

P A R T II

THE UNSATISFACTORY NATURE OF PRESENT MANAGEMENT:

An Explanation of the Inadequacies of
Forest Service Administration

Patrick Donovan Goldsworthy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>First Section:</u> GENERAL INSENSITIVITY OF FOREST SERVICE TO CONSERVING SCENERY	Page
2.1. Traditional Insensitivity to Park-Caliber Scenic Values	2-2
2.2. Historical Forest Service Reactions to National Park Prospects	2-3
2.3. Inadequate Training of Professional Foresters	2-4
2.4. Professional Forester's Insensitivity to Scenic Resources	2-5
<u>Second Section:</u> EFFECTS OF FOREST SERVICE INSENSITIVITY TO NORTH CASCADES SCENIC RESOURCES RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN NATIONAL PARK	
2.5. Skagit River Drainage	2-6
2.6. Cascade River Drainage	2-7
2.7. Suiattle River Drainage	2-7
2.8. Whitechuck River Drainage	2-8
2.9. Sauk River Drainage	2-8
2.10. White River Drainage	2-8
2.11. Chiwawa River Drainage	2-8
2.12. Entiat River Drainage	2-9
2.13. Lake Chelan - Stehekin River Drainage	2-9
<u>Third Section:</u> HISTORY OF EFFORTS TO REFORM FOREST SERVICE POLICIES	2-9

FIRST SECTION: GENERAL INSENSITIVITY OF FOREST SERVICE TO CONSERVING SCENERY

2.1. Traditional Insensitivity to Park-Caliber Scenic Values

The vast majority of those who visit the North Cascades recognize that here is some of the nation's very finest park-caliber scenery that yet remains outside our national parks. It would appear certain that the Park Service will again reach this same conclusion, having done so once already,^{2.1} and reason that these lands thus still qualify for inclusion in the inevitable expansion of the National Park system.

Administration of this area, with its obvious national park quality, should be trusted only to an agency capable of recognizing these values and able and willing to give them the maximum protection they deserve. Unfortunately the Forest Service, which currently administers the area, has traditionally been insensitive to protecting park-caliber scenic values.

When the Forest Service was created in 1897, its first Chief, Gifford Pinchot, firmly argued that commercial use of the public lands should precede their use for recreation--"The object of our forest policy is not to preserve the forests because they are beautiful...or because they are refuges for the wild creatures of the wilderness...but...for the making of prosperous homes...Every other consideration comes as secondary."^{2.2} John Muir, as the Sierra Club's first president, fought a bitter and losing nationwide battle with Gifford Pinchot to attempt to prevent the flooding of Hetch-Hetchy Valley of California.

This tragic loss of the "Second Yosemite", which today is so desperately needed in crowded Yosemite National Park, accurately reflected Pinchot's view, that national parks, in general, should be opened for resource development. The Forest Service, which he directed, henceforth proceeded to oppose bills to create

2.1. "Such a Cascade park would outrank in its scenic, recreational, and wild-life values, any existing national park and any other possibility for such a park within the United States" - National Park Service Committee, North Cascades Area Investigation, 1937.

2.2. Conservation and The Gospel of Efficiency by Samuel P. Hays, Harvard, 1959, pp. 41, 71, and 192.

new parks which did not provide for development.

2.2. Historical Forest Service Reactions to National Park Proposals

Historically the Forest Service has been hostile to the idea of protecting forest scenery and has shown interest in protecting park-caliber scenic values only when confronted with proposals to transfer jurisdiction of some of their lands to the National Park Service. In the early 1920's, shortly after the creation of the National Park Service, the Forest Service became concerned over the possible loss of national monuments which they then were administering. They reacted by dedicating the first of the Wilderness Areas, the Gila Wilderness Area. Shortly thereafter, the L-regulations were adopted, providing for a system of Primitive Areas with minimal road and construction developments. This, however, was just a device to keep other uses out of these lands until plans had been completed to harvest the resources there.

"Following presidential proclamation of Mount Olympus National Monument, the Forest Service, in 1915, succeeded in having the monument reduced by half, so as to exclude virtually all the timber. After the monument was transferred from the Forest Service to the Park Service, in 1933, Congress started to consider the establishment of the proposed Olympic National Park. Foremost in its bitter, outspoken, and tenacious opposition to this proposed park was the Forest Service." In the summer of 1936, in an effort to forestall the new park, the Forest Service designated certain lands adjacent to the national monument as "Primitive Areas" - kept as wildernesses free of roads or improvements - somewhat like wilderness national parks, such as Olympic was to be. To give this arrangement the appearance of permanence, it was done through a Departmental Order of the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than by mere administrative regulation. This method of undercut-

2.3. Ibid., pp. 195 and 196. "When a measure to create Glacier National Park appeared in Congress, prohibiting all commercial use save removal of dead, down, or decaying timber by settlers, the Forest Service prepared a rival measure which would permit cutting of mature timber, water power development, and railroad construction within the Park...As early as 1904 Pinchot recommended that Congress transfer the national parks to the Forest Service, so that he could administer them according to these views."

ting the demand for more parks had been used widely by the Forest Service, and there were some fifty such "Primitive Areas" in the scenic regions of western national forests.^{2.4} Success of this opposition, subsequently suppressed by presidential order, and fortunately uncussessful, would have subjected the famous Rain Forests of the Hoh, Bogachiel and Quinault to the disastrous practice of todays multiple use management.

Also during the 1930's Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes was planning to create other national parks and had a preliminary study made in 1937 of the North Cascades. Immediately, the Forest Service reacted by starting to establish Wilderness Areas under the new U-regulations. This wilderness system, with stricter preservation criteria than were applied to the Primitive Areas, was built up by the imagination of non-career employees, such as Bob Marshall, who was brought in by President Roosevelt through Chief Forester Silcox. In response to the 1937 Ice Peaks National Park proposal, Marshall proposed a Glacier Peak Wilderness Area which was promptly cut in half by Chief Forester Lyle Watts when the proposed park threat was defeated by Washington State's organized commercial interests.^{2.5}

2.3. Inadequate Training of Professional Foresters

The training of professional foresters has given predominant, if not exclusive, emphasis to the servicing of commercial interests. In most instances, these fores-

2.4. Our National Park Policy, John Ise, John Hopkins, 1961, p. 38.

2.5. Quote from Franklin D. Roosevelt and Conservation 1911-1945, Vol. II, ed. by Edgar B. Nixon, General Services Administration, National Archives and Records Service, 1957, Hyde Park, N.Y., pp. 461-466; between Miller Freeman of Washington State Planning Council and Sec. Ickes and Pres. Roosevelt.

"You would have found that in the early stages of the study the Planning Council held seven public mass meetings to pass public judgment on a park proposal which had not been made, and in the light of facts which had not been ascertained. You would have found that after this park proposal had served its purpose in arousing public apprehension, the Council then broadened the scope of its study to include a general inventory of the resources and potentialities of five national forests in the Cascade Range, and concluded that since those five national forests, as a whole, had extensive resources and potentialities no areas therein could be considered for national park status. The Council now cites the sentiment of the seven mass meetings as evidence of the soundness of its position.."

ters who then choose a career in the Forest Service, come with little understanding of the esthetic and intangible values of scenic resources; resources which are at their peak in the North Cascades.

The majority, by training and aptitude, are oriented to believe that man's management of the forests is a scientifically and economically "sound" one and that nature's management is an uneconomical and wasteful one. Most of the forestry school graduates are thus men competent to manage a national forest, which is a commercial enterprise, but ill-equipped to administer a national park, which is a museum of nature's management. The net effect of assigning a Forest Service ranger with this educational background to an exceptionally scenic district is that the ranger in his preoccupation to apply his forestry school training of managing merchantable timber and other commercial resources will hopelessly despoil some of our most valuable natural scenery.^{2.6}

2.4. Professional Forester's Insensitivity to Scenic Resources

It has been commonly demonstrated, from the Regional office down to the Ranger District, that professional foresters are poorly suited, by ability, nature and inclination, to care for the nation's most important scenic resources due to their lack of understanding of landscape esthetics.

The local forester's insensitivity toward esthetic values, are further enhanced by the complicated pivotal roll he must play as a District Ranger. "All Rangers try to sell the allowable cut for their respective districts while at the same time satisfying as many of the potential buyers as possible...paper manufacturers seek it for pulping; lumber processors want it for boards and ties; furniture makers need it for veneer; farmers ask for it to build houses and barns and fences; it is sought for firewood and Christmas trees. The Rangers...play the

2.6. The planning and announcement of the Meadow Mountain Timber Sale in the Darrington Ranger District is a prime example of the invasion of a major scenic entity by commercial management - 7 miles from and within full view of the Cascade Crest Trail and the foot of Glacier Peak. Also of drastic consequence is the Green Mountain Timber Sale in the Suiattle Ranger District in the very heart of the Glacier Peak scenic complex.

chief roles in the management of the timber resources and administration of other land uses, under their respective jurisdictions. For instance, millions of people want to picnic, camp, hike, hunt, fish, and ski in the national forests. Companies want to extract minerals from them, dam their streams (for power or irrigation), run power lines and pipelines and railroads across them. Local, state, and federal agencies want to build roads through them, put garbage dumps in some parts and schools in others and construct reservoirs in still others. Concessionaires seek to erect lodges, eating establishments, resorts, and sports areas. Civic groups, Boy Scouts, 4-H Clubs, and others, want to set up summer camps. City-dwellers come looking for places to build summer homes. The Ranger's dispositions of these applications ...are not final. But they weigh heavily in the final decisions as they are in a better position than anyone else in the Forest Service to calculate what projects are likely to arouse vehement opposition from other forest users, and what enterprises are likely to conflict with possible future developments of their areas.

"The Forest Rangers are encouraged to take as active a part as they can in the communities in which they reside. Gradually they absorb the point of view of their friends and neighbors and not infrequently these field men, though devoted to their leaders, are cowed to varying degrees by local pressures. Their daily associations with timber men and other commercial resource representatives put them under constant psychological pressure to favor those resources."^{2.7}

SECOND SECTION: EFFECTS OF FOREST SERVICE INSENSITIVITY TO NORTH CASCADES SCENIC RESOURCES RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN NATIONAL PARK

2.5. Skagit River Drainage

Intensive logging is in progress on Newhalem Creek and its East Fork, south of the Whatcom-Skagit County line - 2 miles inside the proposed park boundary. A logging road, in conjunction with a timber sale in the Illahot Creek drainage, has already been constructed several miles inside the proposed park boundary.

2.7. The Forest Ranger, H. Kaufman, Johns Hopkins, 1960, pp. 47, 56, 60 and 75.

2.6. Cascade River Drainage

For a stretch of ten miles upstream from the proposed park boundary, logging scars may be seen, with major scenic damage occurring on Marble, Sibley, Found and Roush Creeks. The Forest Service has erected elaborate signs to attempt to justify tragic results of their multiple use logging management of a prime scenic valley - "Cascade River Watershed Managed for Multiple Use - Recreation - Wildlife-Forage - Water - Timber". (The sign was defaced with the words "Pure propaganda!! This kind of a scene should be preserved for the people to enjoy"). Though the vandal's action was wrong his thoughts were correct. Even within 2 miles of Cascade Pass a sign proclaims "The area beyond this sign will be managed primarily for recreation and wildlife. Timber cutting will be limited to the removal of dead and down trees. By example and implication, the scenic valley downstream is managed primarily for its timber resources. Future logging threats are posed by the projection on forest transportation system maps of roads up Sonny Boy, Kindy (Big), and Found Creeks.

2.7. Suiattle River Drainage

Logging has proceeded for 6 miles inside the proposed park along the south side of the Suiattle River. This is the portion of this major entrance valley that is most suitable for campgrounds, as it is fairly wide and level in contrast to the north bank of the river.

In July, 1963, bids were received for the Green Mountain Timber sale (Suiattle Ranger District). If this sale is not cancelled it will be one of the worst examples of Forest Service insensitivity to scenic beauty in the northwest. The sale is planned to go almost two miles up the southern slopes of Green Mountain, virtually to timberline, and to obliterate the trail. From this trail one of the most spectacular views of the forested Suiattle River valley may be had as it curves around behind Glacier Peak only 12 miles away. Other roads have been projected to ultimately penetrate Sulphur, Downey, Buck, and Lime Creek valleys, each a scenic corridor leading to the alpine meadows. The projection of a road up the

Suiattle River and Miners Creek may only be considered if access to the Bear Creek Mines on Miners Ridge has to be provided.

2.8. Whitechuck River Drainage

Huge clear-cut scars have been made along the lower slopes of the valley for 5 miles inside the proposed park and as close as 6 miles from the foot of Glacier Peak. This ignorance of landscape esthetics is about to be perpetuated if the Prospectus for Meadow Mountain Sale (Darrington Ranger District) (4/27/61) is carried out. The sale proposes to log off the same slopes, only further up, almost to timber line, with the obliteration of one of the best alpine trails in the watershed. Here again foresters display their inability to recognize when scenery transcends all other values. Further road projections are indicated as a network along the upper slopes on both sides of the valley all the way to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area. If allowed to proceed, this would rival the scenic devastation that has occurred on the southern slopes of Mt. Baker.

2.9. Sauk River Drainage

Along this river runs most of the Mountain Loop Highway, proposed as a future parkway. The major scar here is on Elliot Creek, pathway to cliff-rimmed Goat Lake. Another instance of scenic destruction is the new logging road up Sloan Creek - route of a proposed parkway - subjecting this valley prematurely to the destructive forces of commercial timber harvesting. Other logging within the proposed park has occurred along the Sauk River and on Falls Creek. Future logging roads are projected up Elliot, Bedal, Sloan, and Cadet Creeks.

2.10. White River Drainage

Timber sales have been made 8 miles inside the proposed park boundary in the vicinity of Panther Creek.

2.11. Chiwawa River Drainage

The Phelps Creek logging operation (12 miles inside the proposed Recreation Area) is the only damage done to the scenery in this watershed. So far this river

valley has been kept in a reasonably natural state.

2.12. Entiat River Drainage

On the North Fork, logging has taken place 5 miles inside the proposed Recreation Area boundary.

2.13. Lake Chelan - Stehekin River Drainage

The major scenic invasion here has been on Railroad Creek in country so steep and rocky that the logs must come out by cable. Though the huge eyesore of the Howe-Sound mine at Holden is present, there is no need to add to the scenic destruction for the sake of manufacturing apple boxes in Chelan. Extensive plans are under consideration for future timber sales on the Stehekin River and Agnes and Bridge Creeks. This would be another Meadow Mountain or Green Mountain mistake, only immeasurably worse - further proof of the insensitivity of Forest Service personnel to the obvious national park caliber scenery which has unfortunately been placed in their hands to administer.

THIRD SECTION: HISTORY OF EFFORTS TO REFORM FOREST SERVICE POLICIES

The damage to the scenery of the North Cascades which has just been described is the cumulative result of Forest Service policies over a period of many years. Efforts to reform those policies have had only a slight impact in lessening the amount of damage.

The Forest Service first took official notice of the recreational values of the North Cascades in 1931 when it set the Glacier Peak Recreation Area aside. As has happened so often since, the Service set aside only a small portion of the area deserving scenic protection, some 233,600 acres. When the Park Service studied the area in 1937 and recommended creation of a park which would protect much more ample areas in the region, the Forest Service developed a sudden interest in protecting the scenic and wilderness values of its lands. As recounted already, Bob Marshall was directed by Chief Forester Silcox - a Roosevelt appointee from New York state - to quickly study the wilderness potential of the region. Marshall

reported back recommending that a 795,000 acre (the so-called "Silcox area") be studied for wilderness classification. However, with commercial opposition having slowed down the momentum of the drive for an Ice Peaks National Park by 1940, the Regional Forester no longer felt that the park was too threatening and reserved only the 352,000 acre Glacier Peak Limited Area for further study.

The history of Forest Service interest in the Glacier Peak area in the 1930's clearly reveals the shortcomings of their attitudes. The Service has a negligible basic interest in scenery and wilderness values and becomes interested only when threatened with losing their land to another agency. As long as public interest forces them to act interested in such values, they will produce signs of such interest, but conviction will be lacking. Far-sighted plans will be proposed in moments of crisis, especially at high levels by non-career employees such as Silcox or by appointive administrators. But when the crisis passes and public concern subsides, the enlightened plan is shelved and a limited plan is substituted. When left to their own devices, the professional foresters of the Forest Service will provide only a minimum plan for protecting public scenery.

Throughout the 1940's and early fifties, the public was too pre-occupied with wars and readjustments to display considerable interest in the future of the Glacier Peak area, and little, consequently, was done. In 1951, the Forest Service announced that preliminary studies on the reclassification of the Glacier Peak Limited Area would soon begin, but nothing subsequently was done. Therefore, in 1955 the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urged the Forest Service to get these studies underway, and specifically urged that the "Silcox area" be made a wilderness area. The Mountaineers reiterated this request in the spring of 1956, and soon thereafter the Service finally produced an outline for its plan for studying the area.

As the Forest Service study got underway, conservationists also began to study the area more intently. Noting the disfiguring inroads that uncontrolled logging had already made by that time, some among them, including David Simons, recognized that the public was not getting independent judgments on what should be

happening to the North Cascades. He felt a fresh viewpoint was needed to evaluate what the future should be for this area of public property. In a letter of November, 1956 to his United States Senator, he interceded for help in having a study made of the area by an inter-agency group. The Chief of the Forest Service replied to this letter, which the Senator forwarded to him, saying that no such study by any other agency was needed as the area was the sole responsibility of the Forest Service and that it was discharging its responsibility.

In view of the adamant refusal of the Forest Service to stop logging in scenic areas and its unwillingness to let any outside agency review its policies, concerned northwest conservationists in 1957 founded the North Cascades Conservation Council to arouse public interest in the compelling need for reform.

That reform was surely needed was made abundantly evident by the land management study which the Forest Service completed on the Glacier Peak region in early 1957. This study consisted of little more than a collection of resource overlay maps that gave no special attention to the spectacular scenic qualities of the area. In contrast to the 795,000 acre "Silcox area", a proposal for merely a 434,000 acre wilderness was tentatively advanced.

This study provided no clues as to how the data on the maps was related to the conclusions concerning the wilderness area that should be proposed, except that the boundaries chosen were related to the overlays in their avoidance of most commercial timber stands.

After two more years of study, this proposal was further reduced to provide for only a 422,925 acre wilderness area. This area was shaped like a "star-fish" in that the wilderness was restricted to the tentacle-like rocky ridges, while the forested valleys between were excised from the wilderness for commercial development. This was the ultimate application of the policy of "rock-piles and ice for recreationists and forests for the timbermen". The "wilderness-on-the-rocks" proposal excluded the scenic climax valleys of the Suiattle, the Whitechuck, the White River, Phelps Creek, and Agnes Creek, as well as the entire area between Cascade Pass and the Skagit River.

The inadequacy of the Forest Service proposal was so appalling that Congressman Thomas Pelly, of Seattle, felt that an entirely independent study of the recreation values of the area was needed before an impartial evaluation could be made of it. He felt the Forest Service had demonstrated that they were not competent to evaluate recreational values and accordingly wrote the Director of the National Park Service in March of 1959 asking that they be allowed to make such an evaluation. He listed 19 questions which he hoped they would answer in conducting an evaluation study. These included a request that the Park Service indicate which areas between Stevens Pass and the Skagit River they felt should be free of commercial use and be protected scenically, and which areas they felt should be kept as wilderness and which developed for road-side recreation.

The Director of the Park Service then sought permission, as required by statute, from the Chief of the Forest Service to make such a study. With no reply to this request being received by the Director, Congressman Pelly then wrote to the Chief directly, requesting that such permission be granted. In August of 1959, the Chief replied denying this request again, as he did in 1956.

Congressman Pelly's misgivings about the Forest Service's proposal, however, were shared by the public. At hearings that fall on the proposal for the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area, testimony went three to one against an emasculated wilderness, and the Forest Service was at last forced to concede to public opinion. It tried, however, to concede as little as possible, with the Regional Forester recommending only that less of some valley corridors be left out of the wilderness. He persisted in recommending that the area between Cascade Pass and the Skagit River be open to multiple use logging.

The Secretary of Agriculture, however, did not approve such hedging concessions to public opinion. In an establishment order of September 6, 1960, he added 35,580 more acres to the wilderness, thus completely closing the corridors along the Suiattle, the Agnes, and Phelps Creek to logging. He ordered that the area north of Cascade Pass be managed primarily for recreation, with the scenery pre-

served and logging allowed only on a limited basis where compatible with these aims.

The following June a new Secretary of Agriculture intervened to restrict Forest Service freedom of action in this area even more. In response to requests from Washington's Senators, Secretary Orville Freeman, in June of 1961, imposed a moratorium on any logging in the Cascade Pass-Ruby Creek area until a policy for preserving the scenery there had been worked out. He directed the Forest Service to prepare a general plan for preserving the landscape scenery of the high mountain areas of Oregon and Washington.

The intervention of the Secretaries of Agriculture, both in 1960 and 1961, again illustrates that progress is made in protecting the scenic and wild values of the North Cascades only when appointive officials intervene to direct the Forest Service to do the proper thing. They cannot be relied upon to do it on their own initiative.

When the Forest Service responded to Secretary Freeman's directive of 1961, the policy it produced again reflected a hedging attitude toward keeping faith with the public. The High Mountain policy it released in March of 1962 provided for Landscape Management Areas--not scenic preserves. These landscape areas were to be managed so that one-half to two-thirds of the normal commercial log harvest would be made in them. Though these areas were supposed to be so placed that panoramic scenery would appear unimpaired from main roads and trails, they were sparsely provided along such valleys as the Whitechuck and failed to protect some of the best views from valleyside roads and trails.

Because the Landscape Management Area policy signaled Forest Service determination to move ahead in logging the approach valleys of the North Cascades, Congressman Pelly felt a new moratorium on logging in the region was needed more than ever to assure positive protection of the scenery there. In June of 1962 he asked Secretary Freeman for a new moratorium on logging below 4,000 feet in 20 key valleys in the area. The Secretary's office responded with a promise that no logging

would be done in 10 of the areas for five years but indicated that the Forest Service felt it should persist in logging immediately in the other 10 valleys.

This answer failed to reflect full understanding of the urgency of the decisions being made in the North Cascades. After further explanation of the nature of the problems there and of their urgency, the Secretary of Agriculture joined with the Secretary of the Interior in January of 1963 in authorizing a joint departmental study of the area, as conservationists had been requesting since 1956. At last, an independent evaluation of the area's values would be made by an agency without responsibilities to commercial interests.

As this independent evaluation might well lead to a revision of policies permitting wholesale logging in the area, Congressman Pelly re-instated his moratorium request in February of this year. This time the Secretary responded by saying that no new timber sales would be scheduled during the remainder of the year in 8 of the 10 areas presently subject to logging and promising to review the matter at the beginning of the following year. However, the Forest Service persuaded him that it would be too difficult to schedule replacement sales outside of the critical area for already scheduled sales, so that damaging sales on the Whitechuck (Meadow Mountain) and Suiattle (Green Mountain) have been allowed to go ahead.

Thus, due to Forest Service intransigence the forests of the scenic climax of much of the North Cascades, in what should be and can still be one of the nation's most magnificent national parks, are still being despoiled. The Forest Service refuses to extend secure protection to these lands. Its concessions to public opinion are invariably temporary and perfunctory.