
THE WILD CASCADES

THE JOURNAL OF THE NORTH CASCADES CONSERVATION COUNCIL

SPRING 2003



Above: Wilman Spires and Wilman Glacier from Monte Cristo Peak.
Below: (left) Eldorado. (center) Glacier Peak from Pugh. (right) Horned lizard on Umtanum Ridge.

— *KARL FORSGAARD PHOTOS*



In This Issue

- 3 The President's Report — MARC BARDSLEY
- 4 Stehakin: Park's Policy of Appeasement Betrays the Public Good — CAROLYN McCONNELL
- 5 From the Chelan Lakeshore Trail — BILL LONGWELL
- 6 Wilderness: Commercialization of the Deeps — HARVEY MANNING
- 7 Outfitter Guides
- 9 Wild Sky Bill
Yosemite Just Got a Nightlife
Other Things for Which Fee-Demo Income Would Come In Handy
Downsize and Privatize
- 10 Wilderness: The Concept and the Law
- 12 The Culture of Deceit — Scandal in the Forest Service: The GAO Report
- 14 Not Your Father's Second Growth
- 16 Motorcycle Lawsuit Against NOVA Fund
- 17 Ira Spring
- 18 The Owyhee Initiative: A Challenge to the Wilderness Act of 1964?
- 20 "Old Growth" Campaign Leader Writes to NCCC — NCCC Responds
- 22 Forty Years of Fighting Forewords — HARVEY MANNING
Book Review: Fred Beckey Tells All
- 23 Hidden Crisis is Taking Root in U.S. Parks
- 24 Hike with Mount Baker Wild!

The Wild Cascades

Journal of the North Cascades Conservation Council

EDITOR: Betty Manning
Printing by EcoGraphics

The Wild Cascades is published three times a year (Spring, Summer/Fall, Winter).
NCCC members receive this journal. Address letters, comments, send articles to:

The Wild Cascades Editor
North Cascades Conservation Council
University Station, Seattle, WA 98145-2980

 *The Wild Cascades* is printed on recycled paper with soy-based ink.

The North Cascades Conservation Council was formed in 1957 "To protect and preserve the North Cascades' scenic, scientific, recreational, educational, and wilderness values." Continuing this mission, NCCC keeps government officials, environmental organizations, and the general public informed about issues affecting the Greater North Cascades Ecosystem. Action is pursued through legislative, legal, and public participation channels to protect the lands, waters, plants and wildlife.

Over the past third of a century the NCCC has led or participated in campaigns to create the North Cascades National Park Complex, Glacier Peak Wilderness, and other units of the National Wilderness System from the W.O. Douglas Wilderness north to the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, the Henry M. Jackson Wilderness, the Chelan-Sawtooth Wilderness and others. Among its most dramatic victories has been working with British Columbia allies to block the raising of Ross Dam, which would have drowned Big Beaver Valley.

MEMBERSHIP

The NCCC is supported by member dues and private donations. These support publication of *The Wild Cascades* and lobbying activities. (NCCC is a non-tax-deductible 501(c)4 organization.) Membership dues for one year are: \$10 - low income/student; \$20 - regular; \$25 - family; \$50.00 - Contributing; \$100 - patron; \$1000 - Sustaining. A one-time life membership dues payment is \$500.



The North Cascades Foundation supports the NCCC's nonpolitical efforts. Donations are tax-deductible as a 501(c)3 organization. Please make your check(s) out to the organization of your choice. The Foundation can be reached through NCCC mailing address:

**North Cascades Conservation
Council
P.O. Box 95980
University Station
Seattle, WA 98145-2980**

**NCCC Website
www.northcascades.org**

NCCC Board

President

Marc Bardsley

Board Chairman

Patrick Goldsworthy

Vice President

Charles Ehler

Treasurer

Tom Brucker

Secretary

Phil Zalesky

Bruce Barnbaum

Polly Dyer

John Edwards

Dave Fluharty

Karl Forsgaard

Kevin Geraghty

Kevin Herrick

Conway Leovy

Harvey Manning

Betty Manning

Carolyn McConnell

Rick McGuire

Thom Peters

Ken Wilcox

Laura Zalesky



Founded in 1957
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

The President's Report

Spring 2003

For the last several years, the North Cascades Conservation Council has been instrumental in shepherding the Wild Sky Wilderness proposal through the many pitfalls of the official wilderness protection process. In conjunction with the work and help of other groups we have laid out boundaries, generated key support among local citizens and educated our political leaders. During the last session of Congress, the proposal was passed by the Senate and nearly passed by the House of Representatives. I am very proud of our effort to date. Now it is time to finish this effort by making a last push at the federal level this year and achieve final Protected Wilderness status for the entire Wild Sky Wilderness. Please do your best to help by writing to public officials and news media without delay.

Maybe just as important as protecting the Wild Sky area is the long-term ability of the environmental community to protect other important areas. There are several of these areas sitting on the sidelines and needing the protection of the Wilderness Act. Prominent among them are Golden Horn, Noisy-Eagle/Mt. Baker, Dark Divide and Glacier Peak Additions. These projects have taken backstage to Wild Sky and it is now time for us to get busy and show the world that Wilderness protection is alive and well.

If you are like me, you have heard the arguments that perhaps it is better to encourage mass recreation in the areas close to town. This strategy proposes to introduce more people to the delights of the outdoors "green bonding" so these people then become advocates for protection of nature. To partially protect the environment while providing recreational entertainment, it becomes necessary to harden trails and campsites, install toilets, upgrade parking lots, etc.

Unfortunately, Wilderness seems to get in the way of all this development. While I understand that these "edge wilderness" areas need special treatment, let's not throw out the baby with the bath water.

We absolutely must concentrate on protecting a maximum amount of Wilderness first and worry about trail maintenance with power saws and helicopters later.

Educating the recreational public to the critical need of Wilderness for Wilderness Sake should be a high priority. Competition between pure recreationists and wilderness purists needs to be minimized.

I have proposed in the past that we push strongly for attractive recreational improvements in environmentally robust areas near population centers. The goal should be to provide opportunities for the public to pursue normal activities such as day hiking and camping while encouraging them to support and protect legislatively mandated Wilderness areas, both existing and the new proposals.

To recap, I urge that we all make one last big push to protect the Wild Sky Wilderness. We must then focus on the other Wilderness proposals now waiting for their chance. And almost as important, we must bring in more supporters by helping establish convenient maintainable destinations rather than spreading them throughout the backcountry, where it is difficult to control overuse.

Marc Bardsley

Once again the Park's policy of appeasement in Stehekin is betraying the public good

CAROLYN MCCONNELL

In 1995, the North Cascades National Park established a disastrous land policy in Stehekin. It turned away from simple land acquisition by purchase and embraced land exchanges. It even published a list of pieces of public land it was willing to trade away — as if this land it had been entrusted to protect in perpetuity were somehow inferior goods. It also published a list of private parcels it wanted to acquire by trade.

This was an invitation to extortion. Suppose you liked one of those public pieces, all of which were wilder and more secluded than the private pieces. If you had one of those private parcels, or if you could get one, you could threaten development — the nastier the better — in the process raising the value of your parcel, and demand as your price whatever piece of listed public land you liked. It wouldn't even matter whether your supposed plans were physically or financially feasible, and if you were friendly with Park administration it wouldn't even matter whether you'd actually applied for any development permits.

That is precisely what has happened. In the early 1990s the Park acquired old mine property high in Horseshoe Basin with no road access in exchange for prime land in the Stehekin Valley, allowing the owner to divert a seasonal stream and build on the land. In 1998, faced with a developer who planned condos on the cliffs at the head of Lake Chelan (at Logger's Point), the Park proposed to trade away a gorgeous stretch of land upvalley. Public pressure and the presence of spotted owls nesting on the public land blocked this idea, forcing the Park to purchase the land outright.

Now the Park Service plans to trade away a pristine parcel surrounded on three sides by public land for a private parcel surrounded by developed private land on three sides, thus in essence creating two new inholdings — a public inholding within an area of private development and a private incursion into previously undeveloped public land. Tellingly, the landowner acquired the land he holds in 1995, just months after the Park included the land on its list it would trade away public land to

get. He has applied for no building permits since then.

The public parcel is a major wildlife corridor linking the valley and the lake, especially for black bear. It is an unusual and lovely forest of mixed maple and fir, some of which may be old growth. This area is critical to preserving any sense of wildness in the lower Stehekin Valley — for human visitors and wildlife alike. This parcel was at one point proposed for trade in the Logger's Point deal, but then dropped from consideration, a tacit admission that it ought not be considered for trade-away.

Contrast this with the private parcel. It lies within the most developed, degraded area of the Valley (developed, for the most part, since the establishment of the Park). It is a near-urban growth zone and should be treated as such. Within this area, further development hardly matters; the damage here has been done. As the environmental assessment itself issued by the Park states, there would be no serious environmental consequences if the Park were to allow the private parcel to remain in private hands. Park policy should seek to contain the damage to this zone, preventing degradation beyond it. Yet the proposed deal does precisely the opposite, expanding the growth zone into undamaged public land.

Any land exchange must by law benefit the public good. In assessing whether this transaction would benefit the public, there is of course the question of how the monetary values of the parcels compare. The private parcel is fewer acres than the parcel the Park would give up. Half an acre of the private parcel lies on the far side of the river, inaccessible by road, and therefore undevelopable, practically. The rest lies either in the river channel or in the floodplain. All the actions the EA lists as potential damage that must be prevented by acquisition of the land are of questionable legality. This presumes that the NPS and all the regulatory agencies with jurisdiction, including the Army Corps of Engineers, fail to do their jobs, an untenable presumption on which to base government action, and certainly untenable as a basis for assessing the value of the land. Any prospective developer has to

know that his plans lie under a legal cloud. Compare that to the piece the Park proposes to give up — a much lovelier parcel with no such legal cloud. Which piece of property would you rather buy?

I am frankly astonished that any fair assessments could find the parcels to have equal value. I have requested that the Park release the appraisals under the Freedom of Information Act.

An additional problem with this deal is that the impact of turning this parcel over to private ownership is assessed on the basis of the Park acquiring easements to constrain development. This, however, locks the NPS into the responsibility to enforce these easements. Nationally, the history of enforcement of conservation easements is not comforting; in Stehekin the Park's spinelessness suggests these easements are worthless. Enforcement depends on the willingness and ability of the relevant institution to enforce them. Why would the Park want to acquire more administrative enforcement responsibilities, especially in a time of constricting budgets? As page 22 of the Park's own Land Protection Plan states, among the disadvantages of easements are "Potential difficulty in enforcement of easement terms; potential need for additional personnel" and "Increased costs in monitoring terms and condition of easement provisions."

Yet these easements lower the supposed value of the Park's land when it trades it away. This may be the shady way the appraisals were made to come out equal.

The logic underlying this proposal is fundamentally flawed. The Park proposed that it could trade away land it acquired from private hands after the North Cascades National Park was established. But I know of no legal basis for the Park treating land acquired after 1968 differently from land placed under its jurisdiction in 1968. The NPS is mandated to preserve all the land under its care unimpaired, in perpetuity.

Some of this land on the Park's trade-away list was conveyed to the Park by NCCC members who had fought for the Park's existence. To turn this land over to

development is an insult to their struggle, their memory, and their descendants.

The owner of this private parcel is a fine member of the Stehekin community and a kind neighbor. My family has long ties to his; my grandparents considered his grandparents, parents, and uncles dear friends. I in no way wish to criticize him. This is not about the landowner, but about the Park's mandate to further the public interest, which this proposal in no way does.

I resent that Park policies — its spinelessness — force me to oppose my neighbor. These policies set neighbors against neighbors and create long-term problems that can be solved only by clear and firm resolve to enforce the Park mandate to protect the valley. As a descendant of people who, along with many others, struggled for years for the creation of the North Cascades National Park Complex, I am deeply saddened that the number of private homes in the Valley has grown exponentially since the Park was established. Stehekin's wildness continues to be degraded. That trend must be stopped, beginning with a decision by the Park to play no role in facilitating destruction of the remaining undamaged land in the Stehekin Valley.

Although the Stehekin Valley lies within the nationally-protected North Cascades National Park Complex, the environmental assessment on this proposal was sent out only to local residents and landowners and a few organizations such as the NCCC. But this is a matter of national concern, and many more interested parties deserve the right to weigh in. Thanks to a request by the Western Land Exchange Project, a vigilant watchdog group, the deadline for comments on the environmental assessment was extended by a week. Several other people asked for longer extensions; we received no response.

This struggle goes to the heart of whether our federal agencies can be trusted to protect the land we entrusted to them. I hope this shady deal can be stopped without a lawsuit; we'll keep you posted.

Spring 2003 Report From the Chelan Lakeshore Trail

Dear Harvey,

Last week I walked the Chelan Lakeshore Trail. Had you gone you would have wept. I don't know if I can ever go back.

The 2001 Rex Creek fire burned 55,000 acres. It burned literally the WHOLE trail from Prince Creek to Hunts Creek. The beautiful spots on Hunt's Bluff are burned. It burned way up Fish Creek.

The whole walk passed through husks of pine trees, all black statues. That wonderful, creek-filled section, lined with birch trees near Moore is burned black. Some places the trail was difficult to follow.

Worst of all, however, is the MAJOR construction at Hazard Creek — a small resort. Two huge cranes, other machinery and concrete plant, all noisily constructing. This is far more intensive than that little house on your old favorite beach.

The truck, car, vehicle junkyard two miles up the Stehekin road was cleaned up — a good sign.

The old water line (wooden pipe) at Moore was burned, as was the Fish Creek bridge.

What's great, however, is Meadow Creek. (Firefighters saved all the buildings along the lakeshore.)

The Meadow Creek Shelter somehow survived AND your two signs "Harvey's Burn — 1985" can you believe it? The northern sign was singed, however. But both signs survive! No doubt an omen.

Spring this year is at least a month behind — at least in the Issaquah Alps.

*Bill Longwell,
Chief Ranger
The Issaquah Alps Trails Club*

The Carbon River Conservation Project: A Lifeline to Mount Rainier National Park

CORRECTION:

The groups that envisioned and created the Carbon River Valley Conservation Project were incorrectly listed in the Winter 2002-2003 issue of The Wild Cascades. The correction follows:

The Carbon River Valley Conservation Project: A Lifeline to Mount Rainier

Mount Rainier National Park is a vision created by the following groups. They are working together to protect this Washington treasure.

Mount Rainier National Park

APEX

The Mountaineers

Foothills Rails to Trails
Coalition

The Wilkeson Historical
Society

Cascade Land Conservancy

Tahoma Audubon Society

Puyallup River Watershed
Council

Sierra Club

Puyallup River Watershed
Council

Puyallup Tribe of Indians

National Parks Conservation
Association

North Cascades Conservation
Council

Biodiversity Northwest

Pacific Forest Trust

Wilderness: COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE DEEPS

The time has come for a very preliminary wrap-up of this NCCC project, a summary of findings to date and speculations on what will be found under the stones when they all are turned over.

The sidebar on page 7 lists nine prior articles from 1998 to 2003.

The project began with all the national forests of the Cascades. It soon became apparent that from the Cascade Crest west the commercial activity is heavily concentrated on the three volcanoes, Baker and Glacier mainly, a lesser amount on Adams. Rainier is a whole separate subject, or should one say scandal or comedy or tragedy? Whatever, not Forest Service business, and they likely are glad of that. Most of the rest of the action is on the edges of wilderness along major highways, “shallow wilderness.” (The volcanoes also are generally shallow, being Fujiyama-like magnets.) Edges are important but for present purposes can be set aside for now.

The investigations of Martha Hall — The Pasayten Project — focused our attention most closely on the eastern Pasayten Wilderness. Many of us long had been appalled by the vicinity of Spanish Camp. Years ago I witnessed a confrontation at Rimmel Lake between a packer and a brand new wilderness ranger. She politely pointed out wholesale violations of the Wilderness Act, was dismissed with a tirade of sexist obscenities. She reported this to the district ranger and was ordered to not bother the packers.

Arriving years later, Martha Hall and her company of researchers found the situation unchanged — except that now the district ranger and the packers had new allies, namely, the Okanogan County sheriff and staff of the major Wilderness commercializer (“environmentalist-educator”). At one point a deputy came on horseback (galoop galoop) trying to find her to arrest her on charges of criminal harassment (taking pictures, writing down notes). It seems to be a felony in Okanogan County to interfere with environmental education offered by pack horse, pack mules, pack burros, pack llamas, pack goats and pack dogs. Martha perseveres, backed

by the North Cascades Conservation Council and some (not all! Why not?) our allies.

Aside from their roles as professors’ aides (some of the “environmental education” courses carry college credit), animals are loved by Dry-Siders. For the money they make.

A friend of mine who grew up in Chelan told me that a twice-yearly event was the passage of the Drumheller woolies down the main street and all the sidestreets and over all the lawns and through all the gardens. Weeks would pass before the dust was wiped off the household furniture and noses could inhale without flinching. But who dared complain? The Drumhellers had arrived here about ten minutes before God.

Finally a Drumheller of the umpteenth generation, who had grown up summering with the bands on high, came to adulthood and announced he thought “there’s something better to do with those flowers than feed them to sheep.” Drumhellers gave up rights they’d had since before the coup of Pinchot-Roosevelt.

Did the rights of flowers triumph? No, because in the Pinchot doctrine the National Forests are to be used for human profit, flowers are a form of capital, like trees, to be harvested. The Drumheller rights were issued to other local folks. (A hiker is well advised to check beforehand to determine if this is a “sheep year,” and if so, to avoid the flower gardens (deflowered and beshitted) in the headwaters of Prince and Fish Creeks.)

Our late member, Dick Brooks, protested to the then Wenatchee Forest supervisor, “Dandy Andy.” Dandy snorted at the effrontery of the Big City Wetsider. The products Dick’s company manufactured were removed from store shelves in Twisp; the local paper cited him as a typical Yankee from Hell. The Brooks family was called upon in their Seattle home by the sheep-dipper, who brought along his wife and li’l chilluns to beg for mercy.

The study Dick funded for the NCCC focused on meadows from Horseshoe Basin to Spanish Camp.

Beyond a certain point my own research ended in speculations. I have been courteously aided by office staff in Wenatchee-Okanogan National Forest. However, there apparently has come a command from somewhere above to not rat on good customers. I suspect that future progress must be made by going to the door of Region Six headquarters in Portland, accompanied by an attorney who will read aloud the Freedom of Information Act, and thus obtain the public documents pertaining to (especially) Outward Bound and National Outdoor Leadership School.

We must never forget and constantly applaud the increasingly meaningful presence of the New Boys (and Women) of the Forest Service, the wilderness rangers.

Though caution is essential to their tenure, some of them are becoming leaky. It is to be hoped that as we keep the heat on, they will emulate the “seasonal” Park Service rangers who led the way in stopping the scandalous logging in Olympic National Park.

Among the documents I have received are:

Okanogan National Forest, Prescription 15A, with the Goal Statement, “Maintain an extensive unmodified pristine environment within designated wilderness without system trails,” and Prescription 15B, “Maintain a predominantly unmodified primitive environment without designated wilderness with a variety of trail opportunities.” Wenatchee National Forest, Land and Management Resource Management Plan, specifying, under the heading “Wilderness,” “Wilderness Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Classes,” — “Pristine, Primitive, Semi-Primitive, Transition.”

These documents, totaling some 50 pages, evidence a great deal of careful, sensitive thinking, and without going into details, I can say there is not a whole lot to criticize and a great deal to cheer. As always, there are excellent people in the Forest Service, and our pressure from outside abets their influence from inside. Unfortunately, we citizen hikers have only anecdotal information testifying to the

enforcement, or lack, in the field.

The morale of the Forest Service is presently at an all-time low. Witness the vigorous dissent by the Association of Forest Service Employees (AFSEE). Witness the internal grumbling about the "Pay to Play" strategy imposed by the Washington D.C. commercializers; the Las Vegas betting action is split between which will be abolished first, the Northwest Forest Pass or the Forest Service. (If the latter, look out, because the replacement will be — Walt Disney Enterprises?)

The Forest Service cannot be unaware that its close relations with the growing outfitter-guide industry is coming under steadily heavier public scrutiny. We note the "Outfitter-Guide Use Allocation" and "Outfitter Guide Special Use Permit" are under review for the Lake Wenatchee and Leavenworth Ranger Districts, for locations in the Pasayten and Lake Chelan-Sawtooth Wildernesses, in specified Roadless Areas.

Meanwhile, the Entiat Ranger District has received a proposal from a "mountain bike outfitter guide service" to operate in the Mad River, Entiat River, and North Fork Entiat River, 5 trips per season, 5 days each, a maximum of 13 riders per trip.

Commercialization of Public Land coverage in *The Wild Cascades*

ISSUE of TWC
Winter 2002-2003

SUBJECT
"Outward Rebound,"
Protests by Outward Bound
and National Outdoor
Leadership School (NOLS)

Spring 2003 (published
separately from TWC)

"State of the Pasayten 2000-2001
Update," Martha Hall

Summer-Fall 2002

Commercialization of Pasayten

Spring 2001

Pasayten report, Martha Hall

Winter 2001

Listing of outfitter-guides in
wilderness

Summer-Fall 2000

Listing of outfitter-guides in
wilderness

Spring 2000

Pasayten report, Martha Hall

Summer-Fall 1999

A hiker in the ravaged meadows
of eastern Pasayten, Mary Lou
Krause

Summer-Fall-Winter 1998

Report on study of grazing —
ravaged meadows in Pasayten,
Kevin Herrick, etc.

OUTFITTER GUIDES

Hidden Valley Camp

Wilderness edge and outside, day hikes and overnight, Nason Ridge and Pilchuck-Monte Cristo, 6051 participant-hours in 2002.

Wilderness Ventures

Pasayten Wilderness deeps, 13-18-day trips, each group 10 "students" and 2 staff, 7 planned trips summer 2002, requested use-days 1010. Robinson Pass-Bald Mountain-Louden Lake-Castle Pass-McMillan Park-Freezeout Lake-Windy Pass-Mill Creek-Azurite Pass-Three Fools, etc.

National Outdoor Leadership School, Pacific Northwest Branch

Pasayten and Glacier Peak Wildernesses deeps, Mt. Baker, Darrington, Lake Wenatchee-Leavenworth, Methow Valley, Chelan, Entiat. "Priority days," 4280. No specifics given, but not authorized for Alpine Lakes Wilderness, Gamma Ridge, camps in Ptarmigan Traverse "Corridor." Sanitation cautioned in Copper Creek. Year, 2002.

Western Washington University

160 "priority days" from Mt. Baker to Methow. For what? Where? Specifics not given. *Northwest Mountain School* Mostly ascents of Glacier Peak, usually via Milk Creek, Ptarmigan, Vista, Ermine, Kennedy Glaciers, Frostbite Ridge. Perhaps classified as the shallows of the deep? Number of user-days not supplied. Some of these might be used for "on-demand private programs." "retain option to provide commercial outfitting

to other youth programs, as we do on Mt. Adams for Moondance Adventures." Incomplete information.

North Cascades Outfitters, Cascade Wilderness Outfitters

Steve Darwood, having just purchased the firm, requested a non-use for 2002, intending to get started in 2003. Permit for "conducting an outfitter sand guide business using Pasayten Wilderness, Lake Chelan-Sawtooth Wilderness, and Twisp River, total "priority

Continued on page 8

OUTFITTER GUIDES

Continued from page 7

use" 200 service days. Trips begin at Andrews Creek, Billygoat, 30 Mile, Wolf, Little Slate, Williams Lake. Camps mentioned at Spanish Camp, Crow Lake, Sheep Creek, Beaver Creek, Crows Nest, Bob Creel, Ptarmigan, Old Miller, Meadow Lake, Peepsite, Eagle Lake, Gardner Meadows, Windy Pass, Strawberry. In the main, "High Hunt," though some Girl Scouts etc.

American Alpine Institute

Winthrop Ranger District, 154 client days. Early Winter Spires, Liberty Bell, Kangaroo Ridge, Cutthroat Peak, Silver Star Mountain, North Cascades Highway Corridor. Edge

Alpine Ascents International

Mt. Baker Ranger District 595 days, Leavenworth 47. 5-day Mountaineering, 13-day Mountaineering, Summit Climbs, "Privates."

American Alpine Institute

58 service days for 2002. Mt. Maude area and Leroy High Route, Stuart Range peaks, Snow Creek Wall.

America's Adventures

70 service days in wilderness. Phelps Creek Trail, Buck Creek Trail, PCT, Nason Ridge Trail (Rock, Crescent, Merritt, and Lost Lakes), Snowy Creek Trail.

High Country Outfitters and Guides (Camp Wahoo)

70 service days. Ingalls Creek drainage (Fourth and Turnpike Creek Trails - loop), Jack Creek Trail. Current request includes Solomon Creek, and Van Epps.

Icicle Outfitters and Guides

280 service days in wilderness. All trails open to stock on the Lake Wenatchee and Leavenworth RDs except the Stuart Lake Trail. Primarily uses the Chiwaukum Creek Trail, Trout Lake Trail, Napeequa Trail, Buck Creek Trail, Rock Creek Trail, Nason Ridge Trail, White River Trail, Little

Wenatchee Trail, Chiwawa River Trail.

NOLS

132 service days in wilderness. White River, Phelps Creek and Leroy Creek Trails. Includes portions of extended trips emanating from other districts.

Reachout Expeditions

50 service days in wilderness. Chiwaukum and Icicle Creek Trails.

Tall Timbers Ranch

178 service days in wilderness. Twin Lakes Trail, Panther Creek Trail, PCT, Indian Creek Trail, Dirty Face Trail, Poe Mt. Trail, White River Trail, Mt. David Trail, Little Wenatchee Trail.

Claude Miller; DBA/North Cascade Safaris

Outfitter and Guide Business using horses and mules for guided horseback and overnight pack trip and drop camps. Pasayten Wilderness, 400 days; Driveway Butte, 6 days; Mudhole Lake, 10 days; Hardscrabble, 14 days. Total "priority use," 4350 service days. Corrals authorized at Billy goat and Andrews Creek. Camps authorized at Spanish Camp and Sheep Mountain. Other camps at Pigmy Basin, Three Fools Pass, Crow Lake, Pevee Meadows, Black Lake, Eagle Lake.

Pacific Crest Outward Bound School

Pasayten Wilderness, Methow Valley, 1655 service days, Lake Chelan-Sawtooth Wilderness, Methow valley, 700 days; Chelan, 100 days; Glacier Peak Wilderness, Chelan, 150 days; Entiat, 150 days; North Cascades Scenic Highway, Methow, 875 days; non-wilderness, Methow 660 days; Chelan 50 days; Entiat 50 days. Total estimated 5341 "student" days for 2002.

Early Winters Outfitting

Pasayten Wilderness (from Hidden Lakes West) 280 "service days": Early Winters Creek area 10 days; South Crest and Upper Methow area 80 days; Cedar Creek 80 days; Little Falls Creek 10 days; Driveway Butte 10 days. Total "priority use" 490 days. 2003 estimated. Harts Pass, Billygoat, Eagle Lake, Oval Creek, Whistler, Goat Lake, Spanish Camp. Supply drops at Hidden Lakes, Cougar Lake, Stab Creek.

Backcountry Burro Treks

Pasayten Wilderness. 394 service days, overnight pack trips and drop camps. Begin at Iron Gate, Harts Pass, Highway 20, Suiattle trailhead. Camps: Horseshoe Basin, Apex pass, Glacier Pass, Snowy Lakes, Horse Heaven, Mebee Pass, Goat Lakes, Tamarack Peak, Mountain Home, Bridge Creek, Five Mile, Hemlock, Suiattle Pass, Canyon Creek.

Llama Packing

Pasayten wilderness, South Crest, Methow Trail. 200 service days. Wolf Creek, Iron Gate, Billygoat, Hidden Lakes, Tatoosh Buttes, Cirque 4, Kendall Meadow, drop camps.

Chinook Pass Outfitters

William O. Douglas Wilderness, 497 user days; Norse Peak Wilderness, 84 days.

Three Queens Outfitter

Horse rides, pack horses, drop camps at Ivanhoe Lake, Waptus; 60 customer days in 2001.

Cascade Corrals, Cragg Courtney

Eagle Creek, Foggy Dew, Entiat, Stehekin, Holden, Buttermilk, 86 guests in 2002. Incomplete report. (Doesn't like people to know what he is doing.)

Sawtooth Outfitters

Chelan and Methow Ranger District, in Lake Chelan-Sawtooth Wilderness, 263 service days; Pasayten

Wilderness 150 days; Eagle Lake area 60 days. Starts at Crater Creek, Andrews Creek, Robinson Creek, Harts Pass, Foggy Dew Creek. Camps at Muleshoe, Cooney, Boiling Lake, and Hidden Lake. About 2/3 was hunting.

Pro Guiding Service

Cascade Crest from Chikamin Peak to Overcoat Glacier including Middle Fork Snoqualmie Trail, Alpine Lakes Wilderness.

Wild Sky bill sparks passionate debate — critics say proposed area isn't wilderness

By Matthew Daly
The Associated Press
Seattle Post-Intelligencer
Thursday, June 5, 2003

WASHINGTON — A bill to create a wilderness area on 106,000 acres northeast of Seattle would protect wildlife and promote clean water and recreational opportunities, supporters said yesterday at public hearing.

But opponents decried the proposal as unnecessary and even destructive. Much of the area targeted for protection is not even wilderness, they said, adding that the plan had not received enough scrutiny as powerful lawmakers try to ram it through Congress.

The proposed Wild Sky Wilderness, on land north of U.S. 2 in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, would be the first new wilderness area in Washington state since 1984.

The measure is being pushed by Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., and Rep. Rick Larsen, D-Wash., after efforts by both lawmakers to get a similar bill approved last year.

The Senate approved the Wild Sky bill in November, but the measure was not taken up in the House.

Murray, in testimony to Senate committee yesterday, said the bill was the result of more than two years of negotiations with local officials and range of groups, including the Washington State Snowmobile Association, Wild Washington Campaign, Backcountry Horsemen of Washington and the Seaplane Pilots Association.

All the groups have signed off on the bill as it has been modified over many months, Murray said.

"I want to stress how long my colleagues and I have been working on this issue and how much it has been in the public spotlight," she told the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. At least three public meetings have been held on the proposal in Washington state and the proposal has been the subject of dozens of news articles and commentary, she said.

Murray and other supporters listed a host of benefits, including protection of wildlife such as bears, wolverines, bald eagles, spotted owls, and deer, as well as promoting clean, cool water for salmon, steelhead and trout.

"People looking for easy and quick access to nature in its purest form will see Wild Sky as a destination," Murray said, noting that Wild Sky is within a two-hour drive for more than 2.5 million people.

But Ed Husmann of Sultan, a member of the Snohomish County Farm Bureau, said much of the area targeted for designation as wilderness does not meet the definition.

"This legislation is actually aimed at creating wilderness where one does not currently exist," Husmann said.

"If the point is to provide access to scenic points, or build trails, or save the trees, it does not take designating a wilderness area to do so."

Husmann and John Postema of Snohomish complained the bill was being forced on local residents by leaders from the Seattle area.

Yosemite just got a nightlife

Delaware North, the Yosemite National Park concessionaire, got its start in horse-racing and pari-mutuel betting before branching out into national park operations. Is it possibly the mastermind behind the mammoth Chukchansi Gold Resort and Casino which opened June 25 near Yosemite, with 1800 slot machines, 46 table games, and all-around Las Vegas excitement?

Presumably this is what President Bush has in mind in the tank-thinkers' scheme for Gateway Communities adjacent to parks and monuments.

Other things for which Fee-Demo income would come in handy

The superintendent of Mount Rainier National Park has announced that funds intended to fix a bridge and a patrol cabin will be spent instead on an 18-month privatization study by private consultants (Disney?). The guy at Interior says we

should be cool, only 29 percent of Rainier Park jobs will be studied for "outsourcing."

A memo sent in May to park superintendents in the Northwest said cuts are necessary to pay for "antiterrorism policing and consultants" (Disney?).

Aside from that, to comply with President Bush's "competitive sourcing" (that is, privatizing) directive, Interior has identified about 58 percent of the 20,000 jobs in the Park Service as "commercial in nature" (Mickey Mouse can do it better?).

Downsize and Privatize

The Department of Interior (where Watt used to roam free and his protégé Norton still does) is planning to turn over management and operational control of the National Bison Range and Ninepipe and Pablo National Wildlife Refuges to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. Other sites where Interior will entertain offers from recognized tribes include 35 national parks in 15 states (including Olympic), all 16 wildlife refuges in Alaska (including Arctic National), and 15 other refuges in the lower 48.

A spokesperson for PEER (Public Employees for Environmental Ethics) has asked for a full review of any actions ceding national assets to entities outside of public control, saying, "This important precedent-setting change is being negotiated behind closed doors, with no public review and no explanation of how Interior will ensure the protection of wildlife and other public resources."

The goal is not so much to promote tribal self-sufficiency (a single casino would do more for that than all the refuges in the system) as to shrink the federal government, as per the Republican platform.

The Bush administration has plans to privatize up to 400,000 federal jobs. IRS private bill collectors would get a portion of whatever they brought in. Private operators of the national parks (Disney Corporation) would employ guides to point out to visitors the Nisqually Glacier and the Pacific Ocean.

"Now here comes another clown with a scheme for Central Park National Park, Disneyland National Park . . ."

— Ed Abbey

Wilderness: THE CONCEPT AND THE LAW

I have before me a “suggested reading” list, a dozen very selected citations, including such authors as Nash, Leopold, Marshall, and McCloskey, and such organizations as Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, and Earthjustice. My focus here is on a single author, Doug Scott, policy director of the Campaign for America’s Wilderness.

A Wilderness Forever Future: A Short History of the National Wilderness Preservation System, June, 2001, is a 40-page research report that runs from Aldo Leopold to Bob Marshall to Howard Zahniser.

Members of our current board of directors were present when “Zahnie,” in an April 1956 speech to the first Northwest Wilderness Conference of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, unveiled his draft proposal (the seventeenth since January!). In June a final draft was introduced in the Senate by Hubert Humphrey, in the House by John Saylor.

Eight years of fierce battle ensued, on one side western industrial interests, conservative members of Congress (notoriously, Wayne Aspinall), leaders of the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service, and President Eisenhower, and on the other — well, the short list would include the North Cascades Conservation Council, founded in 1957, and President Kennedy, inaugurated in 1961.

September 3, 1964, 40 years after the first, temporary establishment of the Gila Wilderness Area, President Johnson signed the Wilderness Act. Howard Zahniser had died in his sleep on May 5, just days after testifying at the final Congressional hearing on the bill.

The Wilderness Act made “instant” Wilderness of 9,140,000 acres of the old, halfway-protected Primitive Areas set aside in a rearguard action by the Forest Service of the 1930s. By June 2001 an additional 96,000,000 acres had been added, bringing the total to 105,752,648 acres.

The chronicle to this point is less than half the story, which proceeds to roadless

areas, RARE II, Eastern Wilderness Act, Alaska, Clinton Roadless Area Rule, etc.

Then came Bush II. An article in the May 4, 2003 New York Times was headlined “The End of Wilderness”:

“From the beginning, President Bush has been far more interested in exploiting the public lands for commercial purposes than in protecting their environmental values. On matters ranging from snowmobiles in Yellowstone to roadless areas in the national forests, his administration has tried steadily to chip away at safeguards put in place by the Clinton administration — largely in an effort to help the oil, gas, timber and mining industries, and often in cavalier disregard for environmental reviews mandated by law.”

A second Doug Scott report, 44 pages, January 2003, *A Mandate to Protect America’s Wilderness: A Comprehensive Review of Recent Public Opinion Research*, “pulls together the key findings in all recent (past four years) public opinion polling about wilderness.”

The Executive Summary (excerpted here) concludes:

- The American people treasure the heritage of wilderness on their public lands.
- The American people want to see more of their federal lands preserved as wilderness — consistently by wide margins. The very high level of support is broadly shared — geographically, urban and rural, across the political spectrum, among all ages and ethnicities.
- Strongly held values drive this majority support. These values go far beyond on-site recreational use of wilderness. They include a sense of duty to preserve a legacy, very high appreciation of archaeological services, etc.
- Americans believe decisions about the fate of their federal lands should be made in the national interest.

For every poll discussed in the report there is a footnote identifying the polling organization and documenting its methods.

“We included no polls sponsored by organizations opposed to most wilderness

protections, for the few we found were classic examples of ‘push polls’ in which bias in the wording of the questions distort public responses.”

To obtain copies of these reports write or email or call:

Doug Scott
Policy Director
Campaign for America’s Wilderness,
705 Second Avenue, Suite 203
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 342-9212
<dscott@leaveitwild.org>

Wilderness LITE

We dozen-year-olds spread out our gear for the multi-day hike in the high Olympics. The leader walked down the line kicking aside items our mothers had insisted were essential to preserving human life in the wilderness. Allowed clothing: 8-inch work boots soled with slivers, hobs, rosebuds, and corks (caulks) in the instep; two pair wool socks; underwear briefs, cotton; Boy Scout shorts; pajama bottoms (to be worn rolled up under shorts, rolled down in high-altitude sunshine; cotton shirt; light sweater or poplin windbreaker; wool stocking cap; sunglasses. Equipment: cup and spoon; Boy Scout knife; notebook and pencil to keep the hike log required for Silver Marmot: sleeping bag (kapok or wool, blankets not acceptable). Group gear: Number Ten cans to be dangled from packs; several community toilet rolls, jammed on horns of Trapper Nelsons or string packs.

The leader then walked down the line tossing each boy a share of the party food. Typical breakfast: stewed prunes, oatmeal with powdered milk and brown sugar, cocoa. Lunch: Sailor Boy pilot bread, cheese, chocolate, raisins. Supper: rice, canned salmon, chocolate pudding, fig newtons, tea with brown sugar. The caloric total was roughly a third of what a nutritionist would consider necessary for the three-to-five days and 30-to-60 miles of scheduled hikes. "Going light."

The evening fire went out when cooking was over. To keep warm until nightfall it was necessary to take individual hikes comparable in length to the day's group hike. The poopouts, those who by day's end had been forced to yield their packs to others, crawled in bags right away to commence the long night's shivering. (The bags affordable by the ordinary Boy Scout could not cope with subalpine temperatures once the sun set.)

During the summer weeks when Camp Parsons was in session, it did not rain. That was confidently expected by followers of Boy Scout Laws, one of which declares that "A Scout is Reverent." Somehow it sometimes did, but we carried no shelter because we had to go light to do 20 or more miles in a day.

In July of 1940 a Three-Day Blow caught us in a meadow some 25 miles via glacier, Lost Ridge (no trail), then valley

trail to the road-end at Constance Creek. The last day was without food because we'd jettisoned most of it to go extra-light on the retreat. We sat down to await pickup by the Big Red Truck. It didn't come, busy as it was picking up other drenched hike parties from the Hoh to the Dungeness to the Hamma Hamma. In twilight we hiked another few miles down the Dose road to a forest suitable for camping.

The epiphany for me — of that hike, of Camp Parsons, of Scouting — was Lost Ridge, the rain coming at us sideways, our legs turning blue, nose and toes numb. I led a jolly trio in hours of Boy Scout songs. We were not joined by our dozen-and-a-half glum companions. I've come across rather few Scouts who after Camp Parsons ever got very far from the car. Wilderness, 180 proof, is not for every taste.

Reverse time's arrow for a glimpse back to John Muir setting out for a multi-day ramble in the High Sierra with a pocketful of squirrel food, curling round a fire at night (no blankets), climbing a tree to enjoy the ride in a near hurricane, exulting in granite peaks falling apart all around in an earthquake.

Skip forward past the glory days of old Camp Parsons (defined as when I was there). Pause at the Co-op's Merchant of the Great Depression, Lloyd Anderson, and the post-WWII torrent of war surplus that outfitted the Khaki Gang. The 7-by-11-foot liferaft sail, made of nylon, a fabric previously too expensive for any other use than female legs, the Mountain Trooper boot with "Bramani" soles (actually, Goodyear's inferior imitation of Vitale's invention), instant potatoes and MPF and the dandy little curiosities in Lloyd's "nickel bins."

Then voila! The sissy tent, miracle fabrics from the chemist's pot, the Ganges Machine, the cell phone, the GPS, and cookbooks on a dozen routes up Blob Knob and where to take your dog for a walk.

At the 1933 Easter Day parade down Manhattan's Fifth Avenue, the street brilliant with costly finery, from the sidewalk came a plaintive query, "I wonder what the poor people are doing today?"

I daresay John Muir would have appreciated a pocketful of space bars and a

space blanket. I was an early fan of the liferaft sail. Wore out two pair of Bramanis. Loved that dried spinach, the freeze-dried shrimp. Yet few memories compare with the Three-Day Blow on Lost Ridge. They don't make rain like that anymore.

I grant that were a Nuremberg trial to be held on the sissification of the wilderness, I'd be in the dock. I was on the Climbing Committee that increased the Seven Essentials to the Ten. The devil made us do it.

My One Step, written for the Co-op at the behest of Jim Whittaker and snapped up for a paperback edition by a New York publisher, for years was one of the two American bestsellers on the subject. Born again, I submitted to that publisher a japyery foretelling the decline and fall of backpacking. Minimalism, that was the future I saw. Less is more.

No telephone was needed for me to hear from New York such a shriek of horror as was torn from St. Augustine by coming face-to-face with a Gnostic.

Another tempest is rolling in on the jet stream and will be more than three days in blowing over — a debate on the comparative propers of wilderness deeps, wilderness edge. I say no more for now. Augustine made sainthood long before he got to Heaven. He and his pack of bishops so thoroughly policed the theological neighborhood that Gnosticism was "disappeared" from history until the Dead Sea scrolls.

When the hardhat mob hauls me away in the tumbrel, I'll thoughtfully pull aside my ruffed collar to give the blade a clean bite and murmur in tribute to Ed Abbey, and his advocacy of "wilderness lite": "Personally I like to give Nature a fair crack at me."

H.M.

The Culture

The fire permit had a serendipity: it gave us an excuse for stopping at ranger stations to hobnob with our culture heroes, the pantheon of Harold and Nels, the gods and demigods who roamed Olympus when the world was young. With permits no longer required, we lost touch. In any event, a new generation, fresh from colleges of forestry, had taken over. They parroted “timber is a crop” and national forests are a “land of many uses.” They also said (he himself said it first) that Gifford Pinchot was “America’s first forester.”

All things considered, Pinchot was a pretty good man, a half-wise man, a sort of holy man. Systematic philosophers agreed that his “greatest good for the greatest number in the long run” was gibberish. But aren’t all sermons on the mount gibberish if applied, say, to the day-to-day ins and outs of running a large enterprise?

Say this for Pinchotism, if not good science it worked pretty well as a religion. For one thing, it made a fair attempt at counterbalancing the other religion of the times, that of the Robber Barons whose name begins with W. For another, his loose-limbed, scatter-headed faith was a “mansion of many rooms.” Catholic dogma comes straight from God, via Rome, but the bishops nevertheless debate what He said, or the Pope says He said.

So it was with Pinchot’s clergy.

Remember when the Western Republican frantic fanatics howled that the Forest Service must increase its cut? A ranger I knew smiled slyly and paraphrased Shelley, “Congress changes and

passes, the Service remains.” Revising long-range plans takes years, much much shuffling of paper. The cut remained as the Service planned.

For a time. But Congresses kept a-coming. It was the Service that changed and passed. This was the environmentalists’ view from outside. But it also was the view from inside seen by the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics. The Government by think tank, much ridiculed when it began under President Reagan, went on, and on, into the reign of President Junior, inflating hugely as privatizers pumped in deluges of funding.

America stands befuddled. Perhaps this is the genuine End Time? The Mouth of Hell opened in the West Wing and spewed out legions winging to every point of the compass, wreaking such evil as the think-tank white papers had been outlining for lo these past twenty years. “Think” tanks! Tank thinkers!

The American Recreation Coalition, voice of the Wreckreation Industry, coalesces in the movement to dismantle government that free enterprise may have more room for its broad shoulders and big butt. The ARC takes credit for devising the Fee Demo “experiment” — which was declared a success before the experiment even began.

Many of us were so boggled by the impudent nose of the camel snuffling under the tent that we did not take immediate alarm. However, save for muddleheads and mugwimps, no person or organization with genuine environmental credentials now is blind to the presence of the rest of the camel nor to the determination of the White House that it be ceded the whole tent.

The Spring 2003 newsletter of the Keep the Sespe Wild Committee, based in Ojai, California, speaks for all of us:

“We are startled by the culture of deceit which must have developed among Fee Demo managers around the nation.”

Not little white lies, petty distortions, opinions unsupported by evidence, the ordinary and normal tactics usual in parliamentary debate. This is an orchestrated culture of deceit. Our Region Six forest supervisors are players, our district rangers, and all those do-gooders in hard hats who go about issuing tickets for no pay except free parking. (Cops don’t need Northwest Forest Passes.)

A song in the age of Harold and Nels and all made fond fun of our culture heroes. The saga of their succession of perils had the recurring refrain, “And now the ranger, is in great danger.”

Avalanches, blizzards, lions and tigers and bears, there were humorous twists in all of these, even the dreaded firestorm. But what is now issuing from the West Wing, the Mouth of Hell, ‘tain’t funny, McGee.

As this long hot summer commences among warnings of calamity in the woods, perhaps we can give our spirits a little lift by massing outside the ranger stations where once dwelt Harold and Nels and chanting:

“LIAR LIAR PANTS ON FIRE!”

H.M.

PLEASE WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN AND SENATORS!

Please take a minute to write or call your Representative and your state’s two Senators to demand the immediate end of forest fees! Later in the year we’ll target particular committees in Congress with our alerts.

YOUR REPRESENTATIVE:

Call the Congressional switchboard at (202) 224-3121 to be connected. Letters should be addressed — Repre-

sentative..., House of Representatives, Washington DC, 20515.

YOUR SENATORS:

CA — Barbara Boxer (202) 224-3553; 112 Hart, Washington, DC 20510
WA — Maria Cantwell (202) 224-3441; 717 Hart, Washington, DC 20510
WA — Patty Murray (202) 224-2621; 173 Russell, Washington, DC 20510

ON THE PHONE

- Tell your Senator or Representative’s staff that you’ve seen the GAO Report about Fee Demo on our National Forests (the Report’s number is GAO-03-470);
- Tell them why you’re calling about it — (example) The Forest Service is unaccountable for the fee money they’ve spent. — Forest fees make so little money — and are so unpopular — that they need to be terminated this summer;
- BLM and US Fish & Wildlife Service recreation fees must also be terminated.

re of Deceit

Scandal in the Forest Service: The GAO Report

Foreword by Scott Silver, May 24, 2003

The Forest Service has been shown to be dangerously unaccountable with respect to its cost of collection figures. It also spent in 2001 what amounts to a \$10 million slush fund in appropriated tax dollars (which was never revealed to Congress in the Forest Service's annual Fee Demo reports) in order to secretly triple the program's administration and enforcement budget. It is now clear that — in 2001 — the Forest Service spent \$15 million to raise \$15 million!

At the end are details on calling and/or writing your Congressman and Senators — please take a minute to do so. We need to keep the heat on forest fees as never before. President Bush has called on Congress to make recreation user fees permanent on all federal lands this year. It is crucial that we keep Congress aware of our strong opposition to permanent fees.

PRESS RELEASE:

Newly released General Accounting Office report slams accountability of U.S. Forest Service Fee Demo Program

A General Accounting Office (GAO) 40-page report titled "Information on Forest Service Management of Revenue from the Fee Demonstration Program" (2001), requested by Rep. Scott McInnis (R, Western Colorado) and released May 19, 2003, reveals a deep-seated culture of deception and a total lack of accountability within the US Forest Service's Fee Demo program, says Scott Silver, Executive Director of Oregon-based Wild Wilderness. The full report can be downloaded from:

www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-470,

Highlights can be read at www.gao.gov/highlights/d03470high.pdf

Here's what the General Accounting Office Found:

The US Forest Service (USFS) has been secretly subsidizing the management of its Fee Demo program with (in 2001) \$10 million of appropriated tax dollars (p.32).

Costs of fee collection at major Fee Demo "sites" — such as the Southern California "Adventure Pass" and the Oregon and Washington "Northwest Forest Pass" — have been under-reported by concealing

hundreds of thousands of dollars in commissions received by pass vendors (p.25).

The USFS has no mechanism for ascertaining whether Fee Demo has lessened the deferred maintenance backlog, which is the very purpose for which Fee Demo was created by Congress in 1996. What's more the GAO concludes that the USFS has no idea how large their maintenance backlog really is! (p.22).

"In what amounts to a complete absence of accountability on the part of Fee Demo managers across the nation, the Forest Service has failed to mention in its annual Fee Demo Progress Reports to Congress that (in 2001) close to \$10 million was used as a tax-dollar subsidy to administer the program" (p. 32), said Robert Funkhouser, President, Colorado-based Western Slope No Fee Coalition. "This alone immediately triples the \$5 million which the Forest Service was declaring as the true cost of collection and administration for the program," adds Funkhouser.

How Much Fee Demo Money Really Goes to Help our Forests?

The Forest Service's reported gross Fee Demo revenue for FY 2001 was over \$35 million (p.6). From this figure we must subtract the reported cost of collection, \$5,051,000 (p. 9), the \$10 million of appropriated funds used to support the fee demonstration program (p.32), and the \$4.6 million in user-fees previously collected at sites that produced fee income prior to becoming fee demonstration sites [i.e., campgrounds, boat launches, etc.

(Source: April 2002 Interim Report to Congress on Fee Demo, p.23).] After these adjustments to gross are made, all of Forest Service fee-demo sites in all of the USA generated a total net increase in fee revenues of a mere \$15 million.

Based upon these figures, "The cost of collection is closer to 50% — requiring more than \$15 million to raise less than \$15 million," said Funkhouser. "The \$15 million adjusted net revenue is likely to still be too high" adds Alasdair Coyne, Director of California-based Keep the Sespe Wild who in June 2002 obtained information about vendor discounts using the Freedom of Information Act. "Vendor discounts for Adventure Passes sold in Southern California resulted in another \$288,500 in lost fee-demo revenues. The revenues lost through vendor discounts at other sites throughout the nation are unknown but are likely to be considerable," said Coyne.

"Until the General Accounting Office audits the BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Fee Demo programs, the amounts of cost of collection and the use of appropriated funds for program management is unclear. The net revenues for the BLM and USFWS combined is less than \$4 million," adds Silver.

Fee Demo's Future in the Balance

The Fee Demo Program was enacted in 1996, extended at least four times and is currently set to expire on September 30, 2004. Legislation to make it permanent did not move forward in 2002. President Bush has once again asked Congress to make these fees permanent but no legislation has

Continued on page 17

Not Your Father's Second Growth

Forests are what set the Cascades apart from other mountain ranges. Many mountains are higher, steeper or more dramatic, but none, excepting perhaps the Olympics, have more impressive forests. Although they are tremendously diverse geologically, the Cascades are (thankfully,) almost free from commercial mineralization. Forests were, and are, their real wealth, and have been exploited ever since Europeans came here.

The timber industry got here long before us tree huggers, and, naturally, went after the good stuff. From 1920 until about 1945, logging railroads were pushed up the low valleys of the central and northern Cascades, and the old-growth forests largely cut out of places like the Middle Fork Snoqualmie, the North and South forks of the Skykomish, the Whitechuck and the Sauk. These valleys were cleaned out starting from the bottom and going up as far as it paid to cut down and haul out trees, usually to where the slopes were too steep or there was no more Douglas fir but only hemlock and silver fir, trees of little commercial value. No one worried about planting nursery grown seedlings, and this was before the time when foresters thought they could out-do nature by planting cloned or cultured "supertrees." Fire sometimes followed in the wake of the railroad loggers, but once the trees were cut, the valleys were pretty much left alone. It's hard to keep trees from growing in the Cascades, and since it took a number of years for the loggers to work their way up these valleys, there were usually ample seed sources nearby to start new forests growing in the logged areas. And grow they did, spreading new green across tens of thousands of acres of stumps.

Traditionally, conservation in the Cascades has been about protecting the native, old-growth forests. Although there is no universally accepted definition of old growth, it is usually taken to mean a forest which has never been logged. It's more than just big trees and a profusion of mosses. Whatever it is, you know it when you see it. Old-growth forests look like

forests should look. Second-growth forests have usually been spurned, looked down upon as "peckerpoles," or "twigs," not worth anybody's time or attention.

But time passes, and forests change. Even old-growth forests, which seem so



Olympic Second Growth Forest — KEVIN GERAGHTY PHOTO

timeless and permanent, change. It takes a long time to see it - forest and human timescales are certainly not the same - but those forests of big old trees are not standing still. Anyone who has visited an old-growth forest over the course of a couple of decades can see the differences. Trees blow down. Loopers, which look like small green inchworms, kill off hemlocks and open things up for yews, cedars, and other species. Slopes move and sometimes fail. Bears strip the bark from and girdle trees in spring to get at cambium. Some trees just die for no apparent reason. Change is ongoing, and any single look at a forest is like looking at just a single frame taken from a motion picture.

Second-growth forests change too, even more than old growth. In the 1970's, forests from the railroad logging era didn't impress many people. They were big enough to qualify as "woods," rather than merely "logged areas," but no one got very excited over them. Certainly they counted for little in comparison to old growth, to "real" forests. But what a difference a few decades can make. Like a gawky, forgettable adolescent who you one day notice has turned into a real person, railroad-logging-era second-growth forests are coming of age, and deserve a closer look.

Now almost 80 years old, these forests usually are found on productive, low-elevation sites, the kind of places which are largely absent from most protected areas. The longer growing seasons and lack of extended snow cover mean that many species grow in them that are not found in higher elevation forests. Indeed, if one had to pick just one factor to indicate how valuable it is to save a place, it would have to be elevation — the lower the better (and rarer, and more in need of protection.) Typical second-growth forests like those that can be seen in the Sauk or Skykomish will usually have a diverse mix of Douglas fir, cedar, hemlock (2 to 3 feet in diameter and 150 feet or more tall), alder, maple, and cottonwood. Lowland species such as bitter cherry, crabapple, western dogwood, cascara and hazelnut, which are seldom found deep in the mountains, can sometimes be seen. The few salmon spawning areas found on national forests are usually surrounded by these forests.

Lowland forests that have been logged only once are now more rare than true old growth. Most private lands in the western Cascade foothills have now been logged twice. The second-growth forests have been stripped off far more quickly than was the old growth. It's getting pretty hard to find any forests older than about 40 years on private lands. Although the refrain is often heard that "the worst clearcut is better than the best subdivision," and the argument put forth that the timber industry should be encouraged to stay in places like eastern Snohomish and King counties, it's hard to find any attractiveness in an industrial tree farm. Roads are everywhere, trees are cut as soon as they are worth the effort to do so, and herbicides are often used to kill any species but Douglas fir. Such depressing landscapes can leave a nature lover reaching for the Prozac.

The picture on state lands isn't much better. Until the last decade, places like the Wallace Falls area and the extensive benchlands near the Sultan River downstream from the Culmback Dam were delightful second-growth wildernesses. They weren't touched for decades after the railroad logging, and these mature second-

growth forests were perhaps the last places in western Washington where a hiker could go for miles and perhaps get lucky enough to actually get lost for an hour or two in a forest growing on flat or nearly flat land. Mountains are great, but one always has the slope to orient by, and it's difficult to get lost in them. And what other experience could possibly compare with not knowing where one is on the all-encompassing grid? Getting lost is one of the rarest experiences in this fast-paced, high-tech world.

Numerous swamps and lakes added interest to these forested flatlands. The second wave of clearcutting has now chopped them all to ribbons, and there are now virtually no forests left near the Cascades where a hiker needs a compass.

The national forests are the last redoubt of natural low-elevation forests, just as with old growth. Most of the old growth, though, is at high elevations and/or on poor sites, places that the timber industry didn't want. The valley bottom, second-growth forests are now the coming thing, at least on the west side of the central and northern Cascades. If they manage to survive a few more decades they will surpass most of the remaining old growth in impressiveness. Whether they will survive is in serious doubt. The Forest Service has targeted these forests for "restoration thinning," advancing the absurd notion that logging will improve them and somehow accelerate their transition to old growth. This would be cause for laughter were they not serious. This comes from the very same people who until 10 or 15 years ago called old-growth forests "biological deserts." Now they've got religion and claim that they can improve upon nature and make better forests by logging (see *The Wild Cascades*, Winter 2002-2003).

These second-growth forests have to be saved if we're to have any chance of preserving productive forest lands in the Cascades. About 6000 acres of them, mostly in the lower North Fork Skykomish valley, will be protected in the Wild Sky Wilderness if enacted. But that is only a small fraction of what's at stake, and NCCC and other groups have a big, important job ahead to keep the rest of them from being sacrificed on the altar of "restoration," Forest Service-speak for the senseless timber program that amounts to little more than a tremendously expensive way to keep a handful of people in jobs and dump unneeded wood into a glutted timber market.

This table produced by the NW Old Growth Campaign vividly depicts their vision for NW National Forests, and gives a good idea of what logging levels might be should that vision become a reality. Note especially the levels projected for the Olympic and Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests: 56 and 71 million board feet per year, respectively. Compare those numbers to the 2001 "harvest" levels — this plan would mean a huge increase in cut levels after years of hard work by the conservation movement to get those levels down to where they have been. These vastly increased levels of logging are the "carrot" that the Old Growth Campaign believes they can offer in exchange for some yet-to-be-defined protection for old-growth forests.

Potential Fiber Production from Young Managed Stands

There are more than 2.5 million acres of young managed stands on National Forests and Bureau of Land Management Districts in western Oregon and Washington (Table 1). More than two-thirds (1.7 million acres) are between 30 and 80 years of age and have potential for near-term fiber production. With nearly half of the young managed stands in matrix and adaptive management area land allocations, there are roughly 1.3 million acres with potential for long-term fiber production (Table 2).

Table 1. Age-Class Distribution on Federal Lands in western Oregon and Washington. Data compiled by Conservation Biology Institute (2001).

Federal Forests	Acres of Young Managed Stands		
	0-30 years old	31-80 years old	Total
Mt Baker-Snoqualmie	195,216	177,459	372,675
Olympic	142,486	141,040	283,526
Gifford Pinchot	180,548	211,760	392,308
Mt Hood	247,799	130,410	378,209
Willamette	35,069	69,768	104,837
Siuslaw	10,232	146,944	157,176
Umpqua	25,322	91,550	116,872
Rogue	10,760	44,254	55,014
Siskiyou	7,747	209,478	217,225
BLM Districts	23,926	451,996	475,922
Total	879,105	1,674,659	2,553,764

Table 2. Age-class distribution among Northwest Forest Plan land allocations on Federal Lands in western Washington and Oregon. Data compiled by Conservation Biology Institute (2001).

Federal Forests	Acres of Young Managed Stands			
	LSR	AMA	Matrix	AMA/Matrix
National Forests				
0 - 30 years	443,015	76,969	335,195	412,164
31 - 80 years	656,207	127,924	438,532	566,456
Total	1,099,222	204,893	773,727	978,620

Continued on page 16

Motorcycle Lawsuit Against NOVA Fund

In April, the Northwest Motorcycle Association (NMA) filed a lawsuit regarding the Nonhighway Road and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) program. NMA's lawsuit alleges that it is unconstitutional to spend NOVA funds on trails intended solely for nonmotorized recreation uses. NMA argues that since the State Constitution provides that gas taxes shall be used for "highway purposes," the gas tax funds in NOVA can be used only on trails open to motorized vehicles such as motorcycles and ATVs.

However, the state's recently completed Fuel Use Study showed that only 20 percent of NOVA money comes from motorized trail recreationists. Most NOVA gas tax comes from people driving on dirt roads to engage in nonmotorized recreation such as hiking.

NMA's lawsuit seeks an injunction prohibiting the state from spending NOVA funds on nonmotorized projects. The latest batch of nonmotorized grants included National Forest trail maintenance in the Snoqualmie, Leavenworth, Lake Wenatchee and Cowlitz Valley Ranger Districts (affecting trails in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, Middle Fork and Dark Divide areas). NMA's lawsuit also threatens bicycle projects such as those in the new Ollalie Area Bike Study, and horse trail projects such as the Ken Wilcox and Harry Cody Horse Camps proposed by the Forest Service.

The Attorney General is defending the state against NMA's lawsuit. We believe NMA's lawsuit has no merit and should be dismissed. We continue to make progress in legislative and administrative reform of NOVA.

Federal Forests	Acres of Young Managed Stands			
	LSR	AMA	Matrix	AMA/Matrix
BLM Districts				
0 - 30 years	10,633	1,306	11,987	13,293
31 - 80 years	188,395	28,302	235,299	263,601
Total	199,028	29,608	247,286	276,894
Total 0 - 80	1,298,250	234,501	1,021,013	1,255,514

Treating even a small percentage of the total acreage available has the potential to produce approximately 700 million board feet of timber a year. For example, a single entry in the 425,000 acres of managed stands between 30 and 80 years old (25 percent of total) which produced 8,000 board feet per acre on average could yield 670 million board feet each year for five years.

This is likely a very low estimate, as it does not consider stand growth over time, treatment response, multiple treatments that will occur in areas with longer rotations, or multiple treatments that will occur in stands currently in younger age classes. In addition, the most reliable data, compiled by Conservation Biology Institute for this analysis, was collected by researchers between 1986 and 1992 and does not include the old forests that have been converted into young managed stands since that time.

It is important to note that these figures are for westside Oregon and Washington forests only and do not include the eastside forests included in the NW Forest Plan area (Wenatchee, Okanogan, Deschutes, Winema), nor do they include Northern California. With these forests factored in, it is probable that total volume that could be generated under a young forest thinning regime under the entire NW Forest Plan area could reach well over 800 million board feet per year.

While restoration of young managed stands hold much promise, the current emphasis on logging mature and old-growth forests has led to an immense public controversy and legal gridlock that has reduced harvest well below 100 million board feet (mmbf) on National Forest land in western Oregon and Washington. By directing resources toward restoring young managed stands, federal lands have the capacity to generate nearly 10 times the volume currently produced.

Table 3: Current volume compared with potential volume from young managed stands.

National Forest / Agency	2001 harvest level (mmbf)	Potential harvest from treating 25% of the 31-80 year old stands (mmbf)
Mt Baker-Snoqualmie	3.7	71
Olympic	2.2	56
Gifford Pinchot	9.5	85
Mt Hood	10.4	52
Willamette	18.8	28
Siuslaw	9.7	59
Umpqua	10.2	36
Rogue	2.5	18
Siskiyou	3.1	84
BLM	No Data	181
Total	70.1	670

Note: Potential harvest figures are based on the assumption that each acre will produce 8,000 board feet on average. Thinning volume can vary greatly due to a large number of variables (e.g. elevation, climate, forest type, etc.). These estimates are not intended to reflect an actual deliverable volume, nor are a proposed target, but provide a "best guess" to the potential for thinning on young managed stand on the national forest system in the Pacific Northwest.

For more information contact: Seth Cool, Northwest Old-Growth Campaign, info@nwoldgrowth.org; (360) 671-9950 ext. 16

Scandal in the Forest Service: The GAO Report

Continued from page 13

yet been introduced in the current session.

"Across the nation, forest fees have outraged the American public, who are well aware that tax dollars have maintained our National Forests for over a century, for all Americans to enjoy," said Silver. Forest fee protest groups are active in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Hampshire, Oregon, Washington and other states. The state legislatures of California, Colorado, Oregon and New Hampshire have passed resolutions calling for an end to the Fee Demo program, as have dozens of counties, cities and towns across the nation (for details see www.freeourforests.org/opposition.html).

"It is time for Congress to terminate this ill-conceived fee program, Americans have already paid taxes to maintain what is theirs. The perverse incentive created by letting the land management agencies appropriate their own funds, outside of congressional oversight, leads to the abuses we see in this report," states Funkhouser. "This GAO Report shows that the Forest Service misled Congress and the American people about the enormous costs involved with forest fees."

Silver concludes: "This year Congress must decide the future of Fee Demo in our National Forests. The data revealed by the recent GAO Report show this to be an incredibly inefficient means of raising funds for public lands. The public has rejected Fee Demo and after seven years of the program so should Congress."

Congressman McInnis, who is not philosophically opposed to the fees, requested the GAO audit to look into concerns raised by the Western Slope No-Fee Coalition and his constituents regarding the program.



Lilies on Boundary Trail, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest
— KEN WILCOX
PHOTO

IRA SPRING

As you have probably heard, Ira Spring passed away recently at age 84. Ira, of course, was well known for his photography. In collaboration with a frequent contributor to this magazine, he helped set the standard for outdoor guidebooks. Although I did not know Ira well, I do recall evenings when Ira and several of us sat around in living rooms throughout the greater Seattle area, drawing lines on a map. We all had the goal of protecting areas in the North Cascades from development and exploitation. In many cases we were successful. Ira had a wealth of knowledge about our favorite hikes and was instrumental in publicizing endangered trails and other natural areas. His efforts helped bring many persons into the outdoors. He was a nice guy and his friends and family will miss him.

Marc Bardsley

THE OWYHEE INITIATIVE

A Challenge to the Wilderness Act of 1964?

Idaho Conservation League
Executive Director and Board
Boise, Idaho

The Wilderness Society
Idaho Director and
National Governing Council

The Sierra Club
National Board of Directors
San Francisco, California

Dear Friends:

Recent news coverage of the Owyhee Initiative (OI), a legislative proposal in which your organizations are involved, has raised serious concerns about the process for and substance of this project. We are writing to you as directors of your organizations to ask that you give thought to the issues discussed in this letter and consider whether your groups should end their involvement in the Owyhee Initiative.

... We are extremely concerned about both the short-term and long-term implications of the OI in terms of public involvement, possible circumvention of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Wilderness policy, grazing administration, potential public land disposals/exchanges, and other areas.

The OI has proceeded through a largely secretive process for more than a year and a half. An email list has been used for occasional, infrequent updates to interested parties, but the substance of the proposal has remained just out of reach of those of us who are not part of the negotiations. Some of us provided early feedback to the OI negotiators regarding the broad concepts for the project described to us, but have generally been cautioned that weighing in on this work-in-progress would be a waste of time.

In the last few weeks, the OI has suddenly accelerated, with a legislative draft apparently imminent. The June 17 story in the *Salt Lake Tribune* highlighted many of the issues we've been apprehensive about, and brought to light some elements of the proposal that are truly objectionable. Since then, the conservationist group proponents of the project made a

presentation in Boise to environmentalists and have also put some information out over email in response to increasing controversy. Unfortunately, in both cases, we have been offered contradictory and confusing information.

As one example: *The Salt Lake Tribune* reported that the OI would include exchanges of public land for less-than-fee interests such as grazing permits, access rights of way, or conservation easements. Indeed, some of us have seen drafts of OI legislative language — one draft from February and one from April — that contain such provisions. Since publication of the *Tribune* article, one of the proponents has vehemently and repeatedly denied that such exchanges were ever seriously considered, but when asked for a draft that does not contain this language, has refused to provide one. Similarly, land exchanges were said to be off the table, but from a recent OI email, appear to be back on.

OI proponents seem to take the position that since this is their deal to negotiate, others have no business knowing the details. We might agree, if your organizations were negotiating the administration/disposal/release/use of lands in which they alone held an interest, but that is not the case. You will note that the signatories to this letter include organizations from far outside the Owyhee region who share our interest in public lands and recognize the impact the OI could have on their work.

Most alarming to us is that by the time this proposal is finalized, we and the public at large will have no real opportunity to affect it before it is swept into legislation and through Congress. . . . we fear that whatever the conservationist negotiators do manage to secure in the legislation could change drastically in the last weeks, days, or minutes before passage of a bill. It has happened before.

Wilderness and WSAs

The last update on the project . . . is woefully devoid of specifics. For example, we don't know what language will be in the bill regarding administration of the

Wilderness. . . .

Adding language and provisions that either deviate from the Wilderness Act or even simply re-phrase what is already in the Wilderness Act leads only to continuing conflict and controversy over interpretation. . . . the OI proposal will further undermine the Wilderness Act and the quality of our National Wilderness Preservation System.

... Special language and exceptions to the Wilderness Act not only erode the authority of the Act but diminish the integrity and meaning of existing and future wilderness.

What exceptions to the Wilderness Act might we see in the OI legislation? In a February 19 article published in the *Capitol Press*, a private consultant participating in the negotiations stated:

"We want to be sure the [wilderness] language in that legislation allows us to continue appropriate management and properly managed grazing... We also want to allow motorized vehicle use for managing grazing... The environmentalists are hesitant about that, but they need to accept that provision or assume they're not going to get some areas they want us to agree to."

... Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) have statutory management requirements in BLM's interim management policy (IMP). In essence, there can be no new developments and wilderness suitability of these areas cannot be harmed by other activities, subject to valid existing rights. Current WSA management appears to provide better protection than the OI proposal would provide for land both inside and outside these areas with regard to grazing.

Cherry-picking wilderness and WSA release

We are alarmed by the omission of large tracts of wilderness-suitable lands from this proposal. The OI proposal appears to "cherry-pick" the most scenic deep-canyon lands, and the lands least in need of legislated protection. Lands contained in the wilderness proposal are

those that are already best protected by rocks, canyons and remoteness. Protecting only the most visually impressive lands will make it much more difficult to obtain wilderness protection for other Owyhee lands in the future. . . . Large tracts of roadless, non-WSA wilderness quality lands that are critical to biodiversity and long-term protection of wildness in the Owyhee country are not included in the OI proposal.

At the Boise meeting, proponents referred to portions of WSAs to be released as “shavings” — a term meant to minimize the significance of the releases. Inevitably, more intensive livestock use will emanate from the “shaved” areas. This will lead to long-term depletion of native vegetation, habitats and soils in OI wilderness, and foster livestock-caused weed infestation in OI wilderness.

Grazing in Wilderness

As noted earlier, any special grazing exception language for Wilderness would likely be no better, and probably worse, than the protections provided by BLM’s current Interim Management Policy. The “guarantees” that the livestock industry apparently insists on obtaining inside OI wilderness in fact guarantees degradation of wilderness quality in the Owyhee and other future Wilderness Areas.

Permit purchase

The question of permit purchase needs to be forthrightly addressed. Public lands should not be traded for grazing permits. Permits should not be purchased with public money, as that would confer the status of rights. Third-party compensation for permit retirement would better avoid future problems, and need not be enacted through legislation.

If the goal is to remove grazing from some or all of the area through legislation, we would suggest a provision that requires BLM to permanently retire any grazing permit that is waived back to the agency or is vacated by the rancher. This would also provide an incentive for conservation-minded interests to buy out these grazing permits.

Structure

The proposed legislation would set up a Board of Directors and Scientific Review Team. One draft states that three of the seats on the Board would go to conservation interests, to be filled by ICL, TWS, and Sierra Club. Using legislation to pre-select specific membership of the Board strikes us

as very presumptive and clearly undemocratic. . . . Public land management agencies do need major changes, but the creation of special-interest boards with de facto authority only moves land management further beyond the reach of the public.

Grazing disputes can currently be challenged through existing administrative and judicial channels by a variety of parties.

BLM should seek advice from scientists in their management, and is in fact required by NEPA to use the best scientific information. But a special committee with the potential to review each decision of this type significantly weakens decision-making authority from the public entities and invests real power in private interests.

Land disposals and/or exchanges

OI proponents have apparently now fore sworn the exchange of public land for less-than-fee interests such as grazing permits, access rights, and conservation easements. They have also assured us that land exchanges with the state of Idaho described in earlier communiqués will not be part of this project. However, it appears that “small” land exchanges for private inholdings are still being proposed. As some of us have discussed repeatedly with OI supporters, exchanges should not be authorized or directed in the legislation but should be proposed, if at all, administratively. If, as proponents state, there is no intent to circumvent NEPA and/or the federal land appraisal standards, there is no reason to make the land exchanges part of the legislative proposal.

On the issue of land exchanges, supporters have discussed the idea of combining NEPA and legislative authority by having the bill mandate the enactment of a Record of Decision stemming from a “normal” NEPA process for the exchanges. However, this would eliminate two essential rights under NEPA — administrative appeal and judicial challenge — and thus would not embody a “normal” NEPA process but would circumvent that statute. . . .

Again, we ask that you, as directors of the organizations negotiating the OI, give serious consideration to the secretive manner in which it has advanced and its impact on the integrity of the Owyhee and future wilderness. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gary Macfarlane
Friends of the Clearwater
Katie Fite
Committee for the High Desert
Janine Blaeloch
Western Land Exchange Project
Denise Boggs
Utah Environmental Congress
Erik Ryberg
Payette Forest Watch
Scott Silver
Wild Wilderness

For a complete list of signatories, check with Janine Blaeloch, Western Land Exchange Project, e-mail: blaeloch@westlx.org.



*Old cedar —
Mt. Baker-
Snoqualmie
National
Forest
— PHOTO BY KEN
WILCOX*

“Old Growth” Campaign Leader Writes to NCCC — NCCC Responds

LETTER TO NCCC

Dear *Wild Cascades*:

A tree farm is not a forest!

That was our rallying cry for so many years as we campaigned tirelessly through the 1980s and '90s to stop the liquidation of ancient forests by the Forest Service and timber industry. Their PR machine said that they replanted scores of happy little trees for every tired and decadent old one they cut.

How ironic that now an article in *Wild Cascades* argues that dense, second-growth “forests” are so important that, presumably, it would be better to continue clearcutting old growth than to thin the plantations.

Before I launch into my retort, a few introductions are in order.

First I want to introduce President George Bush and his Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mark Rey. Mr. Rey is a former timber lobbyist who now is in charge of the Forest Service. Oregon timber barons gave over a million dollars to Bush’s campaign, and Mr. Rey’s job is to pay them back by, among other things, increasing the volume of timber cut on Northwest federal lands to about a billion board feet.

The NWOGC campaign is a coalition of groups like Northwest Ecosystem Alliance, American Lands, Oregon Natural Resources Council, Gifford Pinchot Task Force, and others that have worked to protect our forests for years. Our groups are responsible for the day-to-day field monitoring, appeals, litigation, and lobbying that have kept logging levels minimal and stopped thousands of acres of clearcuts over the past decade.

I founded and direct the Northwest Ecosystem Alliance (which administers the NWOGC). I’m a biologist, was one of the first tree sitters, organized the first spotted owl protests, and used to be on the board of NCCC.

The simple point of those introductions was to identify friends and enemies. Granted, Rey’s attacks on the Northwest Forest Plan and on public lands in general have been issuing at such a rapid rate that it’s not surprising that some activists would find their time more productively spent shooting at friends like the Northwest Old Growth Campaign (NWOGC) than at a real and powerful enemies like Bush and Rey. But it’s still a bad idea.

A lot of the material in the *Wild Cascades* article was just plain false. Here are the key points:

The article claimed the NWOGC was trying to “trade” second-growth logging for old growth protection. That’s crazy talk. Under the Northwest Forest Plan (which the *Wild Cascades* article correctly referred to as “the best thing that ever happened to the public forests of the Northwest”), logging is still allowed in about a million acres of old forest and about two and a half million acres of second growth. The NWOGC simply advocates that the Forest Service leave the old forest alone and instead focus on thinning the dense, second-growth forests (commonly referred to as “plantations”). The term “trade” would only apply if we were giving up additional acres of second-growth that are presently protected. That ain’t the case.

The article said “there is no evidence that second-growth forests are benefited by thinning.” Complete nonsense. There’s a scientific consensus and lots of published studies on how careful thinning of various stand types can accelerate development into habitat useful to old-growth dependent wildlife. Of course there’s no such thing as a free lunch. Thinning can be done poorly and/or in the wrong places. It could involve new roads and other factors that would harm streams and salmon, compact soils, on and on. The NWOGC has developed a set of *restoration principles* that detail our views on how/where to

NCCC RESPONSE

Dear Mitch:

“A tree farm is not a forest,” you say. Indeed. Mature naturally regenerated second-growth forests are not tree farms, however, and are not called “plantations” by knowledgeable people. The NWOGC’s persistent and wilful denial of this important distinction is fully evident in your letter.

Everyone in the conservation movement would dearly love to protect all the remaining old growth on public lands. The continued cutting of federal old growth forests in the southern two thirds of the spotted-owl region is indeed deplorable. But in northern Washington’s national forests old growth is no longer being felled and has not been for some time. Even in the present climate, it is unlikely that such federal old-growth sales will be revived here, if for no other reason than that extensive mature second-growth forests on productive sites are more commercially valuable. The pertinent issue locally—the focus of the recent WC article—is logging of second-growth forests. We have scrutinized a number of such past and proposed thinning sales. Direct examination of sale areas, both before and after logging, provides a strong antidote to vague and benign-sounding talk of “restoring dense overstocked plantations.” We invite you to walk through the proposed Skull Thin just off the scenic mountain loop highway, or the Salmon Creek units of the proposed Sky Forks timber sale, gerrymandered out of the proposed Wild Sky wilderness area boundaries to placate logging interests. Or look over Unit 2 of the proposed Lilly sale on the Olympic. Perhaps you will hear pileated woodpeckers drumming on the large standing snags as we did the day we visited Lilly 2. Take note of the rich, variable understory, the meandering swampy streams, the large overstory trees, the patchy glading. And then explain, please, how constructing access roads, cutting down and skidding out half the trees, is “restoration.”

Some sorts of thinning treatments, applied to some sorts of stands, are arguably beneficial. The great difficulty in carrying out such potentially beneficial thins is the commercial constraint. Noncommercial thins—thins financed not by extracted wood volume, but directly by US taxpayers—are increasingly rare. Commercial thins, the dominant kind, require a network of roads and skid trails or cable corridors to extract trees; they entail the removal of significant quantities of biomass from stands; they require saw-logs of a minimum size and volume. Only mature second growth on good sites—typically 50 to 80 years old, typically naturally regenerated railroad-logged or very early truck-logged stands can support commercial thins. Stands younger than 45 years, or spindly “doghair” stands, the sorts of “dense overstocked plantations” that might actually benefit from careful thinning—cannot support commercial sales. In short, the set of thinning treatments that are defensibly beneficial, and the set of thinnings that are self-financing through extracted wood volume, rarely if ever intersect: the only feasible commercial thins are bad ones. The commercial thins we have seen carried out on our local forests are harmful to wildland values, the development of old, complex forests, and the health of aquatic ecosystems. Ritual flourishing of some pious set of “restoration principles” in no way alters this unkind reality. Until we see clear evidence that ecologically beneficial “treatments” can be financed by the commercial logging mechanism, it is our clear duty to thwart such programs.

That the NWOGC, implicitly or explicitly, advocates trading increased commercial thins in exchange for reduction of current old-growth logging is, you say, “crazy talk.” Unfortunately, the words and deeds of NWOGC spokespeople are inconsistent, and often charac-

Continued on page 21

LETTER TO NCCC

implement good thinning, and we've organized a public forum of scientists and other opportunities for these issues to be worked out and for activists to engage in a productive dialogue. In the end, we'll have to watchdog the Forest Service to make sure it's done right, but what else is new? In a simple choice between clearcutting of old growth, — a disaster every time, or thinning of dense, second-growth stands — which has potential benefits — my mind is made up. For the *Wild Cascades* writers to describe this as a "trophy tree approach that shortchanges the wider landscape" is a foul misrepresentation.

The article mentions a number of beautiful stands that were logged by railroad in the early days, such as the Middle Fork Snoqualmie, Pratt, etc. Three of these places are in Late Successional Reserve where they already can be thinned if the stand is under 80 years old and the logging would result in "net ecological benefit." In fact, the only places that would be thinned under the NWOGC vision are already open and available for thinning (or worse) right now.

The article insinuates that remnant old-growth might be less ecologically valuable than second-growth stands in more productive sites. That's an interesting point to pull out of one's ear, but a broad swath of scientists feel quite strongly to the contrary that all remaining mature and old-growth forests should be protected and that many second-growth stands can benefit from thinning. I'm inclined to go with that more credible advice.

The *Wild Cascades* article also raised questions about the NWOGC's political strategy. To these I simply respond, "Compared to what?" Maybe the writers have a magic wand or silver bullet that would bless all deserving stands with protection, or would lock in the tiny logging rates of the past decade (resulting less from Clinton policy than from litigation by NWOGC groups). But they have yet to make any suggestions for accomplishing these aims. The writers did state that we should be unified in defense of the Northwest Forest Plan, and this is precisely the strategy of the NWOGC. We're trying to make the plan work for ecological and social objectives so it doesn't get scrapped by Mark Rey. In fact, the NWOGC is leading efforts to defend the plan.

The Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest did very well under the Northwest Forest Plan, as logging was reduced over 98 percent. Activists who narrowly focus on this forest might want to stop time right where it stands. But those who also have concern about the old forests still subject to clearcutting on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest and in western Oregon can't be blamed for exploring rational ways to gain further protection. It is highly unlikely, though perhaps conceivable, that the strategy the NWOGC is pursuing (already with success in some of these forests) will have the unintended consequence of increasing logging rates on those acres of the MBS or Olympic National Forests that are anyhow already designated as available for logging.

I want to close this on a hopeful note that perhaps can bring us back together. I'm thinking of the history of the checkerboard lands just south of the Alpine Lakes. For many years lots of us seethed over the injustice of the railroad land grants and held out for Congress to take the lands back. Of course this never happened. Then came the I-90 Land Exchange, trading some of these acres for public forest in the southern Cascades. While NCCC supported the exchange (Marc Bardsley wrote on behalf of NCCC "Sometimes it's better to sacrifice hamburger, even good hamburger, if you can pick up some steak somewhere else.") others opposed the swap as a costly deal with the devil. In the end we worked out the difference, shrunk the exchange, and followed it up with The Cascades Conservation Partnership to successfully save many of the remaining acres.

Similarly, blind idealism alone won't save the remaining old growth or the second growth from the policies of Bush or the ravages of the timber industry. What the NWOGC offers is not a crass *quid pro quo*, a trade of hamburger for steak, but a holistic strategy that involves the best scientists, mending fence with labor and rural communities, and giving a path of least resistance to the Forest Service, timber industry, and Bush Administration. That path involves avoiding logging in con-

troversial old forest and focusing on careful thinning in those areas that most scientists say could actually improve habitat.

Our movement is at its best when it advances on hope rather than cynicism. I hope NCCC will embrace the hopeful vision of the Northwest old Growth Campaign to save the old forests and restore those second growth plantations that need help to become forest.

Mitch Friedman
Executive Director
Northwest Ecosystem Alliance

PS: I'm also a bit disconcerted that these articles ran in *Wild Cascades* without attribution. Does that mean they represent official NCCC position rather than the views of specific authors? If so, NCCC members should know that the board did not invite any response from the NWOGC before taking an official position, publishing articles, or taking the highly unusual step of sending letters to specific authors. This doesn't seem like the right way for longtime allies to relate to one another.

NCCC RESPONSE

Continued from page 20

terized by artful ambiguity rather than plain speaking. We reprint on page 15 the NWOGC's "Potential Fiber Production from Young Managed Stands" document, never disavowed, to illustrate this inconsistency. The numbers in your memo make it clear that in order to "save" old growth trees, you're willing to promote breathtakingly high levels of logging in the rest of the National Forests.

Most of the surviving old growth forests on the national forests around here are on poor sites, and at high elevations. The reason they survived is because the timber industry wasn't all that interested in cutting them. But the natural second growth forests you'd like to trade away to save the old growth are on good sites, at low elevations, and surround the few salmon spawning streams found on the National Forests. No wonder the timber industry (your "non-traditional allies," as you often call them,) is very interested in what you're trying to offer.

As for the claim of an "emerging scientific consensus" that thinning benefits mature second growth forests and accelerates their transition to old growth, we advise you to read the literature more carefully. Conservationists should not accept uncritically the work and public utterances of industry- and Forest Service-funded rent-a-professors who have built their careers on producing justifications for logging.

Some of us who were involved with the Plum Creek I-90 land exchange from the beginning have a different view of how it turned out, and the lessons learned. You are correct in saying that in the end the exchange was shrunk, and most people went away feeling happy about it, or at least not overly unhappy. But the lesson we took away from it is that it is never right to trade away someone else's treasured places in order to save one's own, no matter how much one may believe that the total package is good. Now you are proposing a trade that is a thousand times bigger and worse than anything talked about during the Plum Creek exchange.

You've done all kinds of good work in getting out the message about threatened places and motivating people to give money to save them. It's worked in the Loomis, Negro Creek, and other worthy places, which are now protected because you and others put out the effort to raise the money to buy and protect them. All of that makes it doubly sad to see what you're doing now.

Your campaign could have the result of permanently legislating a high timber cut in the most productive and critical publicly owned forests in the Northwest. We think it's a bad deal, we don't want it, and we will be doing what we can to let everyone know that you do not speak for the NW land and forest protection movement.

— NCCC Board

Forty Years of Fighting Forewords

1964-2003

BY (WHO ELSE?) HARVEY MANNING

During my years with The Mountaineers the guidebooks we published in the 100 Hikes series (“the wildness without”) and the accompanying Footloose-Footsore-etc. series (“the wildness within”) were much more than “recipes for tasty walks.”

They were BATTLE BOOKS. The frontmatters were particularly combative (to the hand-wringing and tut-tutting of the mugwimps). To the best of my comprehension and understanding they embodied the PARTY LINE of the North Cascades Conservation Council and its shoulder-to-shoulder companions.

If the battlefields have shifted somewhat, the fighting goes on, the more desperately now that the government and

the free-enterprise privatizers have seized the initiative and are seeking to repeal the 20th century — to turf us out once and for all.

The Party Line of the NCCC is as feisty as it was in the Time of the Founders. But the environmental movement as a whole is having a fit of Medievalism such as overtook the domains of the Roman Empire after its decline and fall.

My thought here has been to assemble the Fighting Forewords into what amounts to a history of the Party Line, that you youngsters for whom “Brower” and “McConnell” are just names in textbooks may study up on how the 1950s and 1960s and 1970s and 1980s and 1990s happened

— in words written while they were happening.

The 136 pages printed and bound, cost me \$13 each. Postage is about \$3.

Send a check for \$17 to Harvey Manning, at 15819 SE 44th Street, Bellevue, WA 98006-4544, and I will go to the printer, have your copy made up, and mail it to you forthwith.

—H.M.

BOOK REVIEW:

Fred Beckey Tells All

Range of Glaciers: The Exploration and Survey of the Northern Cascade Range, Fred Beckey, Oregon Historical Society Press. Portland, Oregon, 2003. \$40.

You will not put this in your Kely for rainy days under the tarp. (Many of you, I suspect, will photocopy pages relevant to a trip in hand, and that is a violation of federal copyright law and shame on you.)

The volume measures 7 x 10 x 2 inches. About the weight of a sack of nuts and bolts and snaplinks and Friends plus a week’s hearty lunches plus — of course — a copy of the correct volume in his library of guidebooks.

Pages of text, 428. Of these, 50 are photos, drawings, maps. Notes-Sources-Index add 100 pages. Acknowledgements, pages xi-xvi, 195 square inches of agate type with credit to individuals equal in number to the combined populations of

Darrington, Wenatchee, Chilliwack, and Greater Bellingham.

Thus is answered the age-old question of what Fred has been up to since he made the first ascent of Bears Breast in 1939 at the age of — 17, was it?

I would no more attempt to “review” this book than the other Book. One can only marvel at its existence and bow the head in reverent awe.

You will not sit you down to read it cover to cover. That’s why you must lay out the \$40 for your own copy (or borrow from a friend and then engage another friend to fake a robbery). As with the other Book, you will want to keep this by your

bed and read a chapter each night before going to sleep, perchance to dream.

Fred’s name will resound through the ages less for his half-century-plus of first ascents than for (1) this book, and (2) never climbing Everest. More than 1200 people have done that, not counting the 900 tentfulls currently encamped at base. Anybody with \$65,000 can have a crack at it. To do this job, nobody not named Beckey need apply.

—H.M.

Hidden Crisis is Taking Root in U.S. Parks

Seth Borenstein
Knight Ridder Newspapers
25 May 2003

WASHINGTON — Dazzled by views of mountains, deserts and wildlife, visitors to America's national parks rarely notice the missing signs, rotting buildings and fewer rangers to answer questions.

On Sept. 13, 2000, presidential candidate George W. Bush posed before the Cascades in Washington state and warned that national parks were "at the breaking point." He vowed to eliminate a \$4.9 billion backlog in deferred maintenance.

Nearly 1,000 days later, the repair budget at Mount Rainier National Park, the tallest and most visited part of the Cascades, was cut 40 percent. That means that two of the park's most urgent problems — a heavily used footbridge that's rotting and a historic cabin that's falling apart — will go unrepaired.

The budget for repairs at Western parks overall was slashed 28 percent this month, in part to pay for a study, criticized by National Park Service Director Fran Mainella, to determine if park workers should be replaced with low-bid private contractors.

As another summer vacation season begins . . . several former park-service executives voiced fear that the entire national-park system is menaced by a hidden crisis.

They cite multiple problems, including inadequate money for maintenance and daily operations, the Bush administration's plan to shift more than 1,700 park jobs to private firms and a general weakening of protection for air, water and animals.

The Bush administration has increased spending on park-system maintenance and construction above what it inherited by \$321 million over three years. But it still has provided only 15 cents for every dollar that it said was needed to repair long-overdue maintenance problems. The maintenance backlog may now be as high as \$6 billion, according to the General Accounting Office, Congress' auditing arm.

In addition, President Bush has done less to expand the national-park system than any president in more than 100 years. The president's father, as president, once added four parks in one six-day period; his son has added three in a little over two years.

Total space in national parks last year shrank by 187,000 acres, a loss of park space roughly equal to Crater Lake National Park in Oregon. Park Service spokesman Al Nash said he couldn't explain how that happened, nor could three other officials contacted.

"The average visitor, I think, goes to a park and has a wonderful time, comes out and thinks everything is fine," said Denis Galvin, who was acting director of the National Park Service during the first four months of this administration.

Roger Kennedy, national parks chief under President Clinton and a Smithsonian museum director under the first President Bush, put it another way.

"They are treating the National Park Service as if they are custodians of parking lots and tourist destinations, not as if they are custodians of our most precious places," Kennedy said.

At Mount Rainier, the maintenance backlog stands at about \$50 million, said Dan Blackwell, the park's maintenance chief

The current spending level is enough to make the parks better, administration defenders say.

"There will always be things on the list that need to be done," Park Service Deputy Director Don Murphy said. . . .

Parks professionals are alarmed by another plan announced this spring. It would turn over 1,708 federal positions in the National Park Service to private contractors, mostly jobs involving maintenance or security. In an internal memo last month, park service Director Mainella said this switch would cost \$3 million just to study and that that would come at the expense of other park-service priorities.

Park-Service budget documents also show there will be 101 fewer rangers next year than in January 2001, a drop of about 1 percent.

Park workers perform many functions, and it would cost the government more to shift their duties to private industry than to retain them, contended Mike Finley, a 32-year retired parks veteran who was superintendent of Yellowstone, Yosemite and Everglades national parks

Membership Application

Be part of the North Cascades Conservation Council's Advocacy of the North Cascades. Join the NCCC. Support the North Cascades Foundation. Help us help protect North Cascades wilderness from overuse and development.

NCCC membership dues (one year): \$10 low income/student; \$20 regular; \$25 family; \$50 Contributing; \$100 patron; \$1,000 sustaining. A one-time life membership dues payment is \$500. *The Wild Cascades*, published three times a year, is included with NCCC membership.

Please check the appropriate box(es):

I want to join the NCCC
The North Cascades Conservation Council (NCCC), formed in 1957, works through legislative, legal and public channels to protect the lands, waters, plants and wildlife of the North Cascades ecosystem. Non-tax-deductible, it is supported by dues and donations. A 501(c)4 organization.

I wish to support NCF
The North Cascades Foundation (NCF) supports the NCCC's non-political legal and educational efforts. Donations are tax-deductible as a 501(c)3 organization.

This is a NCCC Membership NCCC Renewal Membership Gift NCCC\$ _____

This is a Donation to NCF NCF \$ _____

Total \$ _____

Please cut, enclose check and mail form and check to: Name _____

NORTH CASCADES CONSERVATION COUNCIL Address _____

Membership Chair City _____ State _____ Zip _____

L. Zalesky Phone _____
2433 Del Campo Dr.
Everett, WA 98208

Hike in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Unprotected Roadless Areas with *Mount Baker Wild!*

Mount Baker Wild! is an all-volunteer group of citizens working to protect Mount Baker's spectacular wildlands (see www.wildwashington.org for details).

Many people assume that some of our most popular hiking destinations are protected as park or wilderness, but they aren't. We have organized this hiking calendar so that others who care about wilderness can see for themselves why we think these special places deserve protection.

Hike Schedule — Summer 2003

All hikes are limited to a maximum of 12 people, including the leader(s). Call the number listed to reserve your spot—first come, first served. A waiting list will be kept for hikes that fill up. If you need to cancel, please do so as soon as possible so others have an opportunity to take your place. Hikes will generally go ahead even in less-than-ideal weather. If it's unusually stormy, the leader may cancel or suggest an alternative destination that's less exposed to the weather.

Hikes generally depart Bellingham around 8:00 am, but check with the leader

to be sure, and for directions to the carpool meeting place, as well as more information on what to bring. You don't have to be a star athlete to participate, but it helps if you are reasonably fit and have some previous hiking experience. (If you can hike up to Fragrance Lake in the Chuckanuts in under 1.5 hours without feeling exhausted, you are probably in good enough shape for most of the hikes listed.) The leader can tell you more about what to expect.

Recommended items to bring:

Sturdy boots or lightweight trail shoes with lug soles (required).

Shorts & t-shirts are fine in good weather but cotton jeans are strongly discouraged!

Day pack rain gear

Sweater or jacket

Hat

Gaitors (unless leader says they're not needed)

Sun block

2 liters water

Sunglasses

Lunch & snacks

Camera & film

Flashlight or headlamp

Pocket knife

Whistle

Insect repellent, TP & personal items

Foam pad to sit on

Small first-aid kit, map & compass

(optional)

.....

Bell Pass, Saturday, August 16

A very nice, moderately strenuous hike in old-growth forest leading to meadows on the west flank of Mount Baker. 7 - 9 miles round trip; 1,300 - 1,700 feet elevation gain. Leaders: Helene and Steve Irving, (360) 384-1618.

Three Lakes, Saturday, September 6

A wild, seldom-visited corner of the Twin Sisters Range accessed by a primitive trail; moderately strenuous. 4 miles round trip; 1,200 feet elevation gain. Leader: Randy Walcott, (360) 647-2807, or randy@mtbakergroup.org.

Watson Lakes, Saturday, September 14

Moderate hike to these wild and gorgeous lakes to see early fall colors. 5 - 8 miles round trip; 1,200 - 1,800 feet elevation gain. Leader: Ken Wilcox, (360) 733-7014.

THE WILD CASCADES

Journal of the North Cascades Conservation Council

Post Office Box 95980

University Station

Seattle, Washington 98145-2980

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

SEATTLE, WA

Non-Profit Organization

PERMIT No. 8602