

conservation along the White Salmon and Klickitat Wild and Scenic Rivers. You really must understand this for effective intervention.

#### THE HISTORY OF FOREST SERVICE MISMANAGEMENT OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS:

When Congress passed the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area legislation in 1986, Section 13 (of PUBLIC LAW 99-663-NOV. 17, 1986) was included to instantly designate portions of the White Salmon and Klickitat Rivers National Wild and Scenic Rivers. The Forest Service National Scenic Area Office was placed in charge of administering these rivers, and they had available to them three management "tools" to protect the values for which the rivers were designated: (1) a mandate to create a river corridor management plan, (2) acquisition as central to implementing the plan, and (3) the power of eminent domain when a land use is not in compliance with the plan.

The Forest Service took 5 years to complete the plan for the White Salmon Wild and Scenic River. They created a Task Force representing the interested parties, and charged them to reach consensus agreements on all aspects of the plan, a nearly impossible task. Meanwhile forests were being clearcut and short plats and residential development were on-going. SDS Lumber Company owns 40% of the land within the management area and, over the years they have clearcut most of their timberland holdings. Clearcutting and residential development that is inconsistent with the plan has continued for 33 years without any challenge from the Forest Service.

Although acquisition is imperative to implementing the management plan, in the previous 33 years less than 150 acres have been acquired, and there has not been a single conservation easement purchased. The White Salmon Wild and Scenic River boundaries contain 1,800 acres. Broadly speaking, this means that the management plan for this river has never been implemented.

How did this happen? The Forest Service has refused to confront land owners not in compliance with the plan, and they have not reminded them up front of the Forest Service's power of eminent domain. While it is understandable that a public agency would only use condemnation in extreme cases, refusal to place that power on the negotiating table regarding an inconsistent land use is a serious mistake. Essentially, this has allowed the violators to write their own management plan with chain saws and hammers. This is little improvement over what we had before this river was designated Wild and Scenic.

A good example of a Forest Service negotiation failure is what happened to the land exchange with SDS which the Forest Service considered "central" to implementing the plan, because SDS owns 40% of the land in the management boundaries. SDS wanted out of the Wild and Scenic boundaries because they did not want to deal with the regulations, and they wanted "highest and best use" development prices for their