On Fact-Finding Mission

SEN. HAYAKAWA VISITS BIG SUR

Cranston Postpones, Changes USFS Bill

BIG SUR — Roy Greenaway, Senator Alan Cranston's administrative assistant, told the Gazette on Feb. 28 that hearings for the Big Sur Bill (S2233) had been postponed until April 25 and that the content of the bill would be different than originally proposed.

Reasons cited for the postponement were that Congressman Leo Panetta had requested it and that "Senator Cranston is hopeful that a more general bill can be developed in the near future instead of S2233." The content of the new bill is being worked on, "the general subject of which is to protect Big Sur and keep it from turning into the Sunset Strip," he said.

"Senator Cranston's staff is working with Congressman Panetta and with various people from California who have expressed interest, including the Big Sur Foundation," he said.

Regardless of more specific details, Mr. Greenaway said that, "because there has been so much speculation and conjecture, we don't want to talk about the substance until we're ready to make a public statement."

However, he added, the proposal should be completed by the Senate subcommittee on April 4, "which gives everybody ample opportunity to discuss it" prior to the April 25 hearing.

The one-day hearing will be held by the Senate subcommittee called Parks, Recreation and Renewable Resources chaired by Senator Hatfield as the ranking minority member.

Additional subcommittee members are Senators Church, Johnston, Metzenbaum, Melcher, Torgas, Stevens, McClure and Weicker.

The Wilderness Society Proposes

Big Sur National Scenic Area

By WILLIAM A. TURNAGE
Director, The Wilderness Society

1. BACKGROUND

The beautiful Big Sur coast in Central California includes some of the most spectacular lands in America. According to renowned photographer Ansel Adams, "Surely no more beautiful and spiritually uplifting coastline exists on this earth." The Big Sur region is almost 100 miles long and stretches from Malpaso Creek south of Carmel Highlands to the Hearst Ranch.

Much of the land in the region is owned by the U.S. Forest Service, and is part of the Los Padres National Forest. The 170,000-acre Ventana Wilderness is part of the Los Padres, and is adjacent to parts of the Big Sur. However, lands along the northern 55 miles of the Big Sur Coast are in private ownership.

About 1,200 residents live in Big Sur; there are about 70,000 acres of private land in the region. Most of the coastal landscape is undeveloped, though there are some residences in certain prime scenic locations.

Today Big Sur retains much of the natural beauty that it has always enjoyed. Permanent protection is now needed to put a stop to the inevitable incremental development that has already begun to take place along the coast. Thus far there have been relatively few homes built in the region, but some of the houses that have been constructed in recent years have had a significant adverse impact on the landscape.

The need to preserve the scenic beauty is recognized by both the tourists who visit the region (more than two million annually) and the residents who live there. In a report submitted by the Monterey County Big Sur Coast Citizens' Advisory Committee, it is pointed out that "the trend of recent planning has been to recognize that the Big Sur Coast is best preserved as a great natural and scenic resource for the benefit of future generations by leaving it largely undisturbed, and to ensure that man-made development remains subordinate and complimentary to natural processes that link climate, water, soil, vegetation and wildlife."

But local and regional planning is not the solution to the problem of how to best protect Big Sur permanently. This is because (1) the power of local zoning is limited, and development cannot be restricted adequately without compensating landowners; and (2) tourist visitation to Big Sur presents a serious management problem because of highway congestion.

Continued On Page 21

Nimmo Raps Park Plans

BIG SUR — State Senator Robert Nimmo of a Gazette interview said he had strong feelings that there should be no further federal intervention or involvement in the Big Sur Coast.

He cited that the national debt now exceeded $800 billion and that the inflation rate is now 18 percent and is going up.

The U.S. Congress, he said, "continues to overspend, print more money and go up."

Continued On Page 9
Local News...

Land Use Laws

By Citizens For Responsible Government

There is no possible way the United States government can acquire legitimate control over California redwoods or the Big Sur.

Article I, Section 8 (17) of the United States Constitution states:

"The Congress shall have power to ... exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by consent of the legislature of the state in which such place is, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful buildings."

This section makes it clear that the federal government to acquire "title" to land lying within a state three things must be complied with: 1. Such land must be purchased. 2. It must be purchased by the consent of the state within which it lies, and 3. It must be purchased for the erection of needful buildings of a specific kind.

All else is trespass and usurpation.

The rule of interpretation applicable here is "expression unius est exclusio alterius," which means that the expression of one thing, or class of things, in a document, implies the exclusion of all other things. So that Congress has power to acquire land in the manner granted by Article I, Section 8 (17) but it has no power to acquire land in any manner or for any purpose, NOT granted by Section 8.

If there were no such restraint on Congress, then by the simple process of acquiring all land the federal government could obliterate the states and destroy the republican form of government mandated by Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution. This, of course, is not legally permissible, particularly when it is reflected that the states created the federal government through a federal compact with each other. The states are the principals; the federal government is their agent.

The Constitution cannot enforce itself, which is why all federal and state officers are required by oath to support and defend it.

Whoever controls the land controls the people on it. The penalty for failure to enforce Article 1, Section 8 (17) will be federal tyranny, the destruction of the states and the end of freedom in the United States.

John L. Stedy
Research Director
Citizens For Responsible Government

Big Sur Land Trust Eves Odello Deal

Concerns over levee safety for the Odello land may be for naught.

There is a possibility that the Odello family may abandon its development plans.

The Carmel Sanitary District has renewed its long-standing interest in buying the Odello's 134 acres to use for a wastewater reservoir.

District Manager Michael Zambory said last week that the district may need the reservoir as part of its $13.7 million wastewater reclamation program.

He said that the district has not made a direct offer to the Odello family, but is working with the Big Sur Land Trust to acquire the land for a reservoir.

Zambory said, "We cannot make a direct offer to the Odello, but the Big Sur Land Trust is interested in our plans for the reservoir."

He explained that the district cannot include the reservoir in its reclamation project until it receives state approval. He expected the state Water Resources Control Board to rule in late February or early March on the reservoir.

Zad Leavy, attorney for the Big Sur Land Trust, said that he was exploring opportunities to purchase the Odello land.

He said that a multi-agency purchase may be put together to acquire the land for the sanitary district reservoir.

The city of Carmel, Monterey County, the state Department of Parks and Recreation, the Coastal Conservancy and other agencies will be contacted, Leavy said.

The deal is possible, he said, if the agencies can agree on a single use for the land. He said that the idea of the reservoir was suitable because it could also serve as a marine life refuge.

"It takes a catalyst in a deal like this," Leavy said.

He explained that the Big Sur Land Trust could serve as the lead agency.

Leavy said that the trust is currently raising money for an appraisal of the land.

The Carmel Sanitary District will present four showings of two Robert Blaisdell films. The Country of the Mind and Big Sur: The Dream and the Enigma. Blaisdell, a Carmel cinematographer, has produced many documentaries; one of the most recent for WNET in Boston was on poet Robert Frost. A local educational film done several years back, familiar to Monterey, Carmel and Big Sur youngsters, is titled Father Sky; Mother Earth and features children working with local archeologist Don Howard at a dig near San Jose Beach.

The Blaisdell films to be shown at the Big Sur Grange Wednesday, March 5; Thursday, March 6; Sunday, March 9; and at Pacific Valley School Friday, March 7 were filmed in Big Sur between 1967 and 1972.

The Country of the Mind features Eric Barker reading his own poetry.

The second film, Big Sur: The Dream and the Enigma, features scenes and interviews with Barker, Helmutt Deetjen, Ephraim Donas, Michael Murphy, Henry Miller, Harry Dick Ross, Emil White, Lilly Fassett, Howard Welch, Ham and Esther Ewaldsen, Berley Farber and Caryl Hill, and was filmed mainly between Big Sur Notables Featured in Films

Monterey County Supervisors were expected to approve an operating permit for the Big Sur Taxi.

The permit will allow Tom Nash and George Flammer to operate service from Big Sur to the Monterey Peninsula.

The taxi fleet will consist of a pair of 4-wheel-drive station wagons each capable of carrying five passengers. The fare will be $1.10 a mile for each rider.

The taxis, equipped with mobile telephones, will be available on a 24-hour-a-day basis.

At a February hearing, supervisors heard Harold Thompson's appeal of a country Planning Commission decision denying a use permit to allow the tennis courts at Titus Park to be lighted.

Supervisors Consider Big Sur Taxi Permit

Supervisors conducted a study session on the fiscal 1981 budget.

CAC Forum

Set Mar. 8

On March 8 the Citizens Advisory Committee will host a forum at 7 p.m. on the Neguche Terrace.

The roster of invited guests include Congressman Panetti, Charles Cushman of the National Park Inholders Association, Carmel Highlands photographer Ansel Adams and representatives of the Big Sur Foundation, the Wilderness Society and the Friends of the Big Sur Coast.

Questions for the panelists must be submitted in writing to CAC chairman Roger Newell prior to the forum.

The public is invited and encouraged to attend.

Please send a one-year gift subscription to THE Big Sur Gazette

Highway One, Big Sur, California 93920

TO:

FROM:

$5.00 in Monterey County • $6.00 outside Monterey County • $12.00 out of state • $19.00 foreign

The Gazette is published the first of each month.

I am enclosing my check for $
**Big Sur Town Hall Meeting**

**A Plea for Unity, Openness**

BIG SUR — "Alone our work is of little worth. But together we're lords of the earth. So it's all for each and each for all—united we stand, divided we fall." A motto, a philosophy, a prayer introduced by Penny Verige. It is the closing prayer of the Big Sur Grange. It may also be a guide we might all keep in mind over the coming weeks as we discuss and consider the future of this Big Sur Coast and our relationship with it.

Mr. Jim Josoff, moderator for Sunday night meetings, set the mood for the meeting with a call for openness and honesty in the community. The plea was made in direct relation to a number of rumors and innuendos that have been circulating.

Mr. Josoff stressed the mood for the meeting with a call for openness and honesty in the community.

"In light of this report, we feel we cannot be as trusting of the Federal Government and their proper administration of the area as Mr. Adams."

There was a clarification of the role of Mr. Charles Cushman, executive director of the National Park Inholders Association and Federal Land Inholders Association and his relationship with the Friends of the Big Sur Coast.

This was followed by a question and answer period with Mr. Cushman.

The financial arrangement was made with Mr. Cushman's organization. The report was made public and is available on request.

The discussion shifted to the Cushman's Bill S2233, and the amendment before Congress. Mr. Cushman explained how he became aware of the situation. Subsequently, Mr. Cushman alerted the local residents of its existence. The importance of public response and action was emphasized. Without the telephone calls and telegrams to Washington, the amendment on the Channel Island's Legislation might well be a law today. It would be wise to become familiar with the ways we can make the legislative process work.

In regards to Mr. Ansel Adams' open letter to the Monterey Peninsula Herald on Feb. 3, 1980, Mr. Josoff stated, "Mr. Adams is sincere in his concerns and belief that the local residents would not be affected. The recently released General Accounting Office report, CED 80-14, Dec. 14, 1979, does not bear this out, the government report was highly critical of the abuse by the Park and Forest Service and there lack of regard for the impact and concerns of residents.

"The General Accounting Office studied a number of projects and notes that much unneeded land has been acquired. The present practices of the Federal Government land assessment must be reassessed. This report is available through Congressman Leon Panetta's office."

"In light of this report, we feel we cannot be as trusting of the Federal Government and their proper administration of the area as Mr. Adams."

A representative of the Monterey County Council of Concern, Mr. Gibb Meyer, introduced himself. Mr. Meyer announced a meeting of a public forum to be held at Rancho Canada on Feb. 15 at 1:45 p.m. Mr. Meyer noted the Monterey County Council of Concern supports the Friends of the Big Sur Coast.

Letters of support were received from the Monterey County Taxpayers Association and the Carmel Highlands Property Owners Association.

The meeting ended with the general feeling of optimism with the hope that united, we can solve the problems that face the Big Sur Coast and us as individuals.

---

**Community Calendar**

**MARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AA Meeting</td>
<td>Health Clinic</td>
<td>EMT, Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health Clinic</td>
<td>EMT, Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Country of the Mind&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Dream &amp; Enigma&quot;</td>
<td>Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beggars Banquet</td>
<td>Food Co-op, Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;Country of the Mind&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Dream &amp; Enigma&quot;</td>
<td>Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;Country of the Mind&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Dream &amp; Enigma&quot;</td>
<td>Pacific Valley School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Friends of Big Sur Coast Barbecue</td>
<td>River Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EMT, Grange Hall</td>
<td>Health Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CAC Meeting</td>
<td>Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Co-op, Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Swallows return to Capistrano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AA Meeting</td>
<td>EMT, Grange Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Calendar is a new monthly feature, the purpose of which is to inform the public about meetings, events, entertainment, and items of public interest. To place something on next month's calendar, either phone us at 667-2222 or write to:

THE BIG SUR GAZETTE
Highway One • Big Sur, California 93920
More...  

Local News...

"Help Us Fight!"

Now is the time to stand up and shout, or we’ll be told what to do no doubt!

Fed’s running our lives, with its cons and cont’s...

Ever think you’d be wearing, forest green...

Evergreens, mountains and my laughless canine.

Rally around, Friends of the Big Sur Coast Alert all, of our impending new host.

Leave us alone, we know what’s the must,

Government housing, we’ll never discuss.

Overdevelopment is not our plan.

Very explicit control to each man.

Even the ones with money must pass,

Restriction of county, state and “Big Sur Clays.”

Never do we want to spoil the view.

Monuments we have, we don’t need any new.

Enough is enough! What more do we want?...

Night watchers in, our mountains to haunt?

Till we’re given a chance to show our stuff.

Intervention is out, we’re problems enough!

None we can’t solve, if we stand together.

Today, tomorrow, its now or never.

Error would be in not acting now.

Remove the threat and wipe our brow.

Very few won’t the continual flow,

Ever ending traffic, “Oh, the highway won’t grow.”

No trespassing will be a thing of the past.

Trampling “our lands” will be allowed at last.

Isn’t there enough of the established park? Or must we allow our senator his larks?

Not! Help Us Fight!!

Tootie Trotter

$2.4 Million Okayed for Beach Project

The state Public Works Board has approved spending $2.4 million for the purchase of 2,780 acres south of Carmel Highlands for the Garrapata Beach project.

The money will cover purchase of 10 of the 12 parcels authorized for acquisition in January 1979, according to the state Department of Parks and Recreation.

Golden Gate Was Most Popular Park

“...Earmark $800,000 for LCPS

Coast Commission Will Earmark $800,000 for LCPS

From Coastal Commission News Release

With less than a year remaining for local governments to prepare their local coastal programs (LCPS), the California Coastal Commission has earmarked more than $800,000 to carry out those LCPS which are completed ahead of schedule.

Noting the short time left, state Commission Executive Director Michael Fischer said, “We hope these funds will provide an incentive for early completions of the local coastal programs prior to the January 1981 deadline set by the Legislature.

‘Local governments, hard pressed by Proposition 13 cutbacks to carry out such programs, should welcome the chance to obtain the extra money needed for coastal protection,” said Fischer.

The money will be available only for projects or programs which actually carry out the approved coastal plans.

Examples of projects for which the incentive money could be used include fisheries management, protection of coastal resources, enhancement of urban waterfronts, provisions of access to the shoreline and reduction of losses due to coastal hazards.

Federal regulations prohibit the use of this money for land acquisition.

The goal of these 67 LCPS, required by the 1976 Coastal Act, is to carry out statewide coastal resource and access policies through local plans and zoning ordinances. Once approved by the Coastal Commission, the LCPS enable local governments to take over regulation of coastal developments, a process now handled by the six regional coastal commissions.

Since local governments will face the added work of issuing coastal permits once their LCPS are approved, the additional funds can also be used to pay for necessary increased staff and processing costs. It cannot be applied to costs unrelated to LCPS or otherwise required by state or local law.

The money comes from the federal Office of Coastal Zone Management which has already approved about $4 million for the LCP preparatory program.

Cities now eligible to participate in the incentive program include Carpinteria, Trinidad, Chula Vista, Rancho Palos Verde and Palos Verdes Estates, all with completed LCPS.

Another 15 LCPS are slated for state approval within the next six months.

River Inn Barbeque Scheduled

A fund-raising barbeque for the Friends of the Big Sur Coast will be held at River Inn from 10 to 5 p.m. on Saturday, March 15.

Roast pig and live music will highlight the event.

The purpose of the barbeque is to raise money to prevent further federal involvement or intervention in Big Sur, said a spokesman for the Friends.

Tickets for the event are $7.50 for adults, $5 for juniors (10-15), and children under 10 will be admitted free.

Linda Waterfall Concert

Public radio KAZU is proud to present Linda Waterfall in concert on Friday, March 7 at 8 p.m. in the MPC Music Hall.

Accompanying her on her current tour of the western states is Donnie Treadwell of the Sky Boys on percussion.

Tickets are $5.00 advance at Recycled Records, Monterey; $2.50 Music in the Barnyard and KAZU. They will be $7 at the door.

Coast Commission Will Earmark $800,000 for LCPS

Earmark $800,000 for LCPS

Coast Commission Will Earmark $800,000 for LCPS

Coast Commission Will Earmark $800,000 for LCPS

Fresh Seafood, Family Dinners, Great Views and your Favorite Refreshments! Just a sample of what our wharf restaurants offer
County Local Coastal Plan Lacks Funds

From the Herald
Feb. 27, 1980

Monterey County will not have the money to enforce a local coastal plan for Big Sur and will have to turn to the state and federal government for help, county and state officials told nearly 100 people meeting at the Big Sur Grange Hall Tuesday night.

Those same officials indicated it might be possible to get the outside assistance without major involvement of state and federal agencies in management of the scenic coastal area.

The discussion at the meeting of the Big Sur Citizens Advisory Committee followed by only a day the announcement by the Wilderness Society that it wants the federal government to create a National Scenic Area for Big Sur, to buy some developed parcels and put a halt to all new development along the coast.

Additional Development

The LCP being drafted by Monterey County, as required by the California Coastal Act, envisions some additional development in residential areas out of sight of Highway 1 and in existing commercial centers; acquisition of unbuildable lots visible from the highway; and provision for better management of natural resources in Big Sur and greater public access to beaches along the coast.

Tuesday night's meeting focused on how well the county could carry out those responsibilities. The answer, according to Supervisor Sam Farr of Carmel, whose Fifth District includes the Big Sur coast, said the LCP provides not only for acquisition of those lots in scenic areas where landowners are denied the right to build but also an ongoing management program.

"We have to buy land, provide management for beach access, a water management plan and implementation, wildlife habitat protection and planning permit reviews and enforcement," he said. "There are a lot of other costs implied besides acquisition of viewed lots. My best judgment is we would not be able to implement (the LCP) with just county resources."

Proposition 9

And, he added, with Proposition 9 looming as a new means to cut state tax revenues, "I don't think anybody in California can say if the state or county will be able to afford the plan."

Marjorie Adams, speaking from the audience, said that "if one were writing a play, this would be the theater of the absurd. We have a coastal law that requires the county to do things it can't afford. Don't you think we should start rethinking the whole thing?"

Mrs. Henderson noted that the county cannot consider the costs of enforcing its LCP when it adopts a plan that meets state requirements.

Joseph Petrillo and Don Rubinstein, both of the Coastal Conservancy, indicated that there might be state and federal monies available to acquire land and implement the LCP without strings attached that place the area under outside control.

Petrillo suggested that state monies from offshore oil drilling revenues could go to coastal protection in Big Sur. Rubinstein pointed to federal dollars from the Coastal Zone Management Act as a possible long-term source of aid.

And, Petrillo noted, as far as finding the best way to use the fund while protecting state and national interests as well as local concerns, "We can do just as well in this audience in Big Sur as can be done in Sacramento or Washington, or any place else."

Rubinstein said that there are "mechanisms of precedence for local control of federal money. It's not valid to assume that accepting federal money means you must tolerate a major federal presence."

Stresses Cooperation

The proposed county LCP stresses cooperation between local, state and federal agencies so all are working toward the same goal in Big Sur. This can't happen, Farr said, "without the largest member (the federal government) on the team."

It just happens to be ... the most beautiful place in the world

Luxurious Lanai * Garden Cottages * Fireplaces
Dining Terrace * Gourmet Food * Ideal Convention Facilities
Receptions * Weddings * Little Chapel in the Highlands
Sunset Lounge * Lauder Piano Bar * Year 'Round Swimming
Conference Facilities * Modified American Plan

The Enchantment of Yesterday Combined with the Luxury of Today...

Highlands Inn
Carmel's Only Ocean-Front Hotel
624-3801
Four miles south of Carmel on scenic Highway One
Friends of the Big Sur Coast

Open Letter to Big Sur CAC

To: Members of the Big Sur Citizens Advisory Committee From: The Friends of the Bia Sur Coast

On behalf of the Friends of the Big Sur Coast, we want to say that we appreciate the willingness—even eagerness—of the CAC to study alternatives other than the increased Federal intervention, in our efforts to come up with a workable LCP. We believe that the bulk of the Big Sur community has been lax in not providing you with the citizen input you need if you are to truly represent the interests of the community. We intend to rectify this situation and to that end one of our members, Peter Stock, has been working with some of your members, familiarizing himself with your background documents, while the rest of us are engaged in fighting off the immediate threat of Federal legislation.

Many of you now on the CAC, and others who served before you, have given several years of dedicated study and endured long and involved meetings for the LCP preparation. We think that the present legislation proposed by Senator Cranston is bad for many reasons, but among them is his failure to allow the LCP to be completed before attempting another form of control for the Big Sur Coast. If the federal role possible under the new legislation were to become law, your work would soon be meaningless. We intend to stop this legislation.

The first and most vital input we can give you is to inform you officially of the 654 Sur residents and property owners who have signed our petition saying that they want no increase in the level of federal intervention and involvement in Big Sur, and that they wish to preserve the historic balance of federal, state, county and private ownership and control of Big Sur. We are in the process of preparing these petitions for distribution to all our elected officials and will furnish you with a copy.

Again, to reiterate our position: 654 residents and property owners want no increase in the level of federal involvement on the Big Sur Coast. That position does not mean that we preclude a possible need someday for federal disaster relief, or for meeting the nation’s possible needs for coastal control during some national wartime emergency situation. It does mean that we do not want the federal government to own or control one more inch of land on the coast.

You are the legally designated body to prepare the LCP. We ask that you, as just stated, govern your deliberations, and that you consider the alternatives we present to you tonight, and that you seek and consider other alternatives to federal intervention from within your own committee and from individuals in the community. The Friends of the Big Sur Coast do not claim to have all the answers but we will continue to bring you possible alternatives as we come up with them.

First, we believe that the Coastal Commission and the eventual LCP must be more practical and dollar-wise in the efforts to preserve the grandeur of the coast—which is something we all want to do. To this end we urge a rigid and restrictive the Coastal Commission and the LCP are, the more dollars will be needed, and the less people will be permitted to use some part of their land. A maximum of houses can be built with restrictions, without destroying the views and tourist enjoyment, or the beauty of the coast we all love. There is an erroneous theme running through commission decisions that any visible or partially visible house is detrimental to tourist enjoyment and the enjoyment of future generations. We believe that is untrue. In already developed enclaves, additional houses do not harm tourist enjoyment. These and an occasional house on a hillside, or part of a house, or a light from a house at night, actually reinforce the American Dream—that if someone works hard enough, saves, does without, etc., and is willing to endure the occasional problems of life in Big Sur, he or she can achieve, can enjoy the rewards of living in this national scenic wonder, and can enjoy the way of life. That is what Big Sur is all about. We ask that you and the Coastal Commission consider this in all of your deliberations. (Please remember that the county, even if all 800 of us do not agree to the views of the 654 residents, we wish to be considered.)

We believe that it is vitally important for you to define the problems so that just how much land will be classified as unbuildable because of viewed protection as opposed to the natural restrictions imposed by the land.

We do not want the federal government to own or control one more inch of land on the Coast."

We have frequently heard that property taxes will force the breakup of large agriculture holdings. We are now investigating—and ask that you investigate—the possibility of legislation or a ballot proposition to change the tax laws to base agriculture property taxes on production yield rather than "prize or best use" which is residential usage. Changing the tax law which says that a parcel of land would be taxed on the real yield; its ability to support one steer per 40 to 50 acres, as opposed to agriculture land elsewhere in the state which can support one steer per four or five acres. We understand that some other states do not have tax laws of this kind.

Fifth, we have also heard frequently that the burden of inheritance taxes will cause breakup of large parcels. We ask you to consider the effect of possible legislation or a proposed ballot proposition currently being considered, to eliminate the state inheritance tax.

Changes in both property tax laws and inheritance tax laws would very significantly increase the chances of large parcels remaining intact under private stewardship.

Sixth, we ask that you consider the possibility of other tax incentives (reduced taxation and inverse taxation) for those people whose lands are in the viewed, to make it attractive and practical for them not to further use their lands. If the county is determined to prevent overdevelopment—as we are — then it must also be determined to pay some of the costs and not leave it all to be borne by the individual property owners in Big Sur.

Seventh, after all other possibilities have been investigated, should a need for funds still exist, we suggest you investigate the possibility of a state law requiring the state, the county or any private foundation to enforce these developments rights, scenic easements or fee title, to return all rights to the owner of the property, should the state, county or private foundation attempt to dispose of whatever rights or titles it or they have acquired.

Eighth, and this again concerns the county and its funds or lack of funds. Under the Coastal Act, it is the responsibility of the county to enforce the LCP once it has been written and approved by the state Coastal Commission, just as the county rights now has the responsibility to enforce zoning regulations. For the county to say that it does not have the money to enforce the LCP or the present zoning, is to evade its responsibility. The county must reevaluate its priorities: it is, or it is not important to protect the coast against overdevelopment. We believe that it is important—perhaps more important than other things on which the county is spending its available funds.

We ask that you keep the Friends committee informed of the progress of all deliberations, and to report on how you go and to continue to keep us informed so that you constantly keep in mind that the human presence in the landscape warms and enhances it. The people and the land are what make Big Sur what it is today.
CAC Schedules Series of Meetings

Planning Choices for the Coast

By ROGER NEWELL

Reserve the following dates:
March 8: Panel discussion with persons or groups who intend to make a policy recommendation on the management of the Big Sur Coast. Topic: A Practical Planning Solution for the Big Sur Coast. (Location to be announced)
March 11: Presentation of a planning packet to poll the community on a consensus for the recommendation the CAC should make to Monterey County and to Congressman Leon Panetta. (Grange Hall, 7:30 p.m.)
The CAC has scheduled a series of very important informational meetings to provide the Coastal Community with an accelerated review of the planning problems we face and a constructive reference point from which to develop a viable planning solution for the Coast.

Historical Perspective

In 1962, the people of the Big Sur Coast approved the Monterey County Master Plan. In 1970, the people of the state of California passed Proposition 20. In 1976, Prop. 20 became the Coastal Act which mandates that the county's Master Plan be brought into conformity with the issues raised by the act. Priorities for the uses of the coast were established, giving prime agricultural lands protection, and giving recreational opportunities on the coast preference over residential and other uses of the coast. At all times the protection of the environment shall prevail whenever any conflict in use arises.

As the CAC has studied the requirements of the Coastal Act, one of the things which has become painfully clear is that the total area is served by one access. Highway 1 is the inescapable constant which will affect the future of the Big Sur Coast.

The Coastal Act states that the Highway will remain as it now is, a two lane road.

There are three groups of property owners in competition for use of an already heavily used highway. These are the private owners (residential and commercial), the state owners (several agencies) and the federal owners (U.S. Forest Service being the largest).

Any solution to our coastal planning problems must consider the demands on Highway 1 by each of these groups.

The Coastal Act places the agencies of the state under the control of the Local Coastal Program (LCP). But what happens with the largest land owner in the planning area, the U.S. Forest Service, which is not under the direct authority of the coastal act? How does the community deal with this problem?

As a point of departure for discussion, the CAC is asking the Coastal Community to look at a cooperative council concept which would have the authority to deal with our mutual problems.

Earlier this year, members of the CAC, recognizing a time line problem, started a special study group to explore possible solutions to all of the planning problems. At one of these meetings Mr. Hans Ewoldsen presented a concept to solve the inter-governmental conflicts. The group felt that this concept had merit and has pursued it over the intervening months and feels it should now be presented to the community.

We want to put this concept into a forum context along with other management choices so that the community will have some alternatives from which to make a decision.

Council Concept: The intent of this concept is to keep the major forces in the coastal area in place, and to provide a context in which these forces can meet on mutual ground with equal strength since the decision of any one group affects the others. It is assumed it is better to make such decisions in the Big Sur area, rather than in Salinas, Sacramento and Washington, D.C.

Aspects of the Council to be discussed:
1. AREA — a boundary of jurisdiction agreed upon by the major owners.
2. AUTHORITY — the LCP established as the authority for the area of management.
3. MEMBERSHIP — representation from the county and major coastal owners.
4. POWERS — authority to coordinate and enforce the management of the LCP.
5. FUNDING — establishment of the magnitude of implementation needs and funding sources.

Please join us in a spirit of objectivity as we weigh our planning options for the future of our Big Sur Coast.
Hayakawa in Big Sur

Continued from Page 1

their boundaries to 3,000
acres, and which would have
given the Secretary of
Agriculture authority to
redraw the Forest boundary
with every purchase or gift.
Hayakawa said Cranston
saw no need for hearings,
"but I've learned here all
kinds of objections," he said.
He called Cranston's pro-
posed legislation without
hearings "an end run," and
said "the residents of Big Sur
are much more serious en-
vironmentalists than anybody
in Washington. "No outside agency can be
more ecologically responsible
than the people who are
already here," he said.
"You can only have the
government interfere to,
quote, save Big Sur, by hav-
ing them ruin it. The people
who live here, by tempera-
ment and by choice of
lifestyle, are passionate en-
vironmentalists who need to
be saved from environmen-
talists in New York, Los
Angeles, and Chicago who
want to take management of
the area away from them."

When asked about
rumored proposals for a toll
road or control road,
Hayakawa said he was "in
principle against toll roads,"
and he felt people should
have the right to drive down
the road.
"I don't believe in closing
areas off to tourists," he said.

Regarding recent proposals
from Ansel Adams and the
Wilderness Society to create a
Big Sur National Scenic
Area, Senator Hayakawa
said, "It seems to me ex-
cessive to add yet another
layer of government from
Washington to the existing
county and state Coastal
Commission laws."

When one reporter asked if
he thought there was a con-
spiracy, Hayakawa said,
"There are a number of peo-
ple who would like to see
more National Parks
established, but that does not
constitute a conspiracy, just
as people who oppose parks
don't constitute a conspiracy."

He drew a burst of laughter
from the press when he said,
"We like to use words like
conspiracy to describe those
we disagree with, but of

course, those on our side
have empiricre, objective
planning."

Responding to the argu-
ment made by park pro-
ponents that Big Sur was
threatened by overhear
ment, he said, "There never
has been any overdevelop-
ment as I can see."

"You can only have the
government interfere to, quote, save
Big Sur, by having
them ruin it. The people
who live here, by tempera-
ment and by choice of
lifestyle, are passionate environ-
mentalists who need to
be saved from environmen-
talists in New York, Los
Angeles, and Chicago
who want to take
management of the
area away from
them."

A democracy without a free and truthful flow of
information from government to its people is
nothing more than an elected dictatorship."  
John E. Moss (D-California)

DORIS FEE, Claire Chappellet and Senator Hayakawa laugh
as Marion Harlan dons a Tam-O'-Shanter.

SENATOR HAYAKAWA and aide listened to over 100 residents during recent visit.

ON BUS TOUR, Senator Hayakawa conversed with Barbara Chamberlains, Rosemary Rogers, and others.

A POTLUCK LUNCH was served at a local residence built by
homesteaders.

A Country Inn and Restaurant in Big Sur

Ventana Inn --
an authentic year-round country inn providing ocean-view
peace and privacy. Featuring Japanese hot baths, saunas,
heated swimming pool, and complimentary continental
breakfast.

Ventana Restaurant --
award-winning cuisine in an elegant, yet informal, ocean-view
setting. Cocktails, lunch and dinner, 11 a.m. to 10 p.m.,
every day of the year.

Ventana Store --
a country store of yesteryear, located adjacent to the Restau-
rant offering new standards of quality and uniqueness to
gift-giving.

28 miles South of Carmel on Highway One

For Information & Reservations, Call (408) 667-2331 or Write: Ventana, Big Sur, CA 93920
A Toll Road for Highway 1?

BIG SUR — Contrary to recent rumors regarding a Caltrans study to convert Highway 1 into a toll road, the Gazette learned from an interview with Webb Berkle of Caltrans that "we have no knowledge of any request for a toll road study."

"The only request received to date is from the Big Sur Foundation which wanted estimates of the annual cost of maintenance of Highway 1, from Malpaso Creek to Hearst Castle road," said Berkle.

"Maintenance costs for the road are over $1 million and reconstruction costs average $1.5 million, providing no major construction is involved."

Berkle said Caltrans had been receiving LCP planning documents from the county and had recently received a lengthy report from the CAC highway sub-committee titled "Design Standards for Big Sur Highway."

Another Caltrans spokesman said, "A toll road in Big Sur would be very expensive and would never pay for itself."

Dewey Bishop of Caltrans said that any change to a toll road would require state or federal legislation to change it from its present State Scenic Highway status.

Nimmo Raps Park Plan

Continued from Page 1 feed inflation, part of which comes from massive federal acquisitions of private lands."

He referenced Phil Burton's new $70 million Channel Islands National Park bill as the most recent example.

"Federal acquisition is unnecessary in areas such as Big Sur, because the Coastal Commission has the authority and responsibility to protect the area."

"It makes no sense to me to spend more millions of dollars to take the property off the tax rolls, asserted for the purpose of protection, when it is already protected from excessive development by California law."

"I'm not sure of the motivation of the people proposing it, but they clearly have not gotten the message of Propositions 13 and 4." In response to the Wilderness Society's recent proposal for a National Scenic Area, Senator Nimmo said, "It is an undue restriction on the right of people of the United States to enjoy the coast."

He said that governmental agencies should not be allowed to control people to that extent.

Senator Nimmo concluded that he was "irrevocably opposed to the expenditure of vast amounts of federal dollars that would take additional land off the tax rolls when it is already protected by the Coastal Act. We don't need to spend more millions and simply add to a runaway inflation rate for what is essentially a useless purpose."

Youth Conservation Corps

Applications Available for Los Padres Summer Jobs

The Los Padres National Forest is offering the opportunity for young people between the ages of 15 to 18 to participate in the Youth Conservation Corps Program during the summer.

According to Forest Supervisor Fritz deHoll, there will be a total of 120 jobs available on the Los Padres N.F. This year we plan to operate three camps on the Forest," deHoll said. "The camps will be located near King City, Ojai and Frazier Park. The main objectives of this program are to offer an opportunity for young people to work in and learn about the environment and natural resources while earning money."

Young people interested in learning more about this program may obtain a brochure and an application from their local school counseling offices. This information is also available at any of the Forest Service offices located in King City, Santa Maria, Los Plietos, Ojai and Frazier Park. Applications must be completed and mailed in by March 15.

"We are extremely pleased to be able to offer this kind of an opportunity to the young people of this area," deHoll stated. "During their eight-week participation in the program they will work in projects such as hiking, trails, campgrounds, fuelbreaks, wildlife, erosion control and litter cleanup. In addition to the experience they will gain, the Forest Service and the taxpayer also benefit. These young people accomplish a great deal of much needed conservation related work."

In 1979, 139 participants in the Los Padres CCC program accomplished more than 21 man years of work valued at over $125,000 during the eight-weeks the program was operating.

Selection of these individuals for these jobs is done on a random basis from applicants living within four to six hours travel time from each camp. Enrollees stay at camp during the week and return home on weekends.

FOREST SERVICE OFFICES:
Monterey Ranger District
406 S. Mildred
King City, CA 93940
(408) 383-5344
Forest Headquarters
42 Aero Camino
Goleta, CA 93017
(805) 968-1578

Youth Conservation Corps

Applications Available for Los Padres Summer Jobs

The Los Padres National Forest is offering the opportunity for young people between the ages of 15 to 18 to participate in the Youth Conservation Corps Program during the summer.

According to Forest Supervisor Fritz deHoll, there will be a total of 120 jobs available on the Los Padres N.F. This year we plan to operate three camps on the Forest." deHoll said. "The camps will be located near King City, Ojai and Frazier Park. The main objectives of this program are to offer an opportunity for young people to work in and learn about the environment and natural resources while earning money."

Young people interested in learning more about this program may obtain a brochure and an application from their local school counseling offices. This information is also available at any of the Forest Service offices located in King City, Santa Maria, Los Plietos, Ojai and Frazier Park. Applications must be completed and mailed in by March 15.

"We are extremely pleased to be able to offer this kind of an opportunity to the young people of this area," deHoll stated. "During their eight-week participation in the program they will work in projects such as hiking, trails, campgrounds, fuelbreaks, wildlife, erosion control and litter cleanup. In addition to the experience they will gain, the Forest Service and the taxpayer also benefit. These young people accomplish a great deal of much needed conservation related work."

In 1979, 139 participants in the Los Padres CCC program accomplished more than 21 man years of work valued at over $125,000 during the eight-weeks the program was operating.

Selection of these individuals for these jobs is done on a random basis from applicants living within four to six hours travel time from each camp. Enrollees stay at camp during the week and return home on weekends.

FOREST SERVICE OFFICES:
Monterey Ranger District
406 S. Mildred
King City, CA 93940
(408) 383-5344
Forest Headquarters
42 Aero Camino
Goleta, CA 93017
(805) 968-1578
Editorial:

The Big Sur National Park ... Why Not?

Recent proposals for a Big Sur National Park or Scenic Area cite the need for urgent federal legislative action to protect Big Sur from overdevelopment and to maximize opportunities for the recreating public.

Opponents of the park proposals cite that an average of a dozen homes are built a year, and that the 1.5% growth rate added to the existing 700 homes in 75,000 acres of private land does not constitute overdevelopment.

Proponents of a federal designation reason that the area should be owned and managed by a single federal agency and, although the USFS has a presence in the area, that the National Park Service is the most experienced and qualified managing entity.

Opponents of federal ownership and control point out the excellence and balance of existing private, State Park, and USFS stewardship; a drive down the coast, they claim, proves their point.

Park proponents claim that a federal designation would solve the problem of possible future overdevelopment and would provide a process for preservation, while park opponents state the problems posed are unsubstantiated and a federal designation would, in fact, create more problems that it proposes to solve.

What happens to an area when legislated as a new federal designation?

National Park and Forest Service statistics indicate that from three to five years after an area becomes federally designated by Congress, the number of annual visitors to the area quadruples.

Last week figures released by the National Park Service for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) revealed that last year's 11.3 million visitors was a 28% increase over 1978. The GGNRA was established in 1972.

According to Caltrans, Big Sur has 3,000,000 annual visitors. The statistics would indicate that, if Big Sur became a National Park this year, by 1985, it would have 12,000,000 visitors.

Park proponents Ansel Adams and Bill Turnage have advocated a public transportation system consisting of a caravan of buses carrying visitors from staging areas to and from the Hearst Castle. A parking facility to accommodate 1,000 cars is recommended for both the north and south ends of the park.

Each vehicle in a parking facility requires a 10 by 40 foot space (for parking and backing out), or 400 square feet per vehicle. With 42,000 square feet in an acre, about 100 cars can be parked per acre.

Disregarding larger recreational vehicles, the proposed 1,000-car parking area would require 10 acres of land on one level or a one-acre garage 10 stories high. (A football field is approximately one acre in size.)

Assuming there are three people per car and 30 people per bus, each bus could transport the equivalent of 30 cars. Hence, 300 buses would be required to serve each of the two 1,000-car parking facilities.

The 600 buses could be parked at night in the facilities providing the cars had no overnight privileges.

Location of the staging area parking facilities could be on Odell property at the north end and below the Hearst Castle on the southern end of the park.

However, 1,000 cars containing 3,000 people at each end would allow only 2,190,000 people per year to visit the park, which is almost one million fewer visitors than present use.

To accommodate the anticipated 12,000,000 visitors to the new Big Sur Park by 1985, parking facilities for 4,000,000 cars would be required. Providing the use was equally divided year-round instead of the present summer tourist peaks, the two parking lots would be 350 acres each, or two garages or one acre area by 55 stories high, to house 10,958 vehicles daily.

1,095 buses would be required to transport the 12 million visitors on a daily basis.

By 1985, the federal designation for Big Sur would create a net increase (from the existing 3 million to 12 million) of 9 million visitors to the Monterey Peninsula — an increase of 129% over the existing 7 million Peninsula visitors.

Residents of the Monterey Peninsula could anticipate a 129% increase in visitor needs of food and lodging, fuel and services, water and sanitation capacity.

Park proponents claim that "the Peninsula already operates the most successful tourist industry in the state and would be able to handle the staging area function."

Park opponents claim that the attraction of a new federal park would convert Cambria and the Peninsula into parking lots and feed lots for tourists.

Proponents reason that legislation is urgently needed to Save Big Sur, that they are dedicated to the concept of preservation by federal legislation, and that the park must be rushed through the legislative process this election year or the opportunity will be lost.

Opponents claim the urgency, they hold steadfastly to the status quo of existing stewardship, and they argue that the proponents' plans are a panic effort to plunge Big Sur into a park without any participation or review by local or Peninsula residents.

The Big Sur National Park — Why or Why Not?

Perhaps those questions and others are best directed to Ansel Adams, Wilderness Society director Bill Turnage, Coastal Commissioner Zad Leavy, Supervisor Sam Farr, CAC Chairman Roger Newell, Congressmen Leon Panetta and Phil Burton, and Senator Cranston.
Dear Editor:
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Dear Editor: (please reprint)

under things years old, in protection of the and develop legislation leading regarding Norman. His letters to there has been no My introduction to this I would I am hopeful that we can

Paul

No Big Sur Bill in Congress

Dear Editor: (please reprint)

Dear Paul Viereque:

In accordance with your telephone conversation with a member of my staff on Jan. 24, I would like to assure you that there has been no bill regarding the Big Sur area introduced in the Congress. I am hopeful that we can find a way very soon to jointly develop legislation leading to the protection of the outstanding scenic and environmental values of the Big Sur Coast.

Phillip Burton Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks & Insular Affairs

California Is Ripe for Rail

Dear Editor:

Trains, not dirty planes, must be the workhorse for moving people within California in the new era of energy nightmares. Rail passenger service will cut costly OPEC addiction, air and noise pollution, as well as congestion. And rail isn’t a nostalgic step backwards but a big jump towards energy survival for all. Even our tourist trade will catch more flicker fun-lovingardines with the much safer rail.

But above all, rail will stop OPEC-spoiling planes from turning California into one super-aircraft carrier, bent on wrecking our cities. Rail will help heal the terrible wounds already inflicted by aviation.

Last year the French carried over 700 million of our passengers on their railroad network while consuming only 1 percent of France’s energy.

These statistics are intended to prod Southern Pacific to look up for a moment from their many bottom lines and take up "railroading for Californiаns". California, with half the population of France, is ripe for rail. Energy security compels prosperous SP to compete aggressively with deregulated aviation. Competition can start by putting trains to Monterey back on the tracks. Trains, tracks, roadbed, right-of-way stations, and energy-conscious military passengers are on tap, so prattle about zillions is all hogwash.

You’ll know you’re winning the energy war when seagulls depart from Monterey railroad station and move over to our airport runways. You can help push 250 seats in a fleet of four rail politicians to rail before you vote.

Thomas McGrath

Supports Friends of the Big Sur Coast

Dear Editor:

As pertains to William Turnage’s decrying of “fear mongering” tactics (U.S. Wilderness Society Unveils Big Sur Proposal, Herald, Feb. 26, 1980), I am reminded of President Truman’s response to charges that he was conducting his 1948 re-election campaign as a “muddler.””If it is considered ‘Muddling’ to go out to every village and every town in this land and to tell the people what the facts of life are,” Harry replied, “then I’m a ‘muddler.’”

Mr. Turnage continues to molly concerns about a federal “takeover” of the area are almost humours in their inconsistency with later calls for “the greater use of mass transit to provide access to the coast,” the establishment of “staging areas for visitors at both ends of the scenic area,” to include museums and interpretive facilities, and the provision of “parking garages for 1,000 cars at either end of Highway 1.”

Those proposals, termed proper “federal management” by Mr. Turnage, but labeled “fear mongering” when more closely examined by the likes of Charles Cushman, or CBS’s Tom Snyder and Jessica Savitch, are exactly what we need to daylight out of the residents concerned, who have done such an admirable job in preserving the Big Sur Coast as the unapologetically wild and, yes, Mr. Turnage, “unique” experience that it is.

They are also the reasons why this foundation fully supports Friends of the Big Sur Coast in their efforts to keep federal involvement -- and with it, communication, traffic congestion and over-crowding -- forever out.

Helmut L. Meyer Executive Director, Monterey County Foundation of Concern, Inc.

Should Resist Federal Involvement

Dear Editor:

I am a citizen of Alaska who, over the past few winters, has become familiar with Big Sur and the problems it now faces. Big Sur possesses many of the same qualities which have endeared Alaska to its people. Both are unique, ruggedly beautiful landscapes, but of equal importance, they are both the home of the ruggedly beautiful individual. Both are equally endangered.

Thanks to Senator Hayakawa

Dear Editor:

The following letter was sent to Senator S.I. Hayakawa:

There comes a time when even a campaign needs a renewed commitment, stim­ ulous and exciting. Your visit to Big Sur as the guest of the Friends of the Big Sur Coast was the kind of renewal that any organization would be grateful for . . . but for us it was that and much more. Suddenly we had a representative in Washington who was eager enough to hear his people that he would come to them despite one of the busiest schedules known to man. Suddenly we had someone who would listen to the “little” man, who would look for himself to see how well the Coast has been preserved by those who live on it and love it. Suddenly some of the power was on our side.

If we were active and effective before your visit to Big Sur, we are now unshakable in our determination to prevent any further increase in the level of federal involve­ ment in Big Sur, committing ourselves to all that means.

The Friends of the Big Sur Coast are grateful to you for having sounded the first alarm in January . . . and for your visit . . . for your ability to define our cause in a few phrases . . . for your willingness to help us. Word of your visit and concern has re­ sounded up and down the coast, calling out new volunteers for the cause.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Steering Committee for the Big Sur Coast for your time and energy, and once again thank you for your visit and rallying comments.

Jim JOEFO
General Chairman
Friends of the Big Sur Coast

Big Sur

I sit high upon my mountain looking far out over the sea Making a mental note of all the beauty that surrounds me The Douglas fir with their needles so fine And scattered all around the whispering pine The majestic live oak with their gorgeous beauty and shade Just a few of the wonders that God has made That God’s redwood trees so straight and tall I bow my head in reverence Now, the sun is slowly sinking with the rainbow color There Father in heaven I thank you for my home in the wilderness of Big Sur

Marvel Phillips, Captains
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An Innovative Notion Expressed

Dear Editor,

In our time innovation is deemed a virtue in itself. So let me advance an "innovative" notion of my own. My newspaper reports that at Marina Del Rey the California Coastal Commission has required the owner of the 300-room Marina Belle Hotel, in order to get the "Save Our Coast" commission's permit, "to set aside at least 45 rooms during weekends for rent to moderate and low-income vacationers at half the going rate."

The developer, one Abraham Lurie, capitulating said, "It's a form of blackmail I am willing to pay." To do so he "will use ZIP codes to determine which vacationers are poor and therefore entitled to the half-price rooms."

A moment's thought will reveal the endless difficulties that will arise from discriminating to make some shot in the dark. So, although I do not worship the socialist-equalitarian bandwagon, I am not ashamed to cheerfully propose innovative expansion of the kind of thing imposed upon the submissive Mr. Lurie. To begin, let all of us, artistic photographers, painters and sculptors, and the like, follow the example of the California Coastal Commission and, instead of escalating our prices to the limit, give part of our products to the possessors of low-income ZIP codes for greatly reduced prices, so that the poor also may embellish their homes with works of art. Likewise, lawyers and architects will offer part of their services to people with selected ZIP codes for small fees.

Is this a sly idea? I think not. It is simply carrying the gospel according to the Coastal Commission to its logical conclusion. I hope that many will embrace the challenge of this innovative idea and carry it out voluntarily without governmental compulsion.

Anyway, Senator Hayakawa's scorching of Carter's dishonorable trick and Carter's pull-out were good signs.

Edgar Bonsanto, Santa Cruz

'Battle for Big Sur' Victim

Unfairly Compared to Sawtooth

Congressman Leon Panetta 380 Alvarado Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Leon: Enclosed is a copy of a letter to the Big Sur Foundation which explains itself.

I have sent you a copy and want you to know I have resigned because of my understanding that my name has been used by the Foundation in Washington that even old time residents approved of the Foundation's actions and beliefs.

I have stated before, I am for some kind of equal control authority, but, no increased "Buy-Out" Power for any county or private agency or group. The Big Sur Coast has been compared to the Sawtooth area, but unfairly. The Sawtooth area had no zoning and we have very strict zoning. Sawtooth had developers and we do not and never have had. Mr. Leavy's "facts" on numbers of houses being built are NOT correct, and Mr. Ansel Adams' statement that every time he drives down the coast he sees new roads tearing the hills down, new houses block the views, is simply not true. No new roads have been built in years within view of the highway.

If I can of any help to explore the worth of the concept of a joint powers control group or agency with the county I or any community give of it, please call on me.

Don A. McQueen

A Letter to Roger Newell

Dear Editor:

Please publish the following letter to Roger Newell, chairman, CAC.

The letter writer has written to the CAC describing the conversation he had with Mr. Newell on Feb. 12. I feel that since this is a very important issue and reasons for your resigning, have been made public, that I might expand on the context of our conversation and the things you contended to say in your resignation speech and your letter.

I read the letter you have written to the CAC describing the conversation with me on Feb. 12. I feel that since this is a very important issue and reasons for your resigning, have been made public, that I might expand on the context of our conversation and the things you contended to say in your resignation speech and your letter.

I said to you that I was aware of the incredible number of people who are putting into the CAC. That you have done a great job, but I felt in the interest of the LCP, and to continue the process of moving the county and community, it would be best for you to step down in your step down as chairman. I stated over and over in our conversations that the most important thing is to continue the process of developing a plan that as many people of this coast as possible can accept, believe in and somehow find a way of making a living without causing the irreversible damage that is coming to this coast.

Don A. McQueen

Don't Want to Live in a Park

Dear Editor:

Enclosed is my letter to Congressman Jack Kemp.

Jack Kemp, Member of Congress, Committee on Banking, Urban Affairs and Consumer Protection, Washington, DC 20515

Dear Jack:

We last corresponded about a year ago, regarding your interest in the expansion of Forest Service facilities along the Big Sur coast. I believe your interest in reducing federal control, while individuals and communities who already have a stronger basis to maintain their own affairs and interests than the Federal Government, is well established in nature, has not diminished.

Is it for that reason that I'm writing to you now. Senator Alan Cranston, without the knowledge of Big Sur citizens and without the opportunity for public hearings, recently introduced a bill to amend the Local Coastal Plan and needs to develop a plan that as many people of this coast as possible can accept, believe in and somehow find a way of making a living without causing the irreversible damage that is coming to this coast.

I wholeheartedly support the LAPEL-XPQ, be it private or public, that will protect this beautifully rugged, but fragile land for future generations. The Big Sur area is a legally constituted body, legitimately designated by the national government. These Big Sur citizens are dedicated Americans who believe in and are fighting for what they believe is best for their community and our country, without much gratitude.

They are people who understand the meaning of privacy, while sharing harmoniously with neighbors and visitors; people who are more close to and better at maintaining the delicate ecological balance that has given Big Sur its naturalism from Washington. This community is now close to the completion of its Local Coastal Plan and needs the freedom from further federal intervention to continue its work in protecting this area from any careless development, be it private or governmental.

Jack, we don't want to live in a park. It would be like living in a place where the only roads and signs and concessions and mileage markers are employed, and all the trees and grass develop a naming and bored sameness that reflects the image of larger and larger Government/Big Brother Control.

Last Saturday Senator Hayakawa visited Big Sur and heard many local residents, some third and fourth generation, others, newcomers like me, describe their strong wishes to allow the local process of planning to proceed, local control and protection to continue. The senator vigorously supported the continuation and gave me hope, after investigating the issues, you will too.

I am sending an information packet which presents several perspectives of the problem.

Please, Jack, give this some immediate attention. If you act on my behalf you will represent a microcosm of an American dilemma: the ever increasing development of ordinary citizens and their legitimate interests by a seemingly insensitive state legislature of more and more control.

Alan J. Perlmutter
**Big Sur Is a Wild Land**

Dear Editor:

I am concerned about the activity in motion which would designate Big Sur as a National Historic Site, a National Park, or a potentially, a national park. As a resident of Big Sur, I would be extremely sorry to see the area come under the control of the federal government. We are ourselves, that we can manage and plan our own development, or perhaps not.

Big Sur is, above anything else, a wild land. Even those who own their own properties must bow with respect to the fact that this land belongs to God, and is most surely under no controls except the laws of nature. Big Sur myth has it that everyone cannot live here. The wildness of the area affects humans’ lifestyle and the remoteness and isolation of the way of living, is a challenge not suited to everyone. But certainly everyone who has chosen Big Sur holds its beauty in reverence. Neither wildlife nor Big Sur could continue if our mountains were confined within a government fence.

Last summer, my husband and I decided to go away for a few days. We drove to Big Sur and headed for Yosemite National Park.

Firstly, we learned that the park’s organized camping areas are filled to capacity during most of the summer. Reservation is required to drive ahead through Ticketton. When we did find a space for our tent, we found ourselves surrounded by large truck-type campers, trailers, and mobile homes separated from each other by only a few feet, and we couldn’t hear stereo music from three different sources at once. Families brought bicycles, lawns chairs, electric outdoor lights and all kinds of children’s toys. This is not a vacation in the wilderness: it is an experience of transforming the wilderness into a city housing development. In the evening we attended a park lecture on how to handle the bears. The bears are a severe hazard to the people in the park. Some people actually feed bears in order to get a picture of themselves doing so. Others leave coolers of food on top of their picnic tables. The bears become “peopleized.” They cruise the camping areas looking for goodies. If they don’t find food, they can become angry and aggressive. Some bears have had to be killed because of the threat to humans.

The problem is that thousands of people cannot flood into Big Sur without radically changing the wild character of the country. Big Sur residents have a strong vested interest in tourism and the future, since most of the summer. We would like to see more control in the area.

I think that the lack of direction is a deliberate attempt to mislead and continue understanding the function of the LCP was not to completely rewrite the county regulations, but rather to achieve a possible task for a group of CPOA Unhappy

**Against Federal Takeover**

Dear Editor:

I would like to express my opinion in regards to the Big Sur Coast. I am an endorser also an article from the San Francisco paper that is a pack of lies and they are underestima- ed. You should be aware of this.

The Big Sur Coast doesn’t need any federal or state or any other protector. We have done that very well ourselves!

And now with all the restrictions on coastal lands it is impossible for the development of land to take place.

People like Ansel Adams do not speak for the Big Sur Coast. We don’t appreciate his taking that upon himself and his Washington cronies.

Ansel Adams’ wife is one of the Curry’s who have all the concessions at Yosemite and have made it a rats nest for the sale of land—I guess that’s what he wants for our coast too—well we don’t!

If you represent the people of the area you will vote against controls! Help us protect the coast—from the state or federal governments. Federal, state and county governments own 53 percent of California now—please don’t take any more land off of the tax rolls.

Mary Ruth Spencer
Carmel Highlands

**Disillusioned with LCP**

Dear Editor:

During my absence from the area for two weeks I had time to explore my feelings with regard to my part in the Carmel LCP process. The time I spent working with the county officials on the Highlands-Riviera Master Plan learning the intricacies of planning, zoning, etc., as they carefully directed us toward our planning goals was very pleasant and enlightening. I find it to be in marked contrast to my present CAC experience.

I must admit that I have become completely disillusioned with the lack of direction shown in the preparation of our Local Coastal Plan for this area. We have never been given any understandable information of what our future as members of the Citizens’ Advisory Committee is intended to be— the limits of our authority—how much weight our advice will have with the county and regional and state Coastal Commissions.

It seems to me that the lack of direction is a deliberate attempt to mislead and continue understanding the function of the LCP was not to completely rewrite the county regulations, but rather to achieve a possible task for a group of CPOA.

**The Rosalie Tarpening Case**

Dear Friends:

**Being a rural area, where many women practice home births with a midwife in attendance, the case of Rosalie Tarpening should be of interest to this community. It is the story of a midwife who delivered a still-born baby and was then charged with first degree murder.**

It has happened again! Your freedom of choice has been challenged. Again under tragic circumstances your help is desperately needed. From the moment the news was passed from friend to friend that Rosalie Tarpening was arrested in January with first degree murder and practicing medicine without a license, the shock of this in-justice was felt throughout the freedom-loving health community.

To our knowledge, this is the first time that a charge of first-degree murder has been brought under these circumstances. It raises the question of personal choice and ultimate responsibility in the selection of the birth environment and attendant. We have also been advised that there are “substantial legal issues involved all along the way.” This will be very expensive.

For those of us who know, respect and love Rosalie Tarpening, all other aspects and issues pale beside our single focus, her acquittal, and vindication for all of us interested in alternative health care.

There are indications that the Tarpening case may drag on for some years. It will be necessary to establish a system of support that can sustain a long battle in the courts. To do that we need money, a lot of it, and soon. According to the lawyers, this case may cost upwards of $50,000 to come to trial. Rosalie was arraigned in Superior Court in Madera, Calif., on Dec. 3, 1979. The next hearing is set for Feb. 1, also in Madera.

We ask for your help: contact your friends, organizations and financial sources, publicize the situation and send money.

From your organizations, we would like to see resolutions passed in support of Rosalie; additionally, can we use your group’s name in our literature? Do you have any suggestions? Please help!

Please feel free to write the Defense Fund for further information. Because of the seriousness of the charges and the legal complications involved in this unprecedented case, we ask your understanding if we are not able to address the particular thoroughly.

At the heart of it, we love Rosalie and will do whatever is possible to relieve her and her family of the burden of this unnecessary tragedy. Help! We need your sup- port! Please keep in touch.

Dave Peterson
THE BIG SUR COAST

Robin Coventry — Map
A Timely "Tartuffe" at the Forest

Moliere nearly burned for "Tartuffe." Literally.
On May 12, 1664, he presented his comedy on the dangers of religious frauds and was promptly forbidden to show it in public. Only the favor of Louis XIV kept the Archbishop of Paris from having Moliere burned at the stake. The subject has not lost its timeliness.

In the Staff Players' production at the Indoor Forest Theatre we see how a deadly serious subject can become hilarious.
The hypocrite Tartuffe snaks his way into a wealthy household by playing "holier than thou." The father of the family awards him both household and daughter. But Tartuffe wants the wife, and so begins his downfall.

Nicholas Hovick presents Tartuffe as a straight character. The French tradition has been to paint him in whiteface with lascivious red lips and rolling eyes. Mr. Hovick felt, however, that American tradition and recent events called for a more serious approach.

In this production the choice part is Dorine, the daughter's outspoken maid, played by Nancy L. Bernhard. She sees through everyone's hypocrisies and gets into a lot of trouble by telling idiots the truth.
The Forced Marriage stars Jeff Hudelson as Sganarelle, an aging bachelor seduced into marriage by a lovely but frivolous young temptress. As usual, Mr. Hudelson becomes his character so convincingly that all shiver when he cannot escape the match.

Young Stephen Anthony Moore shows himself to be an excellent comic character actor as a nit-picking philosopher. He should do more such roles.

An Excellent Cast Assembled for Hidden Valley Opera

The Hidden Valley troupe has the vocal chords for Mozart, but they may break their necks on that stage.
It has a series of large-helds designed to represent the canals of Venice. The singers carry in props for scene changes in the dark, not without mishap.
Oberwise the show is great. Every part is difficult and well done.

The excellent cast includes Reg Huston, recently seen at HV as Terzie in Fidelio on the Roof, Deborah Carahugh, well known to Western New York audiences, and Velvali de Ayza, who played Hoteli in Fiddler. John Giger and wife Mary Henrichs-Giger devote much of their year to sacred concerts, but at HV they play the evil Don Giovanni and his forsaken love Dona Elvira. Outstanding lyric tenor Gregory Mercer, who has understudied Luciano Pavarotti at the Chicago Lyric Opera, delivers two superb arias.
The evil Don Giovanni (Don Juan) has dedicated his life to seduction. He feels so remorse when his last results in murder.
On stage he isn't all that successful with the ladies, either, thanks to his virginal mistress. At last he is dragged into hell by a marble statue of his murder victim.
Don Giovanni was a hit at Prague in 1787 as well as at HV in 1974. Mozart was popular enough to steal a tune from his own Figaro for the last scene and have a character call it "over­ rated." Two hundred years later, we still laugh.
Mozart composed the complicated music in six months, and managed to create a few sonatas at the same time. The com­ plicated libretto by Lorenzo da Ponte was borne in 63 days while he wrote two other opera librettos at the same time. But there is nothing rushed about the production. It lasts three hours.
We seldom hear older opera. In Mozart's day opera was evolving from a procession of difficult arias to musical plays. Don Giovanni is both. It has both violent drama and comedy, strong choruses and vocal acrobatics.
Definitely a treat for the ear, sometimes a treat for the eye.
Even in modern dress, Don Giovanni leaves the audience talking about it long after the finale.

Quintessence of Kumquat

Now on the market, kumquats are a miniature citrus fruit with a rind that is sweet and aromatic and a pulp that is acid. Eaten raw, it is best to enjoy nature's balance — rind and all. Originally cultivated in China and Japan, as an ornamental tree, kumquats were often potted and dwarfed and presented at great banquets so the guests could pluck the orange­gold fruit direct from the little trees.
The following recipe is a variation on nature's theme — so that your guests will delight in the most perfect embodiment of the essence of kumquat.

KUMQUAT MOUSSE

2 cups kumquat puree
1/4 cup cord water
3 Tbsp. lemon juice
2 Tbsp. cognac
2 Tbsp. sour cream
KUMQUAT PUREE:
Seed and boil whole fruit until tender. Puree in blender or food pro­ cessor.
1. Bring puree to point of boil in double boiler.
2. Soak geatin in water and add to puree with sugar and lemon juice.
3. Add salt and cognac.
4. Whip one pint of whipping cream, then stir in 2 Tbsp. sour cream.
5. Fold cream into puree.
6. Chill in mold or serving bowl for at least 4 hours before serving.
Garnish and gild each serving with a dollop of whipped cream and a topping of Papaya Syrup (sold in natural food stores).

Claire's Cooking Corner

SUPPORT YOUR BIG SUR VOLUNTEER BY DONATING TO THE BRASSERIE

THE MANDALA BOOKSTORE

THE MANDALA BOOKSTORE
New & Used Books
MEDITATION • PSYCHIC FAIR SUNDAY, MARCH 9
METAPHYSICS • ASTROLOGY • HEALTH CONSCIOUSNESS
THE CLUB
MONTEREY'S FINEST NIGHTCLUB DISCOTHEQUE
Disco Dancing Nightly 8-2 SUNDAY — Live bands MONDAY — Ladies' Night (no cover) Fashion Show 9:30 TUESDAY — Locals' Night (no cover) WEDNESDAY — A special night of Ballroom Dancing to the Big Band Sounds 8 p.m. THURSDAY — Live bands DISCO DANCE LESSONS 8:30-9:30
646-9244 Alvarado at Del Monte • Monterey (ABOVE THE BRASSERIE RESTAURANT)
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NICK HOVICL is the sourless Tartuffe, the arch-hypocrite of Moliere's serious comedy at the Indoor Forest Theater.
Memories of Big Sur in the Back Road Days

By BETTY BARRON

"It seems like only yesterday that I rode with my father on a wooden wagon drawn by two horses past the Dead Ranch on the old coast road," recalls Frank Lloyd, who first came to the Big Sur coast in 1950. Since that time, he has been all but one of the family that built a home in the remote valley. In 1960, Frank and his wife, Marjory, moved to their present home on the coast. So far, they have been here for 12 years, and they are not planning on leaving.

"I spent my childhood here," says Frank, "and I have been coming here for as long as I can remember. My family first came here in 1905, when my father, Ernest Lloyd, was doing plant research at the Carnegie Coastal Laboratory."

"It was not until Frank took her down the coast in their 475 Nash and she saw the sign "Big Sur," that she reached the 'home' that was the most beautiful bit of coastline in the world," says Marjory Lloyd, who was one of the family that built a home in the remote valley.

"The most memorable event for Marjory and Frank Lloyd during their first visit here was to the gardens of the Wildflower Party given by the Lloyd family. They were also the guests of two horses past the Doud Ranch on the old coast road. At night, they were photographed by a photographer who was one of the family that built a home in the remote valley.

"We were driving along the coast road and we saw a sign 'Big Sur,'" says Marjory. "But we were daddy and son, and we didn't have a car, so we couldn't go."

"We were daddy and son, and we didn't have a car, so we couldn't go."
March Ramble:  

The Gladiator  

By JUDITH GOODMAN

A minor case of cabin fever. Three days of wild wind-whipped rain from the south. Zero visibility. Much too strenuous even for me, who loves all kinds of weather, to venture outside. Too many flying objects.

I've been warm and dry. Only three major drips in this well-built house, none of them strategic. I've kept busy—baking Jewish motherbread and peanut butter cookies, devouring 820 pages of Hanah Yo, an enchanting book by Ruth Beebe Hill. Feeling snug. Plenty kerosene. Fuzzy swamp by walking the dog. No worries about losing my light like my fortunate friends on Patterson Ridge with their all-electric house.

Enough already! I am sick of here and it. For three solid days I have beat my brains out searching for words of williwm to comfort myself and anyone else in Big Sur who is troubled by fear of future losses. Privileged to live here these past 10 years in this paradise, have I learned anything that I can put in words to cast light on the present moment? If not, what's the use of all?

On the fourth day, sick of words and myself, I crumple up the 15th false start. There's a hole in the wall of incessant sound, the elegant curve of the cliff behind me. I seek for some sign that the wild bear still roost here; not a single farrow. It's been two years now since the boar retreated to the untouched wilds of Molera.

The chapsrall is sweet with the heavy scent of wild lilies; the fact that the parsley and the grass is thickening; the fact that I can make out the thistles on the hillside at the edge. At last, trudging through the redwoods where wild iris bloom, I begin to enjoy. The woods are full of delicate views both north and south, and exposure to every wind. There ought to be a law requiring folks to live on their land for a calendar year before submitting plans. A law to save us from our follies.

I make my way down the trail through the thistles at the edge. There to be a law requiring us to comfort and anyone else in the world reaching the task, development would follow. So it is. Development follows water.

At the watershed, a wind from the south carries promise of more rain to come. It is time to get moving, top brooding, turn my back on the mess. But I must find a path through the soggy below the windbreak house that has mushroomed on the very spot where, seven years ago, a wind picked me up by my back porch and put me down in a place else. The windless spot on the ridge. I notice that the house is weathering rapidly in its eminence; magnificent views both north and south, and exposure to every wind. There ought to be a law requiring folks to live on their land for a calendar year before submitting plans. A law to save us from our follies.

I make my way down the trail through the thistles at the edge. There to be a law requiring us to comfort and anyone else in the world reaching the task, development would follow. So it is. Development follows water.
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HIGHLANDS GALLERY OF SCULPTURE

Highway One at Fern Canyon Road  
CARmel HIGHLANDS  

OUT OF PRINT BOOKS, OLD & RARE BOOKS,  
SEARCH SERVICE, PRINTS,  
LIBRARIES, COLLECTIONS, ESTATES, ETC, PURCHASED.
Welcome to sunny Carmel Valley!
Wilderness Society Proposes National Scenic Area

Continued from Page 1

frequent trespassing, litter, vandalism, overuse and resource deterioration. In addition, the lack of access the public now has to the area and along the coastal mountains has limited enjoyment of the area and resulted in abuse of landowner rights. This is not simply a local problem, and it requires comprehensive management by a single agency concerned primarily with preserving the scenic beauty and the rugged, individualistic lifestyle that now exists in Big Sur.

II. THE BIG SUR NATIONAL SCENIC AREA

We intend to ask the Congress to establish a National Scenic Area along the Big Sur Coast. Though we have several objectives in mind, our primary concern is for protection of the magnificent coastal views along the Big Sur. Yet we want to accomplish this without affecting any residents until and unless they themselves desire to sell their property to the federal government.

The U.S. Forest Service should manage the National Scenic Area, with the advice and assistance of local and state government agencies, including the California Coastal Commission, the California County Superintendents, California Department of Parks and Recreation, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors, and the Big Sur Citizens Advisory Committee to the local coastal program. The Big Sur National Scenic Area Advisory Committee would be established in the bill, and would include individual citizen members, as well as representatives of the organizations listed above.

The choice of the Forest Service as the agency to manage the Big Sur is a logical one. The Los Padres National Forest is already present up and down the Big Sur coastline, and the Forest Service is familiar with the region and the local community. This includes much of the land in the Big Sur region, and the Forest Service is a familiar agency to the people of Big Sur, and vice versa. The Forest Service has a record of being responsive to citizen concerns about management policies that affect the local community. There should not be the level of mistrust between the Forest Service and the Big Sur residents that could develop if an outside agency, such as the National Park Service, were brought in to manage the Scenic Area. Our commitment to the Forest Service to do this job is strong, and our sensitivity to the concerns of local residents is demonstrated by our commitment to the Forest Service.

A. Planning and Management for Big Sur

The Wilderness Society believes strongly in single agency management of the Big Sur National Scenic Area, and we believe that agency should be the U.S. Forest Service. The most effective land preservation efforts in America have been accomplished by single-agency management. We are convinced that management of the Scenic Area by multiple agencies at the federal, state and county level is not a viable solution. Multiple agency management would make it very difficult to carry out a cohesive strategy for protection of Big Sur, and could frustrate the efforts of local citizens to have their views considered before decisions are made. A specific agency with a clear mission and the tools to accomplish its objectives is the most effective way to preserve the scenic view in Big Sur.

We do not advocate that the Forest Service manage all of Big Sur. The existing state parks and wildlife preserves in the region should continue to be managed by the state of California as long as the state wishes to do so. Nor do we envision that the Forest Service would take over the Point Sur Naval Station until the time when the facility is no longer needed for its present purposes.

Under our proposal, the Forest Service would be required to develop a management plan for Big Sur within two years after the legislation becomes law. The plan would be developed after full public hearings, and maximum opportunity for public involvement. The Big Sur Advisory Committee would make recommendations to the Chief of the Forest Service, and he would have to consider these recommendations before approving the final plan.

The management plan would deal with how to best preserve the scenic values and the lifestyles that are now an integral part of Big Sur in a way that is as sensitive as possible to local and landowner interests. The important questions of how to best manage tourist traffic on Highway 1, how to provide for public access to beaches and the inland mountains and forests, how to provide for public education and interpretation about the Scenic Area and the commercial facilities available would all be addressed in the management plan.

A land acquisition plan would be prepared simultaneously with the management plan and full involvement by the public and the Advisory Committee. While the plan is being developed, land could be acquired from willing sellers. We would expect, however, that the bulk of the land acquisition in Big Sur would take place after there is an approved land acquisition plan.

B. Methods of Land Acquisition

Land would be acquired within the Big Sur National Scenic Area on a willing seller basis, with very limited, defined exceptions only. We want to make it very clear that the circumstances under which the federal government would be permitted to condemn property are quite restricted. If a person decides to build on an undeveloped lot, or to put in a new road, or to significantly expand an existing motel, or commercial enterprise, the land they want to develop would be purchased by the Forest Service. In other words, any activity that impairs scenic values or causes significant environmental degradation will be precluded.

We are not trying to prevent homeowners from adding a new bathroom, or a new wing to their house, or to upgrade their driveway. We will work with affected landowners and with the appropriate members and committees of Congress to arrive at satisfactory legislative language that makes it clear what the rights of property owners are. We want to limit the discretion of the Forest Service to impose unnecessary restrictions on landowners who live in Big Sur.

The Forest Service could buy land from anyone within the boundaries of the Scenic Area who wished to sell pursuant to its land acquisition plan. The land could either be bought outright in fee, or easements that restrict future development could be purchased. Generally, we would expect most undeveloped property to be purchased in fee, unless it could be demonstrated that (1) significant savings to the taxpayer would result from the acquisition; (2) the land would be fully protected; and (3) public use would be allowed to the extent it is needed for access or for enjoyment of the Scenic Area. The Forest Service would be limited in the amount of land it could purchase for recreation development such as campgrounds.

We expect that easements would be purchased in most cases for commercial and residential property. This would permit these property owners to continue to live on or use their land as they have in the past, and to build modest additions to existing homes, but future development would be precluded.

Certain cases the Forest Service would buy developed property in fee, though again only from willing sellers. For example, suppose that a residential property is in full view of Coastal Route 1 looking towards the ocean. The Forest Service might well determine that the house significantly detracts from the scenic beauty of the area, and would not buy an easement that would allow the house to remain permanently. This does not mean that the homeowner would be forced off of his land. Rather, the Forest Service would wait until the owner of the property is willing to sell in fee, and then would buy the entire interest.

This land acquisition scheme offers many potential benefits to landowners in Big Sur. It allows the property owner to keep his property, sell it to the Forest Service, or in some cases, sell an easement. Perhaps most importantly, from the landowner's point of view, it provides him with ready market and/or compensation for not being permitted to develop his property. Without this legislation, the landowners in Big Sur are faced with the unpleasant prospect of not being able to develop and not being paid for giving up development rights.

WHY THIS LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

We believe very strongly that it makes little sense to wait until incompatible development has overwhelmed Big Sur before action is taken. There is a strong consensus among just about everyone involved that Big Sur should be kept pretty much as it is today. Therefore, it is wise to act now to achieve permanent protection for this extraordinary part of the American landscape. Whatever policy is to be decided must anticipate crises, and not simply react to them.

During the past decade the beauty of the Big Sur coast has been degraded. Incremental housing development that is incompatible with protection of Big Sur continues to take place, particularly along the northern part of the coast. The only viable and fair way to stop the development and adequately compensate landowners for giving up development opportunities is through an approach similar to the one outlined here.

Fine dining in town...

or in the country...

The Cove Restaurant at Quail Lodge is ideal for a romantic relaxing evening. You'll find an air of comfortable elegance in this uncrowded country setting. Enjoy a high-wattage view, a sparkling lake and the finest of continental cuisine, always freshly prepared. It's easy to reach and parking is absolutely no problem. Dining at The Cove will be one of your most memorable evenings.
How and When Do We Make Choices?

By MICHAEL FISCHER
California Coastal Commission

No one has ever accused the commission of having become a stable, ritualized, humdrum, bureaucratically ossified agency. Controversy, by its nature, constant pressure to respond to changing demands — those phrases are more accurate. Not surprisingly, the future holds more of the same.

I'm writing to you in response to the LCP initiative — the Jarvis Initiative — the one which would halve the state income tax, reducing state revenues by 25-30 percent. Across-the-board cuts were made in all state agencies this July, it would seriously undermine the LCP effort. In fact, it would be impossible to meet the deadlines established under the Coastal Act. As you all know, this is the high pressure year when local and regional offices are going full tilt on LCP completion. And as you also know, both you and your local governments are stretched to the limit; a cut of $2 million from our budget would break those limits.

Therefore, our first option will be to convince the governor and the legislature that significant cuts in our (relatively) small agency — this year — would be extremely shortsighted. We will argue that:

1. For the short run, we'll have to decide our Jarvis II response quite soon. In fact, by the time most of you read this, I will have submitted our budget proposal to the Department of Finance. Please know that our strongest push will be to postpone any budget cutback until after LCP completion. Failing that, we will design a cut-back budget which minimizes the effect upon the commission's staff resources.

2. For the period beginning in July 1981, we have a bit more time, and need not rush into policy choices. But those choices should be made within the next several months, for a number of reasons: For one, we may find that we need legislative changes to deal with the initial workload rush. While urgency measures could address those changes next session, we might wish to work for an introduction of bills this spring. Another reason, of course, is that many of our staff need to make plans for their professional futures. Those plans, for some, might be affected by the answers to the questions and options listed above. I'd like to give the greatest amount of certainty — and early answers — possible. Beyond that, each one of you — commission employees, elected officials, or staff assistance — would be able to freely contribute to our decisions for the future.

3. Before those decisions can be wisely made, we need two things: information on the nature of the cutbacks and projected effort. Second, even after almost all the LCPs are done, there will be a great demand (especially upon staff) to help local governments manage their future. And that means the need for LCPs as local management agencies (with only six regional offices), all of a sudden, we'll have to separate coastal management among many, many more regional offices.

First, it's quite possible that there will be a number of LCPs which will not be completed until six months or so past the July 81 deadline. Without any regional commissions in place, the LCPs which are likely to raise the toughest conflicts and with no regional commissions around, permits will be be made, we can do the jobs that regional offices, and then, we'll have 72 separate coastal zone management agencies. There will be a handful brand new at the job. There will be many questions from local planning staffs and city councils, about the details of how to handle the new, unfamiliar responsibilities.

A final point in our analysis is that the single most important factor: we need to assure our key LCP staff that there's work for them to do after certification of the toughest LCPs, or, quite simply, to work or leave as soon as another professional opportunity is available — probably before those LCPs are done. A vicious circle.

So it is quite likely we will propose retaining an LCP staff of roughly constant size for the better part of a year past the phase-out of the regional commissions. Though as the direct permit load is shifted to local government, that staff size will begin to decrease — say, in the third quarter of 1981.

For the long run, which will begin somewhere around the middle of 1981, (and open, of course, if we make some basic decisions soon, so that, as we begin our transition in response to short- and middle-run challenges, we don't trip over:

We know that the long-run agency will be responsible for:

appeals from local permit decisions
amendments to local coastal plans
monitoring of local governments' performance, with reports to the legislature

energy-related issues, especially offshore oil development and coastal electric power plants

determining the consistency of federal agencies' actions with our coastal program.

There will be other jobs to do, as well. Peter Douglas has identified five different tasks for our agency during the 1980s: regulation; planning; advice; management; and education. Here is his description:

Regulatory functions would include ongoing permit responsibilities — original jurisdiction permit applications, permit appeals and determinations.

Planning functions include ongoing planning associated with LCP completion and amendments, marine and estuarine regulatory permits, and reports on other specific issues such as transportation systems and planning related to managerial functions such as erosion protection and wetland restoration.

Advisory functions include conducting studies and applied research to assist in the implementation of Coastal Act policies (e.g., CCPs and short term plans) and providing technical assistance when requested.

Managerial functions include ongoing disbursement and management of state and federal funds for LCP implementa-
In Response to Ansel Adams

BY MARGE JOHNSON

I have a high regard for Ansel Adams' talent as a photographer and artist. However, I question his talent as a social planner over our lives and property. His plan for making Big Sur a national scenic area would entail a glaring lack of understanding of property rights and the "pursuit of happiness." Does Mr. Adams share with so many of our fellow countrymen today the philosophy that YOUR property is for the good and enjoyment of all the people while MY property is sacrosanct?

Mr. Adams' recent proposal for making Big Sur a national scenic area needs to be exposed to the light of present day realities regarding unnecessary governmental acquisition of additional lands the abuses inflicted on the owners thereof.


One always likes to believe: "But it can't happen here!" Well, the odds are that it will happen here unless the people are alert to what Congress is being urged to do by those in favor of destroying a lifestyle in Big Sur under the name of preservation.

During Mr. Adams' long absence from the area the property owners and residents of Big Sur managed to preserve their heritage. There has been no over-expansion and over-development as in Yosemite National Park where problems confronting the Park Service appear to be almost insurmountable — at least for the visitors.

The professional lobbyist, Mr. Adams referred to in his press release has experienced the threats and dangers created by a too aggressive Federal land acquisition program. Where? In Yosemite National Park itself! Mr. Cushman may be an "outsider" but he has been an insider who does put him on the inside of the impending threat to Big Sur preservation and I feel he is qualified and experienced to speak to the point of violations of the public trust in bureaucratic government.

If the Monterey County residents are the primary beneficiaries of the Big Sur Coast is there a need for Federal encroachment when state, county and landowners have been able to maintain this treasure trove of glorious magnificence? Is there any reason to expect that these three groups will not continue to be effective for the benefit of future generations?

According to information from the California Coastal Commission staff, 88 residences have been built along the Big Sur coast in the past seven years. This could not in any sense of the word be called "overdevelopment!" An area of well over 250 square miles with an average yearly building rate of less than 12 houses. No person, not even Mr. Adams, can guarantee that "The job can be done without displacing a single resident." All evidence points to the exact opposite being the case — and the evidence is not limited to the Buffalo River in Arkansas and Cuyahoga Valley in Ohio are two specific cases among many where people were forced out of the discretion of a federal agency. Can we expect better treatment because we live in Big Sur, an area of even more splendid beauty? Would not just the reverse be true?

The legislation for both Buffalo River and Cuyahoga Valley was "specifically tailored" to meet the needs of these areas. Nonetheless, the law was written in such a way that the agency involved was given choices (not too dissimilar to Senator Cranston's bill to amend HR 3757) including fee title which was the easy way out for the agency. Could we expect preferential treatment? I doubt it.

At present the federal government owns more than one third of the total land mass of the United States. Federal agencies have four billion dollars to acquire more land in the next 11 years. This money provides for land acquisition, but not staffing and maintenance. These would require a permanent expanded budget for the agency involved. Does the government need more land and more problems of staffing and maintenance and a larger budget? Further, do we want a federal agency to tell us who can do what here? Senator Cranston's bill S2233 has those dangers built into it!

The entire Peninsula area would be affected by creating a Big Sur National Scenic Area. Could the effect by anything other than detrimental considering the traffic on Highway 1 alone? This designation as a national scenic area would bring thousands more tourists to this already fragile area.

In response to the 10 points of Mr. Adams' proposed legislation:

Item 1 — Without criticism of the Forest Service it should be noted that they are already overburdened with staff and management problems, with funding a major need to adequately perform their functions.

Item 2 — A "willing seller," as an inhabitant (which we would all become) has only one buyer to make him an offer — certainly not one either at his end or at the other. Not an inhabitant here has yet been made of the government's "declaration of taking" — a World War II emergency measure which allows the government to take title to your land on a 90-day notice — as was done on the Buffalo River project in Arkansas. There are at present over 10,000 cases in the courts over "declarations of taking" by federal agencies! Not very promising to a small landholder in Big Sur.

Item 3 — The law that provides for a "declaration of taking" could override any other legislation if the Department of Forestry decided to have your land.

Item 4 — The homeowners in Big Sur already have the right to live in their home. Why pick on others? Why pick on someone who would anyone give away their rights or allow them to be taken away and then beg to have them returned by further legislation? Our homes are already our property and the Forest Service has no jurisdiction now or ever should have this! This is an example of giving away your neighbor's property to which you have no right, Mr. Adams, nor do you have a right to interfere with our lifestyles.

Item 5 — The use of the word "participate" is certainly a poor substitute for "control" in the plan for a Big Sur scenic area. We now control our own property and we will sacrifice our right of private property for your pleasure, Mr. Adams! Item 6 — "Encourage ranching and other lifestyles in the Big Sur": this paragraph is a comundrum! How can you encourage the continuing of a lifestyle you are trying to change? A senseless proposal!

Item 7 — Overcrowding and degradation in Big Sur has not come from developers, landowners or residents but from government developing areas for public use without funding for adequate staff and maintenance — the 1972 Big Sur fire at Molera is the case in point. Can we expect more from an agency of the federal government with money to acquire more not to maintain?

Item 8 — When we are trying to "continue lifestyles in Big Sur!" a viable transportation system to replace the present unused (to any great extent) bus service is a redundancy, the expense of which could be spared the taxpayers.

Item 9 — The best answer to this suggestion is the specific case of the federal agency that kept getting "fair market appraisals" on a certain piece of land until the price was finally offered — seven different appraisals it took, but the agency did not end up in court.

Item 10 — This question should be settled in the state of California and not by the federal government. Taxes on land are a local problem and not a national one.

Please, Mr. Adams, let your photography and art be your memorial, not the deprivation of the property rights and lifestyles of the people of Big Sur.
Williamson Act Gets Proposition 13 Relief

From California Grange News

Matheson claims state-owned land controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. The law technically gives the state power to arrest BLM officials who "trespass" on public lands. But Matheson says Utah will remain a claimant for the federal land. The law doesn't force the state to do anything to stake its claim. "We don't even have to file suit," he said. "We can just sit back and wait for the courts to decide whether our claim is legal."

Law signed by Gov. Scott Matheson claims state ownership of 22 million acres—42 percent of the state—now controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. The law

Utah to Join "Sagebrush Rebellion"

From the Herald

Utah has become the second state to join the "sagebrush rebellion," claiming most federal land within its borders. A bill signed by Gov. Scott Matheson claims state ownership of 22 million acres—42 percent of the state—now controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. The law has done extensive legal research in preparation for the inevitable court battle. Last fall, Nevada picked up moral support from the National Grange News of California. The bill divests the federal government of public lands and turning over ownership to the respective states. The Utah law, signed Thursday, sets up a state board to plan use for the land, even that provision is dependent upon a court decision that the state can take over the land. State Sen. Ivan Matheson, R-Cedar City, author of the bill, said the state wants a say in how the land is used.

Millions of tons of coal and minerals lie beneath the sagebrush, and Matheson says the state's economic future hangs on whether those resources will be developed.

Big Sur Crossword No. 11

Across
1. Builder's nightmare, one of many. (6)
2. A philosophy you believe in. (3)
3. What I'm getting at is right now. (4)
4. Where to put locks inside a building. (2,5)
5. Place one to sell it. (2)
6. A feebly cheer. (4)
7. What the wolf wants the female to see. (3)
8. When this happens, it's all over. (4)
9. A disguised way of communicating, the way you'd say it if you had it in your head. (4)
10. Fix a treadle. (3)
11. There'll be a lot of these in the ring in 1980. (5)
12. A rather noble fellow. (4)
13. A way to pin down but not on. (6)
14. Under oath, it's perjury. (6)
15. It's finished, and more. (4)
16. Of these in the ring in 1980. (5)
17. A philosophy you believe in. (3)
18. To say something, but even that". (6)
19. Flora growing from a hula dancer. (3)
20. What happened to the number of tourists off season? (7)
21. An ## with many. (6)
22. It's finished, and more. (4)
23. What about John and Mary? (4)

Down
1. Take it in your work. You'll be pleased with yourself. (5)
2. A way to pin down but not on. (6)
3. A rather noble fellow. (4)
4. Under oath, it's perjury. (6)
5. It's finished, and more. (4)
6. To say something, but even that... (6)
7. An ## with many. (6)
8. To say something, but even that... (6)
9. To say something, but even that... (6)
10. To say something, but even that... (6)
11. To say something, but even that... (6)
12. To say something, but even that... (6)
13. To say something, but even that... (6)
14. To say something, but even that... (6)
15. To say something, but even that... (6)
16. To say something, but even that... (6)
17. To say something, but even that... (6)
18. To say something, but even that... (6)
19. To say something, but even that... (6)
20. To say something, but even that... (6)
21. To say something, but even that... (6)
22. To say something, but even that... (6)
23. To say something, but even that... (6)

RIPPLEWOOD RESORT

JUST OPENED!

Featuring:
Country Breakfasts
Delicatessen Sandwiches
Barbequed Ribs and Chicken
Mexican & Daily Specials
Old Fashion Hamburgers
Natural Foods & Ice Cream
Fay's Fabulous Desserts
Beer, Wine, and Munchies
OUTDOOR DINING ON THE LAWN

RIPPLEWOOD RESORT
in the heart of the sunny Big Sur Valley
Cabinas by the River • Camping Supplies
Chevron Gas • Grocery Store
408-667-2242
FOR THE AWARE

By ARABY COLTON

POSTSCRIPT TO PARTINGTON RIDGE

Our Assemblyman, Henry Mello, was dissuaded from introducing a bill calling for the Department of Fish & Game to make every possible effort to capture, unarmed, and relocate, depredating lions. There were those in the wildlife conservation movement who feared such a bill would encourage a moratorium on the hunting of mountain lions, which runs to January, 1983. We did not share this view. However, Assemblyman Mello felt that the difference in opinion in the conservationist ranks was sufficiently strong to justify not introducing the bill at this time.

FINALLY, SOME GOOD SENSE OUT OF INTERIOR ON PREDATOR CONTROL

Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus’ recent decision on the Department’s Animal Damage Control program are good news: no more denting (burning coyote pups alive in their dens, or dragging them out with hooks and beating them to death); no further use of, or research on, compound 1080; aerial shooting to be tightly controlled; traps to be checked frequently, to be used as humanely and selectively as possible; the use of herders to be seriously considered, and encouraged.

To those who know the facts of wildlife predation on domestic stock, this decision of Secretary Andrus is a welcome, if belated step toward sanity. We suggest letters to him, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, approving his action ... also letters to our senators, Senate Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20510, and our representatives, House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515, urging them to express to the secretary their approval. Secretary Andrus will need support, to withstand the anger of the sheep and cattle men who, understandably, prefer free government extinction of predators to paying herders to protect their flocks.

BUT SECRETARY ANDRUS HAS TWO FACES

He has opened up 35,000 square miles of federal land in Alaska to the airborne slaughter of wolves because, he says, he believes “man-agement of non-endangered wildlife on the public lands is a state prerogative.” (!) To regard wolves, extint in almost all of their original range, as “non-endangered,” to treat coyotes as more important to their ecosystem than wolves are to theirs, is errant nonsense; to regard the management of wildlife as a state right in Alaska, but not in Wyoming or Montana, is simply not defensible.

The fact is, as has been documented by numerous expert observers in Alaska, that the Alaska Department of Fish & Game has allowed gross overhunting of moose and caribou, and is now intent on killing off the wolves to try to compensate. As said by Fund for Animals’ Lewis Regenstein, Mr. Andrus’ decision “makes a mockery of the administration’s commitment to protect Alaska and the environment. What good is it to protect pretty scenery, if there are no wild animals?”

MONTE JOSEPH PHELPS
Born July 27, 1918
Died January 30, 1980

(Editor’s note: the following is a tribute to Monte Phelps by his family and friends.)

Big Sur lost one of her brightest smiles last month, taken in a traffic accident at the mouth of the Little Sur. He was named after Cone Peak, that old marble spike up behind his home, and he was as much a part of Big Sur as that mountain. He was all love and laughter, and he left behind a lot of sad friends who feel a need to carry on his work, the job of filling this world with flowers and happy people. His family and friends have submitted this poem in his memory.

He Is Just Away

I cannot say and will not say
That he is dead, he is just away
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
He has wandered into an unknown land
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there
And you-o-you who the wildest years
For the old time step of the glad return
Think of him fuming on, as dear
In the love of there, as the love of here
Think of him still as the same, I say
He is not dead, he is just away.
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World’s Greatest Nation Plagued by Bureaucracy

Capitol News Service

( Editor’s note: The following editorial appeared in the Jan. 24 issue of the “Paso Robles Daily Press.”)

We are going to have a “registration for the draft.” We of the great United States of America who cannot find, judicial reform bill introduced

Capitol News Service

Legislation designed to make the judiciary more accountable to the electorate was recently introduced by Assemblyman Phil Wyman, R-Tehachapi.

Co-authored by Sen. Walter Sierr, D-Bakersfield, and Assemblyman Don Rogers, R-Bakersfield, Assembly Constitutional Amendment 67 would reduce terms for California Supreme and Appellate Court justices from 12 to eight years. ACA 67 would also require state Senate confirmation of all gubernatorial appointments to courts of record — the Supreme Court, courts of appeal, superior courts and municipal courts.

Before the amendment could become law, ACA 67 would have to be approved by the legislature, placed on the ballot and then passed by the state’s voters.

“Over the years, Californians have taken critical looks at the legislative and executive branches and have approved reform measures to streamline their operations and bring them into line with current needs,” Wyman said. “(The judicial system) is the only branch of our state government that has not been updated in its form and application, to the needs of our citizens.”

Carter Plans Federal Coastal Review Program

From the Costeau Society

President Carter has directed the Secretary of Commerce through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to conduct a systematic review of federal programs significantly affecting coastal resources. The purpose of the Federal Coastal Programs Review will be to evaluate:

1) Whether federal funds, program licenses and permits affecting coastal areas are consistent and coordinated,
2) Whether federal actions contribute to wasteful, uneconomic or environmentally unsound development in coastal areas,
3) The effect of federal programs and activities on critical natural systems, unique and scenic recreational areas and erosion-prone or hazardous areas.

Public meetings to receive comments on the review were held on Feb. 28 and 30 in D.C.; Feb. 13 in San Francisco and New Orleans; Feb. 15 in Seattle; and Feb. 19 in Boston and Chicago.

Additional information is available from Dallas Miner, Office of Coastal Zone Management, NOAA, 3300 Whitehaven Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20235. (202) 654-4249.

Ragged Point Community Completes Newest Addition

By KATHRYN FARMER

Ragged Point, one of the few resort complexes along the coast with a cliff-hanger’s view of the ocean, has recently completed the newest addition to its recreational facilities.

Building slowly and with concern for environmental aesthetics, Ragged Point proprietors Wiley P. Ramey and John F. Curtin began plans for building a central core to their operation in 1976. Designed by the architectural firm of James Mac in Morro Bay, the building opened in July, 1979 and houses registration and business offices as well as a small gift shop, four conference rooms and three rental suites.

“We wanted to build something commercial without being crass,” says co-owner Ramey. “We didn’t want anything tacky.”

With the results, expansion and development of the Ragged Point complex has been long range and gradual. Originally purchased from Money Young in 1962, the Ragged Point site consisted solely of a snack bar and a gas station. Partners Ramey and Curtin have since built a 20-unit motel and, more recently, the new central building.

One old-time South Coast resident said, “It's the most beautiful new building on the coast — it fits in just right!”

Future plans include remodeling the snack shop and building living quarters for the staff.

Thank you, people of Big Sur, for shopping with us. We appreciate it.

Pat & Pauline Herman

Farm Center Country Stores, Inc.
Carmel Valley Rd. 624-4737
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Friends’ Valentine’s Day Fund-Raiser Nets $11,000

By PAULA WALLING

"The wonderful thing about tonight is that the room is filled with people who can’t actually afford to be here," said one party-goer. He meant that for the average person in the room, $100 per plate was somewhat steep a price for dinner.

But Friends of the Big Sur Coast felt residents couldn’t afford not to come — not if they wanted to avoid a heavier federal hand in Big Sur. Friends chairman Jim Josoff feels that overdevelopment in Big Sur is impossible today “except by the federal government.” And anyone trying to get a permit to build a single-family dwelling anywhere along the coast would have to agree with him. Restrictions and red tape delay any such attempts, and the annual average of 12.5 permits along the 90-mile stretch of coastline, says Josoff, “hardly constitutes overdevelopment.”

Josoff and the growing organization feel that the present balance of power between local, county, state and federal ownership and control leaves the land in the safest condition. It is to support this position that Friends of the Big Sur Coast held their first fund-raiser on Valentine’s Day and in a single evening topped the $11,000 mark.

Survival Kit

The money, which some say helps constitute a "war chest" and others have called a "survival kit," will be used for a variety of purposes related to making the feelings of the Big Sur community known outside the community — especially to Washington where it seems that the real decisions about Big Sur’s future are being made.

Chuck Cushman, executive director of the National Land Inholders Association, was in Big Sur for this and other recent events. His organization will receive a portion of the money to help represent the Friends in Washington. Cushman himself is an inholder at Wawona in Yosemite and finds after visiting over 100 National Park Service areas that the Park Service has “a very poor track record” in dealing with people living within its own boundaries. In fact, it recently tried to rid itself of all of them “within four years,” which is why Cushman began the two Inholder Associations.

The organization has also found much evidence of abuse within Fish and Wildlife and the Forest Service, but has spent less time studying them.

Cushman had a chance to visit with residents at the party and provide an update on current proposed legislation.

Old-time Spirit

But the party hardly seemed to have the seriousness of a political rally. It seemed instead more like an old-fashioned "potluck revue" with people coming together.

"Hands Me But Don’t Inhold Me."
A Discussion of Private Land Acquisition Policies

By BOBBIE JEFFERS

This review was made at the request of the Honorable Philip Burton, Chairman of the Committee on National Parks and Insular Affairs, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This report discusses private land acquisition policies and practices of the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. It also discusses alternatives to full-fee acquisition of private lands.

The federal government owns over one-third of all U.S. land with authorization to acquire up to $4 billion of private land during the next 11 years. (Current legislation authorizes up to $10 billion through the Land and Water Conservation Fund — $4 billion for federal acquisition and $6 billion for grants to states and local governments for land acquisition and development over the next 11 years.)

The National Park, Forest, and Fish and Wildlife Services had been following a general practice of acquiring as much private land as possible regardless of need, alternative land control methods, and impacts on private landowners.

The General Accounting Office recommends that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Interior:

1. Establish a policy on when land should be purchased or when other protection alternatives, such as easements, zoning, or federal controls, should be used.
2. Critically evaluate the need to purchase additional lands in existing projects.
3. Prepare plans identifying lands needed to achieve project purposes and objectives at any new project before acquiring land.

The GAO believes the Congress should oversee the implementation of these recommendations.

April 29, 1970, the GAO recommended that the Secretary of the Interior:

1. Consider adjusting the boundaries of certain national recreational areas to exclude expensive properties located on or near the boundary lines of the recreational areas.
2. Establish and consistently apply procedures for estimating land acquisition costs.

Impacts of Federal Land Acquisition:

The negative impact most frequently mentioned by local officials was the reduction of local revenues caused by the removal of private property from the tax rolls.

Also, federal ownership prevents developments or uses of land that would result in much higher revenues to local communities.

Local resistance to federal acquisitions:

On the other hand, local interests are much more wary if they perceive that the federal land might impinge regional economic development or might be converted from a full-use to one where locally important activities are prohibited or discouraged.

Many individuals and local officials also object to governmental ownership as a matter of principle and resent the federal intrusion. The feeling, too, is accentuated in areas where the bulk of the land is federally owned.

At Yosemite National Park, Park Service officials said they were trying to acquire 172 acres of privately owned land, most by the town of Wawona, to eliminate a class of "special privilege" persons who have homes inside a national park. According to a survey by the staff of the House Appropriations Committee, nearly all of the landowners are not interested in selling their property.

Practices resulted in purchase of unessential lands:

The objectives of federal projects range from providing recreational facilities for intense public use to preserving scenic vistas or the status quo. In most instances, the Congress does not mandate a specific acquisition method to achieve project objectives. Instead, the agencies are authorized to purchase lands or interests in lands as they see fit.

The agencies have generally chosen to purchase title to as much project land as possible, which results in the acquisition of lands that are not essential to meet project objectives, as illustrated in the following example.

**Comboy Lake National Wildlife Refuge**

We received the refuge in 1968 and our report questioned whether it should have been purchased because it was a relatively poor habitat for waterfowl. Of the 10,000 acres approved for acquisition, only 144 contained water and marshes.

**Voyagers National Park**

We found no justification for acquiring all the lands within this project. The agency could have controlled about 90 percent of the project area by just acquiring the land, or interests therein, owned by one paper company. Also, 65 percent of the area was protected before any acquisitions.

At this project, the Park Service is purchasing 57,000 acres of swampland for about $200 million without any land use or development plan. As of September 1978, the Park Service had purchased 344,000 acres. Also, about 9,000 acres were in condemnation. A land acquisition force of about 140 was hired for this effort.

Again, the Park Service commented that it has followed the intent and mandate of the Congress in acquiring title to all lands in this project. This response is consistent with the plain language of the legislation, which excludes certain properties from acquisition and gives the authority to purchase interests in lands.

**Nicolet National Forest**

This project exemplifies our observation that funding rather than need dictates land purchases in some projects.

The acquired properties were costly because they had extensive improvements which the agency had no need for and tended to destroy or degrade.

**Spruce Knob-Sneva Rocks National Recreation Area**

We contend the need for this area is not demonstrated by the project. This is contrary to the plain language of the legislation, which excludes certain properties from acquisition and gives the authority to purchase interests in lands.

**New Land Protection Strategies and Overall Policies Should Be Developed**

Alternatives are feasible:

Alternatives to full-fee land acquisition are feasible and could have been used at many of the projects we reviewed. Historically, federal land management agencies have rejected out of hand any strategy other than the acquisition of full title to land in the national forest system park and wildlife refuges. Alternatives such as easements, zoning, and federal regulatory controls should be used wherever possible.

**Easements:**

One of the most widely used alternative land control techniques is the easement. Easements vary in nature and purpose but can be defined as limited controls over land owned by somebody else. Most easements "run with the land"; that is, they are binding on succeeding owners.

**Sawtooth National Recreation Area:**

A well-managed project. The Forest Service has effectively combined land use controls and acquisition methods in the area. By extensively employing land use certificates and scenic easements, it has protected lands while minimizing the impact on the owners and the local tax rolls. Titles have been acquired only to prevent nonconforming land uses.

**Zoning:**

Zoning is the most widely applied land use control. Rural zoning has been widely used to preserve open spaces. States have used zoning effectively to preserve natural areas. In New York, for example, the largest park in the country is protected by a comprehensive plan that employs state-local cooperation.

Oregon also has a successful program.

We are not aware of any reports or other documents which address the issue of how much land the government should eventually own in the United States. Land is finite and the more the government acquires for protection, the less there is for other purposes such as energy, community and economic development. The benefits of federal protection and acquisition of land should be weighed against the costs and impacts.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CONGRESS**

We recommend that the Congress during its authorization, oversight, and appropriations process require the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to report on the progress made in implementing our recommendations. This should include an examination of the extent project plans for new and existing projects have been prepared which, as a minimum,

1. Evaluate the need to purchase lands essential to achieving project objectives.
2. Detail alternative ways to preserve and protect lands.
3. Identify the impact on private landowners and others.
4. Congressional oversight in implementation of our recommendations is needed because of the

1. Large sums of money available from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for acquisition of private lands.
2. Practice followed by federal agencies of acquiring as much private land as possible, resulting in unnecessary land purchases and adverse impacts on private landowners.
3. Successful use of alternatives to full-title acquisition to achieve project objectives.

Requests for multiple copies should be sent with checks or money orders to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section
P.O. Box 37124
Washington, D.C. 20013

Make checks payable to the U.S. General Accounting Office.

**GLEN OAKS RESTAURANT**

Highway 1-Big Sur, Ca. 667-2623 (closed tuesdays)
Glen Oaks Restaurant Reopens

By KATHRYN FARMER

BIG SUR — After a heartfelt absence, Glen Oaks Restaurant reopened Feb. 1 to an appreciative Big Sur community. Closed for six weeks due to repairs and remodeling, Glen Oaks was off to a great start upon opening in late October and, according to new owners Forrest and Marilee Childs, it is once again enthusiastically patronized by locals.

"Until one week before we opened," explained Skip, who is actually Forrest in less formal attire, "we had only been able to peer into the windows. The kitchen was an entirely closed mystery. It was highly unusual, but until escrow and closing we weren’t even allowed inside. From then on, it was one week of 16 and 20 hour days and help from who studied with a professional from the community. The response has been great. We opened with the busiest breakfast and closed with the busiest dinner ever on Christmas Eve, by coincidence. We saw locals two and three times in the first week, but we needed the six weeks to remodel the kitchen and replace things like the flooring and the electrical supply.

Although this is the couple’s first restaurant, they explain, “We are great restaurant critics. We would eat out often and see the things we didn’t like. Finally, we decided to do it ourselves, the way we wanted to feed to them, as if someone really cared,” explains Marilee. “We really wanted to have this ‘taking care of’ focus and so we are small and all the food is prepared to order. Nothing is made in advance and everything is as fresh as possible.

“We think of food as an art form and decided it would be

the prime focus. We’d been working on the menu for five years,” said Forrest. Says Marilee, “Skip is really artistic with food. He has a very thorough knowledge of food properties and then he experiments. To me, this is where the creativity comes in. He searches for the perfect pairings, the right balance, and the best way to present the food.”

A painter, silkscreen artist and display artist, Dan Melvin is also dining room manager, and Addie Adams is the bar manager.

Burton’s Modest Bill Snowballs into $70 Million

From the Chronicle

Last year Representative Phillip Burton, D-S.F., introduced a bill to correct the spelling of names of some areas controlled by the National Park Service.

By the time the house passed the bill and sent it to President Carter earlier this week, the measure—with considerable help from Burton, chairman of the House parks subcommittee—had grown into a $70 million bill that created a new national park near Los Angeles and made major additions to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Pt. Reyes National Seashore. The bill also included projects in Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, New York, Oregon, Texas and Ohio.

And a 3,200-mile national historic trail that runs from New England to Minnesota; a Navy memorial foundation in the District of Columbia; a procedure for identifying and protecting historic sites to remember the nation’s presidents, and four new areas on the commission that runs the Santa Monica Mountains national recreation area.

The bill breezed through both the House and the Senate with no debate and no fanfare.

The bill “just grew,” Burton told reporters yesterday. The bill authorizes $30 million to create the Channel Island National Park near Los Angeles, $5 million for acquisitions at Pt. Reyes, $11.5 million for new parks and the bill also included projects in Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, New York, Oregon, Texas and Ohio.

And a 3,200-mile national historic trail that runs from New England to Minnesota; a Navy memorial foundation in the District of Columbia; a procedure for identifying and protecting historic sites to remember the nation’s presidents, and four new areas on the commission that runs the Santa Monica Mountains national recreation area.

The bill breezed through both the House and the Senate with no debate and no fanfare.

The bill “just grew,” Burton told reporters yesterday. The bill authorizes $30 million to create the Channel Island National Park near Los Angeles, $5 million for acquisitions at Pt. Reyes, $11.5 million for new parks and the bill also included projects in Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, New York, Oregon, Texas and Ohio.

Burton was said to have written the provision into the bill in anticipation of the passage of the so-called Jarvis Bill; a ballot proposition that would cut in half the California income tax. He said the bill does not require a donation of the lands, but allows the state to give them to the Park Service if the state can no longer afford to maintain them.

Under the provision, Tomales Bay State Park could become part of Pt. Reyes, as could nearly 300 acres owned by the state Department of Parks and Recreation. Samuel P. Taylor State Park, 457 acres of parks and recreation land and 582 acres controlled by the Wildlife Conservation Board could also become part of the Golden Gate Recreation area under the bill.

Some 300 acres owned by the former Conservancy, 2.6 acres of the Audubon Canyon Ranch, 129 acres controlled by the Inverness Water Co., 130 acres of the Adams property on Fish Harris Ranch and 30 acres on Inverness Ridge, a six-acre wedge between Tomales Bay and the national seashore and undeveloped lots in West Marin between Tomales Bay and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard would also become part of Pt. Reyes, Burton said.

Acquisitions to the Golden Gate recreation area include:

- Acquisitions to the Tomales Bay recreation area include: 271 acres; Waldo Giacomini Ranch, 519 acres; George and Robert Gallagher Ranch, 331 acres, and the Ortinger estate at Lagunitas Lagoon, 320 acres.

- All undeveloped lands west of Highway 1 to Tomales Bay from the boundary of lands owned by the California Wildlife Board through Miller Point Park are to be included in the Golden Gate recreation area, Burton said.

- He said the Giacomini Ranch will remain in the family’s hands for the remainder of Waldo Giacomini’s life and would be managed in a manner consistent with the uses of the recreation area.

Burton said he expects the secretary of interior “will make every effort” to acquire the remaining additions to Pt. Reyes and the Golden Gate area within three years.

Burton said he still plans for more acquisitions for the Golden Gate area, though he would be no more specific than to say, “I’m moving south.”

He said he planned to bring out another omnibus parks bill which he described as “a small thing dealing with wild and scenic rivers, national sites and trails.” He hinted that bill might contain some legislation that would break a stalemate with Nevada and protect Lake Tahoe.

Perhaps the bill will also correct those misspelled National Park Service names. His voice cracking, Burton mentioned in the bill Congress sent President Carter.

VERDE’S UPHOLSTERY

CARMEL VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER

CARMEL VALLEY, CA, 93921
Sal Verde 669-3220

COUNTRYMART

Gifts • Housewares • Toys

Amusing Items
(408) 372-0303
184 Country Club Drive Center • Pacific Grove 93950

JADE CREATIONS:
Clocks • Tables • Sculptures • Wind Chimes • Books • Jewelry • Custom Work

Jade Specimens: Vuliian & Botryoidal Chalcedony • Polished Nuggets to Boulder
BUY
SELL
TRADE

for all Big Sur and Peninsula residents

CLASSIFIED HEADING:

Name: ____________________________
Address: _________________________
City: _____________________________
Zip: _____________________________

Yes, a new service of the Big Sur Gazette ... now you can run FREE classified ads in your local coastal newspaper! It's easy to do, too. Do you have something to sell? Trade? Looking for something specific to purchase? Let everyone know about it in the TRADING POST! No phone ads, please. Mail your copy to The Big Sur Gazette, Highway One, Big Sur, CA 93920. You can use the handy form above.

DEADLINE: 20th of the month preceding issue.

How to Write a Freedom of Information Act Letter:

SAMPLE REQUEST LETTER

Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552. I hereby request access to or a copy of the document containing the information that you were.

If any expenses in excess of $________ are incurred in connection with this request, please inform me of all such charges prior to their being incurred for my approval. If you do not grant my request within 20 working days, I will deem my request denied.

Thank you for your prompt attention in this matter.

Very truly yours,

SAMPLE APPEAL LETTER

(Name and Address of Head of Government Agency)

Re: Freedom of Information Appeal

Dear Secretary,

By letter dated (month day, year), I requested access to (use description as in request letter). By letter dated (month day, year), I was informed of the Office of Public Information's refusal of my request. Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, I hereby appeal that denial. I have enclosed a copy of my request letter and the denial that I have received. If you do not act upon my appeal within 20 working days, I will deem my request denied.

Very truly yours,

For additional information, write to:

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE
P.O. Box 1727
Washington, D.C. 20013
SITUATIONS WANTED
"CANYON," your local band, needs place to practice 3 nights a week, preferably Carmel or North Coast area. Call 625-0142 or 669.

Palo Colorado Canyon Site. $5000! Call Robert Cross 625-0142 or 669.

Firewood
Jim Hunolt 667-2490

Immediate Cash for
GOLD & SILVER
Jewelry • Coins • Sterling • Bullion Placer & Dental Gold • Platinum Scrap

DIAMONDS
Highest Prices Paid for Diamonds of Half-Carat and Larger

FINE GEM JEWELRY
Especially interested in purchasing jewelry, antique or modern, with Ruby, Sapphire, Emerald, or other precious stones. We are active brokers of investment gems and interested in pieces by Faberge, Tiffany, Cartier, etc.

COLLECTIONS & ESTATES
OBJECTS OF ART
Free appraisals Strictly confidential
PHONE 659-3274

I.

2075 evenings. Will pay.

LAND owners: Independent, responsible individual with local references seeks quiet place out of town (with or without services), to park 20' self-contained trailer home in exchange for caretaking of the land and property. 394-4770.

HELP WANTED

HELP WANTED: The Gazette needs a distributor for Rocky Point to Ragged Point. Call 667-2222.


I WANT TO EXCHANGE my 4-bdrm. home in Santa Cruz for home in Big Sur — one-two weeks in summer. Louise, 425-0840.

CASH PAID, Big Sur cat stories, 250 words or less, for publication. Payment on acceptance. Send to Cats, Box 40, Big Sur. Fact not fiction.

AUTOS FOR SALE
'72 VW STATION wagon. Good condition. $1500. 667-2464.

PERSONALS
RETIRED book-seller, writer, widower, dairies middle-age, dainty woman to enliven the day and brighten the night. Settle down wherever my fair lady prefers. Respond frankly & I’ll do no less. Address: Bob Richman, P.O. Box 1024, Pacific Grove, Calif. 93950.

LAND WANTED
WANTED TO BUY: 1.5 acres in the Big Sur area. Please call Jerry at (408) 377-2246. Possible cash deal.

NOTICES
THE BIG SUR GAZETTE will pay $5.00 for any articles pertaining to Big Sur — as long as they are not already on file with the Gazette office.


No. 11 ANSWERS

Down: 1. pride; 2. reduced; 3. ironic; 4. in; 5. scar; 6. medals; 7. 0 sage; 12. snitch; 15. over; 16. ever; 17. were; 19. lie; 20. dot.

THE BIG SUR COAST
Wrapped on two sides by a wide deck, a new, rustic, redwood, shake-roofed home is architect-adapted to its sheltering five-acre hillside site with panoramic view of ocean, coastline and mountains.

The living room of the open plan interior has skylighted beam ceiling, pine plank floors, redwood paneled walls and a fireplace of Rocky Mountain quartzite, also a window wall opening to the deck.

A breakfast bar and panel of quartzite, hand-crafted cabinets and custom lighting are features of the compact kitchen.

Carmel Valley Business Services
Boxed

SECRETARIAL
Professional Service for Business or individuals
• TYPING • IBM CORRECTING SELECTIVE II
• LETTERS, RESUMES, LEGAL, MANUSCRIPTS, CREATIVE, etc.
• XEROGRAPH • $490 & $500
• LEGAL, 2 SIDES, COLLATING, LABELS, COLORED PAPER
• 14X18 COPIES, QUANTITY DISCOUNTS
• TELE • NOTARY PUBLIC
• MAILING/BILLINGS

Oak Bldg. In Carmel Valley Village
P.O. Box 502-659-5161
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

Window Quilt

THIS IS THE YEAR TO INSULATE YOUR WINDOWS... This attractive shade seals windows virtually air-tight and cuts conduction loss by 65% for double glazing (80% for single). Track and batten system eliminates drafts. Aluminized vapor barrier prevents condensation and reflects heat back into room.

FITS ALL WINDOWS—SLIDING DOORS

ALLEN
1219 Forest Ave. • Pacific Grove • 375-4862

Lori Rent & Associates
Real Estate By The Sea
Junipero near Fifth
P.O. Bin 5567, Carmel, CA 93921
PHONE 624-1593 ANYTIME

The bathroom, with sliding glass panels to the deck, is enhanced with quartzite flooring and counterop, redwood paneling and beam ceiling. Similar use of redwood in the paneling and ceilings is found in the two bedrooms. Contributing to comfort are utility room, telephone, electricity and plentiful water supply. Sunsets over the sea, mountains mysterious in moonlight, the soothing silence of sunny afternoons adds to the allurement of this carefully crafted home in harmony with the Big Sur Coast.

3215 000
(Steve Gurney photo)
An invitation to Big Sur residents...

The Valley Hardware Company is two years young, and we’re going to celebrate our Anniversary this month (more on that later). Right now, we’d like to introduce ourselves to you. We want to know how we can serve you best ... products we should carry ... services that we might offer. In other words, we want to be your hardware store.

We’re located in the Mid-Valley Shopping Center in the heart of Carmel Valley. We’re 5,320 square feet of pure hardware (big enough to have what you want). And we’re owner-managed, which means we’re small enough to serve you personally.

We’ll drop by and take your order right on the job. We’ll discuss your problems and suggest a solution. And if we don’t have what you want, we’ll get it for you. Old-fashioned service that you deserve, and we enjoy giving. That’s what Valley Hardware’s all about.

So stop by and get acquainted. Warm up by the stove, and let’s talk hardware. If you’re a tradesman, or a builder, or if you run a business, we invite your account. Our prices are right and, of course, your credit card is always welcome.

Big Sur, we want to be your hardware store!

THE VALLEY HARDWARE COMPANY

DON’T MISS VALLEY HARDWARE’S SECOND ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION!

March 22 & 23
SATURDAY
8:30 to 6:00
SUNDAY 10:00 to 4:00

Win an XR-50 Gas Weedeater!
...or a Kettle Barbeque
FREE GIFTS & REFRESHMENTS FOR EVERYONE

Factory reps for Colony Paints, Poulan Chainsaws, and Weedeater products will be on hand Saturday to answer your questions and demonstrate products.

Ace Hardware — Featuring Colony Paints
Builder’s Hardware • Plumbing & Electrical
Tools • Lawn & Garden • Automotive Supplies
Cut Lumber • Outdoor • Housewares

625-1200 • OPEN SEVEN DAYS

SERVING BIG SUR FROM THE HEART OF CARMEL VALLEY