



WILDERNESS RECORD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

ISSN 0194-3030

Vol. 15, No. 4

2655 Portage Bay East, Suite 5 Davis, CA 95616

April, 1990

Shasta-Trinity forest plan: new cover, same idea

By Steve Evans

The recent release of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest draft Land Management Plan recalls Yogi Berra's famous phrase, "It's deja-vu all over again!" The plan is little more than a revised version of the original draft withdrawn in 1986 due to public protest. In the 1990 version, the same roadless areas get the axe, private landowners have derailed Wild and Scenic River protection for the lower McCloud, and a citizen-generated alternative which reasonably balances resource protection with local job protection is not chosen in favor of the Forest Service's preferred alternative.


NO WILDERNESS FOR MT. EDDY

Mount Eddy, the only further planning area in more than 6.5 million acres of public land in the four national forests of far-northern California, is not recommended for wilderness in the plan. The 9,846 acres of roadless land encompassing this scenic mountain include several tiny alpine lakes, high meadows, steep slopes, and groves of old-growth trees. Three sensitive plant species are found on Mt. Eddy, making the area ecologically unique. The mountain also offers spectacular views of nearby Mt. Shasta.

Despite these obvious wilderness attributes, the Shasta-Trinity plan fails to recommend the area for permanent wilderness protection. Instead, about 40 percent of the area is slated for motorized recreation and timber management. The Forest Service also is considering Mt. Eddy for a possible downhill ski facility.

To quote the plan, "Mt. Eddy is the last remaining undeveloped subalpine area along the Eddy Range; others have been logged and roaded...The unique feature about Mt. Eddy, which is not present at Mt. Shasta, is the alpine lakes." And yet the Forest Service blithely dooms almost half of this tiny area to further development.

Already released for possible development by the 1984 California Wilderness Act, much of the remaining 305,423 acres of roadless land (in 15 areas in the forest) gets, predictably, the axe. Less than 23 percent, or 69,326 acres of roadless land, is allocated to the relatively protective "semi-primitive non-motorized" category. Much of the remaining acreage is slated for various kinds of

continued on page 5

Dobkins Lake in the Mt. Eddy Further Planning Area.

Photo by Phil Rhodes

Mt. Shasta plan goes too far

By Jim Eaton

The Forest Service says I'm welcome to visit the Mt. Shasta Wilderness—if I leave my dog at home, eschew wood fires, not camp within sight of meadows, pay my reservation fee (or be a lucky first come, first served applicant), and am fortunate enough to meet the trail-head quota.

I have yet to figure out if this is just overprotective management or vindictive retaliation for environmentalists being successful in appealing their proposed downhill ski area on the mountain.

continued on page 4

In this issue:

- "Wilderness Primer" series, part I: Definition of Wilderness...page 2
- Snow Mountain Wilderness boundary faces logging plans...page 3
- Mountain bikes and wheelchairs in wilderness...page 4

COALITION PAGE

Monthly Report

Wilderness management is a topic of great interest to me but takes a back seat to saving unprotected areas. If we don't save the area to begin with, there's no opportunity to fight over management issues later.

But the Coalition has been forced to jump into wilderness management issues as the Forest Service has cranked out wilderness management plans.

We appealed (and won) the Ishi Wilderness plan because it ignored the impact of grazing on wilderness. We appealed the proposal to retain (and declare as historic) small dams in the Emigrant Wilderness.

Now a new list of management issues is before us. The Forest Service has instituted a \$3.00 per person reservation fee in the High Sierra. In Desolation Wilderness they are considering banning all fires. And at Mt. Shasta, they propose banning all fires, pets, and overnight use of stock in addition to charging \$3.00 per head and instituting a trailhead quota.

There are pros and cons on all sides of these topics. I'd like to hear your opinions on these subjects, since the Coalition has to determine which of these proposals we agree with and which we don't.

Now a word about dogs. I am not against banning dogs in Forest Service and BLM wilderness areas, but I question the relative impact canines have on wilderness—especially after hiking through a meadow being chewed to the quick by two hundred cows. I think we should take on the biggest impacts first.

At Mt. Shasta, the Forest Service says that "dogs have been observed wading in creeks and trampling vegetation" (I've seen humans doing the same).

By Jim Eaton

"Moreover, dogs are known to harass small wildlife, their barking contributes to undesirable noise, they disturb campers by roaming through neighboring campsites, and deposit of their solid waste on the surface of the ground is a sanitary hazard."

Just last weekend I met some "hunters" at Cache Creek who were out to shoot ground squirrels and "varmits." The rifle shots whizzing by were undesirable noise (although I saw them kill only an old, abandoned washing machine). As for solid waste—after they require diapers on cows, sheep, horses, mules, and llamas, then come talk to me about dogs.

Uncle Jim's

Wilderness Trivia

Quiz Question:

(Answer on page 7.)

There are three existing or potential wilderness areas in California managed by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. Can you name them?

Wilderness primer, part I:

Definition of Wilderness

Just as wilderness is complex, so is Wilderness—the field of endeavor involving federal and state law, the policies of many government agencies, scores of court cases, politics, ecology, and all kinds of people.

From time to time we worry about whether the information published in the *Wilderness Record* is easily understood by people new to all this. In the spirit of Earth Day, with this issue we begin a series of short articles offering a "wilderness primer," explaining some of the most basic elements of Wilderness.

Wilderness Act, 88th Congress, September 3, 1964
Section 2. (c) Definition of wilderness:

"A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled¹ by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land² retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation,³ which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2)

continued on page 5

Letters

Backcountry use article on right track

Dear Editor:

I'd like to thank Jim Eaton for his excellent article on backcountry use. [*Wilderness Record*, November 1989] Having recently re-read Galen Rowell's *National Geographic* article as well as Jim's, I feel it is safe to say that Rowell's fit of pique in his letter to the *Wilderness Record* [December 1989] is entirely uncalled for. His *National Geographic* article is not just about the John Muir Trail as he claims in his letter; he, or those he spoke with, generalizes at several points about "the younger generation," the "bump of the baby boom generation," backpacking as a 60s and 70s "cult affair," and so on. There is also an attempt to use Yosemite National Park and John Muir/Ansel Adams Wilderness statistics to make a more general case for decline in wilderness use. Rowell has a touching faith in the ability of National Geographic's Research Department to back him up, or more likely, do his statistical research for him since he and they have been so close for many years now. Still, I'd rather trust Jim Eaton, who acknowledges the difficulties or even impossibility of determining the true situation.

Yes, quotas make a real difference. Yes, fashions, outlooks and people change. And yes, the mountains are still there and lots of people are hiking them and enjoying them.

Yours very truly,
Cress Kearny
Oakland, California

Wilderness reservation fees: the more the merrier

Dear Jim:

I am glad to see that you say "wilderness users won't object to paying fair fees for the backcountry." But I am disappointed that the *Wilderness Record* repeatedly calls such fees a "tax."

A reservation charge or other wilderness fee is no more a tax than the cost of the milk you buy at the grocery store or the rent you pay to the landlord. Taxes are money taken without your permission to spend on things over which you have little say. The wilderness charge should be called a user fee, a payment for good or services that you can choose either to purchase or not purchase.

The advantage of a user fee is that it can give the seller an incentive to give you more of whatever it is you are buying. This works very well for the timber industry; they pay market rates for national forest timber, and the Forest Service enthusiastically sells it to them.

However, for user fees to work in this way, the seller has to earn some benefit from the sale. In the case of the Forest Service, it can charge for timber and it can charge for various forms of recreation. In the case of the timber, forest managers are allowed to keep an unlimited share of the receipts for their own budgets. In the case of most recreation fees other than for developed campgrounds, the fees all go to the U.S. Treasury and forest managers keep none. Thus, managers have little incentive to provide recreation.

If I were you, I would ask who gets the wilderness reservation fee. If the Forest Service gets to keep it, I would rejoice. Urge more and ever higher fees for wilderness. The

greater the fee, the more likely you are to get agency support for more wilderness. On the other hand, you should worry if the Forest Service started to charge fees of motorcyclists, four-wheelers, and other ORV users. Such fees would only encourage the agency to promote such uses.

Urge your members to write Congress and demand the right to pay wilderness and other backcountry recreation fees. It's the best way to save the wilderness!

Yours truly,
Randal O'Toole
CHEC

Note: In response to Randal's suggestion, we investigated as to whom the reservation fee revenue will go—the national forests which collected them or the U.S. Treasury. Ernie DeGraff of the Inyo National Forest told us that—after a two-year time lag—65 percent of the fees will go to the ranger district from which they were collected, to manage the reservation program. By law, twenty-five percent must go to county roads and schools and ten percent to trails.

And incidentally, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest is proposing a wilderness use reservation fee for the Mount Shasta Wilderness Area. (Article on page 4.)

Roadless Areas



Bear Wallow Creek upper meadow in the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area.

Photo by Phillip Kay

Citizens work to save Snow Mtn. border

By Katherine Petterson

The U.S. Forest Service plans to log 4,515 acres of the Mendocino National Forest in an area which lies along the southeast boundary of the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area and on the boundary of Lake and Colusa counties. This logging is referred to as the Fur Timber Sale. Three thousand acres are in the "released roadless" area which was rejected by the Forest Service for inclusion in the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area. Now it is targeted for logging with subsequent road building, stream degradation, wildlife and plant life disturbance, and loss of ancient forest ecosystems and species.

Environmentalists are concerned about the impact of this logging both visibly and audibly on the wilderness environment of the southern slopes of the West Peak of Snow Mountain. The opportunity for expansion of the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area will be lost.

A significant portion of the South Fork of Stony Creek, proposed for logging, is on highly unstable and steep slopes. Landslide potential and stream sedimentation would jeopardize Wild Trout Stream classification and its potential inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The mandate for that classification is to conduct logging and road building in such a way as not to detract those values which made the stream eligible.

Spotted owl habitat on the South Fork of Stony Creek has been catalogued. Also at risk in a logging operation are the archaeological and Native American resources. There are known historic and contemporary use areas in this logging proposal.

Local environmentalists oppose the portions of the timber sale on roadless lands adjacent to the wilderness—lands starting near Red Eye Spring, within Road 18NC1.3 to the Lake/Colusa County line, thence north following the wilderness area boundary back to the point of beginning.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Fur sale will be released in early spring of 1991, according to the Forest Service. To comment on the sale or get on the mailing list to receive a copy of this EIS, contact: Janice Gauthier, Stonyford Ranger District, U.S.F.S., HC R-1, Box 12, Stonyford, CA 95979, (916) 963-3128.

Katherine Petterson is a native of Kelseyville, California who has for decades defended Snow Mountain.

Salvage sale planned for northern wilderness corridor

By Stephanie Mandel

Initial reports are that the Black Panther fire salvage timber sale plan is not so bad—except that it is in the Ukonom Creek drainage.

In the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the sale, released in early March, the Forest Service proposes to log dead trees almost entirely (89 percent) by helicopter and build no new roads (except for a quarter mile of "new temporary construction" and about seven miles of "reconstruction").

Trees would be taken, however, from part of the Ten Bear Roadless Area, which Congress released from study as wilderness until the second 10-year planning cycle.

Ukonom Creek flows out of the Marble Mountain Wilderness Area into the Klamath River. Together with Dillon Creek, which flows from the Siskiyou Wilderness to the Klamath, Ukonom Creek serves as an old-growth forest watershed corridor linking the two large wilderness preserves.


"I'd love to see timber sales put together this way somewhere else," said Chris Adams of the Klamath Forest Alliance. "They're walking really softly around this one," Adams added, but his group is concerned that every additional entry into the pristine area degrades its viability as old growth wildlife habitat. "Whether the corridor works or not is a matter of degree; it works less and less the more you fool around with it," Adams believes.

And the Ukonom Creek drainage has been fooled around with quite a bit—23,095 acres of salvage timber have already been logged since the 1987 wildfires. This clearcutting along Lick and McCash creeks, which feed into Ukonom, has already added silt to the creek. The Black Panther EIS has been criticized for failing to assess the cumulative impacts of previous logging on the Ukonom Creek drainage. In addition, the EIS discusses additional logging in the future.

Dave Krueger is an attorney who worked with the Northcoast Environmental Center in Arcata on a lawsuit that forced the Forest Service to complete EIS's for salvage sales in this area. He says "Ukonom Creek is very important from a biological and future recreation standpoint" as one of the few low elevation old-growth forests preserved in the Klamath National Forest.

Krueger also points out that the river corridor was put outside the timber base in the King Land Management Plan of 1978. "They ought not to be managing this area for timber production."

Comments on the Black Panther Fire Salvage EIS are due by April 30, 1990. Send to: Forest Supervisor, Klamath National Forest, 1312 Fairlane Rd., Yreka, CA 96097. For more information contact Penny Eckert or Mo Tebbe, P.O. Drawer 410, Orleans, CA 95556 (916) 627-3291.



Some timber sales planned for proposed inter-wilderness wildlife corridors in northwest California:

Sale name	Wilderness Areas connected
Pine Martine #3	Soda Mtns. (WSA)/Red Buttes
Buckshot	Soda Mtns. (WSA)/Red Buttes
Grider	Red Buttes/Marble Mountain
King Titus	Siskiyou/Marble Mountain
Dillon	Siskiyou/Marble Mountain
Baldy	Siskiyou/Marble Mountain
Clear View	Siskiyou/Marble Mountain
Black Panther	Siskiyou/Marble Mountain
Somes-Butler	Marble Mountain/Trinity Alps
Penney Ridge	Trinity Alps/Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel

Wilderness Management

Major Mt. Shasta restrictions proposed

continued from page 1

Either way, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Mt. Shasta Wilderness Plan is available for public review. Among the proposed rules are:

- a complete ban on domestic pets;
- no wood fires anywhere within the wilderness;
- no overnight camping with stock anywhere within the wilderness;
- no camping in locations within view of meadows;
- maximum party size of 10 and length of stay limited to seven days;
- a maximum of 42 parties per day in the 38,000-acre wilderness, with no more than eight parties per day on the popular Avalanche Gulch route to the summit.

There are more restrictions proposed. You may be required to pack out your solid waste from areas above treeline. Stock users will be required to feed their animals a non-seed bearing type of food prior to wilderness entry. Spiritual visitors will no longer be allowed to leave behind prayer offerings such as crystals or feathers, or build rock medicine wheels.

The Forest Service also proposes to build a trail around Mt. Shasta. This is becoming a controversial plan since the agency wants to build it inside the wilderness boundary while some environmentalists suggest it would be better to build it at a lower elevation, outside the wilderness.

Mountain bikes, wheelchairs provide premise for weakening Wilderness Act

Watch out, hikers and packers, mountain bikes may be sharing the nation's wilderness trails with you if some members of Congress have their way.

Representative James Hansen (R-UT) introduced in August 1989 a bill (H.R. 3172) that would be the first amendment to the 1964 Wilderness Act. It would add to the Act's prohibition on "mechanical transport" the phrase "except for nonmotorized bicycles."

"The situation that now exists in wilderness areas is ridiculous," said Rep. Ron Marlenee (R-MT), one of the mountain bike bill's co-sponsors. "Mountain bikes are a clean and quiet form of outdoor recreation...their impact is...less than that of some other uses currently allowed in wilderness."

Jim Eaton of the California Wilderness Coalition agrees that the impact of some uses, such as grazing and mining, is more devastating to wilderness than any effect mountain bikes might have. Eaton also points out, however, that this does not justify the weakening of the Wilderness Act that would result from H.R. 3172.

Jay Watson of The Wilderness Society says the bill has a "dim" chance of passing Congress. Watson believes that the mountain bike bill is part of a "concerted campaign to weaken or attack the Wilderness Act of 1964." Representative Hansen is widely regarded as an opponent of wilderness, although his press secretary maintains that he would fight motorized use in wilderness areas.

The International Mountain Bike Association has taken the position that they are "reluctant to work for" the Hansen bill because of their concern for the environment and desire to work with other environmental groups in the future.

Don Douglass, President and spokesperson for the group, says, however, that he can "almost guarantee you there will be conflict in the future" over the use of mountain bikes in wilderness.

The environmental impacts of such a trail virtually are ignored in the DEIS. There is one small note that sixty percent of the proposed trail would be built on highly erodible soils.

The proposed plan not only institutes a wilderness permit system, but it also immediately begins trailhead quotas, even for winter use. Three quarters of the permits would be available by advance reservation, with a fee of three dollars per person, while the remaining 25 percent of the permits would be given out first come, first served the afternoon prior to entry.

Wilderness Carrying Capacity

The Forest Service has decided that the carrying capacity of the Mt. Shasta Wilderness should be based on solitude rather than physical impact to the wilderness. This comes from their repeated misunderstanding of the Wilderness Act of 1964, which they claim requires them to manage for solitude. It does not, as is explained in the "Wilderness Primer" article beginning on page 2.

At Mt. Shasta, the Forest Service has divided the wilderness into nine zones: three rated "primitive," four rated "semi-primitive," and two rated "transition."

In primitive areas, they would permit no more than

one encounter with another party per day and no campsites within sight of each other. In semi-primitive areas, they would allow a maximum of four encounters per day and one other campsite within sight of any given campsite. In transition zones, they would allow seven encounters per day and two campsites within sight of another.

As a result, only three permits per day would be given out for a primitive zone, five per day in a semi-primitive area, and eight per day in a transition zone. Since only 25 percent of the permits per zone are available first come, first served, local residents wishing to cross-country ski in the Avalanche Gulch transition zone on the spur of the moment will be competing for the two permits available.

Comments are being accepted through May 7, 1990. Write to: Forest Supervisor, (Attn: Mt. Shasta Wilderness DEIS), Shasta-Trinity National Forest, 2400 Washington Avenue, Redding, CA 96001.

Watch out, cows!

CWC wins Ishi appeal!

The Regional Office of the Forest Service has ruled that the Ishi Wilderness Implementation Plan did not contain sufficient information to support grazing at present levels in the wilderness area. The California Wilderness Coalition appealed the original decision to allow cattle grazing to continue as is without an adequate study to determine the impacts of this level of grazing.

Deputy Regional Forester Joyce Murakoa directed the Lassen National Forest Forest Supervisor to develop specific management objectives and directions for managing livestock grazing in wilderness to prevent degradation and protect wilderness values, especially in the riparian areas. At present there are 547 head of cattle grazing on 36,400 acres of the Ishi Wilderness.

Murakoa also ruled in favor of a portion of an appeal by John Swanson, who contended that the continued use of inholdings, including motor vehicle access, will promote the degradation of the wilderness. Murakoa ordered that the Forest Supervisor fully evaluate the various alternative modes for entry to inholdings to determine the means that will provide adequate access and will have the least lasting impact on wilderness values.

The Forest Supervisor had decided to allow owners to use motorized vehicles on existing routes to their private property at the same frequency as in the past. Murakoa found that the plan did not support the decision to allow motorized vehicles for access. Even if motorized vehicles are determined to be the most reasonable mode of entry, that use must be mitigated in terms of kind of vehicle, time of use, who may use vehicles, and where they may be driven.

Wheelchairs

A second bill sponsored by Rep. Hansen (H.R. 3485) would allow motorized wheelchairs in wilderness. The wheelchair access legislation is unnecessary, according to Watson, because the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service—who manage the majority of the country's wilderness areas—already have policies which allow use of manual and motorized wheelchairs.

H.R. 3485 would amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to say "notwithstanding the Wilderness Act." Watson believes this language would set a precedent for other legislation and would weaken the Wilderness Act.

Other legislation that is currently being developed—the Americans with Disabilities Act—would reportedly require a study and report on the effect that wilderness designations and wilderness land management practices have on the ability of individuals with disabilities to use and enjoy the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Shasta-Trinity forest plan — De'ja' Vu

continued from page 1

motorized use and logging.

Important roadless areas largely slated for the chopping block include major portions of the South Fork Trinity River drainage (Chinquapin, Penney Ridge and East Fork roadless areas), almost half of West Girard in the sensitive McCloud River drainage, and more than half of the Pattison area.



A REVERSAL ON THE McCLOUD

The Forest Service is recommending slightly more than half of a 47-mile stretch of the magnificent McCloud River for addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Unfortunately, the 23-mile lower McCloud is not

being recommended for protection because of opposition by a powerful group of landowners, including the Hearst Corporation, Sierra Pacific logging company, and two exclusive fishing clubs.

Fed by glacial melt from Mt. Shasta, the McCloud is one of the premier trout streams in the nation. The river also offers a challenging, experts-only whitewater boating experience in a wilderness setting. These values are threatened by speculative hydroelectric power development and intensive logging in the river's sensitive watershed. Wild and Scenic status would protect the river, but the landowners are blocking protection of the lower river because they fear it may lead to increased public use, particularly rafting.

Other Wild and Scenic recommendations fared somewhat better in the plan, including proposed designations for the upper Sacramento River, Squaw Valley Creek (a tributary to the McCloud), the upper north and south forks of the Trinity River, and Virgin Creek. Unfortunately, two rivers recommended by environmental groups—Hayfork Creek and Canyon Creek—were found eligible but were not recommended by the Forest Service.

CITIZENS ENVIRONMENTAL ALTERNATIVE NOT CHOSEN

The public has the opportunity to support a citizen's alternative to the plan, called the Citizens for Better Forestry (CBF) alternative named for the loose coalition of individuals and organizations which have been working on the plan since 1986. The CBF alternative protects all proposed Wild and Scenic Rivers and virtually all of the remaining roadless areas.

Further, the alternative greatly reduces the level of unsightly and ecologically destructive clearcutting on the forest and prohibits the use of herbicides and pesticides. More ancient forest habitat, streamside riparian areas, and sensitive fish and wildlife species are protected in the CBF alternative. Unlike the Forest Service's alternative embodied in the draft plan, the CBF plan better protects the environment while supporting the local economy.

YOUR LETTER NEEDED TO SAVE MT. EDDY AND THE MCCLOUD RIVER!

The Forest Service is accepting written comments on its draft plan and EIS until July 7.

In your letter:


* Support the CBF Alternative, which protects more Wild and Scenic Rivers and roadless areas, reduces clearcutting, prohibits the use of toxic herbicides/pesticides, and protects old growth forests, wildlife and fisheries.

* Support Wild and Scenic designation of the entire 47.6 miles of the McCloud, as well as the other rivers

recommended in the CBF alternative (including Squaw Valley Creek, Upper Sacramento, South Fork Trinity, Hayfork and Canyon Creeks).

* Support wilderness designation of all of the Mt. Eddy roadless area and wilderness management for the other roadless areas on the forest, including Chinquapin, South Fork, East Fork, Penney Ridge, West Girard, Trinity Divide and Pattison.

Address your letter to Supervisor Robert Tyrrel,



Shasta-Trinity National Forest, 2400 Washington Avenue, Redding, CA 96001.

Make three copies of your letter and mail them to your Representative in Congress (House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515), Senator Alan Cranston (Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510) and Senator Pete Wilson (same as Cranston's).

In addition, please attend the public hearings sched-

Other states

Arizona's desert wilderness to be protected

Across the Colorado River, Arizona wilderness supporters are looking for passage of desert wilderness legislation this year. Unlike the California Desert Protection Act (S. 11/H.R. 780), the Arizona legislation is supported by both of the state's Senators.

After months of wrangling, Senators and Representatives have agreed to a compromise bill that includes 2.4 million acres of land in the Mojave, Sonoran, and Chihuahuan deserts. Rob Smith, Sierra Club Associate Southwest Field Representative, is optimistic that the legislation will pass Congress this year.

The House Interior Committee has passed H.R. 2570, which covers Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands, and H.R. 2571, which addresses National Wildlife Refuge lands. Both bills were originally introduced last year by Representative Morris Udall (D-AZ).

Smith is pleased that the bill "sets a good example for bills to come on BLM lands" because of its strong support for wilderness water rights. "A lot of the success is in what we prevented from happening," said Smith, adding that "If there's a disappointment in the bill it's that it doesn't have more acreage." Ten or 12 areas that the BLM did not recommend for wilderness were included in the bill.

uled in June to voice your displeasure about the inadequate recommendation for the McCloud, Mt. Eddy, and other rivers and roadless areas. The hearings will be held from 1-4:00 pm and 7-10:00 pm and are scheduled for June 19 in Redding (Holiday Inn, 1900 Hilltop Drive, June 20 in Weaverville (Civil Defense Hall), and June 21 in Mt. Shasta (Mt. Shasta City Park, Recreation Center, 1315 Nixon Road).

Three public briefings will also be held for "persons interested in a general introduction to the proposed Forest Plan." There will be an opportunity to ask questions. Briefings begin at 7:00 pm and will be held on April 10 in Redding (Redding City Council Chambers, 1313 California Street), April 11 in Weaverville (Trinity High School), and April 12 in Mt. Shasta (Mt. Shasta City Park, Lower Lodge, 1315 Nixon Road). For more information, please call Steve Evans at the Sacramento office of Friends of the River, (916) 442-3155.

Wilderness Primer

continued from page 2

has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation;⁴ (3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition;⁵ and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value."

¹ No, this is not *untrampled*. Untrammelled means unconfined, unhampered, unshackled.

² The federal land that has been designated as wilderness, for the most part, has been that managed by four agencies—the Forest Service (U.S. Department of Agriculture), National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management (U.S. Department of the Interior).

³ Preserving land "...without permanent improvement or human habitation..." is the ideal, but in practice Congress has sometimes chosen to designate as wilderness areas with "improvements"—with the intention of restoring the area to its natural state. Examples of this in California are the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area, which had logging and a major road in one portion and the Phillip Burton Wilderness Area (Point Reyes National Seashore), which had ranch houses, fences, power lines, and out-buildings when it was designated in 1976.

⁴ The Forest Service, more than other agencies, misreads this portion of the definition of wilderness. First, they ignore the word *opportunities* and change the *or* to an *and*. Congress does not require a wilderness area to provide solitude. It need only provide *opportunities* for solitude *or* *primitive recreation*. This broad definition of wilderness allows the rock and ice wilds of the High Sierra, the deep forests of the Siskiyou, the main beach at Point Reyes, and the Farallon Islands to all be wilderness areas under this act.

⁵ "...or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimproved condition." A strict size requirement for wilderness was avoided by adding this provision to the 5,000 acres rule of thumb. Allowance is made for worthy and important areas of a smaller size. In California, the 141-acre Farallon Wilderness was designated by Congress because these roadless offshore islands meet the definition of wilderness. Other small wilderness areas are Oregon Islands, 5 acres; Pelican Island (FL), 6 acres; Michigan Islands, 12 acres; Three Arch Rocks (OR), 15 acres; Island Bay (FL), 20 acres; Wisconsin Islands, 29 acres; Hazy Islands (AK), 32 acres; Passage Key (FL), 36 acres; St. Lazaria (AK), 65 acres; West Sister Island (OH), 77 acres; and Big Frog (GA), 83 acres.

Happy Earth Day!

Broadening the wilderness movement

African Americans & the environment

Last October's California Wilderness Conference was colorful in many respects, but not in all. The wilderness crowd was mostly white. Particularly noticeable for their absence were black people.


The question of who comprises the wilderness movement is important to its future success. While wilderness supporters may view their efforts toward preservation as benefitting all people, it is certain that many of the so-called beneficiaries don't see it that way.

In search of dialogue on the subject, I discovered an article by Carl Anthony in the Winter 1990 *Earth Island Journal*. The shortened version of his article that follows only introduces the subject. A longer version of the article will appear in *Call to Action: A Handbook for Ecology, Peace and Justice*, to be published by Sierra Club Books in Spring 1990. — S.M.

By Carl Anthony

When Martin Luther King Jr. decided to raise his voice in opposition to the war in Vietnam, many of his friends, as well as his critics, told him he ought to stick to domestic issues. He should concentrate on securing civil rights of African Americans in the South and leave foreign policy to the professionals who knew best. But King decided to oppose the war because he knew it was morally wrong and because he understood the link between the brutal exploitation and destruction of the Vietnamese people and the struggle of African Americans and others for justice and freedom in our own land.

Today, African American leadership and the African American community face a similar situation. Every day the newspapers carry stories about the changing atmosphere and climate, threats to the world's water supply, threats to the biodiversity of the rainforest, and the population crisis in poor nations that are growing too fast to be supported by the carrying capacity of their lands. Can we afford to view the social and economic problems of African



From RE:SOURCES

American communities in isolation from these global trends?

African Americans could benefit from expanding their vision to include greater environmental awareness. For example, a recent study of the deteriorating conditions within the African American community termed young African American males in America "an endangered species." "This description applies, in a metaphorical sense, to the current status of young African American males in contemporary society," writes Jewelle Taylor Gibbs. His study attempts to present a comprehensive interdisciplinary perspective of the social and economic problems of these young people, providing valuable statistics on high school dropout rates, work skills and attitudes, unemployment, robbery, rape, homicide, aggravated assault, drug addiction, and teenage parenthood. But Gibbs makes no mention of the utter alienation of these young people from the natural environment, which is, after all, the source of Earth's abundance and well-being. The loss of this contact with living and growing things, even rudimentary knowledge of where food and water come from

must present serious consequences that we, as yet, have no way of measuring.

The study said nothing of the difficult days ahead as American society seeks to make the transition from its current levels of consumption of resources to the more sustainable patterns of the future.

Environmental organizations in the United States should modify recruitment efforts in order to expand their constituency to include African Americans and members of other minority groups as participants in shaping and building public support for environmental policies.

Environmental organizations have taught us to appreciate and respect the diversity of non-human species and to recognize the fundamental interdependency of human and non-human life on the planet. Thus far, however, the environmental movement, despite its highlighting of crises in underdeveloped countries, has tended to be racially exclusive, expressing the point of view of the middle- and upper-income strata of European ethnic groups in developed countries. It has reproduced within its ranks prevailing patterns of social relations.

The principle of social justice, however, must be at the heart of any effort aimed at bringing African Americans into the mainstream of environmental organizations in the United States. While recognizing limits to growth, it must avoid misuse of environmental information as a way of rationalizing the economic status quo. It must not misuse concern for endangered species as a way of diluting our responsibility to meet basic needs for human health care, food, and shelter. It cannot manipulate terms so that the legitimate need for population control becomes a code word for preserving racial dominance and purity.

Isolation of African Americans from stewardship of the environment has deep historic roots. It is hard to keep the faith. The African American population migrated to the cities to escape the four centuries of exploitation on the plantations and crop farms, and in the coal mines of the South. Understanding of these experiences, however painful, is an important resource as we seek a path towards sustainable development.

In order to meet responsibilities for citizenship, African Americans must have opportunities and learn to play a greater role in formulating environmental policies which affect all members of the community. We must find new ways to bridge the gap between environmental advocates and African American communities.

Some of the means to achieve this goal might include:

- Presentations to groups with sustainable memberships by existing environmental organizations and individual resource persons.
- Outreach programs by environmental organizations to promote active learning and exposure to the wilderness experience by minority youth.
- Networks among minority-based organizations, environmental groups, public schools, community colleges, and institutions of higher learning in order to expand educational opportunities for minorities in environmental science and related fields.
- Legislative initiatives linking inner-city needs and environmental projects.

There are some hopeful signs. Environmental concerns of minority groups are already an integral part of the planning for Urban Ecology's Ecocity Conference in Berkeley in March 1990.

Carl Anthony is an architect, community activist, and co-founder of Earth Island Institute's Urban Habitat Program emphasizing minority access to global, regional and neighborhood environmental resources.

Beyond White Environmentalism

By Hawley Traux

This essay is the introduction to the January/February 1990 Environmental Action magazine's special Re:SOURCES section titled "Beyond White Environmentalism." The entire 12-page report may be purchased for \$2.50 from Environmental Action, 1525 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 745-4870

That environmental concern is a white thing is a common myth in America today—one which falls apart quickly upon exam. Reality is more complex.

Black, Native American, Chicano, Hispanic—social justice advocates in all these communities are fighting so their people may live and work free of debilitating pollution. Many of these struggles have raged for years. Honoring and preserving the environment is intrinsic to native American and other land-based cultures.

Yet the national environmental groups are undeniably white in leadership, staff, and image. And activism against environmental threats—grassroots, regional, national—is too often divided, by culture and habits of oppression, along ethnic lines. Each segment is largely ignorant of the others' struggles and the common ground they might share.

Here again, generalizations distort. Conscious efforts to explore and build links between the civil rights and environmental communities have been attempted since the early 1970s. Many top priorities of national environmental groups, white though they may be, have a direct bearing on minority communities—like air pollution, where radioactive waste is disposed, and giving communities the "right to know" about toxic threats. The "environmental movement" is not a monolith. Love of Earth does not belong to one people.

Book review

An ideal guide, a premiere trail

The Pacific Crest Trail — Volume I: California

by Jeffrey P. Schaffer, Ben Schiffrin, Thomas Winnett, Ruby Jenkins; Wilderness Press: Berkeley, 480 pages, \$24.95

By Joe Bogaard

Joe, a former CWC intern, qualified himself to write this review by hiking all 1,700 miles of the California Pacific Crest Trail last summer.

It appears to me a Universal Truth: travellers upon the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) always carry well within reach the Schaffer, et al PCT Guide. Without exception, every person I encountered who was walking a significant portion of the West Coast's premiere National Scenic Trail burdened themselves with a tattered, water-stained copy of this book.

The comprehensive efforts of Schaffer, Schiffrin, Winnett, and Jenkins have resulted in this authoritative trail guide. Schaffer et al have published two volumes (I California, II Oregon and Washington) that periodically have been updated as the trail continues to evolve. Late winter of 1989 saw completion of the 4th edition for the California segment (just in time for my May 1st departure).

The first forty pages introduce the trail, discuss back-packing techniques, suggest some appropriate mountaineering references, and emphasize the mental and physical

rigors of the "Big Hike." The introduction also explains the most efficient way to resupply one's food while on the trail: simply use the postal service. The book lists all of the available post offices on and near the route and highlights those that the authors find most convenient.

The balance of this hardy paperback is devoted to a recipe-like, step-by-step trek through the wildlands of California. The California trail has been divided into 18 segments (A-R), taking the hiker from Campo, California, at the Mexican border to the colorful Shakespeare Festival of Ashland in southern Oregon.

Each segment bites off from 60 to 177 miles. There is generally a three-page preview that addresses the possible hazards (e.g. low availability of water or the presence of rattlesnakes or bears), the nature of the trail (e.g. moderate, strenuous), alternative supply and exit points, and other miscellaneous and useful information.

Complete topographical maps, mileages to the tenth of a mile, and the text do all possible to eliminate confusion. Since trail markers are at times scarce or nonexistent, this level of detail can be vital. (I lost the trail once in my 4.5 months, due not to poor guidance but to terrible land management: crisscrossing roads in an extensive clearcut. Unfortunately, the PCT is not protected from such insults.)

My only warning for those who will use the guide revolves around the fact that the official PCT is as yet unfinished. This means that minor trail changes may occur in the future that will not be reflected in the book. Schaffer's guide delineates the locations of the few remaining temporary trail routes, and one should call the appropriate public lands agency if one suspects that the route may have been altered.

Whether you are interested in short 50-mile journeys along the Crest or you actually want to tackle the 1,700 miles of California's PCT, this book is the ideal consultant.



CWC T-Shirts!

Not one, but two CWC t-shirts! The animal design that Linda (left) is wearing is by Bay Area cartoonist Phil Frank; it comes in beige and light gray for \$12. Joe (right) is wearing our official conference shirt; it has no less than six colors and comes in yellow, light green (xlarge & small only), and peach (xlarge, large, & small only) for \$15. All the shirts are 100 percent double knit cotton. To order, use the form on page 8. Please add \$1.50 postage and 75 cents for each additional shirt.

CALENDAR

April 10, 11, 12 PUBLIC BRIEFINGS on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest proposed Land & Resource Management Plan and draft EIS, 7:00 pm in Redding, Weaverville, and Mt. Shasta. See article on pages 1 & 5 for locations.

April 21 JOHN MUIR'S BIRTHDAY

April 22 EARTH DAY

April 30 DEADLINE (extended) FOR COMMENTS on the Black Panther Fire Salvage EIS. Send to: Forest Supervisor, Klamath National Forest, 1312 Fairlane Rd., Yreka, CA 96097. For more information, contact Penny Eckert or Mo Tebbe, P.O. Drawer 410, Orleans, CA 95556, (916) 627-3291. (Article on page 3.)

May 5 WORKSHOP - "Preserving the Biological Diversity of our Public Lands," featuring: Dr. Larry Harris, author of *Fragmented Forest*; David Brower; Meredith Taylor, Director of the Greater Yellowstone Coalition; and Tim McKay. Sierra Club Library, 730 Polk Street, San Francisco, 9am-5pm. Sponsored by the Sierra Club Public Lands Committee; for more information, contact John Hopkins, 409 Jardin Place, Davis, CA 95616, (916) 756-6455.

May 7 DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS on Mt. Shasta Wilderness plan draft EIS. Send to: Forest Supervisor, ATTN.: Mt. Shasta Wilderness DEIS, 2400 Washington Ave., Redding, CA 96001. For further information, contact: Garry Oye, Project Coordinator, Mt. Shasta Ranger District, 204 W. Alma St., Mt. Shasta, CA 96967.

June 19, 20, 21 PUBLIC HEARINGS on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest proposed Land & Resource Management Plan and draft EIS, 1-4:00 pm and 7-10:00 pm in Redding, Weaverville, and Mt. Shasta, respectively. Speakers may be limited to five minutes each, and may pre-register by calling the Forest Supervisor in Redding at (916) 246-5313. See article on pages 1 & 5 for hearing locations.

July 7 DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's proposed Land & Resource Management Plan and draft EIS. Send to: Forest Supervisor, ATTN.: Forest Planning, 2400 Washington Ave., Redding, CA 96001. (Article on pages 1 & 5.)

Uncle Jim's
Wilderness
Trivia
Quiz
Answer:

The Farallon
Wilderness and
potential
wilderness areas in
the Havasu and
Imperial national
wildlife refuges.

from page 2



California
Wilderness
Coalition

Purposes of the California Wilderness Coalition

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

Board of Directors

President—Steve Evans, Davis
Vice Pres.—Trent Orr, San Fran.
Treasurer—Wendy Cohen, Davis
Secretary—Ron Stork, Sacramento
Director—Catherine Fox, S. F.
Director—Bob Barnes, Porterville
Director—Barbara Boyle, Oakland
Director—Mary Scoonover, Davis
Director—Jay Watson, Wash., D.C.

Executive Director—Jim Eaton
Office Coordinator—Nancy Kang

Advisory Committee

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

The Wilderness Record

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

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

California Wilderness Coalition
2655 Portage Bay East, Suite 5
Davis, California 95616
(916) 758-0380

Editor

Stephanie Mandel

Contributors

Carl Anthony
Joe Bogaard
Jim Eaton
Steve Evans
Katherine Petterson
Hawley Traux
Photos & Graphics
Jim Eaton
Phillip Kay
Phil Rhodes

Production

Wendy Cohen
Jim Eaton
Stephanie Mandel

Printed by the Davis Enterprise.

Coalition Member Groups

Focus: Citizens for Better Forestry

They knew the Forest Service would not adopt their ideas. But Citizens for Better Forestry (CBF) spent years putting together their Citizen's Alternative to the Shasta-Trinity National Forest Land & Resource Management Plan and translating it into the agency's computer-speak.

Are they gluttons for punishment or haven't they got anything better to do? Neither—the informal, ad hoc group of Northern Californians felt they needed to be constructive—to present better ideas for forest planning. And even though their alternative was not preferred by the Forest Service in their plan (article on pages 1 & 5), it remains a storehouse of information that may be used in the future.

Maggie Draper, CBF's coordinator on the Shasta, or east side of the national forest, feels that the Citizen's Alternative is the only alternative that is in keeping with the Forest Service's supposed new agenda. With the information available in its computer

terms, the Forest Service can easily use the information gathered by CBF if a more gentle forestry truly becomes the mandate.

The group formed in 1985 in anticipation of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's draft forest plan. Forest planning in Shasta, Trinity, and Siskiyou counties has remained their focus. Although membership has fluctuated, the group has met regularly since that time. As Draper says, "As amorphous as we are, we've been able to get some amazing things done."

American Alpine Club; El Cerrito
Ancient Forest Defense Fund; Ukiah
Angeles Chapter, Sierra Club; Los Angeles
Back Country Horsemen of CA; Springville
Bay Chapter, Sierra Club; Oakland
Butte Environmental Council; Chico
California Alpine Club; San Francisco
California Native Plant Society; Sacramento
Citizens Committee to Save Our Public Lands;
Willits
Citizens for Better Forestry; Hayfork
Citizens for Mojave National Park; Barstow
Committee for Green Foothills; Palo Alto

Committee to Save the Kings River; Fresno
Conservation Call; The Sea Ranch
Davis Audubon Society; Davis
Defenders of Wildlife; Sacramento
Desert Protective Council; Palm Springs
Desert Survivors; Oakland
Ecology Center of Southern Calif.; Los Angeles
El Dorado Audubon Society; Long Beach
Env. Protection Information Center; Garberville
Forest Alliance; Kernville
Friends Aware of Wildlife Needs; Georgetown
Friends of Chinquapin, Oakland
Friends of Plumas Wilderness; Quincy
Friends of the Inyo; Lone Pine
Friends of the River; San Francisco
Greenpeace; San Francisco
Kaweah Group, Sierra Club; Porterville
Keep the Sespe Wild Committee; Ojai
Kern Audubon Society; Bakersfield
Kern River Valley Audubon Society; Bakersfield
Kern R. Valley Wildlife Association; Lake Isabella
Kern-Kaweah Chapter, Sierra Club; Bakersfield
Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club; Palo Alto
Los Angeles Audubon Society
Lost Coast League; Arcata
Madrone Audubon Society; Santa Rosa
Marble Mountain Audubon Society; Greenview
Marin Conservation League; San Rafael
Mendocino Environmental Center; Ukiah
Merced Canyon Committee; El Portal
Mono Lake Committee; Lee Vining
Monterey Peninsula Audubon Society; Carmel
Morro Coast Audubon Society; Morro Bay
Mt. Shasta Audubon Society; Mt. Shasta
Mt. Shasta Recreation Council
Natural Resources Defense Council;
San Francisco

NCRCC Sierra Club; Santa Rosa
People for Nipomo Dunes National Seashore;
Nipomo
Nordic Voice; Livermore
Northcoast Environmental Center; Arcata
Northeast Californians for Wilderness;
Susanville
Pasadena Audubon Society
Peppermint Alert; Porterville
Placer County Conservation Task Force;
Newcastle
Planning and Conservation League;
Sacramento
Porterville Area Environmental Council
Redwood Chapter, Sierra Club; Santa Rosa
The Red Mountain Association; Leggett
Salmon Trollers Marketing Association; Fort
Bragg
San Diego Chapter, Sierra Club
Sea & Sage Audubon Society; Santa Ana
Sierra Association for the Environment;
Fresno
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund; San
Francisco
Sierra Treks; Ashland, OR
Siskiyou Mtns. Resource Council; Arcata
Soda Mtns. Wilderness Council; Ashland, OR
South Fork Watershed Association;
Porterville
South Yuba River Citizens League; Nevada
City
Tulare County Audubon Society; Visalia
U.C. Davis Environmental Law Society
W. States Endurance Run; San Francisco
The Wilderness Society; San Francisco
Wintu Audubon Society; Redding
Yolano Group, Sierra Club; Davis

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.

agAccess
603 4th Street
Davis, CA 95616

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

John B. Frailing
Froba, Frailing, &
Rockwell
1025 15th Street
Modesto, CA 95354

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

David B. Kelley
Consulting Soil Scientist
216 F Street, #51
Davis, CA 95616

C.B. Maisel, C.P.A.
1331 B St.-Box 433
Hayward, CA 94543

The Naturalist
219 E Street
Davis, CA 95616

Robert Newcomb, MD, Inc.
502 S. Euclid Ave, #104
National City, CA 92050

Paul F. Nielson, M.D., Inc.
2323 16th St, Suite 400
Bakersfield, CA 93301

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

Robert J. Rajewski
P.O. Box 4137
Sonora, CA 95370

Recreational Equipment,
Inc.
1338 San Pablo Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94702
&
20640 Homestead Road
Cupertino, CA 95014
&
9 City Boulevard West
The City, Store #44
Orange, CA 92668

Ridge Builders Group
123 C Street
Davis, CA 95616

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

San Francisco Travel
Service
407 Jackson St., # 205
San Francisco, 94111

William P. Schaefer,
Ph.D., Consultant
Laboratory Design
Haz. Waste Mgmt.
3002 San Pasqual St.
Pasadena, CA 91107

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

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

Peter Vincent
Hurricane Wind
Sculptures
Allegheny Star Rt.
North San Juan, CA
95960

Chuch Watson,
Env. Consultant
1022 S Street
Sacramento, CA
95814

Bradlee S. Welton,
Attorney at Law
1721 Oregon Street
Berkeley, CA 94703

Wilderness Press
2440 Bancroft Way
Berkeley, CA 94704

Wildflower Farm
Native Plant Nursery
Delano, CA 93215

Yakima Products, Inc.
P.O. Drawer 4899
Arcata, CA 95521

Yes Electric
22 Claus Circle
Fairfax, CA 94930

Zoo-Ink Screen Print
2415 St, # 270
San Francisco, CA
94107

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

Creative Sound Recording
Michael W. Nolasco
6412 Cerromar Court
Orangevale, CA 95662

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

Donald B. Belkin
Law Offices
1823 Court Street
Redding, CA
96001

Echo, The Wilderness
Company
6529 Telegraph Avenue
Oakland, CA 94609

Gorman & Waltner
1419 Broadway, Ste. 419
Oakland, CA 94612

Kathy Blankenship
Photography
402 Lago Place
Davis, CA 95616

Fred A. Ennerson,
Consulting
P.O. Box 1359
Isla Vista, CA 93117

Hibbert Lumber Company
500 G Street
Davis, CA 95616

Join the Coalition

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

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

Annual Dues: † _____

Individual \$ 15.00
Low-income Individual \$ 7.50
Sustaining Individual \$ 25.00
Benefactor \$ 100.00
Patron \$ 500.00
Non-profit Organization \$ 30.00
Business Sponsor \$ 50.00

Mail to: † tax deductible

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

T-Shirt Orders

Design	Size(s, m, l, xl)	Color	Amount
1. conference design	comes in pale green (no med. or large), yellow, or peach (no med.)		
2. animal design	comes in beige or gray		

Subtotal \$ _____

Shipping \$ _____

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

TOTAL \$ _____