



Phil Farrell  
[Redacted]

Non-Profit  
U. S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Permit No. 34  
Davis, Ca

ISSN 0194-3030

# WILDERNESS RECORD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

Vol. 10

2655 Portage Bay Ave., Suite 3

Davis, CA 95616

January - February 1985

No. 1

## State Slight Henry Coe Wilderness

The Department of Parks and Recreation has issued a preliminary general plan for Henry W. Coe State Park. The plan recommends a state wilderness area of 13,000 acres. Conservationists have been calling for the designation of more than 60,000 acres of wilderness in the 67,000-acre park.

The 13,000-acre wilderness proposed by the State is in the Robinson Canyon area. Another 22,000 acres would become a "special management zone" for ten years, a means of putting off a decision on wilderness, while the remaining 32,000 acres would be available for park developments such as roads, campgrounds, and parking lots.

Conservationists have pointed out that the general plan notes "the park is made up of steep terrain, 97% of which is not suitable for development of large public parking areas, campgrounds, and picnic areas." Since State Parks are not managed under the "multiple use" concept, there should be little controversy over a large wilderness at Henry Coe.

However, opposition to wilderness is coming from

grazing interests who want to run cattle in the park, from equestrians who want to use motor vehicles in conjunction with their riding events, and some park rangers who prefer riding in vehicles to patrolling on foot or horseback.

California's second largest state park is located 21 miles southeast of San Jose in the Mount Hamilton Range. Its diversified topography includes wide valleys, narrow canyons, streams emanating from three river drainages, long ridge lines from which sweeping vistas can be viewed, and craggy rock outcroppings.

Details on the proposed wilderness area at Henry Coe and the California Wilderness Coalition's criticisms on the general plan are inside on pages 4 and 5.



Henry W. Coe State Park

Photo by Bruce Hodge

## Wilderness Faces the Acid Test

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to survey 168 California lakes for the effects of acid rain. Conservationists are concerned about the study because 104 of the lakes are in wilderness areas.

EPA wants to use helicopters to take water samples from the lakes. The agency is in the process of preparing an environmental assessment for the survey.

The agency argues that helicopters must be used for two reasons: the number of lakes to be sampled and the need to get the samples to a laboratory within 12 hours. In the western states, 888 lakes are to be sampled in

the fall in about a five-week period. Each lake should be tested after its waters turn over, mixing different temperature layers, and before it freezes.

Three of the numerous chemical properties to be measured -- pH, dissolved inorganic carbon, and extractable aluminum -- must be analyzed within 12 hours after the sample is taken.


EPA has considered sampling using horse teams to collect wilderness water samples, but the agency believes that this alternative would affect the scientific integrity of the study.

The use of helicopters is to be a one-time event. EPA claims that in later phases

of the study smaller numbers of lakes will be evaluated in more detail and helicopters will not be required.

When sampling a lake, the helicopter will circle the area to make sure they are in the right location before landing on the lake. The engines will remain running during the 20-minute sampling procedure.

California areas to be affected are the Siskiyou, Marble Mountain, Trinity Alps, Thousand Lakes, Lassen Volcanic, Caribou, Bucks Lake, Desolation, Mokelumne, Carson-Iceberg, Emigrant, Hoover, Yosemite, Ansel Adams, John Muir, Dinkey Lakes, Kaiser, and Sequoia-Kings Canyon wilderness areas.



## Coalition Report

by Jim Eaton

This issue of the Wilderness Record marks the beginning of Volume 10. Of course, the Coalition's tenth anniversary isn't until January 18, 1986, but that's because you don't celebrate your birthday until you've actually made it through the whole year.

At any rate, it's exciting to look back over old newsletters and see how far we have come. I still have the hope that come next year we will be able to provide you with a more timely monthly newsletter.

This year already has two changes for the California Wilderness Coalition. Our first book will make its debut in March at the Recreational Equipment, Inc. (REI) sale in Berkeley.

The booklet, entitled "Discover: the California Wilderness Act of 1984," is a source book for package that passed Congress last year: 21 new wilderness areas, 14 additions, the

Tuolumne River, and Mono Lake. It briefly describes each area along with the topo maps needed, trail guides available, and Forest Service addresses for more information. If the area was not completely protected, there are notes about the issues remaining and a local conservation group to contact.

Berkeley REI funded the book as part of a celebration marking their tenth anniversary in that city. The book initially will be sold at the REI stores in California. We'll let you know soon who else is carrying it or how you can order it by mail.

The other main event is the Visalia wilderness conference. After a six-year lull, the CWC Board of Directors has decided it is time to sponsor another gathering of activists and interested people. In the next issue will give you lots more details, but mark your calendars now!

## Warren Fetter

1939 - 1984

[Editor's note: Longtime readers of the Wilderness Record will remember Mark Palmer's "Conversations with Albert." Albert was in real life Warren Fetter, a friend of many CWC members.]

Christmas Eve 1984 marked the passing of Warren Fetter after a 6-month battle with cancer. Those who knew Warren -- his energy, his outspoken support for wilderness, his wild humor -- were saddened indeed by his loss.

Warren used his time unselfishly in conservation causes. He was always available to write letters, stuff envelopes, attend a public hearing in defense of a park or wildlife issue. He was always there; he was always available.

Warren worked as a volunteer for the Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay Chapter on issues affecting the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Point Reyes National Seashore, Mount Tamalpais and Henry Coe state parks, and the Cali-

fornia Wilderness Bill. When he moved to Chico, he immediately took up the cause of the Ishi Wilderness and protection of riparian habitat along the Sacramento River.

Warren decided to move to Seattle in order to be closer to his two sisters (his only family) and to move to a quieter locale. In his three years there he became a leading figure in the local Sierra Club and the Washington Wilderness Coalition.

When he died in Seattle, he was surrounded by his Sierra Club friends. They took his ashes and showshoed to a rocky promontory in one of the new Cascade wilderness areas. There, in the deep sod backed up by the rocks, they planted a spruce tree in Warren's honor, scattered his ashes, read passages from A Sand County Almanac, and sang songs. Warren will remain one with the land he fought so long to save.

-Mark Palmer

## How We Spend Your Money

As in the past, most of the money received by the California Wilderness Coalition was directly spent on saving the wild lands and waters of the state. The issues most frequently worked on affected roadless areas managed by various national forests and Bureau of Land Management. State wilderness issues also were a priority.

The two other major categories of disbursements were our publications, primarily the Wilderness Record, and the maintenance of our office. Membership services required ten percent of our income.

Once again, renewals and donations from members were the main sources of income for the Coalition. Total income was \$14,773.09 in 1984.

## 1985 Wilderness Conference


The California Wilderness Conference is now set for October 25-27, 1985, in Visalia. This is a change from the notice in the last Wilderness Record.

This promises to be a fun and informative event. Speakers tentatively agreeing to attend include David Brower, Barry Lopez, and


Doug Scott (we're still trying to track down Edward Abbey). Wilderness trips and merchandise will be raffled. Advance registration is only \$20.00.

Get those dates on your calendar! Activists and staff will want to attend Friday when many in-depth workshops will be conducted.

Income



Disbursements



## Forest Service/BLM Land Swap

# The Great Terrain Robbery

The Reagan administration is proposing a massive land swap between the Department of Agriculture's U.S. Forest Service and the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management (BLM). About 30-35 million acres of land and underlying minerals would be transferred. In California, nearly 2.9 million acres would be swapped.


"There is little reason to panic over this land swap plan," said Debbie Sease, the Sierra Club's public land specialist. "It is another ill-advised proposal put forth by the Reagan administration with little political reality behind it. There is little support for the idea on Capitol Hill, and some powerful legislators are opposed to it."



Only Congress can redesignate BLM's public lands as

national forest lands or national forest lands as public lands. Some Democratic lawmakers have criticized the administration for not preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS), but the administration contends that an EIS is not needed since the management of the lands will not change.

Proponents of the exchange claim it will enhance public service, improve administrative efficiency, and reduce costs. They estimate that 25 to 35 million dollars would be saved annually, after 35 to 45 million dollars is spent to implement the changes.

Although Congress must approve the transfer, the administration plans to begin changing the agency personnel during the next



 All lands presently managed by FS and BLM will be administered by BLM  
 All lands presently managed by BLM and FS will be administered by FS

three years. Until the lands are legally exchanged, however, the management of the lands cannot be altered. This means that if Forest Service employees are given the BLM's King Range, for example, they will have to learn BLM rules and regulations for managing the area.

Conservationists are worried that the goal of the land swap is faster develop-

ment of the forests and public lands. A BLM press release touted that the exchange "will mean 'one-stop' shopping for the many approvals industry must obtain before mineral development can begin on Forest Service administered lands."

Detailed maps of the land transfer are expected to be made available to be public in June.

### Update

## Geothermal Drilling Proposed for Monache Meadows

The Phillips Petroleum Company is proposing to lease approximately 20,600 acres in the Monache Meadows area of Inyo National Forest for geothermal exploration. Monache Meadows, one of the largest meadows in the Sierra Nevada, was compromised out of the South Sierra Wilderness in the California Wilderness Act of 1984.

In addition to the disturbances that would be caused by exploration, development of the area would require year-round access by vehicles. The meadows already are receiv-

ing off-road vehicle damage during the summer.

The Monache Meadows area is a logical addition to the Golden Trout and South Sierra wilderness areas. The California Wilderness Coalition believes that the Monache Meadows area should be managed for roadless recreation, wildlife values, and watershed protection. The South Fork of the Kern River leaves Monache Meadows to flow through the South Sierra and Domeland wilderness areas. Disturbance of the river would cause degradation of wilderness values downstream.

## Bald Eagles Winter at Cache Creek

The Bureau of Land Management has found a surprising number of bald eagles wintering in the Cache Creek Wilderness Study Area (WSA) in Lake and Yolo counties. Surveys done with helicopters have found as many as 56 bald eagles feasting on carp stranded in

the canyon during periods of low water.

The agency recommended the WSA as "non-suitable" for wilderness designation in 1982, before biologists were aware of this concentration of bald eagles. The area also contains part of the range of a tule elk herd.

## Wild Rivers Stay Wild

The U.S. Supreme Court on January 21 refused to hear an appeal of a lower court decision upholding Wild and Scenic River designation for parts of five northern California rivers. The court's action ended four years of litigation over the Eel, Klamath, Smith, Trinity, and American rivers, which had been added to the river protection system by former Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus in the last hours of the Carter Administration.

The protection had been requested by former California Governor Jerry Brown and was challenged by water and

timber interests and two northern California counties. Opponents, in part represented by the Pacific Legal Foundation, claimed that Andrus and his staff made technical errors in the timing and notice of environmental review of the protection, and that it should be invalidated. In 1983 a district court judge agreed. But a defense mounted by the Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club, and other conservation groups convinced the appeals court to overturn that decision last May.

In all, some 1,235 miles of rivers were protected through the court's action.

- National News Report



Monache Meadows - threatened by geothermal drilling Photo by Tim Sherburn

# Coalition Wants Large Henry Coe Wilderness

by Jim Eaton

For several years conservationists have been working on a proposal to designate about 60,000 acres of roadless land as state wilderness in Henry W. Coe State Park. The Department of Parks and Recreation is now recommending only 13,000 acres for wilderness classification. Another 22,000 acres are proposed as a "special management zone" with a wilderness decision deferred for ten years.

The wilderness recommendation for Henry Coe was included in the preliminary general plan for the park, released for public comment in January. The California Wilderness Coalition reviewed the document and submitted detailed comments on the proposed plan. A summary of our critique follows:

The primary interest of the California Wilderness Coalition (CWC) in the management of Henry W. Coe State Park is for the establishment of a large area of state wilderness to preserve Coast Range ecosystems that currently are not represented in either the national or state wilderness preservation systems. The Declaration of Purpose for Henry Coe is consistent with this goal:

The purpose of Henry W. Coe State Park is to make available to the people for their inspiration, enlightenment, and enjoyment, in an essentially natural condition: the rugged, scenic landscape and wildland value of the inner central coast range of California; the native oak woodlands, riparian corridors, and grasslands which are representative of one of California's classic landscapes; the wildlife and naturally functioning ecosystems therein; and the history and significant cultural features of human occupation and activity.

At least 60,000 acres of the 67,029-acre park are roadless and meet the criteria for state wilderness's

designation. Although this is nearly 90 percent of the state park, in 1977 the Secretary for Resources recommended more than 90 percent of the then-13,119-acre Henry W. Coe State Park as suitable for wilderness. This recommendation for the Upper Coyote River Roadless Area is still pending. Since 97 percent of the enlarged park is made up of steep terrain unsuitable for development of large public parking areas, campgrounds, and picnic areas, a large wilderness designation need not interfere with possible park developments.

On the whole, conservationists find the preliminary general plan to be

The world of today would never know nor would it ever guess, and in its thoughtless, relentless march toward progress, it would never take the time to learn of those whose hearts were buried here. Her decision grew firm! From out of the silence came her answer! This vast wilderness should be a living memorial to those great and sturdy pioneers. She would make it a gift to the people to live forever as a park in memory of her people. It would be free for those eager pressing throngs to come and enjoy its vast primeval wilderness, and where those ghostly shadows could drift in peace forever. From out of the quiet hills would come the peace of one's soul and food for the power of thought.

-Sada Sutcliffe Coe  
-My Log from the Hearth

good, since many of the policies proposed would protect the wild character of Henry Coe. The CWC is deeply disturbed, however, by an anti-wilderness bias that seems to pervade the entire document.

Slightly over two years ago, the staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) proposed a 65,214-acre state wilderness for Henry W. Coe State Park. Now the wilderness recommendation has been reduced to 13,000 acres in the Robinson Canyon area. Even if the "special management zone" is added to the proposed Robinson Canyon State Wilderness, the total is but 35,000 acres. What has happened to the remaining 30,214 acres of land proposed by the staff for wilderness just two years ago? No answer is given by DPR.

The Upper Coyote River Roadless Area, which was proposed for wilderness classification by Huey Johnson, the Secretary for Resources in 1977, has now been dropped. No public policy reversal changed this recommendation. And much of this roadless area is not even included in the "special management zone" for future consideration as wilderness! The only hint of a justification for ignoring the Secretary's recommendation is given by the State Parks and Recreation staff: "Recent park expansions to more than 67,000 acres have greatly increased the roadless area in the park, and the potential for establish-

ing a larger and higher-quality wilderness." [sic]

The proposed Robinson Canyon Wilderness is only eight percent larger than the Upper Coyote River Roadless Area, and the general plan gives no clue as to what constitutes a "higher quality wilderness." Since new park lands adjacent to the Upper Coyote River Roadless Area would significantly enlarge the old wilderness proposal, it seems that the old proposal would be greatly enhanced (higher quality?) with addition of adjacent roadless lands. At any rate, DPR should explain why the Upper Coyote River Roadless Area no longer is proposed for wilderness, what procedure was used to change the Secretary's recommendation, and why portions of the area did not merit "special management zone" designation.

Although it is not clear in the preliminary general plan, it seems that some park personnel want to use internal roads for patrol at Henry Coe. If the 1977 wilderness proposal of the Secretary for Resources had been implemented, internal road access from the headquarters to the eastern portions of the expanded park would not exist. Although this might make some types of management more difficult, this situation would not have been unique. The existing wilderness area at Pinnacles National Monument, for example, precludes motorized travel between the two developed portions of this unit of the national park system. The best management is not always the easiest or cheapest.


The preliminary general plan has few policies which would be in conflict with the designation of a large wilderness area. Indeed, most of the general plan avoids the word "wilderness" while seemingly arguing for that very form of management. Unless there are major shortcomings to wilderness designation at Henry Coe, classification of a large area should be the recommendation. This general plan presents no such shortcomings.

Aside from the anti-wilderness sentiment, the CWC agrees with most of the proposed policies in the general plan. However, the proposed policies regarding livestock grazing, the special management zone, and public recreation requires the following criticisms.

The general plan states that "in special situations, livestock grazing may be successful as a management tool to correct a resource problem." After exhaustive research on the environmental impacts of grazing, the CWC is unable to find any studies to justify this pronouncement. Since the vegetation management policy proposes as the primary objective "to manage toward a natural condition, with a minimum of disruption to

## Henry W. Coe State Park

## Henry Coe Wilderness



natural processes," it is inconceivable that livestock grazing would meet park goals. Livestock grazing, whether for commercial purposes or "resource management" purposes, has no place in state parks.

The discussion of current land use is good, especially the clarification that the purpose of state parks is to make the natural and cultural values available to the public rather than to provide for recreational needs.

But the anti-wilderness bias is still there. A statement in the wilderness section reads "use of Henry W. Coe State Park as a designated wilderness area has been suggested by several individuals... [emphasis added]." Since 1973 there have been repeated proposals for wilderness by numerous organizations and individuals. Indeed, several thousand people have signed petitions in support of wilderness for Henry Coe. In November 1982, 22 people

testified before the State Parks and Recreation Commission in support of wilderness at Henry Coe, including representatives of the Tamalpais Conservation Club, People for the Preservation of Open Space, the Pine Ridge Association, the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club, the ad hoc Committee for Wilderness, and the California Wilderness Coalition. One hundred and forty-six letters were received at that time from others supporting wilderness designation.

The CWC does recognize that much of the land at Henry W. Coe State Park was recently acquired and may still have non-conforming uses. We do not feel that this is a barrier to wilderness designation for the majority of the lands. Since it has been seven years since the Secretary for Resources recommended for wilderness the 12,000-acre Upper Coyote River Roadless Area, there should be no non-conforming uses still remaining in this part of the old Henry Coe park.

The wilderness proposed by conservationists for Henry W. Coe State Park lies in the Mount Hamilton Range east of the Santa Clara Valley towns of Gilroy, San Martin, and Morgan Hill. The wilderness crosses the backbone of the range, with portions lying in both Stanislaus and Santa Clara counties. It encompasses major portions of the upper drainages of Coyote Creek, the North Fork of Pacheco Creek, and the South Fork of Orestimba Creek.

Most of the wilderness is rugged mountain country. Pine and Blue ridges on the west side of the park exceed 3,000 feet. A shoulder of Mt. Stakes to the north reaches almost 3,500 feet.

The roadless area is remarkable in its ecological diversity and is an area of outstanding wilderness values. It presents a full range of the vegetation of the Central Coast Range. There are open sloping meadows and flats covered with wildflowers from January's shooting stars through May's tidy tips and gold fields. Chaparral ranges from both blue and white ceanothus to yerba santa, with giant big-berry manzanitas growing nearly twenty feet high.

California bay and live oak trees dominate the heavily wooded canyons, and sycamores and maples are found along the creeks. In the east, wooded slopes are of mixed hardwoods and digger pines, while in the west the mixed-oak hardwood forest predominates. Lonely stands of Ponderosa pine are found on the highest ridgetops.

The abundant wildlife includes deer, foxes, coyotes, bobcats, mountain lions, and feral pigs. Golden eagles are regularly seen, and red-tailed hawks and other raptors are common. The park abounds with lizards, snakes, rabbits, ground squirrels, and other small rodents.

Geologically, the proposed wilderness would preserve some of the most outstanding outcrops of Franciscan terrain in the

state. Especially noteworthy are the chert crags known as the Rooster Comb, which dominate the skyline from the Orestimba Valley, and the blue schist and other exotic blocks (knockers) that occur in the Burra Burra Peak area.

Scenery ranges from intimate views of forest and remote canyons to sweeping panoramas of the Sierra Nevada on one side and Monterey Bay on the other (in some places, the traveller need only turn 180° from one of these two views in order to see the other). In spots, one can look out over as many as five major ridge systems, all within the park.

The North Fork of Pacheco Creek tumbles over a spectacular series of cascades in a remote canyon to the southeast. There is a lovely and equally remote waterfall on Robinson Creek in the northeast, and there are several other falls in the roadless area.

The proposed wilderness gives a feeling of remoteness from the major metropolitan areas that actually are so close. High above the valley haze, one can listen to the wind through the pines, oaks, and grasses on the ridges, the many varied sounds of streams and waterfalls, the whoosh of a hawk soaring overhead or ducks coming in for a landing on a lake, fish jumping at dusk, lizards scurrying through the leaves, and birds chirping in the trees. Occasionally, an airplane flying overhead reminds you that civilization isn't far away.

In its current state, the roadless area can provide outstanding opportunities for solitude, adventure, and wilderness recreation. Here one can observe firsthand the functioning of a large, complex, and varied ecosystem which provides broad opportunities both for wildlife protection and scientific study. There are no other roadless areas of this size and quality in the interior coast ranges with such fine potential for wilderness.

# Forest Planning Using the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum to Protect National Forest Roadless Areas

by Steve Evans

[Editor's note: the following article may appear to be written in a foreign language. In a sense, it is. Forest planners have their own dialect for national forest planning. But since the management decisions for millions of acres of California's wild lands are being decided in the land management planning process, conservationists have to learn this new language.

The following article explains one of the evaluation methods being used by the U.S. Forest Service]

California's national forests are using a system called the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) to evaluate recreational use and capabilities in the Land Management Planning (LMP) process. According to the ROS User's Guide, ROS "provides a framework for defining the types of outdoor recreation opportunities the public might desire, and identifies that portion of the spectrum a given national forest might be able to provide."

ROS classifies national forest land into six categories:

- Primitive
- Semi-Primitive: Non-Motorized
- Semi-Primitive: Motorized
- Roaded Natural
- Rural
- Urban

The first three categories are dependent upon the size of an undisturbed area and its distance from a road, whereas the other three categories are classified by the amount of road disturbance and development. The "Primitive" ROS category does not necessarily equate to Congressionally-designated wilderness areas because of the "remoteness criteria" which require a setback from existing roads. Predictably, ROS depends heavily on the much abused "sights and sounds" rationale and the Forest Service's unusually strict interpretation of

"solitude."

In the LMP process, ROS categories must be delineated on maps. Of course, most acreage in the national forests will fall into the "Roaded Natural" category. A forest plan will include an assessment of existing ROS categories and provide an outline of what will happen to land in each category under each plan alternative. The plan will include a management prescription providing details as to how land in each category will be managed and what type of uses will be allowed for each ROS class.

The ROS classes of "Semi-Primitive: Non-Motorized or Motorized" (SPNM or SPM, respectively) are the classes which will be utilized to administratively designate national forest "backcountry" areas (the Forest Service is discouraging use of this term). Very little of most forests will be classified as "Primitive" because of the remoteness criteria; only large, existing wilderness areas or large roadless areas that are restricted from off-road vehicle (ORV) use will meet the requirements of this class.

## PROBLEMS WITH ROS

1) Although the national forest system is required to provide a variety of recreational opportunities, each forest need not provide a

full array of ROS classes.

2) ROS management prescriptions are usually very general and may be too weak to prevent excessive logging, mining, or grazing in areas that the forest plan may allocate to dispersed recreational use. Most prescriptions allow salvage logging in an SPNM, so the integrity of a particular classification is entirely up to the forest supervisor. The SPNM management prescription for the Plumas National Forest allows logging to "enhance" recreational opportunities.

3) The ROS "remoteness criteria" are too strict. ROS classifies foot trails that are open to motorcycles as "primitive roads." Therefore, national forests with weak ORV plans that allow extensive motorcycle use in unprotected roadless areas will classify those areas as SPM and allow continued ORV use in the forest plan. Since the old ORV plans left most of every national forest open to unrestricted ORV use unless resource damage could be proven, we are losing SPNM classification by default due to a previous management decision (those ORV plans have come back to haunt us).

4) The "setback" rationale as a part of the remoteness criteria [see Table 1] unnaturally restricts the acreage of an area that is being classified. Furthermore, there is no mechanism in ROS that will

set the boundaries. If the LMP does not provide the same management restrictions in the buffer zone as it does to the ROS class, road encroachment into the buffer zone will shrink an area. Some planners will simply set the boundary in the plan to take care of this problem, but conservationists should keep in mind that ROS is primarily an evaluation tool, not a management designation.

5) ROS has no mechanism to consider changes of existing ROS classes such as restricting ORV use so that an existing SPM area can be changed to an SPNM. The LMP must take this into account. The Forest Service seems to be utilizing some aspects of ROS and ignoring others. Whether the rigidity of ROS will affect LMP decision making remains to be seen.

6) ROS does provide "adjustment" for areas which may not quite fit the acreage, use, or remoteness requirements. Subjective decisions concerning vegetative and geographic screening and unique characteristics are to be taken into account. Of course, it's all up to your friendly forest planner to make these decisions.

7) According to the ROS User's Guide, when "the physical, social, and/or managerial settings are not the same on the same piece of ground, a 'setting inconsistency' is occurring." Planners are supposed to lean towards protecting the physical nature of the area when they resolve these inconsistencies in the plan. But since it is unlikely that Forest Service budgets will allow much on-the-ground management of administratively protected areas, the "setting inconsistency" criteria have no teeth to prevent overuse or destructive uses.

8) Other than "Setting and Experience Characterizations," ROS does not auto-

Continued on Page 7

Table I

Remoteness Criteria					
Primitive	Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	Semi-Primitive Motorized	Roaded Natural	Rural	Urban
An area designated at least 3 miles from all roads, railroads or trails with motorized use	An area designated at least 1/2-mile but not further than 3 miles from all roads, railroads or trails with motorized use; can include the existence of primitive roads and trails if usually closed to motorized use.	An area designated within 1/2-mile of primitive roads or trails used by motor vehicles; but not closer than 1/2-mile from better than primitive roads.	An area designated within 1/2-mile from better than primitive roads, and railroads.	No distance criteria.	No distance criteria.

## (ROS)

Continued from Page 6

matically evaluate subjective values such as wilderness attributes. But display of an "Attractiveness" overlay is optional in the LMP process. ROS class "Attractiveness" must take into account landscape variety, outstanding and unique features, and special features such as scenic or historic areas. On the surface, the ROS "Attractiveness" criteria seem to have the same problem as procedures used during the two roadless area review and evaluation (RARE) studies.

9) The ROS User's Guide concentrates heavily on user capacity and density. Since most national forests have absolutely no dependable user data for dispersed recreational areas, establishing ROS use capacity and density in the LMP is arbitrary.

### HOW TO RESPOND TO ROS

1) Make sure that the forest planners know of your criticisms of ROS.

2) Ignore remoteness criteria or utilize the "vegetative and geographic screening" and "unique characteristics" considerations to get around the criteria. Wilderness begins at the road edge, not three miles away! You can force the Forest Service into bypassing the whole "remoteness" issue by lobbying them to establish ROS class management over an entire area, including the buffer zone established by the remoteness setback. This allows them to follow the criteria,

but forces them to set the boundaries, thereby preventing road or development encroachment into the buffer areas, at least until the forest supervisor says otherwise.

3) Demand a strong management prescription for the SPNM class. Force the planners to categorically establish, in writing, exactly what can and cannot occur in such an area. The current ROS definition of SPNM simply prevents motorized use by the public, but pretty much allows the Forest Service to do anything they please.

4) Don't let current ROS classification dictate future use. The LMP must address all the issues, and if prohibiting ORV use in an area currently classified as SPM is an issue, then the Forest Service must bypass the rigid ROS class system and consider changing the ROS class in the plan to SPNM.

5) If you don't like the ROS classification name, don't use it. The public has a notion of what a "backcountry" area is, but they may be totally alienated from the term "Semi-Primitive: Non-Motorized." Use the word "backcountry" and make the Forest Service translate.

6) Talk to the Forest Service often. Continually monitor the plan development. If you don't like how it is developing, let them know, in writing, and demand changes. They may not respond, but it provides an ideal written record of your concern that can be used in future appeals.

## News Briefs

### Eden Valley - Thatcher Ridge

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is studying wilderness lands in the Eden Valley and Thatcher Ridge areas of Mendocino County. The two Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) are among the last to be reviewed in the state.

Although the agency will be studying the two areas separately, they adjoin the same national forest roadless area. The Forest Service land, however, was released from wilderness review by California Wilderness Act of 1984. If the

BLM and national forest wild lands are combined, the result is a single roadless area of 60,000 acres.

BLM is accepting public comments during a "scoping" period ending April 15. The agency's recommendation will be made in a draft environmental impact statement, tentatively scheduled for release in July, 1985.

If you want to be involved in this wilderness study, you must notify the BLM at their Ukiah District Office, P.O. Box 940, Ukiah, CA 95482.

### Mountain Lion Moratorium Ends

The moratorium on hunting of California mountain lions is due to expire at the end of this year. Wildlife protection organizations are supporting legislation by Senator Robert Presley, SB 76, to extend the moratorium.

The bill would continue the 1971 moratorium on the sport hunting of mountain lions. The measure further restricts the take of lions

for predator control purposes by requiring strict permits for killing depre-dating lions.

Sport hunting organizations strongly oppose SB 76, contending lions should be managed by the Department of Fish and Game. Other groups, including the Sierra Club, argue that such management in the past has been lacking in any sensitivity for the lions.

-Mark Palmer

### Sierra Powerline Proposed

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is proposing a powerline across the Sierra Nevada to connect with lines of Nevada's Sierra Pacific Power Company. The two corridors under study parallel Interstate 80 and U.S. Highway 50.

The I-80 route could

affect the Grouse Lakes and Castle Peak roadless areas. The U.S. 50 powerline might cross portions of the Caples Creek, Dardanelles [Echo-Carson], and Freel Peak roadless areas.

SMUD will be preparing an environmental impact statement for the project this summer.

## California Wilderness Coalition

### Editor

Jim Eaton

### Graphics

Marcia Cary  
Wendy Cohen  
Bruce Hodge  
Tim Sherburn

### Contributors

Jim Eaton  
Steve Evans  
National News  
Report  
Mark Palmer

### Production

Wendy Cohen  
Jim Eaton  
Mary Scoonover

The Wilderness Record is the bi-monthly publication of the California Wilderness Coalition. Articles may be reprinted; credit would be appreciated. Please address all correspondence to: 2655 Portage Bay Ave. Suite 3 Davis, CA 95616 Headlines by Calif. Art and Printing; printing by the Davis Enterprise.

### Advisory Committee

Harriet Allen  
David R. Brower  
Joseph Fontaine  
David Gaines  
Phillip Hyde  
Martin Litton  
Norman B. Livermore, Jr.  
Michael McCloskey  
Julie E. McDonald  
Tim McKay  
Nancy S. Pearlman  
Bernard Shanks  
Richard Spotts  
Thomas Winnett

### Board of Directors

President - Steve Evans  
Vice-President - Bob Barnes  
Secretary - John Hooper  
Treasurer - Wendy Cohen  
Director - Bob Schneider  
Director - Russ Shay  
Director - Trent Orr  
Executive Director - Jim Eaton

### PURPOSES OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

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

## CWC Business Sponsors

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

Ace Family Hardware - Kauai  
4018 Rice Street  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766

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

Antelope Camping Equip. Manuf. Company  
21740 Granada Avenue  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
(408) 253-1913

Baldwin's Forestry Services  
P.O. Box 22  
Douglas City, CA 96024

Kathy Blankenship - Photography  
402 Lago Place  
Davis, CA 95616  
(916) 756-1411

Creative Sound Recording  
Michael W. Nolasco  
6412 Cerromar Court  
Orangevale, CA 95662  
(916) 969-1521

Daybell Nursery  
55 N.E. Street  
Porterville, CA 93257  
(209) 781-5126

Echo, The Wilderness Co.  
6529 Telegraph Avenue  
Oakland, CA 94609  
(415) 652-1600

Four Seasons Sports  
410 Redwood -  
Oakland, CA 94619

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

Hibbert Lumber Company  
500 G Street  
Davis, CA 95616  
(916) 753-5611

Jim's Toy House  
10542 W. Pico Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90064  
(213) 876-9533

Mike McWherter - Author/Photographer  
1231 Bottlebrush Pl.  
Oxnard, CA 93030  
(805) 982-8311

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

The North Face  
1234 Fifth Street  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
(415) 548-1371

Quality Sew-Ups  
21613 Talisman Street  
Torrance, CA 90503  
(213) 540-7001

Recreational Equipment, Inc.  
1338 San Pablo Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94702  
(415) 527-4140

Recreational Equipment, Inc.  
9 City Boulevard West  
The City, Store #44  
Orange, CA 92668

Renewed Resources  
Art Derby  
555 Chapman Place  
Campbell, CA 95008

Bob Rutemoeller, CFP  
Certified Financial Planner  
P.O. Box 7472  
Stockton, CA 95207

S & S Enterprises  
16 Morcom Place  
Oakland, CA 94619

San Francisco Travel Service  
407 Jackson Street, Suite 205  
San Francisco, 94111  
(415) 981-6640

Bob Schneider Contractor - Solar Homes  
2402 Westernesse Road  
Davis, CA 95616  
(916) 758-4315

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

Ski Hut  
1615 University Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
(415) 843-6505

Solano Ski Sport  
1215 Tabor Avenue  
Fairfield, CA 94704  
(707) 422-1705

Wilderness Digest  
P.O. Box 989  
Lone Pine, CA 93545

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

Wildflower Farms Native Plant Nursery  
1831 Terrace Place  
Delano, CA 93215

Yes Electric  
22 Claus Circle  
Fairfax, CA 94930  
(415) 456-7433

Zoo-Ink Screen Print  
2415 Third St, # 270  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
(415) 863-1207

## Coalition Member Groups

Acorn Alliance  
American Alpine Club  
Angeles Chapter, Sierra Club  
Bay Chapter, Sierra Club  
Butte Environmental Council  
California Alpine Club  
California Native Plant Society  
Camp Unalake Assn.  
Citizens to Save Our Public Lands  
Citizens for a Mojave National Park  
Committee for Green Foothills  
Concerned Citizens of Calaveras County  
Conejo Valley Audubon Society  
Conservation Call  
Covelo Wildlands Association  
Davis Audubon Society  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Desert Protective Council  
Earth Ecology Club  
Ecology Center of Southern California  
Env. Center of San Luis Obispo County  
Env. Protection Information Center  
Friends of Plumas Wilderness  
Friends of the Earth  
Friends of the River  
Friends of the River Foundation  
Golden Gate Environmental Law Society  
Granite Chief Task Force  
Greenpeace  
Ishi Task Force  
Kaweah Group, Sierra Club  
Kern Audubon Society  
Kern Plateau Association  
Kern River Valley Audubon Society  
Kern River Valley Wildlife Association  
Knapsack Section, Bay Ch., Sierra Club

Lake Tahoe Audubon Society  
Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club  
Los Angeles Audubon Society  
Marin Audubon Society  
Marin Conservation League  
Mendocino Environment Center  
Mono Lake Committee  
Monterey Peninsula Audubon Society  
Morro Coast Audubon Society  
Mt. Shasta Audubon Society  
Mt. Shasta Resources Council  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
NCRCC Sierra Club  
Northcoast Environmental Center  
Northeast Californians for Wilderness  
Northstate Wilderness Committee  
Orange County Sierra Singles  
Pasadena Audubon Society  
Placer County Conservation Task Force  
Porterville Area Environmental Council  
Redwood Chapter, Sierra Club  
The Red Mountain Association  
Salmon Trollers Marketing Association  
San Diego Chapter, Sierra Club  
San Francisco Ecology Center  
San Joaquin Wilderness Association  
Sierra Association for Environment  
Sierra Treks  
Sinkyone Council  
Siskiyou Mountains Resource Council  
South Fk Trinity Watershed Association  
Stockton Audubon Society  
Trinity Alps Group  
Tulare County Audubon Society  
UC Davis Environmental Law Society  
The Wilderness Society

### Improve Your Appearance - Buy a T-Shirt



We don't got no stinking badges but we do have three color T-shirts featuring the CWC logo of black mountains beneath a blue sky, with yellow sand dunes in the foreground. **KEEP IT WILD** rings the top of the logo, with the **CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION** beneath.

T-shirts are 100% double knit cotton. Mens are available in white, yellow, tan, and blue in S, M, L, and XL. French-cut T-shirts are available in white, pink, and powder blue in women's S, M, and L.

T-shirts are \$8.00 to CWC members; \$10.00 for non-members (tax included). Clearly indicate if you want regular or French-cut, size, color, and a substitute color.

Please add \$1.25 postage; 75 for each additional T-shirt. They also are available at the Sierra Club's S.F. Bay Chapter bookstore and at REI stores in California.

## Join the Coalition!

### T-SHIRT ORDER FORM

Item	size	color	amount
Subtotal			
Shipping			
TOTAL			

Yes! I wish to become a member of the California Wilderness Coalition. Enclosed is \$\_\_\_\_\_ for first-year membership dues.  
 Here is a special contribution of \$\_\_\_\_\_ to help with the Coalition's work.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 City \_\_\_\_\_  
 State \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

	Annual Dues:†
Individual	\$15.00
Low-income Individual	\$7.50
Sustaining Individual	\$25.00
Patron	\$500.00
Non-profit organization	\$30.00
Business sponsor	\$30.00

† tax deductible

Mail to: California Wilderness Coalition 2655 Portage Bay Avenue, Suite 3 Davis, CA 95616