



University of Idaho

Inter-Office Memorandum

To FWR Faculty

From F.L. Newby

Subject Special Visitors to the College

Date 2/3/75

Please note the guest speakers and their scheduled speaking dates outlined on the attached Course Outline. If you would like to avail yourselves of any of these experts for classes, seminars or individual discussion, please contact myself or Richard Walker concerning coordinative and availability. Please allow us sufficient time to contact the guest speaker for confirmation.

Thank you,

Floyd L. Newby

WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT

Course Outline - Discussion Leaders

Instructor: Richard I. Walker

Classified Wilderness

- Jan 21
1. Perspective overview of Wilderness Act.
 2. Course overview; student biographies and expectations.
 3. Brief discussion of Instructor expectations, term paper, and student participation.

Jan 28 William J. Holman, Division of Natural Resources, Special Areas Region 1, USFS. Missoula, Montana.
TOPIC: Classification and reclassification of Federal lands as Wilderness, Roadless Areas evaluation and Wilderness candidate areas studies.

Feb 4 Dr. James R. Fazio, Assistant Professor, Wildland Recreation Program College of Forestry, University of Idaho
TOPIC: A mandatory permit system and interpretation program for backcountry user control in Rocky Mountain Nat'l Park.

Various pre-visitation interpretative methods were tested for effectiveness in increasing the backcountry visitors' knowledge of wilderness and minimizing their resource impact.

Feb 11 Dr. George H. Stankey; Research Social Scientist, Wilderness Management Research, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Missoula Montana.
TOPIC: The concept of Wilderness' recreation carrying capacity; conflicting user groups' perception towards managerial actions, use rationing based on social and biological limitations -- brief coverage of research methodology utilized in this study and future priority research needs.

Feb 18 Dr. James M. Peek, Associate Professor, Wildlife Resources Department, College of Forestry, University of Idaho
TOPIC: Problems and trends in wildlife management in "Wilderness" and National Parks.

Feb 25 Mr. Jack Dollan, Wilderness, Range, Wildlife and Studies (Bob Marshall Wilderness) Spotted Bear Ranger District, Hungry Horse, Montana.
TOPIC: Wilderness management; conflicting interpretations of administrative policy between agency and the various user groups, with emphasis on the recently implemented Bob Marshall Wilderness Management Plan. -- as time permits -- The Wilderness Manager and the political climate.

- Mar 4 Allen S. Defler, District Ranger, Moose Creek District (Selway Bitterroot Wilderness) Grangeville, Idaho.
TOPIC: Development of an Administrative Wilderness Area Management Plan -- the problems and opportunities pertaining to public involvement, Ranger District (7) and National Forest (4) coordination, and the preparation needed to formulate the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness Management Plan. Priority management directions in the proposed plan and how they are to be implemented (as time permits).
- Mar 11 David F. Aldrich, R.D.&A., NFS Coordinator, Northern Forest Fire Lab, USFS, Missoula, Montana.
TOPIC: Wilderness Fire Management -- A model plan for Wilderness Ecosystems. The White Cap Fire Management Study, the implementation of a concept by Forest Service Research and Administration (R.D.&A.). The reintroduction of natural wildlife on Federal Agency Lands (a historical perspective) and the variances between NPS and USFS inventory and management plan methodologies.
- Mar 25 Mrs. Rita P. Thompson, Forester, Bitterroot National Forest, Hamilton, Montana.
TOPIC: Environmental Impact Statement preparation -- discussion will include procedures, format, administrative problems (district/forest coordination) and management opportunities. The "draft copy" of the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness Fire Management Environmental Impact Statement will be the discussion topic.
- Apr 1 Dr. Robert C. Lucas, Project Leader, Wilderness Research, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Missoula, Montana.
TOPIC: Forest Service Wilderness Research in the Rockies and the BWCIA. What are the user group/management similarities and dis-similarities between these two areas and what are the management implications relative to Biological/Sociological carrying capacity, opportunities for solitude, wilderness user limitation and distribution.
- Apr 8 Harry B. Young, Minerals Management Assistant, Sawtooth National Recreation Area, Ketchum, Idaho.

(and)

Dave Lee, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Sawtooth N.R.A. -- Wilderness Zone.
Hailey, Idaho

TOPICS: Mr. Young will address minerals management in both the Sawtooth N.R.A. (includes the White Clouds) and the Sawtooth Wilderness Area. Variance in administrative policy due to the "Wilderness Act" and the N.R.A. Legislation will be covered as will economic costs involved and their management implications.

Mr. Lee will discuss the Sawtooth Wilderness Management Plan. What, if any, are the advantages of a "classified wilderness" being administered within a designated National Recreation Area (funding, personnel ceilings, and a variance from the norm pertaining to administrative implementation of management decisions. As time Permits -- a discussion of your training session for wilderness rangers, maintenance, and law enforcement seasonal personnel will be included.

- Apr 15 William A. Worf, Division Chief, Natural Resources, Region 1. USFS.
Missoula, Montana.
TOPIC: The current status of the National Wilderness Preservation System. How the management direction and policy statements were derived from the "Wilderness Act" and from Congressional intent. As time permits -- the reasoning behind the agency's stand on "Purity" in both wilderness management and area classification.
- Apr 22 Thurman H. Trosper, National President, The Wilderness Society, 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC. Home: Ronan, Montana.
TOPIC: Special interest conservation organizations and their differing goals and methods of operation. How they function as a political factor in Wilderness classification and management decisions and at what levels (local, regional or national) are they most effective. Your comments on Wilderness East and the agency's stand on "purity in wilderness management/classification" would be appreciated.
- Apr 29 E. DelMar Jaquish, Assistant Regional Forester, Information and Education, Region 9, USFS. Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
TOPIC: The Eastern Wilderness dilemma -- opportunities, problems and alternatives. Comments on the Boundary Waters Canoe Area as time permits
- May 6
TOPIC: The Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (P.L. 90-542) management problems and opportunities on classified rivers. Also the charge of the "interagency Whitewater Committee" composed of BLM, NPS and USFS river managers and their input on policy statements and management direction for Wild and Scenic Rivers.

1213 Spruce Circle
Moscow, Idaho
January 31, 1974

Dr. John Ehrenreich, Dean
College of Forestry, Wildlife & Range Sciences
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

Dear John:

Enclosed are copies of two lectures I have put together for presentation to ecology classes taught by John Fisher in Lewiston Senior High School, on February 4 and 5.

Should you decide to go ahead with some sort of exploration of the wilderness management subject through seminars in the College as we discussed in December, these two papers pretty well present what would be my opening input.

I have not really dug for literature on this subject, but what I have found falling into my lap suggests there may be a lot more around. I believe a solid content could be found for a worthwhile discourse at graduate level. Perhaps this could be used to develop material and philosophy for a planned seminar series in the field, to be catalogued for next year.

Will be pleased to hear from you whenever you are ready to go on this matter.

Sincerely,

Kenneth B. Platt
Kenneth B. Platt

THE WILDERNESS CONCEPT IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

Kenneth B. Platt

January 30, 1974

The last generation in America has witnessed a startling turnabout from the frontier philosophy which saw our natural resources as an unmatched opportunity for acquisition and a challenge for conquest. With the coming of affluence - that level of wealth at which as a nation we are spending more for things we do not need than for necessities - we have begun to look upon recreational outlets and esthetic enjoyment as more important than economic returns from large segments of still undeveloped natural resources. At the same time we have set about turning the economic clock back by restricting or taxing economic uses of resources in order to return disfigured lands, polluted waters and besmogged air to some semblance of their pristine conditions.

The turnabout has come none too soon. The needs to husband fast-dwindling scenic resources, to protect from commercial invasion certain primal escape areas, and to preserve some remnants of the wildland charm which was the inherent character of the country in pioneer times, were finally driven home only when we realized we were about to lose the last of them to the insatiable demands of built-in national growth in a purposely expanding economy. But the manner of the turnabout is creating severe economic and political problems. In part it is being expressed as a headon collision between economic growth and resource withdrawal.

Now we are in a period of confusion while the parties to this collision dust themselves off and considered what to do next. It is one thing to stop the blight of the "fast buck" developer; it is quite another to reduce or shut down basic industries which are the lifeblood of a community or area. If our rivers are to remain

undammed and our forests uncut for the sake of pleasure seekers, what resources are to generate the income to provide jobs, homes and other economic necessities for a continuing community?

It has seemed to me, in following the published reports and opinions on the classification hearings regarding land and water resources in the central Idaho area, that this question has been ignored by the classification enthusiasts. It is a question which cannot be left out of any equation that will give an acceptable solution for long-term progress in the area. The answer must be, I believe, in terms of some concessions on both sides, but mostly on the side of the classification requirements.

Having read the September, 1973, Forest Service proposal for classification of the Salmon River under provisions of the national wild and scenic rivers system, I find little in it to disagree with, provided its limitations on acquisition and control of bordering private lands ~~imposed~~ are lived up to. Under this proposal the government would acquire private lands along the river only in the most remote area, and then only from willing sellers. The classification would take in only a strip one-fourth mile wide on each side of the river, where timber cutting would be prohibited, but would regulate timber cutting behind this strip within sight of the river. It would not allow sale of residential lots smaller than 4 acres, would allow commercial developments only where needed, and would require all new structures to be in harmony with their locations.

However, these limitations are far different from the policy apparently applicable to the Hell's Canyon classification, where the Forest Service has been threatening condemnation proceedings against a ranch owner unwilling to sell at the offered price because he can make more by selling homesites to individuals. I am not convinced that the federal government needs to own all bordering lands or to control structural style on all structures within sight of scenic rivers, in order to meet the esthetic needs of passing boaters. Visitors normally should be interested in

seeing the older structures which pioneer enterprise produced. If ^{some} new structures are flimsy or unsightly, they will be replaced in due time. The scenic rivers and lakes of Europe are lined with nothing but privately designed and owned buildings unbenefitted by government guidance, which are not regarded as detracting from the scenery there.

The Forest Service reports that hydropower possibilities on the classified section of the Salmon River could return over \$9,000,000 annually. This seems far more than is likely to come from recreational uses. No doubt a much wider discrepancy would apply in the Hell's Canyon stretch of the Snake River. The questions of power development on these rivers are so complex, however, that I must leave them for others to argue. Suffice it to note that Dworshak reservoir on the Clearwater, in addition to its power and flood control values, now provides fishing and boating for thousands where the undammed river formerly accommodated at most a few score.

My main interest in the current classification controversy is with wilderness. When the hearings on the Idaho wilderness classification were announced for Lewiston last November, I sent a proposal to the Regional Forester in Missoula on it, as well as to the Lewiston Tribune, the Boise Statesman, and the Moscow Idahonian. Only the Idahonian printed the proposal in full; the Tribune's partial printing left out the guts of it. Since that proposal is the heart of my view on wilderness, I want to give it to you now in full. I quote:

"The problems of wilderness area designation and management in Idaho and elsewhere involve such large public values that the current public debate over them certainly is in order. The fact that most such areas still are predominantly in public ownership fortunately gives all interests a right to be heard, although it does not justify equal weight for all views. How to sift these views and reach a consensus on what is the dominant public good, seems to be the main difficulty. We Idahoans, because our State is relatively new, have little at home to go by in

judging long range possibilities. There is danger that some currently popular view may be given more weight than it deserves in the long run.

"The idea I want to put up for testing takes a long range approach which I first suggested to Governor Samuelson in 1970, and have mentioned occasionally since, without ever giving it a public airing. It is this: Wilderness use should be on a rotation basis, like timber harvest. This idea assumes certain points as basic:

"1. As a nation we no longer can afford to permanently set aside huge blocks of renewable resources just to look at.

"2. The pure wilderness concept in land management - leaving an area without access except by foot, horseback or hand-propelled watercraft - already has outlived its time, save for relatively small tracts and trail-fringe areas. In large blocks too much is inaccessible and unused, while overuse destroys the primitive charm of the small fraction within reach from the borders. Some ready examples are a) recent overuse and trashing of the limited high Sierra trails by hikers; b) the sanitation problems created along Idaho's 'River Of No Return' last summer by more float parties than raw nature could accommodate; and c) the crowding of virtually all use of Minnesota's Boundary Waters canoeing wilderness into the outer fringes of the area because so few visitors can take the time or stand the cost of the 2 to 3 weeks needed for a round trip into the deep interior by canoe.

"3. Only a minute fraction of people - the wilderness purists - either notice or care about the difference between pristine forest areas and areas regrown after timber harvesting. For example, Minnesota's present canoeing wilderness and the adjoining Lake Superior north shore area extending into Canada probably is as true wilderness to most visitors as any other part of North America today, although left devastated by the cut-out-and-get-out logging of 75-100 years ago. Natural regrowth has covered the scars, and the summer vacationer 100 yards from the highway and out of sight and sound of automobile traffic can easily imagine himself the first visitor ever to set foot on his particular spot.

"Rotation of wilderness with other legitimate uses would accommodate all classes of users in due time, while avoiding the wastes that go with permanent set-asides for single, and especially for non-consumptive, uses. Access developed to remove timber and minerals would serve during the wilderness cycle to facilitate maximum recreational uses. Soil and stream disturbances initially caused by road construction could be minimized by proper regulation, and would be fully stabilized by the time recreation uses took over for their turn in the cycle. This stability could be almost wholly maintained during ensuing timber harvest and mineral extraction cycles, which would require little new access construction.

"Under this management concept, the portion of the Clearwater basin presently classified for wilderness uses would be kept in that category until timber harvesting was justified by stand maturity or resource management demands, with only such access and use-facilities development as needed for interim protection, regulation, and recreation uses. Portions of the Salmon River drainage now ~~not~~ classified as wilderness, but having important merchantable timber that would be wasted by non-use, would be opened for timber harvest under proper restrictions for watershed protection and for preservation of scenic values. Mineral removal could be permitted under similar restrictions protecting scenic values, minimizing stream disturbance, and providing for surface restoration where important.

"In considering the alternatives of single use, multiple use, rotational use, and possible variants or combinations of these, we should be guided by what results to expect under proper planning and regulation, rather than by what has happened in the past. On this point, it should be encouraging to note the magnificent scenic and recreational values still being enjoyed in wildland areas of Europe, notwithstanding many centuries of multiple use and accompanying private development"

Since writing that proposal I have found a lot of people who agree with me on

the points it makes. An article by Allan May in the December 1 National Observer so strikingly parallels and expands on my ideas that I am going to give you almost the full article for comparison. Mr. Allan is a staff writer on the Everett Herald who recently published a book called Up And Down The North Cascades National Park. I quote now from his article, entitled "Are Its Friends Ruining The Forest?"

"First, let me classify myself. I am a hiker and backpacker. I have no other interest in the forests and mountains except to enjoy the forests and mountains. I have never had a hunting or fishing license, and I'm not likely to. I don't own a motorbike or a horse. In short, from a recreational standpoint, I have no ax to grind except that I like to hike and backpack. I also feel a need for the merchandise the mountains and forests produce: the wood products, metals, water power, whatever.

"I don't believe the recreational use of mountains is necessarily obviated by the forests' other uses ('rapes', the superconservationists would say - they like strong language). Nor do I believe that different types of recreational use of the forests and mountain lands must, necessarily, be mutually exclusive. I see no reason, for instance, why a forest area that has been clear-cut or mined, or flooded by a dam, cannot be used for recreation.

"I am aware that ugliness - like beauty - lies in the eye of the beholder. And if a superconservationist is sickened by the sight of a clear-cut, then for him it is ugly. But I don't see it that way. Where he sees ugliness, I see flowers and brush of immense beauty. I see wildlife - the deer and bear and birds and frogs and insects that gather in clear-cuts. I see berry bushes where my family and I can spend entire days gathering a winter's supply. . . . Later the forest returns, and I see a different kind of beauty, almost precisely like the original one that was cut and converted to things such as the house I live in and the paper I write on.

"Frankly, I become a little miffed at the concept - - - that once a timber sale has been consummated, that part of the forest has been destroyed. With a modicum of

effort and minimum of imagination, - - - clear-cuts could be provided with camp-grounds. The roads that lead to them could be closed to cars so they revert to trails - foot, horse, motorbike, whatever. Then, I think, they could be co-ordinated with uncut or regrown forest areas to add immensely to the hiking-backpacking country available to us backpackers, to say nothing of providing more area for the horse riders and motorbikers who compete with us.

"Nor do I see a possibility of maintaining even the so-called wilderness areas as if they have never been seen by man. The superconservationists have been screaming so long and so loud whenever they find a trampled grass blade that they have the rangers of both the forests and parks muttering about protecting the fragile environment. The demand for back country is increasing tremendously. . . . What both the superconservationists and rangers tend to forget - or ignore - is that the real wilderness disappeared in the late 19th Century.

"The demise of wilderness is the central fact of the backpacker's problem, as the American people more and more flock to the woods and mountains. . . . As the superconservationists watched, trails became eroded, meadows developed bare spots, firewood disappeared, trees were chopped, untouched fields were littered, and garbage was thrown in streams and lakes. Of course, no one could condone wanton damage such as litter and garbage, but people just by existing bring about change to the land. As the number of people in the mountains increased, the changes became more obvious simply because there were people there.

"The superconservationists saw themselves endangered by all this. They banded together to bring pressure on the Government agencies involved to protect their mountains from the changes. The agencies heard no other voices, so they believed they were responding to the majority public demand; they began restricting the mountains. The agencies' actions were wondrously varied. They consisted of legal barriers such as regulations prohibiting certain objects - machines, for instance -

in parts of the mountains. They restricted camping in specific 'endangered' areas. They prohibited horses in certain places. They littered the back country with regulatory and prohibitive signs that by themselves are enough to destroy the 'wilderness experience' for many visitors.

"From my personal standpoint, the most serious negation of the 'wilderness experience' is the permit system. If it is necessary to approach the bureaucracy for permission to enter a piece of land, it seems to me obvious that land cannot be wilderness. If it is managed, it isn't wild. The cumulative effect of the growing list of regulations, I suspect, will be the end of all regulations. What the agencies are doing is harassing people and keeping people out of the land that the people own. . That approach, I believe, can't last forever.

"It is well, of course, that some small areas be set aside and frozen in the manner that the wildernesses are now, so that they remain completely unchanged except by nature. With those small enclaves set aside, all the remainder of the Federal lands in the mountains and forests should be devoted to people - all people - with only passive regard for their effect on the land. In other words, people should be allowed to cause change as long as they don't make it impossible for those who follow to have a good time in the same place.

"That means clear-cut forests, designed for recreation, and dammed streams that produce boating, camping, and fishing as well as power or flood control. That means people allowed to camp in the back country where they will. . . .

"In short, what it means is that the forests and mountains will have to be made available to all of their owners - all Americans - with certain areas set aside for certain types of use on a planned, logical basis - a multilevel development that provides something for everyone. The present approach to recreation-land management is that more and more lands be officially declared wilderness where people, if they are allowed to enter at all, are harassed with permits and regulations. That approach must be scrapped. It must be replaced with a plan that would make only a tiny fraction of the available land wilderness as it now stands. The remainder should be

divided into various categories, ranging from wilderness on one end to developed lands with motels and restaurants on the other.

"The land between the extremes should be reserved for various uses: A place for horses, a place for motorbikes, a place for Jeeps, a place for hiking hostels, and, most of all, a place where people can go and just be left alone without bureaucratic regulation, even if their existence does cause change in the appearance of the landscape. It also means that commercial uses - logging, mining, power development - must be dovetailed with recreational use so that, in most instances, the land can be used for both.

"That concept, in effect, means that rangers and superconservationists must learn that people are more important than land. It also means that backpackers and other users must accommodate themselves to each other, must accept each other and respect each other's right to the land that belongs to all.

"The alternative to all this is more and more regulations, regimentation, and oppression. Pressure will become so great that the forests and mountains will either be closed to us all, or we backpackers will be forced into mortal combat among ourselves as well as with the growing groups of people who want our forests and mountains for other purposes, both commercial and recreational. That, I'm afraid, is a battle we backpackers can only lose in the long run."

Other outdoor writers noting similar practical limitations on the concept of wilderness and its enjoyment are found in recent publications of National Geographic magazine. In the introduction to Wilderness U. S. A., a 343-page book released in late 1973, Sigurd Olson writes:

"And what should be done with the forests that once, half a century ago, heard the ring of axes and breathed the smoke of frontier cabins? The question has raged east of the Mississippi, where most of the national forests once were logged.

"There's a special charm for me in places that have reverted from farm to forest, as in much of the Appalachians. Of course, the enormous chestnuts are gone, victims of blight, and along with them virgin pines and hemlocks that towered in the silence. But the generous rain of the eastern mountains is a potent restorative. And so one now finds in cutover forests thriving stands of hardwoods, spruce, fir, and white pine, conjuring a sense of wilderness as the predecessor forest must have to settlers. Then, without warning, you come on an old stone wall, a chimney of field stone, a lilac bush growing wild. Relics of our heritage, they are a poignant dowry bestowed upon the land, giving a deeper meaning to wilderness.

"Many national forest wildernesses were created in areas of little value for timber - too remote for profitable logging, too high or too dry to yield more than scrub. As the yearning for wilderness grows, the Forest Service responds that it must provide other goods and services also. A quarter of the nation's lumber and plywood is cut on its lands; car and trailer campers must be considered; there is more pressure for ski areas and resorts. . . .

"Sometimes - - - it must seem that wilderness lovers want the whole continent ~~be~~ restored. What they really want is enough wilderness - whatever the sum may be - to satisfy the millions who seek its pleasures. . . . So our wilderness system continues in yeasty ferment, and the ideal is far away."

The leading article in the February issue of National Geographic is "America's Wilderness: How Much Can We Save?" In this article naturalist Francois Leydet recounts visits to five wilderness areas scattered across the United States. The following quotes illustrate some pertinent points for our thinking today:

Mazatzal Wilderness, Arizona - "Save a piece of country like that intact, and it does not matter that only a few people will go into it. That is precisely its value. . . . Those who haven't the strength or youth to go into it and live with it - - - can simply contemplate the idea, take pleasure in the fact that such a timeless and uncontrolled part of earth is still there."

Okefenokee Swamp, Georgia - "Between 1908 and 1926, more than 423 million board feet of lumber, most of it cypress, was removed. Happily, Okefenokee is a good example - - - of what nature will do to restore herself and heal herself. The cypress has come back vigorously."

Allagash Wilderness Waterway, Maine - "For the \$1,500,000 raised through a bond issue and matched by federal funds, the citizens of Maine obtained 56,000 acres including more than 30,000 acres of lake, river and stream. The waterway's shores are masked by a narrow fringe of forest - a restricted zone from 400 to 800 feet wide - within which logging is prohibited. An outer buffer zone extends one mile from the high water mark, within which selective logging is permitted, but no clear-cutting. . . As darkness shrouded the signs of human impact it was easy for me, lying back in my sleeping bag, to imagine that these North Woods were as virginal as in the days when only bands of coastal Indians penetrated them - - - ."

Olympic National Park, Washington - "Roger Allin, Superintendent of Olympic National Park, looked around him with an almost fierce joy. 'If you have never believed in a Creator before,' he said to me, 'just look around you now.' And indeed this wilderness beach seemed to have been freshly minted by the hand of God. . . 'Wilderness is not just a matter of geography,' Allin said. 'It is also a state of mind. . . ' I ventured that there was not much real wilderness left, by this standard. 'Perhaps not, outside of Alaska,' he replied. 'When an area is as heavily visited as this Olympic National Park, some of the pure freedoms of the wilderness are lost. That's inevitable. Still, most of this park is as close to wilderness as we've got! "

Wind River Range, Wyoming - " 'People who live around here usually make their living in one of three ways,' John Butruille, District Ranger, said, 'and they always have. It's cattle, or timber, or tourists, counting the hunters. Each one depends on this forest. They all have to have a piece of these mountains in order to survive.' "

I am convinced from my own thinking that there can never be enough wilderness supplied to satisfy the demand, if exclusive-use areas are insisted upon. Even if we could supply enough area now, it would be overrun in the future as today's millions of visitors double and triple, and still keep growing. The testimonies of the wilderness promoters themselves, which I have just been quoting to you, strongly fortify my view.

The only way that enough more area can be supplied to even approach keeping pace with the demand is to make wilderness a shared use along with other rightful uses. And this area cannot all come from western/national forest lands, and it does not need to. A real sense of wilderness can be found by the vast majority of outdoor lovers and visitors in areas regrown from cutover status in previous generations. Neither do these areas need to be in million-acre blocks. Such large areas defeat the very purpose of wilderness enjoyment by causing destruction of the wilderness character by overuse along their borders, while virtually precluding use of the interior.

For the long pull, we simply cannot afford to forego the economic values of merchantable timber and recoverable minerals on great areas of our forest lands, and we do not need to. By a long range rotation system such as I have suggested, all proper uses can be accommodated without serious conflict or loss of value for anyone.

Going back to my opening statement of yesterday, I repeat: We cannot afford to settle the issue of wilderness set-asides in an irrational power struggle among the many rightful claimants of the varied resources on these lands. The settlement must give each user group its dues, and it must make way for economic uses if our community is to prosper.

In my view, Idaho wilderness areas already are far too large for people to get much good out of them. They need to be broken up and opened up with more access roads, camp grounds, trails, sanitary facilities, trash cans, etc.

For the last 40 years, to my knowledge, Idahoans have been agitating to tax National Forest and BLM lands because they take up more than half the total state area. In lieu of taxes, these lands now yield the state some \$ 6,200,000 per year, as a percentage share of timber sales, grazing fees, and other income. Does it make sense to cut off such income by withdrawing the timber resource from harvest, while arguing that we are a poor state for lack of income from these lands?

Finally, we must not be carried away with any false sense of a noble obligation to forego the economic uses of our wildland resources so that the rest of the United States can come to Idaho to play. As shown by the National Geographic quotes I have read you, other states have ample wilderness play space they can develop in areas where the main economic harvests already have been made, or where recreation has been or can be fitted in with ongoing economic use.

And now, I hope you have many questions.

SOME CONSERVATION FACTS AND FALLACIES

Kenneth B. Platt

January 30, 1974

I was plessed when I saw Mr. Fisher's letter in the December 9 Lewiston Tribune inviting speakers opposed to the proposed Salmon River classification, Idaho Primitive Area classificatibn and Hells' Canyon Recreation Area, and in favor of economic and industrial growth, to give you a more balanced view on these issues than has been presented in local news reports and editorial comments. In this day of shameless advocacy journalism, opposing views too seldom get a fair hearing, and the public presentation of arguments about future use of Idaho's wildland resources is a prime example of such bias. So I welcome this chance to try to help balance the picture.

Press reports have been telling us that those speaking for the proposed classifications far outnumber those opposed. Editorial opinion has made the classifications a cause celebre, while vilifying opponents as "robber barons" intent on raping a public treasure and depriving future generations of their rightful heritage of wilderness joys. This stance takes advantage of the present popularity of environment restoration and preservation sentiment, while ignoring the relative merits of the two sides. It plays a numbers game based on grandiose appeals to the emotionalism of the moment, while posing as the voice of the future.

But we cannot afford to settle the issue on this basis. The resources involved are too great, and their values for the future too important. They warrant the most careful, sober and searching consideration we can give them. In my talks today and tomorrow I will try to give you a better foundation for soundly reasoning out the problem.

So that you may know what weight you wish to give my remarks, let me now briefly present my credentials:

I was born in 1907 in the bottom of the Salmon River canyon south of Winchester - a representative part of the area being argued over. As a boy I knew Craig Mountain when it was still covered with virgin timber, and when its creeks still teemed with trout. I grew up in cattle and sheep ranching there and near Genesee. After graduating from the University of Idaho in animal husbandry and working there five years on public information jobs, I worked in the Bureau of Land Management for more than 20 years, mainly on range conservation, range management, and land use classification, in most of the Western states and in Washington, D. C. This was followed by 12 years of foreign aid work with the State Department in Egypt, Iran and South Korea on problems of land ownership and use and land resource development, as well as emergency food distribution.

I grew up on wild country, made most of my career in it, and I still love it. I have been retired and living in Moscow since 1970.

Conservation has a rather special meaning for Lewistonians. Perhaps I should say, a special flavor or aroma! The fight for clean air that began soon after the Potlatch Lumber Co. sawmill was built here more than 40 years ago made every local resident aware of the evils of air pollution long before protection of the environment became a national battle cry. From their own experience it is easy for Lewistonians to agree with pleas for pure air, pure water, free flowing streams, and virgin wildlands in other areas - a preservation of, or return to, natural values too often lost when economic use moves in.

Beyond this immediate focus, the Lewiston community also shares in the general national concern for conservation of our natural resources. That concern first established Yellowstone Park in 1872, to be followed by dozens of other national parks. It resulted in the creation of most of our national forests in the 1890-1910 period, and in fish and game conservation laws at that time. In the 1930s it

produced the Soil Conservation Service and the Bureau of Land Management. A multitude of other conservation efforts and organizations, from national to state and local scope, have swelled the tide.

But the fact that we all want conservation doesn't mean we all have the same conservation goals. Each of us sees the landscape through eyes seeking different things. The once-a-year hunter who wants to find his game in the first thicket sees things differently from the stockman who takes a protective interest in the deer or pheasants on his land, and doesn't want them killed. The farmer cleaning out his fence rows to reduce crop pests, thereby eliminates upland game bird cover. The artist painting a waterfall, and the power engineer planning to harness it. The hiker seeking inspiration in a primitive forest and the forester marking mature or dying trees for sustained-yield harvest. These are but a few of the many conflicts arising from a common interest in conservation.

In actual practice, our common interest in conservation is likely to be somewhat like our common interest in sports, with each backing a different team to win.

Although there are many non-conflicting interests in conservation, it is the conflicts that give us the problems, as in the present case. Only as related to man's need or interest does a resource have value and merit conservation. Even as sound does not exist where there is no ear to hear it, so value does not exist where there is no use in view. Conversely, when many needs and interests compete for a limited resource, the problems of dividing the resource among different users, of favoring some over others, of limiting total consumption, and the many ramifications of these problems, arise to plague us.

In view of today's energy crisis, it is interesting to note that until a few years ago leading foresters thought there was enough wood-producing capacity in our timber lands to meet foreseeable U. S. needs into the indefinite future. The view rested strongly on the assumption that by the time our supply of good saw timber was

used up, new wood technology would produce more and better wood products from new growth on the cutover lands. It was also based on the presumption that economic uses of the timber resource would continue to dominate forest management policy for the national forests. Today that presumption is so heavily assailed that substantial areas of merchantable timber are being set aside for non-consumptive uses. The inclusion of land having a timber yield capacity of 40 million board feet annually in the central Idaho wilderness classification proposal is such a case.

I do not want to argue the merits of this inclusion at this time, other than to say it seems inconsistent with the steeply rising need for wood-product building materials, now aggravated by a foreseen shortage of substitute materials extending many years into the future. Rather, I want to look at some of the elements shaping public thinking and attitudes that influence how natural resource use decisions are made.

Here I come to the substance of my title: "Some Conservation Facts And Fallacies." Let me list some of the half truths, misconceptions and outright fallacies commonly believed about natural resource conservation, then discuss a few of them in more detail. It is commonly assumed that:

1. Conservation of natural resources is, or somehow should be, a strictly factual, non-political matter.
2. Conservation programs can be charted in terms of resources alone, without regard for persons or industries.
3. Conservation can be achieved directly, through laws and regulations.
4. Conservation is accomplished when the law and regulations go into effect.
5. The achievement of conservation goals can be left to conservation agencies.
6. "Conservation" and "reservation" are synonymous.
7. A common interest in conservation is a unified interest.
8. Public ownership or management is necessary to long-term conservation.

Now let us examine some of these hypotheses.

The idea that conservation of our natural resources is, or should be, a strictly factual, non-political matter is deep-rooted in our thinking. We are convinced the affairs of resource administration should be handled with strict impartiality, without respect to persons or special groups. We got that way through seeing the wastage, and the abuse of special privilege, that have occurred where political favoritism and the spoils system entered in. We have witnessed sometimes bitter fights to place administration in the hands of politically sanitized non-partisan commissions, as in the case of most state fish and game departments.

When the Taylor Grazing Act, providing for administration of public domain grazing lands, was in the making in the early 1930s, the question most at issue was not whether there should be such an Act, but who should administer the Act. The battle was fought first on whether there should be state or federal administration, then on what federal agency should do the job. State administration was defeated because it was thought too vulnerable to local political pressures. As you know, the Act wound up under civil service administration in the Interior Department with a new agency, the Bureau of Land Management, running it.

The Taylor Grazing Act specifically charged the Secretary of the Interior "To stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range," and to pursue various other purposes stated in the Act. It was far more specific and detailed in saying what was to be done than any previous conservation measure passed by Congress. To make the picture complete, it gave the Secretary authority to make such regulations as might be needed to implement its stated purposes. Was range conservation then not merely a matter of getting the new law and regulations into effect?

Let us look at what actually happened. As one who worked in the Bureau of

Land Management for the first 23 years of its existence, I saw it go through no less than four major politically directed reorganizations, and it has had at least that many more since I left it. Today it is faced with a class action suit brought by an environmentalist group seeking to force a complete reversal of the purpose of its administration, from economic uses such as grazing, timber harvest and mineral extraction, to purely esthetic and recreational uses. Should this suit win, it would force a re-writing of the Taylor Grazing Act, with all the national political struggle which this implies.

I believe the foregoing will illustrate the unavoidably political nature of most conservation programs. If more proof is needed, consider the public pressure now building against management policies of the Idaho State Fish and Game Commission, an agency intended to be fully insulated from political interference. Let me at the same time say that I use the term "political" in no pejorative sense, but simply in its basic meaning as having to do with people-to-people relationships. From this standpoint, all conservation programs are political expressions, for all derive from public support. But conservation is a political function in a much more direct and restricted sense than this. Conservation of any resource has its basic justification in maintaining or increasing usefulness. Usefulness, in turn, is an expression of human need. Any conservation program, accordingly, must define not only what is being conserved, but for whom it is being conserved.

Seldom, if ever, do we find a resource in which only a small group is interested. The resource administrator usually finds that his biggest problems arise, not in terms of what should be done for the good of the resource, but in terms of what may be done while dividing the resource among ^{many groups} the ~~people~~ interested in or dependent upon it. In other words, his job may be more one of managing people so as to get the most from the resource than one of managing the resource directly.

And so we see that it is a mistake to think that conservation is, or even that

it should be, a strictly factual, non-political matter. Impartial - by all means. Based on factual information - as far as possible. No respecter of persons - "yes," so far as this means equal consideration for all, but "no" when it comes to putting the resource ahead of its users. You may reduce use by one class of users in favor of a more deserving class; you may reduce one type of use in favor of a more constructive or beneficial type of use; you may restrict present use in favor of expected future use; but you must always keep in mind that the resource exists for the people, not the people for the resource, or the resource for its own sake.

Plainly, a conservation program conceived on this thesis cannot be charted in terms of the resource alone, without regard to persons and industries related thereto. Plainly, too, the conservation aim is not achieved when the new conservation law goes into effect, nor can it be achieved directly by exercise of law and regulations. And still further, the burden of conservation accomplishment cannot be altogether shouldered by conservation agencies. As "Smokey The Bear" posters so aptly say: Only you can prevent forest fires.

We see here that we can no more legislate in conservation than we can legislate in the Kingdom of God, and for very similar reasons. True conservation is rooted in a people's love of the land in which and on which they live. It must proceed from the people. Conservation laws and regulations can only implement the wishes of the majority.

When thinking about conservation, we need to keep in mind its difference from "reservation." In our beginnings of natural resource management, our first experience was with national parks, forest reserves, oil reserves, game refuges, etc. In these types of administration the emphasis is upon total protection, or total exclusion of present use in the interest of expected future need. The term "reserve" is appropriate to such resources as coal, oil and other minerals which, once used, cannot be replaced. It is appropriate to timber in the sense of holding it for future use. The dictionary says "to keep in store for future or special use."

Conservation, on the other hand, means "to keep in a safe or sound state; to save from change or destruction." Conservation thus may be seen as temperence applied to the use of a resource. Like temperence, it implies use, not total abstinence. Use is inherent in the definition of conservation, while exclusion from use is inherent in the definition of reservation.

The element of use in conservation is readily seen in the case of flowing water. After all consumptive uses of water are made, there remain vast quantities wasting to the sea. Let me emphasize the word "wasting." Until flowing waters are harnessed to human needs of one kind or another, they have no usefulness. Once gone by, they can never be recalled. Other supplies may come in their stead, but the power that might have been generated last year, the crops that might have been produced, are lost to us forever. Water flows like time, never to be reversed; we may impound it temporarily, but we cannot bring it back. Range forage is similar to water in relation to time - a flowing resource. If used this year, it will be replaced next year; if not used, it is lost. The timber resource also flows by us, only on a longer time scale.

Let us turn now briefly to the matter of public versus private ownership and natural management of resources. No one questions the private ownership and use of our farmlands, the greatest and most basic natural resource of all, although there is growing public concern for better control of erosion on these lands. Farmlands are readily divisible into family units, and the 50-year failure of Communist Russia to make communal or state farming pay off certainly does not incline us to change to their system. Grazing lands also fit well into individual holdings, with need for public administration only on the poorer lands that require bigger investments in water development, fencing, etc., than most private owners can manage.

Timber resources long were thought to require public ownership and administration to keep them from being wastefully used and to protect watershed and recreation

values in forest areas, but today many private forest owners are regarded as doing a better job of forest management than the U. S. Forest Service is doing. Water resources more clearly need the controlling hand and financial capacity of government to bring about the kinds and degrees of development, and the allocations to different uses, most in the public interest. Air, only recently recognized as needing use and abuse controls, clearly is in the public domain.

To summarize this matter, it seems to me there is no particular magic in either public or private ownership and management of natural resources. The important thing in either case is to conform uses to the needs of the resource itself for safeguarding and, in the case of renewable resources, for their perpetuation.

In addition to the foregoing common but mistaken assumptions about conservation in general, there are two that are put forward in particular by wilderness purists and environmentalists. The first of these is that forest fires, being a natural result of lightning strikes, are a tool of nature for cleaning up brush and litter in the forests, and therefore should not be controlled by man. The other is that man is an interloper in the ecological affairs of nature, and therefore should be excluded as much as possible from wildland areas.

Of course, it is true that before our present civilization took over the North American continent, forest fires did run unchecked by man. Marks of their occurrence are found on surviving trees dating back many centuries. No doubt those fires did consume accumulations of brush and litter and, where running through mature stands of large trees, often did little serious damage. But just as surely there were other fires which destroyed vast stands of first class timber that today would be almost priceless both economically and esthetically.

To me, the idea of letting forest fires run wild in today's forests is at once naive and incomprehensible. The people who propose it ask us, on the one hand, to

set aside huge blocks of economic treasure in the form of timber resources for them just to look at, and on the other hand to let this timber burn to 50-year eyesores if natural fires should strike it. They don't want the trees cut to build homes for people, but they don't mind if the trees burn. They don't want people going into the forests and disturbing the plants and animals by changing anything around with roads and campgrounds and other use facilities, but they don't mind if fire destroys the the whole shebang!

For an object lesson in the the probable benefits of uncontrolled forest fires in the future, we need only look at what they have done for us in the past. The Selway and North Fork basins of the Clearwater drainage both have huge expanses covered with the barkless white ghosts of former living trees, standing stark on the mountains while nature slowly recovers the ground with new forest stands. They have been that way for from 20 to 40 years. But for the lesson to end all lessons, look at the St. Joe and Coeur d' Alene drainages, where the great fire of 1910 destroyed more than 4,000 square miles of prime forest.

This was not a man-caused fire, but a result of multiple lightning strikes. Every effort of available fire fighting forces, including the mining population of the area and ~~x~~ ^{four} military companies^{ies} ordered in by President Taft, in addition to all Forest service and logging industry men, was made to stop it, but so puny were these forces compared with the fire that it was not really interfered with. Thus it met both criteria of today's environmentalists - it was natural and it was uncontrolled.

In the five days that it ran, it burned several towns. It burned 85 people to death. It burned 9 billion board feet of prime timber, worth nearly a billion dollars on the stump at today's prices - a 15-year supply for the whole U.S. market at that time. It put up a smoke cloud that spread clear across the continent, as far north as Calgary and south half way across Wyoming. The smoke was so heavy it required artificial lights at midday in the Great Lakes area. A ship in mid-Pacific

reported it could not take celestial bearings for 10 days because of the smoke.

Smoke from uncontrolled forest fires is OK with the environmentalists because it is a product of nature, but let's not have any ~~farmers~~ burning off grass fields so as to get a crop of grass seed this year!

Considering what unthinkable damage uncontrolled fire once did, and still could do, we can only say, Thank God that the Forest Service had 60 years to build access roads and fire trails in the national forests before today's environmentalists came on the scene.

As to the second point - that man does not belong in the ecological world - fortunately it does not carry a horrendous risk element such as uncontrolled burning. Aside from this, however, it seems to me almost as irrational.

As I pointed out earlier, resources have value only as man needs or enjoys them. To exclude man from the balance of nature is to exclude him from the use and enjoyment of natural resources. Perhaps it was an environmentalist who wrote the song: "You Can Look, But You Better Not Touch."

Obviously, man must be included in the ecological matrix. The balance struck will not be the same as if he were not included, but this will not be all bad. For instance, man will control fire, and thus save the ecological community from extermination. He will also replant devastated areas and make them, if not fully natural, yet often more valuable than before, and maybe even more sightly. In any case, he is an ineradicable part of the whole, and his influence must be accommodated.

I must leave many things unsaid on this very large subject in the short time we have today, but I trust you will now ask questions about any special points you might like to have further discussed.

November 27, 1973

Kenneth B. Platt
1218 Spruce Circle
Moscow, Idaho 83843

Dear Ken:

I appreciate receiving your note and copy of your letter to the editors of the newspapers.

The points you have made are certainly worth airing, and have real possibilities. I would like to have the opportunity to discuss this further with you to determine what our College might do to further your ideas.

I will be looking forward to seeing you.

Sincerely,

John H. Ehrenreich
Dean

JHE:ms

Ken. B. Platt
1213 Spruce Cir.
Moscow

Dear Dean -

Here is an idea that perhaps should be worked over by the College, regardless of the reception that may be given it by the press.

It seems to me to offer possibilities for much more orderly and rational use of our wild land resources than we have or can expect to evolve under present mutually antagonistic-use management approaches.

Would be pleased to have your reaction.

Kenneth B. Platt

Dan Shennick

Editor: The Lewiston Tribune The Boise Statesman The Daily Idahoian

Dear Sir:

The problems of wilderness area designation and management in Idaho and elsewhere involve such large public values that the current public debate over them certainly is in order. The fact that most such areas still are predominantly in public ownership fortunately gives all interests a right to be heard, although it does not justify equal weight for all views. How to sift these views and reach a consensus on what is the dominant public good, seems to be the main difficulty. We Idahoans, because our State is relatively new, have little at home to go by in judging long range possibilities. There is danger that some currently popular views may be given more weight than it deserves in the long run.

The idea I want to put up for testing takes a long range approach which I first suggested to Governor Samuelson in 1970 and have mentioned occasionally since, without ever giving it a public airing. It is this:

Wilderness use should be on a rotation basis, like timber harvest.

This idea assumes certain points as basic:

1. As a nation we no longer can afford to permanently set aside huge blocks of renewable resources just to look at.
2. The pure wilderness concept in land management - leaving an area without access except by foot, horseback or hand-propelled watercraft - already has outlived its time, save for relatively small tracts and trail-fringe areas. In large blocks, too much is inaccessible and unused, while overuse destroys the irreplaceable charm of the small fraction within reach. Some ready examples are a) recent overuse and trashing of the limited high Sierra trails by hikers; b) the sanitation problems created along Idaho's "River Of No Return" last summer by more float parties than raw nature could accommodate; and c) the crowding of virtually all use of Minnesota's Lake-of-the-Woods canoeing wilderness into the outer fringes of the area because so few can take the time or stand the cost of the 3 to 4 weeks needed for a round trip into the interior by canoe.

3. Only a minute fraction of people - the wilderness purists - either notice or care about the difference between pristine forest areas and areas regrown after timber harvesting. For example, Minnesota's present canoeing wilderness and the adjoining Lake Superior north shore area extending into Canada probably is as true wilderness to most visitors as any other part of North America today, although left devastated by the "cut out and get out" logging of 75-100 years ago. Natural regrowth has covered the scars, and the summer vacationer 100 yards from the highway and out of sight and sound of automobile traffic can easily imagine himself the first visitor to this particular spot.

Rotation of wilderness with other legitimate uses would accommodate all classes of users in due time, while avoiding the wastes inherent in permanent set-asides for single uses. Access developed to remove timber and minerals would serve the wilderness cycle to facilitate maximum recreational uses. Soil and

stream disturbances initially caused by road construction could be minimized by proper regulation, and would be fully stabilized by the time recreation uses took over. This stability could be almost wholly maintained during ensuing timber harvest and mineral extraction cycles, which would require little new access construction.

Under this management concept, the portion of the Clearwater basin area presently classified for wilderness uses would be kept in that category until timber harvesting was justified, with only such access and use-facilities development as needed for interim protection, regulation, and recreational uses. Portions of the Salmon River drainage now classified as wilderness but having important timber values that would be wasted by non-use would be opened for timber harvest under proper restrictions for watershed protection and for preservation of scenic values. Mineral removal could be permitted under similar restrictions protecting scenic values, minimizing stream disturbance, and providing for surface restoration where important.

In considering the alternatives of single use, multiple use, rotational use, and possible variants or combinations of these, we should be guided by what results could be expected under proper planning and regulation, rather than by what has happened under the unplanned and unregulated regimes of the past. We might consider also the magnificent scenic and recreational values still being enjoyed in wildland areas of Europe and elsewhere, notwithstanding many centuries of multiple use and accompanying development.

Kenneth B. Platt

Kenneth B. Platt
1213 Spruce Circle
Moscow, Idaho 83843