

Phil Farrell
883 Loma Verde Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Davis, CA
Permit No. 34



WILDERNESS RECORD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

ISSN 0194-3030

Vol. 18, No. 8

2655 Portage Bay East, Suite 5 Davis, CA 95616

August, 1993



Headwaters forest

Photo © David J. Cross

Headwaters wilderness bill to be introduced

By Dana Stolzman

After years of lawsuits, protests, public hearings, and research, forest advocates have a unique opportunity to help pass legislation to protect the largest stands of threatened ancient redwoods—the Headwaters redwood forest complex in Humboldt County. Representatives Dan Hamburg (D-Ukiah) and Pete Stark (D-Oakland) in early August prepared to introduce a bill, the Headwaters Forest Act, based on a proposal submitted by North Coast activists, that would, among other things, authorize a Headwaters Wilderness.

The purpose of the legislation is to provide for the sound management and protection of old-growth redwood forests and to preserve and enhance habitat for the marbled murrelet, northern spotted owl, native salmon stocks, and other old-growth dependent species. The bill, which has approximately 70 cosponsors so far, would in-

corporate 44,000 acres of private land into Six Rivers National Forest in a phased acquisition process, starting with the 4,500-acre Headwaters Grove which is slated to be designated wilderness. Though not an appropriations bill, the Headwaters Forest Act would authorize the purchase or exchange of lands for federal acquisition.

To understand the significance of this legislation, it is necessary to understand the evolutionary history of the redwood ecosystem and the political history of the "timber wars."

Once, a two-million-acre redwood biome spanned the coast from Big Sur to southern Oregon. Today, after 130 years of logging, over 95 percent of the original coastal redwood ecosystem is gone. The remaining old growth lies in Redwood National Park and California state parks, and in the hands of private timber companies which are felling ancient redwoods at an alarming rate. The Headwaters complex, the largest stand of unprotected redwoods in the state, is owned by Maxxam's Pacific Lumber Company.

A variety of habitats are found within the Headwaters complex, including lowland riparian forests, ancient redwood forests, upland prairies, oak woodlands, residual old growth, and second-growth stands. These habitats support a variety of animals, plants, and micro-organisms. Among the mammals are black bear, Pacific fisher, marten, mountain lion, coyote, black tail deer, flying squirrel, and red tree vole. Birds include osprey, goshawk, and migratory and resident songbirds as well as the threatened northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet. Cool, shady

continued on page 5

High noon at Sunrise

Yosemite High Sierra Camp awash in controversy (and sewage)

By Lucy Rosenau

Yosemite's High Sierra camps, long the focus of contention among wilderness users who either love or hate the camps, are flush in the middle of controversy again, this time because the National Park Service intends to construct a new building to house showers and toilets at Sunrise High Sierra Camp this summer. News of the plan for Sunrise trickled out in spite of the agency's failure to notify environmental groups concerned with the Yosemite Wilderness (see sidebar on page 4), and with the news

came old questions about whether the camps belong in the wilderness and whether the law that authorized them to remain allows them to be improved.

The five High Sierra camps persist as non-wilderness enclaves surrounded by the Yosemite Wilderness. A day hike's distance apart, they provide meals and lodging to summer hikers and riders, many of them traveling a circuit that takes them from Tuolumne Meadows to each of the camps in turn and back again. The camps also are used by backpackers who camp nearby and buy supplies and meals

continued on page 4

In this issue:

Our man in the PIT: The view from inside a consensus group....3

**Good news (and good work!):
Meiss allotment to be closed.....4**

**More good news: Critical
habitat acquired in Mojave.....5**

Coalition news

Monthly Report

Each year Wendy attends the annual conference of the American Society of Civil Engineers. I've followed her to Durango (where we backpacked in the South San Juan Wilderness) and to Honolulu (hiking in the crater of Haleakala). Last year I declined visiting Baltimore in August, and I think I might skip next year's Kansas City meeting, too.

But this year it was in Park City, Utah. There are several wilderness areas in the Wasatch Mountains, and there is the High Uintas Wilderness Area—a huge wilderness nearly as large as our Trinity Alps. Sounded good to me.

The Uinta Mountains always have fascinated me. They are the highest mountain range in Utah, topping out at 13,528 feet on Kings Peak. Other than the Brooks Range in Alaska, they are the most prominent east-west range in the United States.

Although we weren't fortunate enough to see one, the range shelters moose (moose in Utah?) as well as elk, deer, mountain lion, and bear. We did see a golden eagle and some amazing beaver clearcuts, dams, and lodges.

Perhaps it was the trailhead we chose, starting at a low (for the Uintas) 8,200 feet, but this seemed to be a pack stock wilderness. Other than two guys we saw the last day and a Boy Scout troop fleeing the heavy rains, all the other people we saw on our nine-day odyssey were riding or using horses as beasts of burden. Before the rains the trails were dusty, after they were quagmires.

We did meet one group of stereotypical cowboys—local men chewing tobacco, drinking Coors beer in the saddle, and blasting away the empties with their sidearms. They were nice enough, but one of the guys had an open saddlebag that left the trail littered with his Reeboks, fishing tackle, and various camp necessities.

Recently, Ike Livermore and I reminisced about how it once was traditional to leave firewood at your campsite for the next visitor, and how that convention no longer seemed in vogue in the Sierra. But that custom seemed intact in the Uintas, where campfire rings are a requisite of every campsite. At the lower elevations that wasn't a problem, considering the abundance of lodgepole, spruce, and fir, but at higher levels wood was scarce.

Unlike the false maxim that "it never rains at night in the Sierra," it not only rains but it snows, hails, and otherwise precipitates in the Uintas. This was a mixed blessing. It chased the crowds out of the wilderness, but it made for hazardous hiking conditions, especially stream crossings.

We dined on brook, rainbow, and cutthroat trout nearly every evening, and the stars were spectacular at night. It was alternately a challenging and relaxing vacation.

There were no quotas, no permits required. And despite the Forest Service map that suggested registering before our trip, the local officials seemed to care little about our visit.

We returned home via the Great Basin National Cow Park and Highway 50. Great Basin was scenic (and I loved ribbing the rangers over allowing bovines in the park), and U. S. 50 was devoid of traffic. I wondered how Jed Smith managed to cross the Nevada desert 150 years ago without a triple-A map or ribbon of asphalt.

All in all, it was a great vacation. But it makes me wonder why I live in Davis. Yes, I'm two hours from the coast and two hours from the mountains, but in one hour I'm nowhere. Oh well.

By Jim Eaton



Bob Barnes organized the CWC's 1989 wilderness conference. Staff photo

Congratulations, Bob

That fine organization, the National Audubon Society, has made a fine decision in hiring CWC Director Bob Barnes as a circuit rider. In his new position, Bob will be traveling up and down the state as part of a campaign to save neotropical migratory birds.

Since he'll be based in Sacramento, we expect to see more of Bob than we did when he was teaching in Porterville. So perhaps the people who most merit congratulations are Audubon and the CWC staff.

Welcome, species

The California Wilderness Coalition is open to all species, though the overwhelming majority of our members are feral people. We are pleased (and a bit mystified) to welcome Native Species for Habitat as our newest member group.

Though we've yet to learn just what exactly these native species are up to, we look forward to working with them. Native Species for Habitat, care of Georgia Stigall, can be reached at P. O. Box 2152, Sunnyvale, CA 94087-0152.

Music to benefit by

Environmental troubadours Bill Oliver and Glen Waldeck will be in Davis August 18 for a concert to benefit the CWC and Yolo Environmental Resource Center. The fun starts at 8:00 p.m. in the Varsity Theater; tickets go for a song, \$5. For tickets, call (916) 758-0380.

Wilderness Trivia Quiz Question:

How did Lost Cannon Creek (Carson-Iceberg Roadless Area) get its name?

Answer on page 7

Letters

Dear Editor,

The article by Charles Morgan in your July issue contains many false statements. One example is his claim that "there is no foundation in fact that pack and saddle stock destroy or pulverize trails any more than foot traffic."

A review of the scientific literature on this subject clearly shows otherwise. For instance, studies have shown that trails used by horses were significantly deeper than trails used by hikers only¹ and that horses caused significantly greater wear than hikers.² One researcher concluded that horses significantly increased the potential for severe trail erosion due to their heavy weight and the churning effect of their hooves.³ Another even found that horses caused more trail wear than motorcycles.⁴ After reviewing all of the available literature, one researcher concluded that "pack stock and horse travel is considerably more damaging to trails than hiking."⁵

It is only natural that Mr. Morgan and the Backcountry Horsemen defend their use of public lands. But it is unfortunate that they find it necessary to stray so far from the truth.

Sincerely,
Peter Browning
High Sierra Hikers Association

A list of references is available from the HSHA, P. O. Box 9865, Truckee, CA 96162 or from the CWC.

Dear Editor,

I was pleased to see your recent article on the High Sierra Hikers Association proposal to establish a network of "foot-travel only" trails in the Sierra Nevada wilderness. This commendable idea is long overdue and would help alleviate growing tensions between hikers and stock users.

I respect the past contributions of the Backcountry Horsemen of California to the Coalition's activities; however, several of the statements made in opposition to the "foot-travel only" concept made by BCH representative Charles Morgan are patently false.

His assertion that maintaining trails for livestock is no more expensive than maintaining them for foot travel has no basis in fact. The vast majority of wilderness trail dollars are spent making trails more safe and comfortable for stock users. One glaring example is the recent work done around Evolution Lakes of Kings Canyon National Park. Here, trail crews

continued on page 6

Wilderness management

Managing wilderness by consensus—will it work?

By Joe Fontaine

Caught in the middle between sometimes-warring groups of public land users, federal land managers increasingly are seeking to create "consensus groups," groups composed of members of the public representing different interests and charged with solving thorny land-management issues. Many environmentalists have been leery of the consensus-group process, either because they do not believe consensus is possible or because they do not trust the fairness of the process itself. Though the example of one consensus group cannot be generalized, we asked longtime wilderness activist Joe Fontaine to describe his experience to date on a consensus group working primarily on recreation management issues for four Sierra wilderness areas.



The Forest Service is in the process of developing a new management plan for much of the wilderness in the central Sierra Nevada. Wilderness users know that different rules in different national forests create confusion and result in less than optimal protection of wilderness. Recognizing this problem in the Sierra, the Forest Service has put together a group of users as a public involvement team (PIT) to help the agency develop a new, unified management plan for the three national forests involved.

Four wilderness areas that lie between Yosemite and Sequoia-Kings Canyon national parks are included. They are the Monarch, Dinkey Lakes, John Muir, and Ansel Adams wildernesses in the Inyo, Sequoia, and Sierra national forests. These areas constitute one continuous wilderness under three different jurisdictions. The purpose of the PIT is to help the Forest Service develop one management plan for the entire area.

Representatives of all major user groups are members of the PIT: backpackers, private and commercial stock users, businesses that cater to wilderness users, Forest Service personnel, the California Department of Fish and Game, commercial users of wilderness as diverse as Outward Bound and Pacific Gas & Electric Company, flyfishing enthusiasts, scientists, a rancher, and a Native American. There are nearly thirty all told. An early objection to the composition of the PIT was raised by the High Sierra Hikers Association, which felt that more backpackers should be included because they constitute the majority of users. The Forest Service responded that they were trying to ensure that all user groups were represented and that since the PIT would operate by consensus, the interests of all wilderness users would be adequately reflected in the final result.

The PIT has met five times since it was organized early this year. The group has identified a number of issues to address and has begun to work through a procedure to deal with them. The issues are:

- What are the appropriate levels and kinds of commercial uses in the wilderness?
- What measures should be used to limit or minimize the

impacts of grazing by domestic livestock?

- What number of visitors, party size, length-of-stay, and distribution can be allowed while maintaining wilderness values, character, and solitude?
- What is the appropriate kind, level, and location of recreational stock use in the wilderness?
- Are the permit and quota systems working? If not, how should they be modified?
- Are camping or travel restrictions needed to protect resource values, and if so, where?
- What actions are appropriate to reduce user impact or restore impacted sites?

statement of principle opposing commercial livestock grazing in wilderness. Yet grazing is legal, however much we may oppose it.

So far there have been no confrontations among different user groups over these and other potentially divisive issues. Dealing with these issues will be difficult at best; at worst they could drive the PIT into gridlock. For now, all parties are communicating openly and effectively.

Currently the PIT is discussing what the Forest Service calls "opportunity classes," a kind of recreational zoning in the wilderness. For example, impacts near trailheads might be very obvious and persistent. Other areas of the wilderness might receive impacts that would be visible near popular campsites and along heavily used trails, but they would disappear or heal with a few weeks of non-use. Still other areas might remain without trails and receive little use, with impacts visible only to trained observers. Each of the issues we have identified could be resolved differently in different zones.

The PIT process parallels but does not replace the public involvement process mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act. The Forest Service has agreed to use the recommendations from the PIT when an environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared according to the provisions of the Act. The issues identified above will be analyzed in the EIS along with alternative resolutions.

Public involvement is needed at all stages if the final product is to meet the needs of the public and the wilderness.

All meetings of the PIT are open to the public, and time at each meeting is set aside for public comment. Public attendance at the PIT meetings so far has been low. I cannot urge readers of the *Wilderness Record* strongly enough to attend PIT meetings whenever possible. Too often those of us who work so hard on campaigns to establish new wilderness areas assume the job is completed when a bill is signed and we move on to the next campaign. Proper wilderness management is vital if wilderness is to be protected permanently and well. Constant vigilance is required if we do not want our victories to be lost through attrition. If the PIT process works and a good wilderness management plan results, it may set a precedent for the development of management plans for other wilderness areas.

PIT meetings are being held in a variety of places in the hopes that all participants will be inconvenienced equally. Two meetings were held in Bakersfield, one in Ridgecrest, one at Fish Camp, and, most recently, one at Mammoth. The next meeting will be October 2, either in Lee Vining or Yosemite Valley. If you would like to attend PIT meetings, call me at (805) 821-2055.



As the PIT process continues, we will have updates on the group's progress.



Temple Crag, John Muir Wilderness

Photo by Holly Lerner

- To what extent should trails be maintained, restored, eliminated, or added?
- What types of facilities should be provided at trailheads? To what extent should signs be provided?
- What fire management practices are appropriate in the wilderness?
- What role should education play in wilderness management?
- What is the appropriate level of wildlife, vegetation, and fishery management in the wilderness?
- What administrative structures, practices, and activities are necessary or appropriate?

Each PIT member will rank these issues by priority. One of the most controversial is bound to be the conflict between hikers and stock users. Stock users maintain they have just as much right to use wilderness as anyone else, and hikers complain about the number of stock animals in the backcountry and their disproportionate impact on trails, campsites, and water quality.

Fires are another divisive issue. Campfires already are prohibited in most high-elevation areas, and more restrictions may be needed to minimize impacts. To many people, however, campfires are a necessary part of a wilderness experience.

How about commercial grazing of cattle and sheep? The California Wilderness Coalition recently adopted a

Wilderness management

Echo-Carson victory!

Bye now, brown cow!

By Jim Eaton

The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) of the U.S. Forest Service has decided to suspend grazing in the upper Truckee River watershed near Lake Tahoe. Forest Supervisor Robert E. Harris determined that the Meiss Grazing Allotment should be rested for five to fifteen years to allow the vegetation and fisheries to recover. The grazing ban will begin in 1995.

The land involved, also known as the proposed Echo-Carson Wilderness and the Dardanelles Roadless Area, is heavily used by backcountry recreationists. During the comment period, about 150 letters were received by the Forest Service. As a result of public comment, a "no grazing" alternative was added to the environmental analysis.

In his decision, Harris declared that boundary and internal fencing will be removed, except for the fence at Scotts Lake used by an adjacent allotment. Posts will be left standing but not maintained.

Every five years the Forest Service will appraise the range to determine if "desired future conditions" are met. When the land recovers to these minimum standards, grazing will resume with controls to maintain the re-

sources at the same level. The Forest Service believes that grazing will be allowed in the future.

According to the *Tahoe Daily Tribune*, the permittees are not happy with this decision. "It will put us out of business," said Doug Joses, adding that his family may have to go on welfare. "This isn't what the American dream is all about. We have cows up here so our kids can do it."

Annual grazing use has averaged 934 animal unit months (AUMs) during the past ten years in the Meiss allotment. (Each AUM represents a month of grazing by a cow and her calf.) A 1970 study estimated the grazing capacity at 722 AUMs at a time when the allotment also included the Grass Lake area, now off-limits to grazing. Sites were established in 1971 to monitor the long-term effects of grazing, but the Forest Service has been unable to relocate these places.

The Echo-Carson area is the most popular backcountry area in the LTBMU outside of the Desolation Wilderness, with between 10,000 and 15,000 people visiting the area each year. The Forest Service receives frequent complaints about cows in the area eroding streambanks, trampling meadows, destroying trails, and clanging their bells.

But there are far more than recreational conflicts with grazing. Cattle in the Meiss country are adversely affect-

ing riparian vegetation, sensitive plants, wildlife, and fisheries.

The willow flycatcher, for example, needs large, dense stands of willows or other deciduous riparian shrubs along streams or adjacent to wet meadows. Cattle can impact this bird, listed as endangered by the state, by knocking over their nests or eating the lower branches of willows where the birds nest.

A restoration program for the threatened Lahontan cutthroat trout has begun in Meiss Meadow. These fish, however, suffer from lack of shade due to browsed willows and loss of habitat from trampling of streambanks. The Forest Service states that with all the cattle removed, it will still take 10 to 15 years for the fisheries habitat to recover.

If the decision by Supervisor Harris stands after anticipated appeals are settled, environmentalists will have to become involved every five years when a new assessment of range conditions is conducted. The Meiss allotment will become an important site for determining how well and how quickly mountain lands recover from past grazing abuses.



Faced with confusing law, Park Service is intent on retaining Sunrise camp...

continued from page 1

at the camps. Those supplies are brought to the camps each week by mule trains which employ the same trails hikers do. Having to yield to mule trains that kick up dust and leave manure on the trails undoubtedly is part of the reason some wilderness users dislike the High Sierra camps. The perception—and to some extent, the reality—that the camps are exclusive is another reason for the antipathy toward the camps. Reservations are hard to get, even by Yosemite's standards, and each year some slots are set aside for dignitaries. At \$73 a night per person for a bed in a tent cabin and two meals, the camps are expensive but worth the price to the people who return year after year.

Separate from the question of how the camps affect wilderness visitors is the more pressing question of how the camps affect the wilderness itself. It is this latter question that is most relevant because Congress directed that the camps be removed if they cause "an increased adverse impact on the natural environment." In deciding to build a new facility, the Park Service seems to be tacitly admitting that, in its present condition, Sunrise High Sierra Camp has an adverse effect on its surrounding environment. Both the sewage system and potable water supply at Sunrise were identified as inadequate in a 1991 environmental impact statement. That the Park Service believes new construction is an appropriate remedy to the current situation, and that many wilderness defenders believe otherwise, illustrates just how confusing and open to interpretation the congressional directive was.

The 1984 California Wilderness Act, which established the Yosemite Wilderness, was accompanied by a report from the congressional committee that reviewed the legislation. The critical passage of the Committee Report states: "If and when it occurs that the continued operation of [the High

Sierra Camps] at the then current acceptable operational standard results in an increased impact on the adjacent wilderness environment (including increased adverse impact on the natural environment within the enclaves

themselves), the operation of these facilities shall be promptly terminated, the facilities removed, the sites naturalized, and...the areas promptly designated as wilderness."

Straightforward as this may seem, it nonetheless has been subject to interpretation by a Park Service that seems intent on retaining the High Sierra camps. Though Sunrise has only recently opened after an unusually heavy winter, the Park Service already has transported 700,000 pounds of construction materials to the camp by helicopter. In 1985, the Park Service built a new "leach mound" system at Vogelsang High Sierra Camp to contain sewage that was polluting meadows and streams. When that system proved inadequate, the agency in 1991 installed composting toilets without soliciting public comment. Despite the controversy that arose over the Park Service's actions at Vogelsang, the agency has again made construction plans, this time without notifying the conservation community.

Whether or not any of the High Sierra camps is adversely affecting its surrounding environment certainly can be determined. The question that remains, whether any camps should then be removed, eventually will be answered, probably by a ruling from a federal court. Though there have been no lawsuits filed to date, some conservation groups are considering bringing suit to halt construction at Sunrise until a court can rule on the legality of the agency's plan.

Though the Park Service has not solicited public input on its plan for Sunrise High Sierra Camp, comments may be sent to Superintendent Michael Finley, Yosemite National Park, Yosemite, CA 95389.

...by any means necessary

On the whole, the California Wilderness Coalition does not spend a lot of time monitoring the National Park Service, which is not likely to build roads and log roadless areas or allow off-road vehicle races through potential wilderness lands.

What rankles environmentalists is that many park officials have the attitude that they can do no wrong. These officials seem to feel that since they are on the right side of environmental issues, they have no need to comply with laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act.

Over the years, the Coalition has written the agency letters about projects in Yosemite National Park. Other than one phone call, our letters have been summarily ignored. Afterwards we do seem to get a spate of notices about minor projects—parking lot extensions, campground alterations, and outhouse relocations—but never announcements of the large projects affecting the wilderness. We only learn about schemes like the sewage treatment plants at the High Sierra camps or the commercial salvage logging along Tioga Pass Road unofficially, from our members or sympathetic Park Service employees.

When Howard Chapman was Regional Director for the Park Service, environmentalists met with him and his staff several times a year to discuss problems and issues. This is not happening now. Perhaps it is time to begin anew.

Wilderness news

Mojave grows while desert bill idles

The Trust for Public Land announced in July that it had acquired and transferred to federal ownership four parcels within the proposed Mojave National Park, much of which will be designated wilderness. Formerly private inholdings, Caruthers Canyon, Rock Spring, Woods Wash, and Marl Spring will have permanent protection once the California desert bill is enacted. Consideration of the bill is expected to resume when Congress reconvenes after its August recess.

Though the acquisition of inholdings, privately-owned parcels surrounded by public lands, is always desirable, if only to facilitate management, the four desert inholdings were particularly important acquisitions because their springs and streams provide rich habitat for wildlife (see article in June 1992 WR).

In all, 1,727 acres of bountiful beauty and biodiversity have been added to the public trust, thanks to the Trust for Public Land.



Woods Wash in the future Mojave Wilderness. Photo by Jim Eaton

Environmental groups file suit to save de-listed Mojave squirrel

A coalition of environmental organizations filed suit August 2 in San Francisco Superior Court challenging the California Fish and Game Commission's recent decision to remove the Mojave ground squirrel from the protection of the state Endangered Species Act.

The lawsuit, filed by the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund on behalf of the Sierra Club, Mountain Lion Foundation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Defenders of Wildlife, and Desert Protective Council, contends that the state Fish and Game Commission violated the state Endangered Species Act and the California Environmental Quality Act in deciding to remove the squirrel from the endangered species list.

The Mojave ground squirrel is found only in brush habitat in the Mojave Desert of California. Habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, and drought threaten to wipe out the species. It has been on the state endangered species list since 1971.

At the request of the Kern County Planning Agency, the Fish and Game Commission voted to remove the squirrel from the state list after hearing claims of economic hardship from Ridgecrest and California City land developers.

Environmentalists have filed lawsuits in the past against the commission when it refused to list a species worthy of protection. All of these lawsuits either were lost by the commission or resulted in a negotiated settlement giving needed protection to imperilled species. The Mojave ground squirrel is the first species ever removed from the state list for economic, rather than biological, reasons.

Headwaters bill a step toward resolving timber wars

continued from page 1

streams support Pacific giant salamander, tailed frogs, Olympic salamander, steelhead, trout, and Coho and other salmon. Coast redwood, Douglas fir, grand fir, western red cedar, Pacific yew, western hemlock, madrone, red alder, tan oak, California bay laurel, and vine maple create a multi-layered canopy. Salal, huckleberry, salmonberry, oxalis, trillium, and numerous ferns blanket the forest floor. Many of these species are on the state or federal endangered species lists, and others are candidates for listing.

Headwaters forest is among California's three remaining nesting areas for the marbled murrelet, a seabird that flies inland to nest on mossy limbs of ancient trees. Like the spotted owl, the murrelet is an indicator species for forest health.

The importance of Headwaters forest goes beyond individual species, however. The forest is a relic of a landscape that otherwise no longer exists, a redwood survivor now isolated by 50 miles of logged land from Redwood National Park to the north and Humboldt Redwoods State Park to the south. It is a link with ancient history and evolutionary journey. It is the seedbed for future recovery of the redwood ecosystem.

Headwaters Grove itself is a pristine ancient redwood forest with pure streams, deep alluvial soils, and some of the tallest, oldest trees on earth. The fate of the grove has

been the focus of bitter controversy since 1985, when Maxxam leveraged \$700 million in junk-bond financing to purchase Pacific Lumber. To pay off its debt, Maxxam quickly began to liquidate its assets, including the Pacific Lumber pension fund and the trees themselves. Overnight, Maxxam transformed Pacific Lumber's selective logging policy to one of clearcutting the last stands of ancient redwoods.

When forest activists awoke to the situation, virtually no one outside the company knew what those lands contained. A vigorous mapping project soon revealed several small redwood "islands" and one large grove that was named Headwaters for its location at the highest reaches of Salmon Creek and Little South Fork Elk River, tributaries to Humboldt Bay. Since then, activists from Earth First! and the Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC) have worked unceasingly in the courts and in the media to publicize

and block the logging of Headwaters. These timber wars came to a head in 1990's "Redwood Summer" campaign.

In 1991, Rep. Stark introduced a sweeping bill to place 200,000 acres of Maxxam land under federal designation. Strenuous opposition from the timber industry eventually stalled a less ambitious version of the legislation in committee.

The current Headwaters Forest Act is truly a historic opportunity to protect this irreplaceable forest because it is the first time that legislation is being introduced and supported by the representative of the redwood region. Rep. Hamburg's predecessor, Frank Riggs, opposed the Stark legislation.

Supporters of the Headwaters bill are hoping to line up more cosponsors. For more in-

formation about efforts on behalf of Headwaters, contact EPIC at P. O. Box 397, Garberville, CA 95542; (707) 923-2931.

Dana Stolzman is the editor of EPIC's newsletter, Wild California.

Headwaters is a relic of a landscape that otherwise no longer exists, a redwood survivor now isolated by 50 miles of logged land from Redwood National Park to the north and Humboldt Redwoods State Park to the south.

Wilderness legislation

Wilderness primer, part XV

Wild & Scenic Rivers

By Steve Evans

Congress passed the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act in 1968 to balance the existing policy of developing some rivers with a policy of protecting other rivers in their free-flowing state. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the Act.

The Wild & Scenic Rivers System is the nation's primary tool for river protection. Compared with the national park and wilderness systems, the federal river system has been relatively under-utilized, although river protection is expected to become more prominent on the national environmental agenda in the next few years.

Depending on how tributaries are counted, there are 16 California rivers, encompassing 1,900 miles, included in the national system so far, most of them in existing or potential wilderness areas. These are (roughly from north to south) the Smith, Klamath, Scott, Salmon, Trinity, Eel, Middle Fork Feather, North Fork American, lower American, Tuolumne, Merced, Big Sur, Kings, Kern, and Sisquoc rivers and Sespe Creek.

The primary purpose of this protection is to prohibit new dams and diversions. It is the only status that absolutely protects rivers from federal hydroelectric licensing—which even national park or wilderness status does not definitely preclude. On public lands, a one-quarter mile corridor on each side of the river is established and managed by a federal agency, usually the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, or National Park Service. Within the public lands corridor, activities harmful to wild-and-scenic values are prohibited.

Designated rivers are classified "wild," "scenic," or "recreational" depending on the level of adjacent development and road access. Wild rivers are unroaded, with access primarily by trail. Scenic rivers may have occasional road crossings but are still largely undeveloped. Recreational rivers can have parallel highways or railroads, buildings along their banks, and other development.

Although many designated rivers flow through wilderness areas, the system can include urban rivers. The lower American River, which flows through the Sacramento metropolitan area, is an excellent example of an outstanding designated river in an urban setting.

Rivers are determined eligible for designation either through congressionally mandated studies or through agency-initiated studies required by the Act. Federal agencies are expected to study the wild-and-scenic potential of rivers as part of their regular land and resource planning. As a result of this provision, more than 2,200 miles of rivers in 202 river segments throughout the state have been found eligible for wild-and-scenic status.

A finding of eligibility means that a federal agency has determined the river to meet the two primary criteria of the Act: The river must be free-flowing and must possess one or more "outstandingly remarkable values." A river segment can be considered free-flowing even if there are dams upstream and downstream as long as the flow is sufficient to maintain its outstanding values. An outstanding value is a natural or cultural resource considered to be unique or representative of its kind within a regional or national context. Outstanding values can include fish, wildlife, recreational, scenic, historic, cultural, geo-

logic, or other values.

Once a river is determined to be eligible, the responsible federal agency is required to protect its free-flowing nature and outstanding values until a recommendation for designation or non-designation is made to Congress. The recommendation phase is also called the "suitability determination."

When determining eligibility, the best professional judgment of an agency's resource specialists is used. When determining suitability, a much more subjective and political weighing of the pros and cons of protection or non-protection is involved.

With one exception, only Congress can designate a wild-and-scenic river. The exception is if a governor petitions the Interior Secretary to add state-protected rivers to the federal system. This happened in 1981 when California Governor Jerry Brown asked Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus to add the entire California Wild & Scenic System to the federal system, thus providing federal protection for the Smith, Klamath, Trinity, Eel, and lower American rivers in the final days of the Carter administration.

State wild-and-scenic protection is considered inferior because rivers are protected only up to their high-water line and because the federal government can license hydroelectric projects on them.

Steve Evans is Conservation Director for Friends of the River and a Director of the California Wilderness Coalition. A longer version of this article first appeared in the Summer 1993 issue of Headwaters, newsletter of Friends of the River.

Gun club aims to shrink Masonic Mtn. WSA

A Mono County gun club is seeking to have a wilderness study area (WSA) boundary moved to accommodate its plans for an elaborate shooting range in Sweetwater Canyon, the *Mono Review-Herald* reported. The Bridgeport Gun Club and county supervisors have asked Representative John Doolittle (R-Rocklin) to explore the possibility of changing the boundary of Masonic Mountain WSA by a hundred yards or less. Such a boundary change would require congressional approval.

Because the proposed shooting range would be on land leased from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the BLM is preparing an environmental assessment to determine how the shooting range would impact wildlife, cultural sites, mining claims, livestock grazing, and of course, the wilderness potential of the WSA. The BLM's Bishop Resource Area Manager, Genivieve Hannon, says agency staff have begun an archaeological survey of the area and will also investigate whether the proposed shooting range will affect deer migration corridors.

As proposed, no facilities would be erected within the current WSA boundaries, but shot and clay-pigeon shards from the some of the firing ranges would fall into the WSA. The BLM is required to protect the wilderness character of WSAs until Congress either designates them as wilderness or releases them to other uses.

Although the official scoping period has not begun, Hannon says the BLM will accept comments on the proposal now. They may be sent to Hannon at Bureau of Land Management, Bishop Resource Area, 787 North Main Street, Suite P, Bishop, CA 93514.

Letters



continued from page 2

spent what was obviously a huge amount of time and thousands of dollars constructing an elaborate series of rock causeways (raised treads bordered by large boulders and filled with dirt), each measuring four to six feet in width and many over a hundred feet in length, across meadows, seeps, and creeks. A tread suitable for hikers would have been far smaller, far less expensive, far less destructive to the surrounding area (rock and fill dirt must come from somewhere), and far less intrusive on the wilderness landscape.

The most blatant demonstration of the additional expense of stock trails was the construction of causeways across modestly sloped stretches of granite (see photo). These structures were built solely for the comfort and safety of stock users. The granite posed absolutely no risk to persons on foot, and consequently no work would have been required if this were a "foot-travel only" trail.

It seems to me that if it takes colossal efforts to ameliorate or prevent damage caused by livestock or to make the route safe enough for stock users, then we should consider closing the trail to that particular use.

Mr. Morgan states that "some backcountry trails have been used by large numbers of livestock for over a hundred years without any reconstruction and are still sound." That is exactly the point of the HSHA's proposal: to identify a network of primary corridors that can be used by livestock without unacceptable impacts and to similarly identify those trails that are not amenable to livestock use—because of excessive grades, erodible soils, or other conditions—and to designate these as "foot-travel only."

Sincerely,
Brian C. Spence
Monroe, OR

Book review

The big book of wild rivers

The Wild and Scenic Rivers of America

By Tim Palmer, Island Press, Covelo, CA, 1993, 339 pp., \$22.95.

Full disclosure requires me to admit that I am quoted in this book (on page 67), and it prominently and positively mentions my employer, Friends of the River (on page 302). Nevertheless, I unabashedly recommend *The Wild and Scenic Rivers of America* to any conservation activist who wants to know the basics about the nation's foremost river conservation law.

I suspect that my copy of this book will quickly become dog-eared as a well-used reference manual. Want to know what President Eisenhower thought about huge federal dam projects? Look it up on page 16. (He regarded federally subsidized dam projects as "creeping socialism.") How often has the federal government exercised its condemnation option on wild-and-scenic rivers? Page 71 has the answer. (Only rarely—in fact, the wild-and-scenic program actually limits the government's authority to condemn.) What is the shortest designated river in the system? Refer to page 193. (It's the 4.2 mile Horsepasture River in North Carolina.)

As a student of the arcane history of river protection, I found the book's history of the wild-and-scenic-river system to be engrossing. Palmer adroitly summarizes the rise of a movement that began with an article in *Montana*

Wildlife by John Craighead, who argued that conservationists should work for a national river protection program instead of always fighting defensive battles against dams. Particularly insightful are the description of the political maneuvering that heralded the passage of the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act in 1968 and the subsequent chronicle of how the new river system grew fitfully over the years.

Palmer also has painstakingly listed pertinent information for every designated river in the system, a Herculean and thankless task given the complexities and definitional variations inherent in a system that includes countless tributaries, creeks that are rivers, and streams that run underground.

The chapter on river management rightly emphasizes the flexibility of the wild-and-scenic system, a flexibility that is its greatest political advantage and disadvantage. As former Representative Robert Lagomarsino once boasted, "I could get Congress to designate my office a wild-and-scenic river if I wanted to." (Perhaps this is why he is no longer in office.)

Palmer tops off his work with a view to the future, giving a particularly gratifying plug for Friends of the River. "If this doggedly determined and talented organization delivers as it has in the past, Friends of the River's 100 Rivers campaign could yield one of the most monumental advances ever for river protection." Sounds good to me.

—Steve Evans

Reprinted from the Summer 1993 issue of *Headwaters*, newsletter of Friends of the River.

CWC t-shirts: the Kiavah good trip!

Erin (l.) models our six-tone landscape shirt now available in jade and fuchsia as well as the ever-popular light blue and pale green for \$15. Nancy wears a design by Bay Area cartoonist Phil Frank; it comes in beige or light gray for \$12. All shirts are 100 percent double-knit cotton. To order, use the form on the back page.



**California
Wilderness
Coalition**

Purposes of the California Wilderness Coalition

...to promote throughout the State of California the preservation of wild lands as legally designated wilderness areas by carrying on an educational program concerning the value of wilderness and how it may best be used and preserved in the public interest, by making and encouraging scientific studies concerning wilderness, and by enlisting public interest and co-operation in protecting existing or potential wilderness areas.

Board of Directors

President—Mary Scoonover, Sac.
Vice Pres.—Alan Carlton, Piedmont
Treasurer—Wendy Cohen, Davis
Secretary—Steve Evans, Davis
Director—Bob Barnes, Porterville
Director—Sally Miller, Lee Vining
Director—Trent Orr, S. F.
Director—Norbert Riedy, S. F.
Director—Ron Stork, Sacramento
Director—Bill Waid, Oakland
Director—Frannie Waid, Oakland

Executive Director—Jim Eaton
Office Coordinator—Nancy Kang

Advisory Committee

Harriet Allen
David R. Brower
Joseph Fontaine
Phillip Hyde
Sally Kabisch
Martin Litton
Norman B. Livermore, Jr.
Michael McCloskey
Julie McDonald
Tim McKay
Nancy S. Pearlman
Lynn Ryan
Bob Schneider
Bernard Shanks
Richard Spotts
Jay Watson
Thomas Winnett

Wilderness Trivia Answer:

It once was thought that John Charles Frémont abandoned his howitzer here in the winter of 1844. It also is possible that name was incorrectly transcribed from "Lost Cañon Creek" on an early map.

from page 2

The Wilderness Record

The *Wilderness Record* is the monthly publication of the California Wilderness Coalition. Articles may be reprinted; credit would be appreciated. Subscription is free with membership.

The *Record* welcomes letters-to-the-editor, articles, black & white photos, drawings, book reviews, poetry, etc. on California wilderness and related subjects. We reserve the right to edit all work.

California Wilderness Coalition
2655 Portage Bay East, Suite 5
Davis, California 95616
(916) 758-0380
jeaton@igc.apc.org

Editor

Lucy Rosenau

Contributors

Jim Eaton
Steve Evans,
Headwaters
Joe Fontaine
Dana Stolzman
Photos & Graphics
David J. Cross
Jim Eaton
Holly Lerner
Brian Spence

Advisors

W. Cohen
J. Eaton

Printed by the Davis Enterprise
on recycled paper.

Coalition Member Groups

Ancient Forest Defense Fund; Branscomb Angeles Chapter, Sierra Club; Los Angeles Back Country Horsemen of CA; Springville Bay Chapter, Sierra Club; Oakland Butte Environmental Council; Chico California Alpine Club; San Francisco California Native Plant Society; Sacramento Citizens Comm. to Save Our Public Lands; Willits

Citizens for Better Forestry; Hayfork Citizens for Mojave National Park; Barstow Citizens for a Vehicle Free Nipomo Dunes; Nipomo

Committee to Save the Kings River; Fresno Conservation Call; Santa Rosa Davis Audubon Society; Davis Defenders of Wildlife; Sacramento Desert Protective Council; Palm Springs Desert Survivors; Oakland Eastern Sierra Audubon Society; Bishop Ecology Center of Southern Calif.; L. A. El Dorado Audubon Society; Long Beach Friends Aware of Wildlife Needs (FAWN); Georgetown

Friends of Chinquapin, Oakland Friends of Plumas Wilderness; Quincy Friends of the Inyo; Lone Pine Friends of the River; San Francisco

Fund for Animals; San Francisco Hands Off Wild Lands! (HOWL); Davis High Sierra Hikers Association; Truckee Inner City Outings Rafting Chapter, Bay Chapter, Sierra Club; San Francisco Kaweah Flyfishers; Visalia Keep the Sespe Wild Committee; Ojai Kern Audubon Society; Bakersfield Kern River Valley Audubon Society; Bakersfield Kern-Kaweah Chapter, Sierra Club; Bakersfield Klamath Forest Alliance; Etna League to Save Lake Tahoe; S. Lake Tahoe

Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club; Palo Alto Lost Coast League; Arcata Madrone Audubon Society; Santa Rosa Marble Mountain Audubon Society; Greenview Marin Conservation League; San Rafael Mendocino Environmental Center; Ukiah Mono Lake Committee; Lee Vining Monterey Peninsula Audubon Society; Carmel Mt. Shasta Area Audubon Society; Mt. Shasta Mt. Shasta Recreation Council Mountain Lion Foundation; Sacramento Native Species for Habitat; Sunnyvale Natural Resources Defense Council; S.F. NCRCC Sierra Club; Santa Rosa Nordic Voice; Livermore Northcoast Environmental Center; Arcata

Pasadena Audubon Society People for Nipomo Dunes Nat'l. Seashore; Nipomo Peppermint Alert; Porterville Placer County Cons. Task Force; Newcastle Planning & Conservation League; Sac. Redwood Chapter, Sierra Club; Santa Rosa Redwood Coast Law Center; Mendocino The Red Mountain Association; Leggett Resource Renewal Institute; San Francisco Rural Institute; Ukiah Sacramento River Preservation Trust; Chico Salmon Trollers Marketing Ass'n.; Fort Bragg San Fernando Valley Audubon Society; Van Nuys Save Our Ancient Forest Ecology (SAFE); Modesto Sea & Sage Audubon Society; Santa Ana Sequoia Forest Alliance; Kernville Sierra Ass'n. for the Environment; Fresno Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund; S. F. Sierra Treks; Ashland, OR Soda Mtn. Wilderness Council; Ashland, OR South Fork Watershed Ass'n.; Porterville South Yuba R. Citizens League; Nevada City Tulare County Audubon Society; Visalia U.C. Davis Environmental Law Society W. States Endurance Run; San Francisco The Wilderness Society; San Francisco Wintu Audubon Society; Redding Yolano Group, Sierra Club; Davis Yolo Environmental Resource Center; Davis

Maybe a pie chart would help

"We could create a little haven for the birds. We could put them all on Air Force One and fly them to some exotic place. That's a lot cheaper than letting a whole region be devastated."

—H. Ross Perot on the northern spotted owl, quoted in *The Oregonian* April 2, 1993

CWC Business Sponsors

Like many citizen organizations, the California Wilderness Coalition depends upon sponsorship and support. We are grateful to the following businesses that have recognized the need to preserve the wilderness of California.

Acorn Naturalists
Natural History Kits
17300 E. 17th, J-236
Tustin, CA 92680

Ascent Technologies
Robert J. Rajewski
525 Avis Dr., Suite 15
Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Bellus Nursery
P. O. Box 1936
Davis, CA 95617

Business Industrial
Group
P. O. Box 691100
Los Angeles, CA 90069

Ca. Fed. for Animal
Legislation
9 Agoura Court
Sacramento, CA 95838

Ca. Native Landscapes
c/o Steve Henson
355 Patton Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128

Carlson Travel Network
301 B Street
Davis, CA 95616

Come Together
c/o Gary Ball
Box 1415
Ukiah, CA 95482

Echo, The Wilderness Co.
6529 Telegraph Ave.
Oakland, CA 94609

Russell Faure-Brac
EIP Associates
150 Spear St., #1500
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ellison, Schneider &
Lennihan
2311 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95816

Genny Smith Books
P. O. Box 1060
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Grueneich Resource
Advocates
528 Market St., #407
San Francisco, CA 94104

William Gustafson,
Attorney at Law
1570 The Alameda, #150
San Jose, CA 95126

Bob Havlan
Business Acquisitions &
Sales
362 Freeman Road
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Mike Honig
Merrill Lynch
P.O. Box 22320
Carmel, CA 93922

Hurricane Wind
Sculptures
c/o Peter Vincent
Allegheny Star Rt.
N. San Juan, CA 95960

ImageWorks, Software
Consulting
P.O. Box 1359
Goleta, CA 93116

Michael R. Jones, DDS
General Dentistry
6 Governors lane
Chico, CA 95926

Richard Kareem, M.D.
1290 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

David B. Kelley,
Consulting Soil Scientist
2655 Portage Bay East
Davis, CA 95616

Lipse Plumbing
2130 Folsom St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

The Naturalist
219 E Street
Davis, CA 95616

Jim Pachi, Attorney
80 Grand Ave. #600
Oakland, CA 94612

Patagonia, Inc.
259 W. Santa Clara St.
Ventura, CA 93001

Recreational Equipment,
Inc.
20640 Homestead Road
Cupertino, CA 95014

Ridge Builders Group
129 C Street
Davis, CA 95616

Bob Rutemoeller, CFP, EA
Cert. Financial Planner
P.O. Box 587
Gualala, CA 95445

Drs. Helene & Rob
Schaeffer
Psychological Corp.
225 West Granger
Modesto, CA 95350

Siskiyou Forestry
Consultants
P.O. Box 241
Arcata, CA 95521

Solano Press Books
Warren W. Jones, Prop.
P.O. Box 773
Point Arena, CA 95468

Toot Sweets
1277 Gilman St.
Berkeley, CA 94706

Christopher P. Valle-
Riestra,
Attorney at Law
5500 Redwood Road
Oakland, CA 94619

Chuck Watson,
WRC Env. Consultants
1022 S Street
Sacramento, 95814

Wilderness Press
2440 Bancroft Way
Berkeley, CA 94704

Wilderness Trek
8304 Foothill Blvd.
Sunland, CA 91040

Wildflower Farm
Native Plant Nursery
Delano, CA 93215

Wilson's Eastside Sports
James Wilson
206 North Main
Bishop, CA 93514

Women's Health Assoc.
635 Anderson Rd., #18
Davis, CA 95616

Your Business
1 Wilderness Way
Relict, CA 88577

Zoo-Ink Screen Print
707 Army Street
San Francisco, CA 94124

Join the Coalition

☐ Yes! I wish to become a member of the California Wilderness Coalition. Enclosed is \$ _____ for first-year membership dues.

☐ Here is a special contribution of \$ _____ to help the Coalition's work.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

Annual Dues: †

Individual	\$ 20.00
Low-income Individual	\$ 10.00
Sustaining Individual	\$ 35.00
Benefactor	\$ 100.00
Patron	\$ 500.00
Non-profit Organization	\$ 30.00
Business Sponsor	\$ 50.00

† tax deductible

Mail to:

California Wilderness Coalition
2655 Portage Bay East, Suite 5
Davis, California 95616

T-Shirt Orders

1. *landscape design* in light blue, pale green, jade, or fuchsia: \$15

2. *animal design* in beige (no med.) or gray: \$12

Design Size(s, m, l, xl) Color Amount

Subtotal \$ _____

Shipping \$ _____

(\$1.50 + .75 for each additional shirt)

Total \$ _____