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House Appropriations in deference to a Governor-appointed task force.

A solar tax credit, reinserted for passage only at 15 percent up to $1,500, passed House Energy but was tabled in Taxation & Revenue. A bill that would have added a surcharge on the purchase price of fuel-efficient cars, and provided a rebate to buyers of fuel-efficient cars, was tabled in House Energy. A bill to require life-cycle costing on all projects above a certain size in order to deter- mine the true costs of buildings, equipment and motor vehicles passed the House Government Affairs Committee but was tabled in House Appropriations.

A memorial calling for a transportation policy which included alternatives to single occupancy car commuting (based on a resolution of Sierra Club's Rio Grande Chapter's Conservation Committee), passed the House floor. And a measure to establish a task force chaired by the Land Commissioner to look at opportunities for converting state and local government vehicles to alternative fuels passed the House floor.

Land Use

The Senate passed with little debate a seemingly innocuous bill with poten- tially broad and devastating conse- quences. The Regulatory Takings Act and associated legislation was written by James Watts' associates and picked up by a few cattle ranchers as a way to strengthen the hand of private land- owners at the expense of the ability of state and local governments to protect New Mexico's land, people and wild- life.

The takings bill set up new and oner- ous requirements on government agencies to determine the constitutional impacts of their regulations. All state agencies, cities, counties and local public bodies, and all regulations, ordi- nances, policies, permits and licenses, would have been affected. The Land Commission, for instance, is directly impinged by 140 laws and over 8,000 regulations; reviewing these would have cost over 3.5 man-years of work, with at least one full-time employee devoted solely to constitutional impact statements.

The bill undoubtedly would have triggered an avalanche of lawsuits. Adverse court decisions could easily wipe out many agencies' budgets. Claims filed against the State Game Commission, for example, for compen- sation for forage consumed by game animals on private property could have totaled over $73 million per year. Fortunately, after a great deal of work by wildlife groups, the Sierra Club and municipalities, the bill died in House Judiciary and Appropriations.

[Ken Hughes is the lobbyist for the Rio Grande Chapter.]

Refuges 2003 Planning: Public Participation
by Jana Oyler

An earlier article in this newsletter ad- dressed the revocation of the National Wild- life Refuge System and the possibility for Sierra Club members to participate in public meetings on the range of options for dealing with the management of the system. Unfortunately, the United States Depart- ment of the Interior did not send out the schedule of public meetings early enough for us to announce in this publication the Albuquerque meeting, which was held March 19, 1991. There will be a meeting April 15, 1991, in Denver, Colorado — that is the closest meeting place left.

You will still have a chance to participate in the process, however. The Draft Plan/EIS will be released for a 90-day review period in March 1992, and there will be public hearings on that draft. If you wish to receive the Draft Plan/EIS, send your request to:

Refuges 2003 Planning Team
U.S. Department of the Interior, FWS
Mail Stop 670 ARLSQ
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240

As an incentive, please note that the FWS received over 33,000 comments on its inade- quate 1988 EIS for the National Wildlife Refuge System—and more than 32,000 of those were from pro-hunting and other indi- viduals and groups who want to see refuges managed primarily for recreational and commercial uses rather than for the benefit of wildlife.

Wilderness is an anchor to windward. Knowing it is there, we can also know that we are still a rich nation, tending to our resources as we should—not as people in despair searching every last nook and cranny of our land for a barrel of oil, a blade of grass, or a tank of water.

—Former U.S. Sen. Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico

Examples of environmental problems on Alaska's North Slope are rife. To name only two: 1) Since 1972, oil development there has caused more than 17,000 spills; 2) Each day, the oil industry on Prudhoe Bay generates large amounts of air pollution, spewing out the equivalent of one-third of the nitrogen oxides produced by New York City.

As Dwight Heeling has argued recently in Amicus Journal (Winter, 1991), drilling in the ANWR and the Outer Continental...

(continued on page 6)
Dear Editor:

I enjoyed the fishing article by Jim Fish in the February/March issue. The first few real estate transactions were particularly good in illustrating the complexity of the fishing for day deal.

I raise beef cattle, on a small scale by industry standards, on my own but the cows have no access to public lands for grazing my current crop. As a long time environmentalist, I believe that the problem of grazing permits is not an "Old West" tradition whose time has long since come, but whose roots are deep. In our western political structure that a difficult struggle is inevitable.

I commend the suggestions to "What You Can Do," with one exception: the boycott. In an effort to hurt the small number of offenders, all the rest of the beef market is hurt. Not only can the target producer lose his business, but the hamburger produced by "them." Because the buyer in the market is more of a product than a consumer, like you, his 3 percent reduced consumption is going to have a much greater impact on me and my customers in the industry than it will on "them." It's reminiscent of the "babies in the bathwater" routine.

I am also remark made in the by-product paragraph about "we'd be healthier" be careful in making statements like that. Did you consider nutritional facts before climbing out on that line?

Hey, I'm all for having the public lands range issues corrected, but let's do it in a reasonable way through the governmental channels from whence it grew.

Dorothy B. Smith

Dear Editor:

I am in receipt of the February/March issue of The Sierraan. In that issue, the planned expansion of Usher Boulevard is proposed to be taken on by the city, and the issues brought up against the proposal of the Public Works Department. My wife and I are long term residents of the Sierra Club, but, we are still strongly against the club in this instance. We wholeheartedly agree with the proposal of Usher Boulevard as a major arterial road along the lines of Tramway Road in northeast Albuquerque or even up into a freeway community.

We have a deep interest in the historic and scenic values placed on the West Mes. We do not want the area developed hodgepodge of mismatched industrial, commercial, and residential areas. We endorse reasonable city planning and zoning to make the west side a more livable and attractive area of our city.

Earl B. Hobbs Jr.

Albuquerque

Dear Editor:

There are many assaults on the public lands occurring every day. One of the most flagrant of these violations of public trust is being perpetrated upon the Gila and Aldo Leopold Wilderness Areas. In a recent Forest Service guide of a grazing allotment called the "Diamond Bar." The Diamond Bar grazing allotment is made up of 144,507 acres, 85 percent of which are contained within the two wilderness areas. The permits are presently increasing their herd size up to the permitted numbers of 188 cattle year long. The Forest Service recognizes the fact that the riparian areas in this allotment are severely overgrazed. Despite this they are continuing to increase the size of the permits in order to protect the resource. The Forest Service and the permittees are proposing to build 45 permitted watering systems, 26 miles of fence, and all of this in wilderness using equipment for what? To overgrow the remaining area and supped to the opportunity for solitude.

The Rea-Bar energy hunt is one of increasingly polluted urban areas: desert-specific solutions to the problem. California and the Persian Gulf, oil fires in Kuwait; gas guzzling auto; and pollution cause ecologic and other health problems. What is so regrettable is that during the 1980s there was truly a window of opportunity when significant gains could have been made.

The argument for the Rea-Bar strategy is that it is the so-called "free market" system. You cannot make such a systemic change that is productive.

Such a strategy must recognize the following:

1) Subsidizing oil exploration in the U.S. will have little long-term effect on domestic oil supplies.

2) Environmental considerations such as protecting environmental sensitive national treasures and concern about carbon dioxide build-up, acid rain, smog, and nuclear waste are no longer discarded in an attempt to increase short-term energy supply.

E. Fred Sigerson

Public Land Committee, El Paso Group

The "free" oil market approach may seem to be successful, since the price of oil has been rising sharply. In reality, the true cost is much higher and paid for with your tax dollars, a polluted environment, and the destruction of many of our sensitive national treasures. The specifics of these costs include: military support in the Gulf region; support for the strategic petroleum reserve; huge subsidies to the conventional energy industries (estimated by one source to be $45 billion per year); environmental restoration (oil spill containment and clean-up, ground water decontamination from oil drilling activity and underground fuel tank leaks, and air pollution regulations). Among the many needs of omission and commission for which Ronald Reagan will be harshly judged by history was his deliberate reversal of the energy gains of the 1970s. Not only did he not continue the development of new energy resources, he dismantled the work that had already been done. As one example, he cut the budget for solar research to less than 3 percent of what it had been under Carter.

Bush thus far has been no better than Reagan. The energy policies that Reagan so-called "environmental" president is simply business-as-usual for with oil exploration in environmentally sensitive areas, such as ANWR, and an emphasis on accelerating licensing of questionable nuclear facilities.
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Energy wars heat up in Congress

News from the frontlines
by Leslie England

Our Arctic Refuge/energy campaigns are racing down the track at full steam. Major developments occurred last week prior to the Easter recess, with the introduction of the Murzak/Udall Arctic wilderness bill and Senator Wirth’s alternative energy package, and with the successful markup of Sen. Bryan’s bill on CAFE standards. This is a huge campaign, and help from activists is vital to carrying it out!

The Murzak/Udall Bill
Rep. Robert Murzak (D-NY) announced March 21 that he would introduce H.J. Res. 239, the Morris K. Udall Wilderness Act of 1991. The bill pays tribute to Mo Udall, who has been our champion for years, and who was the chief architect of the Alaska Lands Act. In addition, the bill designates the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge as wilderness. We applaud Congressman Murzak’s action, and are working to get cosponsors on H.J. Res. 239.

The Wirth Package
Also on March 21, Sen. Tim Wirth (D-CO) introduced his alternative energy package, S. 741. Sen. Wirth has already enlisted a significant number of cosponsors for his bill, including some from the Senate Energy Committee which will consider the legislation. To date, cosponsors are: Sens. Mark Hatfield (R-OR), Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), Wyche Fowler (D-GA), Brock Adams (D-WA), Richard Bryan (D-NV), Joseph Lieberman (D-CT), James Jeffords (R-VT), and Thomas A. Daschle (D-SD).

Although Senator Wirth’s alternative energy package is not perfect, it is a good starting point for the energy policy debate with which Congress will deal this session. It includes excellent energy efficiency provisions, which, when taken together, save 20 more times energy than those in the Johnston energy package. The CAPE standards in the Wirth proposal are identical to those in the Bryan bill. From our perspective, the most important element in the Wirth energy package—and something it does contain—is there is no “drill the Arctic” section. We are also launching a major cosponsor drive for Sen. Wirth’s bill, and, once again, activist help is a critical part of our effort.

The Bryan Bill
Sen. Bryan’s CAFE bill, S. 279, passed out of a Senate Commerce Committee markup March 19 by a strong 14-5 vote. We expect early floor action on the Bryan bill, possibly as soon as the end of April. This bill will save 2.5 million barrels of oil each day by 2005—ten times the estimate of oil in the Arctic Refuge! It will do this by raising the corporate average fuel economy standards, or CAPE, from 27.5 mile-per-gallon average to an average of approximately 40 miles-per-gallon by the year 2000. Because the Bryan bill saves ten times as much oil as might be under the Arctic Refuge, this avoids the need for development of the Arctic to be any part of U.S. energy strategy.

National Energy Strategy
The Administration has finally introduced its so-called “National Energy Strategy” in a huge package which contains a “drill the Arctic” section. The Bush package contains no CAPE standards and does nothing to weaken the U.S. away from its addiction to oil and other finite resources. The Administration is threatening to veto energy legislation if development of the Arctic coastal is not part of the final package; at a March 12 Senate Energy Committee hearing, Secretary Watkins warned that a national energy strategy which did not include development of the Arctic coastal plain is “a vetoable issue.”

The very fact that Bush is threatening a veto is an indication that our message is getting through. The Administration knows that we are pushing for CAPE standards; they figure they can get Arctic drilling hitched to CAFE if they characterize such a move as a “compromise.” Our response: the compromise has already been made.

The oil industry can lease the entire northern coast of Alaska except for one remaining exquisitive jewel. Moreover, there are several undeveloped oil fields with proven reserves that can go on line, including the huge West Sak with an estimated 15–25 billion barrels, as well as those at Point McKinley, Seal Island, Sandpiper and others. Additionally, for the past ten years, the scales have been weighted heavily in favor of the oil industry; it is time for the scales to move toward energy efficiency. The Bush and Johnson proposals only pay lip service to energy efficiency; the cornerstone of their packages is continued development at the cost of precious resources.

Energy Committee Mark-up
As expected, Senate Energy Committee Chairman Bennett Johnston introduced a comprehensive energy package (S. 341) containing a section which would open up the 102nd Congress, when bills to designate the Arctic Refuge coastal plains wilderness, S. 39 and H.R. 39, were introduced; both have garnered a significant number of cosponsors: 21 senators on S. 39 and 90 representatives on the Udall bill. Energy efficiency and CAPE legislation was also introduced early in the 103rd Congress; Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) offered H.R. 446, and Sen. Richard Bryan (D-NV) reintroduced his CAFE bill, S. 279. The Boxer bill now has 46 cosponsors, and the Bryan bill, with 35 cosponsors, is headed to the Senate floor.

Development interests introduced their legislation, Beside Sen. Johnston, Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-AK), and Rep. Don Young (R-AK) offered bills to lease the coastal plain.

Secretary Watkins warned that a national energy strategy which did not include development of the Arctic coastal plain is “a vetoable issue.”

Arctic Refuge coastal plain to leasing and development. As a step in this process, Johnston held a hearing March 12 on the Arctic Refuge title in his development bill, S. 341. Mike Matz, Alaska Coalition Chairman, and Brooks Yeager of National Audubon spoke against development; Johnston is committed to try to open up the Arctic Refuge coastal plain and is pushing to have his bill out of Committee and ready for the floor by the end of April.

All of this since the opening days of the 105th Congress, when bills to designate the Arctic Refuge coastal plains wilderness, S. 39 and H.R. 39, were introduced; both have garnered a significant number of cosponsors: 21 senators on S. 39 and 90 representatives on the Udall bill. Energy efficiency and CAPE legislation was also introduced early in the 103rd Congress; Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) offered H.R. 446, and Sen. Richard Bryan (D-NV) reintroduced his CAFE bill, S. 279. The Boxer bill now has 46 cosponsors, and the Bryan bill, with 35 cosponsors, is headed to the Senate floor.

Development interests introduced their legislation, Beside Sen. Johnston, Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-AK), and Rep. Don Young (R-AK) offered bills to lease the coastal plain.

Action Needed!!

The spring promises to be extremely busy for us, with the possible prospects of both a good bill (Sen. Bryan’s S. 279) and terrible bill (the Johnston bill) hitting the Senate floor at about the same time, and with continued hearings and mark-ups. We very much need the help of grassroots activists to make our Arctic/energy campaign successful. Plan to call your Senators and Representatives, and urge your friends to do the same. Here are points you can stress:

1. It is important for the U.S. to have an energy policy, but it should be a policy based on energy efficiency, one which contains CAFE standards, as the Bryan and Boxer bills outline, and not continued production of finite resources, as Sen. Johnston is pushing in S. 341. Discuss S. 741, the Wirth alternative energy package, with your Members of Congress and point out that Wirth’s bill contains no drilling of the Arctic Refuge coastal plain.

2. Urge your Senators to cosponsor S. 39, the Bush/Senaca Arctic Refuge wilderness bill; urge your Representative to cosponsor the Murzak bill, H.J. Res. 239, which will designate the Arctic Refuge as will designated the Refuge as a wilderness area, thereby extending the designation for our long-time champions, Mo Udall.

3. Urge your Senator to vote for S. 279, Sen. Bryan’s CAFE bill, against the filibuster which the polluters are planning, and against any weakening amendments.


Keep in Touch
To write your senators:
The Honorable
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

To write your representative:
The Honorable
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

To telephone your senators or representatives, call the U.S. Capitol switchboard: (202) 224-3121

The Hidden Cost of Automobiles
from “Accounting for the Autocracy” by Rich Peckhem*

1. Half of the land in an average American city, and two-thirds of Los Angeles, is paved over by cars.

2. In Pasadena, the aggregate cost of parking space (at the supermarket, library, etc.) paid for through increased retail prices, smaller paychecks, and mortgages, is approximately $1,000 per vehicle annually.

3. The cost of vehicle operating space in Pasadena, paid for by increased rents, mortgage payments, and gasoline taxes, is also about $1000 per vehicle annually.

4. In Pasadena, the cost of local government services devoted to automobile use (e.g., traffic control, police and fire protection, road maintenance, etc.) is about $35 per vehicle per year.

5. The IRS does not tax employer-provided parking as income, but does tax employer-supported public transit use.

6. The trial hidden cost of automobile use, including environmental pollution, military expenditures to protect oil, and health costs, is estimated at $2,000–7,000 per person per year.

Refuge

(continued from front page)

shell of North America will cause:

...extensive new damage to an alreadyl beleaguered environment.
Mounting scientiffic evidence reports that ever3y aspect of the fossil fuel cycle—from extraction to drilling, from transport to refining, from distribution to use—exposes land, air, water, wildlife, and humans to a host of dangerous pollutants, many of them toxic.

Wildlife scientists have predicted that oil development within the Refuge would seriously jeopardize a number of species, especially the Porcupine Caribou. According to a Fish and Wildlife Service report, oil exploration/exploitation of the Refuge would probably cause declines in populations of some of the species the Refuge was established to protect, including:

- up to a 40 percent decline in caribou (loss of 72,000)
- up to a 50 percent decline in snow geese (loss of 162,000)
- a 40 percent loss of muskoxen (loss of more than 300)
- marked declines in grizzlies, wolves, and polar bears.

The Gwich'in people in risk.

But not only this remarkable land is at risk. Some 7,000 native people, the Gwich'in, live in the Arctic Plain in both Alaska and Canada. The Gwich'in and their ancestors have lived here for 30,000 years. For their livelihood and traditional culture, they depend upon the Refuge's fish, berries, and Porcupine Caribou herd. Oil development threatens not only the Refuge's natural world, but the Gwich'in culture as well.

Johnston's bill threatens Refuge

Senator Bennett Johnston of Louisiana has recently introduced legislation (S. 341), called the "Energy Conservation Act of 1991." Johnston's bill allows oil exploration and development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Such a provision to compromise a Refuge is, simply put, unacceptable. But because Johnston is proposing a bill that claims to provide the nation a much-needed comprehensive energy plan, it is appealing to a number of Senators, including New York's Jeff Bingaman and Pete Domenici.

Moreover, Johnston's bill offers environmentalists a trap—some modest steps to increase national energy efficiency. But the price to be paid for these modest and thoroughly inadequate efficiency proposals is high—a massive package to develop and produce energy that includes drilling the Arctic, increased reliance on non-nuclear power, and more subsidies for the oil industry.

Alternatives to our oil addiction

Johnston's bill represents "business as usual," a business that will destroy the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge wilderness, and other wild areas of North America. The approach embodied in the bill lacks vision, but is unnecessary. Energy experts tell us that we have available to us, right now, the technology and ability to reduce our oil addiction without drilling every last barrel in wild areas. The alternative is to develop the energy conservation and efficiency measures. According to Dwight Holing, "Energy ana-

lysts calculate that by implementing existing technologies and pre-practices, the industry could cut its fossil fuel use in half by the year 2015 and effect a savings of $1.5 trillion.

What we lack is federal government commitment to foster such measures. By way of example, if the federal government were to require an economy standard of 40 miles per gallon for autos and small trucks, we could save between 8 and 9 billion barrels of oil by the year 2010. This is over 2.5 times the amount of oil the government thinks could be found inside the Arctic Refuge. (There is a 19 percent chance the Refuge contains 3.2 billion barrels of oil—a 20 percent increase for the U.S. at its current rate of consumption.)

Bingaman's position wavers

Both Senators Bingaman and Domenici are members of the key Senate Energy Committee that will decide on the contents of Johnston's bill. Senator Domenici is pre-development. Up to this point, Senator Bingaman has been a strong believer in the firm need to protect the Refuge from drilling. But now he is wavering.

Bingaman has stated that he will try to get any provision for drilling of the Refuge deleted from Johnston's bill. This is good news, but he also has allowed the interest of a comprehensive energy package. He will vote for Johnston's bill on the Senate floor, even if it contains the provision to allow drilling the Refuge. This is very bad news.

Bingaman was asked what it would take...

[Pat Penfield is a member of the Executive Committee of the Southern NH Group of the Sierra Club.]

ANWR Facts

- According to the U.S. Interior Department, the chance of finding economic oil under the Refuge is less than 20 percent.
- If oil is found, it is likely to be in the neighborhood of 3.2 billion barrels—enough to supply U.S. energy needs for 200 days. The chance of finding oil in 100 of the 200 test wells in the size of Prudhoe Bay—just 1.
- Most of the North Slope—55 million acres of Alaska's arctic coastline—is still open to oil development. ANWR comprises only 3 percent of this area.

The infrastructure needed to develop oil in the Refuge would probably include:

- a 400 mile pipeline
to Prudhoe Bay
- 100 miles of pipeline 2 ports
desalination plants 7 large production facilities 60-100 drill pads (several acres each) 6000 workers
- 300 miles of roads.

- There have been more than 17,000 oil spills on Alaska's North Slope since 1972, most at Prudhoe Bay.
- The soil quality underlain by the most oil spills is worse than any other in the nation.

Lessons never learned


WASHINGTON—An unreported preliminary report by officials of the Fish and Wild-
life Service indicates that the oil drilling in Alaska has caused far more environmental damage that the Government predicted.

The report, ...developed, has been completed by the Alaska Science Center in the summer of 1982 and was completed in 1983. The report is highly critical of the Prudhoe Bay oilfield and the Trans-Alaska Pipeline project.

...[A]mong its findings are that 11,000 acres of vegetation used by wildlife at Prudhoe Bay have already been destroyed. The systematization of land development has been completed, and that most of the birds in the area have declined in population, as have bears, wolves, and other predators.

[Representative George] Miller said, ...that the Interior Department had deliberately suppressed the report. The reason, he said, is that the document is damaging to ...efforts to quickly open the Alaska oil field to exploration and development.

The oil industry and the Interior Department contend, ...the effects of the Prudhoe Field and the Trans-Alaska Pipeline project shows that the oil industry and environmental protection can be compatible in the far north...

More War Casualties Likely from Mideast Oil Fires

from the Sierra Club's Nat. News Report

Environmental and health damage from the Persian Gulf war could continue for months or years, mostly due to the hundreds of barrels of burning oil wells that are blackening the skies over Kuwait and surrounding coun-
tries.

"The air pollution from oil fires will cause casualties from the Gulf war long after hostilities have ended," said Daniel Weiss, Sierra Club Pollution Specialist.

Weiss believes the fires pose the greatest threat to human health of any of the environmental damage to the Gulf region, including the oil spill. "The oil well fires are chemical warfare waged on everyone downwind from Kuwait," he said.

A U.S. Defense Department report said the atmosphere around some oil fires was extremely flammable as well as dangerously poisonous.

The clouds of black smoke from burning oil wells can contain carcinogenic such as benzene, as well as sulfur and particulate matter that impair lung function. Increased cancer and respiratory illness rates are expected to result from continuous breathing of the pollution. Breathing the smoke also produces resistance to disease and may result in permanent lung damage.

Over 500 of Kuwait's 1,080 high-pressure oil wells were reported frac-
tured and set afire with explosive charges. It is estimated that 300,000 barrels a day are burning in smoke—an amount equivalent to one-sixth of U.S. daily con-
sumption. Experts fear that with the large numbers of fires, their continuous supply of fuel, and their distance from water sources, the fires could burn for years.

Arctic activists sought

Arctic bills in 102nd Congress

Wilderness bills:
- S. 39 and H.R. 39, to designate the coastal plain as wilderness, introduced 1/31/91 by Rep. Morris Udall (D-AZ) and 1/4/91 by Sen. William Roth (R-DE).

Development bills:
- S. 341; "Energy Security Act of 1991" introduced by Sens. Bennett Johnston (D-LA) and Malcolm Wallop (R-WY) 2/25/91; Tilles DI would open coastal plain to phased oil and gas leasing program.

S. 109; "Arctic Coastal Plain Public Lands Leasing Act of 1991," introduced by Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-AK) 1/4/91, would open coastal plain to oil exploration and

Heidi Fleischmann 260-1217
Sierra Club launches energy campaign

All over the country, from Portland, Maine to Portland, Oregon, Sierra Club activists are organizing the Club’s “Kick the Oil Habit” campaign. On February 20, the day President Bush officially revealed his ecologically dis- tracting energy plan, activists at the Sierra Club’s “Kick the Oil Habit” campaign at 19 cities across the country, two weeks in the localities held rallies and press conferences attracting extensive print, radio and television coverage.

The three major television networks (ABC, NBC, and CBS) also sent to their affiliates nationwide a video news release (VNR) produced by Sierra Club. A VNR is a 90 second news story that TV stations can pull down from satellites and air in the day’s news broadcast. The VNR articulated the problems with the Bush/Johnson Energy Plan and provided visuals of the splendor of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In Washington D.C., Sierra Club President Sue Mermow appeared with Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) to 35 reporters at a press conference. In her press statement, Mermow called on Congress to “do the job that the Bush Administration seems unable to do — end this country’s dangerous addiction to oil.” She said that on February 20, Sierra Club grassroots activists throughout the nation would call on every Representative and Senator to vote against the Bush Administration’s scandalous energy plan. “The Bush Energy Plan has been largely embodied in S. 141, an energy bill put forth by Senator Bennett Johnston (D-LA). If the proposals — collectively called the “Bush/ Johnston Energy Plan” — become law, they would open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. Jump start the dying nuclear industry by weakening public oversight, and make only feeble efforts at energy conservation. The Bush/Johnston Energy Plan, and the subsequent “Kick the Oil Habit” campaign, emerge almost two years to the date after the Exxon Valdez spilled 11 million gallons of oil into Prince Edward Sound on March 24, 1989.

Kicking the Oil Habit

Never again will we allow our reckless addiction to oil to threaten the lives of Americans and the peace of the world. No longer will we allow overconsumption of fossil fuels to endanger the world’s food supplies, forests and climate. Never again will we allow the car culture to plague American families into recession or inflation through massive price fluctuations. No longer will we tolerate attempts to destroy our coastlines, wildlife and wilderness in the vain pursuit of one last fix of oil.

Our leaders tell us that the pursuit of oil is worth the lives of Americans, the risk of global warming, the depression of our economy, and the destruction of our children’s natural heritage. We say to the President, the Congress, the oil industry, and the auto companies that American lives, the stability of our climate, and the safety and security of our country are worth a much greater commitment to energy efficiency and secure, renewable energy sources.

We commit ourselves as consumers and as citizens to demand:

-automobiles that average 45 miles per gallon by the year 2000.
-protected of our — crowns Jewels, such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and our fragile coastal areas, from destructive oil and gas drilling.
-quick transition to an economy based on safe, clean and renewable energy sources like solar power and wind — not nuclear.
-aggressive programs to improve the energy efficiency of the nation’s businesses, utilities, and appliances.

Support needed for critical energy vote

Senators Bingaman, Domenici, Gramm, and Benton need to hear from you! If 60 senators commit to voting against an anti-industry and Big Oil filibuster, in early May the U.S. Senate will vote on a bill that would significantly reduce our nation’s dangerous dependence on oil, protect Alaska’s Arctic National Refuge and America’s coastlines, and help curb global warming. All of this could be accomplished by passing The Motor Vehicle Fuel Conservation Act (S. 525), authored by Sen. Richard Bryan (D-NV). Better known as the Bryan Bill, it requires U.S. automakers to improve the fuel efficiency of cars and trucks 40 percent by the year 2000.

Last year, we fell three votes shy, so even though a majority of the Senate favored the bill, the filibuster could not be cut off and the bill wasn’t brought forward for a floor vote. Don’t let them steal the majority of the majority again! Provided that the Congress would build up to saving 2.5 million barrels of oil per day in only 14 years. That’s more than all the oil reserves off California’s coast, plus the most optimistic estimates for the Arctic Refuge, plus every drop of oil we import from the entire Persian Gulf. It would decrease air pollution, lower gasoline prices, increase U.S. oil independence, lower the cost of oil, and cut the single biggest step this country could take to decrease the threat of global warming.

Bob Bingaman, Domenici, Gramm, and Benton may also have a chance to vote for a key strengthening amendment to the Bryan Bill. Called the “Truth in Testing” amendment, it would require that government miles-per-gallon ratings reflect the vehicle’s true efficiency. Current tests exaggerate fuel efficiency by 15 percent. Despite the overwhelming environmental and economic benefits of fuel efficient automobiles, Congress is under tremendous pressure from Big Oil and automakers. You can help fight this welch. The Club has made another plea to Bingaman and Steed American way forward a safer energy future by writing and phoning your Senators right now, and by encouraging your friends and family to do so as well. Your letter, phone calls and e-mail are the most powerful means of convincing industry’s misinformation and lies.

Contact them by mail at the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510, or phone the Capitol switchboard at (202) 224-5121. Encourage them to take the following action:

- Vote for “closet” to cut off the auto industry filibuster against the Bryan Bill, S. 279.
- Vote against ALL weakening amendments.
- Support the “Truth in Testing” amendment to keep government testing from exaggerating vehicles’ miles-per-gallon ratings.

State legislatures defeat resolution to open Arctic Refuge

Environmentalists defeated a proposal to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil and gas development at the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) State—Federal Assembly meeting, held in Washington, D.C. on Dec. 12—14, 1990.

The NCSL is a non—partisan organization which serves the legislators and staff of the states, commonwealths, and territories. This was the first time that national environmental organizations participated in an NCSL meeting, they have been held at bay by the earnest efforts of some environmental leaders in the state legislatures.

The Environment Committee of the NCSL defeated the Arctic Refuge pro-development resolution by a vote of 11—9. The same policy was passed by the Energy Committee by a vote of 10—3. The oil industry’s lobbying group five top lobbyists and 30 legislators appointed to the Environment Committee just before the vote and actually during the vote.

This was an important vote because it means that NCSL representatives will not be lobbying Congress for development of the Arctic Refuge. In addition, NCSL has an extensive network of party leaders back in the states to lobby their congressional colleagues. These meetings of the NCSL’s State—Federal Assembly will take place in Washington, D.C., May 2—4, 1991. The Arctic Refuge will again be on the agenda.

New drive to clean air

The Sierra Club is supporting a California legislature proposal that would give consumers financial incentives to drive less-polluting cars. The proposal, introduced by state Sen. Gary Hart, would institute a program called “DRIVE Plus” (Demand—based Reductions in Vehicle Emissions plus reductions in carbon dioxide).

The program would increase the sales tax on new vehicles that produce more pollutants than the average car, and decrease the sales tax on vehicles that are cleaner than average. The bill includes a formula that the state Air Resources Board would use to determine the average amount of pollutants produced by new vehicles, and to convert each deviation from the average into a tax increase or decrease.

For example, according to the draft formula, a new car that emitted 0.1 gram per mile less hydrocarbon than the average would be entitled to a sales tax reduction of $195.20 for that pollutant. The car’s total tax reduction or increase would be the sum of the adjustments for hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, particulates, and carbon dioxide.

The program would not cost the state any money — it is designed to be "revenue neutral." People who pay the increased taxes would essentially be paying the people who receive the rebates.

A unique feature of this program is that market incentives would continually induce manufacturers to produce cleaner cars. As emission standards are strengthened and more low—emission vehicles are produced, the average standard would decrease.

Another important feature of the bill is the inclusion of carbon dioxide as a pollutant. Presently, there are no regulations on carbon dioxide, the principal "greenhouse gas" that contributes to global warming. Each gallon of gasoline burned produces about 19 pounds of CO2, into the atmosphere.

This legislation received strong bipartisan support from the California legislature during the 1990 session, but failed to gain the Governor’s Deukmejian’s signature.

For a copy of the bill, contact Paula Carroll at the San Francisco office at (415) 923-5668.
Santa Fe Wrap-Up

Tough going for environmental initiatives

by Ken Hughes

Roger Morris of the Santa Fe Reporter labeled it an "environmental rout." Others have bemoaned the sad state of environmental legislation as it has gone through the legislative labyrinth. Now, at the end of the 1991 session, it is clear that pressures from the business-as-usual crowd and a Senate ending the session in a filibuster frenzy has left as achieving less than hoped for. However, the environmental community also can claim credit for stopping or weakening special-interest bills that would have done harm to the environment.

According to this article is a voting record for House members on some of the more important pieces of legislation which had a relatively close vote. [Ed. note: At publication time, the vote records forenate members had not been tallied.] There were other bills that passed with near unanimity and others that failed to the floor. These are discussed below. I've also assigned a subjective green rating to each member, based on their positions on enviromental bills and their willingness to push or resist them.

Department of Environment

A bill to split the Environmental Improvement Division from Health and Human Services cabinet level department has been signed into law. It administers programs created under the Healthy and Green New Mexico Act, occupational health and safety, and environmental improvement legislation. Yet to be decided are which programs will remain in New Mexico's environmental and occupational health and safety, and recreation and conservation programs, as well as which programs will be folded into the new department.

Groundwater

The Environmental Improvement Division wants to boost efforts to meet provisions of the Ground Water Protection Act to clean up contamination from underground storage tank sites. One bill by Rep. Hawley, which passed both House, creates an Underground Storage Tank Committee; as amended, it includes a representative from the environmental community. Another by Sen. Bradley waives liability of landowner for cleanup costs if in compliance with the groundwater act provisions; the bill was revised before passing both floor committees and questions raised by environmentalists. And Rep. Salazar's bill, passing both floors, sets up a "LUST Busters" groundwater response team.

Fortunately the legislature did not heed Senate Conservation Committee chairman Senator Morrow who, despite EID testimony that 335 leaks from tanks have been reported, deemed the "tenseness of water illegally monitored by pro-polyethylene lobbyists Scott Stancliff and Jerry King before losing on the Senate floor by 2 votes. A similar tire bill put in the House by Rep. Michael Olsina lost on a tie floor vote. And an attempt by Rep. Ginny (who got the obstructionism of the House floor) to slash low fees levied by EID on recyclable material passed the House floor but did in the Senate.

Responsible Mining

Rep. King's bill to reclaim lands affected by exploration, mining or extraction of non-coal minerals was weakened by amendments inserted by House Energy Chair Mora at industry's request to delay implementation of the act until all regulations are finalized, and to strip out a citizen suit provision in the mining bill. Voting to strike the citizen's suit protection: Mora, Barber, Knowles, Light (who was heard to say afterwards "environmentalists won't be satisfied until there are no businesses left in the state"), Sandel, Smith, and Wallach. Voting to keep the provision: Salazar, Madalena, McSorley, Morgan and Piccard. The bill went to Judiciary, where it was tabled, i.e. victory for environmentalists.

Civilians' Suit

This bill, introduced by Rep. Casey in a profile in courage, would have allowed citizens the chance to go after polluters in court when the state could or would not enforce laws. It also would have authorized court grants to the plaintiffs and legal fees. The bill cleared House Judiciary and Appropriations, but was defeated, one vote for our side, before defeat on the floor.

Solid Waste/Public Utility

Rep. Whitney-Williams' bill would have declared solid waste facilities to be public utilities, thereby giving the public greater control over prices and access to financial information. It was tabled in House Business. In the Senate, it was a top priority for major waste firms.

Violations, such as discharging water contaminants without a permit, lying in any document required under the act, tampering with any monitoring device, violating any permit condition, or violating any rule or regulation under the act would have been upgraded from a misdemeanor to a fourth-degree felony. Subsequent violations would have resulted in a third-degree felony, as would any violation that harmed humans, wildlife, groundwater, livestock or crops. Despite strident efforts from environment-
Adopt a public land grazing allotment
Part I. Getting Started
by Jim Fish

Many conscientious employees of both the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service (FS) would like to see an end to the grazing of the West. They need our help. The purpose of this article is to help you get started in helping our friends within the agencies. Public Lands Action Network (PLAN), is developing a pair of handbooks, one for each agency. They should be available by summer. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, the bovine terminus and the woolly maggotts munch away at our public lands.

You do not need to be an expert or to wait for the handbooks to get started. You can learn as you go. The first step is to pick your allotment and locate it on a map, any kind of map. Think about some public land area you have visited where you have seen livestock or signs of livestock. If you would not mind spending a few days a year in this area, you have your allotment.

The next step is to start gathering data on your allotment. This step requires a visit to the local agency office. Keep in mind that the agency employees are paid, with your tax money, to manage your public lands. Part of their job, by law, is to help you understand, appreciate, enjoy and get involved in the management of your public lands. If you put into anyone who is confused on this matter, please let me know. That said, assume the best.

When you go to the agency office, ask to see someone who can help you with grazing allotments. When asked what allotment, pull out your map. When asked what you want to know, pull out the following check list.

1. Who has the permit for the allotment?
2. How big is the allotment and what are the boundaries?
3. Get a map of the allotment if you can.
4. How many animals are permitted on the allotment and for what period are they permitted?
5. How many animals have actually been grazed on the allotment for the past five years?
6. What is the condition and the trend in the condition of the allotment? Ask for a copy of any data they have to support the condition they claim. Where and when was the data taken?
7. Has an Allotment Management Plan been prepared for the allotment? If so, ask for a copy. If not, ask when one will be prepared.
8. What range facilities (fences, artificial waters, roads, corrals, etc.) are on the allotment and where are they? Are there any plans for new facilities?
9. When is the permit up for renewal?

Before leaving the office, ask to be placed on the mailing list for any information related to the allotment.

Now that you have the basic data, the fun starts. Get to know your allotment. Walk the boundaries. Locate the range facilities. Count the animals. Make sure they are on the allotment only when they are permitted to be. Look for areas on the allotment that show signs of damage: excessive bare ground, erosion, trampled riparian areas, lack of wildlife, etc. Make lots of notes. If you are a camera buff, take lots of photographs.

Finally, let us know what you find. Contact PLAN at P.O. Box 5631, Santa Fe, NM 87502–5631 or me at P.O. Box 712, Placitas, NM 87043. If you need information or guidance quickly, call me at 865–3062.

(Jim Fish is founder of the Public Land Action Network and a Sierra Club member.)

Protecting our agency friends
If you find a friend within one of the agencies, rejoice, but not too loudly. Political pressures are still being exerted on those trying to do their jobs responsibly. We need friends within the agencies. We do not want them to be fired or transferred to Wyoming.

We can protect our friends by being careful.

1. Be especially careful in the office, on the phone, and in any letters to maintain a professional tone in your interactions.
2. Develop independent sources of any useful information given to you by your friend. Use the information to ask the right questions of someone else. Or find some related information in some document you have and request an explanation of the related information from your friend's superior. The superior to give you the useful information.
3. Pass extremely useful information on to someone not obviously connected with either you or your friend and have that person develop an independent source.
4. Be patient with our friends. They cannot always do what we want instantly as we would want them to do it.
5. Sometimes, however, it may be necessary to pressure your friend publicly, either to disguise the friendship or to give your friend fuel to go to his or her superior with the argument that the public is demanding action. Make sure your friend knows what you are doing.

Above all, nurture our agency friends. We need them and they need us.
Las Huertas Canyon

Which way recreational management?

by Marion Davidson

Just past Will's house, which is the last house on the road, the pavement ends abruptly and the walls of Las Huertas Canyon loom above the rutted dirt track. Locusts, cicadas, and capulin compete for space beside Las Huertas creek, the largest stream and the only fishery in the Sandia mountains. The secrets of this narrow place partially reveal themselves in the caves of its walls and along the banks of the creek.

The bones of the Sandia man and his dinner remind us of the long history of human habitation in the Canyon. Pueblo Indians utilized sites within the Canyon for their ceremonies. Spanish settlers and their burros roamed the forest of the Canyon for wood and game (deer, antelope, bear and wild turkey.) From time to time, Indians would raid the flocks of sheep and goats that were grazed in the meadows between the narrow walls. More recently, the charms of the Canyon lured homesteaders who tried to eke out a living in the narrow canyon. The old log canyon midway up the eight mile road was built in the late 1880s by the Ellis family.

With this rich history, as well as great natural beauty, Las Huertas Canyon has lured picnickers and hikers for many years to explore her mysteries. My friend Terry's family has gathered in the Canyon for Easter Sunday breakfast for generations. Mother's Day seems to be another date for family gatherings along the banks of Las Huertas Creek.

Summer weekends find the Canyon crowded with visitors, the picnic grounds bulging and the road bumper to bumper with cars that churn up great clouds of dust. Monday mornings see the price the Canyon pays for its secrets — trash, pollution of the watershed, vehicular incursions into the wilderness, and illegally cut trees. The Canyon presents a management problem similar to that of other beloved riparian areas close to growing metropolitan areas — how to handle an expanding visitor population in a narrow canyon with diverse vegetation and wildlife. How the Forest Service decided that paving and realignment of the old one lane dirt road through the Canyon "maximizes net public benefits" is beyond me.

Citizen opposition to the paving of the road through Las Huertas Canyon dates back nearly twenty years when paving was first proposed. Then, in 1985, the Forest Service's Management Plan for the Chihola Forest presented these three alternatives for management of the Canyon — reconstruction, closure or rerouting. The entire Chihola Forest Plan was appealed by several environmental groups (including the Sierra Club and Sandia Environmental Action Community) and the State of New Mexico. In the issues raised in the appeal of the Forest Plan, the plan's treatment of the Canyon was a major one.

The 1986 settlement agreement and consequent Forest Plan Amendment required that the Forest Service involve a "citizen working group" in the analysis of the Canyon's future. As chair of the working group, I can tell you that we spent hundreds of hours developing alternatives for future management of the Canyon. Ignoring the recommendations of the Citizen Working Group (which had met twice a month for almost a year and a half), the Forest Service's 1986 draft environmental impact statement (EIS) proposed paving and developing the Canyon.

The overwhelming public response at meetings and in letters — nearly 400 letters — opposed this plan. The Albuquerque Tribune opposed paving an did Representa-
Gila National Forest

Spring Timber Sale

Forest Guardians has won its administrative appeal of the Spring timber sale on the Queenoaza District of the Gila National Forest. The Spring sale is one of a series of the sale on the marginally productive Queenoaza District that are scheduled for logging over the next 10 years, and there are an extraordinary number of late Pueblo ruins in the area. The Forest Service Region I has remanded the sale for failure to consider the impact of logging on wildlife. [Source: Forest Guardians.]

Allotment Management Plans

The Forest Service is preparing allotment management plans for the Salmon Cliffs area north of Acoma. The Federal Register announced the proposal for the Acoma area April 5. For more information, call Elizabeth Gross at (505) 359-2748.

Carson National Forest

Felippito Timber Sale

The Felippito timber sale on the El Rito District of the Carson National Forest was withdrawn by Forest Supervisor Leonard Lindquist a few days before the 45-day appeal period was due to expire. The Felippito area has the last remaining acreage of old growth left on the Valles Caldera. Federal Sustained Yield Unit, Forest Guardians and N.M. Department of Game and Fish both have strongly objected to the loss of this vital forest habitat.

The new analysis team, unlike those in all other forests in the region, excluded members of the public and outside agencies. Lindquist also excluded public participation on planning teams when he was supervisor on the Kaibab National Forest. Such actions clearly violate the National Environmental Policy Act, which mandates public involvement "to the fullest extent possible." [Source: Forest Guardians.]

Sierra National Forest

Spring Timber Sale

The Forest Service has decided to proceed with the Spring timber sale on the San Miguel and Smokey Bear districts. The Spring sale was appealed by Forest Guardians and Sangre de Cristo Chapter of the Audubon Society, Save the Jemez and the Santa Fe Group of the Sierra Club. The area has been in the public visibility of the proposed cutting practices. However, it is encouraging to see the Forest Service responding to issues raised by local activists. [Source: Forest Trust.]

Lincoln National Forest

Bird Timber Sale

Forest Guardians joined with the Missouri River Chapter of the Audubon Society in an administrative appeal of the Bird timber sale on the Lincoln National Forest. This area is aptly named because it contains all or part of 11 Mexican spotted owl territories—the largest density of owls that we have seen in a timber sale area. The Forest Service was not among of the recommendations were extended beyond reasonable limits to permit logging and road construction in this sensitive wildlife area. The Forest Service also failed to consult the Fish and Wildlife Service over the impacts of logging the threatened Mexican spotted owl.

Maristano Theater of Las Cruces also appealed this sale, and the El Paso Group of the Sierra Club intervened on our behalf. (An attempt by the Southern New Mexico Group of the Sierra Club to intervene barely missed the deadline.) District Manager is due April 5. [Source: Forest Guardians.]

Recreation developments

The Forest Service is planning to amend the Jemez timber sale to include more than 80 additional recreation and trail development projects. The proposals were approved April 5. The top projects include (in order of Forest Service priority): Trail maintenance and construction, Sisahide Trail given a higher priority; four trails visible, 14.5 miles; Cibola Truck Campground development.

Santa Fe National Forest

San Miguel/Smokey Bear Timber Sale

The San Miguel/Smokey Bear timber sale in the Sangre de Cristo Mountains was appealed by Forest Guardians. The sale was closed to the public. [Source: Forest Guardians.]

Chihaua National Forest

Las Huertas Reclamation Development

See article on page 14.

(Editor's Note: Most of the information on this page came from two New Mexico-based groups, Forest Guardians and Forest Trust. I recommend that readers interested in national forest issues support these groups and subscribe to their newsletters.)

Mexican spotted owl threatened, FWS says

John Turner, the director of the FWS, announced in late February that his agency would propose listing the Mexican spotted owl as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. A team of biologists from the FWS and the states of Arizona and New Mexico had spent a year reviewing the status of the bird, and recommended in December that the subspecies be protected. Actual listing is probably a year away, following a public comment period.

Mexican spotted owls are found almost exclusively on national forests in the New Mexico. Even so, the total number of owls is estimated at 1,056. The review team found that about 25 percent of the owl's historic habitat has been removed, 25 miles of road to be built in the San Miguel/Smokey Bear area east of Cumbia. This timber sale was appealed by Forest Guardians. Sangre de Cristo Chapter of the Audubon Society, Save the Jemez and the Santa Fe Group of the Sierra Club. The area has been the subject of proposed cutting practices. However, it is encouraging to see the Forest Service responding to issues raised by local activists. (Source: Forest Trust.)

Sierra National Forest

Sierra Club activists hit with SLAPP suit

Ancient Forest Protection Act Reintroduced

Our opportunity to protect the remaining 10 percent of our ancient forests is rapidly slipping away. Either Congress protects these forests within the next few years, or the ecosystem will disappear.

Last April, Rep. Jim Joult (D-NM) intro-
duced the "Ancient Forest Protection Act," which ultimately garnered 135 Members of Congress on board. Later in the session, Rep. Bruce Vento (D-MN) introduced legislation which included an ancient forest reserve system, and Vento's bill was re- placed out of his Interior Subcommittee. Rep. Joult has again introduced his ancient forest protection bill; at the time of the bill's introduction, 1 long-Sierra Club board mem-
ber and an acknowledged expert on SLAPP suits.

Wolf Expert to Speak

David Moch, world-renowned wolf biologist, is coming to Albuquerque on April 10! He will speak at 7:30 p.m. at Woodward Hall on the University of New Mexico campus (just west of the Student Union Building). Moch has studied wolves in northern Minnesota for over 20 years and has recently studied arctic wolves in producing a book as of possible. The number of wolves in the captive breeding program varies. The population will have to reach 75-100 before any releases will be considered by the FWS.

Mexican Wolf Update

by Susan Larsen

Reinsuring the Mexican Wolf (Canis lupus baileyi) to the wild has advanced one small step on the long road to recovery. In March, public scoping hearings were held in Las Cruces and Tucson to determine the issue concerning wolf reintroduction. At this time, White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) and four Arizona sites are being considered as potential first-release sites. WSMR provides a safe haven for the protection of 30-40 wolves in the Sierra Ocusa and San Andreas Mountains. The sites are now being studied to determine their suitability. A draft environmental assessment should be out by the end of the year.

If you wish to make written comments about reintroduc-
tion, write to:

Mike Speare, Regional Director U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2 P.O. Box 1306 Albuquerque, NM 87103-1306

Comments must be received by May 15, 1991. (The original deadline has been extended.)
Utah Wilderness bill goes into the hopper

Congressman Wayne Owens (D-UT) introduced the Utah BLM wilderness bill into the 102nd Congress March 20. His bill bears the number H.R. 1500, the same bill number as last Congress; Rep. Owens re- served that number for his legislative priority. H.R. 1500 will preserve more than five million acres of Utah's wildlands. Much of the wilderness designated in H.R. 1500 complements the seven national parks formed around the land carved over eons by the Colorado River drainage system; the remainder is located in the unique desert island ecosystems of Utah's Great Basin.

The bill encompasses wildlands of extraordinary diversity and splendor, lands which Bob Marshall termed "second only to Alaska in beauty and majesty." Rich in wildlife, including the threatened desert tortoise and desert bighorn sheep, these lands also house spectacular geological formations, geological myths and other artistic forms left by prehistoric civilizations which lived in Utah's canyons and mountains.

When the bill was introduced, 63 representatives had signed on to the legislation with Rep. Owens. A copresence drive is actively underway. Please urge your representative to sign on to H.R. 1500. For more information, call (202) 547-1411, or Lawson LoCate at 801/355-0059.

Proposed grazing fees hike galvanize ranchers

According to a recent report in Farm Business News, four agricultural organizations have joined forces to convince Congress that grazing fees on public lands should not be unfairly increased. The move is in response to recent legislative attempts to raise grazing fees charged by federal land management agencies.

The newly formed Western Livestock Producers Alliance, comprised of the Palm Bureau, American Sheep Industry Association, the Association of National Grasslands, the National Cattlemen's Association and the U.S. National Range Council, is formed to protect the interests of public land permittees to prevent passage of a bill that would drastically increase grazing fees.

The coalition has sent letters to the 25 ranchers and livestock producers who pay to graze their animals on public lands, seeking their support to "provide the truth to Congress regarding the public, the policy-makers and the media.

Demosthene Stolte, APBIP public lands specialist, said that livestock grazing of public lands can enhance watershed management, soil conservation, forage production and wildlife habitat.

"If grazing fees are raised to unreasonable levels, ranchers will seek substitutes, resulting in less desirable utilization on public lands and lower returns to the federal government," he said.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location/Activity</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 6</td>
<td>BUSH MOUNTAIN, GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS. Strenuous hike. Jim Bell 915-561-8554 (w) 594-2501 (e) (El Paso)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 6</td>
<td>TENT ROCKS, NEAR COCHRITL. Moderate hike. Joe Wheeler 984-074 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 7</td>
<td>ORGAN MOUNTAINS, Moderate/strenuous hike, 7 miles. Paul Bonson 921-607 (w) 769-6613 (e) (Las Cruces)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 7</td>
<td>AVISTA CANYON, FRANKLIN MOUNTAINS. Easy hike for dogs &amp; their owners. Corina Greenfield 914-593-6187 (El Paso)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 7</td>
<td>ATALAYA PEAK, SANTA FE. Easy/moderate hike. Dan Mitchell 992-2082 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 7</td>
<td>BANDEJER NATIONAL MONUMENT, SANCHEZ CANYON, SAN MIGUEL RINGS, PAINTED CAVE, Strenuous loop hike. Merrill Goodwyn 471-5462 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun/Sun Apr 13/14</td>
<td>GILA NATIONAL FOREST, Car camp &amp; day hike Ed Lambert 522-6467 (Las Cruces)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun/Sun Apr 13/14</td>
<td>LOWER GILA BOX, Easy hike &amp; car camp. Dan Olingpen 915-595-8543 (El Paso)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 15</td>
<td>PETROGLYPHS NATIONAL MONUMENT, Easy hike to Rinconada Canyon, optional side trip to Volcanoes. Ike Eastwood 256-6767 (Abq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 15</td>
<td>MANZANO MOUNTAIN FOOTHILLS, Moderate hike. Charlie Hogan 558-5779 (Abq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 15</td>
<td>BAYO CANYON, NEAR WHITE ROCK. Easy hike. Brian Johnson 438-2087 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 15</td>
<td>SANTA FE AREA. Moderate/strenuous hike. John McClure 473-1916 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 14</td>
<td>ARROYO CHAMISA, SANTA FE. Easy hike, dogs allowed. Charles Cocks 671-0005 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 20</td>
<td>WHITE SANDS MUSEUM RANGE, SAN ADREAS WILDLIFE REFUGE. Hike (open to public again). Rollin Winkles, 915-599-3052 (El Paso)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 20</td>
<td>BANDEJER NATIONAL MONUMENT, Moderate hike. Arnold Keikaku 982-4570 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 21</td>
<td>PETROGLYPHS NATIONAL MONUMENT, PEDRAS MARCADAS, Easy hike. Ike Eastwood 255-7097 (Abq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 21</td>
<td>WHITE ROCK CANYON, CAJA DEL RIO, Strenuous hike. Norbert Spierich 983-5692 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 21</td>
<td>SANTA FE SKI BARN, BORREGO TRAIL, Easy hike. Elisabeth Altman 471-6490 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri Apr 26</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE AREA. Full moon 4-mile leisure hike and &quot;Dead or Alive Naturalist Reading.&quot; Dave Morrison 344-5953 (Abq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 27</td>
<td>RIO GRANDE RIVER, WEST OF LAS CRUCES, 4-mile easy hike. Ed and Ann McCleary 526-8026 (Las Cruces)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat Apr 27</td>
<td>THREE GUNS CANYON, SANDIA MOUNTAINS. (Proposed Open Space) 1-mile leisure hike and lunch at Sierra Club Office. Louise Weisend 292-6272 (Abq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 27</td>
<td>SANTA FE AREA. Moderate hike. Myles Brown 471-6075 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 28</td>
<td>UNNAMED CANYON, EAST SIDE OF FRANKLIN MOUNTAINS. Easy hike. Claire Christensen 915-532-4506 (El Paso)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 28</td>
<td>OJALALENT, Easy/moderate hike. Noreen Sanders 984-0386 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Apr 28</td>
<td>LA LUE TRAIL, SANDIA MOUNTAINS, Strenuous hike. Steven Mercher 984-4137 (Santa Fe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For everyone's well-being, leaders reserve the right to turn away anyone whose clothing or equipment or experience appears unsuitable for the particular trip. Carpooling is usually required at the meeting place. Happy hiking! —Norma McCallan, Chapter Outings Chair