



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

1971

Establishing a new national park: policy issues
and management problems.

Sweazey, George Edgar.

George Washington University

<https://hdl.handle.net/10945/15699>

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

ESTABLISHING A NEW NATIONAL PARK:
POLICY ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

George Edgar Sweazey

ESTABLISHING A NEW NATIONAL PARK:
POLICY ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

BY

George Edgar Sweazey

Bachelor of Arts

Carleton College, 1962

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Government and
Business Administration of the George Washington
University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Business Administration

June, 1971

Thesis directed by

Harry Robert Page, AB, MBA, PhD

Professor of Business Administration

LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIF. 93940

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL NATIONAL PARKS	8
Primary or Direct Benefits	
Secondary or Indirect Benefits	
II. THE FACTORS CONSIDERED IN ESTABLISHING THE PARK	18
Population and Employment	
Natural Resources	
Timber Resources	
Recreation Resources	
Fish and Wildlife	
Mineral Resources	
Water and Power	
Range Resources	
Conclusion	
III. THE ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS	37
The Team Recommendations	
National Park Service Recommendations	
Forest Service Recommendations	
IV. POLICY ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS	49
Policy Issues	
Forest Service	
National Park Service	
Public Land Law Review Commission	
Management Problems	
Conclusion	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	64
POSTSCRIPT	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77

INTRODUCTION

This report is concerned with land-use decisions, and the impact of those decisions on some of our most valuable natural resources. In addition to the land itself, the resources to be considered are the five renewable surface resources--outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish--and the subsurface, nonrenewable mineral resources. Each resource has its advocates, and each advocate feels that, to a greater or lesser degree, other uses are not compatible with the optimum utilization of the resource he feels is most important. This disagreement makes it necessary to find some way to weigh the relative merits of each claim, and to arrive at land utilization policy which provides for the maximum public benefit.

The rapidly increasing importance of these decisions is eloquently expressed in the statement of interest of the Natural Resources Council of America which says, in part:

This is an urgent and timely goal, because we no longer have new lands to pioneer. There are no new forests, no new streams, and natural lakes, no new places to turn to when misused land becomes unproductive. We now have reached the horizon of our national dream; there is no other fertile and watered valley beyond the distant mountains. The time has come to plant a tree where one is taken, to prevent pollutants from contaminating water, to take all steps we know to be necessary to replenish and husband exhaustible resources.

We must make do with what we have, to use it more fully and with less waste. A rapidly expanding population and an innovative industrial technology are making vast demands against public and private lands alike. Only the public lands, for the most part, are susceptible to uniform resources management and protection programs

that can be relied on to produce continuing real and intangible benefits for so many of our people.¹

It is not possible to resolve a land use conflict by quantifying the benefits to be derived from each of the possible alternative uses, and thus to arrive at a verifiably correct solution. Many of the benefits are spiritual or aesthetic and, although happier people are generally more productive, it is impossible to quantify this increase in productivity in any meaningful way. This does not mean, however, that it is impossible to approach such problems in a logical, systematic manner, and to attempt to insure that the widest possible range of alternatives is considered.

The land use decisions treated by this report are of two kinds. There is the general question of outdoor recreation versus other uses of the land (timber, mining, and grazing are the three most common alternatives), and there is the more specific question, within outdoor recreation, of the amount of land to be devoted to mass recreation versus the amount to be devoted to wilderness.

The most recent example of an attempt to solve a large scale land use problem, and it encompasses both of the above questions, is the formation of the North Cascades National Park in Washington State. Seven million acres in north-central Washington, an area larger than Vermont, were studied by a joint Department of the Interior--Department of Agriculture team, with the purpose of determining whether or not such a park should be established.

¹Hamilton K. Pyles, Compiler, What's Ahead For Our Public Lands? (Washington, D.C.: Natural Resources Council of America, 1970), p. xii.

This joint study team was an outgrowth of what has been called the "treaty of the Potomac". When Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall took office in early 1961, they learned that there were many interagency transfer proposals in various stages of negotiation. After much discussion and negotiation, agreement was reached to transfer or not transfer numerous areas. In the course of these discussions the two secretaries determined to establish a climate of reasonableness and cooperation that had not always characterized proposed interagency transfers in the past.¹ Part of the agreement was that neither department will unilaterally initiate action to change the status of land under the other department, and the logical outgrowth of this agreement was that joint study teams would be employed to study proposed transfers. The North Cascades study team was told that:

. . . there should be a review of past studies and recommendations, current use and management of the area, proposals for change, and an inventory and evaluation of all resource potentials, including a weighing of the economic and social impact of various alternatives.²

The team utilized six methods of becoming informed and arriving at recommendations:

1. A review was made of existing information, including highlights of the history of the North Cascades, Acts of Congress, legislative proposals, and administrative decisions.

¹U. S., Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture, The North Cascades, by the North Cascades Study Team, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 9.

²Letter from Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, to Mr. Edward C. Crafts, Chairman of the North Cascades Study Team, March 5, 1963.

2. Field examinations were carried out by team members, both individually and collectively. Each member of the team gained a personal knowledge of the North Cascades, the surrounding area, and the management and utilization of resources. This knowledge included both areas that were generally accessible, and those that are normally inaccessible. Travel was by car, boat, foot, horse, and airplane.
3. Public hearings were held in Wenatchee, Mount Vernon and Seattle, in the state of Washington, in October, 1963. Over 300 witnesses or statements were heard or received at these hearings. The record was kept open for a month and about 2,200 additional letters were received.
4. Special resource studies were undertaken, each chaired by a member of the study team, and aided by personnel specializing in each area. These studies covered outdoor recreation, timber resources, range resources, fish and wildlife, water and power, and mineral resources. These analyses did not include recommendations but, instead, provided technical background information on the value, extent, and needs of the various resources.
5. Agency statements and special material were prepared by the National Park Service, Forest Service, and special consultants. The Park Service and Forest Service recommendations were included in the final report as alternative possibilities to the team recommendation, and to make generally available the individual agency points of view.

6. Team consultations were held on the West Coast, in West Virginia, and in Washington, D.C. These discussions were to chart the course of the study, review progress, evaluation information, debate issues, and prepare recommendations.¹

The above approach to the decision making process has both strengths and weaknesses. This report analyzes those strengths and weaknesses and arrives at a determination of how such decisions should be made. The problems to be overcome in establishing the North Cascades National Park illustrate problems that are typical in formulating any large-scale land-use decision. The conflicts over the best use of the various natural resources were strongly joined, as each partisan group attempted to insure that the seven million acres under consideration would be utilized with their best interests in mind. Because the issues to be resolved in the North Cascades area were typical of many land-use decisions, it is believed that the insights gained in this study will have general applicability and will serve as future guides.

The specific research question to be answered was "What were the policy issues and management problems to be overcome in establishing the North Cascades National Park?" This question was broken down into five subsidiary questions:

1. "Why is there a need for additional national parks?"
2. "What factors were considered in establishing North Cascades National Park?"
3. "What were the various opposing recommendations for the park?"

¹The North Cascades, by the North Cascades Study Team, p. 11.

4. "What policy issues and management problems were considered in establishing the park?"
5. "What lessons can be learned from this analysis?"

The research methods utilized in answering these questions were of two basic types. The major method was the utilization of the primary and secondary printed material in the libraries of the Department of the Interior, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and The George Washington University. A secondary method was the help given by various individuals at the Department of the Interior, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and the American Forestry Association. On numerous occasions they answered specific questions, either through telephone interviews or personal interviews, which aided greatly in the preparation of this report.

The report will be divided into five chapters. The first will deal with the question, "Why is there a need for additional national parks?" It will relate the increase in population in the United States to the increase in outdoor recreation, and describe the pressure which results on the existing national park system. It will discuss the benefits to be derived from a national park system, including both the direct, intangible benefits, and the secondary, tangible benefits. As part of this analysis it will describe the administrative machinery within the National Park Service which is attempting to meet this increased pressure, and it will conclude with a discussion of ways to make land for outdoor recreation more generally available.

The second chapter will discuss the factors considered by the North Cascades Study Team in establishing the North Cascades National Park. It will cover the population and employment in the area, and the

timber, recreation, fish and wildlife, minerals, water and range resources. It will include not only a summary of the resources available in the North Cascades, but also some of the more general problems associated with managing those resources.

The third chapter will describe the recommendations which resulted from the study. A compromise team recommendation is given as the final recommendation, but both the National Park Service and the Forest Service submitted position statements which differed considerably from the team recommendation. The issue to be resolved by the study team was not simply whether or not to have a national park. The issue was to determine the best use of the North Cascades area, and it is, therefore, only possible to analyze the decisions by considering the twenty-one recommendations made by the team as a package--they are interrelated and interdependent. This chapter will attempt to provide that unification.

The fourth chapter will discuss the policy issues and management problems which must be comprehended in order to understand the rationale behind several of the recommendations. It will examine the differences in policy between the two principle agencies involved in the North Cascades area--the National Park Service and the Forest Service--because those differences greatly affected the final study team proposal. The chapter will also describe some specific management practices to be followed in the North Cascades National Park, and it will include the more generally applicable policies and management practices recommended by the Public Land Law Review Commission in its recent report.

The fifth chapter will provide a summary and conclusions, and will deal with the lessons learned from the above analysis.

CHAPTER I

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL NATIONAL PARKS

One hundred million people lived in the United States in 1915. The population has passed 205 million today and is variously projected to reach between 265 and 322 million by the end of the century.¹ The implications of this increase in population for the national parks are considerable. If the use of the national park system increased in direct proportion to the population, it would rise from 72,000,000 visits in 1960 to close to 144,000,000 visits in the year 2000. The latter figure was exceeded, however, in 1967.² Outdoor recreation in the United States increases far more rapidly than population because leisure, mobility, and income are increasing more rapidly than population. A rough rule of thumb is that the demand for outdoor recreation will increase at least twice as rapidly as the population.

While this rule of thumb serves as a valid guide to the general increase in outdoor recreation, there are indications that it is a serious underestimate of the public use of the national parks. Marion Clawson, in a paper entitled "The Crisis in Outdoor Recreation" differentiated between user-oriented recreation areas located close to

¹U.S., Council on Environmental Quality, Environmental Quality, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 150.

²U.S., National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, Public Use of the National Park System, 1872-2000, by Ronald F. Lee, p. 60.

the people who use them, such as city and county parks; intermediate recreation areas which are relatively accessible but contain more natural environment, such as state parks and reservoir areas; and resource-based recreation areas, including outstanding examples of natural beauty, such as mountains, lakes, forests or unique historic and scientific sites. The principle areas in this last category, he pointed out, are the national park system and the national forests. He then attempted to estimate the probable growth in demand for each of these three types of recreation areas. He estimated that public demand for user oriented recreation areas would quadruple between 1950 and 2000. For intermediate areas it would increase sixteen times; but for resource-based areas, such as the national park system, public demand might well multiply forty times between 1950 and 2000.¹

He based these estimates on the consideration that two factors--large urban population and more leisure time--would increase the demand for user oriented areas, but that two other factors--higher incomes and greater mobility--would have little importance for this type of area. In fact, these forces might tend to divert the more prosperous and mobile seekers of outdoor recreation to places farther from home. He foresaw a much greater increase in demand for intermediate areas because of large rises in average income and annual travel, but lack of time and money still keeps many families from making trips to the national parks. With higher family incomes and longer vacations, the potential demand in the year 2000 may well be forty times what it was in 1950.

¹U.S., National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, Public Use of the National Park System, 1872-2000, by Ronald F. Lee, p. 61.

Any figures projected to the year 2000 are, of course, highly conjectural. The National Park Service, as of 1967, had not carried its own projections past 1976. This projection indicated a ten-fold increase over 1950, however, and although a ten-fold increase between 1976 and 2002 (an additional 26 years) gives the unrealistic figure of 2,470,000,000 visits, an estimate of one billion visits by the year 2000 no longer seems fantastic.

The responsibility within the National Park Service for meeting these future demands is held by the Office of Programs. The Office of Programs is subdivided into the divisions of Plans and Objectives, Program Planning, and Coordination and Appraisal, described respectively as "the dreamers, the engineers, and the bookkeepers".

The needs of the future are met in different ways by the three divisions.¹ The Division of Plans and Objectives has the responsibility for developing alternate futures or "scenarios" of the things that may occur in the next few decades. The present is projected into the immediate and long-range future--to the year 2000 and beyond--and from this projection are derived the long-range objectives which serve as the basis for the major goals and concrete programs.

The Division of Program Planning has the responsibility of putting these dreams into a form that Congress and the Office of Management and Budget will accept. Mr. George Gowans, the Director of the Division, describes the process by saying that, "a program is simply a schedule of events, like a theatre program. Ours is in a five year context, so that professional services can be planned for. It begins with the superintendent

¹Loretta DeLozier, "Making Park Dreams Come True", NPS Newsletter, October 29, 1970, p. 4.

who decides what his park needs---more buildings, additional maintenance funds or staff. His request goes to the Region and they assign it a priority. The Region sends its requests to us, and we review them to see if they are adequately justified and correctly categorized, and whether they fit into the long-range objectives. We present them to the Director with our recommendations, and he decides which ones will be part of the National Park Service budget."

The Division of Coordination and Appraisal has the responsibility for helping the Park Service get the most for the dollars it has available to spend. The Division administers the current-year construction and professional services programs approved by the Director for the Service Centers, Harpers Ferry and the regions, and maintains progress reports on the accomplishments of these programs. There are two machine based reporting systems used. The Program Administration and Reporting System (PARS) is the main method for reporting status on planning and construction projects, in terms of time and cost. The Project Scheduling System (PSS) will, when perfected, assure that the many separate phases of total projects fit together in logical sequence.

Given, then, that the administrative machinery exists for assessing and planning for future demands, how should this machinery be mobilized to meet the challenge? An analysis of the proper response to the future demands to be placed on the national parks must begin with a determination of the potential benefits to be derived from a national park system, because plans for the future must be made with an eye toward enhancing these benefits. Basically, these benefits may be grouped into two principle categories: primary or direct benefits, and those which are secondary, indirect or otherwise incidental to the purpose for which

the parks were established.

Primary or Direct Benefits¹

The national parks are not operated for the purpose of returning a profit. The reasons for its existence transcend any return which may be readily measured by the standards of the market place. These primary values, however, are reflected in our economy in a positive though intangible manner. Some of the intangible benefits derived from the use of the national parks are:

1. Improved efficiency of the individual in his daily tasks, because of the break from daily routine, resulting in increased national productivity and wealth.
2. Increased national productivity resulting from the development in the individual of new skills, interests, greater knowledge, or deeper perceptions.
3. Provision of a wide variety of recreational opportunities at the lowest possible per capita cost; so that the national benefits noted above are realized even from low-income groups.
4. Reduced need or lower expenditures for extensive law-enforcement programs, correctional institutions of various kinds, mental hospitals, etc.

Secondary or Indirect Benefits²

Although, as stated above, the national parks were not established with a profit motive in mind, it is obvious that they induce certain

¹C. Frank Brockman, Recreational Use of Wild Lands, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 181.

²Ibid., p. 182-184.

expenditures over and above the cost of running them. These expenditures, the secondary or indirect benefits of their use, are reflected in the economy of the nation, the states, and the individual communities.

These benefits are more intangible in nature, many can be measured by customary economic rules, and their effect on the economy of a region can be readily determined. Some of these indirect benefits are:

1. Stimulation of vacation travel. As our standard of living increases, Americans are discovering that expenditures on vacation travel compare favorably with buying a new refrigerator or increasing their life insurance, and the existence of an attractive national park system increases these expenditures.
2. Development of business activity in areas near national parks. Supplies and services of a variety of types (hotels, meals, gas, and oil) are required by visitors to national parks, and result in an inflow of money which would not otherwise have been spent.
3. Stimulation of business activity relative to the manufacture of recreational equipment, clothing, and supplies. The specialized needs of campers, mountain climbers, boating enthusiasts, and others, promote and develop manufacturing enterprises whose activities are reflected in the national economy.
4. Increased property valuations. Vacation travel and other recreational activities, in stimulating business activity in and adjacent to national parks, bring about increased property valuations which are reflected in increased property tax revenue to cities, counties, states and the nation.

5. Increased miscellaneous-tax revenue. With particular reference to out-of-state visitors, recreational expenditures include taxes of various kinds (gasoline tax, sales tax, amusement tax) which are reflected in a direct monetary return to the nation and to various states and municipalities.

There are, in addition, other benefits related to indirect recreational returns which are not directly related to expenditures of various kinds.¹ First, recreational areas favor the development of individual initiative on the part of small businessmen. Because recreational products and services are widely diversified and dependent on personal interests, they have not tended toward monopoly form. This diversification is healthy for most regions. Second, since the national parks are located in relatively remote areas, the business activity they stimulate is a vital factor in the stability and economic development of such regions. This development would not otherwise have occurred. Finally, recreation areas help redistribute money from the major industrial and business centers and thus aid in the prevention of "poverty pockets".

One of the first steps in ensuring that these benefits are realized on the widest possible scale is the identification and protection of those unique areas of national significance that exist on the public lands.² There are a great many areas in the national forest system, and

¹C. Frank Brockman, Recreational Use of Wild Lands, p. 185.

²Report of the Public Land Law Review Commission to the President and to the Congress, Wayne N. Aspinall, Chairman, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 198.

under the Bureau of Land Management, that may very well qualify under existing standards for national parks, monuments, historic sites, wilderness areas, scenic and wild rivers, and national trails. They have not been inventoried or formally designated, and this is the necessary first step in gaining for these areas the protection they need. After these areas have been identified, they should be assigned a priority for protection pending designation under established procedures. In most cases the procedure involves statutory designation, and since this invariably takes time, temporary withdrawal of these areas for limited periods will be necessary to protect them until formal designation is accomplished.

Alaska is an example of a major area where the identification of truly unique areas is of immediate importance. The problem is complicated by both the proposed oil pipeline and the as yet incompletd state land grant selection program, but these problems only emphasize the importance of identifying and withdrawing areas of truly national importance before they are lost forever.

An illustration of the kind of review which must be accomplished is the survey presently being conducted of areas to be included in the National Wilderness Preservation System. The areas being reviewed are the primitive areas of national forests, and the roadless areas of national parks and the national wildlife refuges and game ranges. There is nothing in the Wilderness Act of 1964, however, (the act which established the National Wilderness Preservation System) which precludes surveying lands not previously identified for review, and the scope of this review could, therefore, usefully be broadened to include other unique areas of national significance.

The requirement for additional national parks in particular, and expanded outdoor recreation opportunities in general, need not necessarily be met solely by Federal action. The benefits of national park-type recreation can be realized from state and local recreation areas if the governments concerned are able to finance the development and effectively manage these areas. In some instances a state will be unwilling to assume the responsibility to develop and manage a regional recreation area because many of the potential users will be from outside the state. In such cases the Federal government could, through the appropriate land administering agency, aid in developing these areas and share in the costs incurred.¹ One proposed technique in stimulating state and local recreation programs is the leasing of public lands to these governments. These would be lands which are of less than national significance and which would be used to meet intensive local recreation needs. The price of such transfers would depend on: The amount of land being leased or transferred; the manner in which the United States acquired the property; the planned use of the property; the necessary development costs; the relative financial capability of the governmental unit receiving the land; and the number of people to be served by the recreation opportunities to be offered. These lands would be subject to a Federal right to require return of the land if it was used for a purpose other than that intended.²

One of the major techniques presently employed to expand available recreation is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It was created in 1965

¹Ibid., p. 199.

²Ibid., p. 215-216.

to provide a more certain method of financing both Federal grants to the states for recreation, and various Federal recreation programs. The premise is that the fund would be continually replenished from the fees paid by users of the federally administered recreation areas, and from certain sources. The replenishment arrangements have not worked well, and income from fees have only covered about ten per cent of the total outlays from the fund. As a result, the fund has operated in debt and has borrowed from the United States Treasury since its inception. A temporary attempt to alleviate this problem was adopted in 1968 when Congress amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide that revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing program could be used to guarantee an annual level of \$200 million to the fund. This provision ends in 1973.¹ In spite of the financing problems which have been experienced, the concept of having a revolving fund available to finance recreation needs is a workable one, and should be pursued further.

¹Ibid., p. 215-216

CHAPTER II

THE FACTORS CONSIDERED IN ESTABLISHING THE PARK

Population and Employment

The area being considered by the study team covered parts of eleven counties, and these counties included two-thirds of the state's population. Few people, however, live in the study area itself, because of its mountainous character and because more than 90 per cent of the land is federally owned. This combination of major urban and industrial centers close to a unique wilderness is one of the major factors in the potential recreational benefits to be derived from this area.¹

The study area is close to Puget Sound and British Columbia, and is within reasonable driving distance of the population centers of California and Oregon. It is estimated that, within a half day's drive or less from some portions of the study area, there are now about 3.5 million people, and by the year 2000 the figure may rise to 8.6 million.

In the eleven counties of the study area, 695,000 persons were employed in 1961.² Twenty-two per cent of this total employment was in manufacturing, with the other major employment items being trade, government, self-employed, and service industries. Timber based industry accounts for four per cent of the employment in the eleven county area,

¹The North Cascades, by the North Cascades Study Team, p. 32.

²Ibid., p. 35.

while mining accounts for 0.1 per cent. These percentages are declining. In the twelve year period from 1950-1962, dependency on timber industries in the area declined 17 per cent, while dependency on mining declined 47 per cent. During this same period, employment in the manufacture of transportation equipment rose about 250 per cent. Based on these facts, it was concluded that the timber and minerals that come from the study area do not support a large segment of the total population of the eleven county area.¹

Natural Resources

A summary of the characteristics and significance of the major natural resources in the area is necessary in order to develop a background for the recommendations, and to understand the conflicts which arose. The order in which the resources are discussed does not indicate their relative importance.

Timber Resources

Of the 6.3 million acres of Federal lands in the study area, 2.9 million acres are classified by the Forest Service as timberland available for commercial development.² The Cascade Divide separates the study area into two basic timber zones--a Douglas fir region on the West and ponderosa pine on the East. The Western side contains some of the world's most productive timber areas, both in quantity and in quality. These areas average 55,000 to 65,000 board feet per acre, which is five to six times the average for all the national forests in the country.

¹Ibid., p. 36.

²Ibid., p. 37.

This area contains approximately half of all the national forest allowable annual cut of sawtimber for the state of Washington. The Forest Service estimates the allowable cut from this area at about 605 million board feet per year; any greater cut would not result in a sustained yield. The actual cut, in the years 1960 to 1965, varied from 400 to 600 million board feet. In 1962, the value of this timber was about 10 million dollars, of which the counties received 1.75 million dollars. The value of the products ultimately manufactured from this timber is estimated at about \$160 million, and the number of people involved in harvesting and processing this timber in the study area was about 5,400. (This figure climbed to 7,700 in 1964.)¹

It is recognized by the Forest Service that in some areas timber management and other resource use is subordinated to recreation. The Forest Service divides national forest lands in the Pacific Northwest into four resource management associations--grass-shrub, principle forest, upper forest, and Alpine. Within each of these are landscape management areas where recreation is the primary value. These two concepts are then combined to form "high mountain" areas which include the Alpine region, plus the landscape management areas of the upper forest. The "high mountain" areas are managed for recreation and the principle forest areas are managed for timber.²

The timber industry, quite understandably, objects to any decrease in the amount of land available for commercial timber production, and the plans for the North Cascades were seen as a threat to their

¹Ibid., p. 37-41.

²Ibid., p. 43-45.

economic well-being. The industry frequently refers to an approaching timber "famine", and blames this famine on the refusal of small land-owners to let their land be logged, the withdrawal of timberland for national parks and wilderness areas, and the failure of the government to cultivate the national forests more intensively. The solution it proposes is to cut more heavily on public land.¹ Although the approaching timber "famine" is the usual argument against creating additional national parks or wilderness areas, the facts do not by any means conclusively prove the case. Even within the industry itself, there is disagreement. F. K. Weyerhaeuser, speaking at the 50th anniversary of the University of Washington College of Forestry, predicted that "the harvest of old growth timber would be extended well into the 21st century, and that, beginning about 1970, the rise in Washington saw timber would more than offset the decline in use of old growth timber."² The National Lumber Manufacturers Association itself says that oversupply is the problem. The use of steel, concrete, aluminum, and plastics has resulted in a downward trend in per capita consumption, and the industry is presently failing to utilize 60 per cent of the timber potential.³ Spokesmen for the timber industry, at both the study team hearings and the later Congressional hearings, argued against the creation of a North Cascades National Park, but none of the arguments proved that there would be economic hardship resulting from the creation of a park.

¹Pyles, What's Ahead for Our Public Lands?, p. 24.

²P. H. Zaleskey and F. Butler, "Economic Potential of Wilderness in the North Cascades", Sierra Club Bulletin, n.d., p. 29-36.

³Ibid.

Recreation Resources

The proper balance between utilization of the North Cascades for recreation or timber, and the balance between different types of recreation, is more a matter of personal opinion than of examining the facts and determining a verifiably correct course of action. There is a continuum of personal opinion that ranges from the feeling that cutting any tree is a desecration, to those who feel that it is just as unfortunate that an old growth, over-mature forest is not harvested to make way for a young forest producing new growth. The point of maximum public benefit lies somewhere between these two extremes, and, as a first step in finding this point, it is useful to examine the basic documents that clarify the relationship of recreation to the other resources in the area:

1. The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960. This Act makes it clear that there are five renewable surface resources for which the Forest Service is responsible. These are outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish. The resources named are of equal priority and are entitled to equal consideration. It emphasizes that the principle of sustained yield applies to recreation as well as to the other resources.
2. The Wilderness Act of 1964. This applies to both the Forest Service and the National Park Service, and establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System. These areas are to be protected and managed so as to preserve their natural condition.
3. The Act of August 25, 1916 which established the National Park Service. It directs that service to promote and regulate the use of national parks, monuments, and reservations for the purpose of conserving the scenery and natural and historic objects and

wildlife, and to provide for their enjoyment in such a manner as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

4. Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane's policy letter of May 13, 1918, which specifies three broad principles to be followed in the administration of the national parks. First, national parks must be maintained in absolutely unimpaired form for the use of future generations as well as those of our own time; second, they are set apart for the use, observation, health and pleasure of the people; and third, national interest must dictate all decisions affecting public or private enterprise in the parks.
5. The Act of March 2, 1899. This Act established Mt. Ranier National Park from part of the Mt. Ranier Forest Preserve.
6. The decision of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture of September, 1960, establishing the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area.
7. The land classification order of Secretary of Agriculture Jardine of September, 1926, establishing the Mount Baker Park Division of the Mount Baker National Forest. Logging, mining, and water development projects were permitted if they did not impair the value of the area for recreational purposes.
8. The decision of the Secretary of Agriculture of July, 1935, establishing the North Cascades Primitive Area.¹

Recreational use of the North Cascades dates from the early mountaineering expeditions of nearly a century ago. There are unsubstant-

¹The North Cascades, by the North Cascades Study Team, p. 45-46.

iated reports that Mt. Ranier was climbed in 1852, there were documented climbs in 1870, and Mt. Shuksan was climbed in 1906. Paradise Inn was established in Mt. Ranier National Park in 1916, and recreational use of the park has climbed to a present figure of about two million visits per year. From 1923 to 1933 a small number of camp and picnic grounds and ski facilities were developed in the national forests in the North Cascades, but a major breakthrough in the construction of recreation facilities was the work done after 1933 by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Most of the roads in the area have been constructed by timber purchasers under timber sale contracts. These have made the area more accessible to hunters, fishermen, and other recreationists, and have played a major part in increasing the annual recreation visits to the study area from 3.5 million in 1952 to 6.6 million in 1962.¹

Of the 6.3 million acres of Federal land in the study area, 2.3 million acres is presently dedicated to recreation, related use, or earmarked for special study. These areas include Mt. Ranier National Park, Glacier Peak Wilderness Area, the North Cascade Primitive Area, Mount Baker Recreation Area, and Alpine Lakes, Cougar Lake, and Monte Cristo Peak Limited Areas. The Forest Service further estimates that there are about 5.1 million acres suitable for hunting, 50,000 acres of fishing areas, and about 5,000 acres of boating access areas.

The economic effect of the national park, wilderness, primitive and limited areas in the study area is considerable. These areas contain 356,000 acres of commercial timberland, with eleven billion board feet of

¹Ibid., p. 46-47.

sawtimber. This timber has an estimated value of over \$200 million, could provide an annual sustained yield of 134 million board feet, and could support 1200 employees. Preserving this area for recreation does not mean, however, that all economic value is lost. In 1962, visitors to the area spent \$27 million for hunting and fishing, and \$33 million for activities other than hunting and fishing, for a total of \$60 million. Roughly half of these expenditures were made by residents of the state, and half by the 15-30 per cent of the visitors who came from outside the state. About half of the \$60 million benefits the study area and the immediate vicinity, while the other half finds its way outside the area through taxes, wholesale purchases, and other avenues. It is believed that by the year 2000, recreation expenditures will double or even triple.¹ While these figures catalogue the actual expenditures on recreation in the area, there have also been estimates made of what the expenditures might be if a national park were established in the area. Using Olympic National Park as a close approximation of the new park, it was determined that the average expenditure was \$0.23 per hour per tourist, and this figure was then used to compute recreation expenditures in the proposed North Cascades National Park. It can then be computed that if 300,000 tourists stay 48 hours, they will spend \$3,012,000. If 500,000 tourists stay 48 hours they will spend \$5,020,000. The Department of Commerce estimates that 24 tourists per day per year are the equal, in economic benefit, of an industry with a payroll of \$100,000 per year.² The money spent on recreation can have a significant effect on the economy

¹Ibid., p. 52.

²Zaleskey and Butler, "Economic Potential of Wilderness", p. 29-36.

of a region.

Because many controversial management issues center on recreation, the study team sought to clarify the problem by determining the amount and type of recreational land in the study area. They used as their system of classification the six management classes recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. These classes are:

Class I -- High Density Recreation Areas. These are areas intensively developed and managed for mass use.

Class II -- General Outdoor Recreation Areas. These are areas subject to substantial development for a wide variety of specific recreation uses.

Class III -- Natural Environment Areas. These are areas that are suitable for recreation in a natural environment, usually in combination with other uses.

Class IV -- Unique Natural Areas. These are areas of outstanding scenic splendor, natural wonder, or scientific importance.

Class V -- Primitive Areas. These are undisturbed roadless areas, characterized by natural conditions, including wilderness areas.

Class VI -- Historic and Cultural Sites. These are sites of major historic or cultural significance, either local, regional, or national.¹

Both the National Park Service and the Forest Service attempted to apply these classifications to the study area, and the results differed in some major respects. One was that the Forest Service

¹The North Cascades, by the North Cascades Study Team, p. 54.

classified over twice as much area as Natural Environment (Class III) as did the Park Service. The Forest Service interpretation was based on their multiple use philosophy, which meant that other resource uses as well as recreation were considered. The National Park Service classification was based on optimum management for recreation only, and they did not, therefore, consider some lands whose recreation values were not important enough to receive major emphasis.

The classification of Natural Environment areas is a source of continual disagreement between the two services. While the National Park Service recognizes that almost all lands have some value for recreation, they believe that a recreational classification implies that that land will be formally classified on a map as an area to be managed in a specific way for recreation, and for that reason the Class III designation should be used to protect specific recreational environments and provide for recreation opportunities. The Forest Service position is that, under the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield law, any land, unless recreation is specifically eliminated, has recreational values and should be given, if no other classification is indicated, a Class III designation. Or, more simply, the National Park Service feels that you must prove that an area does have recreational value before you give it a recreational classification, while the Forest Service feels that you must prove that the land does not have recreational value before you are justified in withholding a recreational classification. This difference in emphasis resulted in the great difference in the amount of land classified in Group III (the most general recreation classification) by the two services, and was a source of their difference of opinion over the final proposal for the North Cascades National Park.

Fish and Wildlife

Fish and wildlife resources are an integral part of the recreation enjoyment of the North Cascades. In the period from 1958-1962, the visitor days of hunting increased from 180,000 to 420,000, and fishing from 430,000 to 530,000. Estimated annual expenditures by hunters and fishermen in the area is \$27 million. The conclusions by the study team about the fish and wildlife resource were that:

1. These resources are important both economically and in terms of the enjoyment afforded.
2. All the Federal lands in the area are currently available for hunting and fishing, except that hunting is not allowed in Mt. Ranier National Park.
3. There is an overpopulation of big game animals and a deficiency of winter range. For every 20 square miles of summer range there is only one square mile of winter range.
4. One-fourth of the big game harvested in the state comes from the study area, as does eighteen per cent of the U.S. production of salmon.
5. There are 600 miles of streams in the area where fish production can be improved by channel and stream flow stabilization, pollution control, construction of fish ladders, log jam removal, and other habitat improvement measures.
6. Opening the tree canopy through logging improves wildlife habitat and big game populations for ten to twelve years. A regular program of timber harvesting maintains higher game populations than would otherwise be the case.
7. Steelhead is the most important freshwater sport fish in the state.

8. Major big game populations are: deer, 140,000; elk, 14,600; bear, 12,000; mountain goats, 8,000; the annual harvest is about 15,800 deer, 2,400 elk, 1300 bear, and 300 mountain goats.
9. In the future, both hunting and fishing pressures will increase. The increased hunting will have a beneficial effect in that it will alleviate the present overpopulation of big game, and the unbalance between summer and winter ranges; the increased fishing pressure, however, can be met only by the stream and habitat improvement measures outlined above. Hunting and fishing will continue to be one of the major recreational uses of the study area.¹

Mineral Resources

Most of the mineral deposits to be found easily have already been located. The value of a deposit, however, cannot generally be accurately determined from its surface exposures. This can only be determined by underground exploration. Deposits that do not crop out at the surface can be found only by careful and intensive use of modern geological, geophysical, and geochemical techniques. For these reasons, determining the mineral resource potential of a region is much more difficult than determining the resource potential of surface commodities, such as timber and grazing, which are more readily appraised.

An understanding of the present mining laws is essential to an understanding of the relation of minerals to land use. There are three distinctly different policy systems governing the exploration, development,

¹Ibid., p. 61-63.

and production of minerals on public lands.¹ The first evolved from regulations established by miners in the western mining districts before any Federal law had been enacted. These rules were subsequently embodied in the General Mining Law of 1872. This law allows locators to initiate rights to public land minerals merely by discovery, as long as those lands have not been specifically closed to mineral location. The locator acquires legal title to the land through issuance of a Federal deed known as a "patent", upon payment of a nominal sum. Even without a patent, the locator may produce minerals without any payment in the form of a royalty. This system generally applies to the metallic or hardrock minerals.

The second system was established in 1920 when specific minerals were removed from the General Mining Law's coverage and placed under a leasing system. Leasing requires annual rental until production, and the payment of royalties thereafter. Nearly all public lands may be leased for those minerals coming under a leasing system, but the responsible administrators are free to accept or reject offers to lease. Noncompetitive oil and gas leases and prospecting permits for other leasable minerals are available on a first come, first served basis, except for certain oil and gas leases which are awarded in a drawing procedure. (The drawing procedure applies when the area is within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.) For other leasable minerals, deposits are leased on a competitive-bid basis. Furthermore, under a mineral leasing system, the operations of the lessees are subject to detailed regulation.

¹Report of the Public Land Law Review Commission to the President and to the Congress, Wayne N. Aspinall, Chairman, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 124.

The third system, the materials disposal system, came into being in recent years to provide for the sale of specific common commodities, such as sand and gravel. This system involves a rather simple procedure of making available common materials at a market price usually determined by competitive bidding.

Under the leasing system and the materials disposal system, administrative permits are required prior to any exploration. This is not true of exploration under the General Mining Law of 1872, and this has led to cases where individuals, whose primary interest was not mineral development and production, using this law to obtain public lands for other purposes. In addition, the 1872 law offers no means whereby the government can control environmental impacts, claims which have been dormant for a long time remain as clouds on titles, and land managers do not know where the claims are located. All of these deficiencies in the law have led to abuses of public lands.

In the North Cascades, thirteen nonmetallic minerals or materials have been produced in abundant quantities, or have a potential for appreciable future production. Six of the thirteen are building materials used in their natural state and altered only physically. These materials are basalt, building stone, granitic rocks, pumice and pumicite, sand and gravel, and sandstone. Two others of the thirteen, clay and shale, and limestone, are also used in the building and construction industries after considerable processing. Four of the thirteen, olivine, massive quartz, silica sand, and talc soapstone are presently important for industrial use. Coal is the other nonmetallic in the group of thirteen, and is the most important economically. Since 1855, 128 million tons valued at over \$407 million have been produced

in the North Cascades area. Reserves are estimated at 6,185 tons. Olivine deserves additional mention in that its use as a foundry sand has increased phenomenally since 1946, and the larger of the two sources of olivine in the United States is located in the study area. Olivine will undoubtedly continue to be produced in considerable quantities from this site.

The total value of metallic minerals produced from the study area since 1904 is \$87 million. Copper and gold account for about \$77 million of this total, with half the gold produced as a byproduct of the copper production. Six metals--copper, molybdenum, gold, lead, mercury, and nickel--have a good probability of being produced in significant amounts in the future. Nine other metals are present in significant quantities, but are considered to have a low potential for developing into commercially significant operations.¹

Present mining activity is concentrated for the most part on the nonmetallic minerals. The most common industrial minerals and aggregates are present in almost unlimited quantities, and others are known to be present and available in varying amounts in the area. All are important to the present and future industrial requirements of the country.

Mining on Federal lands in the area is conducted under a number of Acts including the Act of 1872, the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955, and the Wilderness Act of 1964. The 1955 act prohibited future location and removal of common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and prohibited the use of mining claims for

¹Ibid., p. 65-68.

other than prospecting, mining, and processing. In addition, it established a procedure whereby the administrators of surface resources could utilize and manage those resources as long as this did not interfere with mineral development.

Under the Wilderness Act of 1964, mining may continue in the wilderness areas until the end of 1983, after which no patents will be issued except for claims existing prior to that time. Prospecting in national forest wilderness areas will continue, however, and the Secretary of the Interior is directed to survey these areas on a recurring basis to determine their mineral values. Further restrictions on prospecting or development include:

1. Mining claims are permitted on Federal Power withdrawals only under certain conditions. Of the 187,000 acres in the study area in Federal Power withdrawal, mineral exploration is not permitted on about one-third.
2. There are 31,000 acres of Reclamation withdrawals that are not open to mineral entry.
3. About 30,000 acres of administrative and public service sites on national forest lands are not open to mineral entry.
4. Mt. Ranier National Park is closed to all mineral entry.
5. Rattlesnake Watershed, 75,000 acres, was withdrawn from location and entry under Presidential order in 1923 to protect the water supply of the city of Yakima.
6. The Cedar River, Green River, and Sultan River watersheds (82,800 acres) are open to mineral entry, but prospecting is difficult or impossible because access is prohibited or limited.

The study team concluded that minerals have been locally important in parts of the study area, that old-style prospecting has been carried out over most of the area, but that there is a possibility that advanced exploration techniques may uncover significant new deposits and that mineral potential must be considered in the overall management of the resources of the study area.¹

Water and Power

The basic assumption in considering water and power resources is that there will be a continued population explosion and urban concentration in the Puget Sound area during the next century. The population is expected to more than double by the year 2010 to a total of 5.8 million. Along with this population growth, it is assumed that the Gross National Product will increase more than five times between 1960 and 2010, and that heavy industry will be encouraged to locate in the area because of a combination of low-cost electric power, inland and marine water transportation, and favorable recreational and climatic features.

The many glaciers, snow fields, and lakes of the study area constitute a gigantic storage reservoir which releases water via the streams and maintains a considerable supply during the summer periods of low precipitation. In addition to the surface water, large supplies of groundwater exist. At present, a favorable balance between demand and supply exists. About one-third of the available supply is withdrawn. This relationship cannot continue indefinitely, however, without

¹Ibid., p. 68.

conservation measures such as artificial upstream storage, protection of quality, and economies in water use.

Water needs will increase considerably between 1960 and 2010. Municipal and industrial needs are expected to triple, and there will probably be new needs for thermal power. In addition, there may be as much as a twenty-five per cent increase in irrigation withdrawals. The rate of increase in power needs is from the present (1962) three million kilowatts, to fifteen million kilowatts in 1985, and to forty-five million kilowatts in 2010. The hydrocapacity of the study area will meet only a fraction of this need. The present capacity of 0.7 million kilowatts might be expanded to about two million kilowatts. New thermal energy plants using fossil fuels and petroleum could take up the slack, with these plants located near the fuel deposits in the Cascades, but outside the study area. The recommendation for the North Cascades National Park was made on the condition that the park not interfere with the development of the water and power potential of the affected portion of the Skagit River, and this kept the water and power resource from becoming an area of disagreement in the establishment of the park.¹

Range Resources

About 150 stockmen run cattle and sheep on national forest ranges in the study area in the summer. There are approximately 2.7 million acres of coniferous range, and about 800,000 acres of sub-Alpine grasslands in the area. The cattlemen involved rely on this area for about 35 per cent of their annual value of production, and the sheepmen for

¹Ibid., p. 68-70.

about 50 per cent. The value of feed utilized totals about \$500,000 per year. In addition, the range is utilized by the horses used by recreationists, and by big game. The establishment of the park did not have a significant effect on the utilization of range, and the range resource was not, therefore, a major issue.¹

Conclusion

It is important to recognize that the above analysis focused almost entirely on the economic value of each resource, and that this puts the recreation resource at a distinct disadvantage when compared to the others. As noted in Chapter I, it is the intangible values which are the primary benefits of outdoor recreation, and these values are not easily measured or compared. These values are, however, "economic" values in the strictest sense of the word--any resource that is scarce and satisfies a need has economic value--and recreation lands meet these criteria. It is not, therefore, the lack of economic value which causes the difficulty in comparing recreation lands to other resources, but the inability to measure that value in units which can be compared to other resource values. While dollars do provide a useful standard of measurement and comparison, it should be kept in mind that not all the relevant values can be measured in this way.

¹Ibid., p. 73-75.

CHAPTER III

THE ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Team Recommendation

The study team was faced with several major issues which had to be resolved. Among these were:

1. Should there be a new national park?
2. How much wilderness is enough?
3. How best to provide for the more conventional types of recreation desired by the mass of people?
4. How to reconcile national and local interests when the two conflict?
5. How to utilize and manage the timber resource in harmony with other multiple uses in the area?
6. The extent to which scenic roads should be an essential ingredient in making the North Cascades available to large numbers of people.

The team dealt with these problems by formulating twenty-one recommendations. Five deal with wilderness areas; one with a North Cascades National Park; two with Mt. Ranier National Park; four with other recreation areas; two with scenic roads and trails; one with timber management; and six with other aspects of the area, including fish, wildlife, water, and power development.¹ The recommendations follow:

¹Ibid., p. 85.

Recommendation I -- An Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area should be established. Much of this area has been in limited area status under Forest Service management. The team concurred with the Forest Service proposal to create a wilderness area of some 150,000 acres, with the addition of some trails for camping, hiking, hunting, and other wilderness pursuits.

Recommendation II -- An Enchantment Wilderness Area should be established. This is an area of about 30,000 acres east of the recommended Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area. It has outstanding scenic qualities, and provides sharp contrasts in elevation which results in challenging mountain climbing. The National Park Service recommended that the Alpine Lakes and Enchantment Areas be combined into one, but the Forest Service recommended that the two areas be kept separate in order to permit better access and the development of a connecting road. The study team agreed with the Forest Service and recommended two separate areas.

Recommendation III -- A Mount Aix Wilderness Area should be established. About ten miles east of Mt. Ranier is an isolated group of mountain peaks of rugged beauty. The study team concurred with the Forest Service proposal to establish a wilderness area of about 45,000 acres.

Recommendation IV -- The present boundries of the Glacier Peaks Wilderness Area should be extended. This was done to include some additional scenic areas and resulted in the addition of about 39,000 acres.

Recommendation V -- An Okanogan Wilderness Area should be established. This would be an area of about 495,000 acres and follows the boundries of the portion of the North Cascades Primitive Area which lies east of Ross Lake.

Recommendation VI -- A North Cascades National Park should be established. A condition of the recommendation is that adequate access by road, trail, water, and air, including aerial tram and helicopter, be developed. A second condition is that the enabling legislation retain the status quo with respect to distribution of Forest Service receipts between affected counties.

This recommendation was not unanimous by the team. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture did not favor a new national park, while the representatives of the Department of the Interior favored a park but proposed different boundaries and wanted to include Mount Baker. The requirement that access to the park not be limited to the traditional roads and trails will require imaginative development by the National Park Service, and may include such innovations as helicopters, trams, funiculars, and narrow-gage railroads. The recommended park will encompass about 698,000 acres, of which about 15,000 acres will be water. Of the total area, about 9/4 per cent is already dedicated to recreation. Over 99 per cent of the land area is federally owned. The small acreages of private land would be acquired by the National Park Service.

The effect on the timber resources in the study area would not be significant. Of the 683,000 acres of land in the proposed park, only 3 per cent, or 19,000 acres, is commercial timberland now available that would be reserved. If the average stand of commercial forest land is estimated at about 19,000 board feet per acre, this means that about 355 million board feet would be unavailable. This is less than half of one per cent of the total saw-timber volume available in the study area.

There is no real way to assess the mineral potential of the proposed park. There are a large number of mining claims in the proposed area, but many are very old and have never been active.

Fishing would not be affected because fishing, habitat development, and stocking are allowed in a national park.

The study area includes extensive deer, elk, and mountain goat ranges, and hunting is not allowed in a national park. There are, however, no major hunting areas within the proposed park, and the effect of establishing a park would probably be to increase the hunting load on the rest of the study area, rather than to decrease the number of hunters.

A great many factors were considered in deciding to recommend a national park. Among these were the physical characteristics of the region, the need for making the area available to large numbers of people, the minimal adverse impact on resources, the economic benefits that would accrue, the value of a national park name, and the relationship of the park proposal to the other recommendations.

As far as the physical features are concerned, the question of whether or not the North Cascades area meets national park criteria is not debatable. The region does include the unique physical, natural, or geological features necessary to qualify for national park status.

One of the key considerations was that the recommendation for a park be conditioned upon its being developed for mass recreation use, and that adequate access be provided. Under Forest Service management, one half of the area was in wilderness status, with only about 1000-2000 visits per year. Under the national park proposal, the area would be available to people who do not wish to or are unable to utilize wilderness

areas. Additional wilderness areas are proposed, such as the Alpine Lakes, Enchantment, and Mount Aix areas and it was felt that it was more important to preserve the unique characteristics of the North Cascades in a national park, than to simply provide one more wilderness area.

The proposed park would have little or no adverse effect on the utilization of timber, grazing of domestic livestock, or fishing, and there is no significant mineral development in the area. With respect to water and power, it was recommended that the park be established in such a way that it not interfere with the development of the water and power potential of the Skagit River.

The creation of a national park by act of Congress gives the area statutory protection, while under Forest Service administration there would not be the same protection. In addition, under Forest Service administration, the area was planned for continued wilderness use and would be inaccessible to most people. While the establishment of a national park transfers administration of this region to the National Park Service, the Forest Service still controls 1,255,000 acres in the Mount Baker National Forest and 1,607,000 acres in the Wenatchee National Forest.

Recommendation VII -- The southern boundry of Mt. Ranier National Park should be extended to include eleven sections of national forest land. Both the Forest Service and the National Park Service agree to the proposed extension.

Recommendation VIII -- There should be effective coordination and management between Mt. Ranier National Park and surrounding national forest lands. The two agencies have a common management problem in the

need to not destroy the fragile wilderness conditions of the areas under their administration, while at the same time making these areas available for the use and enjoyment of large numbers of people. These problems involve sanitation, abuse of terrain, and utilization of pack stock, and inter-agency coordination is necessary to solve these problems effectively.

Recommendation IX -- Mount Baker and most of the surrounding recreation area should continue to be administered by the Forest Service. An all-year highway leads to Heather Meadows and this area has been developed for both summer and winter use--about 100,000 visitors come for winter use alone. Two new chair lifts and a new lodge are being planned. For this reason, Mount Baker and the Heather Meadows area should not be included in the new national park.

Recommendation X -- The Cougar Lake and Monte Cristo Peak Limited Areas should be declassified as such and administered by the Forest Service under its normal multiple-use management policies. This area is close to Mt. Ranier National Park and management of this area for recreation use would take some of the pressure off the campgrounds in that park.

Recommendation XI -- The Eldorado Peaks High Country should continue to be developed by the Forest Service for recreation, pending the establishment of a national park. This was recommended because of the rapidly increasing recreational pressure on the area

Recommendation XII -- The Forest Service and the National Park Service, in anticipation of the increased recreational pressure on the area, should pursue their respective plans to provide needed facilities to accommodate the demand as foreseen for the next twenty years.

Recommendation XIII -- High priority should be given to the construction of an adequate system of scenic roads. There is considerable mileage of low-class roads in the area, constructed either by the Forest Service or by timber contractors for hauling logs. These roads need improvement in the way of surfacing and/or turnouts to make them suitable for scenic roads.

Recommendation XIV -- An adequate recreation trail system is needed in the North Cascades. Many miles of Forest Service trails were constructed for fire protection and suppression, or other administrative purposes. Improvements are needed on 2,275 miles of trails and an additional 430 miles should be constructed.

Recommendation XV -- With respect to timber management, the Forest Service should:

- (a) apply the policy directives in "Management Objectives and Policies for the High Mountain Areas of National Forests of the Pacific Northwest Region";
- (b) keep clear-cut blocks as small as possible;
- (c) near recreation areas, use clear-cutting only when no other method is possible;
- (d) assure prompt regeneration by planting when necessary;
- (e) artificially revegetate road banks and other areas where there are disturbances following timber harvesting;
- (f) provide scenic strips and roadside improvements;
- (g) permit no timber harvesting for five years in areas proposed for national park or wilderness status, in order to allow time for Congressional action;
- (h) carry on research on the silviculture and harvesting of Douglas fir;

(i) in the design of roads, give consideration to the needs of other multiple resources of the national forests.

Recommendation XVI -- Certain portions of the Skagit River should be given Wild River status.

Recommendation XVII -- The Secretary of Agriculture should support the intervention of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Federal Power Commission project on the Wenatchee River. The Secretary of the Interior should seek the views of the Secretary of Agriculture on the proposed dam on Bumping River.

Recommendation XVIII -- The legislation for the North Cascades National Park should include provisions that protect the installations and plans of the Seattle City Light Company on the Skagit River.

Recommendation XIX -- The Forest Service should work with cities having closed watersheds in an attempt to make these areas available for the expanding recreational needs of the study area.

Recommendation XX -- The State of Washington and concerned Federal agencies should take measures to protect and manage the fisheries resource.

Recommendation XXI -- The State of Washington and concerned Federal agencies should intensify efforts to bring the big game and livestock management into balance with the grazing capacity.¹

While the above are the stated recommendations of the study team, there was not by any means unanimous agreement within the team on all these recommendations, and both the National Park Service and the Forest Service submitted separate position statements. An examination

¹Ibid., p. 85-120.

of these two position statements sheds light on both the issues which had to be resolved in establishing the North Cascades National Park, and on some of the basic policy differences between the two services.

National Park Service Recommendations

1. Enlarge Mt. Ranier National Park.
2. Form a wilderness area out of the Alpine Lakes-Enchantment Lakes wild country.
3. Establish a national park around Glacier Peak.
4. Establish a North Cascades National Park.
5. Establish a North Cascades Wilderness Area east of Ross Lake.
6. Form a national recreation area north and east of Glacier Peak.
7. Design and develop a system of scenic roads in the Cascades.
8. The lands around Baker and Ross Lake, Alpine Lakes and Mount Stuart, and east of Mt. Ranier National Park should be given special protection and management for recreation use.¹

Forest Service Recommendations

1. Add 237,000 acres of wilderness areas and reclassify the North Cascades Primitive Area to wilderness status.
2. Continue intensive wildlife habitat management.
3. Maintain and increase levels of fishing use.
4. Expand the number and location of developed recreation sites.
5. Expand the opportunity for outdoor mountain recreation by new developments in areas where main roads will be built.
6. Emphasize maximum freedom of opportunity for individual users to follow their recreation pursuits with the least possible limitation or restraint.

¹Ibid., p. 179-181.

7. Continue to harvest the sustainable allowable annual cut of timber, following modified principles for those cuts near recreation areas or where management of the landscape is as important as management of the timber.
8. Insure that reservoirs and vegetative cover are managed to produce more water in areas where water supplies comprise a future problem.
9. Continue to use appropriate areas of the national forests for domestic livestock grazing.
10. Continue and expand mining and mineral development in accordance with the laws enacted by Congress.
11. Expand the present road system in the national forest areas for both commodity production and recreation.¹

The major difference between the Forest Service and the Park Service recommendations was over the question of whether or not to establish a North Cascades National Park, and the major cause of this difference of opinion was that, if a park were established, land presently administered by the Forest Service would be turned over to the Park Service. Relations between these two services have ranged over the years from quiet animosity to outright hostility, and each is jealous of its rights and privileges. There is more to this question of administration, however, than "empire building". There are distinct differences in the way land is managed by the two services, and there is an even greater contrast in the way the public views these differences.

¹Ibid., p. 159-160.

The policy differences will be discussed in the following chapter, but because of the importance of public pressure on decisions of this kind, it might be illuminating at this point to have some examples of the kinds of opinions expressed both for and against continued Forest Service management of this area. These sentiments, expressed at public hearings and in letters, were one of the major factors considered in establishing the North Cascades National Park. An example of dissatisfaction with Forest Service management was the statement of Mr. Brock Evans before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular affairs:

Like many easterners, I made no distinction between national forests and national parks when I arrived here. It was my initial belief that national forest land received the same scenic protection and was as free from commercial exploitation as were the national parks. I quickly learned that this was not so, and that the national forests exist for the benefit of loggers, miners and grazers, as well as for those who simply enjoy the scenery and seek recreation there.¹

It should not be assumed, however, that all recreationists are opposed to Forest Service administration. Mr. William Parke, speaking for the Pacific Northwest Ski Areas Association before this same Senate Committee, said:

. . . we think that the Forest Service, with its long experience in winter sports administration and in avalanche control, in site development, and in handling winter resorts, would be far more capable of handling the winter business.²

A slightly different point of view, which, while favoring Forest

¹U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, North Cascades--Olympic Park, Hearings, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966, p. 227.

²Ibid., p. 82.

Service administration, is a tacit admission of the above criticisms of that agency, is the statement of Mr. Roger A. Boyd:

Do we have to set aside all this acreage for recreation when so much of it can be utilized for industry and its subsequent employment of people? Isn't it more desirable to leave it under the management of the Forest Service?¹

An analysis of the testimony, written statements, and petitions received from 257 organizations and 2,334 individuals revealed that, in general, the individuals favored a national park, while sportsmen's organizations and organizations with an economic interest in the area did not favor establishing a park.²

¹James B. Craig, "North Cascades: A Different Kind of Country", American Forests, July, 1968, p. 19.

²The North Cascades, by the North Cascades Study Team, p. 84-85.

CHAPTER IV

POLICY ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Policy Issues

Forest Service

The basic Forest Service policy document is the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960. It states that "it is the policy of the Congress that the national forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes." These are the renewable surface resources of the public lands and, as such, are under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. A major resource obviously missing from this list is the mineral resource. It was omitted because it is not a renewable surface resource and, therefore, cannot be managed for sustained yield, and because the Forest Service cannot control mineral exploration and exploitation in the national forests. The General Mining Law of 1872 opens the land to prospectors unless the land has been closed to mineral location by withdrawal, reservation, or segregation. This lack of centralized control of all uses greatly complicates the administration of the national forests.

It should be noted that the timber resource is placed on an equal footing with the other four resources. While the Act of June 4, 1897, which provides for the management of the forest reserves (later to be called the national forests), does not give priority to timber,

this has historically been the position of the Forest Service, and this apparent downgrading caused some difficulty in getting the support of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association for the bill. Their opposition would have been a major hurdle in getting the bill through Congress, but their objections were eventually overcome and, while the five resources are officially of equal importance, it should be noted that the Forest Service budget for timber is a great deal larger than for any of the other resources.

The Act of 1897 does affect the implementation of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act in that the former states that no national forest may be established except for certain specific purposes, and it later goes on to describe timber and water as two of these purposes. This is interpreted to mean that a national forest cannot be established for range alone or recreation alone, but that it can have one or more of these purposes as objectives if it also has timber or water.

The heart of the act is section 4, which defines "multiple use":

Multiple use means the management of all the various renewable surface resources of the national forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; that some land will be used for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairing the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative value of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.¹

Two of the key phrases are: "so that they are utilized", and "making the most judicious use of the land". The Forest Service

¹Edward C. Crafts, "Saga of a Law--Part I", American Forests, July, 1970, p. 29.

emphasizes use, as opposed to preservation, and this emphasis has led to a fear on the part of many people that public interest is secondary to local or industry use. The Forest Service attempts to allay these fears by pointing out that the last line of the above quote states that they are directed by this law to consider factors other than the "greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output", but their actions have led many people to believe that this is not usually the case.

A final clarification of some of the key points in the law was made by R. E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service at that time, in a speech to the 5th World Forestry Congress in Seattle. Certain points of Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Management were not explained in either the legislative history or the act itself, and his statements became Forest Service policy. The points he made were as follows:¹

1. Emphasis is on utilization, not preservation.
2. Management decisions are to be based on the relative values of the various resources, including intangible values, and should not require maximum production for all resources or for any one resource.
3. Equal consideration is to be given all five resources, but this does not mean using every acre for all of the various uses. Some areas will be managed for less than all resources, but multiple use management requires that there be more than two uses. (This was done to distinguish multiple use from the National Park Service policy of managing two resources, recreation and fishing.)

¹Ibid., p. 34.

4. An essential of multiple use is positive, affirmative management of the several uses involved. Haphazard occurrence of these uses on a particular tract of land does not constitute multiple use management. It requires conscious, coordinated management of the various resources.
5. Multiple use must be over a period of at least a year. It does not require that all uses involved be practiced simultaneously.
6. Size of the area is a key factor. In the national forests, the smallest administrative unit for multiple use will be about 200,000 acres.

The concept of multiple use, even if it were applied with equal emphasis given to each resource, is not by any means completely accepted as the ideal way to run a national forest. In a recent article,¹ the author states that "multiple use, as a method of land-use control, is utterly absurd". He illustrates his case by saying that no American city permits factories to be built in parks, or puts parks in railroad yards, and that national forests, like cities, need to be zoned. Some areas could then be farmed for trees while other areas could be preserved as wilderness, and there is no way the two uses could ever be compatible. Such criticisms have by no means convinced the Forest Service, and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 is still the basic policy statement guiding the actions of the Forest Service.

National Park Service

One of the basic policy documents for the National Park Service

¹E. M. Sterling, "The Myth of Multiple Use", American Forests, June, 1970, p. 27.

is a letter from Secretary of the Interior Lane to Steven Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service. This letter, dated May 13, 1918, provides specific policy guidance in many areas of potential difficulty. The letter is quoted in Man and Nature in the National Parks by F. Fraser Darling and Noel D. Eichhorn, and the comments of those authors follow the statements made by Secretary Lane:

1. Lane: "First, that national parks must be maintained in absolutely unimpaired form for the use of future generations as well as those of our own time; second, that they are set aside for the use, observation, health, and pleasure of the people; and third, that the national interest must dictate all decisions affecting public or private enterprises in the parks". Comment: The first two instructions are possibly contradictory, while the third is a pious hope. The ideals of this paragraph have not been fulfilled and probably could not be. This paragraph is the rhetoric of which most of us are guilty when faced with such a situation.
2. Lane: "In all parks but Yellowstone, grazing by cattle but not by sheep might be permitted in areas not frequented by visitors". Comment: This has been adhered to, but it is now known that cattle can be as harmful as sheep. Even knowing this, cattle are still permitted to graze in Organ Pipe Cactus and Saguaro National Monuments.
3. Lane: "There should be no leasing of summer houses". Comment: This has been firmly adhered to by the service.
4. Lane: "There should be no cutting of trees except for buildings and where it would not hurt the forests or landscape".

Comment: Timber was sold from Olympic National Park and lodgepole has been felled unnecessarily or even perilously in new caravan and camping sites in Yellowstone.

5. Lane: "Roads must harmonize with the landscape". There have been some magnificent achievements and some debatable ones, as was probably inevitable. The new road in McKinley is one of the recent failures.
6. Lane: "The Department and Service should urge cession of exclusive jurisdiction in all parks where it has not been granted". Comment: Some progress has been made, but states will not let go of their fish, and some areas are open to mineral claims.
7. Lane: "Private holdings should be eliminated". Comment: The lag in implementation is expensive and quite inadequate funds have been allocated to this end. The National Parks Foundation has been set up to achieve acquisition of inholdings.
8. Lane: "All outdoor sports, including winter sports, should be encouraged". Comment: This is contradictory to No. 1, and in general the National Park Service has not complied.
9. Lane: "Educational as well as recreational use of the parks should be encouraged". Comment: This instruction has been fulfilled conscientiously and enthusiastically, and the result is impressive.
10. Lane: "Low-priced camps should be maintained, and high-class hotels". Comment: Some camps do not charge at all, and they are well used. The high-class hotels are good in part, but some concessioners are more comfortable than their clients.

11. Lane: "Concessioners should be protected against competition if they are giving good service; and they should yield a revenue to the government, but the development of the revenue should not impose a burden on the visitors". Comment: Should this protection allow a concessioner to erect new buildings in a park where the policy is to move buildings from the park, including the rangers' houses? This dictum has not been reexamined in the light of changing circumstances.
12. Lane: "Auto fees should be reduced as motor travel increased". Comment: Perhaps auto fees should be increased as motor travel increases.
13. Lane: "The Service should use the Railroad Administration to advertise the parks, and should cooperate with chambers of commerce, tourist bureaus and auto highway associations to advertise travel to the parks". Comment: This would now appear to be an archaism and, in addition, national parks need no advertising. Rapidly expanding use indicates that national parks no longer require chamber of commerce-style promotion.
14. Lane: "The Service should keep informed as to municipal, county and state parks and cooperate with them". Comment: This has been done well, sometimes too well, as when a regional recreation area is run by the National Park Service. This function more properly belongs to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and the National Park Service should not perform it.
15. Lane: "The Service should cooperate with the Canadian Park Service". Comment: This has been done and the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park is an outstanding example.

16. Lane: "In studying new park projects, the Service should seek to find 'scenery of supreme and distinctive quality or some natural features so extraordinary or unique as to be of national interest and importance'". Comment: This has been done and the interpretation of "natural features" has been extended to include biological values not immediately obvious.
17. Lane: "The national park system now constituted 'should not be lowered in standard, dignity, and prestige by the inclusion of areas which express in less than the highest terms the particular class or kind of exhibit which they represent'". Comment: This is a corollary of No. 16 and is a good instruction, but interpretation has to adapt to the modern way of seeing things. Mather would probably not have accepted Cape Cod and Acadia, but in 1960 the decision seemed justified. Nevertheless, it is misguided to include such recreation areas as Lake Mead and Shadow Mountain.
18. Lane: "Parks need not be large". Comment: Perhaps not, but the statement is meaningless.
19. Lane: "The Service should study existing parks with the idea of improving them by adding adjacent areas; for instance, adding to Sequoia and adding the Tetons to Yellowstone, and should cooperate with the Forest Service in planning this". Comment: This is excellent and in general this instruction has been well interpreted. The Tetons are a park on their own.

There are, then, obvious differences in policy between the two organizations. The Forest Service, in both policy and practice, is concerned with finding the best use, or combination of uses, for the

land, while the National Park Service is guided by a directive that states that at least one of their primary objectives is to insure that the "national parks must be maintained in absolutely unimpaired form". While the differences between the two organizations are not as cut and dried as their policy statements would suggest--the Forest Service has done a good job of protecting wilderness, while the National Park Service, has, to the dismay of many people, increasingly developed the national parks--the general impression in the minds of most people is that the worst the Forest Service can do is far worse than the worst the National Park Service is likely to do. In the last analysis, however, policies are simply guides, and it is the specific decisions which implement those policies that determine whether the land is abused, used, or preserved.

Public Land Law Review Commission

There is a third land use policy which provides an interesting contrast to the "multiple use" policy of the Forest Service. It is the "dominant use" policy proposed by the Public Land Law Review Commission (PLIRC) in its recently completed report to the President of the United States, entitled One-Third of the Nation's Land. Their Recommendation 4 states that "Management of public lands should recognize the highest and best use of particular areas of land as dominant over other authorized uses".¹ The reasons for preferring a dominant use policy over the multiple use policy are twofold. First, the laws which designate certain lands for primary use (such as the laws establishing the national parks) leave the relationship between

¹Report of the Public Land Law Review Commission, p. 48.

the primary use and other possible uses uncertain. Second, although the Multiple Use Act described above provides authority for the Forest Service to consider and permit any and all of a number of possible uses, it provides little guidance as to how the lands should be allocated to various uses.

As to land set aside for primary uses, the PLIRC recommends that Congress should direct the agencies to manage them for secondary uses that are compatible with the primary purpose. Other uses of these areas are not specifically provided for by law, and such Congressional direction would both clarify the status of secondary uses and would protect the primary use. This recommendation is, in part, simply a recognition of what is happening now. General protection of the land results in the protection of watersheds and wildlife, even if the lands are not managed specifically for these purposes. Grazing and mineral operations occur in some national parks and wilderness areas, and permitted secondary uses of some national recreation areas and wildlife refuges are common now. The guidelines for these practices should be clarified and such clarification should result in a more efficient use of our land.

With respect to the lack of guidance provided by the multiple use policy, the PLIRC recommends that Congress provide for a dominant use zoning system.¹ This would apply to some of the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, and is an extension of the general Congressional philosophy of establishing certain areas for primary uses of national significance. This again

¹Ibid., p. 51.

is a recognition of an existing practice. Not all of a national forest, for example, is subjected to a number or a combination of uses. Within the total area of the forest, there are zones which are designated, in effect, for a dominant use to the total or partial exclusion of other uses. The result is that, while there may be a multiplicity of land uses within the boundaries of the national forest, its whole area is by no means subject to multiple use. If, for example, recreation is the dominant use in one zone, grazing will probably be excluded from that zone, as well as all other uses which are considered incompatible with recreation. This is how multiple use is presently being implemented.

The PLIRC recommendation that Congress provide for a dominant use zoning system would do more, however, than just give statutory recognition to an existing practice. A program would be implemented to insure that areas of national forest and unreserved public domain lands would be classified to identify those areas that have a clearly identifiable highest use. These would then be specified as dominant use areas, and, although other uses would be allowed where compatible, the same sort of relationship between dominant and secondary uses would exist that now exists, for example, in the national parks.

This approach would provide a sense of stability to those users of the public land who fear a constant encroachment on lands devoted primarily to their use, and it would reinforce the actions of administrators who are subjected to a barrage of claims from all sides that a particular use ought to be permitted or barred in the name of multiple use. An additional benefit would be that it would provide a guide for investment of Federal funds in management practices. For example,

investments in timber management would be directed primarily to timber dominant areas, while investments in recreation would be directed primarily to recreation areas.

As logical as the above approach sounds, there are some strong arguments against it.¹ There is no disagreement with the premise that sound planning and management must begin with a classification of the potential productivity of each area. It is important to know which lands have high value for camping and which are low in that value, which have high tree growing potential and which do not. The dominant use concept implies, however, that one use will be more productive of public benefits than all other benefits combined. Secondary uses are permitted only to the extent that absolutely nothing is detracted from the dominant use. The assumption is that intensified management in dominant use zones will result in economies of scale that will greatly expand single benefit production, and that the total benefits from an area managed in this way will be greater than the benefits from an area where the uses are combined and where each, therefore, necessarily interferes with the most efficient utilization of the others.

Under the dominant use zoning concept, a single hillside could have three or more dominant uses. The area adjacent to a stream might be zoned to protect fishing, and no loss of fish in exchange for timber or some other value would be permitted. Farther up the hill, there would be a point where timber producing potential would become more important than stream management and a line would be drawn separating the

¹Carl H. Stoltenberg, "Public Timber and Public Benefits," in What's Ahead for Our Public Lands, ed. by Hamilton K. Pyles, (Washington, D.C.: Natural Resources Council of America, 1970), p. 13-17.

two. Across this line a complete reversal of emphasis would take place, and no timber values would be sacrificed, no matter what the impact of timber management on fish. Even farther up the hill, there might be a line separating the timber dominant zone from a scenery dominant zone. On one side of this line no scenery would be sacrificed for timber or fish, while on the other side, all the scenery could be sacrificed if its preservation conflicted with timber production.

In addition to the obvious problems outlined above, the dominant use concept still provides no legislative guidance in determining which use has the highest priority, and this is the basic reason for land use controversies. If the experts decide that a particular area is critical for fish, important for scenery, and very productive for timber, the controversy over which should be the dominant use would still remain. When there are areas which are well suited to more than one use, it would seem logical that the maximum public benefit will lie in harmonizing the simultaneous production of various benefits and that it is, in fact, more efficient to give up a small amount of benefit from one use in order to realize a large benefit from a different use.

Management Problems

One of the best examples of the differences in management practices between the Forest Service and the National Park Service is the way the two services have implemented the Wilderness Act of 1964. The Act recognized the differences in management practices of the various Federal agencies administering lands which could be included in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and did not, therefore, attempt to delineate the specific management practices to be followed.

As a result of this freedom of action, the Forest Service has permitted grazing in the national forests; mineral prospecting and mining until 1984 (with authority to construct transmission lines, water lines, and telephone lines, and to utilize timber for such activities); and water conservation and power projects as authorized by the President. None of these activities will be permitted in national park wilderness.¹

Some of the specific management practices to be followed in North Cascades National Park, as outlined by Roger J. Contor, the park superintendent, illustrate this same concern with promoting only the "non-consumptive" uses of the park.² One way that large numbers of people will be accommodated in the park, without destroying its quality, will be through zoning for different types of use. There will be paved roads, quiet trails, and no trails, and each provides a different kind of access and meets a different need. Another technique will be to restrict the maximum number of people in the wilderness areas. He makes the analogy of an airplane which has a limited capacity, and once that capacity has been reached, no more customers can be accommodated. Before the saturation point is reached, however, there are certain management practices which will help to limit congestion. One of these, which will be practiced in North Cascades National Park, is the use of roads, trails, or boat routes which provide "continuous flow" or "loop" patterns, as opposed to "dead end" patterns. The "dead end" pattern,

¹George B. Hartzog, Jr., "The Wilderness Act and the National Parks and Monuments," in Wilderness and the Quality of Life, ed. by Maxine E. McCloskey and James P. Gilligan, (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1969), p. 17.

²Roger J. Contor, "The Care and Feeding of North Cascades National Park," The Mountaineer, June, 1969, p. 24-29.

which is typical of many national parks, doubles the apparent congestion. Other specific practices will be: Require hikers to carry gasoline for cooking so that wood will not be cut; a "plus one" system will be advocated in which each hiker is encouraged to carry out his own garbage and the trash left by one other person--plastic bags will be provided at trail heads to facilitate this; saddle and pack horses should be hobbled, as opposed to picketing, to prevent localized damage; sterile feeds which will not sprout and grow should be carried for the horses; and the park will encourage walking stock parties as opposed to riding parties--one pack horse can carry enough gear for three or four people, and this will minimize the damage to the trails by horses. All of these practices are specific examples of the concern of the Park Service that, ideally, the only indication that the parks have been used should be the few blades of grass that have been bent by the passage of the visitors.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the policies which guide the Forest Service and the National Park Service, and it has examined the management practices which are the visible implementation of those policies. It is apparent that there are significant differences between the two agencies, and it was the Forest Service's obvious inclination toward use of the land, as opposed to protection of the land, that became a deciding factor in the study team's recommendation to establish a North Cascades National Park.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Every seven and a half seconds a new American is born. During his seventy years on earth each of these individuals will require 26 million tons of water, 21,000 gallons of gasoline, 10,150 pounds of meat, 28,000 pounds of milk and cream, 9000 pounds of wheat, and huge quantities of a variety of other foods and tobaccos. He will require a private endowment of \$5000 to \$8000 worth of school building materials, \$6300 worth of clothing, \$7000 worth of furniture, and a share of the nation's pulpwood, paper, steel, zinc, magnesium, aluminum, and tin.¹ But while he is assuming that this vast quantity of materials will be available as part of his birthright as an American, this same individual will see nothing inconsistent in wanting a place to go fishing, hunting, camping, or just have a place to "get away from it all." The demand for outdoor recreation is increasing just as spectacularly as the demand for material goods. A growing urban population, more leisure time, higher incomes, and greater mobility are all contributing to a pressure on recreation areas which is increasing at least twice as fast as the population.

The arguments for and against the formation of a North Cascades National Park illustrate the above conflict. The technique used to resolve this conflict, and to attempt to arrive at the best possible land

¹Robert Rienow, "Political Thickets Surrounding Wilderness," in Wilderness and the Quality of Life, ed. by Maxine E. McCloskey and James P. Gilligan, (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1969), p. 221.

use decision, was the formation of a joint study team composed of individuals from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. The team was directed to study an area of seven million acres in the state of Washington in order to assess the economic and social impact of various proposed alternatives. The team reviewed existing information, sponsored field examinations, held public hearings, conducted special resource studies, studied agency statements, and held team consultations. The study team was unable to agree on a single proposal for the North Cascades, and instead, three distinct proposals were included in its final report:

1. The chairman, Dr. Edward C. Crafts, recommended creation of a North Cascades National Park, favored the continuation of the existing Mount Baker National Recreation Area, and opposed the creation of a new national recreation area.
2. The Department of Agriculture opposed the creation of a new national park, recommended the establishment of an Eldorado Peaks High Country recreation area, and recommended continued Forest Service administration over the Mount Baker National Recreation Area.
3. The Department of the Interior proposed the creation of two national parks in the study area--a Mount Baker National Park and a Glacier Peak National Park. They also recommended two new national recreation areas.

These differences of opinion were not entirely unexpected. There is a history of friction between the Forest Service and the National Park Service which goes back to 1905, when forest reserves were transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

Since that date new national parks have almost invariably been created from Forest Service administered lands, and the Forest Service understandably does not like to see its holdings diminish.

The team recommendation was an attempt to reconcile these two points of view, and showed a recognition of the basic differences between these two agencies. This was illustrated in a paragraph which stated that, "Both the Forest Service and the National Park Service are competent, highly respected and dedicated agencies. Despite the great advances made by the Forest Service in recent years in recreation matters, the National Park Service properly is recognized as the agency which should administer and develop the extraordinary, unique, and outstanding National Park-type areas of the nation."¹ The report makes an additional key distinction between lands administered by the two agencies when it says that, ". . . under Forest Service administration, there would not be a statutory assurance that there would be under creation of a park by Congress."²

Many more factors were considered, however, than just the differences in administrative policy between two agencies. The first step in the decision making process was the determination that the area does, in fact, possess the unique features necessary to qualify for national park status. In the area in question, the extraordinary mountain scenery precluded any real debate on this question, but in some areas eligible for national park status this might be an area of controversy.

¹The North Cascades, Study Report, p. 109.

²Ibid., p. 109.

The next consideration by the team was the importance of mass recreation in the area. This area is located close to several major urban and industrial centers, and for this reason the recommendation for a park was conditioned upon its being developed for mass recreation use, with adequate access by road, trail, water, and air. One of the major considerations in recommending national park status for the region was that, under continued Forest Service management, about half of the area would be in wilderness status, and many people do not have the time, skill, or inclination for wilderness travel. For those whose interests do lie in that direction, additional wilderness areas were proposed as part of the overall plan.

As part of the decision-making process, the effect of national park status on the natural resources in the area was considered. Special resource studies were conducted by professionals from various Federal agencies and covered the timber, range, fish and wildlife, water and power, and mineral resources. The conclusion of the study team was that the establishment of a park would have little adverse effect on the utilization of timber, grazing of domestic livestock or fishing, and that there was no significant mineral development in the area. With respect to water and power, it was recommended that the park be established in such a way as to not interfere with the water and power potential of the affected portion of the Skagit River.

In summary then, the major factors favoring the establishment of a North Cascades National Park were, "the statutory assurance of protection and continuity of the park if created by Congress, the obvious natural characteristics of the area for a national park, the economic benefits that could be expected from increased tourism in the area, the

opening of much of the area to mass recreation use rather than continued dedication of nearly half of it for wilderness area use, the economic advantages that would accrue to the area through its having the benefit of national park stature, and the fact that all of this can be done without adversely affecting tax rolls, utilization of timber, or other natural resources in the area."¹

An understanding of the factors that were considered in the decision making process, however, is only the first step in analyzing the effectiveness and efficiency of that process. The analysis must also concern itself with whether or not all the pertinent facts were considered, and whether or not the conclusions based on these facts were properly drawn. In the first area, the gathering of facts, the study team did an excellent job. The team spent two and a half years gaining information through field examinations, public hearings, special resource studies, reviewing existing information, studying agency statements, and holding team consultations. Of course, the very thoroughness with which the team performed this aspect of its job can be criticized, because the process must have taken thousands of man-hours and cost a great deal of money, but the fact remains that they did a superlative job of assembling the pertinent information.

On the question of whether the conclusions based on these facts were properly drawn, however, it is possible to criticize the report in several areas. The first of these concerns the discussion of the economic advantages that would accrue to the region if a national park were established. These benefits would stem from an increase in visitor

¹Ibid., p. 109.

use, from capital development, and from the funds spent for maintenance and operation of the park. The increase in visitor use was calculated by comparing the proposed park to Mt. Ranier National Park and the conclusion was drawn that, "There would be an estimated annual visitation of about 1.3 million persons, of which perhaps 35 per cent would be from out of state. Visitor days are estimated at 2.4 million, annual visitor expenditures at \$20.8 million."¹ This statement as it stands is misleading because it implies that establishing this park will result in additional expenditures in the area of \$20.8 million. In order to accurately determine the additional expenditures stimulated by this park, it is necessary to deduct from the \$20.8 million the amount of money that would be attracted to the area if it remained in its present condition, and the amount of money that would be diverted from all other competing recreational areas. There would undoubtedly be a net benefit remaining after performing this computation, but it would just as undoubtedly be considerably less than \$20.8 million. A similar analysis can be made of the net benefits to be derived from capital development. The study report estimates ". . . an average annual benefit from capital construction of \$7.4 million for the first five years. This would result in an estimated \$2 million in wages and 400 persons employed."² The \$7.4 million dollars is not a net benefit to the entire population if it is simply money that is being spent in this area that would have been spent elsewhere by the Federal government. Also, the 400 persons employed do not constitute a net gain in employment, if there is nearly full employment in the region and this labor

¹Ibid., p. 123.

²Ibid.

is simply diverted from other productive uses to the development of the North Cascades.¹ While there are no figures given for the third area of economic benefit, funds spent for the maintenance and operation of the park, one would again have to determine that these funds would not have been spent elsewhere before such expenditures could truly be called additional benefits from the establishment of the park. The study team report makes no such attempt at marginal benefit analysis, and therefore, offers figures which could be misleading.

A second reason for establishing the park was the statutory assurance of protection for the region if a park were created by Congress. The implication is that, since Forest Service lands are administered under a "multiple use" philosophy, the interests of various pressure groups would have to be served, and the scenic and recreational values of the area would suffer. This conclusion can most directly be refuted by realizing that it is the Forest Service that has been administering and protecting the North Cascades area up to the time of the study report, and the recreational and scenic values of the region have obviously not been lost. In order to aid the Forest Service in withstanding future pressures, Congress could provide statutory protection by designating certain Forest Service lands as recreation areas. The degree of protection afforded Forest Service lands as compared to National Park Service lands then depends almost entirely on the skill and fortitude of the particular administrators, and not on fine legal distinctions. There are even some indications that National

¹John Hendee, An Evaluation of the North Cascades Study Report, College of Forestry, Institute of Forest Products, University of Washington.

Park Service philosophy is changing away from an emphasis on protection. The Mission 66 program of the National Park Service, which was implemented to promote usage of the national parks, used the term "parkscape," which has very definite connotations of altering the landscape, and the slogan "Parks are for People" indicates an emphasis on mass recreation which is inconsistent with preservation. The study report itself illustrates this same inconsistency where, on the one hand, there is implied criticism of the Forest Service for managing the region for wilderness use rather than mass recreation, and on the other hand, it recommends removing this land from Forest Service jurisdiction in order to assure protection of the land. It is, then, by no means a foregone conclusion that it was necessary to create a national park in order to protect this region.

If one were to search for the single most valid criticism of the land use decision-making process, at whatever level of government, that criticism might be that there is a blind attempt to arrive at the maximum net public benefit without a firm indication of what the public wants. The realization of the primary benefits of a national park system is dependent on providing for the individual whatever form of outdoor recreation meets his particular needs and desires. This information can only partially be obtained from an analysis of the usage of the various facilities provided by the national parks. Such an analysis reveals only what has been done in the past, not what the public would like to see done in the future. This information cannot be obtained from public hearings, where the intent is to answer the more general question of recreation versus the exploitation of our natural resources. Such hearings do not provide a representative cross section of public opinion.

A step in the right direction was made by The Christian Science Monitor which, on August 7, 1968, invited readers to comment on key issues confronting the national parks. It was the largest public survey ever conducted on national park policy, and the answers to the questions they asked provided specific information which can and should serve as a guide.

For example, on the question of what to do about overcrowding, the response was that the National Park Service should not build more campgrounds, lodges, or roads to handle the additional people. Instead, the National Park Service should establish a limit for entrance to each park, much as you would for a theatre. When a certain capacity is reached, the park should be closed, and would reopen only to fill vacancies. This has been done in only a few parks, and only after the overcrowding reached a point where the park was no longer providing an enjoyable experience for the visitors. In spite of this mandate from the public, wider penetration of the parks is still a seriously debated issue.

On the related question of what the policy of the National Park Service should be toward wilderness areas, the overwhelming majority felt that all the present wilderness-type areas in the parks should be preserved, and that there should be no additional development on these lands. This choice specifically rejected such alternatives as setting aside lands for new campgrounds, nature trails, or chalet-type lodges, and was against the construction of aerial tramways to facilitate access to scenic views. (Aerial tramways were one of the specific recommendations of the North Cascades study team.) This again provides specific information for management decisions.

These are examples of the kinds of information that can be gained through such surveys, and while it can be argued that the people who responded to The Christian Science Monitor survey are no more representative of public opinion than the people who go to the hearings, there are social research techniques which can determine what the public as a whole would like to see done. Such information is indispensable to policy formulation on both the question of mass recreation versus wilderness, and on the more general question of outdoor recreation versus other uses of our land and other natural resources. The lack of such information is probably the greatest weakness in present day attempts at intelligent land use decisions.

POSTSCRIPT

Although a great many conflicts over the best use of the North Cascades area were resolved before the North Cascades National Park was established, controversy over some of the basic issues is still in evidence. A newspaper article¹ described in some detail two of these conflicts--the degree of recreational development to be pursued and the natural resource exploitation to be permitted.

The North and South units of the park, together with the Ross Lake and Lake Chelan national recreation areas, form 1,053 square miles of outdoors. In the past this territory has been enjoyed by only a few explorers, trappers, miners, and mountaineers, and even today access to North Cascades' wilderness areas is still primarily by foot. Completion of the "North Cross State Highway" is expected in either late 1972 or early 1973, but even then, auto access to the park will be limited, and no other roads are proposed. In spite of this present and expected continued limited road building in North Cascades, conservationists are concerned by National Park Service proposals that would open the wilderness areas by the construction of three aerial tramways, and by the construction of enclaves in the wilderness which would provide campsites, shelters, and possibly even some form of restaurant service. Conservationists argue that wilderness so treated cannot remain wilderness

¹Dorothea S. Michelman, "The Fight To Save North Cascades For the Backpackers," The Washington Post, February 28, 1971, p. F10.

for long, and they point to the denuding and erosion that has already scarred several North Cascades' passes under the impact of the relatively few hikers and climbers who have traveled there in the past. The Park Service contends that due care in their development, restrictions on intensity of use, and prior instruction of backcountry travelers on the proper use of the facilities will prevent deterioration of the surroundings. In addition, special effort will be made to avoid intensive use of Alpine Meadows and other plant communities which have little resistance to damage by human visitation.

The conflict over the natural resource exploitation to be permitted centers on the need to supply the fast growing Puget Sound area with electricity. The City of Seattle Light Department has made a \$45 million proposal to raise the height of Ross Dam--located between the North and South units of the park--by 125 feet. This would greatly enlarge the existing twenty-four mile long Ross Lake reservoir. Three areas would be seriously affected by this enlargement. More than 6000 acres of forests, wildlife habitat, and recreational lands would be destroyed along the Skagit River, across the Canadian border--a move with serious international implications. Big Beaver Creek Valley, on the western shore of Ross Lake would lose its beaver ponds, marshes, and 1000 year old red cedars. In Thunder Creek Valley to the south, the flooding would wipe out an entire rain forest of 250 foot conifers.

As of this date, neither the recreation nor the natural resource conflicts have been resolved. The National Park Service proposals, which were aired at public hearings, have been sent to the President. Eventually a plan will be submitted to Congress for approval. So, more than eight years after the formation of the study team, and more than

two years after the creation of North Cascades National Park, the fight to protect this area has not been won. This illustrates the importance of realizing that conservation battles are never "won." As long as there are pressures for the consumptive exploitation of an area, those who favor non-consumptive use must have the tenacity to continually re-fight the battles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Public Documents

- Brockman, C. Frank. Recreational Use of Wild Lands. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.
- Darling, F. Fraser, and Eichhorn, Noel D. Man and Nature in the National Parks. Washington, D.C.: The Conservation Foundation, 1967.
- DeBell, Garrett. ed. The Environmental Handbook. New York: Ballantine Books, Inc., 1970.
- Doell, Charles E. Elements of Park and Recreation Administration. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1963.
- Hendee, John. An Evaluation of the North Cascades Study Report. College of Forestry, Institute of Forest Products, University of Washington.
- Isa, John. Our National Park Policy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1961.
- McCloskey, Maxine E., and Gilligan, James P. ed. Wilderness and the Quality of Life. San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1969.
- Pyles, Hamilton K. compiler. What's Ahead For Our Public Lands? Washington, D.C.: Natural Resources Council of America, 1970.
- Siegal, Shirley Adelson. The Law of Open Space. New York: Regional Plan Association, Inc., 1960.
- Report of the Public Land Law Review Commission to the President and to the Congress. Wayne N. Aspinall. Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- U. S. Congress. House. A Bill To Establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to Designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to Modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for Other Purposes. H. R. 8970, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1968.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The North Cascades. Hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1968.

- U. S. Congress. House. Establishing The North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, Designating the Pasayten Wilderness and Modifying The Glacier Peak Wilderness, In the State of Washington, and for Other Purposes. H. Report, 1870 to Accompany H. R. 8970, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1968.
- U. S. Congress. House. Extension of Remarks of Hon. Jack Westland Speaking on the North Cascades National Park. February 19, 1962. Congressional Record.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. A Bill To Establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to Designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to Modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for Other Purposes. S. 1321, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. An Act To Establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas, to Designate the Pasayten Wilderness, and to Modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for Other Purposes. Pub. L. 90-544, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, S. 1321.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. Authorizing the Establishment of the North Cascades National Park, The Ross Lake National Recreational Area, The Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, Designating the Pasayten Wilderness, and Modifying the Glacier Peak Wilderness, In the State of Washington, and for Other Purposes. S. Report 700 to Accompany S. 1321, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. North Cascades--Olympic Park. Hearings Before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966.
- U. S. Council on Environmental Quality. Environmental Quality. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- U. S. Department of the Interior. Administrative Policies for Natural Areas of the National Park System. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.
- U. S. Department of the Interior. Administrative Policies for Recreation Areas of the National Park System. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.
- U. S. Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture. The North Cascades. By the North Cascades Study Team. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- U. S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. Public Use of the National Park System, 1872-2000. By Ronald F. Lee.
- Washington. Governor Daniel J. Evans' North Cascades National Recreation Area Report and Recommendations. 1966.

Magazines

- Brockman, C. Frank. "A Park For The North Cascades"? American Forests.
September, 1966, p. 9-11, 50-52.
- Brooks, Paul. "The Fight For America's Alps." Unpublished Article
Submitted to the National Parks and Conservation Association
for Comment. Later to be Published in the Atlantic Monthly.
November 3, 1966.
- Contor, Roger J. "The Care and Feeding of North Cascades National Park."
The Mountaineer. June, 1969, p. 24-29.
- Crafts, Edward C. "The Saga of a Law--Part I." American Forests.
June, 1970, p. 12-19, 52-54.
- Crafts, Edward C. "The Saga of a Law--Part II." American Forests.
July, 1970, p. 28-35.
- Craig, James B. "North Cascades: A Different Kind of Country."
American Forests. July, 1968, p. 18-19, 34-35.
- Kenney, Nathaniel T. "The Spectacular North Cascades." National
Geographic. May, 1968, p. 642-667.
- McArdle, Richard E. "Why We Need the Multiple Use Bill." American
Forests. June, 1970, p. 10, 59.
- Sterling, E. H. "The Myth of Multiple Use." American Forests.
June, 1970, p. 24-27.
- Zaleskey, P. H. and Butler, F. "Economic Potential of Wilderness in the
North Cascades." Sierra Club Bulletin. "n.d.", p. 29-36.

Newspapers

- Cahn, Robert. "Saving America's Alps." The Christian Science Monitor.
October 10, 1968, p. 9.
- Cahn, Robert. "Will Success Spoil the National Parks"? The Christian
Science Monitor. Reprint, 1968.
- DeLozier, Loretta. "Making Park Dreams Come True." NPS Newsletter.
October 29, 1970, p. 4.
- Michelman, Dorothea S. "The Fight To Save North Cascades For The Back-
packers." The Washington Post. February 28, 1971, p. F10-F11.
- The New York Times. Editorial. February 23, 1970.
- The Washington Post. Editorial. May 19, 1968.



Thesis
S927

Sweazey

Establishing a new
national park: policy
issues and management
problems.

127812

700171

DISPLAY

Thesis
S027

Sweazey

Establishing a new
national park: policy
issues and management
problems.

127812

thesS927

Establishing a new national park :



3 2768 002 06025 3

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY