

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to express my views.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Udall?

Mr. UDALL. Sir, I think your statement has more good sense and judgment in it than anything I have heard in the last 3 or 4 days and I congratulate you for coming here and presenting it. You said you read the Sierra Club Bulletin. You are not a member of that organization, are you?

Mr. SVENDSEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. UDALL. And for how long have you been a member?

Mr. SVENDSEN. Approximately 6 years, maybe 7.

Mr. UDALL. I thank you very much for a real contribution to these hearings.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from California?

Mr. HOSMER. Sheriff Svendsen, I don't know why you were late but I am sure glad you finally made it.

Thank you.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from California, Mr. Burton?

Mr. BURTON of California. No questions.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Skubitz?

Mr. SKUBITZ. No questions.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Utah, Mr. Burton?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Sheriff, I want to commend you on a fine statement. It is refreshing to hear the other point of view. Thanks for coming.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. WYATT. I have no questions.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. HANSEN. No questions; I do appreciate your statement.

Mr. ASPINALL. Thank you very much for a very clear statement.

The next witness and last witness will be our very good friend and coworker, Mr. S. M. Brandborg, executive director, the Wilderness Society.

While Mr. Brandborg is taking the stand, I will say I remember, as most of you do, his predecessor, Howard Zahniser, a lovable fellow and the most gracious and cooperative fighter that anybody ever had.

STATEMENT OF STEWART M. BRANDBORG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Mr. BRANDBORG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Stewart M. Brandborg, executive director of the Wilderness Society, a national citizen organization of over 32,000 conservation-minded members with its headquarters at 729 15th Street, NW., in Washington, D.C. The Wilderness Society's long-time, broad purpose is to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness, wherever found, and to see established enduring policies and programs for its protection and appropriate use.

I would ask permission, Mr. Chairman, that the text of the article, "Attack on Grand Canyon," by William Bradley, as published in the Wilderness Society's magazine, the Living Wilderness, the winter 1964-65 issue, be placed in the record following my testimony.

Mr. ASPINALL. Without objection. This will not be able to go into the record. Mr. Brandborg, it will have to be placed in the file.

(The document referred to will be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Are you going to read all of your statement?

Mr. BRANDBOG. I would, if I could have your permission. As I understood it yesterday, I was to have 30 minutes. I hope that I can be much more succinct and brief and not require that.

Mr. ASPINALL. I understand that that is possible. Go ahead.

Mr. BRANDBOG. I would also like, Mr. Chairman, to submit for the committee files the new Sierra Club volume, "Battle for Yosemite," by H. R. Jones. This provides an excellent backdrop in its treatment of the controversy over the Hetch Hetchy project in Yosemite National Park, a backdrop for the issues that are being faced here today.

Mr. ASPINALL. Without objection, it may be received.

(The documents referred to will be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. BRANDBOG. The society's interest in the bills before this committee to authorize the Lower Colorado River Basin project has centered on the consideration of the impact upon park and wilderness lands of the proposed Marble Gorge and Bridge Canyon projects. We are also concerned about the proposed Hooker project that would be authorized by this legislation, the reservoir of which would extend, as we understand it, into the Gila Wilderness Area of New Mexico. In our study of these proposals we have been keenly aware of the critical water needs of States in the Lower Colorado River Basin, and it is our hope that these may be met with alternative projects and programs that do not impinge upon the wilderness lands of either the national park system or the national wilderness preservation system.

Congress, in enacting the Wilderness Act, has recognized that the greater part of the wilderness which remains in our country today is found in national forest wilderness and primitive areas, the wildlife refuges and wildlife ranges, and the national park system. These are areas which have been set aside administratively or through action of Congress for preservation of certain wilderness and wildlife values and outstanding scenic, historic, and natural features.

Congress has established procedures in the Wilderness Act which permit designation of areas of wilderness in each of these Federal jurisdictions for addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System. It also has established a national policy for the protection of wilderness, in the words of the act, "for the American people of present and future generations" and—

for the use and enjoyment of "wilderness area" in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character * * *

Within the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, and the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Monument and Grand Canyon National Park, are extensive wilderness lands which are subject to review under the act's procedures for placement in the wilderness system upon the authorization of Congress. There seems to be little question that a major part of the vast wild land areas within these two units of the park system can qualify as wilderness under the Wilderness Act's definition and that they are worthy of such preservation in perpetuity as a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Anyone who has seen the Grand Canyon, who has read about it, or who has even seen pictures of it, is aware of its inspiring and spec-

tacular features. Even in this period of technological advance and impressive feats in outer space, it continues to hold its own as one of the geological "wonders of the world," an awesome product of the natural forces that through a period of thousands of years have given it such impressive characteristics.

These forces have left it, until now, essentially unmarked and unimpaired by man and in keeping with the act's definition of wilderness "affected primarily by the forces of nature." There are few units of wild land in our Nation today which offer a richer variety of what the Wilderness Act describes in its definition of wilderness as features of "ecological, geological, * * * scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value."

In this connection, we would urge the committee to draw upon the resources of the Government by calling as witnesses representatives of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, to testify upon the impact of the two dams proposed for construction in Grand Canyon and the feasibility of alternatives that have been recommended during these hearings.

The many testimonials to the incomparable features of the Grand Canyon, including the excellent book by Francois Leydet, "Time and the River Flowing," presented to this committee during these hearings and that are already recorded both in our literature and on film, need not be elaborate. The Leydet book provides an excellent basis for evaluating the great sacrifice to park values that would be inflicted by Bridge Canyon and Marble Gorge Dams. More important than attempting to add to this documentation at this time is to determine whether we in this Nation are going to respect the sanctity of those lands which, like the Grand Canyon National Monument and Grand Canyon National Park, have been set aside in their unspoiled and natural state to be preserved for some special purpose within our wildlife, national park, and wilderness systems.

The same consideration must also apply in the case of determining the impact of the proposed Hooker Reservoir upon the Gila Wilderness Area in New Mexico. Established in 1924, this was the first wilderness area to be set up within the national forests. Now, as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System, the Gila is one of our most widely known national forest wilderness areas. Infringement of the Hooker Reservoir upon this area must be avoided if the National Wilderness Preservation System is not to be violated. We strongly urge that this dam be designed and located to prevent any encroachment upon this unit.

We are encouraged by the action of the Bureau of the Budget in requesting that consideration of the authorization for the Bridge Canyon project be postponed. We would urge that this committee delete both the Bridge Canyon Dam and the Marble Gorge Dam from the bills which it has before it, as well as all related facilities that would impinge upon the natural and unspoiled features of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. Certainly one of the most striking of these natural features is the Colorado River itself, the waters of which have been the principal force through thousands of years in shaping the canyon.

The argument that damming the river at Marble Canyon will not

affect either the park or the monument will not stand up if we consider the effects of such an impoundment upon the natural flows and temperatures of the river as it passes through the Grand Canyon gorge. The unnatural and wide fluctuations of the dammed stream, with resulting deposits of debris and silt, would destroy the river's shorelines and their animal and plant communities, and would mar the magnificent rock faces of the canyon where they rise as sheer expanses from the water's edge. The wild character of the Grand Canyon cannot be preserved if Marble Gorge is built.

The Bridge Canyon project would also destroy natural flows and levels of the river in addition to flooding the river and tributary canyons of Grand Canyon National Monument and the lower 13 miles of the Colorado River within the national park. The claim that impoundment of the river at Bridge Canyon will not detract from the wilderness and scenic qualities of the Grand Canyon is without basis. Such a reservoir, even though confined and constructed within the lower walls of the canyon, will destroy some of the most important natural features of the free flowing Colorado, as it is now found, its shores and the lower canyon within both the national monument and the national park. It becomes obvious, in view of this serious impact, that the development of the Grand Canyon with dams and related facilities cannot be carried out in a manner that is consistent with the primary purposes of the park as required in the 1919 act establishing Grand Canyon National Park.

Beyond these considerations, and more basic than arguments that are developed by those who rationalize the intrusions of dams and water development projects within both the Grand Canyon and the Gila Wilderness Area, are the precedent-setting implications of these proposed projects. Their authorization would clear the way for further serious violations of our national park system and our National Wilderness Preservation System, and would open the question as to whether we in this Nation shall honor earlier dedications of lands that have been set aside for preservation for future generations of Americans.

If Congress now authorizes dams and other nonconforming developments in these units of the national park and national wilderness systems, it will open the door to a host of proposals for development within many of the dedicated national parks and national monuments, the wildlife refuges and ranges, and wilderness lands both within the wilderness system and in the national forest primitive areas, and in other protected areas.

It is important that we recognize this as a matter of principle which underlies our national policies for the preservation and protection of all park, wildlife, and wilderness lands. If we are unable now to respect the dedications which have been made within the relatively short span of a few decades in this century, we can expect to find ourselves in the position of having to justify similar encroachments for many purposes other than those for which these units were established and set aside. In each instance the end result will be the same: the sacrifice of irreplaceable land areas and losses that are irrevocable.

In conclusion, I would emphasize again that the Wilderness Society is very much aware of the critical water needs of people in the Lower Colorado River Basin. We are deeply concerned about these

and we would wish to encourage any alternate programs to meet these requirements without the construction of facilities within the Grand Canyon or the Gila Wilderness Area that violate the integrity of the national park system and the national wilderness preservation system.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to present these views to the committee. Thank you.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think this is your first appearance in your new official position, is it not?

Mr. BRANDBORG. I think I have been here on behalf of some of the earlier park bills, earlier in the year. Certainly this is my first appearance before you and I welcome the opportunity.

Mr. ASPINALL. You are a very good successor to the job. There are approximately 2½ minutes for questioning for each member. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Udall.

Mr. UDALL. I will reserve my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Brandborg, is there any requirement for membership in the Wilderness Society, other than paying dues?

Mr. BRANDBORG. I think an interest in wilderness is a requirement. But essentially the payment of \$5 dues fee—\$3 if the person is a student—is the principal requirement.

Mr. HOSMER. Are you a paid official of the society?

Mr. BRANDBORG. Yes, I am.

Mr. HOSMER. Does the society have annual meetings?

Mr. BRANDBORG. Yes, it does.

Mr. HOSMER. Any other meetings?

(Mr. Brandborg shakes head in negative.)

Mr. HOSMER. When was the last one?

Mr. BRANDBORG. Within the last 3 weeks, the meeting of the Wilderness Society's governing council was held in Colorado.

Mr. HOSMER. The governing council, you say?

Mr. BRANDBORG. Yes.

Mr. HOSMER. But not the society itself?

Mr. BRANDBORG. The governing council is responsible for the business of the society.

Mr. HOSMER. I am asking about the society itself, not the governing council. Does it have any annual meetings?

Mr. BRANDBORG. The governing council has the annual meeting for the purpose of conducting the society's business.

Mr. HOSMER. The membership?

Mr. BRANDBORG. The 32,000 members beyond those who belong to the governing council you are inquiring about, is that right?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes.

Mr. BRANDBORG. The members participate in meetings of our governing council as they did at Durango 2 weeks ago. They participate in our field trips and in the frequent meetings we have with our membership in various communities across the country. But they do not meet as a total membership with the council at these annual meetings.

Mr. HOSMER. Is it not a fact that you have never polled your membership relative to the recommendation you have made on their behalf for the deletion of Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams and the elimination of the Hooker Reservoir?