



# WILDERNESS RECORD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

Vol. 4

P.O. Box 429, Davis, CA 95616

March-April, 1979

No. 2

## State Blasts RARE II

California is asking Congress to make important changes in recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service for the future use of more than six million acres of undeveloped lands in the state.

Overall, these State recommended adjustments represent a step in the right direction. Yet, they fall short of what needs to be done, and what conservationists have been seeking.

In testimony March 8 in Washington, D.C. before the House Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands, California Secretary for Resources Huey D. Johnson said the Forest Service recommendations were biased in favor of the timber industry, used a computer process that was inflexible and confusing to the public and did not provide for adequate public participation.

The Forest Service recommendations were part of a national review called RARE II (Roadless Area Review and Evaluation) of more than 62 million acres of undeveloped lands in the country. In California more than 330 areas comprising more than 6 million acres were included in the review and recommendations.

"The state recommendations call for designation of 1,450,000 acres to wilderness classification, and 1,682,933 acres to non-wilderness classification. Decisions on the future uses of the remaining 3,084,067 acres should be deferred pending additional studies," Johnson said.

Forest Service recommendations submitted to Congress on January 4, 1979 called for 900,000 acres to wilderness, 2,500,000 acres to non-wilderness and 2,600,000 acres to future planning.

"The Forest Service spends far too little in reforestation and other activities which would enhance the long-term productivity of our public lands. It substantially undercharges for such uses of its lands as timber cutting and mining. It spends far too little on the resource, sells it too cheaply to special interests and attempts to make its resource management appear sound by focusing on the short-term fiscal view," Johnson said.

"It's time for a change," he said. "The Forest Service should begin to manage our resources on the basis of all their values — fisheries, wildlife, water quality, watershed protection and recreation — not just on the basis of how many dollars can be produced in the short-term through timber cutting.

"Failure to invest today in resources that will provide for the economic strength and environmental health of our children and grandchildren is stealing from the future."

The State's plan for RARE II would improve that of the Forest Service by recommending for wilderness Granite Chief, the White Mountains, Big Butte-

Shinbone and several areas in Trinity County. Most importantly, many areas proposed for non-wilderness by the Forest Service are being recommended for further planning, including Pleasant View, San Mateo, South Sierra, Russian Peak, Kangaroo (Red Buttes), North Mountain and enlargements of Sheep Mountain, Snow Mountain, Trinity Alps, Marble Mountains and Siskiyou.

The biggest disappointment of the State's recommendations was San Joaquin. While asking for some additional wilderness near Devils Postpile, the State agreed to non-wilderness for lands near Mammoth threatened with ski area development and lands on the west coveted by loggers. In view of the controversial nature of these areas, further planning was called for by environmental groups.

Other disappointments include non-wilderness for Penney Ridge, Cub Creek, Sherwin, Dexter Canyon, Glass Mountain, Mono Craters and parts of Carson-Iceberg.

Almost all of Mt. Shasta was proposed for wilderness, but a critical 691 acres of virgin red fir forest slated for ski development went to further planning.

continued on page 8



The May Ishi Conference will focus on this last home of the Yahi Indians.

Photo by Nancy Morton

## Ishi Conference

May 4, 5, 6

Ishi is a name familiar to most Californians. Children and adults know him as the last Yahi Indian who died in 1914. Now, there remains only the memory of him and his culture. But east of Red Bluff, in northern California, lies a region of foothill country still as rugged and wild as on that August morning when Ishi made his decision to leave the land of his people. The proposed Ishi Wilderness encompasses 95,280 acres in the homeland of the Yahi.

The many and varied facets of the Ishi Country will be the subject of a three-day Ishi Conference to be held in Chico on May 4, 5, and 6. Archaeology, history, economics, and geography of the region are among the topics which will be explored during the weekend.

An informal gathering will be held Friday evening to provide participants the opportunity to meet each other. On Saturday, May 5, the opening address will be

given by Dennis Banks, American Indian Movement leader and participant in the Longest Walk. This will be followed by the movie, *Ishi — In Two Worlds*, and a panel, "PAST: Living in the Foothills" with Yahi expert, Dr. Jerry Johnson, CSU Sacramento professor, and a local historian, Dr. John Nopel, retired CSU Chico professor.

After a lunch provided for participants the afternoon will commence with the multi-media presentation "Ishi Country — In Two Worlds" produced by two members of the Ishi Task Force, Sami and Dave Izzo.

A second panel "PRESENT: Managing the Front Country" will delve into the issues surrounding the front country today. Members of the panel are the Almanor District Ranger, Bill Swanson; Tom Taylor, ichthyologist; natural historian Dr. Roger Lederer, CSU Chico Professor; and Steve Evans of

the Northstate Wilderness Committee. A third panel will deal with "FUTURE: At the Crossroads." Alan Lamb, Director of Recreation for the U.S. Forest Service, Region 5, will talk about potential Forest Service recreation management, while John Amodio, Sierra Club wilderness coordinator, and Sami Izzo, Ishi Task Force member, will present the stand for wilderness. A slide presentation on "Minimum Impact" will be shown.

At the evening dinner, provided by the sponsors, Northstate Wilderness Committee will present a skit, "Chapparral Saga." Highlight of the day will be the keynote speaker, poet Gary Snyder, who will share his own insight into the man Ishi and the concept of a wilderness memorial.

Sunday will be the time for action. All individuals who attend the conference are invited to hike the Ishi Country for a day. Hikes will be in the northern por-

tion of the proposed reserve, ranging from easy walks to strenuous cross-country travel. More than fifty people attended the first conference hike in 1977 and found it unforgettable. Each hiking group will be limited to 25 people and will feature a lunch-time workshop in a spectacular setting. Planned hikes include Antelope Creek, upper Mill Creek and Kingsley Cave. Participants will leave Chico at 7:30 Sunday morning and stop at Woodson Bridge, 20 miles north of Chico, where those who camp out will be staying.

Conference participants will learn about the history, the present use, and the choices for this large area of public land. Then they will see it for themselves. On the basis of these experiences, the Ishi Task Force will lead a grass-roots effort for a wilderness bill.

Cost for the three-day event is \$10.00. This includes both lunch and dinner on Saturday. Hikers must provide their own food and bring necessary gear. Both camping (20 miles north of Chico) and housing will be available. For more information, contact Steve Evans or Sami Izzo at (916) 345-8070. You may also write to the Ishi Task Force, 708, Cherry Street, Chico, CA 95926.



# Coalition Report

by Dave Brown  
Exec. Director

The first quarter of 1979 has been a very productive period for the California Wilderness Coalition. Together with Friends of the River and other organizations, we produced a statewide conference which may very well catalyze a new growth of organizational strength for the wild lands and waters movement in this state.

Several people who were unable to attend the Confluence have contacted us to see how they can become more involved. I hope more of you who read this will do the same. We are at a very exciting juncture at present, one from which we can make California an example for land and resource protection.

To help the grass roots groups and individuals to capitalize on this potential, the Coalition has been striving to improve its ability to provide full-time staff for research, educational, and coordinating efforts. We recently received a grant to conduct the Public Lands and Resources Education Project. This grant provided the money to hire a Project Coordinator and an Administrative assistant who will be developing educational publications, handling information or research requests from groups and individuals, assisting with local workshops, and developing a Public Lands Resource Center at the Coalition's Main Office in Davis.

Dennis Coules, who was hired as the Project Coor-

inator, has a Masters Degree in Ecology, and has a special interest in rare and endangered species. Dennis also has experience in analyzing environmental impact statements and reports. He will be concentrating a good portion of his attention on the California Desert and the BLM wilderness review.

Our new Administrative Assistant, Valerie Brelsford, is a recent immigrant from Colorado. She brings to the job experience in office coordination and information handling, and will have primary responsibility for establishing the Public Lands Resource Center. An avid outdoorsperson, Valerie also has a special interest in wildlife protection and management.

At the annual meeting of the Coalition on February 3, the Board of Directors elected Bob Barnes as the sixth Board member. Bob has taken a year off from his teaching duties in Porterville to devote his considerable energies to attaining protection for the South Fork of the Kern River Watershed. He has also been very active in promoting both group and individual membership in the Coalition.

There is still one vacancy on the Board of Directors, and anyone who is able and willing to devote some time to helping build up the Coalition may serve. Persons wishing to volunteer or make a nomination should contact Wendy Cohen, President of the

Board, at the Coalition's Main Office.

Despite the progress we have made in the last few months, the Coalition is still severely handicapped by **lack of money**. Many members make generous contributions along with their membership renewals but these funds only provide a few hundred dollars a month. We have some grants pending to fund special projects such as our Public Lands and Resources Education Project. However, grants are risky, take time, usually do not support office expenses such as telephone, postage or travel, and do not fund regular salaries for non-grant staff. All of these expenses must be met through donations.

If we are to successfully help grass roots activists meet the challenges of post-RARE II legislation, protection of the California Desert and other Bureau of Land Management wild places, and all the rest of the myriad threats that face California's wild lands and waters, **we need more money.**

Also, if you have any suggestions on sources of donations or fundraising ideas we could certainly use some creative thinking. We are opposed by vast sums of money earmarked to finance the destruction of our remaining wild lands and waters. There must be many financial sources in California which can be utilized to help combat resource exploitation war chests. Please help in any way you can.



Political caucus groups take advantage of the sunny skies to plan future strategy.

Photo by Ken Smith

Flanked by Jim Eaton and Brock Evans, Wilderness Society Executive Director Bill Turnage addresses the conference.

Photo by Ken Smith



## Conference Held

With well over 400 wilderness and wild river activists in attendance, the 1979 "Wild Land and Water Confluence" in Sacramento succeeded in fostering a new sense of togetherness among the groups and individuals fighting to save California's wild heritage and future. People traveled great distances to participate — from as far away as Susanville and San Diego.

The theme of the Confluence was "Preserving California's Future," and the goal was achieved — to enhance the vision that wilderness is an important part of the future, and that essential values are insured

by maintaining wild areas. The gathering also recognized that river and wilderness issues are closely related and served to bring their respective constituencies into greater cooperation.

California Secretary of Resources Huey Johnson gave the keynote address to the assemblage and focused on the interrelated nature of the issues affecting the confluence of California's waters. Subsequent panels on wilderness and water issues provided important overviews on the need to implement Aldo Leopold's land ethic and on the diverse issues affecting river and water planning.

The featured speaker on Saturday evening was Barry Lopez, author of the book *Of Wolves and Men*. His eloquent talk reminded people not to get trapped using only scientific reasons to protect wild places but to speak out for beauty and other individual perceptions.

The intent of the Sunday morning program was to increase cooperation and coordination among groups and individuals around the state and to involve new people in the existing efforts. Regional strategy sessions were introduced by Doug Scott, northwest representative of the Sierra Club.

Scott effectively emphasized the need for people

to become better organized within Congressional districts. He pointed out that the political process which protects wild lands and waters is working, and that activists can achieve even greater results by tapping the support which the "silent majority" can offer.

Activists split into regional groupings which included: the North Coast (Congressional District 2), Northeastern California (District 1), the Northern Sierra (District 14), the Southern Sierra (Districts 15, 17 and 18), Southern California (Districts 20-43), the Bay Area (Districts 5-13) and Sacramento (Districts 3 and 4).

One region which was unrepresented was the central coast from Santa Barbara to Monterey (Congressional Districts 16 and 19). Both the Wilderness Coalition and Friends of the River will be working to identify and involve new groups and individuals from that area in regional and statewide coordination.

The seven regions represented identified local, regional and statewide issues affecting wild lands and waters in their Congressional Districts, as well as compiling lists of traditional and potential support groups. Several also decided to hold regional conferences over the next year in hopes of recruiting new local activists.

## Wilderness Classes

The Berkeley and Davis campuses of the University of California are offering numerous courses in or about wilderness issues. Two of particular interest to wilderness supporters are listed below.

**California Floristics** — In this program noted botanists, many from the U.C. Davis botany department, describe — with lectures and slides — the plants that contribute so much to this state. Speakers describe and identify individual species, communities, conditions, adaptive strategies, reproductive habits and responses of California flora to human pressure.

Speakers and topics: **California's Coastal Flora from the Oceans to the Redwoods** — Michael Barbour, professor, UCD botany department; **Plants of the Valley: The Oak and Problems of Preservation** — TBA; **California's Desert Plants: The Beauty of Survival** — Robert Pearcey, assistant professor, UCD botany department; **Mixed Conifer and Sierran Montane Trees and Shrubs: Methods and Controversies in Post-fire and Post-logging Forest Regeneration** — Steve Radosevich, assistant professor, UCD botany department; **California's Alpine and Sub-Al-**

**pine Vegetation: A Case of Extremes** — Jack Major, professor, UCD botany department. Approved through botany department, UCD. X401.1 (784A38) Davis: Room 3, Kleiber Hall, UCD; Saturday, 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m.; May 12; 1 meeting; \$15 for 1/2 quarter unit Extension credit. Passed/Not Passed grading only. Approval pending. Call (916) 752-3098.

**Volcanoes, Glaciers, and Bristlecones: The Mammoth-Mono Basins and White Mountains** — X 128 (3) (Geology and Geophysics) — Study of the geology of the east side of the Sierra Nevada and White Mountains, concentrating on volcanic and glacial geology of high-altitude regions. Focus is on: **Mammoth-Mono Basins** — recent volcanic features including Mono Craters, Obsidian Dome, Inyo Crater Lakes, and hot springs; glacial features including Convict Lake and moraines, Tioga Moraines, Pleistocene Lake Russell and an overview of the Minarets area from Minaret Summit; Mono Lake and the effects of water diversion by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power; and a geothermal energy project. **White Mountains** —

periglacial phenomena; history of early life from local fossil localities; bristlecone pine ecology. DORIS SLOAN, M.S., Lecturer, Environmental Studies, UC, Berkeley, and HOWARD WEAMER, B.A., Back Country Ranger, Yosemite National Park; botanist.

**Berkeley/Owens Valley:** July 7-13; 8 a.m. Sat. to 6 p.m. Fri.; \$250, includes transportation from Berkeley and return, camping fees, and food (edp 015081P) Call (415) 642-4111.



California Resources Secretary Huey Johnson delivering the keynote speech at the conference.

by Ken Smith



# BLM Initial Wilderness Inventory

note  
9/1/80

On March 1 the California state office of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) released its "Draft Initial Inventory" of lands administered by the BLM outside of the California Desert Conservation Area. The lands affected by this inventory effort are spread throughout California, with major concentrations in northeastern California, the King Range, Owens Valley and the Mono Lake area. Conservationists have discovered several problems and inconsistencies in the Draft Initial Inventory.

The BLM has determined that 2,503,418 acres, or 55% statewide, should not be considered for wilderness, while 2,076,554 acres or 45% statewide, should receive an intensive inventory.

The purpose of the Initial Inventory is to identify those areas that obviously

do not meet the qualifying criteria for wilderness found in the Wilderness Act of 1964, section 2(c). Areas that do meet the 2(c) criteria will be intensely inventoried later to determine if they should receive formal Wilderness Study Area status. The BLM has provided a set of one-half-inch-to-the-mile maps showing each tract of BLM land in California and a booklet of narratives describing those areas they feel do not meet 2(c) wilderness criteria.

As the inventory has been conducted by individual BLM District offices, the information provided in the narratives varies according to District. For example, the Susanville District has indicated whether its lands adjoin wilderness study areas or potential wilderness study areas administered by other federal agencies such as the U.S.

Forest Service. However, the Bakersfield District office failed to provide this information.

As a result, many BLM areas actually contiguous with Forest Service RARE II areas are proposed to be dropped from future wilderness consideration, although a joint study of the wilderness potential should be conducted. In some cases areas are proposed to be dropped from further wilderness consideration because they "contain less than 5,000 acres of contiguous public lands" even though they are contiguous with RARE II areas comprising up to 53,000 acres! Some of the RARE II areas adjacent to proposed dropped BLM areas of the Bakersfield office are Tinemaha, Coyote SE, Coyote N, Black Canyon, Soldier Canyon, South Sierra, Cannell, Chico and Greenhorn Creek.



California Desert

The BLM also gave as a reason for dropping some areas from further inventory and study the "lack of topographic or vegetative screening." This questionable reason was previously used by the BLM to remove many extensive areas in the California desert from further wilderness consideration during the California Desert Conservation Area Wilderness Inventory. Many conservationists argued that "screening" is not always necessary to provide outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive recreation in large, remote areas. Therefore, the use of this criterion to drop areas from the initial inventory, which proposes only to identify areas that "clearly and obviously do not qualify for wilderness consideration," has been criticized.

In addition to describing

areas of the initial inventory, the narratives also describe six "Instant Study Areas," which are areas that were formally designated as Natural or Primitive Areas prior to November 1, 1975 and whose wilderness recommendations must be reported to the President by July 1, 1980. These six areas are Negit Island, Bitterbrush, Baker Cypress/Lava Rock, San Benito, Piute Cypress and Chemise Mountain. The BLM has proposed to study four of these as portions of surrounding BLM roadless holdings, but their comments on Negit Island have stirred considerable controversy.

Negit Island, located in Mono Lake, is a highly important California gull rookery. According to the BLM, "This island is only 197 acres, thereby making its preservation and use in

an unimpaired condition impractical." It is interesting to note that Congress has previously designated as wilderness islands as small as three acres in size.

A 90-day public comment period on the Draft Initial Wilderness Inventory is scheduled to extend until May 29, 1979. To receive the inventory maps and narratives, write to **BLM, State Office, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825**. The Draft Initial Inventory will be followed by the Final Initial Inventory/Draft Intensive Inventory to be published June 30, 1979. Another 90-day comment period will follow, ending about September 30, 1979. In November the Final Inventory Maps will be released, and the Wilderness Study phase will begin. By 1991 final wilderness recommendations will be forwarded to Congress.

## Wilderness Research

by Sari Sommarstrom

Wilderness management was a hot topic for books in 1978: **Wildlife Management in Wilderness** by Clay Schoenfeld and John Hendee and **Wilderness Management** by John Hendee, George Stankey and Robert Lucas. These authors are quite familiar names in literature; they are all prolific writers on wilderness management. Hendee, Stankey and Lucas do it full time for the U.S. Forest Service Experiment Stations, while Schoenfeld teaches journalism and wildlife ecology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Fifteen years of experience on the subject since the passage of the Wilderness Act are summarized in the two books. Although little new research information is presented in them, both provide, for the first time, a thorough review of the literature and a clear description of the basic concepts and principles of wilderness management. The pieces of the controversial management puzzle are at last brought together, with the various philosophies given an appropriate airing.

**Wilderness Management** devotes separate chapters to the topics of: Principles, Management Planning, Carrying Capacity, Wilderness Ecosystems, Wildlife, Fire, Use and Users, Visitor Management, Site Management and Future Issues and Challenges. The first third of the book mainly describes wilderness policy and the evolution of the National Wilderness Preservation System, with some portions written by

guest author Roderick Nash.

While the Forest Service authors reflect some of their agency's management philosophies and biases, they at least attempt to make their assumptions clear. Regarding the "purity doctrine" of the agency, they present both sides of the argument and then recommend that, "It is extremely important that the management philosophy be applied with common sense to avoid extreme purity, which can trigger a purity backlash."

Another "bias" which slips in is the solitude issue. Wilderness is made synonymous with solitude, despite the fact that the Wilderness Act states that a wilderness "has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation." The topic "solitude" is one of the most common listings in the book's index, as one measure of its emphasis. In their discussion of social research on wilderness carrying capacity, the importance of solitude in wilderness is treated mainly as a "rhetorical question," since the authors claim the Act says it's important, and that conflicting findings of other researchers have "several potential explanations." The careful reader of **Wilderness Management** will be aware of such fact and opinion distinctions.

**Wildlife Management in Wilderness** is an expanded version of the brief wildlife chapter in **Wilderness Management**. Its views are shared by the Wildlife Management Institute,

which owns the copyright. The book is addressed to: (a) agency personnel for use as a field manual, (b) college students of wildlife management and (c) wilderness users.

The major theme of Schoenfeld and Hendee's book is, "Management of wildlife involves more management of humans than anything else." Minimizing human influences which may degrade wilderness quality is preferred over the control of wilderness ecosystems and wildlife to accommodate human use. Their recommended philosophy for wildlife policy is to keep wildlife wild, seek natural relationships and populations of indigenous species, allow natural processes to control (i.e. fire and disease) and permit hunting and fishing only where appropriate.

Game animals are emphasized in **Wilderness Management** because, "The literature is lean on non-game wildlife," claim the authors. While solitude again creeps in as a policy, it does not detract from the valuable discussion of the many facets of wilderness-wildlife management.

**Wildlife Management in Wilderness**, by Schoenfeld and Hendee, The Boxwood Press, 183 Ocean View Blvd., Pacific Grove, CA 93950. 172 pp. — \$3.95.

**Wilderness Management**, by Hendee, Stankey and Lucas, U.S. Forest Service Misc. Pub. No. 1365, U.S. Superintendent of Documents, Wash., D.C., Oct 78. 381 pp. — \$10.50.

## Desert Wilderness Review

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has announced that the Final California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Wilderness Inventory Map and Narratives will not be available until March 31. Release of these documents was originally scheduled for February 28. According to CDCA Wilderness Coordinator Charles Tulloss, the reason for the delay is to allow meticulous checking and consideration of the large amount of public comment received on the Draft CDCA Wilderness Inventory during the November 1 to February 1 comment period.

The final documents will contain a list of the specific areas that the BLM State Director will transmit to the BLM Desert Plan Staff for further study as Wilder-

ness Study Areas. The list will be final 30 days after publication in the Federal Register, unless new information is received as a result of publication and any amendments to the decision go through separate formal publication and 30-day extension periods.

The study phase to begin March 31 will operate through the regular California desert planning process and consider all uses and resources of the lands involved. For each Wilderness Study Area, the Desert Plan Staff will determine suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. These decisions will be shown in the Draft Desert Plan scheduled to be published January 1, 1980 and the Final Desert Plan scheduled for September 30, 1980.

Starting October 1, 1980,

the Plan will be submitted to BLM State Director Ed Hastey, the Secretary of the Interior and the President. After their approval the Plan and wilderness recommendations will be submitted to Congress for legislative action.

Participation of conservationists in the study phase will be very important. No schedule for public participation has yet been announced, but the Final CDCA Inventory mailing will contain a special workbook on the Study Phase, with instructions and information on public involvement and participation. If you are not already on the CDCA Wilderness Review mailing list, write to Charles Tulloss, CDCA Wilderness Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management, 1695 Spruce Street, Riverside, CA 92507.

# WE NEED PHOTOS!



## Statement to the House Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands

by Huey D. Johnson,  
California Secretary for Resources

"The U.S. Forest Service should think in terms of generations if not of centuries. But continuing pressure from lumbermen, mining companies and enterprising recreational developers makes it hard for Forest Service officials to think beyond the day's schedule of appointments. The result is a built-in bias in favor of early utilization, which shows in the recommendations the Forest Service had just drawn up for classifying some 62 million acres of undeveloped land in the national forests."

That is a quote from an editorial in the January 29, 1979 *Business Week* magazine. It states California's position and our concerns and explains why I am here before you today.

Although we are concerned with maintaining healthy timber, mining and energy producing industries, we are also concerned with the entire array of resources management and the public need for open space and recreation.

The *Christian Science Monitor* editorial of January 8, 1979 also stated the situation for what it is:

"The United States is down to the last batch of federal lands that can be saved for preservation as wilderness. Scattered all over the country, they add up to 62 million acres, less than the area of Wyoming. Now the future of these 'roadless areas' in the national forests has been cast in doubt. The Agricultural Department has made proposals for them that appear to need much more than 'fine tuning.'"

"They (the recommendations) would designate only 15 million acres as wilderness and 11 million for further study while opening 36 million for various kinds of development. There are strong arguments for at least reversing these proportions, designating sufficient wilderness areas besides barren ice and rock, and being sure possibilities are not overlooked for both preserving wilderness and attaining necessary development."

Congress is likely to be the referee for that "fine tuning."

Some of the key issues in RARE II are related to economics — but to old economics. James Reston once said there are dogmas and creeds and practices which were ideally suited to one age and were disastrous in another. There's a new factor in the economics of resources. I call it "livability." This factor is a measure of the quality of living that we share as population pressures grow and shortages increase.

The Forest Service RARE II planning exercise has been unsuccessful; few, if any, people are satisfied. Unfortunately, the U.S.F.S. recommendations are stealing from the future rather than investing in it.

The process has three major inadequacies, and

the inadequacies are the direct cause of the failure of the Forest Service recommendations.

The three inadequacies of the process are:

1. Bias toward industries
2. Ill-conceived and inflexible computer data process
3. Inadequate public participation process

Bias toward industry shows up in two ways in the process. First, the big rush to get all the decisions made as soon as possible and secondly, the push to allocate as many areas as possible into either wilderness or non-wilderness, whether there is adequate information to base these recommendations or not. It is clear that the process is designed to find reasons **not** to put areas into wilderness.

From the standpoint of communications RARE II is a failure. It is a failure because it relies too heavily on computer technology. I am not opposed to computers, but at present there are a number of important human issues and values that computers cannot handle. Answers from computers are controlled by the programmer. In this case the process was rigged to support "business as usual." To ignore the voter and to substitute a computer program for public involvement and the awareness citizens get from it is to undermine democracy itself. Technocracy must develop better ethics than that.

The resulting computer process not only decreased human participation but also resulted in inadequate data and confusing information. Let me give you some examples. The summary

entitled "State of California Resources Gained or Lost" is taken directly from the DRAFT EIS. This summary is the information upon which the Forest Service asked the public and the State of California to make recommendations for wilderness or non-wilderness allocations for the six specific roadless areas shown.

The following paragraph from Appendix D of the same report is the leading paragraph of the report describing how the Forest Service developed these summary figures:

"The physical and biological factors were evaluated using a matrix of management activities on one axis and physical and biological elements on the other axis. Relative values ranging from a -5 to a +5 were then assigned in the matrix through full discussion of the interdisciplinary team. After the values were assigned for each element, the columns were tallied vertically and horizontally, ignoring the algebraic sign. The totals indicate which management activities and which elements of the environment are most affected by that particular alternative. Those items with the highest ratings are then discussed in the writeup as being the most significant factors for that alternative."

The previous narrative discussed how each of the highest rated activities affects the environment either positively or negatively."

Compare that confusion and resulting meager amount of information with this report (Snow Mountain wilderness study) prepared at Congress' request for consideration of a single wilderness study area. You note that this document is not very large, 93 pages, but more important, it contains a great deal of information upon which the public, the State and Congress can develop decisions.

On the other hand, the Forest Service argues that they have reams of backup data for the small summary for each of the roadless areas. This may be true in some cases, but that, too, is part of the process problem. This is illustrated in Table 2, entitled "Getting Essential Documentation from the Forest Service," prepared by the Sierra Club and Wilderness Society for its members. Review of the six points of obtaining the essential documentation clearly demonstrates that this part of the process bureaucratically imposes unreasonable burdens on the general public.

Also tied to the computer process is the problem of inflexibility. The Forest Service's process did not provide for altering boundaries. It has been demonstrated in several cases (for example, Trinity County, to be discussed later) that boundary changes can sometimes be made to lessen economic impact of designating an area to wilderness.

In California alone, over 330 roadless areas were evaluated. It appears that

this part of the process is designed more to conceal elements of the decision-making efforts rather than to provide and assist the public in understanding and developing recommendations.

The third major failing of the RARE II process is its failure to provide for adequate public participation. The RARE II approach demonstrates little experience with urban reality and reapportionment. The city dwellers of New York and Iowa and Florida, as well as those in California, each of whom owns 2.7 acres of the public lands across the nation, were not provided ample opportunity to participate in the Forest Service RARE II process.

To start with, the Forest Service chose to have no public meetings or hearings where citizens could obtain information and comment to the U.S.F.S. In lieu of such public meetings, the Forest Service had open house sessions in its various district offices located within the U.S. Forest Service lands. This approach clearly prejudices the input to the Forest Service because only those living within the forest had ample opportunity to stop in. The citizens of our cities, each of whom owns just as much of the Forest Service lands, found it very difficult to go the many miles to those Forest Service offices. This is important since about 90 percent of the State's 23 million people live in our major metropolitan areas.

As a partial solution, the Forest Service had a "National Forest System Advisory Committee" to assist in RARE II. While a creditable idea, the timing and obfuscation of data has brought open criticism

from many of the Committee's members.

Another defect of the process is the change in midstream by the Forest Service regarding its evaluation of form letters. Initially, the Service indicated personal letters would be given more weight than form letters, petitions, etc. However, detailed evaluation of correspondence received by the Forest Service shows that equal weight to form letters and petitions must have been given for the U.S.F.S. to draw the conclusions that it did. Concern for this possibility was expressed by public interest groups a couple of months ago. However, the effect of the midstream rule change did not become apparent to us until after the Forest Service recommendations came out January 4. Since then, the Governor's Office has been deluged by employer-prepared form letters such as these.

These letters typically consist of two separate letters with everything properly addressed, including a machine stamped and addressed envelope to the Governor's Office. All that needs to be done is for an individual (after receiving such a letter from his employer) to sign the letter and drop it in the mail box.

The final insult to the public at large in the RARE II process results from the Forest Service's refusal to allow the public to comment specifically on the Forest Service's recommendations. In the last month, the Forest Service has changed its procedures to allow state administrations and Congress to comment specifically on the Forest Service recommendations, but what of the general public?

Is it fair that the public's only opportunity to comment on Forest Service recommendations must be made all the way to Washington?

If the process is inadequate the results are sure to follow suit. The Forest Service's handling of the RARE II decision in Trinity County provides the ultimate example. I am speak-

ing, in this case, of Trinity County's recommendations which were based on a task force, mediation approach representing broad public involvement including timber, recreational, real estate, the fishery, wilderness and environmental interests. The recommendations were further accepted by statewide and by national groups, including the State of California. This process represented the kind of process the Forest Service should have employed instead of the computer-oriented program it did.

In short, residents of the county and also citizens groups representing both state and national interests early in the process recognized the inadequacy of the Forest Service data and also the importance of properly allocating the 300,000+ acres of RARE II lands in the county. As a result, the county formed a citizens group representing the interests I described before. The group developed additional information regarding all resource values. After considerable give and take, final recommendations were developed and supported by the various interests. The recommendations were further supported by a unanimous vote of the County Board of Supervisors and also by the State of California.

Now take a look at the total disregard that the Forest Service had of this public process and of these efforts.

Recommendations in total acres by:

	Trinity Citizens' Task Force	U.S.F.S.
Wilderness	179,500	16,800
Future Planning	6,200	68,000
Non- Wilderness	185,300	263,700
Withdrawal from Primitive Areas	0	59,500

The comparison is obvious. Unfortunately, these results seem to verify preoccupation on the part of the Forest Service to financial management as opposed to resource manage-



A Siskiyou Wilderness would protect Devil's Punchbowl, a popular campsite.

Photo by Dave Van de Mark



## State of California

### RARE II Recommendations

#### Angeles National Forest

Area #	Name	USFS	STATE
L5307	Sheep Mtn.	NW	FP
5008	Pleasant View	NW	FP

#### Cleveland National Forest

5013	Trabuco	NW	FP
5014	Wildhorse	NW	FP
5015	San Mateo	NW	FP

#### El Dorado National Forest

B5024	Salt Spring	NW	W
-------	-------------	----	---

#### Inyo National Forest

A5058	White Mtns.	FP	W
B5058	PLLSR/Brasen	FP	W
5029	South Sierra	NW	FP
5059	Blanco Mtns.	FP	W
5060	Birch Creek	FP	W
5061	Black Canyon	FP	W

#### Klamath National Forest

A5081	Russian	NW	FP
B5074	Portuguese	NW	NW
		(8,500 acres)	W
		(8,500 acres)	FP
B5077	Snoozer	NW	NW
		(14,700 acres)	FP
		(7,400 acres)	FP
E5701	Siskiyou	NW	FP
C5079	Orleans Mtn.	NW	FP
5067	Grider	NW	FP
5068	Johnson	NW	FP
5078	Shackleford	NW	FP
5703	Kangaroo	NW	FP

#### Los Padres National Forest

5130	White Ledge	NW	FP
5136	Antimony	NW	FP

#### Mendocino National Forest

B5144	Snow Mtn.	NW	FP
5137	Wilderness	FP	W
5143	Reister Canyon	NW	FP
5145	Big-Butte	FP	W
5280	Skeleton Glade	NW	FP

#### Uninventoried Middle

Fork Eel River	NW	FP	(30,000 acres)
----------------	----	----	----------------

#### Six Rivers National Forest

B5079	Orleans Mtn.	FP	NW
B5701	Siskiyou	NW	NW
		FP	(27,400 acres)

#### Blue Creek Uninventoried

C5079	Orleans Mtn.	NW	FP
5145	Big Butte	FP	W
5250	North Fork	NW	W

#### Rogue River National Forest

6703	Kangaroo	NW	FP
------	----------	----	----

#### Siskiyou National Forest

B6701	Siskiyou	NW	FP
-------	----------	----	----

#### San Bernadino National Forest

L5307	Sheep Mtn.	NW	FP
5178	Deep Creek	NW	FP

#### Sequoia National Forest

5029	South Sierra	NW	FP
5200	Jennie Lakes	NW	FP
5208	Rincon	NW	FP
5305	Domeland II	NW	W

#### Shasta-Trinity National Forest

A5299	Fisher Gulch	FP	NW
			(400 acre)
			W
			(2900 acre)
B5218	Bell-Quimby	NW	W(1100 ac)
			NW(9800
B5219	Castle Crag	NW	FP
B5231	Mt. Shasta	NW	W(9000 ac
			FI(691 ac
			W
B5800	Bakeoven	NW	W
B5803	China Springs	NW	W(200 ac
			NW(700
C5079	Orleans Mtn.	NW	W(13,700)
			NW(49,200
C5228	Little French	NW	W(22,600)
			NW
5220	Chancelulla	FP	NW(3,700)
			W(8,200)
5223	Devils Rock	NW	FP
5225	East Beegum	NW	FP
5233	Pattison	NW	W
5238	West Girard	NW	FP
5804	Weaver Bally	NW	W
5805	Cherry Flat	NW	W
5806	Granite Peak	FP	W
5807	Lake Eleanor	FP	W

#### Sierra National Forest

B5047	San Joaquin	NW	NW
			(35,000)
			W
			(13,000)
			FP
			(36,900)

#### Stanislaus National Forest

A5986	Carson-Iceberg	NW	W(2,000
			NW(14,100)
5256	North Mtn.	NW	FP
5811	Bell Meadow	NW	FP
5813	Eagle	NW	FP
5815	Night	NW	W

#### Tahoe National Forest

A5261	Granite Chief	FP	W
-------	---------------	----	---

ment.

If the Forest Service's process was not correct then what would be? A proper approach should start with the objective of producing the highest possible returns to society in perpetuity and not simply to rush, cut, dig or drill at this time. All resources values should be considered — timber, fisheries, watershed, protection, mineral production, recreation, geothermal energy, wind energy. Many of these received inadequate and, in many cases, no consideration in the Forest Service process.

The Forest Service's practices are not only unsatisfactory with respect to the management of their own lands but they are also in conflict with the efforts of the State of California.

California isn't ignoring the needs of the resource or of the local economies. We are engaged in an array of programs which not only are intended to enhance the long run productivity of the resource but also maintain or develop a diversity of economic opportunity in local communities, for example:

Our Forest Practices Act and reforestation efforts not only provide timber, and jobs in the short run, but also provide jobs in the long term through reforestation to maintain the forests' productivity.

Our fisheries rehabilitation and restoration programs offer continued opportunity in another important industry in the California northwest. Successful progress here, however, depends on high-quality

watersheds which cannot be maintained with poor forestry practices. Yet, not only has the Forest Service ignored this important consideration in its RARE II planning, it has also ignored the benefits derived to the fisheries resource from no harvesting in watersheds with high values for their habitat. This is yet another example of the bias built into the RARE II process which encourages commercial timber production.

These programs in conjunction with our efforts to encourage the development of a broad array of recreational opportunities in the state illustrate not only our concern toward long-term productivity of our resources but also the great importance of avoiding "boom" and "bust"

cycles in local economies. California history is manifestly instructive in the problems associated with local economies dependent on a single activity. Whether looking at gold mines, timber harvesting, or aerospace engineering, local economies need diversity in order to be successful in the long run.

Present management of the National Forests, which relegates all activity but timber harvest and mining to low priority, not only continues to make local communities dependent on timber harvest and mining activity, but also forces dependence on the public sector because the private sector's relative position is weakened and payments such as the Forest Service's in-lieu tax become so im-

portant in local finance.

A combination of history and the pressures for providing wood products have contributed to a preoccupation by the Forest Service toward financial management rather than resource management. The Forest Service seems to measure its contribution in terms of its budgetary position. That is, the Forest Service takes considerable pride in the fact that its timber sale and other receipts from the public lands are substantially greater than the budget allocations it receives. Is this profit? Does it help the discussion at all? I think not. The Forest Service spends far too little in reforestation and other activities to enhance the long-term productivity of our public lands. Furthermore, the Forest Service also substantially undercharges for the consumptive uses of the public lands such as timber harvests and mining. Thus, the Forest Service spends too little on the resource and sells it too cheap, but makes the resource management appear sound by hinging its arguments on notions of fiscal-balance. I submit that this is not evidence that the Forest Service receives the best price for its resources. The same reasoning would lead me to believe that the best price for my house is \$3,000 if I spent \$1,000 to fix it up for sale (painting, cleaning, advertising).

More generally, I think it's time for a change. The Forest Service needs to manage our resources for the broad social values, not treat those broader social values as a residual to be accommodated only after the directly marketable resources such as wood products and minerals have been extracted.

One of the many important, but unfortunate, by-products of the Forest Service underpricing of its timber resources is the effect it has on private sector forests. Faced with competition from the underpriced public forest resources, private forests cannot get the prices they need to manage as effectively as they might and have to be pressured to reforest their lands.

The Forest Service and Office of Management and Budget must realize they cannot continue harvesting our forests, rangelands and other resources year after year without reinvesting enough in these natural systems to maintain their long-term productivity. Before long the carrying capacity of these lands will have been diminished, the quantity and quality of our resources base decreased and we will have passed the point of diminishing returns, if in fact we have not already done so in many cases.

In this period of stagflation and increasing concern over government spending, we should not be irresponsible in our management of natural resources. Perhaps one of the greatest challenges to our generation is to find a way to regain control of government spending programs while making sure we still invest in our future. Investment in our resource — base — the source of the real wealth of our country — is not a trivial problem. As we tighten our belts, let

us not ignore the future. To do so would be "penny wise and dollar foolish".

Last summer at the Forest Service's request, I had forestry, timber, water quality, fisheries and other experts review the Forest Service's draft RARE II document. It was immediately apparent that the document did not contain enough information from which the State, public or others could make specific recommendations to the Forest Service.

It was not possible to ascertain from the RARE II process and supporting documentation what the resource management considerations were. It was also impossible to determine what the economic implications of possible individual recommendations or alternatives were. In their headlong rush to finish RARE II, the Forest Service has applied economic models ill-suited to their use. The input-output (I-O) economic modeling technique used is at best only a crude first approximation of economic effects of major changes such as RARE II. When coupled with a weak data base, failure to account for either short- or long-term adjustments (e.g., shifts to recreation) in local economies, and the problems of aggregating local I-O results, it is an unsatisfactory technique. Perhaps with more time and effort the technique can be more useful.

Accordingly, the State expressed its concern in a September 29, 1978, letter to the Forest Service indicating that because the RARE II process is inadequate and thus cannot contribute to the timely resolution of the issues, the State would not comment at that time with one exception, Trinity County. We indicated that in lieu of submitting comments on other areas at that time the State would initiate a new process for evaluation of the roadless areas in California. This process would provide, as did the process used in Trinity County, for increased public participation, mediation of conflicts likely to rise between special interest groups and for adequate consideration of important environmental values. We also indicated the Forest Service would be invited to take part in the process.

As predicted in October, the Forest Service's final recommendations allocated too few lands to wilderness and too many lands to non-wilderness. We note, however, that in California a greater percentage of the areas were allocated to future planning than in most states. We believe this is a reflection of Zane Smith's, the Regional Forester, personal sensitivity to the fact that the resource values in California are special, that conflicting interests are real, and that the 6 million acres being evaluated amount to the last 6 percent of unallocated California lands. Still, the Forest Service recommendations released too many controversial lands into the non-wilderness category.

Therefore, I had various California state agencies review the Forest Service recommendations in detail

continued on page 6



continued from page 5

and develop a set of recommendations which we on this date have transmitted to Secretary Bergland.

I asked my staff to support the Forest Service recommendations where the information available either in RARE II documents or from previous studies indicated such was justified. On the other hand, if there were not enough data available to make the type of final decisions required and if the resources were significant and the issues controversial, areas in those categories should be placed into future planning.

Review of the State's recommendations indicates that there is substantial agreement between our recommendations and those of the Forest Service on both wilderness and non-wilderness categories. However, we do request the Forest Service and Congress add an additional 550,000 acres of wilderness at this time and place an additional 484,000 acres in further planning.

The major difference in our respective wilderness recommendations relates again to Trinity County. Recommendations of the Trinity County Task Force, the County Board of Supervisors and the State of California would allocate almost 179,500 acres into wilderness. The Forest Service's insensitive approach, however, resulted in recommendations of only 16,800 acres into wilderness.

In addition to the Trinity County recommendations, we are also recommending that the Granite Chief (35,200 acres), Tahoe National Forest, and the White Mountains (298,600 acres) Inyo National Forest, be placed in wilderness.

The future planning allocations, however, is the most important allocation for discussion today and for some time in the future. For it is these lands that are most vulnerable to further inroads and development.

The recommendations for the additional 1 million acres of lands to be placed future planning allocation are based not only for concern for the areas but as previously indicated on lack of information and inadequate processing by the Forest Service's RARE II documents. We've reviewed the matter very carefully and are satisfied that these lands must be placed into future planning for the Forest Service decision to be legal. There's not sufficient basis nor enough information to support allocation of these lands into non-wilderness or into wilderness category. In short, any allocation other than future planning would not be in compliance with the Resources Planning Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

We have carefully analyzed each of the changes we are recommending in the Forest Service's proposals. Our results indicate there would be negligible local economic impact by December 1983 if our recommendations were adopted. Most of the areas involved have a relatively low potential yield of timber. Some planned timber sales would be affected in the Klamath area, but as a pro-

portion of total activity it is very small. We estimate that the Forest Service could make up all of the difference by planning harvest activity elsewhere; the impact of our recommendations on the allowable cut is very small. Generally very few sales are planned elsewhere in the areas we recommend changes; the few there are are predominantly salvage, timber stand improvement, and habitat improvement.

We are currently examining the long-term local economic impacts of our recommendations. Our effort here seeks to incorporate structural changes in the economies as they would be affected by the State and, hopefully, the Forest Service policies and programs outlined earlier.

The State of California asks your support for these recommendations. We, of course, solicit your support to place all of the lands recommended for wilderness into that category in due time. We are more concerned, however, as indicated previously with lands recommended for future planning. In the event, however, that the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture do not concur with these recommendations then we solicit your Congressional designation of these critical lands as wilderness study areas so they can be protected while ample time and evaluation proceeds to determine a final designation.

One of the additional tragedies of the rush involved in the RARE II process is that it detracts from other important long-term natural resource issues. Last month I had presentations read before your committee and others expressing our concern for the proposed reductions in the Forest Service and BLM budgets.

At a time when we can hardly ignore the evidence of past neglect and when recognition of the needs of future generations for trees that take a generation or more to grow cannot be denied, it is indeed disappointing to see that substantial reductions are proposed in both reforestation and timber management improvement.

In California the Forest Service estimates it has a backlog of 124,000 acres in need of reforestation. However, the actual backlog may be much greater, perhaps two or three times that amount. Sadly, neither the Forest Service nor any other federal resource management agency has ever had adequate funds to make comprehensive inventories and assessments of the resources for which they are responsible.

There is obviously a parallel. If the Forest Service had more money to do better management, to do more reforestation, there would be less pressure and less need to log every last tree off lands that rightfully should be reserved for wilderness.

In addition to working with you and others to hopefully increase the budgets of these agencies, it is apparent that there are other needs if the national forests in California are going to be properly managed. The inadequacy of the Forest Service's RARE



Preston Peak, in the heart of the proposed Siskiyou Wilderness.

Photo by Dave Van de Mark

II process, due in part at least to its budget inadequacies, gives us great concern in California. Sometimes, however, it is not as easy for professional managers to analyze and make recommendations regarding problems as it is to have qualified citizens become involved. Accordingly, I'm in the process of designating a "California Citizens Committee on U.S. Forest Service Management" to review the policies of the national forests in California and to make recommendations.

Relative to the budgets and also to the RARE II problem, we are asking you to recognize the interest of California's present 22 million people as well as future additional millions in

the condition of their forests, fisheries and range-lands and other resources which are our mutual responsibility.

I opened this statement with a quote from the BUSINESS WEEK January 29 editorial. Many were surprised about the position taken by the business magazine. Others were not. Nevertheless, the editorial states California's position better than I can paraphrase it. Therefore, let me again quote from that editorial but this time from the last paragraph:

"Under the circumstances, it would have made sense to put a large part of the 62 million acres in the 'further study' classification. Since the Forest Service did not make this move, Congress

should overhaul the recommended program to keep future options open."

In summary, as a policy it is important that we get prime timber lands into sustained production. It's important that in doing so, these lands be managed for both present and future timber needs and not be exploited for the short-term benefits of a few.

Resolution of the issues raised by RARE II, providing it is done in a way that satisfies total public interest, can mark the beginning of a new era in land and resource management in our country.

We need managers who can enhance the remarkable process of sunlight and soil being

turned into forests that, if managed properly, can provide wood products in perpetuity to meet the needs of our society.

However, nothing can be more important than preserving the wilderness areas that are the birthright of present and future generations, the real owners of these precious public lands. Wilderness will be needed both as a measure of the quality of our lives, as resources which can provide recreation and priceless opportunities to recharge the human spirit, and by scientists for whom they can provide standards of productivity as well as the opportunity to preserve unique and irreplaceable life forms.



## Terrestrial Vegetation of California

### Book Review by Nick Van Pelt

**Terrestrial Vegetation of California**, edited by Michael G. Barbour and Jack Major, 1977. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley and Sons, New York. 1002 p, illustrated.

This is a very useful handbook for wilderness conservationists concerned with the formal protection of California's unusually diverse vegetation. It begins with an overview section on California climate, flora, and ecological history; the chapter on "Research natural areas and related programs" is particularly valuable, although it slights wilderness, saying only that "many scientists will find the conditions they need for their studies in these types of areas".

The book is organized by floristic province into chapters on vegetation types, and further subdivided by ecological and geographical types, such as the "red fir forest" of the "Montane and subalpine vegetation of the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Ranges". Each chapter was assigned to one or more experts well-qualified to review the studies done on a particular type and to

outline research deficiencies and management implications, as well as to present their own knowledge.

Although statements with conservation implications are to be found throughout, the concluding sections on the status of knowledge of vegetation types are the most interesting and disturbing. We learn that there are many instances of a disproportion between basic research and the rate of exploitation of an ecosystem.

Gordon, Parsons and Rundel, in the chapter on the Sierra Nevada, write, "Limited research has evaluated the bio-geo-ecological consequences of logging practices in the Sierra Nevada, and these studies have been local in scope. Management of mountain meadows also requires increased attention. Grazing and recreational uses have greatly modified the structure of Sierran meadows; thus we know little about the pristine conditions that management efforts are striving to restore."

In many instances it's possible to relate a deficiency of knowledge to a particular conservation

proposal; the "desert montane white fir forest" or the eastern Mojave ranges is neglected, as are other relict conifer "islands" within Wilderness proposals. On the other hand, some detailed descriptions and citations of other research have a lot of overlap with significant roadless areas; for instance the alpine landscapes of the "rainshadow ranges" — the Whites and Sweetwaters.

Partly because so many of the occurrences are localized, it's easy to reference places that may lie within *de facto* wilderness, and thereby relate the state-of-knowledge of plant communities to particular "wilderness regions," such as the Siskiyou, the Modoc country, and the Peninsular Ranges. The book is also, sadly, a documentation of damages already done, not just to familiar ecosystems, but to rare species of restricted occurrence. The Vogl et al chapter on the closed-cone pines and cypresses describes needless destruction of these trees by "chaparral management" and by removal of com-

mon materials by open mining in southern California.

The book is very well indexed by species and locality, although the lack of common names in the text will hinder most people's access to the plant community descriptions; they should use a flora if unfamiliar with the Latin names. The black and white photographs are not abundant relative to the tables, maps, and diagrams. The chapter on vegetation mapping, the literature references, and the tables showing non-Wilderness natural area systems (pp. 82-100) should be particularly valuable to conservationists beginning or revising field studies. As a "scientific sourcebook", **Terrestrial Vegetation** and its future revisions will be more and more valuable to the conservationists seeking technical support for proposals in particular regions or vegetation types, whatever the natural-area system being expanded. At \$48.00, individual purchase of the book is impractical, but it should be on the reference shelves of every public library in the state.



## Wilderness Wildlife

# Martens, Fishers and Wolverines

by Dennis Coules

Of the many species of fur-bearing mammals found in California, the marten, fisher and wolverine are the most dependent on wilderness conditions for survival. All are found in dense old-growth forests in North America, with the wolverine also ranging occasionally into more alpine areas of the Cascades and the Sierra Nevada. Not surprisingly, these species have become quite scarce in California and are only occasionally seen. All are protected under California state law and may not be taken at any time.

Members of the family Mustelidae, these three carnivores are related to the weasel, mink, ferret, skunk, badger and otter. Many members of the weasel family are noted for their ferocity and blood-thirsty predaceous habits. They often play an important role in control of the populations of rodents and other herbivores.

The American pine marten, *Martes americana*, is found in California chiefly in dense spruce, fir and lodgepole pine forests at elevations ranging from 4,000 to 13,000 feet. It is about the size of a house cat, with a bushy tail half as long as the body. A yellow-orange throat patch on the otherwise dark brown body makes this animal easy to identify. An extremely agile climber, the marten chases and eats squirrels and chipmunks,

as well as rabbits, rats, insects, berries, nuts and a variety of other foods. It is chiefly nocturnal and may be observed at dusk. The only one I have observed growled very convincingly when approached too closely, with a voice much too menacingly deep for its size. Few animals prey on the marten, but fishers, lynx and great horned owls have been known to do so occasionally.

Like most Mustelids, martens are solitary and only associate during the breeding season in July and August. At this time males may engage in fatal combat. There are usually three young per litter, born in April. The marten may live 17 years or more. Its curiosity, however, makes it a very easy animal to trap.

The fisher, *Martes pennanti*, is found in remote areas of mixed coniferous forest, yellow pine, red fir and lodgepole pine. In California it is found in the Sierra Nevada between Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks and in old-growth forests of the Northwest. It is most often found near watercourses and is an excellent swimmer. The fisher is nowhere common, and populations average only one per hundred square miles even in the most suitable habitat.

The fisher is larger than the marten, light to dark brown with grayish head and shoulders, black feet

and sometimes irregular white spots on the throat and chest. This predator is active day or night and feeds on whatever it can overcome, including squirrels, martens, marmots, rabbits, raccoons, reptiles, foxes and lynx. It is the only animal that regularly preys on porcupines, which it may attack in the winter by tunneling underneath the snow to bite the unprotected neck or abdomen. It is one of the swiftest of climbers, and can race down tree trunks head first. The fisher gives birth to two to four young in May or June, denning in standing or fallen hollow trees or holes in rocky ledges.

The wolverine, *Gulo gulo* (previously *Gulo luscus*), is extremely rare in California, with only 15 individuals estimated to exist in 1933. It is found in the Sierra Nevada from Lake Tahoe south to the Kern gap, and recent sightings indicate a possible range expansion into Shasta and Trinity Counties and the Siskiyou Mountains. Remote areas of coniferous forest or alpine tundra comprise the wolverine's habitat.

The wolverine is the largest member of the weasel family at three feet in length and up to 45 pounds. The head and short tail are normally held low. General body color is chestnut brown with two yellowish bands along the shoulders to the base of

the tail. There is a patch of light-colored fur at the base of the throat.

The Latin name *Gulo luscus* can be translated as "half-blind glutton," which refers both to its feeding habits and its unusual habit of sitting up on its haunches and shading its eyes with a forepaw when looking into the distance. The wolverine is active day



Fisher



Wolverine

or night and throughout the year. Food includes carrion, rodents and other small mammals and snow-bound deer or caribou. It reportedly also sometimes attacks and eats moose and bears. Much food is obtained by chasing off other predators at their kill, none of which can reportedly resist this thievery, including grizzly bears, mountain lions and wolf packs. It often raids human traplines also and may carry off or damage the traps. Whatever it cannot eat is smeared with a foul secretion of the musk glands.

If the marten, fisher and wolverine are to survive in California, protection of their habitat is vital. Logging roads, vehicles and mechanized equipment are not compatible with their occupancy of an area. Mature old-growth forests are rapidly being depleted through clearcutting, especially in northwestern California. In lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service, wilderness designation may be the only method of assuring the continued existence of these interesting creatures.

## Siskiyou N.F. Plan

Siskiyou National Forest has announced that the draft environmental statement for the Forest Plan will be completed by December 31, 1980. The Forest Plan is a single integrated plan for all uses of a National Forest. Public workshops on the Forest Plan are scheduled in local communities in April, 1979, and written comments are requested by May 13, 1979.

In this preliminary planning stage, comments are requested which include "issues, concerns and opportunities" that should be considered in the Forest Plan. Issues, concerns and opportunities that are identified by the public will be used in the formulation of plan criteria, alternatives for management of the Forest and evaluation criteria for these alternatives. Persons with any opinions at all concerning the management of Siskiyou National Forest should make their comments available to insure that the issues of their concern will be addressed during the planning process.

Address comments and requests for more information to: Bill Covey, Siskiyou National Forest, P.O. Box 440, Grants Pass, OR 97526, Attn: Forest Plan Interdisciplinary Team.

## Memorial

### Willi Unsoeld

On March 5, the American wilderness lost a very special friend. Willi Unsoeld was killed in an avalanche on Mount Rainer, while teaching a mountaineering seminar.

Willi, who distinguished himself as one of the first Americans to reach the summit of Mount Everest, was a member of The Wilderness Society Governing Council and an eloquent spokesman in defense of wild places. He spent most of his life with the wilderness, either by visiting it himself or by striving to help others enjoy the wilds, working with Outward Bound and teaching out-

door skills seminars.

In addition to working to save wilderness, Willi was also concerned with the well-being of its defenders. He constantly reminded activists not to burn themselves out, but to get out into the mountains, deserts, and rivers, and experience their healing and inspirational values.

We are going to miss Willi in the difficult years ahead. Let us remember his warmth and with his inspiration fight the good fight for the preservation of wilderness.

John Amodio  
Dave Brown  
Jim Eaton



Marten

## Staff

### Record Staff

#### Editor - Jim Eaton

Fred Gunsky  
Beth Newiman  
Jim Trumbly  
Dennis Coules  
Mike Nolasco  
Dave Brown  
Sari Sommarstrom

The **Wilderness Record** is the bi-monthly publication of the California Wilderness Coalition. Address all correspondence to: P.O. Box 429, Davis, CA 95616 (916) 758-0390. Articles may be reprinted. Credit would be appreciated.

### Board of Directors

**President** - Wendy Cohen  
**Vice-President** - Sari Sommarstrom  
**Secretary** - Steve Evans  
**Treasurer** - Beth Newman  
**Director** - Jim Eaton  
**Director** - Bob Barnes  
**Director** - unfilled

### Staff

**Executive Director** - Dave Brown  
**Project Coordinator** - Dennis Coules  
**Administrative Assistant** - Valerie Brelsford

### 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 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.



# Ticketron Comes to National Parks

The National Park Service announced today that it will initiate a pilot program of advance reservations for campsites this summer at three western national parks — Yosemite, Grand Canyon and Sequoia-Kings Canyon.

A one-year contract has been signed with Ticketron, a nation-wide reservation company, to provide the service covering approximately 1,300 campsites at the three parks, according to Howard H. Chapman, Western Regional Director of the Service.

Reservations may be made in person at over 150 Ticketron outlets in California, including department stores and sporting goods outlets, or by mail from throughout the United States to the Ticketron Reservation Office, P.O. Box 2715, San Francisco, Calif., 94126, Chapman said. He emphasized that campsites reservations can not be made by telephone.

Reservations also may be made in person through computer terminals at five NPS locations, Chapman added. They will be located at the three parks concerned; the Los Angeles Field Office of the Service, Room 2043, New Federal Building, 300 N. Los Angeles St., Los Angeles and at the NPS Information Office on the 14th floor of the Federal Building, 450 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco.

The contract is renewable at the option of both parties on a yearly basis for an additional four years and may be expanded to include campgrounds in other parks in the future, Chapman said.

Campgrounds covered by the program for the summer of 1979 include the five Yosemite Valley campgrounds; Lower River (154 campsites); Lower Pines (179 sites); North Pines, (90 sites); Upper River (124) and Upper Pines, (240). Also included are Mather Campground on the South Rim of the Grand Canyon with 300 sites, and 200 sites at Lodgepole Campground, Sequoia.

Reservations may be made up to eight weeks in advance, starting March 30, for the period between the Memorial Day and Labor Day weekends except that some of the terminal outlets in the parks may not be operational until May 15.

Mail orders must be received in Ticketron's San Francisco office at least two weeks in advance so that they can be processed and the reservation ticket returned. "Neither the Park Service nor Ticketron can be responsible for delays in postal service," Chapman cautioned. "Therefore, we suggest that when possible, reservations be made well in advance." Reservation forms may be picked up at Ticketron outlets through-

out the United States.

Chapman further noted that reservations can be made for a particular park and campground, but not for specific campsites. A campsite is assigned when the visitor arrives at the campground for which he/she holds a reservation.

The daily use charge for campsites at Yosemite is \$4; at Grand Canyon, \$3, and at Sequoia, \$2. In addition, there is a one-time fee of \$1.75 for each reservation made. Holders of a valid Golden Age Passport (for persons 62 or older) are entitled to a 50 percent reduction in daily campsite fees providing they present the Passport when making a reservation in person. On a mail request the Golden Age Passport number must be shown on the reservation form. It also must be in possession of the camper while occupying the campsite.

The length of stay at a reserved campsite is limited to 7 days at all Yosemite and Grand Canyon campgrounds under the system, and to 14 days at Lodgepole in Sequoia. Requests for consecutive reservations will not be honored. A maximum of one family or six persons may occupy any one family campsite.

Pets will be permitted only in Upper Pines Campground at Yosemite, and at both Mather in Grand Canyon and Lodgepole in Sequoia, Chapman said.

# Park Entrance Fees

WASHINGTON — The Wilderness Society today strongly criticized plans by the Office of Management and Budget to raise entrance fees to our National Parks.

"If anything entrance fees should be abolished," William A. Turnage, the Society's Executive Director, told the Senate Appropriations Committee. "Our National Parks are symbolic of the public's ownership of the public lands. They should be free and open to everyone regardless of economic status."

According to Turnage, demanding entrance fees decreases the sense of ownership and increases

the psychological as well as economic barriers. He compared public attitudes toward commercial amusement parks and national facilities like the Smithsonian Institution.

"When a tourist enters Disneyland," explained Turnage, "he may feel a sense of wonder, but when he enters the Smithsonian that wonder is mixed with pride that his tax dollars helped make it all possible — that what he sees belongs to him. Paying an admission fee would only detract from his positive proprietary sense."

Calling the proposal to raise entrance fees "ab-

surd," Rep. Phillip Burton said he will fight this year to either freeze or abolish all such fees.

"We set aside the national parks for the enjoyment of all the American public and they shouldn't have to pay this kind of money to visit them," Burton said.

Lower fees or no fees at all would encourage more people to visit parks and would not discriminate against those who have lower incomes, the San Francisco Democrat said.

On the Senate side, Sen. Dale Bumpers, D-Ark., chairman on parks, has taken a similar stand.



PHOTO BY J. KAUKONEN

# RARE II cont.

continued from page 1

The State also primarily recommends further planning rather than wilderness for important areas. Considering the consistent anti-wilderness bias of the Forest Service in their land-use planning process, the State's recommendations seem to be based more on what is politically safe

than what would protect the resource.

Despite some disappointments in key areas, the position explained by Huey Johnson is much more favorable towards wilderness lands than that of the Forest Service. Environmentalists are urging the governor to extend the

State recommendations to include such areas as San Joaquin, Siskiyou additions, Red Buttes, Snow Mountain, South Sierra and the Shasta red-fir forest on Mt. Shasta as immediate wilderness designations rather than avoiding a decision through a further planning recommendation.

# CWC Business Sponsors

Like any political organization, California Wilderness Coalition depends on sponsorship and support. The organization is grateful to the following businesses that have been able to see beyond just selling their products to the great need to preserve the wilderness in which their products are used.

**The Smilie Company**  
575 Howard St.  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415)-421-2459

**Echo, The Wilderness Company**  
6505 Telegraph Ave.  
Oakland, CA 94609  
(415) 658-5075

**Wilderness Press**  
2440 Bancroft Way  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
(415) 843-8080

**Mammoth Maintenance Service**  
P.O. Box 155  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
(714) 934-8616

**The Naturalist**  
219 E Street  
Davis, CA 95616  
(916) 758-2323

**Antelope Camping Equipment Mfg. Co.**  
21740 Granada Ave.  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
(408) 253-1913

**Solano Ski Sport**  
1215 Tabor Ave.  
Fairfield, CA 94533  
(707) 422-1705

**New World Outfitters**  
1055 Market St.  
San Francisco, CA 94103

**Alpine Products, Inc.**  
P.O. Box 403  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
(916) 372-2861

**The Alpine Supply Co.**  
130 G. Street  
Davis, CA 95616  
(916) 756-2241

**The Mountain Shop, Inc.**  
228 Grant Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
(415) 362-8477

**Four Seasons Sports**  
410 Redwood  
Oakland, CA 94619

**San Francisco Travel Service**  
728 Montgomery St.  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 881-6640

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