



# WILDERNESS RECORD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS COALITION

Vol. 9      2655 Portage Bay Ave., Suite 3      Davis, CA 95616      November - December 1984      No. 6

## National Forest Wilderness: Where Do We Go From Here?

By Steve Evans

"Saving that one last roadless area will be the toughest fight ever."

- Doug Scott  
Deputy Conservation Director  
Sierra Club

Triumphantly received and bitterly criticized, the California Wilderness Act was quietly signed into law last October by an abnormally silent President Reagan. A typical legislative compromise, the bill pleased no one completely. Development interests and resource exploiters blasted the Act as a "lock-up." The larger environmental organizations tut-tutted about the acreage compromised away to so-called "multiple uses" but were generally supportive. Some smaller conservation groups opposed the bill outright because of its "compromise upon compromise" nature, usually to the detriment of wilderness acreage.

But it's the law of the land now. So where do we, as wilderness activists, go from here?

For the purpose of limiting the scope and length of this treatise, let us disregard the millions of acres currently under wilderness study by the Bureau of Land Management and the tens of thousands of acres of potential State Wilderness areas. The issue of National Forest wilderness is far from resolved. Long a major issue of contention in National Forest planning and management efforts, the idea

of wilderness, and the willingness of the public to support it, guarantees its appearance in future Forest Service endeavors.

Wilderness was an important issue when National Forest multiple-use plans graduated to unit plans. Wilderness was the primary purpose of RARE I and RARE II. Now, with a tremendous boost provided by Congressional approval of the California Wilderness Act, wilderness will be the critical environmental focus in forest-wide land management plans due to be completed (at least in draft form) for each national forest in California by December 31, 1985.

The timber industry and the Forest Service will no doubt be chagrined to hear that wilderness absolutely refuses to disappear from the collective public mind. For environmental reasons as basic as preserving our public land as much as possible in a primitive state, we will insure that "wilderness" will remain as issue. Despite specific areas, dear to our hearts and minds, lost or compromised in the California Wilderness Act, we must accept that the bill is a good first step. But it is not the time for wilderness activists to beat



Siskiyou Wilderness

Photo by Mark Palmer

their pens into plowshares. We have a long way to go.

### A 1985 WILDERNESS PRIMER

The California Wilderness Act designated 39 new wilderness areas and additions to existing areas. Over 1.8 million acres of national forest land was protected as wilderness in the bill. In addition, the bill lists numerous roadless areas which are to remain in "further planning" status, their wilderness characteristics to be preserved until the Forest Service considers their potential for wilderness designation in the forest-wide land management plans. The bill also "releases" hundreds of roadless areas for multiple uses other than wilderness, such as logging and road build-

ing. Although a battle has been lost, the war concerning these "release" areas is far from over.

Forest-wide land management plans, or LMPs, are intended to allocate various regions of every national forest to the "best and highest use" or combination of uses. Wilderness can and should be a primary issue in this planning process since wilderness is a true multiple use. Wilderness provides excellent opportunities for primitive recreation, high quality wildlife habitat, and pristine watershed values. Wilderness also allows such consumptive uses as grazing and mining, with strict environmental controls. No other public land use pro-

Continued on Page 3

## Coalition Report

By Jim Eaton

There was some concern in the environmental community that with the passage of the California Wilderness Act many of our volunteers would decide it was about time to move on to other things.

Well, we shouldn't worry. The past few months I found people all around the state eagerly awaiting their next challenge.

In Quincy, Friends of Plumas Wilderness had just dedicated the Bucks Lake Wilderness, but they were in the thick of the Lassen forest plan and working to save the Chips Creek roadless area. Snow Mountain's supporters are now casting an eye on BLM's Cache Creek Wilderness Study Area.

Desert Wilderness activists are becoming better organized. At meetings in Bishop and Los Angeles, I was impressed with the optimism of conservationists

who know they have a long, long struggle ahead.

In the Bay Area, the Henry Coe Task Force continues to marshal support for a large state wilderness in our second largest state park. Members of the Wilderness Subcommittee for the Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club are adopting the Hoover Wilderness Additions.

We may not see a lot of legislation in 1985, but we will see a lot of action. And if you are looking for an issue that needs help, read our "Wilderness Primer" in this issue.

We would like to welcome Recreational Equipment, Inc. of Orange as our newest business sponsor. Two organizations have joined the Coalition's ranks: the Marin Audubon Society and the Environmental Protection Information Center in Garberville. Thanks!

## Readers' Opinion

Dear CWC:

I'm writing in response to the letter from D.P. Christenson which criticized your previous article "Fish Introductions Proposed for Klamath Forest." I found several parts of his letter disturbing. I've worked in wilderness areas and have seen the work of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) first-hand.

The problem with dams is that DFG continues to work on them in wilderness and roadless areas, often without serious regard for wilderness resources. I've witnessed extensive resource damage caused by DFG crews in wilderness areas. Don't get me wrong. I'm not only opposed to sloppy work, but I am adamantly opposed to raising and maintaining dams in wilderness areas to promote recreational fishing. Mr. Christenson states that someone should explore and evaluate justifications for repairing and/or raising a particular dam, "before raising an issue." Well if

we don't repeatedly raise these issues, there will never be any serious evaluation of DFG activities in wilderness.

Species diversity is a concept we all endear. However, introducing foreign species is not equivalent to preserving what we have, and I feel that it is against the concept of wilderness. Surely, the brook trout in question are not native, but neither are the goldens or arctic grayling DFG plans to replace them with. As far as I am concerned, leave the brook trout alone, and keep DFG out of the Klamath Forest wilderness and roadless areas!

Finally, he states that "the use of rotenone or antimycin at the levels prescribed to kill fish does not present any public health or environmental problem." If this statement was made in good faith, it only shows his ignorance on this topic. Many scientists question the increasing use of these poisons. I agree that they may be necessary

## Update

### Small Wilderness Proposed for Henry Coe

In November, the California Department of Parks and Recreation completed part of a draft general plan for Henry Coe State Park. Unfortunately for the many supporters of a large state wilderness park in the rugged Coast Range between San Jose and Merced, only a token wilderness acreage was proposed in this draft plan.

Only 12,900 acres in the northeastern section of the 67,000-acre park were recommended for wilderness classification. Conservationists have been asking for 60,000 acres of wilderness. The public will have an opportunity to comment in this plan in the spring.

-Ron Stork  
-Tehipite Ch., Sierra Club

## News Briefs

### EPA Acid Rain Study

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) wants to use helicopters to take water samples from lakes in wilderness areas as part of their national acid rain survey.

EPA wants helicopters because of the large number of lakes to be sampled and the need to take samples to a laboratory within 24

hours. The choppers would circle several times before landing on each lake; motors would remain running during the twenty minute sampling.

The agency reports that in California 57 wilderness lakes will be sampled. With the passage of the Calif. Wilderness Act, however, it appears that twice as many lakes may be in wilderness.

### 1985 Wilderness Conference

The California Wilderness Coalition is planning a statewide Wilderness Conference for October 11-14, 1985, in Visalia. The tentative schedule calls for registration and slide presentations on Friday evening, with the bulk of the conference occurring on

Saturday and Sunday. Field trips will be offered Sunday afternoon and Monday (the Columbus Day holiday for some people).

More details will be announced in the January-February Wilderness Record, but mark your calendar now!

### CWC Annual Meeting

The annual meeting of the California Wilderness Coalition will be held at 10:00 a.m. on February 1, 1985, at 2320 Goldberry Lane, Davis, California. The meeting will coincide with a regular

Board of Directors meeting. Agenda items include election of officers, membership expansion, current issues, fundraising activities, and the 1985 wilderness conference. Members are welcome.

to save the Kern River golden trout, but I disagree with the increasing use of these chemicals to "promote species diversity" in wildland areas.

I appreciate the Wilderness Record keeping us informed about DFG plans to manipulate wildlands. Keep up the good work!

Tom Suk  
Davis

#### Notice to Readers

The Wilderness Record encourages reader response and comment. We hope you will feel free to express yourself concerning wilderness issues of interest to you or in response to articles and opinions appearing in the Record. The Editor reserves the right to condense or edit any letter received.

# A 1985 Wilderness Primer


Continued from Page 1

vides so much for so many. The 1976 National Forest Management Act (NFMA) set the stage for the current LMP process. Details of this process have been developed through the promulgation of Forest Service regulations and regional planning directives. Congress has taken a keen interest in this process, as seen by the "further planning" studies required by the California Wilderness Act. As a member of the general public, you have one advantage over the politicians, computer programmers, foresters, and special

interest lobbyists that are directing the complex planning effort mandated by NFMA. It is that the law requires frequent and sincere federal efforts encouraging public participation. The preservation of further wilderness areas in California requires your participation in the LMP process.

## Further Planning Areas

The California Wilderness Act set aside 65 roadless areas, compromising over 1.8 million acres in "further planning" status (see Table I). The bill provides no further direction concerning



these areas, but it does show a basic congressional intent to preserve the "wilderness option" for these 65 areas until the Forest Service makes a recommendation through the LMP process as to their potential for wilderness designation.

Considering the current political climate of the Reagan Administration, it is unlikely that the Forest Service will recommend any of these "further planning" areas for wilderness designation. This is in spite of the fact that the further planning status for these areas originally was conveyed by the Forest Service in RARE II. It is evident throughout the LMP development process that the Forest Service intends to maximize the exploitation of commodity resources. The more timber, minerals, range, and water extracted from the public lands, the greater the revenues that are deposited in the National Treasury -- a key Reagan Administration goal. Unfortunately, maximum commodity outputs result in the destruction of the natural environment by the widespread deterioration in recreation quality, wildlife habitat, biological diversity, and water quality. For all practical purposes, such results are permanent when carried out on the scale envisioned by the Reagan Administration.

The 65 further planning roadless areas will be the first line of defense in public efforts to preserve wilderness through the LMP process. Forest Service Region 5 (California) direction requires consideration of unique wilderness characteristics and features, rec-

reation and ecosystem values, and public involvement. Despite the apparent intent of the Forest Service to process further planning areas as quickly as possible into the "release for non-Wilderness multiple use" category, wilderness activists are provided an invaluable opportunity to generate widespread public support for these further planning additions to the wilderness system.

In addition to the further planning areas, the Act also designated three special planning areas (see Table II). Past congressional "planning areas" required lengthy studies by the Forest Service and an

## Table II Special Planning Areas

Roadless areas designated as Planning Areas by the California Wilderness Act (Sec. 102 (a)) that may be studied for potential wilderness designation in the forest planning process.

NATIONAL FOREST	ACREAGE
SAN BERNARDINO Pyramid Peak Planning Area	17,000
STANISLAUS AND TOIYABE Carson-Iceberg Planning Area	30,000
TOIYABE Hoover Wilderness Additions	49,200

independent EIS process. It is unclear at this time whether the Forest Service can incorporate the congressionally mandated planning effort for these three special areas into the LMP process. If not, then wilderness activists are provided with another opportunity to extend wilderness protection.

Continued on Page 4

## Table I Further Planning Areas

Roadless areas remaining under Further Planning to be studied for possible wilderness designation in the forest planning process, according to the California Wilderness Act (Sec. 111 (d) 3).

NATIONAL FOREST	MAP #	PD	ACREAGE	NATIONAL FOREST	MAP #	PD	ACREAGE
ANGELES				Garcia Mountain	5107	FP	25,200
Arroyo Seco	5012	FP	5,000	Black Mountain	5108	FP	16,300
Sespe-Frazier	5270	FP	15,200	La Panza	5109	FP	5,500
Subtotal	2		20,200	Machesna Mtn.	5110	FP	31,700
CLEVELAND				Los Machos	5111	FP	11,700
Caliente	5017	FP	5,900	Big Rocks	5112	FP	11,900
Sill Hill	5304	FP	5,200	Stanley Mtn.	5113	FP	15,900
Subtotal	2		11,100	Horseshoe Spr.	5115	FP	13,300
ELDORADO				La Brea	5117	FP	61,100
Caples Creek	5027	FP	17,900	Diablo	5127	FP	19,200
Subtotal	1		17,900	Matilija	5129	FP	32,000
INYO				Dry Lakes	5131	FP	16,600
Boundary Peak	B5058	W	66,200	Sawmill Badlands	5134	FP	90,000
White Mtns. A.	A5058	FP	155,800	Antimony	5136	FP	39,500
Mazourka	A5064	FP	82,200	Quatal	5268	FP	6,900
Palute	B5064	FP	138,100	Little Pine	5278	FP	1,000
Coyote S.E.	5033	FP	53,800	Subtotal	20		773,000
Table Mountain	5035	FP	4,500	MENDOCINO	none		
Buttermilk	5038	FP	1,000	MODOC	none		
Wheeler Ridge	5040	FP	16,300	PLUMAS	none		
Laurel-McGee	5045	FP	5,700	SAN BERNARDINO			
Horse Meadow	5049	FP	5,700	Cucamonga B	B5174	FP	14,900
Tioga Lake	5050	FP	800	Cucamonga C	C5174	FP	4,000
Hall Natural Ar.	5051	FP	5,700	Sugarloaf	5186	FP	8,800
Log Cabin Sadlbg.	5052	FP	14,700	Raywood B	B5187	FP	18,615
Benton Range	5056	FP	11,400	Subtotal	4		46,315
Blanco Mtn.	5059	FP	17,400	SEQUOIA			
Birch Creek	5060	FP	28,500	Oat Mountain	5197	FP	12,400
Black Canyon	5061	FP	30,700	Kings River	B5198	FP	24,300
Andrews Mtn.	5063	FP	11,800	Dennison Pk.	5202	FP	6,700
Subtotal	18		650,300	Moses	5203	FP	24,359
KLAMATH	none			Scodries	5212	FP	48,000
LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT				Cypress	RARE I	FP	1,949
Freel	5271	FP	15,600	Subtotal	6		117,708
Subtotal	1		15,600	SHASTA-TRINITY			
LASSEN				Mt. Eddy	5229	FP	9,600
Heart Lake	5096	FP	9,900	Subtotal	1		9,600
Wild Cattle Mtn.	5093	FP	5,100	SIERRA			
Trail Lake	B5095	FP	1,300	Kings River	B5198	FP	24,368
Ishi	B5098	FP	20,100	Subtotal	1		24,368
Mill Creek	5284	FP	9,800	SIX RIVERS	none		
Butt Mountain	5100	FP	8,600	STANISLAUS			
Subtotal	6		54,800	Carson-Iceberg	B5986	FP	10,000
LOS PADRES				Subtotal	1		10,000
Sespe-Frazier	5002	FP	320,700	TAHOE	none		
Black Butte	5102	FP	20,500	TOIYABE			
Bear Mountain	5103	FP	21,400	Sweetwater	4657	FP	59,980
Bear Canyon	5104	FP	12,600	Hoover Extension	E4662	FP	55,241
Map # = RARE II Number				Subtotal	2		115,221
PD = Planning Designation				TOTAL	65		1,866,112
FP = Further Planning							
W = Wilderness							

# Protection for Released Areas

# A 1985 Wilderness

Continued from Page 3  
It may appear that congressional approval for the "release" of 241 roadless areas to "multiple uses other than wilderness" in

the California Wilderness Act (see Table III) permanently assures that over 3.1 million acres in this state will never achieve wilderness protection. Not neces-

sarily. For example:  
1) Many areas will remain de facto wilderness simply because they have no commodities worth exploiting and/or because they are too

inaccessible and too expensive to exploit;  
2) Many areas still enjoy widespread public and congressional support for protection and nothing in

## Table III "Released" Areas

Roadless areas released to non-wilderness uses by the California Wilderness Act (Sec. 111) but can be allocated for such non-exploitative uses as primitive recreation, wildlife, and watershed in the current forest planning process and may be re-reviewed for possible wilderness designation in the next planning cycle (10-15 years from now if remaining roadless).

NATIONAL FOREST	MAP #	PD	ACREAGE	NATIONAL FOREST	MAP #	PD	ACREAGE
<b>ANGELES</b>							
Salt Creek	5003	NW	11,700	Shackleford	5078	†	NA
Fish Canyon	5004	NW	32,900	Mt. Hoffman	5066	NW	500
Tule	5005	NW	10,300	Tom Martin	5069	NW	9,400
Magic Mountain	5006	NW	15,500	Box Camp	5071	NW	900
Red Mountain	5007	NW	8,600	Muse	5072	NW	200
Strawberry Peak	5009	NW	7,900	Boulder	5073	NW	500
Sheep Mountain	5307	†	16,500	Black	5080	NW	8,200
West Fork	5270	NW	4,000	Russian	5081	†	22,400
San Gabriel Add.	5267	NW	4,200	Johnson	5068	NW	9,300
San Dimas	5001	NW	6,100	Cub	5272	NW	200
Pleasant View	5008	FP	26,700	Flem	5273	NW	200
Subtotal	11		144,400	Jacobs	5274	NW	500
<b>CLEVELAND</b>							
Cutca Valley	RARE I	NW	8,000	Ten Bear	NA	NW	22,400
Barker Valley	RARE I	NW	6,500	Siskiyou A/B	B5701	†	NA
Sawtooth Mtns.	New		1,600	Kangaroo	5703	NW	40,500
Eagle Peak	5019	NW	6,800	Kelsey	B5070	NW	3,000
No Name	5020	NW	5,200	Indian Creek	5702	NW	6,200
Coldwater	5011	NW	9,000	Condrey Mtn.	5704	FP*	3,100
Trabuco-Hot Spr.	5013	NW	23,500	Subtotal	24		NA
Wildhorse	5014	NW	10,800	<b>LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT</b>			
Ladd	5010	NW	5,700	Granite Chief	B5621	NW	1,243
Subtotal	9		77,100	Dardanelles	A/B5982	FP*	14,500
<b>ELDORADO</b>							
Salt Spring	B5024	NW	1,200	Pyramid	5023	FP*	8,400
Poison Hole	5025	NW	1,700	Subtotal	3		24,143
Fawn Lake	5028	NW	1,100	<b>LASSEN</b>			
Pyramid	5023	FP*	24,300	Cinder Butte	5090	**	16,000
Rubicon	5026	FP*	5,100	Cub Creek	5094	NW	9,100
Dardanelles	5982	FP*	8,000	Cypress	5088	**	3,528
Tragedy-Elephants	5984	†	NA	Devil's Garden	5087	**	3,500
Raymond Peak	5985	†	NA	Lava	5084	NW	8,479
Subtotal	8		NA	Mayfield	5085	NW	17,292
<b>INYO</b>							
South Sierra	5029	†	NA	Mt. Harkness	5092	**	300
Wanoga Peak	5030	**	11,380	Prospect	5086	**	4,200
Independence Cr.	5031	**	14,700	Timbered Crater	5083	**	4,400
Tinemaha	5032	**	29,380	Lost Creek	5089	FP*	8,300
Coyote North	5034	NW	11,500	Polk Springs	5097	FP*	9,400
North Lake	5036	**	3,100	Chips Creek	5099	FP*	31,100
Horton Creek	5039	NW	7,800	Subtotal	12		115,599
Nessie	5204	**	1,500	<b>LOS PADRES</b>			
Rock Creek West	5042	**	3,040	Chalk Peak	5105	NW	7,100
Whiskey Creek	5043	**	1,210	Silver Peak	5106	NW	15,500
Nevahbe	5044	**	650	Santa Cruz	5121	NW	21,200
Sherwin	5046	NW	3,800	Condor Point	5122	NW	17,200
San Joaquin	B5047	†	NA	Camuesa	5123	NW	7,200
Grant Lake	5048	NW	2,500	Malduce-Buck B	B5124	†	14,000
Mt. Olsen	5988	NW	2,800	Mono	5125	NW	29,200
Mono Craters	5288	NW	6,900	Juncal	5128	NW	11,500
Dexter Canyon	5053	NW	18,100	White Ledge	5130	NW	18,700
Glass Mountain	5054	NW	59,200	Nordhoff	5132	NW	12,000
Watterson	5055	NW	7,700	De La Guerra	5279	NW	5,700
Deep Wells	5057	**	10,800	Tequippis	5263	NW	8,700
Excelsior	5989	**	47,300	Machesna Mountain	5110	†	NA
Soldier Canyon	5062	NW	38,400	Miranda Pine	5114	FP*	12,800
Subtotal	22		NA	Tepusquet Pk.	5116	FP*	5,400
<b>KLAMATH</b>							
Snoozer	B5077	NW	22,100	Spoor Canyon	5118	FP*	12,300
Callahan Flow	5065	NW	2,000	Fox Mountain	5120	FP*	51,300
Orleans Mtn.	A-C5079	†	NA	Cuyama	5135	FP*	19,000
Grider	5067	NW	11,000	Subtotal	18		NA
Portuguese	A/B5074	†	NA	<b>MENDOCINO</b>			
Crapo	5076	NW	1,500	Thomes Creek	5139	NW	17,280

RARE = Roadless Area Review and Evaluation  
Map # = RARE II Number  
PD = Planning Designation  
NW = Non-Wilderness  
FP = Further Planning  
W = Wilderness  
\* = released by Sec. 111 of the California Wilderness Act  
† = portion of roadless area not designated wilderness by Sec. 101 of the California Wilderness Act.

NATIONAL FOREST	MAP #	PD	ACREAGE	NATIONAL FOREST	MAP #	PD	ACREAGE
Reister Canyon	5143	NW	6,331	East Beegum	5225	NW	8,600
Snow Mountain	B5144	†	15,500	East Girard	5227	NW	43,758
Wilderness Contig	5137	†	NA	Kettle Mountain	5230	NW	9,300
Elk Creek	5140	FP*	18,900	Little French C	C5228	†	NA
Black Butte	5269	FP*	17,800	Orleans Mtn.	F/N5079	†	NA
Big Butte-Shinbone	5145	†	NA	Panther	5232	NW	12,700
Subtotal	12		NA	Pattison	5233	NW	29,866
<b>MODOC</b>							
Callahan Flow	5065	NW	6,000	Penney Ridge	5234	NW	5,400
Mr. Hoffman	5066	NW	10,350	Salt Gulch	5286	NW	6,524
Knox	5146	NW	5,900	Slate Creek	5235	NW	7,039
Sears Flat	5147	NW	12,500	South Fork	5236	NW	17,783
Lavas	5148	NW	25,400	Wells Mountain	5133	NW	9,237
Damon Butte	5149	NW	24,700	West Beegum	5239	NW	5,300
Dobie Flat	5150	NW	12,900	West Girard	5238	NW	41,150
Burnt Lava Flow	5151	NW	8,500	Chanchelulla	5220	†	NA
Hat Mountain	5152	NW	9,900	East Fork	5226	FP*	6,200
Mount Vida	5153	NW	9,100	Subtotal	25		NA
Soldier	5155	NW	9,400	<b>SIERRA</b>			
Powley	5156	NW	6,200	Ferguson	5240	NW	6,100
Bear Camp Flat	5154	NW	2,300	Devil Gulch	5241	NW	30,300
Parsnip	5162	NW	8,200	Shuteye	5243	NW	7,700
Dry	5163	NW	7,100	Sycamore Spring	5246	NW	8,900
Steele Swamp	5165	NW	20,000	San Joaquin B	B5047	†	NA
Big Canyon	5166	NW	6,400	Mt. Raymond	5242	FP*	6,700
Crane Mountain	5705	NW	2,400	Dinkey Lakes	5244	†	NA
Mt. Bidwell	5706	NW	11,760	Rancheria	C5198	†	NA
Subtotal	19		199,010	Subtotal	8		NA
<b>PLUMAS</b>							
Chips Creek	5099	FP*	13,900	Siskiyou	B6701	†	NA
Middle Fork	5167	FP*	29,300	Subtotal	1		NA
Bald Rock	5169	FP*	3,850	<b>SIX RIVERS</b>			
Grizzly Peak	5170	NW	6,700	Blue Creek	RARE I	†	NA
Adams Peak	5171	NW	5,500	Board Camp	5308	NW	5,000
West Yuba	5172	FP*	6,000	Cow Creek	5222	NW	1,310
Lakes Basin	RARE I	NW	9,349	Kelly	5247	NW	5,500
Dixon Creek	MUP	NW	5,000	Monkey	5248	NW	8,900
Subtotal	8		79,599	Mt. Lassic	5309	NW	6,800
<b>ROGUE RIVER</b>							
Kangaroo	6703	†	8,022	Packsaddle	5708	NW	3,630
Condrey Mountain	6704	FP*	11,216	Pilot Creek	5310	NW	10,210
Subtotal	2		19,238	Red Cap Add.	RARE I	NW	NA
<b>SAN BERNADINO</b>							
Sheep Mountain	5307	†	NA	Salt Creek	5252	NW	9,420
Circle Mountain	5176	NW	6,600	Ship Mtn.	RARE I	NW	15,400
Cajon	5177	NW	7,500	Siskiyou B	B5701	†	NA
San Sevaine	5175	NW	8,000	Slide Creek	RARE I	NW	11,760
City Creek	5183	NW	10,900	Soldier	5251	NW	14,940
Deep Creek	5178	NW	23,400	S Kalmiopsis	5709	NW	280
Granite Peak	5180	NW	11,700	Underwood	5237	NW	9,930
Heartbreak Ridge	5303	NW	6,200	Orleans B & C	5709	†	NA
Crystal Creek	5182	NW	7,500	North Fork Smith	5707	FP*	39,400
Mill Peak	5181	NW	9,500	Subtotal	17		NA
Pyramid B	B5189	NW	8,800	<b>STANISLAUS</b>			
Horse Creek	5196	NW	10,100	Mt. Reba	5255	†	4,600
Hixon Flat	5302	NW	7,300	North Mtn.	5256	NW	8,100
Cahuilla	5194	NW	7,100	Trumbull Pk.	5257	NW	6,500
Rouse Hill	5195	NW	13,700	Cherry Lake	5810	NW	1,100
Cactus B	B5188	†	NA	Bell Meadow	5812	NW	4,400
Subtotal	16		NA	Water House	5813	NW	16,000
<b>SEQUOIA</b>							
Staff	B5213	NW	44,300	Dome	5814	NW	14,900
Black Mountain	5204	NW	15,800	Night	5815	NW	3,100
Slate Mountain	5205	NW	13,100	Carson-Iceberg	A/B/C5986	†	NA
Cannell	5209	NW	47,300	Tuolumne River	5258	FP*	18,200
South Sierra	5029	†	NA	Raymond Peak	5985	†	NA
Rincon	5208	NW	59,700	Subtotal	12		NA
Chico	5210	NW	43,700	<b>TAHOE</b>			
Mill	5214	NW	29,900	Bald Mtn.	5981	NW	6,453
Lyon Ridge	5211	NW	5,200	Duncan Cryn.	5259	NW	9,403
Greenhorn Creek	5215	NW	29,600	Grouse Lakes	5260	NW	21,100
Agnew	5199	FP*	18,200	N.F./M.F. American	5265	NW	11,900
Kings Canyon	RARE I	*	3,200	Castle Peak	NA	NW	18,000
Woodpecker	5206	†	NA	Lakes (Basin)	NA	NW	551
Domeland Adds.	5207	†	3,100	Granite Chief	A5261	†	10,200
Subtotal	14		NA	West Yuba	5172	FP*	14,900
<b>SHASTA-TRINITY</b>							
Backbone	5216	NW	14,700	East Yuba	5264	FP*	17,900
Bell-Quimby B	B5218	†	NA	North Fork Amer.	5262	FP*	49,100
Bonanza King	5217	NW	20,136	Subtotal	10		159,507
Castle Crags A	5219	†	NA	<b>TOIYABE</b>			
Chinquapin	5221	NW	22,454	Bald Mtn.	4981	NW	960
Cow Creek	5222	NW	23,963	Carson-Iceberg	4986	†	NA
Devils Rock	5223	NW	17,516	Wildhorse	4656	NW	24,260
Dog Creek	5224	NW	5,899	Devils Gate	4658	NW	8,640
Eagle	5300	NW	7,373	Long	4660	NW	3,870

# Primer

## Wild and Scenic River Corridors

the release provisions of the California Wilderness Act prevents the Forest Service from allocating these areas to non-exploitive, non-consumptive uses such as wildlife habitat, primitive recreation, etc., in the LMP process; and

3) The release provision in the Act allows for reconsideration of a released roadless area's potential for wilderness designation in the next LMP planning cycle, some 10-15 years from 1985, provided that 5,000 acres or more of the area still remains roadless.

Many roadless areas released by the Act will no doubt be irrecoverably lost for future wilderness consideration. But these losses can be fought by pushing for administrative allocations that protect visual quality, primitive recreation values, wildlife habitat and critical watersheds.

In Region 5, the Forest Service is utilizing an evaluation system called the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) to allocate specific forest areas for recreational uses. ROS designations include Primitive (congressionally designated wilderness), Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (*de facto* wilderness or administrative "backcountry"), Semi-Primitive Motorized (open to off-road vehicles), Roaded Natural, Rural, and Urban. Not surprisingly, a major portion of all national forests will fall under the Roaded Natural designation, if clear-cut areas can be regarded as such.

Many roadless areas as small as 5,000 acres can be administratively protected in a *de facto* wilderness state under the Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized designation.

Since ROS originally was intended as an evaluation process, it is sadly lacking as a management allocation system. Most notably, ROS utilizes an ill-devised buffer system that depends on Forest Service sincerity in the maintenance of Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized con-

A bright spot in the California Wilderness Act was the inclusion of the Tuolumne River in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Wild River designation prevents the construction of dams, limits nearby development, and preserves the free-flowing nature of the streams. Forest Service guidelines for Wild River management generally provide *de facto* wilderness status to the inner canyons of designated Wild Rivers.

In 1982, the National Park Service completed a Nationwide Rivers Inventory. The Inventory was intended to provide baseline data on significant free-flowing rivers, to assist in the conservation of such rivers, and to identify potential candidates to "round out" the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Several rivers in California were included in the inventory.

Region 5 LMP direction for California's national forests requires that "rivers identified in the Nationwide Rivers Inventory must be assessed for their suitability for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System." The Inventory includes 33 river segments in the national forests in California (see Table IV). This direction provides an unparalleled opportunity for wilderness activists to support the



conditions. Nevertheless, ROS provides a critical tool for the preservation of previously released roadless areas and a rallying point for the public that may have assumed that these areas have been permanently lost to development due to the California Wilderness Act.

designation of several hundred miles of free-flowing rivers and their canyons as National Wild and Scenic Rivers. Wild River designations also provide an opportunity to develop coalitions with such user groups as anglers and rafters as well as providing a unique alternative to rally public support.

The directive also states that "in cases where a seg-

ment of a designated river ... extends into or across a designated or proposed wilderness, favor the dual designations of the river corridor as both wilderness and a wild and scenic river." Since the Wilderness Act contains a loophole allowing Presidential approval of water projects within designated wilderness areas, this will provide double protection.

### Table IV Wild River Segments

Nationwide river inventory segments to be studied for possible national wild and scenic river designation according to Region 5 land management planning direction (DI-6).

<b>ELDORADO</b> Consumnes River North and Middle Forks Mokelumne River North Fork Rubicon River (also Tahoe Forest)	<b>SIERRA</b> Kings River Middle and South Forks San Joaquin River Main, North, Middle & South Forks
<b>KLAMATH</b> Salmon River North and South Forks * Woolley Creek *	<b>SIX RIVERS</b> Van Duzen River * Smith River North, Middle, and South Forks * plus 35 tributaries *
<b>LASSEN</b> Deer Creek Mill Creek	<b>STANISLAUS</b> Carson River East Fork (also Toiyabe Forest) Clavey River Merced River Main and South Forks Stanislaus River North Fork Tuolumne River South Fork
<b>LOS PADRES</b> Big Sur River Piru Creek Sespe Creek Sisquoc River	<b>TAHOE</b> Rubicon River (also Eldorado Forest) Yuba River Middle and South Forks
<b>SEQUOIA</b> Kern River South Fork	<b>TOIYABE</b> Carson River East Fork (also Stanislaus For.) West Walker River
<b>SHASTA TRINITY</b> New River * McCloud River Trinity River North and South Forks *	

\* Segments not designated Wild and Scenic under the Andrus Decision

### How to Get Involved

1) Get on the "public involvement" mailing list for the national forest(s) of your choice.

2) Read "A Conservationists Guide to National Forest Planning" [\$1.00 from the California Wilderness Coalition, 2655 Portage Bay Avenue, Suite 3, Davis, California 95616

3) Provide area and resource specific comments to the Forest Service. Monitor the LMP plan development. Meet with the planning team and review maps, outputs and other information.

4) Build coalitions with important user groups such as hunters, anglers, recrea-

tion clubs, etc. As your friends and fellow hikers to get involved.

5) Hike the threatened areas. Check boundaries, document resources, and build a coalition of recreationists who wish to protect the area.

6) Send a certified letter to the Forest Supervisor and national forest of your choice requesting immediate notification of any development plans for released roadless areas.

7) Join the California Wilderness Coalition's Adopt-a-Wilderness program and receive information of threatened areas and what you can do to help.

# Wilderness Wildlife

## A Plan For Old-Growth

By Dennis Coules



A review of *The Fragmented Forest* by Larry D. Harris (University of Chicago Press, 1984, 211 pp.)

Old-growth forests throughout Western North America are being reduced to mere fragments of their former dominance over vast landscapes. Associated with old-growth forests are many resident wildlife species for which old-growth provides primary habitat. In addition, numerous wide-ranging species need expanses of wildlands for survival.

*The Fragmented Forest* is based on the premise that our scattered system of relatively large isolated national parks and protected wilderness areas will not be enough to preserve viable populations of our native wildlife. Harris proposes that a system of numerous old-growth "islands" of various sizes, connected by riparian strips and located systematically throughout the managed forest, should be established on national forest lands. Harris views this proposal as a "extensive" approach to wildlife conservation which must be developed to complement the current "intensive" approach of national parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas. These old-growth habitat "islands" could be placed in strategic locations relative to wilderness areas and national parks, giving the overall system a much better chance of conserving wildlife species and populations.

National forest lands in the West already are assuming the form of isolated stands of old-growth surrounded by clear-cuts and second-growth forest. As Harris puts it, "an [old-growth] island system chosen by design will be superior to one inherited by default." Harris' old-

growth system represents a synthesis of the ecological theory of island biogeography, wildlife biology, and forest management. Although chiefly based on research and data from the Cascades of Oregon and Washington, the principles involved are applicable to planning for old-growth forests and other increasingly isolated natural habitats everywhere.

### Island Biogeography and the National Forests

Island biogeography theory derived from the observation that larger islands generally support more species of plants and animals than smaller ones. In many cases, a tenfold increase in area corresponds to a doubling of the number of species present. An island of a given area has an equilibrium number of species that it will ultimately support. The rate at which this equilibrium is reached depends on such factors as distance from a source of colonists, extinction rates on the island, and time since island formation. The degree of island isolation works in concert with size to determine rates of species loss because local extinctions may be balanced only by immigration.

Land bridge islands that were once connected to the mainland but later separated by rising sea levels are analogous to wildlife preserves or wilderness areas that are set aside while the surrounding area is altered. Such islands or reserves are at first "supersaturated," containing more species than the area can support at equilibrium. Land bridge islands that were separated from continents about 10,000

years ago, at the end of the last ice age, include many of the East Indies, Trinidad, and Britain. These islands now contain far fewer species than were originally present. The percentage of species remaining has been shown to be directly proportional to the size of the island in many studies comparing the fauna of these islands to that of the continents to which they were attached.

There is good evidence for the applicability of island biogeography theory to habitat "islands" of isolated forest preserves. One such example is Mount Rainier National Park. In 1920, fifty species of mammals were present in the park. This was reduced to forty-nine by 1935 and only thirty-seven by 1976, a loss of 26% of the original mammal fauna in only 60 years.

As is true for oceanic islands, the rate of species loss in an isolated habitat is inversely related to the size of the habitat patch. Comparing twenty-four semi-isolated mountain ranges of the Northern Rockies, the smallest range (11 square miles) has lost 50% of the large mammal species originally present since settlement and development of surrounding areas. In comparison, the largest ranges (up to 4,480 square miles) have lost as few as 4% of the species originally present.

### An Old-Growth Island System

Recent patterns of logging, road-building, and other development in the national forests make island biogeography theory ever more applicable to the landscape. For example, as lit-

tle as 25% of the national forest of the Western Cascades remains as old-growth, with only 3.3% remaining in Siuslaw National Forest. The accessible low-elevation forests have been reduced by an even greater proportion. More and more, the pattern is becoming one of isolated stands of old-growth surrounded by a sea of clear-cuts and regeneration growth.

At least forty to forty-five species of vertebrates in the Western Cascades depend on old-growth as primary habitat and cannot meet their requirements outside this forest type. Furthermore, about twice as many "rare" species occur in old-growth as in cut-over areas. Lower elevation sites provide primary habitat for several times more species than higher elevation sites.

Harris' specific proposal for maintenance of old-growth habitats in national forests involves an inter-rotation series of long-rotation management units. Each of these units consists of an old-growth core area and a buffer zone of several surrounding stands that are cut on a 320-year rotation. This assumes that it takes 240 years for an old-growth ecosystem to develop and allows an additional 80 years for each stand to function as such.

These long-rotation management units would serve to complement the present system of parks and wilderness areas, which would function as source areas for immigrant species. Each individual old-growth stand also would work to maintain locally-adapted ecotypes of species dependent on old-growth.

To best provide for wildlife travel corridors and gene flow between old-growth stands, the management units would be situated along protected riparian strips. A large number of small, old-growth "islands" would be used to link together larger, old-growth "islands" at lower elevations and the existing wilderness areas that tend to be at higher elevations (see figure).

In choosing individual old-growth stands for protection, Harris recommends that the following characteristics be given top priority:

- (1) Moist sites containing surface water (for long-term protection from fire);
- (2) A topographic bench and

a riparian strip dominated by hardwoods and connected with at least one other stand;

(3) Lower elevation (there is greater species richness at lower elevations; also, lower elevation forests have been the most over-exploited);

(4) A north or east aspect (for fire protection), but ideally extending over a ridge top so that the ridge system could be used as a dispersal route;

(5) Remoteness from human traffic and resultant fire danger;

(6) Presence of surrounding replacement stands that can serve as buffer areas;

(7) A minimum viable size for an old-growth preserve

of about 125 acres if it is substantially surrounded by mature timber, but ten times this amount if surrounded by clear-cuts; and

(8) Stands with unique individual characteristics, such as endemic species.

To sum up, Harris' "integrated system of larger preserves and lower-elevation old-growth islands must serve in place of the original 'continent' of continuous boreal habitat and attendant species."

#### Can It Work?

To date, the major controversy in applying island biogeography theory to conservation has been whether a few large preserves will maintain more species than many smaller preserves. Given the large territories required by many wide-ranging carnivores, the most convincing arguments have favored preserves of the largest possible size.

Harris side-steps this question by saying that future additions to the system of parks and wilderness areas are not likely to be larger than those already protected, and that even our largest parks cannot preserve species in isolation that once had virtually an entire continent to range over. With this political and biological reality, his proposal for an extensive system to interconnect wilderness, parks, and smaller habitat patches is worth consideration.

However, this view overlooks the argument that extinction will be a much more important factor than immigration in the early stages of approaching equi-


librium from supersaturation, which current ecological theory supports. Can we count on immigration rates within this proposed system to be great enough to counterbalance the trend toward extinction on a local or regional scale? Clearly this will depend on the biology of the individual species involved.

Although Harris does well in showing how to superimpose his system on actual landscapes, a more detailed analysis of the dynamics of specific wildlife populations and how well they might adapt to this patchy habitat arrangement would be helpful. A discussion of minimum viable population sizes for the more sedentary species in relation to the recommended sizes of old-growth "islands" also would be useful.

As Harris points out, "if it were possible to manage the entire forest landscape in a very low-intensity, long-rotation manner, there would be little if any need for special provision areas." But given the U.S. Forest Service's accelerating liquidation of old-growth habitats, a system such as Harris proposes for non-legislatively protected areas may be all we can hope for, if the Forest Service can be convinced to set aside even this small amount.

#### Further Reading

The Fragmented Forest is available from the University of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637 for \$11.95 postpaid (paperback). Order ISBN #317641.



A possible spatial and size-frequency distribution of different-sized old-growth islands along riparian strips at progressively greater distances from a present wilderness area in the Willamette National Forest.

## California Wilderness Coalition

### Editor

Jim Eaton

### Contributors

Dennis Coules  
Jim Eaton  
Steve Evans  
Ron Stork

### Graphics

Marcia Cary  
Mark Palmer

Wendy Cohen  
Jim Eaton  
Fred Gunsky  
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.

