderness preservation. The organization was founded by John Muir in 1892 and now numbers more than 16,000 members residing in all fifty

states and Canada.

I speak today for the directors and members of this organization.

As we would see it, the conflict of ideas represented here today is between those who want unlimited motorboat use of all parts of Yellowstone Lake and the trained personnel of the National Park Service who are charged by law with saving and perpetuating the existing bird and mammal population and natural conditions of Yellowstone National Park. In order to preserve these irreplaceable wildlife and wilderness values, the Service plans to exclude motorboats from a section of the waters of Yellowstone Lake, waters which penetrate unspoiled mountain scenery, and waters which constitute habitat for many Park birds and mammals relatively undisturbed by man.

Simply stated, the question before us today is whether or not we are going to permit the desires of a minority of Americans, those wanting free rein on every foot of Yellowstone Lake, to not only take precedence over the best interests of the majority, but also to (1) obliterate the opportunity for owners of canoes, rowboats, and kayaks to visit an undisturbed wilderness section of the lake; and (2) to cause considerable destruction of birds, eggs, nests, and fledglings in

the Molly Island rookery area of the Southeast Arm and to disturb other important wildlife habitats in the three arms in question.

It has been pointed out that due to the tremendous power of twin inboard and outboard motors, which generate an excessive wake, hand-propelled craft such as those mentioned are considered unsafe for use near areas of heavy motorboat traffic. Therefore, if we are to provide both for motorboat and for canoe and rowboat recreation on Yellowstone Lake, there must be some zoning of the lake. We don't see what reasonable complaint our motorboating friends can have regarding a proposal which designates a large part of the lake for their use and a small part for canoes, wilderness and wildlife.

Moving on to what we consider to be the more important question of preservation of national park values, the proposed National Park Service regulations could quite reasonably be put into effect simply for the protection of wildlife, without any reasoning based on the equitable distribution of public use. For in addition to setting aside Yellowstone as a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, the 1872 law establishing the Park enumerated the resources to be preserved for all time from wanton

destruction. These were, among a number of others, the natural curiosities or wonders and fish and game of the Park.

✓ The National Park Service Act of August 25, 1916, re-emphasizes this statement of intent in its oft-quoted phraseology: the National Park Service "shall promote and regulate the use of the parks" so as "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of same in such manner and by such means as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

This is a mandate which the National Park Service tries to carry out. It is a mandate which the Park Service certainly cannot carry out if it continues to permit unrestricted use of Yellowstone Lake by all forms of motorboats.

The number of visitors to Yellowstone Park has grown from a very few to nearly one and one-half million, thus adding tremendously to the great responsibility of the National Park Service to provide for both use and preservation. One of the types of use which has grown greatly in the last decade is that of motorboats on Yellowstone Lake. In 1954 there were 1,758 boats in use. By 1959 this had grown to nearly

5,000 These 5,000 boats mean something like 20,000 people, or less than one and one-half percent of the total Park visitors.

The ever-greater problem caused by this increase in motorboats use on Yellowstone Lake can be better understood in the light of the damage caused by even a few boats in certain sections of the lake. Despite statements to the contrary by some of the motorboat industry, the very competent biologists of the National Park Service have demonstrated that the wake and noise of a large boat a half mile offshore may directly or indirectly destroy birds' nests and fledglings on the Molly Islands and other important bird nesting areas.

It is quite obvious that motorboating is not compatible with wilderness, with wildlife, nor with quiet canoe trips.

The National Park Service must be concerned with the one and one-half percent of its visitors who want to use motorboats, as well as the rest of the visitors, who either directly use the wilderness as wilderness or understand the meaning of wilderness to Yellowstone merely because wilderness is there. The Park Service has proposed that the South, Southeast and Flat Mountain Arms of Yellowstone Lake be restricted to hand-propelled craft only -- nonmechanized.

During the past year there has been a campaign of dissemination of misinformation about the National Park Service's proposal. This propaganda has been fed both to newspapers surrounding the Park and to individuals and organizations in various parts of the country. The usual arguments against any type of wilderness dedication have been used together with some special arguments adapted to the local Yellowstone situation.

Opponents of these very mild regulations have stated that only selfish, rich, wealthy young people will benefit by this proposal. They maintain that wildlife and motorboats get along fine together. They state that storm damage is much greater than any caused by the boat wake. They ask, "How can wilderness be enjoyed if no one can see it? We must have boats to get in to enjoy wilderness." They condemn the Park Service for keeping out women, children, and crippled people because lack of comfort and safety in the arms, they maintain, will preclude these groups seeing them. They allege that it is illegal because of the 1872 Act, which they quote only in part as dedicating Yellowstone as a public park or pleasuring ground. They even invoke deity, saying that it is their God-given right to enjoy this area as they wish.

As one man put it: "Members of our club feel

every American citizen is entitled to drop anchor in these sheltered arms of Yellowstone Lake. The question is, what constitutes a national park if it isn't supposed to be a playground for everyone?"

This reminds us of a story told by the Park Ranger of a lady who, after paying her Yellowstone entrance fee, asked the Ranger, "Which side of the road are the moose on?"

The most charitable conclusion one could reach is that she did not understand the purpose and meaning of national parks as differentiated from a zoo. Neither, it would seem, do some of the motorboaters understand this purpose, and particularly those who insist that no body of water be denied to them or to their search for speed and horsepower status, and who thereupon are fighting for the right to invade and disrupt at will what should be the wilderness waters of Yellowstone National Park.

There are many individuals dedicated to the national park principle who feel that any kind of motorboat on any portion of the lake does not conform to the Act of 1916 establishing the National Park Service.

Since motorboat use and wilderness use of Yellowstone Lake are not compatible, it appears obvious that some restrictions are necessary to provide both types of

experience. While those who desire to paddle a canoe across some wilderness sections of Yellowstone Lake -- like motorboat enthusiasts -- are but a segment of the total number of people using the Park, they, like motorboaters, should have a place on Yellowstone Lake.

If these regulations are not put into effect, the motorboating minority will have been given the right to exclude other visitors from a rightful experience: the experience of knowing that untrammelled wilderness still exists on and near Yellowstone Lake, whether or not they set foot or paddle in it.

While the argument based on the rightful experiences of one group of national park visitors versus the rightful experiences of another group is a most important argument, the effect of motorboat use on the wildlife of Yellowstone must also be carefully considered. Molly Islands, in the Southeast Arm, provide the only utilized nesting territory on Yellowstone Lake for four species of oceanic birds: the white pelican, the California gull, the double-crested cormorant, and the Caspian tern.

Cormorants and terns are most sensitive to any type of disturbance while nesting. Cormorants fly off when boats are still 100 yards offshore. This abandonment of the nest and young by the adult bird

leaves them open to predation by gulls as well as to the effects of weather and the wake of passing motorboats. Motorboaters' pseudo-biological conclusions should not be set forth as fact -- conclusions jumped to after casual and prejudiced observation.

And finally a point considered most important by the Sierra Club: Mechanical noise destroys wilderness.

The exhaust, the racket and the roar of motorboats slice through wilderness just as effectively -- even if for shorter periods of time -- as a bulldozer putting a new road through a primeval forest.

The Sierra Club urges that action be taken quickly to set aside the Southeast, South and Flat Mountain arms of Yellowstone Lake for hand-propelled craft only. The National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior should put the proposed regulations into effect without delay. It is hoped that the motorboating groups -- when they realize the importance of the issue at stake -- will join with conservationists and the National Park Service in supporting these important proposals. Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much, Mr. Kilgore.

I am going to insert at this time -- because I

think I will not get any more letters here today -- I have a letter here from Mr. L. C. Binford, who is Chairman of the Executive Board of Directors of the Izaak Walton League of America, who asked me to read this into the record. I will not read it into the record but will put it into the record, because of trying to save some time; so that will be printed in as requested.

(The above-referred-to letter from L. C. Binford is copied into the record, as follows:)

L. C. BINFORD
Attorney at Law
6802 N.E. Broadway
Portland 13, Oregon

August 22, 1960

Mr. Conrad L. Wirth
Director National Park Service
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Special Delivery Letter to Civic Auditorium, August 26, 1960

Dear Mr. Wirth:

It had been my intention to attend the public hearing you are holding at Idaho Falls to hear testimony on the proposed limitation of use of boats on Yellowstone Lake, but inability to secure direct air transportation has made it impossible.

Representatives of Izaak Walton League will have appeared before you at Cody, Wyoming, and at Lake Hotel in Yellowstone National Park. While these appearances were by men who live in Wyoming, you can be assured that they presented the views of members generally of the

Izaak Walton League of America.

Improved highways and boat trailers have made it possible for we owners of boats to travel great distances for our boating pleasure. Last year I trailed my boat 6,000 miles and was as far as 2,500 miles from Portland, Oregon.

Having read recent magazine articles on Yellowstone Lake and the testimony from the "Hearings before a . . . Committee on appropriations, United States Senate . . on proposed boating regulations for Yellowstone Lake," I now plan to trail my boat to that lake.

Surely Yellowstone Lake is large enough to serve motorboat owners and to leave a little area for those who like to escape the 'whine' of motors. Regulation as proposed excluding motors from South Arm of the lake should be put into effect at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully yours,

L. C. Binford, Chairman
Executive Board of Directors
Izaak Walton League of America
6802 NE Broadway
Portland 13, Oregon

* * * * *

HEARING OFFICER: I also have received since I have been here twelve letters in opposition to the proposed regulations, and they will be placed in the

file, but the list of the names of those who sent in the letters and the position they took will be put in the printed record; and I also have twenty-seven letters in favor of the proposal received since I have been here and they will be treated the same way as those which are in opposition.

(The above-referred-to names appear in the record at the close of this day's proceedings.)

HEARING OFFICER: The next person to be heard is C. A. Patterson, President of the Snake River Boat Club, and he will be followed by Dr. Milton D. Rees, who is Public Relations Chairman of the Snake River Boat Club; he is in the hole.

C. A. PATTERSON, D.D.S.; IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO;
PRESIDENT, SNAKE RIVER BOAT CLUB: Thank you, Mr. Wirth.

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to represent the Snake River Boat Club as its president. We have 100 families in this club. But I am also a member of the Bonneville County Sportsmen's Association which numbers about 5,000 people. I also represent the Russell Lions Club, which is forty-two families. I represent the Pocatello Boat Club with seventy-five families. I am head of the boys and girls committee of our Russell Lions Club. I am also merit badge counselor for Troop 6, boy scouts, locally, so I

feel I represent about 2,000 people when I give my views on the resistance to closing these arms for the use of what we consider the public.

I am from an area in Minnesota, the lake region of Minnesota, and I moved to this wonderful country because of the wilderness. I am a true wilderness lover. There isn't anything that gives me a greater thrill than to smell pines out in the primitive forests or hear the lapping of water way away from other people. However, I feel that the other man has a right to that same water. Why should we exclude him from a privilege that I enjoy so much?

I also have a small motorboat -- the smallest in my club, by the way. I own a rubber boat -- a rubber raft, rather -- and a kayak. And as a canoeist in Minnesota years ago, I have taken two-week trips very often; and if we could, we would have a little motor along, by the way, to get us back when we ran out of food.

So I have grown, more or less, from the canoeing and I feel that a major portion of the canoeists -- and they are true wilderness lovers. I know many of the men who have spoken previously. I have gone on camping trips with them and they are very fine sportsmen. However, a great number of them in time will come over

to the motorboats, as I have, and if I take a canoe trip into there, I would certainly appreciate the privilege of taking a small motor along. And I would like to go into those arms with a canoe, but I would like a motor to get me back. I can't spend all summer up there, if the weather happens to turn perverse.

Now, there are many bodies of water that I have gotten into with my kayak. I have a fold boat that two of us can fold up into a package of approximately forty pounds, and I can get into some of the most gosh-awful places with that thing you ever heard of, so I know there is going to be no roars of motors and stench of gasoline there and it is very secluded; very difficult to get there so very often, if I want to get way back.

However, I don't always have time to do that, but on a weekend, on a three-day vacation, I can enjoy Yellowstone Park. I can take my entire family with me, where on these kayak pack-trips or saddle-horse trips, generally my two sons and I will go alone, only the two, leaving the two women at home, my daughter and wife.

But the shortage of water in this area, to a former Minnesotan who has canoed through a great deal of an area -- and lived on a lake -- where almost everyone owned a lake up there -- I owned a lake exclusively,

myself, in the past, but the shortage of water in this area is appalling. We are so destitute of water for boating use that it seems almost criminal that anyone would think of stealing any of the water from us. We of the boat fraternity were so happy to see Palisades Reservoir come in, but now the water-users have drawn all the water out of it and it is a big mudhole. Yellowstone Lake is really the only escape for a boater in some of this area.

6 The county I lived in in Minnesota had more water than the whole State of Idaho; and water is a nuisance up there, so they can set aside certain tracts of water exclusively for the use of canoers. Now in the same light, I feel that the Park has done a fine thing in putting aside Flat Mountain Arm. There is five miles of water. It takes a pretty good canoeist to go five miles to camp and come back. But why should the canoeists want more than that five miles of water?

Every body of water in the state also has a section set aside where there is no one goes in, fishing is restricted; and boaters, who are self-governing people, clean, honest, law-abiding taxpayers, are self-regulating to a great degree. They will abide by the laws. Regulations could be made to make things more practical for the boaters, for their families, and for the canoeists.

I many times picked canoeists up in Minnesota when they were in trouble and the winds came up and they couldn't get back; if I had a motor, I would help them in. If I was on the other end, I certainly appreciated seeing the man with the boat come up and help me out of the trouble.

But I feel that the five miles that has already been set aside, of primitive area, is very practical. It is within reach of most canoeists, although most of them would appreciate the help of a motor to get them there. Even Flat Mountain Arm would be a lot better accessible with a small motor on the back of the canoe.

V I feel also that we pleasure boaters solved another major social problem. In this growing times when the cities are becoming so large there is a tremendous need for escape. We have millions of people coming along, future generations and countless lions needing this recreation. Can we turn our backs on the fact that our population has increased thirty million in the last ten or twenty years? And there is a tremendous population boom that there is just no accounting for. Are we facing this problem realistically in shutting down more of the water areas, shutting down the areas, closing out the men who would like to

get out and use recreational facilities and this primitive area? Most people do not have the means of getting back there other than with a motorboat.

Now, there were thirty-nine million people used motorboats in 1959, and that is a fairly good population segment; it is not a tiny minority group. However, the statistics just quoted by Mr. Kilgore about this area being so infrequently used by boats -- only one and one-half percent of the visitors to Yellowstone Park, it is true, have their boats along. However, these people came from places where they had water, where they were not confined to small congested areas with their boats. They have their own water back there. They come out here -- I have taken people from Minnesota up to Yellowstone Lake, however, and they have enjoyed the waters that we have. They have the facilities back there, but they would like to see our water also.

Just because we do not use the water back there, why should we restrict that, put it aside, eliminate its usage? I feel we are solving a major social need in recreation for the average person who can get out and use these facilities, by having this water kept open and expanding facilities rather than closing them down.

Now, we realize the Park is really under the

gun for expanding facilities. There should be an answer. They need more money and more improvements. However, closing it down does not solve the problem; it creates more congestion in the areas that are available yet. So I think we could face this more realistically and provide more room and not crowd people together more completely on these areas that are left open for the boaters which are not the choice areas.

Another thing about a boat with a motor on it, it is amazing the similarity to a big boat without a motor when you turn off the key. It is almost like a canoe. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.

The next witness is Dr. Milton T. Rees, who is Public Relations Chairman of the Snake River Boat Club, and in the hole will be Merle Britton of Idaho Falls, representing the River Rogue Boat Club -- Rogue River Boat Club, I would imagine.

A VOICE: You were right the first time.

HEARING OFFICER: All right. You are in the hole.

DR. MILTON T. REES, M.D.; 360 12TH ST., IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO; PUBLIC RELATIONS CHAIRMAN, SNAKE RIVER BOAT CLUB: Mr. Chairman, I deem it a pleasure to be able

to speak here a few minutes. I know a lot has been said and some might be in repetition.

I just want to say that before I came over here I talked to a man whom I was instrumental in getting out of the iron curtain, and I told him what meeting I was going to attend, and I said, "The Director of the National Park Service is going to be here and we are going to have the privilege of standing up and voicing our views in this matter." And he says, "Only in the United States could that happen," and he says, "Over in Germany" -- and I spent three years there -- "they would close the waters and that would be the end of it."

So we deem it a pleasure and we do think it is exceptionally fine that you could find time to come out here and hear our views on this matter.

I see Mr. Garrison has slipped out the back. I think he has heard me so often and he had so much correspondence from me, that he was glad to leave. However, I have heard that he and Mr. Wirth have been together for the last few days. And to show the esteem that Mr. Wirth has of Lemuel Garrison -- or "Lon," as we call him -- if you remember when we had the earthquake here and Yellowstone Park was being shaken to pieces and our teeth were chattering and our buildings were wobbling back and forth, he gave a statement to the public.

He says, "Now, you folks relax." He says, "The Park will soon be back at normal and operating." He says, "I have an excellent man out there, an old campaigner," he said, "He is used to trouble -- Lemuel A. Garrison." He says, "He will take care of those quakes in a hurry."

I would like to say that I have been boating on Yellowstone Lake for thirty-five years. That is a long time. I covered a survey of the birds on Molly Island for the University of Utah in 1930. In thirty-five years I have seen very little change in the lake. I have seen diminution of the number of birds on Molly Island, but I don't say that that is the boats that have done it. I say that those birds are not under the Park jurisdiction or custodianship all the time. They make long flights to the south, farmers take pot-shots at them, school boys do. And if you will look over every bird rookery in the United States but maybe one or two -- very few exceptions -- where the birds are watched and patrolled all the time, they are all getting fewer. It is not the boats that are destroying them.

I won't mention anything about the wakes. I know that has been discussed, and I think our wakes are not causing much of that trouble.

Now, I think that there are thirty-nine million

people participating in boating. Two and a half billion dollars are spent in recreational boats and equipment, and there are eight million recreational boats in the United States and six million of these are the smaller outboard type, mostly the type in use on Yellowstone Lake.

Boating is a family sport in which old and young, all can participate; and if the arms of Yellowstone Lake are closed, our old people will not be able to enjoy this wonderful area. And I take in consideration the man who was seventy-two years old who went down there. He is an exception. I am a physician. I know that people seventy-two years old as a rule are not out roughing it in rowboats and in canoes.

I have a little mother eighty years old. She loves to go down there with me. I wouldn't want to put her in a canoe. We even have a little spot down there we call "Grandma Rees' Point," she goes there so often and she enjoys it so much. And smaller children who are eager to catch a fish -- it denies the pleasure of this area to the public in general. I am sure there will be few that will take access to it.

Now, that is the only place that I know of in the west where you can take a visitor or a boy and in a very short time have them into a primitive area and

be guaranteed that they can catch a native trout. These arms are too far away from the highway to be reached by canoe, unless they are towed by bigger boats and at the discretion or at the mercy of the concessionaires. And hikers and horseback riders are very few in there.

The other day, two weeks ago, I was down at Peale Island and had the pleasure of seeing for the first time in thirty-five years a horseback party come through. They were the Wilderness Area Riders and they stopped at Peale Island and they enjoyed a very fine boat ride furnished by the Ranger No. 1, a big boat powered with twin-screw Chrysler engines, and one of the riders said that was one hell of a trip, the boat ride they had down at the South Arm. I was fishing on the shore, fly-fishing. The big boat went by. I was out about to my knees in the water, and the wake from this twin-screw boat didn't go over my hip boots, but just about. They made me stand on my tip-toes; so that wake probably, again, is not to be considered.

Now, the Park Service says they are only taking a small part of the lake, they only want a small part of the lake, but they want about forty-five percent of the shoreline (indicating map), of the best fishing, the most protected area. This part of this shoreline from here down is nothing but rocks.

HEARING OFFICER: There is a marker on the table there if you want to use it.

MR. REES: Thank you, sir. This part is dangerous (indicating). If wind comes, it will pound a boat to pieces, and even beaching a boat there in a storm will swamp them. So this part of the lake is not good for boating.

If they would give us two buoyed right of ways through here to these choice (indicating) areas of the lake, we would give them this open part for the boats; but that is the choice part of the lake that they want -- the best fishing, the most wildlife and the most primitive of all the lake.

I don't know whether this gentleman from the Sierra Club realized that ninety-six percent of the Park right now is primitive area and that they have three other good big lakes that are in primitive areas: Shoshone Lake, Heart Lake and Beula Lake. Now, Beula Lake is not very big, but Shoshone is a big lake and Heart Lake is a big lake; so why should we give up one that is readily available for boats when there is so much primitive area already in existence there? If there was no other primitive area, Mr. Wirth, I am sure we would be glad to relinquish any claim to that for boats.

(Applause.)

As I mentioned before, another complaint is that we disturb animals. I have a picture of a bull moose chasing my two daughters into the boat, and the picture isn't complete because I dropped the camera and ran and let out a holler before he helped them in the boat with his horns. I just don't believe we are bothering the animals up there. Sometimes they bother us.

I had a group of Explorer Scouts out on the Flat Mountain Arm and they stayed up all one night keeping a bear out of the camp, and the bear would go in one side of the tents and the boys would come out the other, and they wouldn't use the doorway either.

At one time we could use Dot Island for a camping ground. It was ideal because the bears couldn't molest us. That has been taken away from us. There has never been a campground on Frank Island, that of, but Dot Island was equipped with lavatories and tables and fireplaces and was an ideal place for boaters. We can't boat on any -- or camp on any of the islands now, so we think that they have some discrimination against the boaters.

I think, too, that the Park should certainly expand their facilities. One of the mats there at the Thumb launching sites was donated by a personal friend

of mine, now deceased, Steven L. Richards. I helped put in some of the launching places out there.

I don't believe -- and I want to make this my last statement -- that we can afford to designate such a wonderful site, an area, to be used by so few people. They say that only one and a half percent of the Park visitors come in there with boats, and I am sure that that would be greatly reduced if, for example, that area was restricted only to hand-operated boats and canoes.

I think that boaters in general are conservationists. They are sportsmen. We have all volunteered to help Mr. Garrison all we can up there. We have had a suggestion sent him that if he is undermanned he could deputize a few of the men like they do here in the county. When our county commissioners first saw the waters up there at Palisades it looked like a tub full of corks on a weekend, and they threw up their hands because their sheriff force did not have enough to do it. But our sheriff deputized twelve good men in this town, as water deputies, with their jurisdiction limited only on the waters of Bonneville County, and it greatly helped the situation.

I have also written Mr. Garrison a letter telling him if the Park boats would fly the Park flag

so they could be recognized, what a great help it would be in controlling a few boaters who do hot-rod around or do get too close to the nesting birds.

Once again, I want to make myself known as how grateful I am of the privilege in being able to speak in behalf of the citizens. I think if these arms are taken away from us it will be a direct blow against the people who have boats and who have used those arms for thirty-five years and who have not damaged them and who have not drowned the ducks and who have not eroded the shorelines. We might have littered the shore a little bit, but it was because no facilities were set up there for us to drop our garbage in. However, the big boats have their own shredding machines. They will cut up the pieces and drop it in the lake and it doesn't reach the shore to clutter it up.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Dr. Rees. We appreciate your kind remarks.

The next witness is Merle Britton of Idaho Falls, representing the River Rogue Boat Club, and in the hole will be Jack Hagen of Idaho Falls, speaking for himself.

MERLE BRITTON; IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO; RIVER ROGUE BOAT CLUB: My name is Merle Britton. I have no claims or distinctions as a doctor or a specialist in wildlife. About the only claim I can make is I have raised a family, my wife and I have enjoyed the experience and we have enjoyed boating for a good many years. I started boating back in Missouri in a rowboat. A school marm in Minnesota taught me how to handle a canoe. I boated in powerboats on the Columbia, the Colorado, Lake Yellowstone, Puget Sound. I find it a wonderful experience and one that even at my age I can still enjoy. I have here a prepared statement that expresses the position of our boat club in regards to this closing. Unquestionably we are opposed to it. Do you want to include it in the record?

HEARING OFFICER: We will include it in its entirety.

MR. BRITTON: In its entirety?

HEARING OFFICER: Yes.

(The above-referred-to statement is copied into the record, as follows:)

A statement presented on behalf of the River Rouges Boat Club in Cody, Wyoming, on February 3, 1960.

Honorable Senator McGee:

I first wish to express my appreciation for

unrecorded

the privilege of appearing at this hearing relative to the closing of the arms of Yellowstone Lake to public boating. My own interest and experience in boating covers a span of nearly fifty years, from home-made row-boats of boyhood to canoes, skiffs, kayaks, and early outboards, down to our present plastic runabout, with few interruptions. The present boat has made many trips to Yellowstone Lake as well as carrying us to scenic spots and fishing grounds in the lakes of northern Idaho, salmon fishing on the Pacific at West Port Washington, for bass on Lake Meade, and many spots in between.

I represent thirty-five members of the River Rouge Boat Club with headquarters on the Snake River near Roberts, Idaho, and many of their friends and neighbors who have expressed concern about the action being considered here.

One of the reported reasons for the proposed closing of these arms to motorboat traffic, is the erosion of the shoreline created by waves in their wake. If this were occurring, the first to cry out for action to stop it would be the members of the boating clubs. They are pledged to the support of conservation and dedicated to the preservation of the natural beauty of our shoreline wherever found. Anyone familiar with the

weather during the boating season on Yellowstone Lake has a healthy respect for the frequent thunderstorms that occur and fears the power of the waves that accompany it. They also know that daily the wind normally arises before noon and blows until sundown, with waves marching before it across the lake of greater force and many times more numerous than all the boats on the lake could create in an entire season. Frankly, this reason is complete ridiculous.

The point has also been brought up that the closing is desirable to protect the wildlife, both bird and animal, from the disturbance caused by boats. The need for sanctuary for nesting areas is recognized and admitted; however, in these arms the only such areas brought to my attention are small, easily marked, and would be cheerfully respected without closing the entire arm. Modern boats, both outboard and inboard, are equipped with adequate mufflers and are at least not any more noisy than the cars on the highway. It is easily observed that these cars have had no marked effect in disturbing the animals, even having trouble at times getting them off the road to allow passage. In my own observation, elk, moose and bear have each shown little or no concern at the near approach of boats.

Discussion has also been raised relative to

spawning grounds for the native cutthroat trout, with apprehension expressed that these arms must be closed to insure their continued propagation. It is an established fact that the fish population of Yellowstone Lake has increased rapidly since the closing of the fish hatchery which was supplying fingerlings to other areas by stripping fish trapped in the lake.

Further reason given for closing these arms and restricting boating activity refers to the boating group as a "minority." Being a member of that "minority" group is a privilege shared by many. For example, Bonneville County, in the State of Idaho, alone has registered 631 boats in 1959. According to the OBC Bulletin, Volume 2, No. 8, issue of November 1959, the nation's total pleasure craft fleet exceeded 7,700,000 boats. Of these, 5,525,000 were outboards. Quoting from the same source, "Some 39,000,000 Americans, men, women, and children of all ages took to the nation's waterways in boats of every description for fun and recreation in 1959 * * * * * There is every indication that boating will continue to grow at a rapid rate, bringing two and one-half to three million newcomers into the sport each year." This appears to be a very sizable "minority," who would be deprived of the use of the area in question.

This group of people come from all walks of life. They have homes and jobs and are active supporters of civic affairs in their communities. They pay taxes on their property and on their income to support local, state and national government, the same as every other citizen. In addition, they also pay taxes on their boats and boating equipment. They respect the rights of others and do not expect special privileges. Neither do they like to be discriminated against.

A great deal of money, taxpayers' money, has been spent and is being spent to improve facilities for the regular tourist in the parks. The boatman cannot park his boat in the same area. Special areas are set aside for camp trailers. Not even a single dock is available to the boatman except for the time it takes to purchase fuel. The launching ramps are crowded, remote from campgrounds and lacking essential facilities, such as parking, water and toilets.

✓ The present campgrounds on the arms of Yellowstone Lake are scarcely worthy of the name, with the exception of Trail Creek. Toilet facilities are sketchy or nonexistent, and what few tables there are must be propped up to use. Garbage pits likewise are either too shallow, practically inside the campground or omitted altogether. The bears are permitted more privileges

than the humans, with immunity for depredations to property, public and private.

With such campgrounds, the boaters are blamed for not keeping campgrounds tidy. The 2nd of July 1959 Mrs. Britton and myself spend four hours cleaning up the campground on Flat Mountain Arm and burying the debris in the shallow pit provided, preparatory to a club outing the following day. No new material was added as we dug ourselves a new pit farther from the campground. When we returned with the group the morning of the 3rd, our work had all been undone. A bear had visited the site during our absence and scattered everything out again. This was pointed out to a Ranger inspecting our camp later, whose only comment was, "Remember, the bears were here first." A number of our group were later reprimanded for "rocking" the bear away from the camp during this same inspection.

There was no toilet facility at this campground, although near the water's edge was stored a complete prefab unit, knocked down and strapped, appropriately labeled, "Government property." A similar unit was also found on South Arm at another campground, likewise lacking this facility.

We of that "minority," respectfully submit our own recommendations for some changes which we feel

are needed badly on Yellowstone Lake. The first and simplest of these changes recommended is the placing of jurisdiction for all boats on Yellowstone Lake, and all national lakes or waterways, under the competent authority of the U. S. Coast Guard. This would assure both the public and Park Service fair and unbiased administration by competent, well-trained personnel.

At present, permits are issued and boats are regulated under authority of the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Chapter 1, Part 20.13; Yellowstone National Park. This is a brief but comprehensive document, with provisions to prohibit commercialism, limit maximum size and type of boat, and safety provisions acceptable to all boatmen.

While the regulations as written are considered reasonable, their interpretation and enforcement is discriminatory. For example, all boats, inboard or outboard, with centerline measurement of sixteen feet or less, are restricted to operation within one-fourth mile off shore only. Authority for this restriction is claimed under Paragraph 6 of the above-named code, which is quoted here in its entirety:

(6) "Special limits for small boats. No boat sixteen feet or less in length measured through the middle of the boat from bow to stern, canoe (regard-

less of length) or other water-borne craft not propelled by motor shall be operated at a distance of more than one-quarter of a mile from the shore of any lake."

Congressman Jack Westland of Washington is quoted in the Bell Buoy Bulletin of December 11, 1959, after making inquiry on this subject to the Acting Director of National Park Service, Washington, D. C., calling attention to the fact -- "the regulation applies only to boats without motors." We agree with that interpretation, but restrictions are still issued. We further recommend that boat trailers and boats be subject to a fee similar to the one collected now for house trailers. In return for this fee, they would expect and should receive service in the form of adequate launching ramps, with all necessary facilities adjacent. Camping and parking areas should be available near the ramps, and improvements should be made to camps about the lake shore. Dockage should be provided at the ramps and campgrounds, and also in the area near stores to permit the boater to tie up in safety while procuring supplies. A nominal amount of supervision would be required together with garbage collection as in other areas of the Park.

If we could have a small part of this, a grateful and growing "minority" --the boating public -- would show their appreciation by continued cooperation

with all officials and groups interested in conservation, thankful to be once more welcome in our great and wonderful Park.

M. Britton, Chairman
Program Committee
River Rogue Boat Club

Home Address - 1285 Garfield
Idaho Falls, Idaho

* * * * *

MR. BRITTON: I would like to add a few remarks. I will make this brief because I know we are running late. As the Superintendent Garrison has returned -- and I am going to use his name in vain -- I may quote you, sir?

I have here the minutes of the meeting at Cody that I participated in. And in the absence of being an expert myself, I am going to use Superintendent Garrison's statement to support our contention that it is unnecessary to close these arms.

I will touch lightly on the wind damage because I think it has been pretty well conceded that this is not a real problem. It is apparent that if there was erosion in this lake there would be sediment in the water, at least around the boaters, and this is one of the clearest lakes I know of in the mountain area, so erosion is not a problem.

A point under contention, however, is the dangers to waterfowl nesting areas. In the first place,

it was conceded at the Cody hearing that most of the nesting is over before the heavy boating; and then secondly, Senator McGee asked pointedly if it were necessary to close the entire arm to protect the nesting areas at Molly Island. These were under mention at the time.

On Page 33 of this brochure Mr. Garrison stated that a one-half mile buffer zone or restricted area would be sufficient around nesting areas at Molly Island and including Trail Creek, Beaver Dam Creek, the lower Yellowstone River and certain areas around Peale Island. Now, I have not quoted you verbatim, but it is there.

A third point has been raised regarding irresponsible and hot-rod drivers of high-powered boats. All responsible boaters realize this is a serious problem and we are doing everything in our power to educate the boating public and, where necessary, to restrain them by legal action. Adequately patrolling and enforcement of existing rules on Yellowstone Lake could take care of this.

Superintendent Garrison agrees with the statement. I quote from Page 145 of the above brochure, his statement on this subject.

"I don't believe the discussion of the hot-rod issue is germane here because that is a matter we can

control by regulation and reasonable patrol, and it will be done within reason as far as we are able to do it."

And I promise you we of the boating public will help you do it, because this is one thing that we find is giving us a black eye when a few people go out and act foolish and make a rough name for us.

Now, Mr. Garrison continued this statement with another with regard to litter in campgrounds around the lake, another point in contention and has been made much of in this area. I quote:

"The litter situation is somewhat the same. We must share the responsibility for this because we have not made adequate provision for the disposal of litter up the lake. We intend to start work on that this summer. There have been many good suggestions."

I understand they have started work on that this summer. I have worked on it last summer and the summer before and the summer before and so have a lot of other boaters and we have worked on it almost entirely alone.

Considerable comment has also been made about this twenty percent -- and I am going to touch on this only lightly because other people have covered it -- but I assure you they are taking far more than forty percent of the good boating water that is open to us. They are

turning people loose -- as one gentleman mentioned -- in a rather large body of water with a canoe.

Now, ours is a relatively small boat and in the Thumb area along in the summer of '59 we picked up two boats in distress. The one was the 4th of July or the 5th of July, and that was down in the south end of the arm about where Grant Village is going to be -- four fishermen caught in a sudden blast of wind and carried out and unable to row back. And when my wife threw them the line their gunnel was practically under water, and we pulled them up onto that -- well, where they could jump out and push their boat up onto the sand at a point.

The other one occurred some three weeks later and was up close to the so-called launching ramp we have at Thumb, and this was an elderly gentleman in a rowboat. You know where the point comes out just below the launching ramp. He had got swept out there and it was getting quite rough. We were heading in for shelter when my wife called it to my attention. We turned around and circled them, gave them line and pulled them into the shelter. I beached my boat. I went over to help them with theirs and a young gentleman came crawling out of that boat and collapsed on the beach. He didn't

walk, he crawled. If they turn people loose in this manner in rowboats over in the South and Southeast arms, it is easy to predict the dire results this action will bring. I hope it doesn't happen. If there hadn't been a powerboat right there -- I am not a doctor, but I doubt if this old man would have ever gotten away from there alive.

Another objection offered refers to the noise created by the boats, resulting in the disturbance of animal and birdlife. This, too, has been well covered. I would just like to say two things. If you want to see the animals along the lake, you have got to get up early at daylight and cruise to do it, the same as you have to go in from West Yellowstone early if you want to see the elk and the animals down there, especially when it gets hot, because an animal is smart. He gets into the shade in the heat of the day. Hunters will testify that this is true of wild game anywhere.

The real problem seems to be one of administration. The growth of the boating population simply outstrips the Park Service's facilities for handling it. A complete but belated start has been made to improve these facilities.

Many references have been made to the Act of

March 1, 1871, which created Yellowstone Park as our first national park and the responsibility of the Park Service to protect from injury or spoilation all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities or wonders within said Park in retention in their natural condition. Included in this same Act in Section 1 is a statement that it is a public park or pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. The Park, to say it simply, is there for the people to use. The operation of boats on Yellowstone Lake is a continuation of that intended use and enjoyment of the Park, and we feel that the prevention of such use by the Park Service or any agency of the government, to the people for whom the Park was founded, is unthinkable and should not be permitted.

I thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Britton.

The next speaker is Jack Hagen of Idaho Falls, who speaks for himself, and in the hole will be Mr. Martin Trillhaase of Idaho Falls, who will also speak for himself.

JACK HAGEN, IDAHO FALLS: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

One of the previous speakers had mentioned that

one not having been on Yellowstone Lake would not be qualified to speak. However, there might be some other qualifications that are still more important. I consider myself privileged to be one of the few in the area today that have been raised in this country, not in this immediate country but in north Idaho. I have packed on a good many hundred miles of trails. I have been swamped in Coeur d' alene Lake in a boat. I have done quite a bit of boating at Puget Sound, and I think Lake Pend Oreille to the north might be comparable for roughness, but I am not going to talk on these points because, after all, it has been pretty well covered.

I think the important thing is we are talking about a national park now. Maybe it is one of our last hopes to preserve any wilderness. We know what the rest of it is facing. And to make it short, let me just read my statement. There is a great deal that could be said.

The National Park Service was created by act of Congress, approved August 25, 1916. By this the bureau was directed to "promote and regulate the use of the federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations herein specified by said parks, monuments and reservations, which purpose is to conserve

the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Whatever else is said, I think these men had foresight.

Today it is quite clear that we need more men with foresight, men with a sense of the values that transcend material things. The population growth is now virtually exponential and will be doubled by the end of the century. With the combined increased leisures and growing interest in small powerboats, what will the south arms of Yellowstone Lake be like without the proposed control?

Many people and some excellent friends have enjoyed powerboating in the areas under discussion for several years. I can easily sympathize with these same people who boat in this area for the wild atmosphere that it has. Unfortunately, I am afraid that all of us are going to find more and more restrictions necessary as the numbers of people increase.

The argument advanced by some as to the accessibility of the region for more people is ridiculous. A wilderness area cannot be preserved with easy access. Further, I do not believe it possible to effectively

police such an area. What is and is not allowed must be very clearly defined.

I am for the Park Service, and would recommend that more people take the time to read their reports, reports written by professionals in their field.

Let our national parks be a testimonial and a sanctuary of our country, a reminder of how and why it came to be -- not another symbol of an overly-materialistic society.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.

The next speaker is Martin Trillhaase. I hope I am pronouncing this correctly. And in the hole will be Albert Pulling of Pocatello, Idaho State College.

MARTIN TRILLHAASE, 365 MARJACO ST., IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to bother to contradict the statements of the powerboat associations. They have done a pretty good job of that, one by one, so I will just read this statement that I have prepared.

First, I wonder why this hearing even has to be held. The National Parks Act of 1916 clearly charges

the Park Administration with making and carrying out decisions of this kind. In this case Mr. Garrison's staff has carefully and thoroughly studied the situation on the lake before reaching their decision.

Now that these hearings are being held and being held only in the several states adjacent to Yellowstone National Park, I hope the final decision -- and I am not sure who will make this decision -- will not be based on what amounts to a public opinion poll or, more specifically, an organized pressure campaign within a 200-mile radius of Yellowstone National Park. If this issue so vital to this original National Park and to our National Parks System is to be decided by a plebiscite, let it be a national plebiscite.

So I believe firmly that this issue should be decided on the basis of what is consistent with the National Parks Act of 1916. If the arguments of the associations of powerboat peddlers and their parrots, the powerboat clubs, are valid, let's keep all areas of the lake open to powerboats of all sizes. This will eliminate the charge of discrimination.

And, out of consideration for the aged, the infirm and the crippled, who have been referred to so often in these hearings, let's build a superhighway

to these remote areas of the lake. Then the Parks Service will not be discriminating against those unable to own powerboats. While we are at it, let's stop discriminating against big game hunters in the national parks, against bait fishermen on the Madison, against railroad and airline and mining interests in the Park. In short, let's take the easy route -- the route which leads to the eventual end of wilderness in this nation. This is the logical extension of the arguments of the powerboat peddlers.

I sincerely hope that the Parks Service and the Interior Department will back up Mr. Garrison on this vital issue. To do less would be a repudiation of him and the other dedicated professionals this nation has entrusted with the priceless heritage of our National Park System.

Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

(Five-minute recess.)

HEARING OFFICER: We will now move forward. There are one, two, three, four -- six left. The next witness will be Albert Pulling of Pocatello, Idaho, Idaho State College, and in the hole will be Rex G. Fluharty of Idaho Falls, who will speak for himself.

Mr. Pulling.

ALBERT "PIERRE" PULLING; POCA TELLO, IDAHO;
IDAHO STATE COLLEGE: To save time I have written a letter to Mr. Wirth that I will deliver to him as soon as I have finished reading it.

I strongly favor the zoning as proposed, and am glad to note that Shoshone Lake and its outlet may also be zoned. In fact, I would cheerfully prohibit all motorboating in the Yellowstone National Park, and all other national parks. Some big, slow excursion boats, run by the Park Service itself, or concessionaires under Park Service supervision, would be logical for lake sightseeing, in the cases of those who are too old, too young, too lazy or too dumb to use a canoe. Incidentally, I see no reason why boats should be restricted to hand-propulsion as has been reported; sailing is logical.

There is no occasion to reiterate reasons for the restrictions that are proposed. The reasons given by your Service, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Izaak Walton League, and various other people and organizations, are so well known that it would be trite indeed to parrot them. It has been very ably presented here by other people, by the way, today.

Perhaps it will be logical to mention that my experience and training should show that my opinions are professional. I am a forester with a specialty in game management. My degrees are from the New York State College of Forestry and the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources. My life has been spent in what I hope is the sensible conservation of our resources. I have voted in order in New York, New Hampshire, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada and Idaho. My work has taken me into the rest of this country with the exception of the Deep South and some of the Southwest. I spent years in Canada, including five years teaching in a Canadian university. I have had considerable travel in both continental Europe and the British Isles. I was a federal biologist for fifteen years. I have been in the West since 1940, and at Idaho State College since September 1948. I know Yellowstone Park fairly well, and several of my students have been in Park Service employ. I came to this Intermountain area from choice, but not for payola.

Though I will not repeat reasons for the proposed zoning, I will refute certain published reasons for opposing this zoning, and some of those same reasons

have been stated today. For example, the Salt Lake Tribune on Wednesday, August 24, 1960, reported as follows:

"William S. Goan, of the Billings, Montana, Boat Club, charged that the zoning plan would discriminate against the aged, the physically handicapped, and those financially unable to make an expensive pack or canoe trip into the wilderness area." And I will repeat: "and those financially unable to make an expensive pack or canoe trip into the wilderness area."

This statement needs proof. I will be sixty-nine tomorrow, and will cheerfully prove that I can go to the south arms of Yellowstone Lake in a canoe, either alone or with my wife in the bow.

That is, I am wondering how old is "old."

I would further ask why a canoe is more expensive to own, transport, or operate than a motorboat. Further, perhaps I should note that I also own two horses, and they are no more drag on a trailer than many motorboats. Further, examination of our income, which is a matter of public record, will show that it is not large. The whole size of it is that I am interested in horses and canoes. Mr. Goan is interested in powerboats, and everyone finds, by one means or

another, some way of satisfying these interests.

Anyone may be broke, but if he is interested enough in whiskey he manages to stay drunk. I haven't got that in the letter.

(Applause.)

Mr. Charles L. McBee, also of the Billings Boat Club, especially disagreed with the National Parks Service contention that birds and animals were disrupted by motorboats. The Tribune did not amplify his reasons nor the authority for this opinion. The competent federal biologists have other views, and I agree with them. These fellows are there and know what they are doing. I know enough about it to know that.

Mr. McBee, however, was further quoted as saying that he disliked the wave of hatred that has been directed at Yellowstone boaters by people across the country, many of whom have not been west of the Mississippi.

To this I would first counter that a national park belongs to the national public. A person in New York who cannot exercise these rights very often, has the same rights in a national park as one who lives in nearby Billings. A relative newcomer to the West ---

I have only been here since 1940 -- I find too few people with broad interest in the West's natural resources. The West's economy is still too immature for this interest. It will grow up, but as of now I find the West the worst enemy of their own nationally-owned natural resources. For years my help in combatting the West's savage commercialism relative to public resources has come from the East and West coasts. One may never have been west of the Hudson, to say nothing of the Mississippi, yet he has the same rights in Yellowstone as if he lived in West Yellowstone or Gardiner.

Mr. Martin Littleton, of Cody, contended, among other things, that:

"If you are going to close these lake areas, close them to all boats, including hand-operated ones, because these areas will be unsafe for canoeists during storms, and you will be luring them into perilous situations."

I share Mr. Littleton's caution in the use of canoes. He may or may not have had my experience with these versatile watercraft. I will not burden you with reiteration of this experience. My second book on this subject, "The Principles of Canoeing," Macmillan, 1954,

details it sufficiently. I repeat that I can go anywhere in Yellowstone Lake in a canoe. I have used a canoe on the North Shore of Lake Superior and the East Coast of Hudson's Bay. Please note that, like flyers, there are bold canoeists and old canoeists. The bold never get old, and I am old. A canoeist, to get old, must know when to go ashore and boil tea. Motorboaters also get in trouble at times. Possibly all sailors should read Henry Drummond's poem, "The Wreck of the Julie Plante," and I will quote the last stanza. Sorry that I can't quote it in better Quebec French.

"Now all good wood scow sailor man
Tak' warning by dat storm
An' go an' marry some nice French girl
An' leeve on wan beeg farm.

"De win' can blow lak hurricane
An' s'pose she blow some more,
You can't get drown on Lac St. Pierre
So long you stay on shore."

Pursuing this problem a little further, it is possible that The National Park Service should stiffen their already reasonably-strict regulations on Park boating. The beam depth and design of a canoe has more to do with its safety than its length. People in this general area know little and seemingly care less about canoes. Their handling is a simple but fine art.

Both the National Park Service and the boat clubs could use their influence to foster this simple and inexpensive art.

I will cheerfully answer questions.

I will add just a least little bit to this letter, and that will be partly directed toward Mr. Wirth in connection with improving things for canoeing a little in these arms of Yellowstone and in other places. This portage a few years ago in here (indicating map) was not in very good shape. I have never been on this lower portage, that is this portage between the Flat Mountain Arm and the South Arm. It may be all right now. I haven't been in there in several years. But those portages should be cut out carefully and about every quarter of a mile there should be a horizontal pole across so that anyone carrying a canoe can rest it without too much trouble, and I repeat that perhaps some special instruction could be fostered by the Park Service and some of the boat people.

This morning this picture of this Tippecanoe business, where these fellows did all this tipping over -- utterly foolish. They get instruction in many cases in connection with canoeing; principal

thing they learn is how to fall out, how to swim. It is about as sensible as giving an aviator more practice in bailing out than he has in flying.

I would be delighted to answer any questions now or later. Before I came up I put an eighteen-foot prospector model canoe on my truck that is parked out here. That is a suitable canoe for traveling in these south arms, and I didn't put the tump line on it, but if you will look at it, you will note it has a yoke so that you can readily carry it. In my younger and wilder days, I carried a canoe once as much as eight miles, and I have frequently carried them three miles, and can yet.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Pulling.

The next witness is Rex G. Fluharty. I hope I pronounced that right. The man in the hole is Dr. Harold D. Barnard.

REX G. FLUHARTY, IDAHO FALLS: The first thing I would like to do is to submit a petition which we have written up and had signed in the last three days. It is as follows:

"We, the undersigned, urge that the south arms of Yellowstone Lake be closed to motorboats. We

favor the preservation of the National Park wilderness areas."

There are approximately sixty signatures on this petition, and although these people were kind enough to sign this, I must say that the statements that I have to make have to be my own personal ones, because generally I do not have them as an organization so that I can support them. I find it is impossible to speak for two people, let alone sixty. Two thousand might be quite a question.

I think one of the impressions that I would like to give to you is that after discussion the other day a group of us decided that although we weren't familiar with this area, we did have a right to say something. The impression has been gained that if you have not entered this area, if you haven't boated there, you have no right whatsoever to express any interest in it or to express any opinion. I think that a great deal of these people are not even sportsmen in that sense. However, I think what one is dealing with here are definitions, and I gain the distinct impression from these people that their definition of a wilderness area is one without motors, so that they were very surprised to find out that only twenty percent of the lake was being restricted, and many of them expressed

a strong interest in seeing motorboats restricted from the lake altogether. Now, this certainly is no proof, and yet we are a very particular group of people.

However, I think that there is a strong group of people who are passive, who do not feel that their opinions are strong and you will not hear from them. I think you will find that they do respect the opinions of the Park Service, and I think my impression from them was that they are not fooled by the emotional response of the motorboat people.

Now, I know lots of these motorboating people, and I have the utmost respect for them. They are courteous, they are very good campers, and I am sure from the emotional response that we have had that they must love this area very greatly and the sacrifice is very great. My feeling, however, from my understanding of the wilderness area and the spirit of the Park, is that these areas should be closed.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

(The above-referred-to petition, introduced by Mr. Fluharty, contains the following signatures:)

Rex G. Fluharty, 1218 9th St., Idaho Falls, Idaho.

M. Moore, 1546 Beverly, Idaho Falls.

M. J. Hutchinson, Box 823, Blackfoot, Idaho.

R. E. Tidball, 163 E. 13th St., Idaho Falls.

Arlene Radford, 360 E. Pacific, Blackfoot, Idaho.

Arthur W. Brown, 2590 E. 17th, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Ross S. Musden, #33, 675 Wabash, Idaho Falls.

Kenneth A. McCollom, 240 Tantphaus Drive.

Richard Munker, 590 Lincoln Drive.

J. E. Cline, 495 N. Ridge, Idaho Falls.

Calvin H. Hogg, 1311 10th St., Idaho Falls.

Diana Sharp, Rt. 2, Blackfoot, Idaho.

S. W. Reich, 1135 Austin, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

R. M. Foss, 1310 Lake Avenue, Idaho Falls.

J. E. Evans, 1450 Antares Drive, Idaho Falls.

Muriel A. Fluharty, 1218 Ninth Street.

William F. Zelezny, 1694 Juniper Drive, Idaho Falls,
Idaho.

Marjorie V. Stanton, P.O. Box 415, Arco, Idaho.

June Smith, P.O. Box 34, Shelly, Idaho.

Ruth Virtue, 1182 S. Meridian, Blackfoot, Idaho.

Hazel Watlington, 235 Horrocks Drive, Blackfoot,
Idaho.

Elton H. Turk, 535 12th, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Willis L. Guff, 781 Oxford, Idaho Falls.

Wm. Bradley Lewis, 150 11th, Idaho Falls.

Joseph M. Beeston, 1604 Charlene St., Idaho Falls,
Idaho.

Myron Hatch, Route # -- Idaho Falls, Idaho.

D. D. Jeffries, 984 Stokes Ave., Idaho Falls,
Idaho.

Eugene H. Mogleby, 368 12th, Idaho Falls.

E. Fast, 1549 Beverly Road, Idaho Falls.

Robert L. Tromp, 1480 Bower Drive, Idaho Falls.

S. Darrell Reeder, 540 E. Whittier, Idaho Falls.

J. A. Dunbar, 850 Shoup, Idaho Falls.

Lorin D. Weber, 813 Reed, Idaho Falls.

Theodore Watanabe, 368 12th, Idaho Falls.

P. D. Randolph, 575 Wabash, # 30, Idaho Falls.

R. Kennedy, Box 362, Arco, Idaho.

J. F. Marhovish, 655 Northrup, Idaho Falls.

F. W. Sheeley, 225 Ronglyn, Idaho Falls.

D. A. Nelson, Rt. 2, Shelley.

Warren H. Burgus, 628 So. Farming Ave., Idaho Falls.

R. P. Schuman, 1480 Antarie, Idaho Falls.

B. Kusch, 1550 Starger, Idaho Falls.

Julius R. Berrett, 320 Linder Drive, Idaho Falls.

Dean A. Millsap, 221 Sunset Drive, Idaho Falls.

R. L. Heath, 1620 Charlene St., Idaho Falls.

Neldon H. Marshall, 227 W. 19th St., Idaho Falls.

Dennis B. Farnes, 255 N. Stout, Blackfoot.

Harvey T. Brown, 470 Owens Avenue, Dona.

Richard E. Schmank, 814 Raymond Drive, Idaho Falls.

Norman H. Talle, 265 4th St., Idaho Falls.

George W. Griffing, 666 East 16th, Idaho Falls,
Idaho.

Gary D. Marshall, Box 92, How, Idaho.

Larry C. Gannon, Box 495, Arco, Idaho.

Dean Shippen, Memon, Idaho.

Robert C. Young, 1530 Stanger, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Alan LaMar Trego, Route 1, Blackfoot, Idaho.

Warren C. Francis, 652 So. Fanning, Idaho Falls.

Robert R. Spencer, 546 D. Street, Apt #1, Idaho
Falls.

Jake D. Joyce, 455 3rd St., Idaho Falls.

Edward Hylsky, 546 D St., Apt #1, Idaho Falls.

Ronald R. Smith, 150 E. Crowley, Idaho Falls.

Frank Petree, 408 Sixth, Idaho Falls.

Eleanor C. Stevenson, 1207 Tenth, Idaho Falls.

C. E. Stevenson, 1207 Tenth, Idaho Falls.

John R. Huffman, 291 W. 17th St., Idaho Falls.

* * * * *

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.

The next witness is Harold D. Barnard, M.D.,
retired surgeon of California and a past president of
the Western Conservation Club of California, from
Pond's Lodge, Idaho; spends summers here at Lake Hotel,

during August usually. And in the hole will be Leslie K. Barbee.

Dr. Barnard.

HAROLD D. BARNARD, M.D.; PAST PRESIDENT OF WESTERN CONSERVATION CLUB OF CALIFORNIA; POND'S LODGE, IDAHO: Mr. Wirth, ladies and gentlemen, needless to explain, the conservation club of which I am past president is thoroughly in line with all the other conservation clubs, and nobody would want to see the preservation of the wilderness area any more than the people with whom I am associated. But I am thoroughly convinced that there are some very important objections to the reservations and the prohibitions that are being suggested by the Park Service.

I have a profound respect for the Park Service. I think their administration of the fish problem deserves commendation for efficiency, and from everybody that is interested in fishing in the Park. The three-fish limitation there has certainly paid off handsomely. But as to the limitations as proposed in the two south arms, I am utterly opposed to them.

To begin with, I am not convinced at all that the arguments as presented are capable of substantiating the reasons. We have covered and listened to the

preservation of the wilderness problem. I am not going to go back to that. I might mention, however, that I have stood on Molly Island, where I shouldn't have been, and observed the birdlife there and the results of the waves, so-called, and I find that the cormorants and the pelicans were the chief residents of that island; and if you can give me any logical reason why we couldn't get along with a few less cormorants or a few less pelicans, especially pelicans, why, I could have difficulty in agreeing.

The pelican, who is the subject of some very interesting and entertaining poetry, I think we could place him where he belongs. In fact, those of us who use the marshland of Utah for duck hunting, we would be tickled to death if they would wash the island a little more thoroughly and get rid of the birdlife that annoys us so much there.

However, the chief offender is the swan, and I am not talking about the trumpeter swan. All conservationists know the history, the story of the trumpeter swan, and we are all very much anxious to see that his race be preserved.

I am not going to go into the erosion question: I think it has been thoroughly answered. It is a little absurd to think that the motorboat can compete with the

storms that are prevalent in that area.

Yellowstone Lake is a very dangerous lake. I first became acquainted with Yellowstone in 1910. I rode through there on a coach drawn by four horses. During the last ten years it has been my custom to spend the month of August at the Lake Hotel, and I bring my nineteen-foot cruiser there to enjoy it. The South Arm and the Southeast Arm are, without a question of a doubt, the most desirable and enjoyable part of the boating that the lake has to offer.

I think I could perhaps express my opinion and make this very brief. I don't think there is a thing involved in this question that could not be answered by adequate policing. I don't think that it is necessary to prohibit the motor men from going into those two arms, but I do feel that the policing of that lake over the many years that I have been acquainted with it, has been totally inadequate. There are among the motorboating fraternity a good many people that would be well to police -- you can't. There is always going to be some hot-oddgers and some people who lack the decency and the courtesy which their boating demands.

As for the gentleman who previously spoke about the danger of heavy craft, it might interest him

to know, if he doesn't already know so, that there is written a law which says that a motorboat is responsible for any damage that its wake does, and if he wanted to go to the trouble of filing a complaint, I think he could make it very disagreeable for the people who aren't courteous enough to respect the man in a small boat.

I furthermore feel that to encourage canoes and rowboat people in the two arms is a very questionable procedure. I have been over there and spent many hours in those waters and I have spent a good many hours over there where I would have liked to have been somewhere else, and to encourage the inexperienced and the novices at navigation to undertake the responsibility over there, is a very, very questionable procedure. If I was going to be asked for an opinion as to what would be the most satisfactory legislation to encourage suicide, I think that would be my first choice.

If motorboaters are increasing in great numbers, to exclude the people who enjoy their boats is really discriminatory. The motorboat is not particularly a pleasing thing to smell, but as I remember it, the fuel used in the initial trip that I made through the Park also offered some disagreeable odors. I don't think it is very logical to assume that the motorboat is to blame for the ill smell. And I might call your

attention to the fact that if you ever followed a park bus, you would also have to agree that maybe a little incense of peppermint or something in the gas might help the situation.

The litterbug will always be with you. He is only a minor percentage. The hot-rodder, the people who are inadequate emotionally to drive a car, will always be with you, but in spite of that fact most of the people who are enjoying the boats, they are pretty reasonable, and I believe that with adequate policing -- I think that is your answer to your whole problem. If he hasn't got policemen enough in his own organization, I think he could find plenty of people who would gladly accept a deputy appointment for the purpose of eliminating the dangers. I know in my own county we had a very effective deputy sheriff organization and it worked very efficiently. To summarize this, I think that the problem could be entirely handled by adequate policing.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Doctor.

The next witness is Leslie K. Barbee and the man in the hole is R. A. Cushman. Mr. Barbee is from Jackson, Wyoming. He represents the BPOE No. 1713,

the Jackson Fire Department and the Jackson Boating Association. Mr. Barbee.

LESLIE K. BARBEE; JACKSON, WYOMING; BPOE
1713; JACKSON FIRE DEPARTMENT AND JACKSON BOATING
ASSOCIATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Little did I realize that when I got home last evening from a very enjoyable week back in Yellowstone Park and on the lake, that I would be told about this meeting today. And one of the neighbors, Marian Davidson, brought me over here today, and so we are here. And everything, practically, that I am going to say has already been said three or four times, but since I am here -- and I was thinking a few minutes ago that the only reason this building isn't filled with people from Jackson, Wyoming, is because they are handicapped by the same problem I have had all my life, and that is by making a living, and so I know.

I have lived in Jackson over twenty years, been going to Yellowstone Lake to the Park for over twenty years, and I am so incurably optimistic for Jackson and Jackson Hole and Yellowstone Park that, well, I know maybe I am a little leaning over backwards, I am so in favor of them.

But I do want to say this, as the rest of you expressed your views, it hurt me very much. I, too,

have just passed sixty-nine, and I am still able to enjoy it and go hunting and use my horses and use my boat. My wife is the bookkeeper for the Elk Refuge in Jackson, Wyoming, and has been for years, and for breakfast we have something about the problems of Jackson Hole, for lunch we have some of the same thing and for dinner we have again some of the problems of Jackson hole.

But I am in favor of the thing the previous speaker has said, that surely we can arrive at some conclusion or some satisfactory solution to this problem other than restricting these areas. Many things have been brought to my attention today, for which I had never thought about, in spite of the fact that I have been going to Frank Island for years. Only yesterday I stood at Plover Point and went in there and here was a box, asking me to register; and I thought, how wonderful, I am going to get to sign my name. And I opened up the door and not a slip of paper, no pencil for me to do that with.

In going along the shore the day before yesterday I noticed a man in a canoe, and he was going along very nicely and he waved at me and I at him. And then to my surprise yesterday I saw him again, and here he was going along until he came to a storm and, being

the chap nearest him with a motor, I gave him help to get ashore. And so when I stopped at West Thumb to get something to eat, this chap came in and sat beside me and he said, "You know, Mister, my arms are so tired, I couldn't have gone any further if it hadn't been for your help." And here I am sixty-nine and here he is a young man in his twenties. I looked at him and he stood about six foot four, and he himself said that "This is beyond me."

I think of the restrictions. This summer the wife and I have had our relatives visiting us, and how happy it was for us to put them in our boat, our motorboat, and to take them around over Jackson Lake. How happy it is for us to share what we have with these elderly people that otherwise would be restricted from getting to see these places. It so happened that just about a week ago on Jackson Lake we were going along in our boats and my wife pointed out that there stands a deer right down to the edge of the water, refreshing herself with a drink, seemed to pay no attention at all to our going by in our motorboat.

Now, what I have to say isn't too well organized, but a few years ago in teaching school in Jackson, when it came summertime I went up on Jackson Lake and I found a little island, a goose nest with several eggs in there.

I was so happy to find this. I have heard today so many folks say that they want to keep things just in their original form so that you can really see wildlife and the fowls and that it won't be molested. So as soon as I got home from this trip I notified all of the youngsters that I had in my school room. The next day I put them in my boat and took them up there and I had the pleasure to take each one of them over there and to enjoy this goose nest and count the eggs. Not a one of my youngsters touched the nest; not a one of my youngsters was anything but well pleased that they got to see that, which they had been reading about.

Now, I wonder -- I would like to ask this question -- if we are molesting wildlife. I have noticed now for nearly ten days there have been three trumpeter swans over at Jackson, right down almost to the city limits, seemingly paying no attention to all the folks that go by.

Well, I wanted to add my two cents worth. I am not going home without doing that. And I think you very kindly.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Barbee. The next witness is R. A. Cushman of Idaho Falls, who speaks on his own behalf, and in the hole, Merland Clark, Idaho Falls. He will also speak on his own behalf.

Mr. Cushman.

R. A. CUSHMAN, 431 9TH STREET, IDAHO FALLS,

IDAHO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have some points; several of them have been made, though one hasn't been.

To start out with, I think it is important to realize that the Park people are professionals and are being paid to do a job. They are qualified to do it or they shouldn't be there. Experts can make mistakes also, but I think their chances of making one are a lot less than a layman's. I think it is wrong, as a couple of people have done, to impune the motives of the Park people.

I think the main point here today is on the preservation of the wilderness aspect of the Park. The southern arms of the lake are in an area which is now wilderness, and I think just about everybody here is for wilderness. Right now, as far as wilderness is concerned -- with the exception of the birds -- I think there isn't too much of a problem due to the boats. They are few enough. The wilderness is still in pretty good shape, but with the increase in boating which has occurred over the past few years and is continuing, the situation can only get worse. There will come a time when the southeast arms will be as heavily populated

as Thumb is now, and wilderness can't exist under a situation such as that.

I think one of the most important things to consider here is that the proposed zoning-law regulations will not keep motorboat owners or people who like motorboats off the south arms. It will simply keep their boats off. If they would like to motorboat up to the area and moor and take off with a canoe or rowboat, that they can either carry with them or rent, there is nothing to preclude this. However, use of those arms by motorboats will certainly make it so that canoes won't be able to, particularly as the use increases. The extra cost of a canoe or a rowboat shouldn't be too much of a problem, I should think, to anyone who can own a nineteen-foot cabin cruiser.

That was something else someone mentioned here today that this proposed zoning would be discriminatory, it would act in favor of the rich man because only a rich man can afford to hire a guide and go into the south arms. I think this is patently not so. I have two friends who have gone in on a canoe just recently, and they aren't rich. I think that the powerboat owners, particularly cabin cruisers, are apt to have a lot more money than most people.

I would also -- I don't have any information,

I do have an interest, as to how many people in the boat clubs have boats that are large enough to fit on Yellowstone Lake under the existing regulations.

I have some other answers to other people's comments, too. Mr. Howell said something about the Park being a God-given resource, and I believe that is true. However, I don't think it was given only to the people of our generation. I think it is there for those who come after. He spoke also of his aged uncle who has some films of the Park of when he went in there on a trip recently and he is going to enjoy those films as long as he is able to watch them. I feel the same way for my children and their children, also. I would like them to be able to go into that area thirty to fifty years from now and feel that what they see is what is there now rather than the result of years and years of boating and marinas, refreshment stands, the way Thumb is.

Someone else said that boats don't leave a trail, and that is true, but people do; and the more boats you have, the more people you have and the less wilderness.

Mr. Dyer who spoke a while ago brought out what he called an absurdity, to make all of Wyoming a wilderness area. I agree this is an absurdity;

however, the law calls for preservation of the Yellowstone Park area in its natural form and I think that there is a vast difference between all of Wyoming and upholding the law. Incidentally, I feel that the Park Service has to call for this zoning or they will be remiss in their duties under the law.

I don't feel I have any ax to grind, since I don't own a boat or a canoe. Any special interest I have is in the interest of wilderness. I think, too, that Mr. Huck Miller said he didn't own a boat, but I would suspect that just about every opponent of the proposed zoning is a boatowner and, as such, definitely has a special interest.

Mr. Dyer is a representative of a manufacturer's association of 220 boat and, I presume, motor manufacturers. I think he has a very special interest.

I think if I had anything to say, I would rather see the whole lake closed completely to motorboats.

Red Fish Lake used to be a beautiful spot, but you just can't enjoy that very much any more because of the presence of motorboats zipping up and down and making all sorts of noise, and I would like to have the wilderness preserved.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Cushman.

The next witness is Merland Clark of Idaho Falls, on his own behalf, and the person in the hole is myself.

Mr. Clark.

MERLAND CLARK, IDAHO FALLS: Mr. Wirth, ladies and gentlemen, it has been my privilege to have a motor-boat on Yellowstone Lake for the last fourteen years, and I have enjoyed that privilege very much. I have been treated with courtesy in Yellowstone Park by those in authority, the Rangers, and those who are in charge of the Park have been kind to me and have extended me many courtesies. I have had the pleasure of boating with quite a number of the Rangers and their wives, and we have had enjoyable trips together in the arms of the lake. I have had people as my guests from New York, from Chicago, from Los Angeles, and I think I could go on and name many, many, many cities where people have come to Yellowstone Lake to enjoy a boat trip on my boat. We have taken old and young.

I, too, have been interested in scouting and still am. I have taken many scout boys with me, many scouters. We have had lots of enjoyable trips.

Over the years I have been there, I see no difference in the lake. It looks to me about as it

did when I first went there. I have always thought of the arms as being safe for all boats. Many times I have gone in off the rough waters into the arms of the lake to find a calm spot to wait until the wind went down. I have thought rowboats were a hazard on Yellowstone Lake, particularly a little ways away from shore. The reason I have thought this is because even though I have seen very few in this time, I have been obliged to help some, and on two occasions I am certain that they never would have survived had I not been closely.

I have not seen the lake congested with boats. There are many more boats there now than there were many years ago, and they are increasing in number, but in my several trips this year into the arms of the lake I have seldom seen more than two or three boats. I have never seen a congested area, or I should say I have never seen boats congested in the areas over there.

We have seen more game each year. We have thought that the game is becoming acquainted with us and enjoy seeing us come over into the arms of the lake. I have many pictures of wildlife and have taken many of them without disturbing the wildlife. I have seen the moose out in the water and have slowly glided by them within a couple of hundred feet of them, and they haven't even been disturbed.

I have failed to see litter on the shores of the lake to any extent at all. We try to be courteous. We try to be kind. We are thoughtful of others and we are conscious of others and we have made it a practice all these years when there are smaller boats in the area than ours, and especially rowboats, we have throttled our motors down and stayed our wake. We have gone to shore on many occasions and helped people who are endangered and have thought the waters were too rough, that they couldn't return to shore or back to whence they came.

As I have stated, I have only seen a very limited number of canoes in the arms of the lake and I strongly think that Yellowstone Lake is not an area, water area for canoers. I think it is unsafe. I have seen people out in the lake who have gladly welcomed the noise of the gas exhaust and the terrible noises we have spoken of or heard spoken of here today. I have seen people who have welcomed that noise and had been glad as it has neared them, because they have needed help.

All of the years we have been on the lake we have carried a garbage can with us. When we have gone to shore we have taken our garbage to the garbage pits, and where we have gone ashore that there were no garbage

pits we have carried a shovel with us, and when the garbage needed to be disposed of we have gone out and buried it out of the way.

I would like others to enjoy the lake as I have enjoyed it. I really have had a good time there all these years, and for my part I could willingly forego it now, but I would like others to enjoy it and have the pleasures and the fun of taking their young people, their old people and their friends on some of these trips.

I question the judgment of the men who have stated here today that they could safely traverse the waters even of the arms of the lake. I, like you, have seen the waves out in the arms of the lake higher than the tops of our boats. We tried to measure the height of the waves a couple years ago and we estimated them beyond twelve feet. I wouldn't like to be in a canoe under those conditions out in the water anywhere, and so I say again I do not think this is a canoe man's lake -- not that I would prevent in any way, if it were in my power to keep them from going, them doing so. I welcome them, and I would like to extend help and safety and pleasure to them wherever I could.

I have greatly enjoyed my experiences in the Park. I have a great deal of respect for the Rangers there and

all of the authority there and I have enjoyed my association with all of them. I think it would be a mistake. I think it would be too bad if we were to close the arms of the lake to the powerboats, because it would be virtually unused; very few others, percentagewise, would get over there. I thank you very kindly.

(Applause.)

✓ **HEARING OFFICER:** Thank you very much.

That ends the list of witnesses that have submitted requests to be heard, and I assume there are no more to be heard.

✓ I do wish to file with the record the list of some forty-four who have submitted their request to be in support to the zoning. I do want to say in behalf of the National Park Service, especially Superintendent Lon Garrison and myself, Mr. Flynn of the Department, we appreciate your coming here and giving us the benefit of your thoughts. I know the Secretary of Interior will be much pleased with the turnout and the number of people who have been willing to come here and to express themselves upon this, and that he will give their thoughts very careful consideration. I am very much pleased with the way in which people have presented their material. As one man said, he came

here and expected to see a lot of fireworks, but there weren't any. I hope he wasn't disappointed, because we prefer to get the facts, people's opinions, rather than a lot of argument. I have nothing more to add before I close the minutes, unless somebody wishes to say something. Otherwise, fifteen hours from now I will be in Washington, D. C., but I will have lunch before then.

Thank you very, very much.

(Applause.)

(Hearing proceedings closed at 3:40 p.m.)

* * * *

(The following names of Idaho residents supporting the zoning proposal, are copied from the list above-referred to by the Hearing Officer:)

H. J. Swinney, Boise.

Mrs. Floy C. Douglas, Boise.

Garth Nelson, Rexburg.

Lyle Stanford, College of Idaho, Caldwell.

Petition, 69 persons, Idaho Falls Area.

Bland Giddings, Idaho Falls.

Bill Duff, Coeur d' Alene.

Robert Kerr, Rexburg.

John K. Long, Idaho Falls.

William J. Lewis, St. Anthony.

Ernest E. Day, Boise.
James H. Phelps, Jr., Pocatello.
A. D. Marler, Thornton.
Merlan A. Hale, Pocatello.
H. Ralph Stephenson, Pocatell.
Amos B. Chase, Pocatello.
Karl C. Klingler, Boise.
Mrs. Jack I. Hagen, Idaho Falls.
Mr. and Mrs. Carl Boyd, Lenore.
Julius Larsen, Pocatell.
John E. Weida, Idaho Falls.
Edwin H. Keller, Pocatello.
J. W. Emmert, Coeur D' alene.
Alton B. Jones, Pocatello.
F. N. Bistline, Pocatello.
L. E. Ashliman, Rexburg.
Marriner D. Morrell, Rexburg.
David R. Stevenson, Pocatello.
E. S. Stucki, Rexburg.
D. W. Stowell, Rexburg.
S. B. Garrett, St. Anthony.
Delbert Taylor, Rexburg.
Earl Thomson, Pocatello.
Albert Var S. Pulling, Pocatello.
Edson Fichter, Pocatello.

J. A. Marley, Pocatello.

James L. Platt, Pocatello.

Ray J. Davis, Pocatello.

A. E. Taylor, Pocatello.

Jeanette Hatch, Idaho Falls.

S. R. Meadows, Pocatello.

Joseph A. Hearst, Pocatello.

Blair W. Archibald, Blackfoot.

* * * *

(The following names are copied from signatures affixed to letters received by Hearing Officer at August 26 hearing, expressing support of zoning proposal:)

Clayton W. Rennie, Port Angeles Senior High School, Port Angeles, Washington.

Bruce Bowler, 244 Donna Building, Boise, Idaho.

Mrs. Charles A. Shierson, 322 State Street, Adrian, Michigan.

H. M. Weber, Conservation Chairman, California Garden Clubs, Inc., 1975 Evelyn Drive, Santa Rosa, California.

William B. Morse, Western Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute, 3146 N. E. Tenth Avenue, Portland 12, Oregon.

Margaret Oberteuffer (for Mr. and Mrs. W. H.), 1128 Southwest Englewood Drive, Oswego, Oregon.

James J. Swisher, Jr., 712 Linda Vista Drive,
Visalia, California.

Cornelia E. Wayburn, So. Sea View Terrace, San
Francisco 21, California.

Evangeline Machlin, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

E. F. McNees, Montana State Chairman, National
Boating Association, Butte, Montana.

Mrs. W. D. Affleck, P. O. Box 113, Ely, Nevada.

Charles D. Gallagher, 401 Murry Street, Ely,
Nevada.

Jay E. Brinton, Ely, Nevada.

Philip Welles, Hereford, Arizona.

C. J. Hanel, Secretary, Jackson County Chapter,
Izaak Walton League of America, 200 Erie Street, Medford,
Oregon.

Randolph Jenks, 2146 East 4th Street, Tucson,
Arizona.

Darwin Lambert, President, Great Basin National
Park Association, Ely, Nevada.

John S. Stanton, P. O. Box 2495, Carmel, California.

Edwin J. Dolan, 2066 NW Overton St., Portland 9,
Oregon.

Lynda Carithers, 6709 Pyle Road, Bethesda 14,
Maryland.

Douglas Carithers, 6709 Pyle Road, Bethesda 14,

Maryland.

Ronald E. Burnett, 7117 S. E. 20th Ave., Portland
2, Oregon.

L. C. Binford, Chairman, Executive Board of Direc-
tors, Izaak Walton League of America, 5802 NE Broadway,
Portland 13, Oregon.

Elizabeth B. White, M. D., Old National Bank Build-
ing, Spokane, Washington.

Raymond F. Sheets, 323 Koser Avenue, Iowa City,
Iowa.

R. C. Davis, 1285 S. E. Lambard Street, Beaverton,
Oregon.

* * * * *

(The following names are copied from signatures
affixed to letters received at August 26 hearing, express-
ing opposition to zoning proposal:)

Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Harrington, 803 Collyer Street,
Longmont, Colorado.

E. V. Simison, M. D., 1448 East Center, Pocatello,
Idaho.

R. Don Bistline, Pocatello, Idaho.

Jerome C. Turner, P. O. Box 930, Pocatello, Idaho.

Blaine E. Gasser, Pocatello, Idaho.

Park Price, 300 North 5th, P. O. Box 710, Pocatello,
Idaho.

✓
Cedric M. Allen, President, Seagull Boat Club,
P.O. Box 452, Pocatello, Idaho.

Perry A. Nelson, 746 East Center, Pocatello, Idaho.

Hugh Wagnon, Publisher, Idaho State Journal,
Pocatello, Idaho.

L. G. Brannon, member, Billings Boat Club, Down-
town Apartments, Billings, Montana.

H. W. De Wolf, Secretary-Treasurer for Jackson
Volunteer Fire Department and Jackson Hole Boating
Association, Jackson, Wyoming.

Robert S. Clark, Secretary, Dale Redfield, Exalted
Ruler, Jackson Lodge No. 1713, BPOE, Jackson, Wyoming.

* * * *