

Y4
.In 8/14

1023

93-26
In 8/14
93-26

93-26 SNOW MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS IN THE
MENDOCINO NATIONAL FOREST

GOVERNMENT

MENTS

Storage

13 1973

LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

✓
ESTD 69 62153
ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 11-16-00 BY 60321

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 2813

TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AS WILDERNESS

H.R. 4012 and H.R. 9063

TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN LANDS IN THE MENDOCINO NA-
TIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA, AS THE "SNOW MOUNTAIN WIL-
DERNESS" FOR INCLUSION IN THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS
PRESERVATION SYSTEM

HEARING HELD IN
WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 25, 1973

Serial No. 93-26

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1973

21-046

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JAMES A. HALEY, Florida, *Chairman*

ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina	JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	<i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona	CRAIG HOSMER, California
PHILLIP BURTON, California	JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington	SAM STEIGER, Arizona
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin	DON H. CLAUSEN, California
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan	PHILIP E. RUPPE, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP, Oklahoma
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	MANUEL LUJAN, Jr., New Mexico
ABRAHAM KAZEN, Jr., Texas	JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., Georgia	KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania	RALPH S. REGULA, Ohio
JOHN MELCHER, Montana	ALAN STEELMAN, Texas
TENO RONCALIO, Wyoming	DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York	JAMES G. MARTIN, North Carolina
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio	WILLIAM M. KETCHUM, California
HAROLD RUNNELS, New Mexico	PAUL W. CRONIN, Massachusetts
YVONNEBRATHWAITEBURKE, California	DON YOUNG, Alaska
ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT, Guam	
WAYNE OWENS, Utah	
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands	
JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma	

SIDNEY L. MCFARLAND, *Staff Director and Chief Clerk*

LEWIS A. SIGLER, *Counsel*

WILLIAM L. SHAFER, *Professional Staff Consultant on Mines, Minerals, and Public Lands*
CHARLES LEPPERT, Jr., *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JOHN MELCHER, Montana, *Chairman*

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	SAM STEIGER, Arizona
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona	JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania,
PHILLIP BURTON, California	DON H. CLAUSEN, California
HAROLD RUNNELS, New Mexico	JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT, Guam	RALPH S. REGULA, Ohio
WAYNE OWENS, Utah	DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma	DON YOUNG, Alaska

BOB HUNT, *Consultant on Public Lands*

JAMES ROCK, *Minority Staff Consultant*

NOTE.—The chairman of the full committee is an ex officio voting member of this subcommittee. The first listed minority member is counterpart to the subcommittee chairman.

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of:	
H.R. 2813-----	1
H.R. 4012-----	2
H.R. 9063-----	2
Report of:	
Department of Agriculture-----	3
Department of the Interior-----	4
Statements:	
Clausen, Hon. Don H., a Representative in Congress from the State of California-----	4
Cranston, Hon. Alan, a U.S. Senator from the State of California-----	18
Davis, Edwin F., editor, Willows Daily Journal-----	36
Eaton, James, of Davis, Calif-----	52
Leggett, Hon. Robert L., a Representative in Congress from the State of California-----	9
Morrill, Donald, the Wilderness Society-----	26
Nelson, Thomas C., Department of Agriculture, Deputy Chief, Forest Service-----	20
Parrish, Connie, California representative, Friends of the Earth-----	30
Petterson, Katherine, Kelseyville, Calif-----	39
Tunney, Hon. John V., a U.S. Senator from the State of California--	19
Letters:	
Bohlen, Curtis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to Hon. James A. Haley, dated July 23, 1973 (report)-----	4
Campbell, J. Phil, Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, to Hon. James A. Haley, dated July 24, 1973 (report)-----	3
Constance, Lincoln, professor of botany, University of California, Berkeley, to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, dated Jan. 29, 1972-----	44
Craig, George A., executive vice president, Western Timber Association, San Francisco, Calif., to Hon. John Melcher, dated July 20, 1973 (telegram)-----	7
Dorn, Carolyn, Ulsiah, Calif., to Hon. John Melcher, dated August 6, 1973-----	59
Dresbach, David W., Golden Rule Mobile Village, Willits, Calif., to Hon. John Melcher, dated August 1, 1973-----	58
Goddard, Dr. Wilson B., University of California, Davis, Calif., to Lake County Board of Supervisors, dated February 22, 1972-----	57
Kirby, Robert V., to Congressman John Melcher dated July 27, 1973--	8
Rimmer, Gene, Lakeport, Calif., to Hon. Don H. Clausen, dated August 3, 1973-----	59
Robinson, David G., The Harbor, to Congressman John Melcher-----	7
Smith, William F., resource manager, Louisiana-Pacific Corp., Ukiah, Calif., to Hon. John Melcher, dated July 24, 1973-----	7
Stebbins, G. Ledyard, president, California Native Plant Society, Berkeley, Calif., to Hon. Robert L. Leggett, dated January 13, 1972--	42
Wiggin, John J., to Hon. John Melcher, dated July 28, 1973-----	8
Additional information:	
Colusa County, Calif., Board of Supervisors, Resolution No. 72-10, dated February 29, 1972-----	12
Flora and Fauna of Snow Mountain-----	46
Glenn County, Calif., Board of Supervisors, Resolution No. 72-10, dated February 22, 1972-----	11
Lake County, State of California, Board of Supervisors, resolution-----	6
Nye sale alternatives, submitted by Mr. Nelson, Deputy Chief, Forest Service-----	23
Report: The Phytogeographic Significance of Snow Mountain, by L. R. Heckard, curator, Jepson Herbarium-----	42

The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science. The author then proceeds to a detailed examination of the various theories which have been proposed to explain the origin of life. He discusses the theory of spontaneous generation, the theory of biogenesis, and the theory of abiogenesis. He also discusses the theory of the origin of life from non-living matter, and the theory of the origin of life from living matter. The author concludes that the theory of abiogenesis is the most plausible of the theories which have been proposed. He also discusses the possibility of the origin of life from extraterrestrial sources.

SNOW MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS IN THE MENDOCINO NATIONAL FOREST

WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:40 p.m., in room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, John Melcher (chairman), presiding.

Mr. MELCHER. The Subcommittee on Public Lands will come to order.

The hearing this afternoon will be held on H.R. 2813, by our colleague Mr. Clausen from California; H.R. 4012 by Mr. Leggett and others; and H.R. 9063, by Mr. Leggett, to designate certain lands in the State of California as wilderness.

Without objection, H.R. 2813, by our colleague, Mr. Clausen, H.R. 4012 and H.R. 9063 will be made a part of the record and will be considered as read in full and will be made a part of the record at this point.

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

[The bills referred to follow:]

[H.R. 2813, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To designate certain lands in the State of California as wilderness

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1132(b)), certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, which comprise approximately thirty-seven thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Snow Mountain Defacto Wilderness Area", dated June 1971 are hereby designated as wilderness and shall be known as the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The wilderness area designated by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

[H.R. 4012, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To designate certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, as the "Snow Mountain Wilderness" for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890), certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, which comprise approximately thirty-seven thousand acres, and which are generally depicted on a map entitled "Snow Mountain DeFacto Wilderness Area" and dated June 1971, are hereby designated as wilderness.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The wilderness area designated by this Act shall be known as the "Snow Mountain Wilderness" and shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas.

[H.R. 9063, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To designate certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, as the "Snow Mountain Wilderness" for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890), certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, which comprise approximately thirty-seven thousand acres, and which are generally depicted on a map entitled "Snow Mountain DeFacto Wilderness Area" and dated June 1971, are hereby designated as wilderness.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The wilderness area designated by this Act shall be known as the "Snow Mountain Wilderness" and shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas.

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation issued thereunder or the provisions of any contract entered into pursuant to any such law or regulation, the Secretary of Agriculture may modify the terms of any contract involving the sale of timber on land located within the wilderness area designated by this Act, if the Secretary receives the consent of the parties to any such contract. Such modifications may include provision for the sale of timber located on other National Forest lands within the Mendocino National Forest in lieu of the timber on land located within the wilderness area designated by this Act.

(b) The timber which may be provided in lieu of the timber located on land within the wilderness area designated by this Act, as specified in subsection (a) of this section, shall be to the extent practicable approximately equal in volume, species, size, and accessibility to the timber located within such area and shall be sold at the same rates as may be specified in any contract which may be modified in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, the Department of Agriculture report dated July 24, and the Department of the Interior report dated July 23, on this bill and similar bills will be made a part of the record.

[The reports referred to follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1973.

HON. JAMES A. HALEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you requested, here is the report of the Department of Agriculture on H.R. 2813, a bill "To designate certain lands in the State of California as wilderness," and on H.R. 4012 and H.R. 9063, bills "To designate certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, as the 'Snow Mountain Wilderness' for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system."

The Department of Agriculture recommends that the bills not be enacted.

The bills would designate approximately thirty-seven thousand acres located in the Mendocino National Forest, California, as the "Snow Mountain Wilderness Area" to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1131 et. seq.). Additionally, H.R. 9063 would also authorize the Secretary to modify the terms of any contract involving the sale of timber within the wilderness area. The purpose of such a modification would be to delete from the contract timber located within the wilderness area, and provide in lieu therefor timber located on National Forest lands outside of the wilderness area.

In 1969, the Forest Service of this Department concluded an intensive study which was made to determine the best uses of the natural resources of the Snow Mountain area. The Snow Mountain study area generally included the same land which the bills would designate as wilderness. In making this study, wilderness establishment was one of the land use alternatives considered. The public was asked to comment on land use alternatives and freely responded.

The Forest Service concluded from its study that the Snow Mountain area could serve a variety of resource purposes and needs. It also concluded that no single resource use, need, or characteristic of the area is so dominant as to warrant dedicating the total area to that use.

As a result of these conclusions, the Mendocino National Forest developed a plan which provided management direction for eight sub-units of the area according to their respective capabilities. Two of the sub-units, consisting of 12,860 acres in total, have key attributes for primitive, dispersed type of recreation use and will be managed under the plan to maintain their scenic and primitive quality. In three other sub-units watershed and recreation considerations will predominate followed by timber management considerations. In the three remaining sub-units the respective management priorities by sub-unit are timber management, wildlife, and scenery.

We believe the pattern of land uses prescribed for the Snow Mountain area by the Forest Service will be of more benefit to the Nation's people than designating the area as wilderness.

Subsequent to the initial decision of the Forest Service to not recommend wilderness designation, the possible management options for the Snow Mountain area were reviewed again. Because of its size and unroaded nature, the area was identified as a roadless and undeveloped area of over 5,000 acres in extent, and was reviewed and evaluated under a recent study of all such National Forest roadless areas conducted by the Forest Service.

The basic purposes of the roadless area review study were to: (1) provide a systematic and orderly means for selecting roadless areas for study as possible wilderness areas; (2) afford prompt recognition of areas having considerable wilderness value so that the values could be protected until a final determination can be reached as to their classification for wilderness or other purposes; and (3) provide for orderly and meaningful public involvement in considering the best use of National Forest roadless areas.

A total of 1,448 roadless areas containing some 56 million acres were systematically evaluated. Each of the areas was rated as to its potential wilderness quality using such criteria as scenic quality, isolation, size, camping quality, and physical opportunities available for adventure and challenge. The evaluation procedure also rated the potential establishment cost, and costs of other resource values forgone (such as timber value) by wilderness classification. Compared to all other areas, we determined through the evaluation process that the Snow Mountain area had a low quality rating for wilderness purposes and was of high

cost. As a result of this study the Forest Service further concluded that the area should not be proposed as a new wilderness study area.

The boundaries of the wilderness area proposed by the bills encompass a larger area (by 7,000 acres), than considered in the studies made by the Forest Service. As a result, the proposed boundaries include an active Forest Service timber sale. The timber sale is located on slopes facing away from and to the north of logical topographic boundaries for a Snow Mountain Wilderness Area. Incorporation of the timber sale area would not improve the characteristics of any wilderness proposal for the Snow Mountain area. Rather, the inclusion of the timber sale area would only increase the amount of timber value forgone.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Under Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1973.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 2813 and H.R. 4012, similar bills to designate certain lands in the State of California as wilderness.

The subject bills would designate approximately 37,000 acres in the Mendocino National Forest, California as wilderness. This area is not included in the National Forest Service list of 235 roadless areas which they propose to study for potential inclusion in the wilderness system. Therefore this Department has not been requested to perform a mineral survey evaluating the mineral potential of these lands.

We know little of the mineral resources of the area. The area is underlain by sandstone, shale, conglomerate, greenstone, chert, limestone, and schist of the upper Jurassic and Cretaceous Franciscan Formation. We know of a deposit of onyx in the extreme northeast corner of the area on the Nye Ranch along Bear Wallow Creek. Manganese deposits in chert lenses are reported to occur about 4 miles east of the area in the Franciscan Formation. Fouts Springs near the southeast corner of the area was the site of a resort based on the mineral springs, and hot springs occur $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 miles south of the area.

We defer to the Department of Agriculture on the wilderness value of these lands, however we believe that before its inclusion into the wilderness system, more definitive information should be obtained regarding the resource potential of the area.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

CURTIS BOHLEN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MELCHER. I recognize the gentleman from California, Mr. Clausen, a member of the committee.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement that is prepared, and I will not take the time of the subcommittee to read my statement.

I would ask unanimous consent that that be included in the record as if read in full.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Clausen follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. DON H. CLAUSEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this statement in strong support of my bill, H.R. 2813, to create the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area in Northern California.

At the outset, I want to express my sincere gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for your responsiveness to our requests for a hearing on the Snow Mountain question. I know I speak for every witness here today when I say that we recognize the legislative and scheduling burdens you face at this particular time and that we deeply appreciate your conscientious attention to our request for hearings on this legislation.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is important to obtain prompt enactment of this legislation in order to insure that any future use of this area will be compatible with its existing primitive character.

The people of the area whom I am privileged to represent here in the Congress are clearly in favor of the establishment of this wilderness area as they have demonstrated formally through the official endorsement of this legislation by the Lake County Board of Supervisors.

I ask unanimous consent that the Board's endorsing resolution be included in the hearing record immediately following my introductory remarks. In addition, Mr. Chairman, a number of my constituents may want to comment for the record on this legislation and I ask unanimous consent to have until August 15 to submit these views to the Subcommittee for inclusion in the record.

Let me also take this opportunity here to commend the work of Mrs. Katherine Petterson of Kelseyville, California who has spearheaded the effort to initiate protection of the Snow Mountain area that is embodied in this legislation. I know the Subcommittee will want to pay particular attention to her remarks.

As we all know and recognize, Federal land policy has begun to change in the past decade from a policy of disposition to one of retention. In the past the Federal government encouraged the use of public lands as demonstrated by the land grants to soldiers in the Revolutionary War and the Civil War, to colleges, to railroads and to many others.

Today, however, we are committed to retaining and preserving more and more of these lands for the beneficial use of the general public. In addition, we want to upgrade wherever possible the uses of which we put these lands.

In my judgment, the Snow Mountain area in California fits perfectly within this concept as it has both the requisite characteristics of a primitive wilderness area, as well as the support of the local people most directly affected by its preservation.

I do not support those who would have us lock up public lands to the extent of prohibiting them to any use at all. The phrase "beneficial use of the general public" assumes that these lands will be utilized in many different ways in order to meet the varied interests of our people.

For example, to oppose logging for its own sake is to fail to recognize the obvious need in our society for many wood and paper products. The same is true of many other forest-related activities which provide millions of Americans with outdoor experiences every year; such as skiing, camping, fishing and other forms of outdoor recreation.

On the other hand, where we have an area that is generally recognized as one in which there is a unique opportunity to preserve a pristine area for all time with a minimum of impact on other public uses and with a maximum benefit to those able to enjoy the wilderness experience, then we have a duty and a responsibility, in my judgment, to take prompt and immediate action.

This is precisely why, after careful study and discussions with many knowledgeable and concerned people, I introduced this legislation shortly after the 1970 Census data added Lake County to my Congressional District. This is also why I re-introduced the bill immediately after the beginning of the 93rd Congress.

Northern California, as the members of this Subcommittee know, is an area of great natural beauty; a beauty its residents want nothing to mar. If Snow Mountain is designated a Wilderness Area it will mark the fourth major nationally protected conservation area in my Congressional District, in addition to the Golden Gate National Urban Recreation Area near us and hundreds of thousands of acres of State, local and private parklands.

I sincerely doubt that any other Congressional District in the country can exceed or even match our record in this field.

Thus, we want to continue our progress in a way that will permit maximum control by the local people who are most directly affected by these Federal decisions and in a way that makes certain that the esthetic beauty and natural values are maintained in perpetuity.

Approval of the Snow Mountain bill by this Committee and its enactment into law will help us meet this goal and insure the availability of this unique area to all Americans and to future generations yet to come.

I am confident the record we compile here today in support of this measure will demonstrate the need for early Congressional action on this proposal and I am confident that need will be established and fulfilled.

Mr. CLAUSEN. In this way, it will permit more of the witnesses that have come some distance to present their views.

Second, I have a resolution from the county of Lake that I would like to have made a part of the record.

And third, I have a written letter that was written to you by an organization in the area, and there may be others that will be forthcoming. So I would like to have the record left open at this point, should there be others that have not as yet arrived and put in the record at this point.

Mr. MELCHER. The resolution as described by the gentleman from California and the letter mentioned by the gentleman will be a part of the record at this point, and the record, without objection, will be held open at this point to include other matters pertaining to the designation of the proposed lands as wilderness.

[The documents referred to follow:]

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF LAKE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Resolution No. 72-42—Resolution endorsing and supporting passage of SB 2680 (Cranston) and HR 9806 (Leggett) for the establishment of Snow Mountain Wilderness area

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States, Senate Bill 2680 as introduced by the Honorable Alan Cranston, United States Senator from California and HR 9806 as introduced by the Honorable Robert Leggett, member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of California, for the establishment of a Snow Mountain Wilderness comprising approximately 37,000 acres of land, generally located in Southwestern Glenn County, north-eastern Lake County and northwestern Colusa County of California.

Whereas the preservation of Snow Mountain as a wilderness area has been the subject of detailed study and numerous meetings attended by interested citizens and persons of Lake County, the great majority of whom expressed sentiments in favor of establishing such a wilderness area, and

Whereas it would be in the best interests of the people of Lake County, the people of the State of California and of the United States as a whole for such an area to be preserved as a wilderness, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Lake, That, 1. Snow Mountain should be established and designated by Congress as a wilderness area: 2. SB 2680 and HR 9806 now pending before the Congress of the United States have approval and endorsement of the Board of Supervisors and the passage of such legislation is encouraged. 3. Copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to United States Senators John V. Tunney and Alan Cranston, and to Congressmen Robert Leggett and Don Clausen.

Ayes: Supervisors Wrieden, Lampson, Wilds.

Noes: Supervisors Denner, Martinelli.

Absent: None.

WESLEY O. LAMPSON,
Chairman of said Board.

Attest:

JAMES L. SHINN,
Deputy Clerk.

By JEANNE R. SIGHTS,
Clerk of said board.

LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORP.,
Ukiah, Calif., July 24, 1973.

Hon. JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee, House Interior and Insular Affairs
Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We were disappointed to learn of the support of S. 114, the Snow Mountain Wilderness bill by our California Senators, Mr. Cranston and Mr. Tunney, and our representative, Mr. Clausen. We feel they have been poorly advised by preservationist zealots who have never made any effort to understand the results of the U.S. Forest Service study which set aside substantial vehicle control and scenic areas while still leaving open the possibility of operation of timber management and other multiple use functions in other areas suitable to these uses and compatible to the environmental demands. To these zealots, the word "wilderness" has sacred connotations which override all other considerations.

A thorough unbiased review of the U.S.F.S. study and management decision on this area will show that due consideration was given to the total needs of those dependent on the lands and for the lands themselves.

Louisiana-Pacific has a mill at Potter Valley, California which is dependent for raw material on the area to the east and of which the Snow Mountain area is a part. About 200 families are directly supported by this mill operation. The mill has been at this location for 20 or more years and can be sustained forever by the growth on the forested areas under proper management. In 1965, a large fire destroyed 30,000 acres of timberland in the area reducing the immediately available timber base. The Snow Mountain Wilderness proposal threatens to erode this base permanently. The U.S.F.S. has been unable to offer a major sale in the Potter Valley area since 1970 partially because of manpower and budget restriction. We have been forced to dip heavily into our own fee lands to supply this operation. The Potter Valley people cannot afford to have their resource base eroded at this time and especially when it is really no purpose.

The Forest Service has offered an alternative to total lockup. It is a viable plan benefiting more than just a small vocal group. Please consider this in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. SMITH,
Resource Manager.

[Telegram]

WESTERN TIMBER ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., July 20, 1973.

Hon. JOHN MELCHER,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

Limited notice prevents our testifying in person July 25 on HR 4012, HR 2813 and HR 9063 bills to establish a snow mountain wilderness. We support forest service position. Such legislation is undesirable because roadless recreation assured on much of area as part of multiple use plan. California has millions of acres of wilderness, and classification of more would prevent good management of essential resources. We respectfully ask your rejection of these bills and inclusion of our statement in the hearing record.

GEORGE A. CRAIG,
Executive Vice President.

THE HARBOR.

Congressman JOHN MELCHER:
Care of Representative Don Clausen.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to you in order to express my views on the Snow Mountain bill which is before your committee. I am opposed to it very much for the following reason:

We have 1267 sq. miles here in Lake County, with a pop. of only 18,000 people of which 23 percent are over 65 years of age. 52 percent of this land is already owned by Government agency's.

Mendocino National Forest alone has 351,000 acres and very, very few people use it. Our lake has 43,800 acres and not too many people use that.

We the people of Lake County cannot afford any more land off our tax rolls in order to set up an area that probably not more than 10 people a year will use.

When we the people of Lake County are told every day that there is not enough Federal money to help us with our important problems like ours: Water shortage, sewers, or the cleaning of our Lake. I feel the spending of Federal money on turning a desolate area into a Wilderness area in a waste.

Thank you.

DAVID G. ROBINSON.

JULY 28, 1973.

HON. JOHN MELCHER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MELCHER: I appreciate this opportunity to submit this statement on the proposed Snow Mountain Wilderness. I believe there is a re-awakening, a changing appreciation of the needs of modern industrialized man, and that this changing perception recognizes the place that wilderness areas can play in relieving societal pressures, in enhancing the quality of life. For these reasons I urge prompt and favorable action to create a wilderness sanctuary to preserve the qualities which I believe all of us recognize are in growing need. I sincerely hope that the recommendation of the Forest Service is not followed. Let us instead follow the course of nonselfishness, of non-special interests which the Forest Service represents, and for a change show positive and wise leadership. Approve the establishment of the Snow Mountain Wilderness, with an encompassing size of at least 37,000 acres.

Thank you for this opportunity. I remain.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. WIGGIN.

JULY 27, 1973.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee,
House Interior Committee.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Many of our present wild areas are being "loved" to death, there are not enough such places, especially close to cities. Snow Mountain is about 150 miles from San Francisco Bay Area. If for no other reason Snow Mountain should be designated wilderness.

Most of scenic rugged Mendocino National Forest has been or is being developed. This is another reason why the 37,000 acre Snow Mountain plot should be saved.

I have read Forest Service statements that this area is low in timber values. Therefore there could be but little loss for the lumber market.

We are bringing too few areas into National Wilderness preserves for future needs. The Snow Mountain proposal with its diversified flora and fauna and scenery due to its 3,000 to 7,000 foot elevations will be a welcome addition to U.S. natural oases.

I will thank you to help make the Snow Mountain 37,000 acres a National Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

ROBERT V. KIRBY.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state publicly, however, how much I appreciate the fact that you have scheduled this, recognizing that we just completed a very hectic scheduling of events associated with the nationally publicized Alaskan pipeline. And I am surprised that you are even able to make it here today.

But recognizing all the scheduling problems that you do have, I do want to express, on behalf of the people in my district—and I am sure I speak for Mr. Leggett and others that are interested in this whole mountain wilderness area proposal—our deepest appreciation for your consideration in setting this date for hearing.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman very kindly, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to have this hearing this afternoon and to learn about the gentleman's proposal and other Members of the House, and I understand Senator Tunney is in support of it.

Mr. CLAUSEN. And Senator Cranston.

Mr. MELCHER. And Senator Cranston.

Our first witness this afternoon will be Congressman Bob Leggett from California. He is a very distinguished Member of the House and is a very good friend to all of us in the House.

I have a particular pleasure, Bob, in welcoming you before this subcommittee this afternoon. We will be delighted to hear what you have to tell us.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. LEGGETT. Very good.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clausen, I want to thank you both for scheduling this hearing on behalf of the majority and minority parties. We have a bipartisan representation.

I think that most of our witnesses that we have here are bipartisan. This is legislation that we testified to last year in the Senate, and then just a few weeks ago in the Senate.

I have a prepared statement. I would ask that my statement be incorporated in the record at this point, and my testimony along with that of Congressman Clausen will be supplemented by the statement by Mr. Jim Eaton of the Sierra Club and Mr. Don Morrill of the Wilderness Society and Ms. Katherine Petterson, who lives practically on top of Snow Mountain.

We also have in the audience Mr. Ed Davis of the Willows Daily Journal and a half a dozen other associated newspapers in the central valley of California.

And I have along with Congressman Clausen, resolutions from the board of supervisors in my area, which I will submit at the appropriate point. And we also have the Friends of the Earth, represented by Connie Parrish and George Alderson and others. And I believe those are substantially all the unofficial witnesses that are here.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, Congressman Leggett's entire statement will be made a part of the record at this point. And also without objection, at the conclusion of his presentation, the documents or statements that he had mentioned will be made a part of the record at that point.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Leggett follows:]

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I want to thank you for taking up the Snow Mountain Wilderness issue immediately after your laborious consideration of the Alaska pipeline. In comparison to the pipeline, Snow Mountain might seem like a minor issue, but to the people of Glenn, Lake and Colusa counties it is not insignificant.

As you know, the timing of this hearing is especially crucial. Road work on the Nye Timber Sale portion of the proposed wilderness has already begun,

and Commander Industries, the Company holding the contract for the Nye Timber Sale, was scheduled to begin logging the area this week.

First, a little history. In January of 1970 the Forest Service promulgated their management plan for the Snow Mountain area. Almost simultaneously, I began receiving a large number of correspondence urging my support of a wilderness classification for the area. Nevertheless, I refrained from taking a position on the issue until I had an opportunity to review all sides.

In July of 1970, I personally toured the proposed wilderness area in the air and on foot with the District Ranger, and in 1971 I introduced my first Snow Mountain wilderness bill. I would like to summarize for the Committee why I came to this decision.

First, Snow Mountain is the last potential wilderness area in this portion of California. There are nearly a million non-wilderness acres in Mendocino National Forest. Snow Mountain is the last little bit of all this Forest that is roadless and undeveloped. If established, Snow Mountain would be the closest area to the populations of metropolitan San Francisco, something like 125 miles, and would be the only wilderness area in the Mendocino National Forest accessible throughout the year. I have enclosed a map of potential wilderness areas in California to demonstrate how unique Snow Mountain is in this respect.

Second, the 37,000 acre Snow Mountain wilderness proposal has almost unanimous local support. The proposal has been co-sponsored in Congress by all four Federal Representatives of the area, Senators Cranston and Tunney, and Congressman Don Clausen and me. It has received the official support of the Boards of Supervisors of all three counties involved, and nearly 100 percent of the mail that I have received on this matter, (and it has been considerable) has been in favor of H.R. 2813 and H.R. 4012. I have copies of the Boards of Supervisors' resolutions in support of a Snow Mountain wilderness to be included in the Committee's record.

Unfortunately, in spite of the intense interest in H.R. 4012, the Snow Mountain area is in danger of being permanently scarred by a timber operation in the northwest corner of the proposed wilderness. This timber sale was awarded to Commander Industries in June of 1970 during the period that I was reviewing the locally initiated wilderness proposal for the area. This contract is scheduled to expire in December of this year.

I really can't blame Commander Industries for going ahead with their logging plans. They do have a contract, and it must be completed before the end of this year. I want to commend Commander for their decision last year to delay logging on the Nye Sale pending Congressional action, and for their continued interest in seeking an alternative timber site to replace the portion of the Nye Sale that lies within my proposal.

Over the last year I have been attempting to arrange just such an alternative. It appears, however, that the Forest Service does not have the authority to modify the Nye Timber Sale to this extent. For that reason, I have developed an amendment to this bill which will extend the necessary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in this instance.

The amendment, included in H.R. 9063, is very simple. It allows the Secretary to replace the timber in the Nye Sale that infringes on our wilderness with an alternate site outside of the proposal. This language was originally recommended to be by the Forest Service as a way to solve the current legal impasse.

The Forest Service has also been kind enough to designate a possible alternative timber sale in close proximity to Commander's Elk Creek Mill. This area, shown on this map, and known as the Kern Subdivision, holds about 3.8 million board feet of timber. The total timber available to Commander under the proposed alternative, then, would be 4.6 million board feet, when you add the 800,000 board feet that are available to Commander in the portion of the Crockett Subdivision that lies outside of the wilderness boundaries.

I have been advised, by the Forest Service, that although the Kern/Crockett alternative is about one million board feet less than the Nye Sale, net profits for the two sales should be about equal. This is due to the fact that the Kern Subdivision is much more accessible than the Pocket Subdivision, which it would replace.

It is stated in this amendment, of course, that this switch will only be effectuated if Commander Industries agrees to it. So far, I have not received any word from Commander whether they will accept the alternative or not. I understand that they will have to go into the Kern Subdivision and conduct a full-

fledged timber survey in order to corroborate everything that I have said today. I would like to point out that as late as July 3 the local press was reporting that Commander was amenable to a switch. I have enclosed a copy of that article.

Everything considered, I believe that this is a very fair compromise. By extending Commander this alternative site we will be protecting the integrity of the Snow Mountain wilderness without endangering the continued operation of Commander's Elk Creek Mill.

I know that it will be argued here today that in view of the current timber supply crisis we can't take this 5.5 million board feet of timber off the market. I am very concerned about the skyrocketing cost of lumber supplies around the country, but the way to alleviate this problem is not to blindly cut the last remnants of wilderness.

Years of effort have gone into the development of the Snow Mountain wilderness proposal. Unless the Congress acts soon all of this work will be ruled moot, and the last wilderness area in the Mendocino National Forest will be compromised forever.

Mr. LEGGETT. At this point I will insert a resolution by the board of supervisors of the county of Glenn, and a resolution by the board of supervisors of the county of Colusa, enacted unanimously. The resolution of the board of supervisors of the county of Lake, is on p. 6.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, so ordered.

[The items referred to follow:]

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, GLENN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. 72-10—RESOLUTION ENDORSING AND SUPPORTING PASSAGE OF SB 2680 (CRANSTON) AND HR 9806 (LEGGETT) FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SNOW MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS AREA

As a basis and premise for this Resolution, the Board finds:

1. There is now pending before the Congress of the United States, Senate Bill 2680 as introduced by the Honorable Alan Cranston, United States Senator from California, and HR 9806 as introduced by the Honorable Robert Leggett, Member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of California, for the establishment of the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area which is generally located in Southwestern Glenn County, Southeastern Lake County and Northwestern Colusa County of California.

2. The preservation of Snow Mountain as a wilderness area has been the subject of detailed study and many meetings attended by interested persons and citizens of Glenn County, the great majority of whom have expressed sentiments in favor of establishing such lands as a wilderness area.

3. It would be in the best interests of the people of Glenn County and in the best interests of the people of the State of California and of the United States as a whole for such an area to be preserved as a wilderness.

Therefore, it is resolved that:

1. Snow Mountain should be established and designated by Congress as a wilderness area.

2. SB 2680 and HR 9806 now pending before the Congress of the United States have the whole hearted approval and endorsement of this Board of Supervisors and the passage of such legislation is solicited and encouraged.

3. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Alan Cranston, United States Senator and to Honorable Robert Leggett, Member of Congress.

Passed and adopted this 22nd day of February, 1972, by the following vote:

Ayes: Holvik, Polzin, Reimers and Colbert.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

Abstaining: Abstaining.

RALPH P. COLBERT,
Chairman.

Attest:

MILTON E. WALKER,
County Clerk.

RESOLUTION No. 72-10

A RESOLUTION TO THE HONORABLE ALAN CRANSTON, THE HONORABLE JOHN V. TUNNEY AND THE HONORABLE ROBERT L. LEGGETT SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE PROPOSED SNOW MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS AREA

Whereas the Honorable Alan Cranston and the Honorable John V. Tunney, Senators from California, have introduced S. 2680, a bill in accordance with the Wilderness Act that proposes the designation of approximately thirty-seven thousand (37,000) acres entitled "Snow Mountain DeFacto Wilderness Area"; and

Whereas the Honorable Robert L. Leggett, Representative from California, has introduced H.R. 9806 in accordance with the Wilderness Act that concurs with the proposal of the Honorable Alan Cranston and the Honorable John V. Tunney. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Board of Supervisors, also representative of all the people of the County of Colusa, herein by unanimous expression fully endorses the foregoing recitals and pledges support of S. 2680 and H.R. 9806 bills to designate the Snow Mountain DeFacto Wilderness Area.

Passed and adopted this 29th day of February, 1972 by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Frank L. Miller, C. Martin Wilmarth, Edwin G. Ross, H. L. Peterson and R. J. Swallow.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

R. J. SWALLOW,
Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

Attest:

MARTHA NANNEN,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. LEGGETT. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for taking up the Snow Mountain issue after your laborious deliberation of the pipeline matter that has been referred to. In comparison with the pipeline, this is not of monumental significance, except for the people that are conservation minded.

As you know, the timing of this hearing is especially crucial. Road work on the Nye timber sale portion of the proposed wilderness has already begun, and Commander Industries, the company holding the contract for the Nye timber sale, was scheduled to begin logging the area this week.

I understand just today that a preliminary restraining order was issued by the Superior Court of the State of California against Commander Industries, against further proceeding; and a hearing on the temporary injunction has been scheduled for August 7. They have in mind the proceedings that are taking place, I am sure, here in the Congress of the United States.

First, a little bit of history on this project. In January 1970 the Forest Service promulgated their management plan for the Snow Mountain area. Almost simultaneously, I began receiving a large amount of correspondence urging my support of a wilderness classification for the area. Nevertheless, I refrained from taking a position on the issue until I had an opportunity to review all sides.

I might say that the Forest Service analysis of Snow Mountain was extremely comprehensive. It was complex, and it was multifaceted, and it was not the kind of document that you could discard lightly.

In July of 1970, I personally toured the proposed wilderness area by air and on foot with the district ranger. And in 1971, I introduced my first Snow Mountain wilderness bill. I would like to summarize for the committee why I came to this decision.

First, Snow Mountain is the last potential wilderness area in this portion of California. There are nearly a million nonwilderness acres in Mendocino National Forest. Snow Mountain is the last little bit of all this forest that is roadless and underdeveloped. If established, Snow Mountain would be the closest area to the populations of metropolitan San Francisco, something like 125 miles, and would be the only wilderness area in the Mendocino National Forest accessible throughout the year. I have enclosed a map. I have here for submission to the committee a map of potential wilderness areas in California to demonstrate how unique this Snow Mountain project is.

And what it shows—it stands out like a fly in a bowl of milk, right there in the middle of the coast ranges, in the middle of, now, our colleague, Clausen's, district. It was in my district at the time that we pioneered this proposal.

The 37,000-acre Snow Mountain wilderness proposal has almost unanimous local support. The proposal has been cosponsored in Congress by all four Representatives of the area, Senators Cranston and Tunney, and Congressman Clausen and myself. It has received the official support of the boards of supervisors, as I have mentioned, and likewise, my mail supports this project.

Unfortunately, in spite of the intense interest in H.R. 4012—that is coauthored by not only the four of us, but by 15 other Members of the House—the Snow Mountain project is in danger of being permanently scarred by a timber operation in the northwest corner of the wilderness. This timber sale was awarded to Commander Industries in June of 1970, during the period that I was reviewing the locally initiated wilderness proposal for the area. This contract is scheduled to expire in December of this year, and is quite a legal contract.

I cannot really blame Commander Industries for going ahead with their logging plans. They do have a contract, and it must be completed before the end of the year, or it reverts. I want to commend Commander, of course, for their delay in logging this project up to this point, because they were waiting for the Congress to take some action on these proposals. But, of course, with the time expiring, they had no other alternative but to go and move ahead.

We have come up with an alternative at this point that would allow them an alternative site, and I will describe that site in just a moment. Over the last year, I have been attempting to arrange this alternative. It appears that the Forest Service does not have authority to modify the existing timber sale. For that reason, I have developed an amendment to this bill which has been incorporated into the Senate bill already and will extend the necessary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to accomplish the objective we have in mind.

The amendment, included in H.R. 9063, is very simple. It allows the Secretary to replace the timber in the Nye sale that infringes on our wilderness with an alternate site outside of the proposal.

I wonder if I could have assistance from some of our prop people. This is Jim Eaton and Mr. Thornton from my office, and they have a mockup here of the Snow Mountain wilderness area. And this one was prepared, Mr. Eaton, by whom?

Mr. EATON. The students at the University of California.

Mr. LEGGETT. As I talk, you can go ahead and point out what we are talking about.

As I indicated, the amendment allows the Secretary to replace the timber in the Nye sale that infringes on our wilderness site.

Maybe if you would indicate, Jim, the boundaries of the existing proposed wilderness area so that the committee can see that. If you would also, then, indicate the Nye sale site, both within and without the wilderness area.

The language that we have provided in H.R. 9063, which has been incorporated in the pending Senate bill, was provided to me without recommendations by the Forest Service.

The Forest Service has been kind enough to designate a possible alternative timber sale in close proximity to Commander Industries' Elk Creek Mill. This area, shown on this map, and known as the Kern subdivision—do we have a map of the Kern subdivision?

If you would approach the chairman and show him on the map both the existing wilderness area and the existing Nye timber sale area, then show him the Kern subdivision area.

The Kern subdivision area holds about 3.8 million board feet of timber. The total timber available to Commander under the proposed alternative, then, would not only be the 3.8 million in the Kern alternative, but 800,000 board feet that are available to Commander Industries in the portion of the Crockett subdivision that lies outside of the wilderness boundaries, but is included within the existing timber contract.

I have been advised by the Forest Service that, although the Kern-Crockett alternative is about 1 million board feet less than the Nye sale, the net profits of the two sales at this time should be about equal. This is due to the fact that the Kern subdivision is much more accessible than the Pocket subdivision—if you could show the Pocket on there—which it would replace.

It is stated in this amendment, of course, that this switch will only be effectuated if Commander Industries agrees to it. This is not mandating any breach of contract. It provides an alternative to the Forest Service, such that they will have the power to negotiate through the Secretary of Agriculture a suitable alternative.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Do you have reason to believe that the Nye industries people would accept this alternative?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes.

I would submit at this point a copy of the front page of the Willows Daily Journal of July 3. We have the editor and publisher here that can verify this is a true and correct copy.

The title is:

Commander says, we will have to look at the swap.

What they have said is that they cannot buy the swap until they have investigated it, but their mind is certainly not closed to it.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Are there existing cruises or an inventory of the timberland that would indicate that they are comparable?

Mr. LEGGETT. There are cruises, and I understand Commander is not satisfied with that. They would actually want to cruise again the properties themselves and conduct a full-fledged timber survey to corroborate everything that we have said today. If everything we have said

today is not accurate, then, certainly, I would not want to impose on them anything they could not handle.

I would like to point out that as late as July 3, Commander has indicated that they are amenable to a negotiation. However, they did indicate that they had no formal contact with the Forest Service, mainly because the Forest Service is legally incapacitated from negotiating with them at this point.

Everything considered, I believe this is a fair compromise. By extending Commander this alternative site, we will be protecting the integrity of the Snow Mountain wilderness without endangering the continued operation of Commander's Elk Creek Mill.

I know that it will be argued here today that, in view of the current timber supply crisis, we cannot take this 5.5 million board feet of timber off the market. I am very much concerned about the skyrocketing cost of lumber supplies around the country, but the way to alleviate this problem is not to blindly cut the last remnants of wilderness. Moreover, with the billions of board feet which are on the market today, 5.5 million board feet, I can say, will have no substantial impact on the market.

Years of effort have gone into the development of the Snow Mountain wilderness proposal. Unless the Congress acts over the next few weeks, I think the last wilderness area in the Mendocino National Forest will be compromised forever.

I want to thank the chairman again for your patience in going over this statement, and we do have some other people now who are prepared to supplement my remarks.

I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much, Bob.

I do have one question.

This forest land is not designated as a primitive area at this time?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is true. It is part of a national forest. And this is a national forest that is about as close to the San Francisco Bay area as any national forest in the State.

Mr. MELCHER. Are there private inholdings within the proposed boundaries?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes. There are 640 acres inside the 37,000 acres that are in private hands.

This, I might state, that in the long omnibus wilderness proposal submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States, he included a great number of wilderness areas. I forget the exact number that were designated. Snow Mountain was not included in that designated area. If it was, of course, this could float with that whole bill.

Mr. CLAUSEN. On that subject, inasmuch as you had represented the area—the county of Lake—prior to the time that it was placed in the first district—you are obviously more familiar with the total proposal and the background of this.

Could you tell me why it was not included? Was there any reason why it was not included in the recommendations for wilderness designation by the executive agencies?

Mr. LEGGETT. One of the reasons is that most of these wilderness areas have considerable whiskers on them, and they have been in the mills of the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club for a great num-

ber of years. This is a relative youngster in the proposals. It has been receiving considerable attention from these groups of late, however.

The project might be a little smaller than some of the wilderness areas, but it is larger than others approved by the Forest Service. I do not believe that the reason for the exclusion was that the administration has unqualifiedly opposed the project. They have come up with a hybridized multiple use of this project, which is a fairly well-done job, done by the Forest Service for multiple use of the Snow Mountain area. It protects part of it, uses part of it for a road, and subjects another portion to logging.

It just so happens that all the boards of supervisors around there have looked at the Forest Service proposal. They have studied it. They think it is a good suggestion, and they would like to go a little bit further and give this entire area wilderness protection.

Mr. CLAUSEN. For the record, I wonder if you could further identify the Commander Industries—who the principals are, and their specific location, if you have that information.

Mr. LEGGETT. Commander Industries, as I understand it is a corporation. The president of Commander Industries is a man by the name of Mr. Earl Schwab. They have a principal place of business at Red Bluff, in colleague Johnson's area. And their mill that we have referred to in the hearing is actually located in your congressional district.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. The gentleman from California, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have read through your statement, Bob. I think it makes it very clear this has been under consideration for some time. As you suggest in your statement there has been consideration given to exchange involving the time sales that are now under consideration.

Have you been following that close enough to know when was the last agreement, or if there was an agreement reached on the two proposed exchanges?

Mr. LEGGETT. The Forest Service has not been able to offer a formal offer of the properties, one for the other, mainly because they just do not have authority to do that. They have suggested a number of alternatives. In the amendment that I suggest to the wilderness bill, we do not tie the exchange to any particular tracts of land.

What we do in section 4(a) in the supplemental bill that I filed, 9063, we state:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation issued thereunder or the provisions of any contract entered into pursuant to any such law or regulation, the Secretary of Agriculture may modify the terms of any contract involving the sale of timber on land located within the wilderness area designated by this act, if the Secretary receives the consent of the parties to any such contract. Such modification may include the provision of the sale of timber located on other national forest lands within the Mendocino National Forest in lieu of the timber on land located within the wilderness area designated by this act.

So this does give discretionary authority to the Secretary to accomplish this objective, and we have preliminarily negotiated it. Certainly, I cannot commit Commander Industries, but I am sure that, in light of the fact that the superior court today issued a restraining order on their further logging, they might have a substantial interest in the exchange, one that can produce for them a similar profit to the project under which they currently have a contract. They would be extremely interested in it, I think.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you know if there is any agreement reached between the Secretary and the company that holds the contract for the sale?

Mr. LEGGETT. No, there has not. This is just to give them authority to—actually to commence and complete negotiations that we have been carrying on, actually, outside of official channels.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. CLAUSEN. You are satisfied that the existing contract with Commander Industries is legal and valid?

Mr. LEGGETT. I think that everybody stipulates that the contract is a legally executed document. It describes the timber and is a fair contract. The only problem is the fact that the contract was let while we did have under consideration, informally, this general subject matter, which is not grounds to set it aside, but certainly, perhaps, grounds for an injunction temporarily to restrain logging at the present time.

Mr. CLAUSEN. That was the next question. What effect would this restraining order that you alluded to earlier in your testimony have? Was this by the superior court?

Mr. LEGGETT. As I understand, the attorney general of the State of California, without any connivance from my office—they decided that this was in the interest of the State of California to protect it as a wilderness area. And they thought that perhaps we were getting into redtape in the Congress and that perhaps they could help us out in achieving these wilderness objectives.

I provided them with an affidavit of the facts as I knew them to be. Outside of that, I have not aided, abetted, counseled, or done anything with respect to the restraining order.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. The gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RUNNELS. I have no questions.

Mr. MELCHER. I have one further question.

When I looked at the proposal there, as you presented it, and as I picked out the type of terrain that might be the usual terrain to serve as the boundary for a wilderness area, did you consider lopping off one or both portions of the areas where the timber sales were made?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes. It was the opinion of the conservationists that there is a portion that can be lopped off. That is the 800,000 board feet that we referred to, which is referred to as the Crockett area. And that would remain from the existing sale.

To take anything else, it is the conservationists' view, virtually unanimously, that there would be a rather substantial erosion into the concept of the wilderness in this particular area.

Mr. MELCHER. Which is the Crockett area on your map?

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Eaton, could you point it out?

I might say that this is, of course, just a topographical layout. There are beautiful trees and all kinds of firs that are on top of here.

The Crockett area would be this portion here, on the other side of the ridge-line. The Nye area is this area; and the Pocket portion is here [indicating].

Mr. MELCHER. You were considering lopping off Crockett?

Mr. LEGGETT. If we lop off this off here [indicating], we would have a big tongue sticking into the center of the district here. While this is, perhaps, an arguable point to lop that off, there is some beautiful

timber in here which we feel measurably enhances this ridge-line here [indicating].

Mr. MELCHER. What you have allowed in that northwest corner is a boundary, lower down, near roads or without roads?

Mr. LEGGETT. I think there is one dirt trail that goes through here. It does, however, qualify for wilderness protection on virtually all the criteria.

I think there are other conservationists that can speak specifically to the reasons why this line was drawn at the top of that particular ridge-line, as opposed to further down the hill. There is considerable local history that a lot of the folks in the audience are prepared to give to the committee.

Mr. CLAUSEN. If the gentleman would yield.

Ms. Petterson, who lives in the area, is intimately familiar with it.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank you very much, Bob, for your testimony and for your presentation of the topographical area.

Mr. LEGGETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MELCHER. We found that very helpful.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I want to thank you, Bob, for not only the presentation but the excellent cooperation we have enjoyed on this particular project.

Mr. LEGGETT. I would also like to submit at this point—I see you have an original statement of Senator Cranston. If we could submit that for the record.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, Senator Cranston's statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

And also without objection, the statement submitted by Senator Tunney will be made a part of the record at this point.

[The prepared statements of Senators Cranston and Tunney follow:]

STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN CRANSTON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to submit this statement to the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee in support of H.R. 4012, to designate the Snow Mountain wilderness area within the Mendocino National Forest, California. This bill is identical to S. 114 which I have introduced in the Senate.

The Snow Mountain area merits wilderness designation. The 37,000 acre wilderness proposed in H.R. 4012 is a superb example of the coastal mountain ranges in Colusa, Glenn, and Lake Counties. Rugged in character and dominated by 7,056 foot Snow Mountain peak, the area provides a unique opportunity for solitude within a couple of hours drive of major population centers in the state—Sacramento and San Francisco. Although not heavily timbered, it is an area rich in native flora and fauna. The vegetation includes grasslands, mountain meadows, many chaparral types, canyonoaks, oak woodland, mixed conifers, high elevation red and white fir and others. Snow Mountain also abounds with wildlife—deer, squirrel, bobcats, golden eagles, quail, bear and mountain lions. The Middle Fork of Stoney Creek flowing through the area supports a fine native trout fishery.

The Snow Mountain de facto wilderness is the last remnant of the 1,082,642 acre Mendocino National Forest that still is undeveloped, other than the already-designated 73,997 acre Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel wilderness. Except for some very recent road clearing, there are no non-conforming features within the proposed Snow Mountain wilderness.

Support for designation of the 37,000 acre wilderness has been overwhelming. There is nearly unanimous local citizen support. The Boards of Supervisors of all three counties involved have adopted resolutions endorsing the wilderness proposal. Both Senators and the two Congressmen representing the area favor wilderness designation and have sponsored the necessary legislation.

The only opposition to the bill I know of comes from the Forest Service and the timber industry. In spite of longstanding public support for the wilderness, in January, 1970, the Forest Service decided to oppose designation of this area as wilderness, adopting instead a multiple use management plan for 27,000 acres, including 6,618 as backcountry, 6,238 acres as scenic area, and six other zones with modified management. The Forest Service plans include the extension of a large two-lane Pacific Coast highway through the heart of the wilderness area.

In addition, the Forest Service awarded a timber sale contract involving 3,080 acres, of which 770 are to be logged, to Commander Industries in June, 1970. 2,002 acres of this sale are actually within the proposed Snow Mountain wilderness boundaries. According to the terms of the timber sale, the timber must be cut by the end of this year. I favor a plan to offer Commander Industries alternative timber. This is still possible since to date no logging has taken place. However, time is short. I understand that Commander Industries has cleared a timber access road into the wilderness area itself. According to local observers, there is no significant or permanent damage yet.

Only immediate establishment of the Snow Mountain wilderness can protect this area from imminent logging and continued road building and preserve the area for the public now and in the future. I urge the Subcommittee's early action on H.R. 4012.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony before this Subcommittee today.

I have made my remarks brief because I believe the situation of the Snow Mountain wilderness can be capsulized rather easily.

By way of introduction, I would like to say that I am personally committed to the wilderness concept. The wilderness is perhaps the last untouched land where man can meet nature on nature's own terms. It is an outdoor classroom, a laboratory for ecological research and a living sample of the original American landscape. Moreover, the wilderness is—for all practical purposes—a nonrenewable resource.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that lands which legitimately qualify as wilderness areas under the 1964 Act should be so designated—and Snow Mountain is one of those areas.

Mr. Chairman, the merit question of whether or not Snow Mountain should be a wilderness is purely academic. The question before us is whether or not there will be anything left to designate as a wilderness after this logging season.

It is myopic to romanticize, however, and ignore the logging issue. This country needs timber. As a matter of slight departure from the subject at hand, we are all aware of the fact that we are experiencing a lumber shortage as a result of questionable export policies.

But the answer to this problem is not to overact by nonselective logging. We have stated as national policy that we recognize the need to balance esthetics and economics. I believe we can do that by carefully identifying our resources and selecting for use those which do not have serious overriding environmental and social quotients.

Realistically, I know that we may not be able to set aside as wilderness all those lands which are presently eligible, but by refusing to establish critical areas now can only mean that ultimately there will be pitifully little left to choose from.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot urge too strongly that your Subcommittee favorably report this legislation.

Mr. LEGGETT. I might also submit for your informal use this document.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

Our next witness will be Thomas C. Nelson, Department of Agriculture, Deputy Chief, Forest Service.

Mr. Nelson, the subcommittee is delighted to have you with us this afternoon. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS C. NELSON, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, DEPUTY CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY GEORGE M. LEONARD, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR, TIMBER MANAGEMENT

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With me today is George M. Leonard, who is Special Assistant to the Director of Timber Management here in Washington, D.C. I would ask that he sit at the table with me, as he has the details on the timber sale.

Mr. MELCHER. We are pleased to have Mr. Leonard with you, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure for me to be here before the subcommittee to present the views of the Department of Agriculture on legislation proposing a Snow Mountain wilderness area on the Mendocino National Forest, Calif.

In 1969, the Forest Service concluded an intensive study which was made to determine the best uses of the resources of the Snow Mountain area. The Snow Mountain study area generally included the same lands which the bills would designate as wilderness. In making this study, wilderness establishment was one of the land use alternatives considered. The public was asked to comment on land use alternatives and freely responded.

We concluded from the study that the Snow Mountain area could serve a variety of resource purposes and needs. We also concluded that no single resource use, need, or characteristic of the area is so dominant as to warrant dedicating the total area to that use.

As a result of these conclusions, the Mendocino National Forest developed a plan which provided management direction for eight subunits of the area according to their respective capabilities. I would like to briefly discuss this plan, with the aid of the map attached to the copies of my statement, which explains how the area will be managed under the Mendocino National Forest plan. Essentially, this plan presents the alternative to wilderness designation.

As you can see from the map, the area covered under the plan generally conforms to the area of the proposed wilderness. Motorized vehicular use is only permitted within the area of the plan on certain designated trails.

Subunits A and B, the Snow Mountain back country and Middle Fork Stony Creek units, consist of 12,860 acres in total, and have key attributes for primitive, dispersed type of recreation use. They have been designated as scenic areas under Secretary's regulations. They will be managed under the plan to maintain their scenic and primitive quality. Motorized vehicular use is prohibited in the back country unit, unit A, and prohibited from the canyon zone of the Middle Fork Stony Creek unit, unit B.

Subunit C, the Pacific Crest Travel Zone, consists of 700 acres and is established along the planned route of the Pacific Crest Highway. It will be managed to maintain a pleasing landscape to the traveling public.

Subunit D, the Hummingbird-Cooper Butte Unit, consists of 7,300 acres. It offers the best opportunities for wildlife habitat improvement within the total area. This unit will be managed to maintain and improve plant cover for wildlife by carrying out such projects as converting overmature brush to improve winter browse conditions for deer.

Subunits E, F, G, the county line, North Ridge, and Box Springs Units, consist of 7,900 acres in total. Some good stands of timber can be found in these units, but watershed and esthetic considerations predominate. Timber will be harvested only to the extent that the dominant values can be protected.

Subunit H, the Bear Wallow Unit, consists of 1,250 acres. This is a good timber growing area. Management will be directed to growing and harvesting timber consistent with other resource requirements.

We believe we have prescribed a pattern of land uses for the Snow Mountain area that will be of more benefit to the Nation's people than designating the area as wilderness.

Subsequent to our initial decision not to recommend wilderness designation for the Snow Mountain area, we again reviewed possible management options for the area. Because of its size and unroaded nature, the area was identified as a roadless and undeveloped area of over 5,000 acres in extent, and was reviewed and evaluated under a recent study of all such national forest roadless areas conducted by the Forest Service.

The basic purposes of the roadless area review study were to: (1) Provide a systematic and orderly means for selecting roadless areas for study as possible wilderness area; (2) afford prompt recognition of areas having considerable wilderness value so that the values could be protected until a final determination can be reached as to their classification for wilderness or other purposes; and (3) provide for orderly and meaningful public involvement in considering the best use of national forest roadless areas.

A total of 1,448 roadless areas containing some 56 million acres were systematically evaluated. Each of the areas was rated as to its potential wilderness quality using such criteria as scenic quality, isolation, size, camping quality, and physical opportunities available for adventure and challenge. The evaluation procedure also rated the potential establishment cost, and costs of other resource values forgone, such as timber value, by wilderness classification.

Compared to all other areas, we determined through the evaluation process that the Snow Mountain area had a low-quality rating for wilderness purposes and was of high cost. As a result of this study, the Forest Service further concluded that the area should not be proposed as a new wilderness study area.

The boundaries of the wilderness area proposed by the bills under consideration encompass a larger area, by 7,000 acres, than considered in the studies made by the Forest Service. As a result, the proposed boundaries include an active Forest Service timber sale. The timber sale is located on slopes facing away from and to the north of logical topographic boundaries for a Snow Mountain Wilderness Area. Incorporation of the timber sale area would not improve the characteristics of any wilderness proposal for the Snow Mountain area. Rather, the

inclusion of the timber sale area would only increase the amount of timber value forgone.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement, but before answering questions, I think I should comment to the committee about various statements that have occurred in various Snow Mountain hearings.

First, the statement was made that the Forest Service is opposed to the creation of wilderness. Here, I think the record does not indicate this to be the case, because national forest wilderness and canoe areas, which were conceived and protected as much as 40 years preceding the Wilderness Act, were the source of the original 9.1 million acres that were included into the wilderness system by the act.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Nelson, what hearings are you referring to?

Mr. NELSON. I am referring to the previous hearings of the Senate.

Mr. MELCHER. On the Senate side?

Mr. NELSON. On the Senate side, on the Snow Mountain hearings.

Mr. CLAUSEN. This year?

Mr. NELSON. Some this year and several previously.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Nelson, if you will forgo that; if the committee members are interested in the statements made on the Senate side, we will elicit that, or we will get at that in the questions that we ask you, if you do not mind.

We would prefer to discuss your testimony before us here today.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MELCHER. I notice on page 3, at the bottom, you say the Snow Mountain area had a low-quality rating for wilderness purposes and was of high cost. I do not really follow what you are getting at there.

Mr. NELSON. We had a series of criteria devised for evaluating the 1,448 roadless areas which were part of the study that we conducted, Mr. Congressman. And then we attempted to apply a quality index for ranking this total number of roadless areas as to their potential wilderness values.

The quality index included such factors as the scenic quality of the area, the variety of the conditions within the area, and its isolation and its size.

Mr. MELCHER. What about the high cost?

That is the part that puzzles me.

Mr. NELSON. There were two principal factors that came into the cost here, Congressman. First, there are about 640 acres of private land, and the remainder of the cost, if I recall correctly, was primarily based on the timber values forgone.

Mr. MELCHER. I can understand the cost of an in-holding, but I cannot understand forgoing something that you are not going to sell being referred to as a cost.

Those are the two points that you are referring to, however?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. MELCHER. The gentleman from California, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. While we are faced here with a bit of participation on the floor and we will have to go, the questions that I have would be directed toward the timber sale which has been awarded and is now a matter of record.

As I understand it, there has been an injunctive proceeding brought in the court, where cutting has been halted in the proposed wilderness area?

Mr. NELSON. It is my understanding that the temporary restraining order was granted yesterday, which prohibited the logging of timber within the Nye timber sale and also any further road construction within the sale until hearings, which are scheduled August 7.

Mr. JOHNSON. The road construction has stopped on the sale, as well as the cutting of timber?

Mr. NELSON. That is my understanding, that the restraining order of yesterday had that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON. Has the Forest Service evaluated the operation on the part of the Federal Government as it relates to this timber sale?

Mr. NELSON. I am not sure I understand your question, Congressman Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. That timber sale was offered and, as I understand it, Commander Industries was the successful bidder, and the cutting was authorized after all of the conditions had been met of the sale, as to road construction and other matters of concern that were included in the sale?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. These actions have already been halted by the court, as well as the road construction. What is the obligation of the Federal Government in this instance?

Mr. NELSON. I do not know the answer to that question, Mr. Congressman. I do know that we are preparing our statements for the hearings and getting material together. This came upon us yesterday, and I do not have the background at this time.

I can attempt to get this for the record.

Mr. JOHNSON. I presume that you are preparing to appear in court in support of your obligations as to the timber sale having been let?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Our colleague, Mr. Leggett, made mention of the trade, or an exchange of the cutting rights in other areas within the Mendocino and other national forests. How far have you gone with that?

Mr. NELSON. At Congressman Leggett's request, we had worked through a series of alternative sale areas. At the same time, we informed the Congressman we did not have the authority to substitute sales. So we have worked out a series of alternatives in this case.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am wondering if your alternatives, if they are in writing, could be made part of the record?

Mr. NELSON. They can be made part of the record, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that that be made part of the record.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, the material will be made part of the record at this point, when it is available.

[The material referred to follows:]

NYE SALE ALTERNATIVES

(1) GOAT ROCK—ESTIMATE VOLUME, 4.8 MMBF

Advantages.—Comparable timber.

Disadvantages.—Part of a sale in the current sale program. Forest would not meet sell quota if the sale was deleted. Road construction needed.

Conclusion.—Not considered an acceptable alternative.

(2) HUNTER RIDGE OR FIR ROOT SPRING—ESTIMATED VOLUME, 5.5 MMBF

Advantages.—Comparable timber.

Disadvantages.—Would need road construction. Hunter Ridge would need a right-of-way and Fir Root Spring would need on intensive geological investigation. One year would be required to prepare the sale and additional financing would be needed. Five-year sale plan would need to be adjusted.

Conclusion.—Not considered an acceptable alternative.

(3) MIDDLE RIDGE—ESTIMATED VOLUME, 5.5 MMBF

Advantages.—Higher quality timber. Area already roaded.

Disadvantages.—Would require shortline, skyline logging. Timber would not be available for at least six months. Sale preparation costs would be higher because of the specialized logging system.

Conclusion.—Not considered an acceptable alternative.

(4) GARNETT CAMP—ESTIMATED VOLUME, 5.5 MMBF

Advantages.—Comparable timber that could be tractor logged.

Disadvantages.—True fir timber while NYE Sale was predominantly ponderosa pine. Would cause shuffling of sales in 5-year sale program. Timber would not be available for at least 6 months.

Conclusion.—Not considered an acceptable alternative.

(5) RECENTLY CUTOVER AREAS—ESTIMATED VOLUME, 5.5 MMBF

Advantages.—Road in place. Little impact on sale program. Comparable timber.

Disadvantages.—Would be overcutting in certain areas to detriment of water quality, wildlife, fisheries, and silviculture.

Conclusion.—Not considered an acceptable alternative.

(6) KERN—ESTIMATED VOLUME, 3.8 MMBF

Advantages.—Comparable timber. Roads in place with shorter log haul. Least impact of any alternative.

Disadvantages.—Less timber than in Nye Sale. Would have to be field checked and marked.

Conclusion.—An acceptable alternative in the event special legislation would be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is one other matter here. Have you negotiated with the—the halting of the timber sale, as to the alternatives?

Mr. NELSON. I will ask Mr. Leonard if he would speak to that question.

Mr. LEONARD. The local forest people have had some informal contacts with Commander Industries in terms of whether they would be willing to consider alternatives, yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. In the areas where the alternatives would take place, where they actually go forward and the harvest would take place—are they within the area that is considered in the bill, as far as where the timber is and where the manufacturing would take place?

Mr. LEONARD. The six alternatives that were identified are in the same general area of the Mendocino National Forest. They are outside the wilderness proposal entirely. Some are closer and some are farther from the Elk Creek plant, which is the plant that gets the timber from the Nye sale.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. The gentleman from California, Mr. Clausen.

Mr. CLAUSEN. This delicate area that has been described, to us as the Crockett subdivision, and then you have the Nye area—it is my

understanding from previous testimony that the Nye area is the one that is the most critical in the eyes of the supporters of the wilderness area. Is this correct?

Mr. LEONARD. The timber sale itself is called the Nye Timber Sale. It has two subdivisions, one of which is the Crockett subdivision, and the other is the Pocket subdivision. So the Nye includes the two subdivisions.

Mr. CLAUSEN. It is my understanding that a part of the area was going to be logged by road, and part would be logged by helicopter. Is it in the Pocket area where the logging by helicopter will take place?

Mr. LEONARD. Yes. The Pocket subdivision. As of yesterday, the contract was modified to provide for the logging of the Pocket area by helicopter, so no permanent roads would be necessary in the Pocket subdivision. There will only be temporary roads.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Is it going to be feasible to carry on helicopter logging, because of the elevation of that area?

Mr. LEONARD. Yes, sir. No problem. No problem with helicopters.

Mr. CLAUSEN. This is the traditional practice in the area?

Mr. LEONARD. It is a new practice in the area, but Commander Industries has reached agreement with a helicopter company to log the area. And our studies show it is feasible to use helicopters in this area. They have been used at higher elevations than this.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I may want to get back to this a little bit later on.

Is this area going to be affected by an overall road system that is going to cover the whole Mendocino National Forest that will carry out the programs of the Forest Service?

Mr. NELSON. Congressman, on the map in front of you, this area C was planned as a road corridor which would connect above and below with other portions of the Mendocino.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I will pursue this a little later on. I do not want to take the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman. This is a matter that was brought to my attention. I will pursue this with the Forest Service later on, with all the other questions.

You are here in Washington, both of you?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Nelson, you mentioned that Pacific Crest highway. What would be the alternative route of the highway if Snow Mountain is designated as wilderness?

Mr. NELSON. At this point in time, Congressman, we have not developed an alternative for this particular highway. It has been planned for some period of time along the crest.

Mr. MELCHER. Where would it be? Could you point it out here on the topographical map?

Mr. LEONARD. Essentially, it comes through this timber sale area here [indicating]. In fact, a portion of the road that is being built on the timber sale is on the location of the Pacific Crest highway as it comes along the slope of Snow Mountain.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you.

Mr. CLAUSEN. How much timber is involved, total, in the so-called Nye sale?

Mr. NELSON. About 5.5 million board feet.

Mr. CLAUSEN. 5.5 million board feet?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct, 1.7 million board feet is in the Pocket or eastern sales unit. The 3.8 million in the Crockett or the western sales unit.

Mr. CLAUSEN. These alternative sites, I am assuming would be used for an exchange arrangement, if you will, assuming they have a contract now that is valid and legal. Are there going to be additional dollar factors involved because of the lack of access? Is this going to be a factor?

Mr. LEONARD. In none of the six alternatives that have been identified can we make a perfect match in dollars. In some cases, it would require more timber volume. In one case, it takes twice as much timber volume to get a relatively comparable dollar value. In the alternative that we have identified that looks most favorable, the timber is closer to their mill, so it will take a little bit less volume to come up with an essentially comparable dollar value.

Mr. CLAUSEN. It is my understanding that you assisted in the legal drafting with Congressman Leggett, in preparation of what is now section 4 of his H.R. 9063. Is this correct?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct. It was at his request.

Mr. CLAUSEN. What is the official position of the Department? Do you support this language, or were you just accommodating the

Mr. NELSON. We were accommodating the Congressman.

Mr. NELSON. We were accommodating the Congressman.

Mr. CLAUSEN. If we were to offer an amendment consisting of the language as he has proposed in section 4, what would be the official position of the Department?

Mr. NELSON. On that particular amendment, I would feel, sir, that the Department would not have any objection to some type of compensation to the contractor for the Federal taking.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Leonard.

I think representatives of the Bureau of Mines are present in the room. If they will identify themselves.

Mr. WILDARE. W. L. Wildare, Bureau of Mines.

Mr. MELCHER. For the record, will you tell us if you know of mineral potential in the areas or have studied the proposed area?

Mr. WILDARE. We have not made a mineral survey of that area, and we do not know what the mineral potential might be.

Mr. MELCHER. There has been no survey?

Is there any indication of mineral potential?

Mr. WILDARE. There has only been the crudest of geological mapping, primarily to fill in the gaps of the State geological map. We know relatively little about particulars about the geology. We have not made a survey for the minerals.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank you.

The next witness will be the Wilderness Society, Mr. Harry Crandall and Mr. Don Morrill.

STATEMENT OF DONALD MORRILL, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY ACCOMPANIED BY DOUGLAS SCOTT, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Crandall was not able to make it today, and I have Mr. Doug Scott of our staff here.

With the committee's permission, I could submit my statement for the record and summarize the major points.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, your entire statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

You may summarize it.

[The prepared statement of Donald Morrill follows:]

STATEMENT OF DONALD MORRILL, REPRESENTING THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

I am Donald Morrill representing The Wilderness Society. As you know, The Wilderness Society is a national non-profit conservation organization of some 85,000 members actively engaged in educational programs to acquaint Americans with the need for wilderness in a quality environment.

The Wilderness Society is in full support of the 37,000 acre proposal for Snow Mountain Wilderness, and commends the diligent efforts of local citizens which has brought the proposal this far. The Wilderness Society is grateful to the Committee for the prompt scheduling of hearings on this vitally important and endangered wilderness resource. We also deeply appreciate the efforts of Congressman Robert Leggett and Congressman Don Clausen, whose bills for a Snow Mountain Wilderness are being considered today (H.R. 2813, H.R. 4012 and H.R. 9063).

The 37,000 acres of Snow Mountain Wilderness offer superb aesthetic, watershed, recreational and wildlife values. The mountain itself, which lies in the approximate center of the wilderness, rises to a height of over 7,000 feet, and is one of the largest mountains of the Central Coast Range of California. The 37,000 acre area is a remnant of what was until very recently a vast coast range wilderness. It supports a great variety of plant and animal life, including the fast disappearing mountain lion. Included in the proposal is a considerable length of the Middle Fork of Stony Creek, including the headwaters. The creek is a potential candidate for wild and scenic status, and is one of the outstanding native rainbow trout streams in California.

Snow Mountain's close proximity to the rapidly expanding population centers of North Central California greatly enhance its recreational value. As a life long resident of Berkeley, California, I am very much aware of the acute need for primitive recreation within relatively easy reach of the San Francisco Bay Area. Establishing a Snow Mountain Wilderness would not increase the availability of such recreation, but would at least assure that the last great wilderness of Mendocino National Forest would be preserved.

Another outstanding recreational advantage of Snow Mountain Wilderness is its accessibility early and late in the season, as well as the excellent opportunities for winter wilderness enthusiasts.

I recently had the opportunity to hike into the Snow Mountain area, and saw both how beautiful and how fragile the region was. South of the proposed wilderness, off-road vehicles have chewed up acres of what was once beautiful ridges. Prompt action is vital to protect this area from similar abuse.

Virtually every level of government has recognized the significance of preserving the Snow Mountain area. The three Boards of Supervisors of the counties in which the wilderness lies have formally endorsed the 37,000 acre proposal. The State has expressed considerable interest in protecting Snow Mountain. Senators Alan Cranston and John Tunney have introduced legislation in the Senate for a 37,000 wilderness. Congressman Robert Leggett and Congressman Don Clausen, whose districts include area within the wilderness proposal, have introduced similar legislation.

Unfortunately, years of responsible citizen effort may well be in vain, if an existing timber sale, much of which is within the proposed wilderness boundaries, is allowed to be completed. We feel strongly that the so-called "Nye Sale" was a serious mistake, and if cut will destroy a far more valuable wilderness resource.

There was considerable public sentiment for the 37,000 acre proposal in 1970 when the timber contract with Commander Industries, Inc. was signed. Yet the Forest Service gave little or no notice of their intentions of selling the timber to citizens interested in a wilderness proposal. The unfortunate consequence of this negligence is that a clear expression of public sentiment may go totally unheeded, and irreplaceable wild land may be logged and roaded.

We understand that Commander Industries, Inc., the contractor, agreed to postpone logging of the Nye Sale for a year, pending outcome of legislation.

They also have indicated willingness to consider alternative timber. The contract for the Nye Sale expires in December 1973, and accordingly, Commander apparently has decided to proceed to complete the terms of the contract.

We understand that Congressman Leggett has introduced a new bill, H.R. 9063, for a 37,000 acre wilderness which includes an amendment which would preserve the integrity of the wilderness area, and provide for the substitution of alternative timber outside the proposed wilderness. We believe that this could well be a vehicle for resolution of this unfortunate conflict.

As you know, many Americans are disenchanted with a government which to them seems remote and unresponsive. The Forest Service in the case of Snow Mountain has failed dismally to reflect public sentiment, and has acted repeatedly to discourage responsible citizen participation in government decisionmaking. We urge the committee to report a 37,000 acre Snow Mountain Wilderness Bill and help restore the faith of those who have so long and patiently labored to protect this area.

Mr. MORRILL. First of all, we would like to thank the committee for holding hearings promptly on this matter. The area right now is quite critical, as we see it, as a wilderness resource and also endangered by both logging and roads.

We would also like to thank the efforts of Congressman Clausen and Congressman Leggett in helping to bring this to the attention of the committee.

I am an original resident of the San Francisco Bay area and I have just returned from a trip there and am aware of the acute need for primitive recreation within relatively easy reach of the San Francisco Bay area. Snow Mountain wilderness, although, it would not increase the amount of area set forth for primitive recreation, would at least assure that this area would not be eroded and logged.

I recently had an opportunity to hike into Snow Mountain, and I saw how beautiful the area was and also how fragile the area has been. South of the proposed wilderness, a great deal of off-road vehicles have made extensive—have been used extensively, and many of the ridges are scarred by large motor vehicle trails.

As other witnesses have mentioned, virtually every level of government in California is supporting the preservation of Snow Mountain area. We are quite concerned that years of effort by responsible citizen groups and citizens in the area might prove futile if the present Nye sale is allowed to be completed.

We feel quite strongly that the Nye sale was a serious mistake on the part of the Forest Service, that there was a considerable citizen support for this area as a wilderness. And we feel that as a wilderness resource, it is far more valuable than its timberland.

Mr. MELCHER. Did the Wilderness Society participate in the hearings in the region, in the area?

Mr. MORRILL. No.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, on that point, numerous of our members in the area were notified of the various planning hearings in the late 1960's that were held on the subject, and doubtlessly, some of those members participated as individuals. We were not formally represented.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you.

Mr. MORRILL. We understand that Commander Industries postponed their cut, and commend their public spirit in that regard. And we do understand that there is road construction going on now, and that the preliminary injunction was issued through the court.

We hope that there will be some way out of this unfortunate conflict. We feel that Congressman Leggett's bill—the new bill, with the amendment, H.R. 9063—is a possible vehicle for resolution of the conflict.

We certainly hope that the committee will see fit to act expeditiously and provide a 37,000-acre Snow Mountain wilderness.

Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. The gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I see we have a vote.

Mr. MELCHER. The committee will stand recessed for purposes of going to the floor for a vote.

We will be back here at 5 minutes of 3.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. MELCHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. There may be some questions that I will want to direct to you, but I do want to express, Mr. Morrill, my appreciation for taking time to come before the committee, and also the personal time you have given to me in acquainting me with all the factors as you see them.

Suppose the logging on the Nye sale continues and it is actually completed, do you feel that the Congress can go ahead, or should go ahead, in authorizing the Snow Mountain Wilderness area?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could speak to that. In our view, the tremendous public interest in your area and across California is represented not only by the Board of Supervisors, your sponsorship of this bill, Mr. Leggett, and many members of the delegation, the Senate, and now the law suit by the State.

And I think that it comes as a surprise to a lot of people that that suit was filed by the State, not the Sierra Club or the Wilderness Society. This demonstrates an overwhelming case against proceeding with the timber case. We feel that there is a way to solve this problem to reflect that public interest.

That's what we hope the committee will do. If there is simply no willingness on the part of the Congress to fulfill that and act that way; we still feel that the great bulk of this area merits wilderness protection. We think the local people from your area in California to develop this proposal has a sound justification for this boundary. The timber sale is not well justified, it is a deficit sale. And we hope you will see fit, in this case, in these extraordinary circumstances, and using the device of section 4 of Mr. Leggett's bill to override the sale.

We think that is applicable to all parties.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I brought up this question because it was earlier alluded to that there was a legal and valid binding contract here. So I was wondering what your position would be if for some reason this current restraining order was not to be effected, from your point of view, whether or not the remainder of the acreage would still, in your judgment, be adequate to qualify under your criteria for a wilderness area.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, it would. Mr. Chairman, let me say on that point, we have been impressed by the record of public spirit on this, on the part of Commander Industries, the holder of the contract; their willingness to go along with Mr. Leggett and others for a year's stay on the operation. That was a very wholesome sign.

We hope, in view of the State's actions, in view of the overwhelming interest of the people of the area, that Commander will see fit to find this an acceptable arrangement. Our interest has been to suggest to you and Mr. Leggett, and to this committee, to urge of this committee, an absolutely equitable treatment of Commander while terminating the contract. They should be made whole in every way, and we would support that.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I add one item on the minimal survey to point out that there is a requirement in the Wilderness Act that would cover this area as designated. In section (d) (2) of the Wilderness Act, areas designated as wilderness are required to be surveyed on a recurring basis by the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines.

So, if this area is designated, it will be studied under that program. And we feel, in view of the unlikelihood by all geological evidence in the literature we have reviewed, on the unlikelihood of any productive mineral sites in this area, that it's well to go ahead with the designation of the area, confident that it will be studied at a later date according to the law.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

Our next witnesses are Ms. Connie Parrish, California representative of the Friends of the Earth, and Mr. Richard Caulfield, staff assistant accompanied by Mr. George Alderson, legislative director, Friends of the Earth.

STATEMENTS OF CONNIE PARRISH, CALIFORNIA REPRESENTATIVE; RICHARD CAULFIELD, STAFF ASSISTANT, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, ACCOMPANIED BY GEORGE ALDERSON, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

Mr. ALDERSON. Thank you very much. I'm George Alderson, and I'd like to introduce my two California representatives. Connie Parrish is our California representative in our San Francisco office, and Richard Caulfield is the Californian who is on our Washington staff this summer.

Ms. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today and testify in support of H.R. 9063, a bill to establish the 37,000 acre Snow Mountain Wilderness in northern California.

We have supported the fine efforts of Congressmen Leggett and Clausen as well as those of Senators Cranston and Tunney to attain wilderness status for this magnificent area. We are particularly grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the prompt scheduling of hearings on Snow Mountain in light of recent activities which threaten to fundamentally alter the wilderness character of this important area.

The concept of a Snow Mountain Wilderness was first conceived by a group of far-sighted citizens back in 1952. They recognized the superb scenic values of the area—its high mountain plateaus and peaks and its rocky gorges—and its scientific importance as one of the few remaining vestiges of the once-vast Coast Range Wilderness.

Over the years, citizen support has blossomed for the Snow Mountain Wilderness as more and more people came to recognize its importance as a vital addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System. The proposed wilderness classification now has the support of cattlemen, horsemen, sporting groups, and local residents.

It has the endorsement of the State of California and the boards of supervisors and Lake, Glenn, and Colusa Counties, within which the proposed wilderness is located.

It is abundantly clear that Snow Mountain qualifies for inclusion as a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The Wilderness Act specifies that an area, in order to qualify for inclusion, must be recognized as a place where the Earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man; where outstanding opportunities exist for solitude; and where ecological, geological, scientific, educational, scenic, or historical values exist. Snow Mountain, with its variety of topography and abundance of scenic and scientific values, clearly qualifies under these criteria.

Approval of the Snow Mountain Wilderness is crucial; furthermore, because of its close proximity to the San Francisco and Sacramento metropolitan centers. The San Francisco Bay area also, only 80 miles from Snow Mountain, is home for over 5 million urban dwellers—a substantial number of whom seek the beauty and solitude of wilderness at every opportunity.

As a resident of the bay area, and as the representatives for over 4,000 California members of Friends of the Earth, I can attest to the critical need for the Snow Mountain Wilderness for those desirous of the wilderness experience.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

We will receive both of your testimonies, Mr. Caulfield, and then we'll question both of you together.

Mr. CAULFIELD. My name is Richard Caulfield. I'm a resident of the bay area in California.

Mr. Chairman, recent activities in the Snow Mountain wilderness area threaten to undermine years of citizen effort aimed at providing a wilderness retreat for millions of urban dwellers in California. The Forest Service, in blatant disregard for the concerns of local citizens and counter to their professed policy of multiple use, has gone ahead with a sale of 5.5 million board feet of timber, most of which is within the boundaries of the proposed wilderness.

Friends of the Earth believes that this sale was a serious mistake. And I might add, we are heartened very much by the State of California this morning to seek an injunction against the cutting.

True multiple use policy places equal importance on watershed, wildlife, and recreational values as well as on timber. The Forest Service, which has opposed the idea of a Snow Mountain wilderness since its inception, has perpetrated a travesty on multiple use by planning to go ahead with the destruction of watershed and recreational values even after a clear expression of local citizen and governmental support for wilderness was heard.

Today the Snow Mountain wilderness stands seriously threatened by logging and roadbuilding—both of which will destroy the scenic quality and solitude of the area.

It is not too late to save Snow Mountain, however, should this committee decide to act favorably on H.R. 9063. Friends of the Earth supports the use provision of this bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to modify the terms of the existing timber contract.

We commend Congressman Leggett for proposing this legislation as a vehicle for saving the superb wilderness character of Snow Mountain, and we appreciate the prompt scheduling of hearings by the subcommittee on this threatened area.

We wonder if Commander Industries, the company involved in the timber sale, could be trying to bluff Congress out of creating a Snow Mountain Wilderness by taking an intransigent position against a timber swap. Is Commander Industries willing to turn a deaf ear to the interests of local residents and bear the responsibility for ravaging this superb wilderness?

We hope this will not be the case. Friends of the Earth suggests, however, that this committee move ahead with the approval of H.R. 9063, demonstrating a congressional commitment to the preservation of Snow Mountain.

We are confident that Commander, when given the opportunity to act affirmatively in the interest of both local citizens and the Nation, will see fit to agree to a modification of this timber contract.

Friends of the Earth commends Congressmen Leggett and Clausen for proposing this legislation as a vehicle for saving the wilderness character of Snow Mountain, and we appreciate the prompt scheduling of hearings by the subcommittee in this threatened area.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Caulfield and Ms. Parrish, we will question you both together, if that's all right with you. You both state that you're all residents of the bay area.

Is that correct?

Ms. PARRISH. Yes.

Mr. MELCHER. What do you mean? San Francisco? Oakland?

Ms. PARRISH. Our Friends of the Earth office is in San Francisco.

Mr. CAULFIELD. I was born in Santa Rosa. I grew up in San Jose and went to school in Berkeley.

Mr. MELCHER. We're really stretching the bay.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Where do you live now?

Mr. CAULFIELD. I'm currently with Friends of the Earth in Washington.

Mr. MELCHER. I once lived in Oakland, so I can appreciate how much—and I realize the statements that you have made about how you would like to get out of the bay area and enjoy yourself free from all the hubbub of the metropolitan area.

What forms of recreation are now enjoyed in this area that is being proposed for wilderness?

Mr. CAULFIELD. There is quite a bit of backpacking activity in the area. Of course, there are a very large number of members of the Friends of the Earth, and of other groups and organizations that do this kind of activity. There are a number of offroad vehicle enthusiasts that enjoy this area.

I might point out that the area we're in favor of is 37,000 acres. With regard to offroad vehicles, I would like to point out in the Mendocino

National Forest, outside of this wilderness proposal, there is an additional 950,000 which is open to offroad vehicles, and is open for general multiple use activity.

Mr. MELCHER. What I'm asking though, if in this area that is being proposed for wilderness, if there are other forms of recreation participated in or enjoyed that are going on now other than backpacking, or something that would conform to the wilderness area.

In other words, if it's designated as a wilderness area, are we changing anybody else's recreational patterns that have been using it for a number of years? Do they ride motorcycles in there for instance?

Mr. CAULFIELD. Yes, that was my reference to offroad vehicles, was motorcycles, that type of thing.

Mr. MELCHER. In this area?

Mr. CAULFIELD. In this area.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, maybe it would be possible to get a more detailed response on that from the representatives of the Snow Mountain Committee; and more intimately familiar with the uses. The essence of it is that it is wilderness except for the motor vehicles situation. Since there are no roads in there, it is essentially a trail situation.

Mr. MELCHER. I think that's an excellent suggestion. The witnesses who follow will perhaps be more able to give us a more complete answer on that.

Mr. Caulfield, you are talking a destruction of a watershed. Do you mean those two areas where the timber sale is?

Mr. CAULFIELD. Yes. My reference in that statement was to the impact, first of all, of the timber sale, where the area of course is known for its shallow soil; that would be subject to erosion.

Mr. MELCHER. Are you saying that the timber sale that was entered into would destroy a watershed?

Mr. CAULFIELD. I do not mean to say that the timber sale as such would destroy the entire watershed value of the Snow Mountain area.

Mr. MELCHER. No, I don't mean that. I mean destroy a watershed, any given watershed or a portion of a watershed.

Are you saying that the timber sale that has been described is going to destroy a portion of a watershed?

Mr. CAULFIELD. I would say that the timber sale would have a serious impact on the watershed value of the area in the sense of causing erosion and this type of thing.

Mr. MELCHER. I'm very much disturbed. If you have real evidence that these timber sales are going to be harmful to a watershed to any extent, we would appreciate having it. This would be a matter, aside from the designation of this as a wilderness, it would be something that the subcommittee would like to have.

Mr. ALDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the clear-cutting in general according to the testimony of Earl R. C. Ray of the EUA in the Northwest region creates serious siltation problems.

Mr. MELCHER. I agree. There is evidence here that this as clear-cutting is there? We have not heard evidence this afternoon that there is clear-cutting of this.

Mr. ALDERSON. Perhaps there is that type of cutting.

Mr. MELCHER. They have said that they were going to remove this by helicopter. There was no reference to clearcutting.

Mr. ALDERSON. That was the first I heard of helicopters, this afternoon.

Mr. MELCHER. You are not testifying that this is clearcutting, are you?

Mr. CAULFIELD. No.

Mr. MELCHER. It's just a general statement.

Mr. CAULFIELD. My reference was that there would be an impact on the watershed values as a result of the logging. It is not meant to imply a wholesale destruction of a watershed as a result of that logging.

Mr. MELCHER. It still disturbs me. I would hope that the Forest Service has the capability of allowing a timber sale in a manner that will not hurt a watershed.

You are saying that all timber sales hurt a watershed. I have got more to learn on this, I'm sure. I hope you're not saying that. I hope that's not true.

Mr. ALDERSON. Mr. Chairman, they do all cause an impact of one degree or another. As we see it, it's a matter of the degree.

In a case like this, where you have an untouched watershed, we believe that that has a substantive watershed value that should be preserved if possible; if it does not have to be cut.

Mr. MELCHER. You are further confusing me because I don't know whether you are telling me that regardless of what the Forest Service does, if they allow a timber sale, there's going to be watershed damage. It's news to me. I certainly hope that is not the case.

Mr. ALDERSON. There always is siltation. A lot of it results from the road construction in connection with timber sales. The Forest Service has to strike a balance between the areas that are going to do serious watershed damage, permanent damage to the watershed, and others where there may be less or more temporary problems of siltation.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I will not take too much time. I have had an opportunity to talk briefly with the representatives, and I will have a chance to chat with you now that you're here in Washington.

Following briefly the questioning of the chairman, is it your position that you are in opposition to all timber sales?

Mr. ALDERSON. No. We do not oppose all timber sales. In fact, we testified at the hearings on timber practices that the Senate has held and the House Agriculture Committee has held.

We do have an abiding concern to find the best way to minimize the impact on the watersheds. I recently had the opportunity to visit some selective logging areas in southern Oregon with the Bureau of Land Management representatives there to try to get at this very question. They think they have found a way there to do it with less damage to the watershed.

This is a quest that we would want to join with you on because, as we see it, the flow of water from these streams and the protection of the soil for permanent protection of trees, is the base for the ecology of these areas is something that concerns us all.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Then your basic position, if I understand you correctly, is one of the kinds of timber management or forest practices in a given area that might be employed by an agency. Is that what it is?

Mr. ALDERSON. That is correct. In this case, we do have an area that is virtually untouched, one of the few left in this region of California.

Our proposal is that the citizens of the area and the State and the county documentary have the responsibility to try to hang onto that and practice as good forestry as we can on the remaining areas.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I will not argue with you on the matter of this being one of the few remaining areas. I have flown in that area too much. There's a lot of areas that are still remaining in the area. There are a lot of primitive areas.

Even though I'm a coauthor of the bill, I did not want the record to reflect the fact that there are not a lot of areas that are still untouched and will remain as such in the area. We have some 6 million acres of publically owned lands in that immediate area, so there are some areas of significant size.

It's a question of us all working together to try to find out that appropriate balance. Some areas need to be preserved, some areas need to have the multiple-use conservation concept. I am hopeful that we can accomplish that.

I have noticed that in your remarks, Mr. Caulfield, you took to task the Commander Industries; wherein you stated the company involved in the timber sale, "We wonder if Commander Industries would be trying to bluff Congress out of creating a Snow Mountain wilderness by taking an intransigent position against a timber swap."

This is a little bit in contrast to what I believe Mr. Scott had to say. He was indicating that they were quite cooperative. This seems to be counter to the testimony of the people from the Wilderness Society.

Would you clarify this? Was this prepared before you came here, or what is your position on this, because you heard Mr. Scott who proceeded you who was quite laudatory of the cooperation Commander Industries had presented in the way of cooperation?

Mr. CAULFIELD. We would like to join with Mr. Scott and the Wilderness Society in complimenting Commander Industries for the cooperation they have shown to this point. Recent evidence has shown that they have been less willing—and of course, with the upcoming deadline for their contract, their existing contract being December of 1973, we would hope that Commander Industries would continue to try to cooperate with the Congress in this regard and go along with the swap that would provide comparable timber, and would meet the provisions of the contract, the existing contract.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I will get into this more with you on a personal exchange when we have more time.

Mr. MELCHER. I just want to make one point. Ordinarily, this subcommittee and the full committee has been careful about establishing wilderness areas on the basis of topographical boundaries, or natural boundaries.

The testimony that Mr. Nelson gave us this afternoon, in describing where the timber sales are, clearly shows that the topographical boundary exists somewhere else other than including the line as presented in the proposed bill.

I understand your testimony; you are in favor of the whole 37,000 acres, but I would caution you though if the subcommittee gets involved seriously with a writing of a bill and perfecting of a bill, that at that point it would certainly be brought up, the topographical boundaries, and would so designate out along those lines and the timber sale would not be involved at all.

Then we would come back to the point of whether the timber sales are that adjacent, that close to a wilderness area would be harmful. We would probably say not if it were done according to the description that was given this afternoon.

Mr. CAULFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think the Friends of the Earth is in favor of the full 37,000-acre proposal, because there is a need for this type of recreation, and I understand that additional witnesses will be testifying with regard to these boundaries.

Mr. MELCHER. Certainly, your position is clear. I appreciate it very much. Thank you all.

Mr. Edwin F. Davis, Willows, Calif., Editor of the Willows Daily Journal.

Mr. LEGGETT. I'd like to introduce, Mr. Chairman, my constituent, Mr. Davis. He is a publisher and editor of some half dozen daily newspapers in California. I think this is the first time he's testified before a congressional committee. He does not have a prepared statement, but does have critical knowledge about this transaction and the bill.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much, Congressman Leggett.

Mr. Davis, we welcome you here to the subcommittee. We are interested in your testimony, and we think it would be very pertinent if we understand Willows is right in the area or adjacent to the area.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I might take a moment to welcome the gentleman before the committee, and say I'm very interested in what you have to say because during the years I have enjoyed flying in and out of Willows. It's one of my favorite duck-hunting areas. I am well familiar with the Willows area.

Mr. DAVIS. I was going to comment, Congressman Clausen, before your first election to the office, I was Associate Editor of the Santa Rosa Press Democratic. As a matter of fact, my good friend, Lee Levinger played quite a part in your original campaign. He has said these great things about you, and convinced me of your worth.

But I moved out to San Francisco to the Chronicle, then out to the Valley. But from the help you give us, not only the wilderness area but in our very important canal, I want to say I gained one good Congressman at a loss of another, believe me, when I moved from Santa Rosa to the Valley.

Mr. MELCHER. Is the Santa Rosa Democrat truly a democratic paper?

Mr. DAVIS. No, truly far from it. That's the reason I left.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN F. DAVIS, EDITOR, WILLOWS DAILY JOURNAL

Mr. DAVIS. Chairman Melcher and Congressman Clausen, these are informal remarks as Congressman Leggett indicated. As Congress-

man Leggett did, I approached this from scratch; this whole thing about the Snow Mountain wilderness area, as a matter of fact, I first learned about it when it was a plan of the Forest Service to divide this area into the eight units that Mr. Nelson so well described.

I went over it with the Forest Service, and I thought they made a very good case, but the more I went into it, the more I became convinced that that was not the answer. I, as Congressman Leggett has, have examined the area. I have a stiff right knee, I have for some time, but I take it up to the 6,000 altitude before I decided to come back, and I probably will not get that far again.

But I believe it is very important to others who can back pack and who can hike and can ride horseback up there, and really enjoy this natural wilderness area. I want to say, I was very much impressed by Blaine Cornell, Mendocino National Forest supervisor, and I thought that he had a real interest in a balanced program for that area and for the whole Mendocino National Forest.

I felt for a couple of reasons that I will spell out, that this great emphasis on timber that we get now, that it comes more from Washington than it does from our local area, Mr. Clausen. I have got to say this in honesty. I feel that the balance is being destroyed. Mr. Nelson has spoken of a balance, but there is no balance. If we have to sacrifice, as I understand, about \$50,000 worth of timber to sustain the yield per year for this great wilderness area, that has been pointed out, is so close to the bay area, and Sacramento and other places—I would like to briefly describe one of my great concerns. This point system the Forest Service uses to designate what is a good wilderness area and what's a bad wilderness area, I think they came up with a 48 percent flunking of Snow Mountain area.

They never considered, for instance—they are talking, maybe, about the Trinity Alps that has, I presume, much greater wilderness value, but it is closed half the year to most people. It is a much greater distance from the bay area, from populated centers. So how can you compare something like that that is remote with something that is close to the people who will use it. On that basis alone, you would have to double the points that you give the Snow Mountain Wilderness and I notice—I do not want to directly challenge Mr. Nelson, but I must—in his point system here he misses proximity. There is nothing about proximity, but certainly proximity was used by the Forest Service. I do not think they gave it any significance as far as Snow Mountain is concerned, but from my observations I must say very honestly, I think that thing is loaded. I honestly do. I think it was loaded, and because of this scant amount of timber that cannot keep Commander Industries operating for more than a few months at the most at its capacity.

I was rather disturbed about the Pacific Crest travel road. They have a road in there that is already well into that timber area as I understand. That is going to cut up the whole western section of the proposed wilderness area if it goes through. It was not brought out, but there is, as I understand it, an existing road on the western flank of the wilderness area that could make a perfectly good main road to carry out this management that I believe you mentioned, Congressman Clausen. Perhaps it was Congressman Melcher.

Mr. CLAUSEN [presiding]. Does the Pacific Crest Road that you make reference to, does it go through the proposed boundaries of the Wilderness Area?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, as proposed by Congressman Leggett. My understanding, subject to approval—I am not a great specialist on this—but it would cut right down there [indicating], separating out this area. You can hardly have a wilderness area if it is bisected by a main travel road, which this is to be. It is to be a scenic road, and I have my feeling that this is described as doing all these things, and going in there to get the timber when you have a perfectly good road going around there that could be improved.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Have you been up in the area?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, I have.

Mr. CLAUSEN. You are quite familiar.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not quite familiar with it. I've gotten to 6,000 feet, and I did have a chance to look around it. I am not an expert on it, Congressman Clausen.

Mr. CLAUSEN. What I am asking then, for the record, is it your testimony that in your judgment there is an alternative route that could be used?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I talked to the—those at the Mendocino Forest, that there is a road that could be used that goes on the outskirts of the proposed 37,000 acres of the wilderness area. We have editorialized that this is a subsidized operation. It would be at a great expense to the taxpayers. It would add to the former price of timber. Maybe not now; a couple years ago it would have represented \$100,000 subsidy, it would have demanded pipes to go under the road provided by the Forest Service, roads going in.

The only prime purpose I see to that road is to log timber when you have an alternative road that could be constructed along the western edge of the wilderness area. In other words, I cannot escape feeling that we are talking about loaded dice.

I think that is about all I have to say.

Those were just informal comments and my feeling on it.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Thank you very much for taking the time to come back, sir.

We do have a vote, and we will be recessed for 10 minutes.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. MELCHER [presiding]. The subcommittee will come to order. We will resume the hearings on the Snow Mountain Wilderness area.

The committee will be delighted to hear from Ms. Katherine Petterson, Kelseyville, Calif.

Ms. Petterson?

Mr. CLAUSEN. Let me take this opportunity, if I may, to introduce to the committee Ms. Petterson, who has certainly been the prime leader for the Snow Mountain Wilderness area proposal in the county of Lake, and she has flown all the way back to Washington from California solely for the purpose of making her presentation, so that I think her testimony will be very significant.

Mr. MELCHER. We very much appreciate having you here, Ms. Petterson.

Would you proceed?

STATEMENT OF KATHERINE PETTERSON, KELSEYVILLE, CALIF.

Ms. PETTERSON. Thank you, Mr. Clausen, for your introduction.

Of course, it takes a great many people to bring something like this to a hearing before your distinguished group. Quite a bit has been said prior to my testimony that is in my prepared statement, so as I go along I will delete quite a bit of it for the sake of time.

What I would like to do is given you a brief background of the history of this proposal and my interest in it, and then a few points that I feel are important.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Melcher, I would ask unanimous consent that should she decide to leave out any of her statement, that her entire statement be printed in the record as though read in full.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Petterson follows:]

STATEMENT OF KATHERINE PETTERSON, KELSEYVILLE, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Katherine Petterson from Kelseyville, California, and am the Lake County representative of the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today on behalf of HR 2813, introduced by my local Congressman Don Clausen, and HR 4012, submitted by my neighboring Congressman Robert Leggett. These bills are to designate that certain lands in the State of California be established as wilderness, known as the "Snow Mountain De Facto Wilderness Area".

A Snow Mountain Wilderness was first attempted back in 1952 by the Konocti Rod and Gun Club in Lake County. Realizing the devastation that would result to scenic Snow Mountain should it be logged, we approached the U.S. Forest Service for advice and support. They were not responsive, and the general public, 21 years ago, could not visualize the extent of the impact the timber industry would have on our forests; so the movement died for lack of interest. In 1966, after a road was constructed on adjoining St. John Mountain the people of Stonyford were concerned that Snow Mountain would be next. A public meeting attended by cattlemen, horsemen, sporting groups and interested citizens resulted in the formation of a citizens group known as the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area Committee. I was selected as the Lake County representative.

We incorporated the help of the Sierra Club and from 1966 to 1968 made studies of the area and held conferences with the Forest Service. In one of these early meetings we submitted a boundary proposal which on the north and west side would be Forest Route No. 18NO4 (shown on your map).

We were told that a road was a poor wilderness boundary. Geographical reference points and a 5,000 foot elevation were recommended instead. We took this advice, unfortunately, and compromised on a boundary as shown on the map by the solid line using ridge-tops and creeks where possible. This encompassed approximately 27,317 acres.

In the latter part of 1969 the Forest Service issued a report on the study area, stating "the Snow Mountain area appears to meet most of the minimum conditions for wilderness . . ." and "Timber values do not preclude wilderness establishment . . .". In November the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area Committee and two chapters of the Sierra Club issued a joint position paper, asking for a wilderness of the total study area. In addition, we specifically stated that logging or road building on the south side of Crockett Peak or the west slope of St. John Mountain would destroy the existing wilderness value of the area and would adversely affect the native trout fishery of the Middle Fork of Stony Creek and Bear Wallow Creek.

On January 29, 1970 the Forest Supervisor issued his management decision directing that only about 12,000 acres in the Snow Mountain Crest Area and Stony Creek Gorge be maintained as primitive; the rest to be divided into management units for timber harvest where feasible, Off Road Vehicle roads and trails, water impoundment sites, range/brush manipulation. The Snow Mountain Wilderness Area Committee objected to the diminutive size of the area designated for primitive use and sent a letter to the Forest Service on

February 17, 1970 stating that we would seek Congressional designation of wilderness for the entire study area. Our confidence that the Forest Service would do nothing to impair the wilderness characteristic of the area was destroyed when, in July of 1970, we first learned of the Nye Timber Sale, a sale contiguous to the study area, that should have never been made. The sale consisted of two divisions, as shown on the map with roads to be built into both areas. Congressman Leggett, upon completion of his review, realized this would conflict with our wilderness concept and wisely incorporated our original boundary request into his Snow Mountain Wilderness Area bill (shown by dotted lines on the map). Commander Industries is to be commended for having deferred their operations pending efforts to get the Forest Service to negotiate an exchange. Nothing was done, so now I urge you to act swiftly to keep at a minimum the road and logging activities now in progress.

In the recent Roadless Review, the Forest Service gave Snow Mountain a low quality rating, and I should like to briefly give my criticism of this report. "Opportunity Costs" were high—\$1,084,000. The original figure of \$360,000 for land acquisition was later reduced to \$182,000. No corresponding adjustment nor explanation was made as to why the total opportunity costs remained the same. The country has given the market value of the 320 acres of privately owned land within the wilderness area at \$50.00 an acre; the USFS at \$570.00 per acre. Due to the isolation and inaccessibility the Forest Service valuation is unrealistic. Also not indicated is the fact the Wilderness Act does not require purchase of private land before establishment of a wilderness. The act states exchange of lands of equal value or purchase is desirable but not required.

A "scenic quality factor" of 93/200 was computed. This evaluation could reflect many variables. Was the rating officer qualified for a strictly objective observation? Many people prefer desert country over lakes and streams. Others enjoy the ocean in preference to the mountains. If the gentleman in question was spooky about rattlesnakes he certainly would be hesitant about venturing into the Stony Creek Gorge. With whom did he confer for guidance into areas little known to but a few who have taken years to explore the area? To indicate that Snow Mountain has a limited range of opportunities offering only horse travel, camping, backpacking is ridiculous.

"Public Involvement" was categorized as "obviously divided". The review grouped comments into seven categories: County Supervisors, Chambers of Commerce, members of environmental and outing organizations, timber industry, ski organizations, and private individuals. Obviously, 16% of this grouping would favor wilderness, so it is surprising that Snow Mountain rated as high as 23% in support for a wilderness.

The USFS roadless area inventory began in 1968 and was completed in 1972, a four year period for studies and evaluation. The public was given six weeks, with an additional three weeks for written comments. The Hearings conflicted, perhaps intentionally, with college finals in most schools. For interested students wanting to appear at the public hearings, this was a real handicap—quite unfortunate because these young people have shown a real concern for wilderness preservation.

Other opposition has come from the timber industry and the two landowners of 480 acres who feel their rights are being abused. The timber industry, an important part of our economy, can maintain a sustained-yield concept thru wise and efficient timber management programs. But keep in mind the distinction between timber management and timber mining. Logging of Snow Mountain, I contend, would be timber mining—the removal of residual old growth timber from sites uneconomical to manage. The terrain and soils of Snow Mountain are such that the cutting and removal of trees with a minimum of disturbance to the surroundings i.e. residual vegetation, watershed, habitat, and esthetic values would be uneconomical and, in most places, impossible. It is not surprising to have this Snow Mountain Wilderness Area opposition in view of the constant industry pressure for more lumber plus efforts to produce timber faster by Presidential proclamation. Unfortunately this is not accompanied with increasing funds for reforestation and timber stand improvement. As loudly as we cry for protection of our vanishing wilderness areas, so should we loudly cry for funds for timber management and reforestation of productive sites.

Private ownership of 680 acres is less than 2 per cent of the total acreage. 480 acres is in the Crest Zone owned by a family which is against the wilderness concept. They complain about the encroachment of people on their land, that wilderness will serve as an added attraction and result in overuse, abuse and ultimate destruction of their property. Yet, these same landowners endorse

multiple-use for Snow Mountain. The biggest drawback for them would be the restriction of road building into their holdings if they could finance them. With multiple-use, the USFS would build these roads.

I would like to refer to the exhibits that I have attached to my testimony and comment about them quickly: Dr. G. Ledyard Stebbins, an eminent botanist and president of the California Native Plant Society suggests that considerable botanical exploration be done on Snow Mountain. Dr. Lincoln Constance, professor of botany, University of California, Berkeley, indicates an identical interest in letter dated Jan. 29, 1972, to Senator Jackson.

Last summer I came upon a group of about twenty people studying the plants in the upper area of Snow Mountain. I prevailed on them to forward me a report titled "The Phytogeographic Significance of Snow Mountain", by L. R. Heckard, Curator, Jepson Herbarium. In it is mentioned H. Hamann who is well-known in the naturalist field. This family has really been great to me through the past years with their encouragement and help, and I submit their comments. Finally, I submit a report by Dr. Hemphill whom I met in 1950 while he was doing research for his Ph. D. in this area. His collection and intense interest spurred my desire for protection of this mountain. I would like these exhibits to be made part of the record.

I could speak many words on the beauties of Snow Mountain: the unusual geography of combining in 37,000 acres the tranquility of alpine country which plunges into the spectacular gorge of Stony Creek. Found in this country is a great variety of flora and fauna including some rare species such as the mountain lion, one of which I tracked in the Low Gap area only 10 days ago. The slopes of Snow Mountain should remain untouched by man's busy projects for they are too fragile. The qualifications for Snow Mountain as wilderness exist, otherwise the bills you are reviewing could not have been submitted.

Opposition is based on the idea that man should diversify for his well-being the physical characteristics of the land, changing the distribution of living things and adding human order to the ecological determination of nature. The other day I stood on top of adjoining Sheetiron Mountain. All around me multiple-use management was obvious. For those who so desired the roads, they were there—miles and miles of them. From where I was the view, also accessible by car, was there, and the alpine country. For fishing, the Eel River, Corbin Creek, and Sand Creek ran in a distance into Pillsbury Lake, all accessible by car. The ORV's could have a wonderful time, whether the Forest Service liked it or not, challenging the slopes of abandoned logging roads in areas which lay in a distance around me. It was quite obvious the multiple-use management was everywhere, excepting in one island to the south—Snow Mountain. I wondered then why it was such a struggle to preserve this one small portion of country so ideally conceived for a wilderness which, in its natural state had so much to offer.

I cannot better explain the need for wilderness than was done by Dr. Rene J. Dubos in his lecture here in Washington last December before the American Association for the Advancement of Science: "Man has succeeded in humanizing most of the earth's surface but, paradoxically, he is developing simultaneously a cult for wildness. . . . His response to the thunderous silence of deep canyons, the solitude of high mountains, the luminosity of deserts is the expression of an aspect of his fundamental being that is still in resonance with cosmic events. Undisturbed Nature knows best . . . how to make men aware of the cosmos and to create an atmosphere of harmony between him and the rest of creation".

I want to acknowledge with appreciation your efforts, Chairman Melcher and those of my Congressman Don Clausen and of Congressman Robert Leggett in scheduling this hearing. The roadbuilding for logging has been progressing rapidly, thus the urgency for action on these bills. The people at home are concerned and hope something can be done right away. We are upset by the bureaucratic behavior of the U.S. Forest Service which refuses to listen to our elected representatives. We, the people, are asking support from this supposedly custodial agency for a Snow Mountain Wilderness. We denounce that the Forest Service has become a production agency and is exploiting this portion of the wilderness proposal. I have neither read nor heard any statements favoring this incursion into our wilderness area.

Thank you.

CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY,
Berkeley, Calif., January 13, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: We were alerted recently by one of our directors to the fact that the National Wildlife Federation's Washington, D.C., report stated that Senator Cranston had recently introduced legislation to establish a Snow Mountain Wilderness Area in Mendocino National Forest. Upon making inquiry, we learned that you had previously introduced H.R. 9806 for this purpose. We are eager to offer our support, for Snow Mountain is of considerable botanical interest.

As a relatively remote region, Snow mountain still is not botanically well known. The extreme ruggedness of the gorge of the Middle Fork of Stony Creek, which is reportedly the most dependable native rainbow trout fishery in the area, is a good example of why there is considerable botanical exploring left to do—and also why the area seems eminently suitable for designation and preservation as a Wilderness. The gorge is traversable only during low water and by use of climbing ropes.

Snow mountain comprises three adjacent summits above 6500 feet in elevation, the highest being somewhat over 7000 feet. It is the southernmost high peak in the North Coast Ranges, rising nearly a thousand feet above its closest neighbor, Crockett Peak, three-and-a-half miles away, and 300 feet above St. John Mountain, six miles distant. Heights of summits to the south drop off rapidly. Unlike its two neighbors, Snow Mountain presents a large bulk above the 6000-foot line, and consequently an opportunity for considerable development of high-elevation flora in the many different exposures presented by the complex topography. We note that evidence of glacial activity occurs at the head of Dark Hollow Creek.

Such a situation of high, rather isolated terrain is likely to produce much of interest to the plant geographer, for it affords opportunity for isolated stands of plants outside of usual range. Though much botanical exploring remains to be done, it is known that some such plants indeed occur on Snow Mountain. A poppy, *Argemone munita* subsp. *rotundata*, that occurs mainly on the eastern slopes of the Sierra Nevada, is to be found on Snow Mountain. The rare *Cycladenia humilis*, is at its southern limit there, and the Snow Willow-herb, *Epilobium niveum*, makes one of its rare appearances in the North Coast Ranges. The Red Fir, *Abies magnifica*, reaches its southernmost limit in the Coast Ranges on the two highest summit peaks. It is to be expected that other rarities will be found with further study.

Documents on file with the California Natural Areas Coordinating Council, a private group inventorying the state for important natural areas that should be preserved, report an open alpine marsh of botanical interest on private lands between the two highest peaks. Snow Mountain East and West are both on file for the wonderful flower gardens they present in season, and uncommon bird and other animal life is mentioned, too. Vistas from the summit areas are reported to be spectacular, as the elevation well above the surroundings would lead one to expect.

Timbering in the early 1960's resulted in new access roads penetrating toward the Snow Mountain area and use of off-road recreational vehicles markedly increased. The upper elevations, because of the rather gentle terrain and openness of the plant cover, have been particularly abused by trail bikes. We are glad to note that such use has already been restricted by the Forest Service and will, of course, be forbidden under Wilderness classification. We are unclear as to the status of the Pacific Crest Travel Zone somewhat to the west of the peaks. If it has not been superseded by the Wilderness proposal, we would urge that it be dropped in its entirety. Existing roads surrounding the area seem to be quite plentiful and adequate. Another road, cutting through the proposed Wilderness, could only lead to destruction of those values that the legislation is attempting to preserve.

The California Native Plant Society is wholeheartedly in support of the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area. Please let us know if we can be of any assistance in passage of H.R. 9806.

Sincerely yours,

G. LEDYARD STEBBINS, *President.*

REPORT: THE PHYTOGEOGRAPHIC SIGNIFICANCE OF SNOW MOUNTAIN

The accompanying lists are provisional, based on a brief botanical reconnaissance of Snow Mountain by the California Native Plant Society in July 1972

and on collections and reports made by Milo Baker, H. Hamann, L. R. Heckard, H. L. Mason, P. A. Munz, and G. T. Robbins. The mountain is still in need of a detailed search for its most rare plants, and previously reported plants must be confirmed by examination of voucher specimens.

That Snow Mountain harbors rare plants (Table I) has been known for some time. The mountain also was known to have the southernmost stand of Red Fir (*Abies magnifica*) and of Mountain Alder (*Alnus tenuifolia*) in the Coast Ranges, but it was not known that many other plants also share this geographic characteristic. Our preliminary studies have shown that at least 65 plants (Table II) reach their known Coast Range southern limit on Snow Mountain. Most of these plants are typically of the Sierra Nevada and Northern California. Thus Snow Mountain becomes of particular geographic significance in the distribution of California's native plants. Whether the reason for this particular distribution lies in the physical and climatic features of Snow Mountain or in the ecological adaptation of the plants themselves is not known. It is conceivable that the plants possess genetic differences in their adaptive attributes. It is to be hoped that the plants will continue to find a hospitable environment, away from man's disturbances, where they can be studied in future years.

—L. R. HECKARD, *Curator, Jepson Herbarium.*

GEOGRAPHICALLY SIGNIFICANT VASCULAR PLANTS OF SNOW MOUNTAIN

(A preliminary report based on a brief survey by the California Native Plant Society, July 1972). Compiled by L. R. Heckard, Jepson Herbarium, University of California, Berkeley 94720.

I. RARE PLANTS FOUND ON SNOW MOUNTAIN

- Cycladenia humilis*—Scattered in a few localities in ranges on both sides of the upper Sacramento Valley.
Epilobium nivium—Restricted to a few mountains of the inner Coast Ranges of northern Lake and Mendocino counties.
Eriogonum ursinum var. *nervulosum*—Known only from Goat and Snow mountains, the latter the TYPE locality.
Linanthus rattanii—Known only from a few collections from the inner North Coast Ranges of Lake, Tehama, and Mendocino counties.
Montia saxosa—Snow Mountain is the type locality for this plant, which is found occasionally from here to Siskiyou County.
Orobanche pinorum—Known in California from only six localities, the most recent collection being from Snow Mountain.
Penstemon purpusii—Known only on a few other peaks of the North Coast Ranges from Humboldt Co. to Snow Mountain, its TYPE locality.
Pityopus californicus—Known from only five other localities in California.
Raillardella scabrida—Found only on Snow Mountain, the TYPE locality, and on nearby mountains of Mendocino and Tehama counties.

II. PLANTS THAT REACH THEIR KNOWN SOUTHERN LIMIT IN THE COAST RANGES ON SNOW MOUNTAIN

(Those not heretofore known to occur as far south as Snow Mountain indicated by an asterisk.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <i>Abies magnifica</i> | <i>Chaenactis douglasii</i> |
| * <i>Agrostis thurberiana</i> | <i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i> ssp. <i>albicaul</i> |
| <i>Agrostis variabilis</i> | <i>Collomia tinctoria</i> |
| <i>Alnus tenuifolia</i> | * <i>Cordylanthus viscidus</i> |
| <i>Antennaria geyeri</i> | <i>Crepis occidentalis</i> ssp. <i>conjuncta</i> |
| * <i>Arabis platysperma</i> | <i>Cycladenia humilis</i> |
| <i>Arctostaphylos nevadensis</i> | * <i>Dodecatheon Jeffreii</i> |
| <i>Arenaria nuttallii</i> ssp. <i>gregaria</i> | <i>Epilobium brevistylum</i> |
| * <i>Arnica longifolia</i> ssp. <i>myriadenia</i> | <i>Erigeron inornatus</i> ssp. <i>inornatus</i> |
| * <i>Brickellia greenei</i> | <i>Eriogonum lobbi</i> |
| <i>Calycadenia truncata</i> ssp. <i>scabrella</i> | <i>Eriogonum spergulinum</i> |
| <i>Carex fracta</i> | * <i>Gallium bifolium</i> |
| <i>Castilleja applegatei</i> var. <i>fragellis</i> | <i>Gallium grayanum</i> |
| [= <i>C. pinetorum</i>] | <i>Gayophytum humile</i> |
| <i>Ceanothus lemmonii</i> | <i>Gilia leptales</i> ssp. <i>Pinnatisecta</i> |
| <i>Cercocarpus ledifolius</i> | * <i>Hackelia jessicae</i> |

II. PLANTS THAT REACH THEIR KNOWN SOUTHERN LIMIT IN THE COAST RANGES ON
SNOW MOUNTAIN—Continued

<i>Haplopappus whitneyi</i> ssp. <i>discoideus</i>	<i>Polygonum Kelloggii</i>
<i>Holodiscus boursieri</i>	<i>Potentilla glandulosa</i> ssp. <i>nevadensis</i>
<i>Horkelia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>flavescens</i>	<i>Pterospora andromeda</i>
* <i>Juncus howellii</i>	<i>Purshia tridentata</i>
<i>Lesquerella occidentalis</i> ssp. <i>diversifolia</i>	* <i>Quercus vaccinifolia</i>
* <i>Lewisia triphylla</i>	<i>Ranunculus alismaefolius</i>
<i>Listera convallarioides</i>	* <i>Ribes binominatum</i>
<i>Machaeranthera shastensis</i> var. <i>eridiata</i>	<i>Ribes lobbii</i>
* <i>Melica stricta</i>	<i>Stephanomeria lactucina</i>
<i>Mimulus breweri</i>	<i>Symphoricarpos acutus</i>
* <i>Mimulus primuloides</i>	<i>Trichostema oblongum</i>
<i>Montia chamissoi</i>	<i>Trifolium cyathiaferum</i>
* <i>Muhlenbergia filiformis</i>	* <i>Trifolium longipes</i>
<i>Osmorrhiza occidentalis</i>	<i>Veratrum californicum</i>
* <i>Pedicularis semibarbata</i>	* <i>Veronica serpyllifolia</i> var. <i>humifusa</i>
<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>	<i>Viola machiskeyi</i>
<i>Polygonum davisae</i>	* <i>Zauscheria californica</i> var. <i>latifolia</i>

BERKELEY, CALIF., January 29, 1972.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: It has come to my attention that S. 2680 to establish the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area in Mendocino National Forest, California, is before your Committee.

A few years ago in response to a query from representatives of the Forest Service, I wrote pointing out the unusual nature of the area that made it of special interest to the plant explorer. I presume that the current effort is to some extent a culmination of the studies being conducted at that time.

As a teacher of some forty years standing, I have throughout my career emphasized to students an appreciation of the teaching, research, and aesthetic values of the natural landscape. That same forty years, however, has seen an accelerating loss of natural landscape and diminishing opportunities to preserve some of the best of what remains.

In the Snow Mountain region we still have such an opportunity, and one of exceptional value for scientific purposes aside from its wilderness values. For Snow Mountain, as I pointed out in my previous letter, is a relatively isolated high peak, the southernmost high peak in the North Coast Ranges. Consequently it presents the possibility for development of an unusual flora at extreme geographic limits. And, indeed, several unique or rare plants are known as constituents of the Snow Mountain flora, though that flora as a whole is as yet still not well studied.

I am, therefore, very pleased to support a move to protect the region through establishment of the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

LINCOLN CONSTANCE,
Professor of Botany,
University of California, Berkeley.

MS. PETTERSON. The Snow Mountain Wilderness was first attempted back in 1952 by the Konocti Rod and Gun Club in Lake County. Realizing the devastation that would result to scenic Snow Mountain should it be logged, we approach the U.S. Forest Service for advice and support. They were not responsive, and the general public, 21 years ago, could not visualize the extent of the impact the timber industry would have on our forests; so the movement died for lack of interest. In 1966, after a road was constructed on adjoining St. John Mountain the people of Stonyford were concerned that Snow Mountain would be next. A public meeting attended by cattlemen, horsemen, sporting groups and interested citizens resulted in the formation

of a citizens group known as the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area Committee. I was selected as the Lake County representative.

We incorporated the help of the Sierra Club and from 1966 to 1968 made studies of the area and held conferences with the Forest Service. In one of these early meetings we submitted a boundary proposal which on the north and west side would be Forest Route No. 18N04 as shown on your map.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that her map that she alludes to be made a part of the file so that it can be referred to.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to can be found in the files of the committee.]

Ms. PETTERSON. We were told that a road was a poor wilderness boundary. Geographical reference points and a 5,000-foot elevation were recommended instead. We took this advice, unfortunately, and compromised on a boundary as shown on the map by the solid line, using ridge tops and creeks where possible. This encompassed approximately 27,317 acres.

In the latter part of 1969 the Forest Service issued a report on the study area, stating "the Snow Mountain area appears to meet most of the minimum conditions for wilderness" and "Timber values do not preclude wilderness establishment." In November the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area Committee and two chapters of the Sierra Club issued a joint position paper, asking for a wilderness of the total study area. In addition, we specifically stated that logging or road building on the south side of Crockett Peak or the west slope of St. John Mountain would destroy the existing wilderness value of the area and would adversely affect the native trout fishery of the Middle Fork of Stony Creek and Bear Wallow Creek.

On January 29, 1970, the Forest supervisor issued his management decision directing that only about 12,000 acres in the Snow Mountain Creek Area and Stony Creek Gorge be maintained as primitive; the rest to be divided into management units for timber harvest where feasible, off-road vehicle roads and trails, water impoundment sites, range/brush manipulation. The Snow Mountain Wilderness area committee objected to the diminutive size of the area designated for primitive use and sent a letter to the Forest Service on February 17, 1970, stating that we would seek congressional designation of wilderness for the entire study area. Our confidence that the Forest Service would do nothing to impair the wilderness characteristic of the area was destroyed when, in July of 1970, we first learned of the Nye timber sale, a sale contiguous to the study area, that should never have been made. The sale consisted of two divisions, as shown on the map, with roads to be built into both areas. Congressman Leggett, upon completion of his review, realized this would conflict with our wilderness concept and wisely incorporated our original boundary request into his Snow Mountain Wilderness area bill, shown by dotted lines on the map. Commander Industries is to be commended for having deferred an exchange. Nothing was done, so now I urge you to act swiftly to keep at a minimum the road and logging activities now in progress.

Other opposition has come from the timber industry and the two landowners of 480 acres who feel their rights are being abused. The timber industry, an important part of our economy, can maintain a

sustained yield concept through wise and efficient timber management programs. But keep in mind the distinction between timber management and timber mining. Logging of Snow Mountain, I contend, would be timber mining, the removal of residual old growth timber from sites uneconomical to manage.

The terrain and soils of Snow Mountain are such that the cutting and removal of trees with a minimum of disturbance to the surroundings, that is, residual vegetation, watershed, habitat, and esthetic values, would be uneconomical and, in most places, impossible. It is not surprising to have this Snow Mountain Wilderness Area opposition in view of the constant industry pressure for more lumber plus efforts to produce timber faster by Presidential proclamation. Unfortunately, this is not accompanied with increasing funds for reforestation and timber stand improvement. As loudly as we cry for protection of our vanishing wilderness areas, so should we loudly cry for funds for timber management and reforestation of productive sites.

Mr. MELCHER. We will take a 10 minute recess for a vote.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. MELCHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

Ms. PETTERSON, you may continue.

Ms. PETTERSON. I would like to mention that I have some fine exhibits submitted by naturalists, botanists and so forth from the area, but I have misplaced them, so I would like to submit them later if that is permissible.

Mr. MELCHER. What are the exhibits?

Ms. PETTERSON. One is Flora and Fauna of Snow Mountain and one is a letter stating what is there.

Mr. MELCHER. It is all typed material.

Ms. PETTERSON. Yes, it is.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, the material will be printed in the record at this point when submitted.

[The information referred to follows:]

THE FLORA AND FAUNA OF SNOW MOUNTAIN

(By Donald V. Hemphill, Ph.D., Chairman Biology Dept., Pacific Union College, Angwin, California, "The Vertebrate Fauna of the Boreal Areas of the Southern Yolla Bolly Mountains, California", 1952, Zoology Department of Oregon State University).

The birds and mammals of the summit areas are often restricted in habitat much as an island in a sea. In such cases, these are ecological islands of high mountain forest altitudinally above the extensive yellow pine belt. Most of the following are found only on Snow Mountain but some extend along the high ridge to the Goat Mountain summit.

BIRDS

Sooty Grouse
White-headed Woodpecker
Yellow-bellied Sapsucker
Hammond Flycatcher
Wright Flycatcher
Mountain Chickadee
Cassin Finch
Yolla Bolly Fox Sparrow
Green-tailed Towhee
Lincoln Sparrow
Mountain Bluebird

MAMMALS

Water Shrew
Silvery-haired Bat
Golden-mantled Ground Squirrel
Yellow Pine Chipmunk
Townsend Chipmunk
Northern Flying Squirrel
*Long-tailed Meadow Mouse
Porcupine

*Possibly an undescribed new race from Snow Mountain (Dark Hollow Meadows).

OTHER BIRDS

Western Turkey Vulture
 American Goshawk
 Cooper Hawk
 Northern Sharp-shinned Hawk
 Western Red-tailed Hawk
 American Golden Eagle
 N. American Sparrow Hawk
 Dusky Poor-will
 Northern Black Swift
 Monterey Red-shafted Flicker
 Western Pileated Woodpecker
 Cabanis Hairy Woodpecker
 Willow Downy Woodpecker
 Western Wood Pewee
 Northern Violet-green Swallow
 American Holarctic Raven
 Clark Nutcracker
 Northern Chestnut-backed Chickadee
 Slender-billed White-breasted Nuthatch
 Sierran Mountain Quail
 Coast California Quail
 Northern Kildeer
 Pacific Bandtailed Pigeon
 Western Mourning Dove
 Calif. Coast Screech Owl
 Pacific Horned Owl
 Anna Hummingbird
 Rufous Hummingbird
 Migratory Allen Hummingbird
 Calliope Hummingbird
 Western Kingbird
 Northern Western Flycatcher
 Olive-sided Flycatcher
 Blue-fronted Stellar Jay
 Northwestern Scrub Jay
 Interior Scrub Jay
 California Bush-tit

Coast Bush-tit
 Red-breasted Nuthatch
 Black-eared Pigmy Nuthatch
 Sierra Nevada Brown Creeper
 North American Dipper
 Western Mexican Bluebird
 Western Golden-crowned Kinglet
 Lazuli Bunting
 Cassin Solitary Vireo
 Western Warbling Vireo
 Lutescent Orange-crowned Vireo
 Calaveras Nashville Warbler
 Pacific Audubon Warbler
 Black-throated Gray Warbler
 Townsend Warbler
 Hermit Warbler
 Northern Tolmie Warbler
 Golden Pileated Warbler
 Pallid Wren-tit
 Northern Rock Wren
 San Joaquin Bewick Wren
 Western House Wren
 Western Robin
 Monterey Hermit Thrush
 Northern Townsend Solitaire
 Brewer Blackbird
 Western Tanager
 Pacific Black-headed Grosbeak
 Western Evening Grosbeak
 California Purple Finch
 Northern Pine Siskin
 Red Crossbill
 Sacramento Spotted Towhee
 Western Lark Sparrow
 Western Chipping Sparrow
 Sierra Nevada Oregon Junco

OTHER MAMMALS

California Raccoon
 Mountain Coyote
 Townsend Grey Fox
 California Valley Coyote
 Douglas Beechey Ground Squirrel
 Mendocino Flying Squirrel
 Tehama Brush Rabbit

Humboldt Pine Marten
 Fisher (*Martes pennanti*)
 California Mountain Lion
 California Wildcat
 Northern Sonoma Chipmunk
 Columbian Black-tailed Deer

REPTILES

Northern Mountain Swift
 Common Western Skink
 Western Yellow-bellied Racer
 Western Garter Snake
 Pacific Prairie Rattlesnake

Shasta Alligator Lizard
 Pacific Rubber Snake
 Pacific Gopher Snake
 Common Red-sided Garter Snake

AMPHIBIANS

Rough-skinned Newt
 California Western Toad
 Pacific Giant Salamander

Pacific Tree Toad
 California Yellow-legged Frog
 Oregon Red Salamander

FISHES

Coast Rainbow Trout

Eastern Brook Trout

FLOWERS

(Not included in thesis)

FOREST

Trees

Shasta Red Fir
White Fir
Jeffrey Pine
Sugar Pine
Incense Cedar
Nuttall Willow

Shrubs

Pine-mat Manzanita
Green Manzanita
Shiny-leave Gooseberry
Pioneer Gooseberry
Sticky Currant
Red-flowering Currant
Western Mountain Ash
Desert Mahogany

FOREST CHAPARRAL

Trees

Blue Elderberry

Shrubs

Snow brush
Bitter Cherry
Huckleberry Oak

MEADOW

Herbs

False Hellebore

GARRY OAK WOODLAND

Trees

Garry Oak

Shrubs

Brewer Oak

STREAMSIDE WOODLAND

Shrubs

Mountain Alder
Creek Dogwood
Cascara Sagrada
Wood Rose

Sitka Willow
Western Service Berry
Blackcap Raspberry
Siskiyou Gooseberry

ROCKY RIDGE AND CLIFF

Shrubs

Cream Bush
Desert Mahogany
Great Basin Sagebrush
White-stemmed Rabbit Brush
Antelope Brush

Western Choke-cherry
Western Service Berry
Cascara Sagrada
Dwarf Barberry
Western Rabbit Brush

BIRDS

Golden Eagles, nesting in the crags
White-headed woodpeckers on North
Ridge
Pileated woodpeckers
Green-tailed towhees
Pine siskins
Oregon juncos
Plain titmice
White-breasted nuthatches
Mountain chickadees
Water ouzels
Red-tailed hawks
Swainsons Hawks
Redshafted flicker

Acorn woodpecker
Greathorned owl
Pygmy owl
Hummingbirds—Rufous, Anna, Allan
Sparrows—Fox, White-crown, Gold-
en-crown, and unidentified other
species
Robins
Ravens
California vultures
Nighthawks
Red-bellied sapsuckers
Mountain bluebirds
Wrentits, Bewick wrens, Mountain
quail

TREES

The most remarkable of the tree or shrub growth is the grove of very ancient mountain mahogany, *Cercocarpus Ledifolius*, beyond East Peak toward Sheetiron

above Stony Creek, on an elbow to the left of the trail. Their age must be phenomenal.

The slopes of Red fir, *Abies nobilis*, as the trail rises to the summit, are not valuable as timber because of the gnarled growth, from battling snows and wind, that makes them remarkable as scenic monuments.

In the pass above Summit Springs, the wind-twisted *Pinus jeffreyi* are one of the wilderness's greatest ornaments.

Pinus ponderosa and *Libocedrus decurrens* form vigorous forest stands.

FLOWERS

Epilobium nivium is the mountains' rarest flower, found in only a couple of other locations in California.

Asclepius solanoanum is another rarity, thriving on serpentine slopes at higher elevations.

Cycladenia humilis, in dense mats of fluorescent rose below melting snow-banks, startles with its masses of widespread color in its season.

Zauschneria californica, in flaming red, *Monardella* in misty lavender, color open slopes in fall.

Dicentra uniflora, an alpine rarity, appears in ephemeral bloom as snow melts on summits.

The tall creamy *Eriogonum*, and the procumbent rosy fluff bloom appearing later in summer are the most spectacular in this family.

Dicentra formosa comes with melting snow in the Red fir forest, *Dicentra chrysantha* with *Argemone* on the crags of North Ridge later. *Penstemon purpurea* colors the summit flats of West Peak in early summer. *Linum Lewisia's* blue shows beyond East Peak early. Milk Ranch's glade is solid with blue of procumbent Delphinium, gold of alpine buttercup in early summer, along with white violets at water's edge. The white orchid *Habenaria dilatata* stand up to 30 inches tall by hundreds later in the upper glade.

MS. PETTERSON. I could speak many words on the beauties of Snow Mountain: the unusual geography, of combining in 37,000 acres the tranquility of alpine country which plunges into the spectacular gorge of Stony Creek. Found in this country is a great variety of flora and fauna including some rare species such as the mountain lion, one of which I tracked in the Low Gap area only 10 days ago. The slopes of Snow Mountain should remain untouched by man's busy projects for they are too fragile. The qualifications for Snow Mountain as wilderness exist, otherwise the bills you are reviewing could not have been submitted.

Opposition is based on the idea that man should diversify for his well-being the physical characteristics of the land, changing the distribution of living things and adding human order to the ecological determination of nature. The other day I stood on top of adjoining Sheetiron Mountain. All around me multiple-use management was obvious. For those who so desired the roads, they were there, miles and miles of them. From where I was, the view, also accessible by car, was there, and the alpine country. For fishing, the Eel River, Corbin Creek and Sand Creek ran in a distance into Pillsbury Lake, all accessible by car. The ORV's could have a wonderful time, whether the Forest Service liked it or not, challenging the slopes of abandoned logging roads in areas which lay in a distance around me. It was quite obvious the multiple-use management was everywhere, excepting in one island to the south, Snow Mountain. I wondered then why it was such a struggle to preserve this one small portion of country so ideally conceived for a wilderness which, in its natural state had so much to offer.

I want to acknowledge with appreciation your efforts, Mr. Chairman Melcher, and those of Congressman Clausen and Congressman Robert Leggett in scheduling this hearing.

The road building for logging has been progressing rapidly, thus to spur action on these bills. The people at home are concerned, and hope that something can be done right away. We are upset by the bureaucratic behavior of the Forest Service which has refused to listen to our elected Representatives.

We the people are asking support in this supposedly custodial agency for Snow Mountain Wilderness. We denounce that the Forest Service has become a production agency and is exploiting this portion of this wilderness proposal. I have neither read nor heard any statements favoring this inclusion into our wilderness area.

I wish to thank you for that, and then bring up just a few points that have come about today. First, Pacific Crest Travel Zone. It is interesting to note in the management plans of the Forest Service they state that the Pacific Crest Travel Zone will be managed to maintain a pleasing landscape for the traveling public three fourths of a mile from where it starts on the Crooked Tree Trail over the ridge. The logging road they are constructing now is on the west side of the ridge. Three quarters of the way out on this, on the other side of the ridge, a pile of roots has been dug out of sight from the road and left in a landing area, I suppose, to rot in the eventual future.

Then I would like to point out on the map here that this Pacific Crest Trail is designed to come out at this ridge, and then drop off the slope of Snow Mountain into the Rice Creek and Deer Creek range. As you can see from this map, this is just about as steep a country that you could ask for. Any road put in there would undoubtedly be an erosion potential.

Mr. MELCHER. Ms. Petterson, I wonder if you identified on your map the inholdings?

Ms. PETTERSON. Yes, sir. I have not outlined them, but you will notice right on the top where the junction of the three counties, there is about 97 acres in this area. This little one down below, Signal Peak, you see a little square there. That is 40 acres, and I believe Commander probably owns that. The Milk Branch, that area up there, is owned by the Jones-Weger family in Lake County. Over in Glenn County, at Sprouts Springs—well, it is on the map, it is this area right on Snake Lake. It is meadowed area right in there, and there is timber right on that one. There is no timber up on the crest, though, on those inholdings there.

Mr. MELCHER. You mention in your testimony that a family owning 480 acres was adverse to this proposition.

Where are they located?

Ms. PETTERSON. They live in Upper Lake County.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MELCHER. I yield.

Mr. CLAUSEN. You say that it is 480 acres?

Ms. PETTERSON. Privately they own 480.

Mr. CLAUSEN. What is their name?

Ms. PETTERSON. Clair Jones and his cousin, Audry Weger.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Is it your testimony that they are opposed?

Ms. PETTERSON. They are opposed.

Mr. CLAUSEN. This acreage, this would be characterized as an inholding in the confines of the boundary of the wilderness area?

Ms. PETTERSON. Yes.

Mr. CLAUSEN. This would have to be acquired?

Ms. PETTERSON. No, not under the Wilderness Act. Land acquisition is not required to make an area a wilderness under the Wilderness Act.

Actually, the problem with the private land up there—

Mr. MELCHER. Ms. Petterson, I think it is a little bit more complicated than that; if the inholdings would remain there the family would naturally want access, would want a road, vehicles there, powerlines there.

Ms. PETTERSON. It would be pretty difficult, Chairman Melcher, due to the great distance and the terrain to build a road up there. It would have to be built according to Forest Service specifications and if the Forest Service allowed them to build that road, it would be quite problematical if they could afford to do so.

Mr. MELCHER. I do not know the circumstances at all. I would assume if they continue to live there, if they do not have a vehicle, they would want a vehicle at some time.

Ms. PETTERSON. They do not live there. They acquired this land in 1932 to run cattle and sheep.

Mr. MELCHER. It is your testimony at no time do they take a vehicle in there?

Ms. PETTERSON. Audrey is quite a horsewoman there.

Mr. MELCHER. They would not run in an electric powerline?

Ms. PETTERSON. I would not want to say that. To put one in expense-wise would be quite prohibitive. There is no power. The closest powerline to this area would be Stoney Fork.

Mr. MELCHER. I judge that this inholding is well within the boundaries.

Ms. PETTERSON. Yes, the only one that may not be well within the boundaries would be the one owned by Commander Industries. That is on the northern edge, the west slope of St. John Mountain.

Mr. MELCHER. The original study area that you have shown identified by the solid line, it is quite a bit smaller and for the most part excludes any of the timber sale land, and I am wondering if the study area boundary were on the basis of a topographical area, terrain.

Ms. PETTERSON. Not entirely, sir. On the north portion we originally, if you will notice Crockett Peak there, we originally asked for the boundary to go from Crockett Peak as is shown by the dotted line to the road and follows down. We were discouraged in doing this by the Forest Service by saying that it was too hard to keep the traveling public out of the wilderness when they had the road as a boundary all the way around.

So they recommended this geographic boundary running over to Crockett Peak. Then we drew a theoretical boundary up in the higher elevation and around to what they recommended as a 5,000-foot elevation. They recommended to us to use the 5,000-foot elevation, which we did.

Then, as the 5,000-foot elevation went through the private property, we went around the private property. That is why there are those jags down there. We pretty well followed that course on the eastern side. On the eastern side we went into Stoney Creek. Then we hit a trail. There is a trail there. We followed the trail for a ways, then took the

ridge up on the St. John Mountain. I think that is the ridge the road is on now.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much, Ms. Petterson.

Ms. PETTERSON. May I just say a little more?

Mr. MELCHER. Certainly.

Ms. PETTERSON. I think I know this area better than anybody. I am not trying to brag or anything. It was mentioned on the watershed impact on this Nye sale. This is the Skeleton Creek Range here, and it is very steep. Actually, it is steeper than is shown here on this map, and they are extending this road around here [indicating] to pick up timber that they are bringing off the top. It is so steep they cannot bring the timber up here [indicating] to take it out, so they are bringing it down this way to the other road. You do have two creeks there not shown too clearly here that drop in and out of this logging area, and it will affect the Skeleton Creek drainage. This over here, is very steep, and I think there are four or five creeks that go down into the Pocket area, and they drop off at a real rapid rate.

So you will have a watershed impact. I do not know enough about it to say how drastic it would be. Then the recreation opportunities, there were bikes going up here [indicating] and somebody had winched a jeep up here right before the Forest Service had cut it off, to show how hard it is to get it up here, they had to winch it up and they had it up into this country. That is the only four-wheeled vehicle that has ever been able to get up there. Then the bike riders were going through here until the Forest Service closed it up.

There are opportunities for hunting, fishing. It is good fishing in here. Lots of hunting. Like I say, there is mountain lion. There is bear up in this country. Of course, mountain lions are protected. There are quite a few deer. A lot of people go up here for deer hunting, photographic opportunities, canyon climbing, if you want to call it that. This gorge, it is the only one place that I know of that you can get down without using ropes, into it. Of course, this country is virgin. There are very few people that go into this area, and certainly a great deal of exploration can be done in there.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much, Ms. Petterson. Thank you for coming to Washington from California to provide the committee with this information. We appreciate it very much.

Ms. PETTERSON. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Jim Eaton, Davis, Calif.

Welcome to the committee. I think you have been with us all afternoon, and you were very helpful pointing out the points of interest on the topographical map.

Did you prepare the topographical map?

Mr. EATON. I helped with a large number of students at the University of California at Davis that have been working on this project for several years.

Mr. MELCHER. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JAMES EATON, DAVIS, CALIF.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, my name is James A. Eaton, conservation executive of the Mother Lode Chapter of the Sierra Club. The

Mother Lode Chapter is a subunit of the Sierra Club and its 6,000 members live between Yosemite and the Oregon border.

The students of Active Conservation Tactics, University of California at Davis, could not send a representative to this hearing today and have asked me to convey their complete support of the legislation to establish a Snow Mountain Wilderness area. They have worked 4 long years on this proposal and are anxious to see this issue resolved.

I am pleased to have this opportunity today to tell you of the Mother Lode Chapter's complete support of the proposals before you to have the 37,000 acre Snow Mountain area designated as wilderness. We have long felt that congressional action is needed to fully protect this scenic wild area, and we are happy that both of our Senators and the two Congressmen representing the region agree.

As a northern California native and resident of Davis, I have found the Snow Mountain area to be a convenient place to visit, especially during the winter months. Indeed, I have spent more time there than in any other Forest Service roadless area in California.

Does the Snow Mountain proposal meet the criteria set forth in the Wilderness Act? The Forest Service concluded in 1969 that it did. However, during the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation the Forest Service decided that the area rated a wilderness quality index of only 93 out of a possible 200, a value considered low.

But what is this quality index? While the Forest Service has been running around California informing the public that wilderness areas are not primarily recreation areas, they turned around on this review of potential wilderness areas to rate them according to certain subjective recreational values. What does the number of lakes, campsites, or trails have to do with wilderness quality? These criteria automatically discriminate against desert and other dry wild areas or fragile ecosystems that cannot withstand heavy recreational pressure.

Even if this rating system were valid, the values given to Snow Mountain are much too low. Having visited more than 30 roadless areas in California, I would rate Snow Mountain above some of the areas rated among the top ten in California.

The high opportunity costs of the area are also misleading. While the Forest Service stresses the potential value of the timber in the area, they also admit that road construction needed to reach the scattered stands of trees would be costly and difficult. If the costs to the Government of access to the timber were added on as a capital liability, the opportunity cost would undoubtedly drop.

We also hear that the Roadless Area Review showed the public to be clearly divided over Snow Mountain and that 69 percent of the comments on this review were against any further wilderness in California. Since this was not the impression I had received during the Review's public meetings, I decided to review the record.

The public comment received during the 1969 Snow Mountain study showed 365 responses for wilderness and 60 against, with most of the pro statements coming from individuals and many of the con statements from timber companies throughout California. The Forest Service analysis of the public comment during the Roadless Area Review shows 10 responses for and two against. Since I attended three of the public meetings and received copies of some of the written testi-

mony, I know that the responses in favor of studying Snow Mountain are greatly in excess of 10. If the united support of the wilderness proposal by local, State, and national elected officials indicates anything, it is that Snow Mountain is not a clearly divided public issue, but a contested issue between the public and the Forest Service and timber industry.

The review of the record for all of California is also interesting. I have not looked through all of the 4,000 plus responses, but I have determined that in excess of 15,000 responses are form letters. I find the tabulation of form letters on an equal basis with individual letters and public testimony to be deceiving, to say the least.

There is a timber problem, however. The problem is not that there is much commercial timber in the area, but that some of this marginal timber has already been sold. The original Snow Mountain study area did not include the lands in the Nye sale because the Forest Service had already decided to log these sections. The citizens' wilderness proposal includes portions of the sale area because these lands are important to the integrity of the Snow Mountain region.

The Crockett Peak section of the Nye timber sale includes a part of the almost untouched watershed of the Middle Fork of Stony Creek, an outstanding wild river and fishery. The timber sale would also push forward the Pacific Crest Highway here, a dream of the Forest Service to carve a two-lane highway across Snow Mountain. With roads to the top of Snow Mountain's three nearest neighbors, Sheetiron, St. John and Goat Mountains, 2,164.4 miles of existing roads and 1,428 miles of planned roads on the Mendocino National Forest, and a north-south road already constructed around Snow Mountain, a highway through the heart of this area is absurd.

The Pocket subdivision—and I have several photographs here that I would like to show you—is also important to the wilderness proposal as it would protect the western slope of St. John Mountain as well as one of the most gentle and beautiful trails in the region, the Low Gap Trail. There is no commercial timber in this area; the section was combined with the Crockett Peak subdivision in order to justify ripping off the few scattered stands of trees found here. Every tree that I saw that was 18 inches or greater in diameter was marked for cutting.

You asked the question about clear cutting. I do not think this is termed in clear cutting, but in fact I think it will look very much like a clear cut when you take out all the trees 18 inches in diameter or larger.

If we were before you 8 years ago, all of St. John Mountain would have been in our wilderness proposal. But the Forest Service allowed a road to be sliced up St. John's southeast slope, a scar that daily reminds the residents of Stonyford of the need to keep Snow Mountain from this same fate.

Since we have had questions on topographical boundaries, at this time I would like to point out why I feel most of this proposal is on topographical boundaries as much as possible, if I could do that. If we would start at St. John's Mountain, it is obvious we are on a topographical boundary coming down the ridge. It is limited primarily by the road that comes up St. John Mountain. When we go around Snow

Mountain it is difficult to find a boundary around the base of the mountain, but in the case of Snow Mountain there are numerous parcels of private property. That is the basis of most of this boundary until we get to the South Fork of Stony Creek, which is a very fine private property, some of which has been logged, skirts the private property around until we finally find another ridge to come down to.

At this point we have another problem because the Eel River—there is a road between the Eel River and the mountain. It does follow the road boundary from this point [indicating] and this is the part Ms. Petterson was speaking about, where the Forest Service had suggested that the boundary have proper view. We are on another topographical boundary, a creek, until we reach the ridgeline of the watershed at the Middle Fork of Stony Creek.

Here we are protecting the watershed which is almost a totally untouched watershed for a really wild river. Portions of this ridge were logged, and it has slightly grown over, the Clearwater Creek area. If we felt we could have included this area when this wilderness boundary was done several years ago, we were trying to avoid all possible conflicts with wilderness, and some of this had been logged. We have drawn a boundary around an area that has been logged. The most logical boundary would be right down the ridgetop here, to keep this whole watershed intact.

The Nye sale pocket portion appears to be just pushed across the ridge. As I pointed out, if we were here 8 years ago, this would be a boundary around St. John Mountain, which is an integral part of this entire wilderness proposal.

The boundary shown here is limited by private property and development of the north. That is why it comes across the contour until it comes back up St. John Mountain.

I would suggest that it was the feeling of the people that are interested in this proposal that this side of St. John is going to remain in the wilderness state. There is some private property here, so to avoid the conflict with the private property, the line was drawn here.

This is indeed an integral part of this entire proposal. One of the trails we are speaking of comes along the side of St. John and comes down here. The area that would be logged in the sale, in the whole slope of St. John Mountain is seen from many areas to the north, would be in this wilderness proposal instead of being logged.

Mr. CLAUSEN. What fork of the Eel River is immediately to the west?

Mr. EATON. This is the South Fork and Lake Pillsbury that would be located right here [indicating].

Mr. CLAUSEN. Thank you.

Mr. EATON. Commander Industries has shown an interest in resolving this problem by obtaining alternate timber outside the wilderness proposal. The timber industry, however, seems terrified at the prospect that a precedent might be set by such action. They seem to agree with the Forest Service that once made, bad decisions should never be admitted or mitigated.

We agree with Congressman Leggett's proposal to allow Commander Industries to harvest timber from an alternate site. We do not

feel that Commander should be penalized for signing a contract in good faith, and we feel that this is a fair alternative that will resolve the problem.

I have here an article entitled "Firm Seeks Alternate Timber in Glenn." that indicates Commander is interested in an alternate site. I would also like to share with you at this time a report prepared by the student group at Davis. They have asked me to submit it. I would like to read two portions on some issues that have come up first before I submit it to you.

First on geology, the report on the geology of this area says as follows: "Geologically the Snow Mountain area is markedly different from any other of California's wilderness and parks that are carved out of granite massives." There are no granitic rocks present on Snow Mountain. Much of the mountain is composed of sedimentary rock of various types, uplifted from the shallow ocean floor. Serpentine intrusions are found along the north and middle forks of Stony Creek, and lava flows are present on the north side of Snow Mountain. There are no known deposits of commercial grade minerals. The Forest Service reports that "to date no discoveries have been made that would indicate economic mineral deposits. Experience in this portion of the coast range indicates little likelihood of future discoveries."

That reference is the Forest Service report on the Snow Mountain study area of the Mendocino National Forest, which I believe has been made part of the record already. The geological literature available confirms the statement. The footnote for that includes Geologic Reconnaissance of the northern coast ranges and mountains in California with a summary of mineral resources. This is the California Division of Mines Bulletin.

The Snow Mountain area is interesting to the geologist as it contains Pleistocene glaciation in Dark Hollow Creek. I might add that is the most southern limit in California. There is also a fringe of ultramafic rock on the extreme edge of the area, which is an important site to the proponents of the theory of plate-tectonics as evidence of mountain building. Unstable soils are found throughout the area, specially in the drainages of Dark Hollow Creek and Trout Creek. To add to the unstable soils, we point out that just south of the southern boundary as now marked by the South Stony Creek, there is a road that the Forest Service constructed a few years ago that has been closed by slides for 2½ years at this point.

Also, I would like to share with you some information on the land ownership. Ms. Petterson was pointing out the opposition of some of the major landowners, the two people that own the 480 acres inside the proposal. This report quotes an article from the Sacramento Bee, "Two Voices Cry Out Against The Snow Mountain Plan." Following are some selected quotes from it. Mrs. Weger would like to see the mountain "remain as natural as possible." A state in which the wilderness designation would appear to be destined to maintain. Mrs. Weger is particularly vehement about the encroachment of trail bikes and four-wheeled drive recreational vehicles. They push and push just as far as they go, maneuvering their vehicles up the cliffs to encroach a little further, destroying as they go, she protests. As for

the Pacific Crest Highway route the Forest Service envisions for the future to provide a route north to south in the Mendocino National Forest, Mrs. Weger is strenuously opposed, "Let me put it this way. I think some pleasures such as the opportunity to observe such rare scenic beauty should be earned. I think people should work a little for such sights. It's appreciated more that way."

If I could, I would like to enter for the record both this report that the students have prepared for this committee and a letter from a local landowner who owns land in Snow Mountain.

Mr. MELCHER. Without objection, the report will be made a part of the file and the letter will be made a part of the record at this point. Being no objection, so ordered.

[The report referred to may be found in the files of the committee.]

[The letter referred to follows:]

DR. W. B. GODDARD,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Davis, Calif., February 22, 1972.

LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DEAR SIR: As a land holder within the Mendocino National Forest and in close proximity to the proposed Snow Mountain Wilderness Area, I am taking this opportunity to give my support to the measure. My father and I have ranched Rice Valley for over twenty five years and have seen many changes in this period unfortunately many of which have not been environmentally sound. The management of timber is a case in point.

Many years ago we sold timber in Bevan Flat and know from the experience the small return financially compared to the disorder to the land. From this experience and from observing forest practices I feel timbering in the National Forest should only be allowed when it definitely enhanced the natural environment. Indiscriminate road building to small patches of timber has been much over done and in opinion is the best way to reduce Mendocino National Forest to a status of a tree farm. This would loose to Northern California one of the last relatively undisturbed areas with natural beauty in close proximity to population centers.

It is probably not possible to convey an appreciation for Snow Mountain's natural Alpine character to those who have not stood on her summit and experienced the view and open glades only found in relatively remote areas of the Sierra. This beauty will not last under the extensive road building program already too far advanced. Soil erosion and siltation are already evident on high slopes of the mountain from logging spurs left to naturally deteriorate.

I have been impressed by the leadership demonstrated by the Lake County Board of Supervisors in trying to preserve such areas as Snow Mountain. I sincerely hope that the board will again take a firm stand supporting this measure so that my children's children will also be able to enjoy the view from the summit as I have.

Sincerely yours,

WILSON B. GODDARD.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Eaton. Your testimony is very helpful to the subcommittee and I appreciate it.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I want to express my appreciation for the thoroughness of your testimony. You must have done a great deal of research on this. I do not think I have any questions.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you very much.

Mr. EATON. Thank you.

Mr. MELCHER. H.R. 9063, one of the bills under consideration, section 4 is a part of that bill, and in answer to the question from the gentleman from California, Mr. Clausen, Mr. Nelson stated that the

Forest Service would support section 4. It has been questioned as to whether or not that that was confusing the record. I found no such confusion present. The Forest Service testified in a report to Mr. Nelson's testimony to this committee today that they are not in favor of any of these bills. They are not in favor of the designation of wilderness for Snow Mountain, but if a bill is passed, they would support section 4.

The subcommittee will hold the record open on Snow Mountain for further submission of articles or statements or data, pertinent data. The public hearing on the proposal of the Snow Mountain Wilderness area is concluded at this point.

[Additional information for the record follows:]

GOLDEN RULE MOBILE VILLAGE,
Willits, Calif., August 1, 1973.

HON. JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MELCHER: My good personal friend and Representative Don Clausen, alerted me to the hearing of your subcommittee set for July 25, now passed. Don said I would have until August 14 to have a written statement included in your formal hearing record. The material I am submitting deals with the proposed dedication of Snow Mountain, in northern California, as a National Wilderness Area.

First, may I refer to a letter I wrote May 5, 1971 to Senator John Tunney about saving Snow Mountain: This area can be seen on practically any ordinary map of California. It rises 7,000 feet at a point on the Coast Range in northwestern California, pretty much on a line between Willits on the West and Willows on the east; it is included in the Mendocino National Forest and lies in Lake, Colusa, and Glenn Counties; it is accessible to a fast-growing population in both the San Francisco Bay Area and the Sacramento Area; thus it is ideally located for enjoyment by wilderness seekers who cannot spend much money and time to travel long distances, which is necessary to reach most wildernesses. Snow Mountain includes the upper watersheds of still-unpolluted streams which send bright, pure water in all directions toward places where the need for clean water becomes greater very fast. This mountain is known for the large annual snowfall for spring flows (hence the name Snow Mountain). These snowmelt sources produce beautiful streams that sparkle their way down into the Eel River to the west, and into the large system of Stony Creek with its important reservoirs to the east. This wilderness has a long history of good governmental actions, starting first with its preservation as the Stony Creek Reserve, later named the California National Forest, finally the Mendocino National Forest. Efforts to have it named as a Wilderness Area started shortly after the Wilderness Act was passed. This would have been successful before now if the U.S. Forest Service had not worked against the public desire and stalled it. Let me say that this recent attitude by USFS did not exist during the former years, or Snow Mountain would have been so spoiled that our recent efforts would be meaningless.

Besides myself, I can mention at least two other individuals who have worked for Snow Mountain's preservation during the past several years. One is "an oldtimer" named Sharkey Moore—a mountain man of the pioneer traditions—from Stonyford in Colusa County. Another is a never-give-up housewife from Kelseyville in Lake County, Katherine Petterson. After hearings held by County Supervisors in all three of the home counties, official resolutions were passed by all three local governing boards favoring Snow Mountain Wilderness. Congressman Don Clausen and both of California's U.S. Senators have introduced legislation to bring it about. Congressman Bob Leggett also. The citizens have spoken, loud and clear, but the Forest Service seems to have acted as though this area belongs not to us the people who really own it, but to the agency we hire to manage it. Congressman Melcher, as I wrote to you on May 14 of this year, the present policy of the Forest Service cannot be condoned any longer. The great forest preserves made possible by statesmen like Theodore Roosevelt

are not commodities to be bartered away for cash, as is presently happening because of the present bureaucratic servility to powerful commercial interests. We the majority of American citizens and actual owners of National Forests have already decided that many portions of the public Forests must be preserved for watershed, wildlife, recreational, and inspirational uses. As I said before to you, Mr. Melcher and your committee, please in the name of God do something right away to stop the irreversible desecration.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. DRESBACH.

ULSIAH, CALIF., August 6, 1973.

HON. JOHN MELCHER,
*Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
House Interior Committee,
U.S. Congress, House of Representatives.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge your committee to give a favorable recommendation to the bill sponsored by Rep. Don Clausen, namely the bill to designate the Snow Mountain area of Lake Co., Calif., as a National Wilderness Area.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN DORN.

LAKEPORT, CALIF., August 3, 1973.

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN,
*Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

SIR: I am writing this letter to express my interest and concern for the protection of our natural wilderness areas in general and Snow Mountain area (California) specifically. I understand that there is a hearing scheduled on the bill to make this region a National Wilderness Area. I wish to stand publicly acknowledged as a supporter of this measure.

God has given us in this United States some of the most beautiful scenery in the world. Many major areas have been protected by national parks and monuments, but in spite of this, we are losing so very much of the truly wild areas that our ancestors enjoyed. Even though a comparably small number of people might be able to "use" the various regions, this should in *no* way be a measurement of the intrinsic value of a resource such as Snow Mountain, a resource which is impossible to regain once lost.

Though this Heaven and Earth shall pass away soon, I still feel we should be conscientious in preserving what is left for us to preserve. May the Holy Spirit lead you in this matter.

Sincerely,

GENE RIMMER.

[Whereupon, at 4:50 p.m., the subcommittee proceeded to other business.]



