



WILDERNESS RECORD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

Vol. 2

P.O. Box 429, DAVIS, Ca. 95616

September - October, 1977

No. 4

State Reveals Wilderness Plans



Virgin redwood forests are proposed for State Wilderness at Prairie Creek State Park.

At a series of public hearings held on August 10, 11, 15, and 17, in Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, and San Francisco, the California Resources Agency unveiled its tentative proposals for designation of state-owned lands as Wilderness areas.

The Agency was required by the California Wilderness Act (enacted in 1974) to review state-owned roadless areas under its jurisdiction and recommend areas for designation as Wilderness to the State Legislature, which has the power to include them in the California Wilderness Preservation System set up by the Act. Two areas have so far been designated as Wilderness: the 9,800-acre Mt. San Jacinto State Wilderness and the 87,000-acre Santa Rosa Mountains State Wilderness.

Four Departments within the Resources Agency participated in the review: Fish and Game, Forestry, Parks and Recreation, and Water Resources. At the hearings, the Departments of Fish and Game, Forestry, and Water Resources recommended that none of their lands be designated as Wilderness, whereas the Department of Parks and Recreation presented proposals for 22 State Wilderness areas, totaling 177,000 acres (ranging in size from 200 acres to 58,000 acres).

The Department of Parks and Recreation also recommended that 20 additional roadless areas under its jurisdiction totaling 75,000 acres be designated as "natural preserves" rather than

Wilderness. Natural preserve is a classification applied by the State Parks and Recreation Commission that is designed to recognize and protect outstanding natural features.

Few people attended the hearings. The only opposition expressed to the wilderness proposals was from off-road vehicle users in San Diego who objected to possible closure of jeep trails in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. All others who testified spoke in favor of the state's Wilderness proposals and most urged expansion of the proposals.

Jim Burns, assistant to the Secretary for Resources who chaired the hearings, said that the Secretary would carefully consider all citizen suggestions for expansion of State Wilderness proposals. The Secretary intends to give equal consideration to his Departments' recommendations and public input before developing his final recommendations for the State Legislature, Mr. Burns noted.

continued on page 4

DO IT TODAY!!!

We are about as tired of writing this bi-monthly appeal for new members as our regular readers are of reading it. But the truth of the matter is that the majority of people who read these words are not now members of the California Wilderness Coalition. They have picked up one of many free copies distributed around the state.

We are pleased to know that they are interested enough in wilderness to read the **Wilderness Record**. We would be a lot happier yet - and a lot more able to produce the **Record**, put on workshops, send out Wilderness Alerts, testify on behalf of wilderness at

public hearings, monitor agency plans that affect wilderness, and do all the many things we do to help preserve the wilderness our readers love and use - if every person now reading these words who is not already a Coalition member would join.

So the message is: join the Coalition. Do it today. For only \$6.00 a year; 50 cents a month; 1½ cents a day; one-fourteenth of a cent per hour - well, you get the message - you can do your part for wilderness, and get a guaranteed supply of **Wilderness Records**; and be a little more certain that the wilderness so important to you today will still be here tomorrow.

RARE II Workshops

The first phase of the new Roadless Area Review and Evaluation has ended. The public workshops were held throughout the State, and they were fairly well conducted. How much information the Forest Service received is not known at present, nor is it possible to learn if they really intend to respond to our comments and suggestions.

A variety of interest groups attended the meetings. From information received by the California Wilderness Coalition, it appears that most workshops had a mix of wilderness users, vehicular recreationists, and industry representatives. A few of the meetings were dominated by one particular group; at Susanville the timber industry was out in force, ranchers in Alturas, miners

in Reno, and environmentalists in Bishop. Some people, particularly off-road vehicle enthusiasts, were disappointed when they learned that the workshops did not offer them a chance to rant and rave against wilderness.

In most workshops the explanations given and information available from the Forest Service was very good. The Inyo National Forest deserves special mention; they had large-scale forest maps of roadless areas available free of charge. The biggest criticism of the early meetings was the lack of detailed maps.

Main advantage of the workshops was the public's opportunity to offer suggestions for additions and deletions to the roadless inventory. The other function was the listing and ranking of

criteria for the evaluation of roadless area, a process poorly designed by the Forest Service. Many of the criteria could be interpreted in different ways, and many useful standards were not listed. What the Forest Service intends to do with this doubtful experiment remains to be seen.

The next phase of RARE II has not been defined by the Forest Service. There may be a new series of public meetings for citizens to express their views on whether or not particular areas should become wilderness. The individual Forests may also use the RARE II data when preparing new land-use plans. Whatever direction the agency follows in using this new inventory, citizens should plan on taking an active role.

Photos Needed

Your photo could be printed on this page, instead of gathering dust in a drawer. We need photos of California wilderness resource areas to use in the **Wilderness Record**. Write the Coalition for more information.

California Wilderness Coalition P.O. Box 429, Davis CA 95616

☐ 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 with the Coalition's work.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Zip: _____

ANNUAL DUES: *
(Note: one dollar of annual dues supports the **Wilderness Record**)

Individual	\$ 6
Low-income individual	3
Patron	500
Non-profit organization	25
Sponsor (business)	25

*not tax deductible

V2N4



The Sweetwaters Mtns. was one of many RARE I roadless areas dramatically increased in size in RARE II.

RARE II Inventory - Gains and Losses

It has taken a lot of work to analyze the new Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II), but the effort has been most illustrating. It was quite a chore, however, to track down the name changes from RARE I to RARE II, find the missing areas on the microscopic maps provided by the Forest Service, and extract readable large-scale maps from the Service so that we could finally see what is going on.

The Forest Service's second look at roadless areas in California has produced 2.8 million acres of newly inventoried wild lands. When these lands are added to the RARE I inventory and the *de facto*

wilderness areas missed again in RARE II, the State total comes to around six million acres of unroaded, undeveloped, and unprotected wilderness resource lands.

The title of largest roadless area should probably go to the proposed Golden Trout Wilderness (416,000 acres), but this area's Final Environmental Impact Statement disqualifies it from the RARE II sweepstakes. (The Trinity Alps is likewise not counted). The RARE II record holder is the Sespe-Frazier roadless area on the Los Padres National Forest, weighing in at 327,000 acres. This mammoth area was created by combining

five different RARE I areas and 120,000 acres of newly discovered wild lands.

The 262,200-acre White Mountains roadless area comes in second place, although only narrow jeep and powerline corridors keep it from tallying 350,000 acres. Also ranking in this class are the 224,370-acre Carson-Iceberg and the 216,500-acre Siskiyou area.

Only six areas made the 100,000-acre category: Excelsior (172,950), San Joaquin (157,200), Paiute (142,100), Madulce-Buckhorn (134,000), Hoover Extension (105,010), and Dinkey Lakes (100,300). The Inyo and Los Padres forests share the record for most newly

discovered roadless areas with each finding thirty. The San Bernardino and Modoc National Forests deserve special distinction - in RARE I they had but one inventoried area each, but in RARE II the San Bernardino found twenty-three more and the Modoc twenty. In all, 190 newly discovered roadless areas were inventoried in California.

The largest "overlooked" roadless area is Raymond Peak. This 71,250-acre tract was totally missed during RARE I. The most significant advance from the two inventories goes to the Los Padres Sawmill-Badlands roadless area that climbed from

cont. on page 3



Large areas of the Trinity Alps were not inventoried in RARE II.

Wilderness in Los Angeles?

To many whose image of Los Angeles is smog and freeways, it comes as a surprise to learn that a beautiful, and in places near pristine, wilderness survives in that sprawling metropolitan area. Much of the Santa Monica Mountains and seashore, though under ever-increasing development pressure, has so far resisted the onslaught of the bulldozer and endures today as a living museum of the natural beauty of Southern California.

Now an unparalleled, and possibly final, opportunity exists to save a portion of this national resource. Representative Anthony Beilenson (Cal.) has introduced legislation into Congress which would authorize \$100 to \$150 million to purchase 40,000 acres in the Santa Monicas. Field hearings were held September 1, 1977 in Los Angeles on his bill, H.R. 7246, but support is needed from all over the country if the measure is to pass.



The crucial Little Kern watershed in the proposed Golden Trout Wilderness.

Troubled Waters for Golden Trout

Efforts to preserve the proposed Golden Trout Wilderness in Sequoia National Forest suffered a major setback on July 13 when the full House Interior Committee voted by a narrow margin to reduce the size of the Golden Trout Wilderness in the Endangered American Wilderness Act from 416,000 acres to 179,000 acres.

Santa Lucia (21,250 acres) and Ventana Wilderness Additions (61,800 acres), the two other

California areas in the Endangered American Wilderness Act, survived the Interior Committee mark-up intact.

Rep. William Ketchum (R-Calif.), whose district includes the proposed Golden Trout Wilderness, waged a campaign to remove the area entirely from the bill. During committee action, Rep. John Krebs (D-Calif.) from a neighboring district, offered a compromise proposal of 333,000 acres, eliminating lands at the south end of the proposal.

Then Rep. Jerry Huckaby (D-La.) offered an amendment to Krebs' proposal, chopping the acreage still further to the 179,000 acres supported by the Administration. This amendment prevailed over Krebs' proposal by a vote of 24 to 20. Finally, Rep. Steve Symms (D-Id.) proposed that the whole Golden Trout area be eliminated entirely from the bill but was defeated on an 18 to 26 vote.

When the confusion had cleared, the 179,000-acre boundary had prevailed and the Golden Trout area emerged deeply wounded on the east, west, and southern flanks. The greatest losses were critical habitat for the golden trout in the Little Kern River watershed, now planned for timber cutting by the Forest Service, and the Horseshoe Meadows area, which the Forest Service plans to develop for intensive recreation.

Approval by the Committee for the whole bill, as amended, came on a 60 to 4 vote. It now awaits a vote by the full House.

Conservationists have not given up on Golden Trout, and may attempt to restore the deleted areas by amendment on the floor of the House. The Senate has yet to consider the bill, and efforts will be made to maintain the full Golden Trout area when the Senate acts on the Endangered American Wilderness Act.

Staff

Editor - Phil Farrell
Fred Ginsky
Jim Trumbly
Jim Eaton
Bob Anderson
Tom Jopson
Sami Izzo
Kathryn Utter

Photos by:

Alan Houser
John Modin
Phil Farrell

The WILDERNESS RECORD is the bi-monthly publication of the California Wilderness Coalition. Address all correspondence to P.O. Box 429, Davis CA 95616. Telephone is (916) 758-0380. Articles may be reprinted. Credit would be appreciated.

Officers of CWC

President - Phil Farrell
Treasurer - Bob Schneider
Secretary - Jim Eaton
Director - Steve Evans
Director - Francia Welker

PURPOSES OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION:

... To promote throughout the State of California the preservation of wild lands as legally designated wilderness areas by carry-

ing 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 cooperation in protecting existing or potential wilderness areas.

NEWS BRIEFS . . .

New F.S. Appeal Regs.

The Forest Service has revised its regulations covering administrative appeals of Forest Service decisions, effective July 28, 1977. Time deadlines were tightened, and one level of possible review was eliminated. The net effect is to make appeals of

Forest Service actions, such as land-use plans or timber sales, more difficult, and to require greater vigilance on the part of conservationists to keep track of Forest Service actions.

A number of other minor revisions and

clarifications were made in the appeal format and review procedure.

The new appeal regulations can be found on pages 32780 to 32782 of the **Federal Register** for June 28, 1977. Copies can be obtained by writing to the Coalition.

Desert Meeting Planned

Citizens interested in preserving wilderness in the California Desert will be gathering in Palm Desert on October 15th. At this working meeting, preliminary boundaries of desert roadless areas will be outlined and participants will accept the responsibility to coordinate future efforts on

their favorite areas.

The meeting is not planned as a workshop or conference. There will be some discussion of new developments in the Bureau of Land Management, the Clean Air Act, and other topics; but the majority of the time will be spent poring over maps.

Anyone interested in or knowledgeable about the California Desert is invited to attend. If you would like to come to this meeting, please contact the California Wilderness Coalition by October 1 so that we may send you more information and study material.

Wilderness Air To Be Kept Clean

Amendments to the Clean Air Act, signed into law by the President on August 8, 1977, include new rules to protect air quality over wilderness areas and related lands.

Part C sets up procedures to prevent already clean air from being dirty - the so-called "significant deterioration" provisions. Three classifications for clean-air areas are set up: Class I, where virtually no new pollution will be allowed; Class II, where a minor

amount of new pollution will be allowed; and Class III, where significant amounts of new pollution may be allowed, but in no case will primary and secondary air standards be exceeded.

A special provision states that all international parks, national wilderness areas over 5,000 acres in size, national memorial parks which exceed 5,000 acres, and national parks over 6,000 acres existing on the date of the Act (August 8, 1977) are permanently

designated as Class I and cannot be redesignated.

National monuments, primitive areas, national preserves, national recreation areas, national wild and scenic rivers, national wildlife refuges, national lakeshores or seashores, and new national parks or wilderness areas created after the date of the amendments can only be classified Class I or Class II, provided they are at least 10,000 acres in size. Smaller ones can be designated Class III.

Foundation Formed

The California Wilderness Foundation was formed in July to raise funds for the non-lobbying activities of the California Wilderness Coalition. The Foundation has applied for tax-deductible status from the Internal Revenue Service, and only needs confirma-

tion of that status to begin its work.

Since gifts to the Foundation will be tax-deductible, the Foundation hopes to raise large donations from individuals and businesses. In turn, the Foundation would then fund educational programs of the Coalition,

such as the **Wilderness Record** and Wilderness Alerts. The Foundation has set a first-year fund-raising goal of \$10,000.

The Foundation will be sharing the office of the Coalition, and can be contacted at P.O. Box 429, Davis, CA 95616.

Meeting with Rep. McFall

Wilderness lovers in El Dorado County met with their local congressman, Rep. John McFall, during the recent August congressional recess to discuss wilderness preservation needs in the 14th district, which includes such well-known potential Wilderness areas as Carson-Iceburg, Mokelumne Extensions and Hoover Extensions.

Rep. McFall admitted to a lack of familiarity with wilderness issues but was very interested to learn more.

The group described many uses of wilderness that argue for its preservation, including recreation, wildlife habitat protection, watershed protection, and scientific study of undisturbed ecosystems.

The congressman expressed concern over the effect of Wilderness classification on other land uses, such as logging, alpine skiing, and snowmobiling. He also wondered if there were or ought to be other, less stringent classifications for

land similar to wilderness. The group responded that the Wilderness Act provides for flexible management of designated areas and excludes only uses that are incompatible with preservation of the land in its natural state.

Citizens at the meeting judged it a successful first step in educating Rep. McFall about the need for more Wilderness in his district, and plan to continue to urge his support for Wilderness.

Ishi Conference Set

What does the future hold for the Ishi country? How can its unique wilderness and historical values be protected against the encroachments of logging, off-road vehicles, and dam-building? These questions will be the focus of the Ishi Conference, a three-day program sponsored by the Ishi Task Force and scheduled for September 30 to October 2 in Chico, California.

Ishi country is a large (50,000-acre) roadless area located along Mill and Deer Creeks east of Red Bluff in the Lassen National Forest. This is a rare low-elevation foothill wilderness of lava flows,

wild rivers, scenic bluffs, and rocky canyons, covered with chaparral, grassland, oak savannah, and pines. It is the ancestral home of the Yahi Indians.

The conference will begin Friday evening, September 30, at 7:00 p.m. with a multi-media slide show, "Ishi Country - In Two Worlds," followed by a panel discussion of the "Resources of Ishi Country." The next day, Saturday, October 1, will begin with a panel discussion at 9:00 a.m. on the "Future of Ishi Country," politically, economically, and ecologically. Both programs will be held in Bell Memorial Union

Room 107 at the California State University campus in Chico.

The second part of the conference is a leisurely hike to Deer Creek, leaving Chico Saturday afternoon and returning Sunday evening. A sleeping bag, ground cloth, clothes, pack, and willing legs are all that is needed. Meals will be provided for the hike as part of the \$5.00 conference registration fee.

Further information and a registration form can be obtained from Ishi Task Force, 708 Cherry Street, Chico, CA 95926, telephone 916-345-8070. Anyone with an interest in the Ishi country is invited to attend.



Lake Helen, Lassen Park. Snowmobilers are pushing for access to areas like this.

Is Lassen Park Going Downhill?

Downhill skiers made a strong pitch for expanding downhill ski facilities in Lassen Volcanic National Park at recent public meetings. Environmentalists, though not quite as vocal, asked that Lassen remain natural and that some existing developments be removed.

Six public meetings were held in August for citizens to express their views on a Draft General Management Plan for the park. Most of the meetings were well attended, with more than 100 persons at the Redding meeting.

In addition to the alpine skiers, a few snowmobilers came to ask that Lassen be opened to their machines. There was also some discussion on the relocation of the Manzanita Lake facilities to an area not threatened by rock avalanches.

The position of the California Wilderness Coalition, Friends of the Earth, and The Wilderness Society that was expressed calls for removal of ex-

isting downhill ski facilities in favor of showshoeing and cross-country skiing. Those groups also asked that the current ban on snowmobiling be retained.

The environmental organizations also supported relocation of the Manzanita Lake facilities outside the National Park but questioned the construction of new commer-

cial developments at government expense. They supported a review of the existing wilderness boundaries to add at least 25,000 acres to the Lassen Park Wilderness.

In addition to the public meetings, the National Park Service accepted written comments through September 6. No date for release of the final plan was announced.

RARE II Inventory

cont. from page 2

11,520 acres to 90,000 acres.

The award for most confused forest is given to the Shasta-Trinity for reducing in size seven RARE I areas, splitting another into two, and forgetting to inventory a large part of the Trinity Alps. They even reduced the Mt. Shasta Wilderness Study Area by 12,000 acres.

The bewilderment award is shared by the Klamath, Rogue River and Siskiyou forests for correcting the earlier injustice of breaking the proposed

Red Buttes into the Seiad, Thompson, and Butte Fork Roadless areas but now calling the area "Kangaroo." Everyone but the Forest Service uses Red Buttes as the name, so why Kangaroo?

Parts of RARE II look good. Most National Forests did seem to have tried harder to do a better job this time around. There are still many errors that should be corrected; hopefully the Forest Service will make these changes after listening to the public this summer. The big challenge now is protecting these wild lands.

NAACP Supports Wilderness

At its most recent national convention, held this summer in St. Louis, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) adopted a resolution in support of efforts to designate Wilderness areas.

The resolution was authored by wilderness activist and NAACP member Willie Hyman of Chico, California. Willie crusaded against apathy, hostility, high-level politicking, and parliamentary maneuvers on behalf of his resolution. His hard work resulted in a surprising 26-to-5 vote in favor of the resolution by the NAACP Resolution Committee, and subsequent passage by the NAACP Board of Directors.

The adoption of this resolution by the NAACP gives a great boost to wilderness supporters who

have been arguing that preservation of wilderness is in the general interest of all Americans.

The timber industry and other special interests who seek to exploit wilderness are expected to lobby the NAACP to reverse its new pro-wilderness position. But Willie is confident that his resolution will withstand such attacks.

The full text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas, 'Wilderness' can be defined as land which retains its primeval character without permanent human improvements, untrammelled by man, and is affected primarily by the forces of nature;

"Whereas, the qualities and benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness is well known for its opportunities in providing for primitive recreation, preservation of a 'resource pool' un-

affected by man;

"Whereas, America's wilderness resource is dwindling at an astonishing rate through resource exploitations such as mining, clear-cutting, and development;

"Whereas, an enduring resource of wilderness is needed by Americans of all races and economic backgrounds, especially minorities and the poor living in the inner cities;

"Whereas, many young people born in the inner city grow into adulthood without experiencing the enjoyment of the great American outdoors;

"Therefore Be It Resolved, that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People support endeavors to set aside more land areas to be designated as wilderness areas; and to urge Congress to expand wilderness areas."

Alpine Planning Unit

MORE STUDY FOR CARSON-ICEBERG

The Carson-Iceberg Wilderness Study Area would be expanded, but other nearby roadless areas would not fare as well under a proposed land-use plan for the Alpine Planning Unit of the Toiyabe National Forest.

The Forest Service land use proposal is described in a Final Environmental Statement issued August 5, 1977. It is scheduled to go into effect 90 days later.

Thirty-eight thousand acres of roadless land in the East Fork Carson River and Wolf Creek drainages would be added to the existing 134,000-acre Carson-Iceberg Wilderness Study Area. The combined area will receive intensive study to determine its suitability for Wilderness classification. Meanwhile, it will be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Off-road vehicle use will continue on certain designated trails, however.

The Raymond Peak roadless area, which is contiguous to roadless lands on the Eldorado National Forest that in turn are contiguous to the existing Mokelumne Wilderness, would be maintained in a roadless and undeveloped state while a joint study of the entire roadless area is conducted with the Eldorado Forest to determine its future use.

Smaller roadless areas in the Elephant's Back and Stevens Peak areas would be given similar treatment.

Nearly 11,000 acres of the Horsethief roadless area (Freel Peak area) would be opened to timber harvesting and other development, as would the entire small Cottonwood roadless area along the Carson River, under the Forest Service proposal. The remainder of the Horsethief area - the highest elevation and steep east slopes - would remain roadless.

Conservationists find the proposed plan to be generally good, but are extremely disappointed with the plan to develop

part of the scenic and wild Horsethief area. The Horsethief area has wilderness values more important than the meager contribution it could make to commodity resource production, especially since the Environmental Statement admits that designation of the Horsethief area as Wilderness would not reduce overall commodity production for the planning unit!

Copies of the Environmental Statement can be obtained from Forest Supervisor John Lavin, Toiyabe National Forest, 111 North Virginia St., Reno, NV 89503.



Citizens propose state wilderness at Tehama Wildlife Area, shown above.

Myth of the Month

Editor's note: Those people who oppose wilderness preservation have promoted and gained wide acceptance for certain ill-founded or untrue contentions that argue against wilderness. In this column, we will attempt to expose and refute these myths about wilderness. We welcome suggestions from our readers for topics to investigate.

(This month's column first appeared as an article in the **High Country news** for Friday, June 4, 1976. Excerpts only are reprinted here, as the original article was very long. The issues raised in this article are particularly timely in light of the new Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management wilderness evaluation programs now getting underway.)

By DAVE FOREMAN
with contributions by Bart Koehler, Bill Bishop, and Art Wright

"Sure, I want the Diablo Badlands roadless area to stay wild. But what worries me is that if it is formally designated as a wilderness area, then the name will act like a magnet and draw too many people. The area will be destroyed by recreationists just like the Paradise Meadows Wilderness. Let's not make Diablo Badlands an official wilderness - let's keep it like it is. Wilderness designation will destroy its wildness."

Sound familiar? It should - the above argument has been gaining increasing credibility during the last few years. It has especially become popular among Forest Service and other agency personnel and among those who pose as friends of wilderness but who are really diametrically opposed to the wilderness concept.

How valid is this argument? It certainly sounds plausible - and if it is valid, we should re-think wilderness designation. But, on closer examination, this argument reveals its fallacy.

Lost in the above argument are the reasons for

wilderness preservation. It is important to remember that it is the "National Wilderness Preservation System," not the "National Wilderness Recreation System." Indeed, some wilderness should be preserved for its own sake, without any need for human justification.

Similarly, solitude is not the only goal and purpose, and value of wilderness recreation.

We have to admit that much of this emphasis on solitude, and among some people much of the fear against formal wilderness designation, is based on selfishness. I knew the Gila Wilderness before many people - it's mine. I appreciate the Gila Wilderness more than anybody else - it's mine. All you interlopers - stay out!

Quite obviously, many wilderness areas receive no substantial human use at all.

Of course, there are some wilderness areas that are being used excessively. But are these areas being used heavily because they have the official name wilderness area tacked on them? I think not. They are being used because they are scenic, well-watered, cool, fishing and climbing meccas, near population centers, or famous. They simply are the attractive kind of wild country that appeals to most wilderness recreationists.

Many wilderness areas will never receive heavy use simply because they do not appeal to most people; and the more attractive areas - formal wilderness or not - will be discovered and used.

Now, it cannot be denied that in some cases designating an area or considering it for wilderness designation has drawn more use. But it doesn't create more wilderness users. It merely disperses use.

Another consideration along this line is that wilderness areas are fairly uncommon now. Putting the name wilderness area on a place sets it apart. It says to the fellow looking at a map, "This is something special."

But our wilderness system is just beginning. There are only 127 wilderness areas in the United States. When the wilderness system is completed, there will be well over 1,000 (maybe 2,000) wilderness areas. The name will not be uncommon anymore.

The real problem with over-use in a few wilderness areas lie in poor wilderness management by the administering agency.

The purpose of wilderness management should be to allow the natural ecological processes free rein - but to control, administer, and manage the human use.

Of course, agencies should develop effective, convenient, and non-tyrannical methods of controlling wilderness recreation.

Another way agencies can help is by not advertising wilderness areas. Wilderness designation cannot be done in secret, but dedication ceremonies, brochures, signs by the highway, and newspaper articles are not always necessary. The agencies seem to have gone out of their way to publicize some areas - thus attracting more use.

There is, of course, only one long-range alternative to wilderness designation for a wild area - and that is development. Road construction, cutting of marginal timber, off road vehicle use, dams, ski areas. With the innumerable development pressures rising, wild country cannot remain wild long without official legal protection as wilderness.

State Reveals

Wilderness Plans

cont. from page 1

Conservationists were pleased with the many Wilderness proposals put forth by the Department of Parks and Recreation, but feel that the overall program is deficient in several ways.

Conservationists cannot accept the "no-wilderness" recommendations of the Departments of Fish and Game, Forestry, and Water Resources. Each of these Departments manages areas with important

wilderness resources. Twenty-four thousand acres of the Tehama Wildlife Area in Tehama County, managed by the Department of Fish and Game, is proposed for Wilderness designation by conservationists.

Many Wilderness proposals within the State Park System include only part of a roadless area. This was a particular problem with Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, where only 104,200 acres of roadless land were recommended for Wilderness, leaving an additional 276,000 acres of roadless wild land open to other uses and classifications!

Most state roadless areas are small to begin with. Their essential wilderness values can best be protected if the entire roadless area is classified as Wilderness.

Conservationists disagree with many of the Department of Parks and Recreation proposals for natural preserve designations instead of Wilderness. Although both Wilderness and natural preserve designations would protect natural or ecological features, only the Wilderness classification can guarantee the preservation of wilderness values.